

EDUC 630
ORGANIZATIONS AND POLICY: CURRENT ISSUES
SPRING 2007 SYLLABUS

TIME AND LOCATION

Wednesdays 10:00AM–12:00PM, 2:00PM–4:00PM
WPH 603

(Note occasionally we will meet at a different time/day/place.)

PROFESSOR

Dominic Brewer
Office: WPH 901D
Office Hours: By Appointment
Campus Phone: 213.821.1953
Email: dominicb@usc.edu

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Lindsey Moss
Email: lindsey.a.moss@usc.edu
Campus Phone: 213.821.5534

COURSE OVERVIEW

This course introduces students to contemporary issues in the study of educational organizations and policy in both K-12 and higher education in the United States. The curriculum provides an overview of policy analysis in education and illustrative research on important educational policy topics with an emphasis on the improvement of urban education. We will focus on empirical research rather than theoretical perspectives.

We will begin with an overview of (i) educational research traditions, (ii) the organization and funding of education research including the linkages between research, policy and practice, and (iii) research design. We will return to these throughout the course.

The remaining classes will focus on policy topic areas covering some of the major issues at the heart of contemporary debates: the role of the government and of markets in allocating educational resources; the bureaucratization of educational systems; the challenges of policy implementation; the social and economic context of education policy; the politics of educational decision making; the role of employees in educational organizations and policymaking; and accountability for performance.

Several key questions will reoccur throughout the class: How are the structure and culture of educational organizations important? How does context matter in educational organizations and in our efforts to change them? What motivates policymakers at various levels? What are the primary approaches to changing educational organizations today? What is the role of accountability in educational policy, and how is it changing how organizations work? Does policy make a

difference in reforming what goes on inside educational institutions? What are the connections between levels of the educational system? Who are the key players outside the educational system that affect what happens inside the system?

We will mainly use K-12 readings but will try to 'compare and contrast' with higher education wherever possible. The group project will make this comparison explicit in two key areas – choice/competition and accountability policy

Students will build skills as emergent scholars of education by learning how to analyze and critique research, learning how to apply research knowledge to practical problems and learning how to make academic conference-style presentations.

TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER MATERIALS

We will mainly utilize journal articles and other readings. In general, we will provide copies of the readings.

There are two recommended texts:

- McEwan, Elaine K. and Patrick J. McEwan (2003). *Making Sense of Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Slavin, Robert E. (2007). *Educational Research: In an Age of Accountability*. New York: Pearson.

Both cover much of the same material – research design – from a non-technical perspective. They are not at the technical level needed for Doctoral students to conduct research, but they are excellent reference books to have as background for understanding research design issues intuitively.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The course requirements consist of: (i) weekly briefs and presentations on class readings: (ii) a group paper and presentation on either accountability or choice/competition and (iii) an open-ended individual paper on any policy topic of your choice.

(i) WEEKLY BRIEFS AND PRESENTATION

To facilitate the learning process, students are expected to read all the readings in advance of each class. Readings will be assigned to each student at the start of the semester. You may 'trade' among yourselves based on interest. *Please remember that even though you will only present on your assigned readings, you are expected to read everything for that week.*

Each student will be required to briefly present on and raise discussion about their assigned reading. Your responsibilities will involve a *10-minute oral presentation* and circulating a *1-2 page brief* (double-spaced; bullet points are encouraged) on the reading to the class. The brief and the presentation must cover the following areas:

- *Brief summary:* Describe the purpose, major arguments, and the methods used and findings, if applicable.
- *Most interesting point:* In your opinion, what are the one or two most interesting points or compelling ideas raised by this reading? Why?
- *Weakness or flaw:* What weakness or flaw did you find in this reading (e.g., what part of the author's argument not compelling? Why?)
- *Relationship to other readings:* How does this reading relate to other readings we read for this week or other weeks? Does it suggest a novel perspective? Contrasting or similar point of view?
- *Discussion questions:* Please suggest questions for class discussion.

The written briefs should be posted on Blackboard by 5pm on the day before class (i.e. on Tuesday evening). This will give everyone a chance *to print out and read all briefs* before class on Wednesday. Note that briefs will not be individually graded.

(ii) GROUP PROJECT AND PRESENTATION

Working *in groups* of 2 or 3 students, you should prepare a short (maximum 10 double-spaced pages) paper and a PowerPoint presentation (20-30 minutes) on *one* of the following question:

Group 1: What can K-12 policymakers learn from the system of choice, competition and regulation in U.S. higher education?

Group 2: What can higher education policymakers learn from U.S. K-12 accountability policy?

