

CQ PRESS

GUIDE TO

URBAN POLITICS AND POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES

Edited by

CHRISTINE KELLEHER PALUS

Villanova University

RICHARDSON DILWORTH

Drexel University

2016

SAGE was founded in 1965 by Sara Miller McCune to support the dissemination of usable knowledge by publishing innovative and high-quality research and teaching content. Today, we publish over 900 journals, including those of more than 400 learned societies, more than 800 new books per year, and a growing range of library products including archives, data, case studies, reports, and video. SAGE remains majority-owned by our founder, and after Sara's lifetime will become owned by a charitable trust that secures our continued independence.

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi | Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

 SAGE reference



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

Urban Schools and School District Governance

by Paul Manna and Elizabeth Pelletier

13. Police Foundation, *Newark Foot Patrol Experiment* (Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1981), 43–68.
14. James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling, "Broken Windows," *The Atlantic Monthly* 3 (March, 1982), 29–38.
15. Skogan, *Disorder and Decline*, 187–193.
16. Herman Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1990), 32–49.
17. Varied examples can be found in the following works: Michael K. Brown, *Police Discretion and the Dilemmas of Reform* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1981); David L. Carter, "Measuring Quality: The Scope of Community Policing," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. Larry T. Hoover (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1996); Robert R. Friedmann, *Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992); Lorraine Green, *Policing Places with Drug Problems* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996); Larry T. Hoover (ed.), *Quantifying Quality in Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1996); Jack J. Kuykendall and Peter C. Unsinger, *Community Police Administration* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1975); Kenneth J. Peak and Ronald W. Glensor, *Community Policing and Problem Solving: Strategies and Practices* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996); Albert J. Reiss, Jr., *The Police and the Public* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971); Darrel W. Stephens, "Community Problem-Oriented Policing: Measuring Impacts," in *Quantifying Quality in Policing*, ed. Larry T. Hoover (Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1996); David Weisburd and Craig Uchida, eds., *Police Innovation and Control of the Police: Problems of Law, Order and Community* (New York: Springer Verlag, 1993).
18. David H. Bayley, "Community Policing: A Report From the Devil's Advocate," in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, ed. J. R. Greene and S. D. Mastrofski (New York: Praeger 1988), 226.
19. Wesley G. Skogan and Susan M. Hartnett, *Community Policing, Chicago Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 5–9.
20. Stephen D. Mastrofski, "Community Policing as Reform: A Cautionary Tale," in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, ed. J. R. Greene and S. D. Mastrofski (New York: Praeger, 1988), 47–67.
21. For further evidence, see John E. Eck and Dennis P. Rosenbaum, "The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity, and Efficiency in Community Policing," in *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*, ed. Dennis P. Rosenbaum (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994), 3–26; Kuotsai Tom Liou and Eugene G. Savage, "Citizen Perception of Community Policing Impact," *Public Administration Quarterly* 20:2 (1996), 163–179; Skogan and Hartnett, *Community Policing, Chicago Style*; Jihong Zhao and Quint C. Thurman, "Community Policing: Where Are We Now," *Crime and Delinquency* 43:3 (1997), 345–357.
22. Wesley G. Skogan, et al., *CAPS at Ten: Community Policing in Chicago* (Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, 2004), 153–155.
23. William J. Bratton, *Turnaround: How America's Top Cop Reversed the Crime Epidemic* with Peter Knobler (New York: Random House, 1998), 227–242.
24. Jack Maple, *The Crime Fighter* with Chris Mitchell (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 33.
25. U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, *Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department* (Washington, DC: Department of Justice).

