ABSTRACT

Title of Document:	ALLOCATING STATE FUNDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAMS: A CASE STUDY OF EDUCATION POLICYMAKING IN MARYLAND
	Gail Margaret Bailey, Ed. D., 2007
Directed By:	Professor Betty Malen, Department of Education Policy Studies

The research had three purposes: to determine what factors account for the legislative decision outcomes resulting in the allocation of state funds for Maryland's school library media programs in 1998 and the denial of continued funding in 2001; to test the capacity of an integrated policymaking model to account for legislative victory and defeat; and to add to literature on state education policymaking in Maryland and school library media funding decisions in state arenas.

The study employed an integrated framework developed by combining Kingdon's (1995) multiple streams model with Mazzoni's (1993) power and influence model to examine each legislative decision making event as a political process influenced by the power of the players and shaped by developments in each of the multiple streams. In combination, these two frameworks helped to analyze how efforts to secure dedicated state funding for school library media programs succeeded in 1998 and failed in 2001. The investigator employed an exploratory case study to

render a provisional interpretation of the two legislative decision outcomes regarding state funds for school library media programs.

The case study produced findings that point to two significant factors that impacted the ability of advocates to secure categorical state funding for school library media programs in 1998 but not in 2001: (1) the key role played or not played by the governor and (2) contextual forces that either enabled or constrained advocacy efforts.

The study demonstrates the utility of the integrated model in explaining state education policymaking. Kingdon's multiple streams concept provides broad analytic categories as manageable units of analysis and Mazzoni's power and influence categories provide the analytic tools required to map out the dynamics in each stream. The study includes implications for those who may want to influence education policy decisions in state arenas.

ALLOCATING STATE FUNDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA
PROGRAMS: A CASE STUDY OF EDUCATION POLICYMAKING IN
MARYLAND

By

Gail Margaret Bailey

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
2007

Advisory Committee:
Professor Betty Malen, Chair
Professor J. Edward Andrews
Dr. Carla D. Hayden
Professor Jennifer King Rice
Professor Thomas D. Weible

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Today's school library media programs have evolved over time from random collections of trade books, textbooks, and teacher materials into comprehensive educational support systems. These programs include several components designed to support the school-wide instructional program: an organized collection of instructional materials available in a variety of formats; certified library media specialists charged to work in collaboration with teachers; and an instructional program designed to teach students how to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively across the curriculum (AASL, 1998; MSDE, 2000). As early as 1740, Benjamin Franklin included a plan for a school library in his academy, and states such as Massachusetts (1837), Michigan (1837), and New York (1839), provided funds or allowed local school districts to raise money specifically for "library purposes" (Morris, 1992, p. 1). In 1892, New York State passed a law in 1892 providing matching funds to local school districts for library materials and requiring that a teacher take care of these materials. This legislation prompted other states to make a concerted effort to provide schools with libraries. Still, some states promoted student use of public libraries or combined public and school libraries to meet students' learning requirements (Morris, 1992).

While these early efforts by policymakers reflect uneven support for establishing school libraries, they are considered to have important historical significance for two reasons: (1) policymakers recognized the principle that a library facility in a school could have some educational value; and (2) these efforts

established a precedent for the use of public funds to support these school libraries (Morris, 1992, p. 2). As a result, the concept of school libraries continued to develop with the help of professional organizations, foundations, and school administrators, as well as state and federal policymakers.

In 1918 and 1945 respectively, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) published reports and issued standards that guided state and local efforts to provide school libraries. Between 1963 and 1965, the Knapp Foundation conducted projects to demonstrate for policymakers the "ideal" school library. State and federal policymakers used this information to develop recommendations and eventually policy that promoted the school library media center concept in response to theories of how children learn. School library collections began incorporating other media, such as periodicals, prints, phonograph records, and transparencies to support the new teaching strategies adopted by teachers (Morris, 1992, p. 13), and state and federal funds provided the money to purchase many of these materials. In 1958, the United States government responded to the launch of the Soviet space exploration program by passing the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) to increase financial aid to schools to support improved teaching in science, mathematics, and foreign languages with instructional materials. Several years later (1965), Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title II authorizing funds specifically for school libraries and requiring states to match expenditures. This funding continued for approximately 15 years until the federal government curtailed spending in the 1980s.

Declining federal financial support for education, including school library

media programs, continued into the 1990s. This resulted in budget cuts, elimination

of staff, increased work loads, unionization, job actions (i.e., work to rule) within the

profession, increased competition for existing funds, and increased costs of

educational materials. In many areas of the country, declining enrollments, school

closings, and reducing staff exacerbated these fiscal problems. In addition to

economic factors, several trends challenged school library media program

implementation. These included pressure from conservative groups to censor

collections, the insistence of back-to-basics groups to use textbooks instead of trade

books, and the necessity to absorb computer technology, library automation, and the

concepts of networking with other libraries into the library media center management

(Morris, 1992). Both economic factors and social issues have had a strong influence

nationwide on the condition of school library media programs.