Papers and presentation slides should be posted on Blackboard by the start of class on Tuesday February 27. Class discussion will follow the presentations.

This assignment is designed to develop your ability to analyze a given problem in a logical manner, utilize relevant research and draw valid inferences from it, and work together. You will be graded on the extent to which you make a compelling case for your arguments and use the insights from weeks 1-7. You can take any approach to the assignment you wish. For example, you may narrow the focus to a particularly important or interesting aspect of the question, focus on a current specific policy case, or use a broad systems approach.

(iii) INDIVIDUAL PAPER AND PRESENTATION

The third assignment is a 10-15 page (double-spaced) paper on any policy topic of your choice, and a 20-minute PowerPoint presentation based on the paper.

The only requirement is that you focus on a current reform/policy that attempts to improve urban education, and which is related to course material. You should analyze the chosen issue drawing on material we have read in the course and from other sources. You can focus on a policy instrument or decision, at institutional level or higher (state, federal) but it is highly recommended that you focus on a narrowly defined issue (for example, Mayoral control of LAUSD, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the implementation of a particular whole-school reform, etc.). You are encouraged to discuss possible topics with the Professor in advance of starting the assignment.

Papers and presentation slides should be posted on Blackboard by the start of the last class on Wednesday April 25. If you wish to receive feedback on your work you may submit a *draft paper* by April 11. The evaluation of papers will be based on the extent to which the paper is thoughtful, well organized, clearly written, and engages readings and concepts from the course in an appropriate manner.

GRADING

Weekly Reading Briefs and Presentations	30%
Group Paper and Presentation	30%
Individual Paper and Presentation	40%

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-7766.

INCOMPLETES

IN – incomplete (work not completed because of documented illness or some other emergency occurring after the twelfth week of the semester; arrangements for the IN and its removal should be initiated by the student and agreed to by the instructor prior to the final exam); **IX** – lapsed incomplete.

CONDITIONS FOR REMOVING A GRADE OF INCOMPLETE. If an IN is assigned as the student's grade, the instructor will fill out the Incomplete (IN) Completion form which will specify to the student and to the department the work remaining to be done, the procedures for its completion, the grade in the course to date and the weight to be assigned to the work remaining to be done when computing the final grade. A student may remove the IN by completing only the portion of required work not finished as a result of documented illness or emergency occurring after the twelfth week of the semester. Previously graded work may not be repeated for credit. It is not possible to remove an IN by re-registering for the course, even within the designated time.

TIME LIMIT FOR REMOVAL OF AN INCOMPLETE. One calendar year is allowed to remove an IN. Individual academic units may have more stringent policies regarding these time limits. If the IN is not removed within the designated time, the course is considered "lapsed," the grade is changed to an "IX" and it will be calculated into the grade point average as 0 points. Courses offered on a Credit/No Credit basis or taken on a Pass/No Pass basis for which a mark of Incomplete is assigned will be lapsed with a mark of NC or NP and will not be calculated into the grade point average.

EXPECTED SCHEDULE

DATE	WEEK	ASSIGNMENT DUE
January 10	1. Education Research	Reading Brief 1
January 17	2. Research Design	Reading Brief 2
January 24	3. Systems and Policymaking	Reading Brief 3
January 31	4. Organizations and Change	Reading Brief 4
February 7	5. Policy Goals and Tradeoffs	Reading Brief 5
February 14	6. Markets and Government	Reading Brief 6
February 21	7. Accountability	Reading Brief 7
February 27 (Tuesday)	8. <i>GROUP PAPER PRESENTATIONS</i>	Group paper and presentations
March 7	9. Teacher Policy	Reading Brief 8
March 14	<i>SPRING RECESS – NO CLASS</i>	
March 21	10. The Limits of Policy	Reading Brief 9
March 28	11. Policy Design and Implementation	Reading Brief 10
April 4	12. Scalability and Sustainability	Reading Brief 11
April 11	<i>AERA – NO CLASS</i>	Individual paper DRAFT (optional)
April 18	<i>Travel – NO CLASS</i>	
April 25	13. <i>INDIVIDUAL PAPER PRESENTATIONS</i>	Individual paper FINAL draft and presentations

*Reading briefs are due the Tuesday before class by 5pm.
All assignments should be posted on Blackboard.*

WEEK 1 - JANUARY 10
EDUCATION RESEARCH

This introductory class provides an overview of educational research. Topics include the origin and development of education research, the relationship of education to other disciplines, the relationship between research and policy and practice, and the organization and funding of education research. We will briefly consider how the study of *organizations* and *policy* relates to the field as a whole as well as similarities and differences in K-12 and higher education research traditions.