FURTHER READINGS

- Angell, J. E. "Toward an Alternative to the Classic Police Organizational Arrangements: A Democratic Model," *Criminology* (August/November 1971): 185–206.
- Bayley, David H. *Police for the Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Fogelson, Robert M. *Big-City Police*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Friedmann, Robert R. *Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Germann, A. C. "Community Policing: An Assessment." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* 60 (1969): 89–96.
- Goldstein, Herman. *Policing a Free Society*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company 1977.
- Hoover, Larry T., ed. *Quantifying Quality in Policing*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1996.
- Kelling, George L., and Catherine M. Coles. *Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Communities*. New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- , et al. *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Summary Report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1974.
- Mastrofski, Stephen D. "Community Policing as Reform: A Cautionary Tale." In *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, edited by J. R. Greene and S. D. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger, 1988, 47–67.
- Moore, Mark H., and Darrel W. Stephens. *Beyond Command and Control: The Strategic Management of Police Departments*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1991.
- Muir, William. *Police: Streetcorner Politicians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Peak, Kenneth J., and Ronald W. Glensor. *Community Policing and Problem Solving: Strategies and Practices*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996.
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr. *The Police and the Public*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Skogan, Wesley G. *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press, 1990.
- and Susan M. Hartnett. *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Skolnick, Jerome H., and David H. Bayley. *Community Policing: Issues and Practices Around the World*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1988.
- United States. *President's Commission Report on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: The Challenge of Crime in Free Society*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Walker, Samuel. *The Police in America: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1999.
- Wilson, James Q. *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- and George L. Kelling, "Broken Windows," *The Atlantic Monthly* 1982, 29–36, 38.
- Wilson, O. W. *Police Planning*, 3rd ed. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1958.

URBAN COMMUNITIES FACE NUMEROUS challenges as they attempt to meet their residents' needs. Historically and to the present day, educating the children who attend urban schools has been one of the most persistent. City school systems serve highly diverse populations—racially, ethnically, linguistically, and socioeconomically—that can challenge even the most dedicated and talented educators. Furthermore, politicians and parents frequently turn to urban schools to remedy a long list of social and economic problems, even those that may be indirectly related to education and persist due to the failings or low capacity of other societal institutions. Given the sweeping nature of the issues confronting urban school systems, the case of urban education not only reveals the struggles and accomplishments of cities themselves but also helps to illustrate broader trends in American politics and public policy.

In this chapter, we provide an overview of urban education and discuss opportunities for future research. Throughout the discussion, we focus on two key issues. One is the degree to which political and social forces have shaped educational outcomes for urban students. The other is the dynamic nature of the institutions that govern and implement education policy in urban settings. In all, we note that urban communities have struggled to provide excellent educational experiences because their institutional environments have been so complex and contested, the needs of their students have been so great, and the difficulties urban school systems face have tended to overwhelm the capabilities of these systems and other supporting institutions.

OVERVIEW OF URBAN EDUCATION

Urban education has been a popular area of study for scholars across the social sciences. Many researchers have focused on the political and social contexts that influence urban schools, including the role of race, competing political interests, and the neighborhoods where schools are located. Others have investigated the institutional arrangements that

govern and implement policy, including studies of traditional school systems and boards and more recent work on newer forms of governance. In this first major section of the chapter, we describe key concepts that have animated this work, and we summarize major findings in the literature.

Political and Social Dynamics

As other chapters in this volume document in much detail, the nation's urban centers have experienced tumultuous political and social changes over the past century. Large populations migrated from country to city. Legal segregation and other forms of codified discrimination were dismantled, yet their lingering effects remain. Whites and more affluent residents moved out of urban centers during the 1960s and 1970s and have been returning in recent years. Economic changes have left numerous urban areas, or pockets within them, without job opportunities to support a vibrant middle class. Urban areas have seen a persistent and increasing influx of immigrant populations from around the world. All these changes, among others, have created complex political and social environments in which schools must operate. Frequently, education has been called a "ticket out of poverty" or "the civil rights issue of this century." Intense debates persist about whether urban school systems and urban communities more generally have the capacity required to serve their students well.

Scholars of urban education have argued that understanding race is crucial for grasping the trajectory of school reform efforts in cities.¹ Data on student outcomes consistently show that African American and Hispanic students lag behind their white peers on all measures of educational success.² Although urban school systems tend to spend relatively high amounts of money per pupil, nevertheless, students who are racial minorities tend to have less expert teachers and must learn in antiquated buildings or with uninspiring curricular materials.