Lagemann, E. (1999). An auspicious moment for education research? In E. Lagemann & L. S. Shulman (eds.), *Issues in Education Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 1-16.

Cohen, D. & Barnes, C.A. (1999). Research and the purposes of education. In E. Lagemann & L. S. Shulman (eds.) *Issues in Education Research*, pp. 17-41.

Shulman, L. (1997). Disciplines of Inquiry in education: a new overview. In R. Jaeger (ed.), *Complementary Methods for Research in Education*, 2nd Edition. Washington DC: American Education Research Association, pp. 3-29.

Mitchell, T.R. & Haro, A. (1999). Poles apart. In E. Lagemann & L. S. Shulman (eds.), pp. 42-62.

Cohen, D. & Garet (1991). Reforming educational policy with applied social research. In D. Anderson and B. Biddle, *Knowledge for Policy: Improving Education through Research*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 123-140.

Hill, P. (1996). Education (how research affects policy and how both affect education). In G. Galster (ed.), *Reality and Research: Social Science and US Urban Policy since 1960*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, pp. 131-155.

McEwan, E.K. & McEwan, P.J. (2003). *Making sense of research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, pp. 18-31.

WEEK 2 - JANUARY 17
RESEARCH DESIGN

This second introductory class builds from week 1 in considering the questions that education researchers are trying to answer and the methodology appropriate to answering them. We will consider the array of research designs utilized in both quantitative and qualitative traditions including when they should be used, common challenges associated with their use, and examples of good and bad execution. The critical importance of good research design will be emphasized. We will consider research in two areas, class size reduction, and charter school effectiveness, as we discuss research methods. The framework from this class will be applied repeatedly throughout the remainder of the course.

Angrist, J. (2004). American education research changes tack. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 20 (2), pp. 198-212. (Note you can ignore the technical material.)

Ehrenberg, R.G., Brewer, D.J., Gamoran, A., & Willms, D. (2001, Fall). Class size and student achievement. *Psychology in the Public Interest*.

Betts, J., & Hill, P. (2006), *Key issues in studying charter schools and achievement: A review and suggestions for national guidelines*. Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project Charter School Achievement Consensus Panel.

Experimental methods: Slavin ch. 2 (also McEwan and McEwan ch. 3)

Quasi-experimental methods: Slavin ch. 3, ch. 5 (also McEwan and McEwan ch. 4)

Qualitative methods: Slavin ch. 7, ch. 8 (also McEwan and McEwan ch. 5)

WEEK 3 – JANUARY 24

SYSTEMS AND POLICYMAKING

This class begins our discussion of the systems of K-12 and higher education in the U.S. We will attempt to lay out the major organizational building blocks, how they developed and why and how they relate to each other. We will discuss who (i.e. what institutions are involved), what (i.e. the functions these institutions are attempting to carry out) and how (i.e. the instruments used) of educational governance. We will deliberately consider different perspectives from history, sociology, economics and political science. Finally, we will discuss the role of what is sometimes termed “systems analysis” as an analytic tool.

Kirst, M., & Wirt, F. (2005) *The political dynamics of American education*, 3rd edition. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing, pp. 29-62.

Levitt, S. D., & Dubner, S.J. (2005). *Freakonomics: A rogue economist explores the hidden side of everything*. New York: Harper Collins, pp. 3-24.

Hess, F. (2004). *Common sense school reform*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 1-36.

Kingdon, J.W. (1993). Politicians, self-interest, and ideas. In G.E. Marcus & R.L. Hanson (eds.) *Reconsidering the Democratic Public*. Penn State University Press, pp. 73-89.

Portz, J. (1996). Problem definition and policy agendas: Shaping the educational agenda in Boston. *Policy Studies Journal*. 24(3): pp. 371-386.

McDonnell, L. & R. Elmore (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2): pp. 133-152.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering towards utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 12-59.

Chubb, J.E., & Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings, ch. 1-2.

Brewer, D.J., Gates, S.M., & Goldman, C.A. (2002). *In pursuit of prestige*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, pp. 1-24.

WEEK 4 – JANUARY 31

ORGANIZATIONS AND CHANGE

This class moves us from the system level to the individual institutions that deliver educational services – i.e. schools, colleges and universities. We will consider the relationship of these institutions with each other and with the rest of the system, including the issue of how centralized or decentralized policymaking should be, and the tendency of systems to bureaucratize as a way to handle differential organizational capacity. We will discuss the challenge of achieving change at the institutional level.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering towards utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 60-84.

Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-27.

Rowan, B., & Miskel, C.B. (1999). Institutional theory and the study of educational organizations. In J. Murphy, & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 359-384.