Urban education activists were optimistic during the 1960s and 1970s that the rise of minority leadership in urban settings would help combat the inequities urban

schoolchildren suffered. The view was that when school boards, city councils, and mayors' offices were led by people who resembled the children attending urban schools, those children would have their interests better represented, and urban systems would improve. The notion that "passive representation" would translate into "active representation" motivated this thinking.³ Research on race and education has shown, however, that improving urban school systems, especially in the nation's largest urban centers, requires much more than minority leadership. Particularly in cities where a majority of local governing officials are black, tensions can emerge in interactions between local black elites and external political and economic elites, who often are white.⁴ A strategy of simply forming a coalition of black leaders is not enough. The group context must also be taken into account for reform efforts to have a chance to succeed. Deep histories of racism and conflict can complicate these efforts.⁵

Research on urban education and race reveals the larger reality that assembling and holding together a strong coalition to support urban school improvement presents a formidable challenge. Two concepts guiding much of this research, "social capital" and "civic capacity," help show how immense urban needs, institutional fragmentation, multiple competing interests, and a constantly changing set of education reform measures all can intersect to undermine potential progress and improvement.⁶ The variable of race touches on all these issues and makes it even more difficult for policy elites to develop and maintain cooperative relationships. Although formal institutionalized coalitions can help ensure that strong reform movements persist, the complications just discussed make it difficult to reach agreements that are likely to endure given the frequent leadership and policy churn that affects urban school systems.⁷ Urban districts appear to be caught in a dilemma, fostered by the politics of pluralism in the United States: cooperation among competing interests is required for success, but doing so can take much time and eventually come undone as interested parties become impatient with the slow pace of progress. Unfortunately, these dynamics often undermine the experiences of urban schoolchildren.

In addition to considering the institutional, political, and social variables relevant to urban education, it is also crucial to view education in cities in terms of the broader urban context. Some question whether urban education reform is destined to disappoint given the influence of contextual factors, aside from schools, on child development. Children grow up in complex environments, and scholars have emphasized the importance of viewing child development in the context of the broader neighborhood.⁸ For example, children in urban centers may live in close proximity to high levels of violent crime and perhaps also reside in a "food desert" with limited access to grocery stores with

healthy food. Further, national and international economic changes have deepened the needs urban communities face and deepened inequality within and across urban and suburban settings.⁹ Given the need to account for context, there is an intense debate about the power of schools to overcome larger problems that emerge in high-poverty, high-need areas with fast-moving and diverse populations.

Institutional Dynamics

Many of the existing institutions of urban education in the United States had their roots in the Progressive Era. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Progressive reformers worked to centralize and regularize the operations of big city districts. These efforts tended to embrace three main assumptions: urban schooling should be insulated from partisan politics; centralization would enhance efficiency of school operations; and a science of administration could be developed for schools that would enable them to effectively carry out the policies nonpartisan governing boards and bureaucratic experts had developed. In so doing, urban school leaders searched for the "one best system," working to consolidate, standardize, bureaucratize, and professionalize diverse schools and school systems.¹⁰ While some viewed these reforms as a way to spread equality of educational opportunity to diverse populations, others suggested these uniform systems worked to the disadvantage of the diverse groups they were supposed to serve. School boards were crafted in this era as part of an effort to minimize political influence in the education system, isolating schools from the corruption and chaos of urban political machines. Now some worry that the pendulum has swung too far and that efforts to eliminate politics from school governance "have also removed coherence, energy, and accountability."¹¹

During the last three decades, several changes have disrupted the traditional model of neighborhood schools run by a centralized school district, and many of the most dramatic changes have occurred in urban areas. Some changes have been adaptations on the Progressive model, as with elaborate rating systems, designed by state policymakers, to judge the performance of schools, principals, and teachers, putting a modern spin on the technocratic reform strategies of the early 1900s.¹² Others have attempted to return more control to local school buildings themselves, such as Chicago's embrace of school-level governing boards that gave local neighborhoods more power over operational decisions of the district's schools.¹³ Many contemporary approaches, in contrast to past attempts at standardization, focus on student outcomes rather than simply bureaucratic outputs. Still, much debate exists over whether the measurement systems under consideration and presently in use are effective or support the daily work of teachers and principals on the ground. Such systems are now in the early stages of

implementation, so much of the evidence on their performance remains forthcoming.