Bolman, L., & Deal T. (2003) *Reframing organizations: Artistry and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 20-67.

Mills, A.J., & Simmons, T. (1995). Understanding bureaucracies: The age of organizational giants. In *Reading Organization Theory: A Critical Approach*. Toronto: Garamond Press, pp. 35-57.

Honig, M. (2003). Building policy from practice: District central office administrators' roles and capacity for implementing collaborative education policy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), pp. 292-338.

Kezar, A. & Eckel, P. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principle or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), pp. 435-460.

Neumann, A. (1995). Context, cognition, and culture: A case analysis of collegiate leadership and cultural change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32 (2).

WEEK 5 – FEBRUARY 7

POLICY GOALS AND TRADEOFFS

Inherent in any choice is a tradeoff between alternatives. In educational policymaking this typically involves some interplay between what might be called "efficiency", "liberty" and "equity". In this class, we "step back" and consider these goals, how they conflict, and how educational policymaking resolves these conflicts.

- McDonnell, L.M. & Weatherford, S. (2000). Seeking a new politics of education. In L.M. McDonnell, P.M. Timpane, & R. Benjamin (eds.) *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, pp. 174-206.
- Cremin, L.A. (1989). *Popular education and its discontents*. New York: Harper and Row, pp. 85-103.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, ch. 1 – 3.
- Wolfe, B. & Zuvekas, S. (1997). Nonmarket outcomes of schooling. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27(6): pp. 491-501.
- McDonnell, L.M. (1995). Opportunity to learn as a research concept and a policy instrument. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 17(3): pp. 305-322.
- Boyd, W.L. & Hartman, W.T. (1998). The politics of educational productivity. In D.H. Monk & J. Underwood (ed.), *Microlevel School Finance*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Hanushek, E. (1997). Assessing the effects of school resources on student performance: An update. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 19:2, pp. 141-164.
- Greenwald, R., Hedges, L.V., & Laine, R.D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3): pp. 361-396.
- Coleman, J. & Mortimer, J. (1994). Interchange. In A.C. Petersen & J. Mortimer (eds.), *Youth Unemployment and Society*. Cambridge: University Press, pp. 34-76.

WEEK 6 – FEBRUARY 14

MARKETS AND GOVERNMENT

At the heart of many debates over educational policy is the appropriate role of the government and of markets in allocating educational resources. What does it mean to rely on market or government mechanism and what are the effects? We will consider the rationale for each approach, and the ways in which the roles are carried out – through operation, financing and regulation. We will discuss the empirical evidence on the outcomes of each in light of the goals we discussed in week 5, and in light of the systems and organizational perspectives we covered in weeks 3 and 4. Current policy debates over charter schools and vouchers will be used to help frame the issues.

- Friedman, M. (1962). The role of government in education. In M. Friedman (ed.) *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 85-107.
- Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 1-43.
- Hess, Frederick (2004). *Common sense school reform*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 69-99.

Witte, J.F. (1990). Choice and control: An analytical overview. In W. S. Clune & J. F. Witte (eds.) *Choice and Control in American Education*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press, pp. 11-46.

Gill, B., Timpane, M., Ross, K., and Brewer, D.J. (2001). *Rhetoric versus reality: What we know and what we need to know about vouchers and charter schools*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. RAND MR 1118, pp. 1-68.

Goldhaber, D. D., & Eide, E.R. (2002). What do we know (and need to know) about the impact of school choice reforms on disadvantaged students? *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(2): pp. 157-176.

Holme, J. J. (2002). Buying homes, buying schools: School choice and the social construction of school quality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(2), pp. 177-205.

Lubienski, C. (2003). Innovation in education markets: Theory and evidence on the impact of competition and choice in charter schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(2), pp. 395-443.

WEEK 7 – FEBRUARY 21

ACCOUNTABILITY

The role of government has changed dramatically in the U.S. K-12 sector in the past decade with a move away from input- and process-based regulation to an emphasis on “standards” and student achievement outcomes. The framework for regulation has been “accountability.” In fact, accountability comes in many different flavors. The class considers the basis for test-based accountability, how it has been designed and implemented at the federal and state levels, and its consequences.

Hess, F. (2004). *Common sense school reform*. New York: Palgrave McMillan, pp. 32-67.

Stecher, B. & Kirby, S. (2004). *Organizational improvement and accountability: Lessons from other sectors*. Santa Monica: RAND, pp. 1-9, 117-124.

Hentschke, G. and P. Wohlstetter (2004). Cracking the code of accountability. *USC Urban Ed Magazine*.

Fuller, E J. & Johnson Jr., J.F. (2001). Can state accountability systems drive improvements in school performance for children of color and children from low-income homes? *Education and Urban Society*, 33(3), pp. 260-283.

Fuhrman, S.H. & Elmore, R.F. (Ed). *Redesigning accountability systems for education*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 245-290.

Meier, D. (2000). *Educating a democracy: Will standards save public education?* Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 3-31.

O'Day, J. (2002). Complexity, accountability, and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), pp. 293-329.

Carnevale A., & Desrochers, D. (2004, May). *Standards for What? The Economic Roots of K-12 Reform*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

WEEK 8 TUESDAY – FEBRUARY 27
GROUP PRESENTATIONS

WEEK 9 – MARCH 7
TEACHER POLICY

A critical group affecting educational policymaking and the performance and operation of educational organizations are the employees that work in them. This class considers some recent policy debates over K-12 teachers.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). *What matters most*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Goldhaber, D.D. & Brewer, D.J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22: pp. 129-145.

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B., & Thoreson, A. (2001). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(1): pp. 57-77.

Goldhaber, D.D. & Brewer, D.J. (2001). Evaluating the evidence on teacher certification: A rejoinder. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(1): pp. 79-86.

Walsh, K. (2001), *Teacher certification reconsidered: Stumbling for quality*. Baltimore, MD: The Abell Foundation.

Podgursky, M. (2001). Regulation versus markets. In M.C. Wang & H.J. Walbert (eds.), *Tomorrow's Teachers*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan, pp. 117-148.

Hassel, B.C. (2002). Better pay for better teaching: Making teacher compensation pay off in the age of accountability. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.

Hess, F. (2004). *Common sense school reform*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 101-132.

WEEK 10 – MARCH 21
THE LIMITS OF POLICY

In the remaining three classes, we consider some of the major challenges to the accomplishing educational reform through policy mechanisms. In this class we discuss the importance of the social and economic context of education policy. We will focus on urban education reform as a case study.

- Rothstein, R. (2004). *Class and schools*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, pp. 1-59.
- Karoly, L. (2001). Investing in the future: Reducing poverty through human capital investments. In S.H. Danziger and R.H. Haveman (eds.), *Understanding Poverty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 314-356.
- Iceland, J. (2003). *Poverty in America*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, pp. 70-97.
- Hess, F. (1999). *Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform*. Washington DC: Brookings, pp. 1-58, 89-123.
- Anyon, J. (1997), *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform*. New York: Teachers College, pp. 3-38, 151-186.
- Henig, J. & Rich, W. (2004). *Mayors in the middle: Politics, race and mayoral control of urban schools*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 3-24, 249-266.

WEEK 11 – MARCH 28
POLICY DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

- Honig, M. (2006). Complexity and policy implementation. In, M. Honig (ed), *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation*. Albany, NY: SUNY, pp. 1-23.
- Palumbo, D.J. & Calista, D.J. (1990). Opening up the black box: Implementation and the policy process. In D.J. Palumbo & D.J. Calista (eds.), *Implementation and the Policy Process*. New York: Greenwood Press, pp. 3-17.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1990). The RAND change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9): 11-16.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (2006). Implementation Research in Education. In M. Honig (ed.), *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation*. Albany, NY: SUNY, Ch. 11.
- Smith, M. & O'Day, J. (1991). Systemic school reform. In S. Fuhrman & B. Malen (eds). *The Politics of Curriculum and Testing*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press, pp. 233-267.
- Malen, B. (2006), Revisiting policy implementation as a political phenomenon. In M. Honig (ed), *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation*. Albany, NY: SUNY, pp. 83-104.
- Ritter, G.W. & Boruch, R.F. (1999). The political and institutional origins of a randomized controlled trial on elementary school class size: Tennessee's project STAR. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21:2 pp. 111-125.
- Brewer, D.J., Krop, C., Gill, B.P., and Reichardt, R. (1999). Estimating the cost of national class size reductions under different policy alternatives. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(2), pp. 179-192.

WEEK 12 – APRIL 4
SCALABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

Chelimsky, E. (1987) What have we learn about the politics of program evaluation? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 9(3), pp. 199-213.

Glennan, Thomas K. et al (2004). Expanding the Reach of Education Reforms. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, pp. 1-39.

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), pp. 387-431.

Cuban, L. (1992). What happens to reforms that last? The case of the junior high school, *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 227-51.

Datnow, A. (2002). Can we transplant educational reform and does it last? *Journal of Educational Change*, 3(3), pp. 215-239.

Elmore, Richard (2005), *School Reform from the Inside Out*, Cambridge MA: Harvard Education Press, pp. 7-39.