The expansion of school choice is another factor that has disrupted the traditional model of neighborhood schools run by centralized public school districts. School choice has changed the mechanisms by which children are assigned to schools, as well as altering the organizations and institutions that run them.¹⁴ Various forms of school choice have provided parents with opportunities to choose the schools their children attend and, in some cases, allowed schools themselves to operate free from oversight or intrusion of local school authorities. In urban settings, these arrangements can include choices within the traditional system, such as highly selective public schools or magnet schools focused on a theme. They also include public charter schools, which, although independent, sometimes share space in the same buildings with traditional urban schools, an arrangement known as "colocation." The most dramatic break with past practice has been voucher programs that allow parents to use public funds to pay for private school tuition, including tuition at private religious schools.

A vigorous debate continues among education researchers, policymakers, advocates, and other interested parties about the effects of school choice on student outcomes. The empirical findings on the topic have been mixed, and it is difficult to make overarching claims about the effectiveness of these policies because choice policies and schools vary greatly between and within cities. The effects of school choice often depend on the political and institutional context in a given city.¹⁵ Some studies have found that school choice policies boost student achievement, but those gains can vary by student group, grade, or subject, and generally speaking, the findings in this area are not unanimous.¹⁶ Some worry about the unintended consequences of school choice, such as increased segregation of students by socioeconomic status, race, and parental motivation. Furthermore, while choice policies are often viewed in stark contrast to traditional methods of school assignment by neighborhood residence, it is important to remember that school choice already exists for children whose families have the ability to afford housing in communities or neighborhoods with strong schools.¹⁷

Other institutional changes in urban school districts have simultaneously embraced parts of Progressive thinking while departing from others. Facing concerns that traditional school districts lack coherence and strong leadership, some cities, with state legislative support, have given their mayors power over various aspects of schooling. The granting of mayoral control has often neutered the power of traditional school boards and led to the empowerment of aggressive and sometimes controversial school chancellors. Iconic cases in recent years include New York City, where the mayor gained the authority to appoint the chancellor in

2002, and the District of Columbia, where mayoral control was granted in 2007. Mayoral control is in line with the Progressive idea that greater centralization is likely to enhance efficiency and promote performance. However, in connecting schools more directly to the fates of city politicians (who sometimes run for office under partisan labels), it departs from the notion that schools should be above politics.

While the concept of mayoral control is often debated as one single reform, the success of mayoral control depends on the historical, geographic, and political context. Political conditions, personal qualities of the mayor, and existing educational governance structures in the city at the time, as well as other factors, all help shape the outcomes of a mayor's reform efforts.¹⁸ The specific governance arrangements underlying mayoral control vary significantly across cities, and in no case do mayors actually have complete control over education. The empirical evidence about the effectiveness of mayoral control is mixed at best. There is some evidence that mayoral control is associated with higher student achievement, streamlined management, and more spending for education.¹⁹ However, despite the potential of mayoral control to jump-start reform efforts in cities where the status quo is deeply entrenched, it is not a one-size-fits-all solution. The effectiveness of increased mayoral control depends heavily on political context and the specific conditions in the city in question.²⁰

In studying the ebb and flow of urban education governance, it is important to recognize that the recent changes discussed in this section are occurring within a broader context of larger changes across the nation. In general, education governance is becoming absorbed by more general all-purpose government institutions rather than remaining siloed in separate governance structures.²¹ Urban school boards and state education boards and agencies still exist, yet their ability to operate independently has been eroded. More overtly political actors and institutions, including governors and state legislators as well as mayors themselves, have attempted to wrest control of urban systems from these more traditional institutions. Numerous factors have driven these changes, and a lively debate continues about their root causes. To justify increasing political involvement in education, some point to disappointing academic achievement, mismanagement, and financial troubles. Others suggest, in more conspiratorial tones, that urban schools and public schools more generally are being set up to fail so forces outside of the traditional players, including school choice providers and testing companies, can benefit.

FUTURE RESEARCH ON URBAN EDUCATION

Researchers interested in exploring urban education have no shortage of topics they might engage. Future studies have the potential to make valuable theoretical and empirical

contributions to scholarly discussions of this topic and to more general debates in numerous social science fields. The diverse institutional arrangements that govern urban schools and execute policy provide much variation to study, as do the diverse social and political contexts that characterize urban settings.

Studies of urban education have the potential to make broader, more practical contributions as well. Insights from such work can generate ideas to help urban policymakers and school officials improve their own practices and create better learning opportunities for children. Further, they can inform broader state and national debates about how to improve the nation's schools given that so many proposals for policy change in education focus on or are inspired by efforts to improve schooling in urban settings. This second part of the chapter lays out some promising future paths for aspiring researchers of urban education.

Case Selection

Identifying the universe of cases for a scholarly study is one of the most important decisions a researcher can make.²² The best researchers always develop a careful strategy for selecting cases while also considering the degree to which case selection influences the generalizability of a study's findings. This is true whether a study focuses on a small collection of cases to discuss in depth or uses quantitative methods covering many cases. Researchers of urban education should remember that elected officials, news reporters, and activists do not always select their favorite examples with that degree of care.

In carefully contemplating their cases for study, scholars of urban education can not only make important contributions to the academic literature but also inform popular discussions about education policy and reform. It is important for researchers to remind public officials and activists that there is much more to urban schooling than simply the experiences of the nation's largest urban centers or those cities with the most charismatic leaders. Popular discussions in the national media or among politicians or commentators, for example, frequently gravitate to leaders and policies in cities such as New York, Chicago, Miami, Los Angeles, and the District of Columbia. While there are good reasons to study these cities, one should not assume their experiences are necessarily representative of those in other urban systems across the nation. While some parallels undoubtedly exist, choosing a particular policy agenda for urban schools based on the experiences of a single or even a small number of cases can be dangerous when their experiences do not necessarily generalize to urban or other settings across the country.

One approach for future research, then, would be to expand the range of urban education cases that typically have received attention in academic studies, from public officials, and in the media. It likely would come as a surprise

to many readers, for example, to learn that in the 2011–12 school year, California's Santa Ana Unified school district, located in Orange County, had more students than the Boston public schools (57,250 vs. 55,027) or that Nevada's Clark County School District, home to Las Vegas, had 110,000 more students than the Houston Independent School District did for that same year (313,398 vs. 203,066).²³ The somewhat narrow focus on more well-known urban districts or settings represents a missed opportunity that a more open-minded approach to case selection could remedy.

Governance

Researchers interested in institutions and governance will find many promising directions to explore in future work. A focus on more traditional institutions, such as school boards and school board elections, is one arena with much promise. Urban school board elections have become more high-profile affairs in recent years. Campaigns have become increasingly competitive as outside groups have become interested in board elections and funneled campaign dollars toward their preferred candidates. These election outcomes have important implications for representation, the content of local education policy, and the influence of local teacher unions, which traditionally have had the upper hand in these relatively lower-profile contests.²⁴

Newer institutional forms, some still emerging, have broken from the traditional school board model of governance and provide additional paths for study. Among these approaches, mayoral control of school districts (a centralizing approach) and the expansion of school choice (a decentralizing institutional form) have received the most attention. Even within those broad categories, differences exist. Mayors may rule with a high level of control or embrace a more flexible portfolio-oriented approach in attempting to cultivate an effective blend of traditional and nontraditional schooling arrangements.²⁵ There is also significant institutional diversity in the public charter school sector, where intentionally developed networks (e.g., KIPP), charter management organizations that run schools across districts and states, and stand-alone operations all educate students each day in the nation's biggest cities. Those alternative forms of organization merit additional attention, and researchers interested in democratic accountability, bureaucracy, policy implementation, and the relationships between institutions and student outcomes all will find promising lines of research to pursue.

As state governments become increasingly engaged in education policymaking, their evolving relationships with urban school systems will be an additional area for future research. Historically, these relationships have attracted much attention from researchers interested in topics such as desegregation and school finance equity, since state policies have much influence over these matters. Representation also

has been a major focus in the past and, as other chapters in this volume note, urban areas often have had great challenges pursuing their interests in state legislative arenas, where their own representatives tend to be outnumbered by those of suburban and rural communities. While those topics remain relevant today, emerging state policies in other areas also have important implications for performance, equity, and democracy. For example, states have begun to experiment with more aggressive school accountability policies that have resulted in urban schools being shut down or taken over by the state, which sometimes involves incorporating those schools into statewide "recovery districts." The potential implications for equity and democratic accountability loom large here and merit further attention.

Expansion of the Submerged State

Urban school systems have faced increasing demands as elementary and secondary education has risen on national, state, and local policy agendas during the last three decades. As a result, urban leaders have reached out to other groups to help them develop, implement, and evaluate educational policies. Huge numbers of these actors are employed in the nonprofit or private sectors and encompass representatives from consulting firms, advocacy groups, and local and national foundations, among others. Examples include Mass Insight Education, New Leaders, the Boston Consulting Group, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Scholars of public policy, administration, and American political development describe these groups as comprising "hidden agents" operating in the "shadows of government" and contributing to an expansion of the "submerged state."²⁶ Although this language suggests a negative connotation, and some critics have framed them as such,²⁷ it is important to recognize that there is nothing necessarily sinister about these arrangements and that they operate in essentially all policy areas.²⁸ Textbook companies, consultants providing professional development or strategic planning advice, and contractors contributing to school operations have participated in urban education systems for years. Similarly, foundations interested in education, such as Annenberg and Ford, were active players in urban settings before Gates came onto the scene, and nonprofit organizations, including churches and other religious institutions, have commonly worked to mentor urban children, sometimes partnering with urban schools. These organizations are especially active in pre-K education and in programs such as Head Start.²⁹ Prior work on urban schooling and civic capacity has explored these connections.³⁰

Recent forms of the submerged state in urban education are relatively understudied and raise important questions that future researchers could pursue. Consider these two examples. First, are urban school systems equipped to effectively leverage the dollars and assistance that flow into

their communities from these nongovernmental actors? Some argue that due to low urban capacity, city governments should rely more on contracts with the nonprofit or private sectors in order to execute their core functions. However, if urban governments have low capacity to carry out programs, will they have the capacity to effectively monitor the efforts of these nongovernmental groups to ensure funds are properly spent and children benefit? Second, what role should private foundations play in the development and implementation of urban education policy? Both local and national foundations have attempted to advance certain urban policy agendas. In some communities, individual school districts themselves have helped create foundations as fundraising instruments, which provide important flexibility through supplementary funds that can help them stretch their formally budgeted dollars even farther. Research on these topics is scant but beginning to emerge.³¹ However, the questions of foundation effectiveness and implications for democratic accountability are crucial, and scholars who have pursued these topics have called for more research on them.

Race

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the 2014–15 school year was the first on record that white students were a numerical minority in public schools across the United States. Scholars of urban politics and policy are well aware of the key role race has played and continues to play in urban affairs. In education, specifically, researchers interested in race have called important attention to issues such as racial segregation in urban communities, which can contribute to educational inequities for students of color. The recent waves of education policy change during the last two decades have raised other equity issues and also have racial implications. Consider these examples.

Teacher and principal recruitment, preparation, and evaluation is one relevant area with numerous racial dimensions. Since the passage of the federal Race to the Top initiative in 2009, especially, states across the country have changed policies affecting the teaching workforce. They have increased admission standards to teacher and principal preparation programs and adopted policies that have tied evaluations to student test scores. Although these initiatives are only now taking hold, anecdotal evidence has suggested that they disproportionately affect minority teachers and school principals.³² This has important implications given prior research on bureaucracy, race, and representation, which shows that minority students tend to perform better when school officials, especially teachers, share their race or ethnic background.³³ If current policies have the short-term effect of decreasing the number of minority personnel in urban schools, in the longer run, minority students could be put at an added disadvantage.

Another issue with important racial dimensions is the phenomenon of school closures or state takeovers of urban schools, which was noted earlier. Takeovers or closures in urban communities tend to disproportionately occur in schools that have high percentages of minority students. Little work has explored the ensuing effects on the students themselves or the neighborhoods in which the closures or takeovers occur. One area that has received some attention is the danger some urban children face as they are forced to attend school in neighborhoods with rival factions or gangs due to closures. The issue of school closure brings up other important issues as well. The literature on student mobility indicates that students who switch schools frequently tend to have worse academic outcomes. One could ask, then, are policies that promote school closure and takeover contributing to this problem? Is there evidence that students who leave a school that has been closed end up going to schools that can better serve their needs? Some researchers have found that students exhibit a decline in achievement following closure of their school.¹⁴ From a broader perspective, it is also important to consider the ripple effects school closures could have on the overall neighborhoods in which they occur. In urban neighborhoods with high unemployment or crime, schools themselves may be critical institutions (along

with churches and other houses of worship) that help hold a neighborhood together or provide opportunities for neighborhood residents such as employment, after-school care, or weekend and evening activities. Does removing such an institutional anchor in disadvantaged neighborhoods create other problems or challenges, even if it may help improve educational opportunities for some children?

A final area of study in which race will continue to be a salient variable is in the political arena, where race has important implications for party and interest group politics.¹⁵ Education policy is an interesting topic area in which traditional understandings of politics as left versus right or blue state versus red state can break down. Although black voters overwhelmingly support Democratic candidates, urban blacks in particular tend to be favorable toward policies such as school vouchers, which Democrats and their union allies traditionally have resisted. Advocates frequently describe recent emerging policy agendas, such as expanding choice or minimizing union power in teacher assignments, as efforts to remedy racial inequities in education in the nation's largest urban areas. These emerging reforms may have interesting and broader partisan effects on long-standing local coalitions in urban settings, as well as on state and national party organizations.

NOTES

1. Jeffrey R. Henig, Richard C. Hula, Marion Orr, and Desiree S. Pedesclaux, *The Color of School Reform: Race, Politics, and the Challenge of Urban Education* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999); Clarence N. Stone, "Civic Capacity and Urban Education," *Urban Affairs Review* 36 (2001): 595-619; Marion Orr, *Black Social Capital: The Politics of School Reform in Baltimore, 1986-1998* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1999).
2. U.S. Department of Education, "Trial Urban District Assessment, National Assessment of Educational Progress," 2013, <http://www.nationreportcard.gov/uda.aspx>.
3. Kenneth J. Meier and Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr., *Bureaucracy in a Democratic State: A Governance Perspective* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).
4. Henig, Hula, Orr, and Pedesclaux, *The Color of School Reform*.
5. Orr, *Black Social Capital*.
6. Henig, Hula, Orr, and Pedesclaux, *The Color of School Reform*.
7. Frederick M. Hess, *Spinning Wheels: The Politics of Urban School Reform* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999); Melissa Marshall and Paru Shah, "Keeping Policy Churn off the Agenda: Urban Education and Civic Capacity," *Policy Studies Journal* 33 (2005): 161-180.
8. Urie Bronfenbrenner, *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979).
9. William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Knopf, 1996).
10. David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

11. Frederick M. Hess, "Looking for Leadership: Assessing the Case for Mayoral Control of Urban School Systems," *American Journal of Education* 114 (2008): 219-245.
12. Jal Mehta, *The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
13. Dorothy Shippy, *School Reform, Corporate Style: Chicago, 1880-2000* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006).
14. Julian R. Betts and Tom Loveless, eds., *Getting Choice Right: Ensuring Equity and Efficiency in Education Policy* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2005).
15. Frederick M. Hess, *Revolution at the Margins: The Impact of Competition on Urban School Systems* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2002).
16. Paul Teske and Mark Schneider, "What Research Can Tell Policymakers about School Choice," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 20 (2001): 609-631; Patrick J. Wolf, Brian Kisida, Babette Gutmann, Michael Puma, Nada Eissa, and Lou Rizzo, "School Vouchers and Student Outcomes: Experimental Evidence from Washington, DC," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 32 (2013): 246-270; John F. Witte, *The Market Approach to Education: An Analysis of America's First Voucher Program* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).
17. Todd L. Ely and Paul Teske, "Implications of Public School Choice for Residential Location Decisions," *Urban Affairs Review* 51 (2015): 175-204.
18. Joseph P. Viteritti, ed., *When Mayors Take Charge: School Governance in the City* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2009); Jeffrey R. Henig and Wilbur C. Rich, *Mayors in the Middle: Politics, Race, and Mayoral Control of Urban Schools* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004); Kenneth K. Wong, Francis X. Shen, Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, and

Stacey Rutledge, *The Education Mayor: Improving America's Schools* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2007).

19. Wong, Shen, Anagnostopoulos, and Rutledge, *The Education Mayor*.
20. Viteritti, *When Mayors Take Charge*; Henig and Rich, *Mayors in the Middle*.
21. Jeffrey R. Henig, *The End of Exceptionalism in American Education: The Changing Politics of School Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2013).
22. John Gerring, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
23. U.S. Department of Education, "Common Core of Data," 2013, <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.
24. Kenneth J. Meier and Amanda Rutherford, "Partisanship, Structure, and Representation: The Puzzle of African American Education Politics," *American Political Science Review* 108 (2014): 265-280.
25. Paul T. Hill, Christine Campbell, and Betheny Gross, *Strife and Progress: Portfolio Strategies for Managing Urban Schools* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2013); Viteritti, *When Mayors Take Charge*; Henig and Rich, *Mayors in the Middle*.
26. Meier and O'Toole, *Bureaucracy in a Democratic State*; Paul C. Light, *The True Size of Government* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999); Suzanne Mettler, *The Submerged State: How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).
27. Diane Ravitch, *Reign of Error: The Hoax of the Privatization Movement and the Danger to America's Public Schools* (New York: Knopf, 2013).
28. Lester M. Salamon, ed., *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
29. Andrew Karch, *Early Start: Preschool Politics in the United States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013).
30. Henig, Hula, Orr, and Pedesclaux, *The Color of School Reform*.
31. Sarah Reckhow, *Follow the Money: How Foundation Dollars Change Public School Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Frederick M. Hess, ed., *With the Best of Intentions: How Philanthropy is Reshaping K-12 Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2005).
32. Stephen Sawchuk, "Diversity at Issue as States Weigh Teacher Entry," *Education Week*, May 7, 2013, http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2013/05/08/30entry_ep.h32.html.
33. Meier and O'Toole, *Bureaucracy in a Democratic State*.
34. Ben Kirchner, Matthew Gaertner, and Kristin Pozzoboni, "Tracing Transitions: The Effect of High School Closure on Displaced Students," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 32 (2010): 407-429.
35. David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier, *The Politics of Latino Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2011); Meier and Rutherford, "Partisanship, Structure, and Representation."

FURTHER READINGS

- Goertz, Margaret E., and Leanna Stiefel. "School-Level Resource Allocation in Urban Public Schools: Introduction." *Journal of Education Finance* 23 (1998), 435-446.
- Henig, Jeffrey R. *The End of Exceptionalism in American Education: The Changing Politics of School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2013.
- Henig Jeffrey R., and Wilbur C. Rich. *Mayors in the Middle: Politics, Race, and Mayoral Control of Urban Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Henig, Jeffrey R., Richard C. Hula, Marion Orr, and Desiree S. Pedesclaux. *The Color of School Reform: Race, Politics, and the Challenge of Urban Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Hess, Frederick M. *Spinning Wheels: The Politics of Urban School Reform*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999.
- Howell, William G., Patrick J. Wolf, David E. Campbell, and Paul E. Peterson. "School Vouchers and Academic Performance: Results from Three Randomized Field Trials." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21 (2002), 191-217.
- Karch, Andrew. *Early Start: Preschool Politics in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013.
- Levin, Henry M. "Educational Vouchers: Effectiveness, Choice, and Costs." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17 (1998), 373-392.
- Marschall, Melissa and Paru Shah. "Keeping Policy Churn off the Agenda: Urban Education and Civic Capacity." *Policy Studies Journal* 33 (2005), 161-180.
- Mehta, Jal. *The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Orr, Marion. *Black Social Capital: The Politics of School Reform in Baltimore, 1986-1998*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1999.
- Reckhow, Sarah. *Follow the Money: How Foundation Dollars Change Public School Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Schneider, Mark, Paul Teske, and Melissa Marshall. *Choosing Schools: Consumer Choice and the Quality of American Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Tyack, David B. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Witte, John F. *The Market Approach to Education: An Analysis of America's First Voucher Program*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Wong, Kenneth K., Francis X. Shen, Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, and Stacey Rutledge. *The Education Mayor: Improving America's Schools*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2007.