The trends and forces described on the national scene as impacting the growth

and development of school library media programs also affected Maryland. State

educators recognized the educational value of a school library years before the New

York legislature passed a state law providing funds for school libraries. As early as

1867, an Act of the General Assembly authorized the annual payment of $20 to each

school district to purchase volumes for a circulating school library if the district

agreed to match this amount. The legislature advised each district "to avail itself of

the provision of the law" to "create a taste for reading, while…add[ing] to the fund of

general knowledge" (Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly, 1867, p. 37).

Additional references to school libraries in the *Maryland Manual* from 1870 to 1992

indicate varying levels of support for the library programs (i.e., technical assistance and regulation). In 1902, the general assembly established the Commission of Libraries and instructed it to advise "public school libraries in the State" (Session Laws, 1902, pp. 348) on the establishment, maintenance, selection and cataloguing of books, as well as to provide books for traveling libraries throughout the State. The Commission of Libraries had responsibility for school libraries until 1947 when the Division of Library Extension was created within the state education department to assist school districts in developing school library programs (*Maryland Manual 1950*).

In 1987, the State Board of Education (SBE) passed the Public School Library By-law adopting standards for school library media programs that provided guidelines for local systems to follow. The SBE, however, did not provide state funds to assist local school systems to implement the regulation (COMAR 13A.05.04.01). Prior to 1987, the last reference to state funding for school libraries appeared in 1870 when the general assembly ordered the "sum of ten dollars per annum" to be paid by the board of county school commissioners from the state school fund to any school house district that raised an equal amount to purchase books (Supplement to the *Maryland Code*, Session of 1870). In the absence of state funds dedicated for the purpose of implementing school library media programs, local school systems must shoulder the full responsibility for financing these programs.

Despite multiple program evaluations that document the educational value of the school library media programs in various settings (Scholastic, 2006), Maryland state government does not dedicated funds to ensure that school library media

programs meet state standards. As a result, library media programs are dependent entirely on local funds. Expenditures for library media materials over a recent ten-year period illustrate persistent patterns of undependable local spending as gauged by the number of school library media programs that do not meet state guidelines for staffing and collection size. Since the last known dedicated state funding for school libraries in 1870, the state has intervened only on two other occasions to consider dedicated funding for the library media program; the first occasion resulted in a legislative victory for advocates of state support for school libraries, but the second ended in the legislative defeat of a measure to sustain state funding for school libraries. This dissertation describes case study research that examined these two decision events.

The brief history of school library media programs that began this paper does not explain the political dynamics that are inherent in any policymaking process that determines "who gets what, when and how" (Lasswell, 1936, as cited in Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976, p. 5). The literature provides only scant information on the process through which these funding decisions were made.

The case study research described in this paper examined two specific legislative events in the Maryland General Assembly (1998 and 2001) as political processes that pivot on the power of the players, are shaped by developments in what John Kingdon (1995) terms *streams* (processes involved in problem recognition, policy development, and political events), and are often decisively affected by policy entrepreneurs (proposal advocates). Specifically, by conducting a case study of the two legislative decisions using Kingdon's *multiple streams* concept as the primary

theoretical orientation augmented by Tim Mazzoni's (1993) *power and influence*

model, this research sought to: (1) illuminate policymaking strategies and the

conditions of their use to determine why the effort to allocate resources to school

library media programs was successful in 1998 and not in 2001; (2) test the capacity

of this integrated policymaking model to account for legislative victory and defeat;

and (3) add to the limited literature on state education policymaking in Maryland and

school library media funding decisions in state arenas.

Background on the Policy Issue

As the introduction made clear, school library media programs have evolved

from spotty collections of books into comprehensive educational programs comprised

of several components that support the school-wide educational program. These

components include information services, organized collections of print and

electronic resources, and information literacy skills instruction. Typically, such

programs are staffed with certified library media specialists who are supported by

media assistants in using diverse collections of materials in a variety of formats (i.e.,

print, digital, and video). Most importantly, library media staff collaborates with

classroom teachers to instruct students in the effective use of information skills.

Over 60 years of research that includes studies conducted in states as diverse

as Alaska (Lance, 1999), Colorado (Lance, Wellborn & Hamilton-Pennell, 1993;

Lance, Rodney & Hamilton-Pennell, 2000), and Pennsylvania (Lance, Rodney &

Hamilton-Pennell, 2000) illustrate that school library media programs can have a

positive influence on student achievement. Despite these research findings, school

districts in Maryland provide inconsistent financial support for these programs; state

categorical funding for school library media programs in Maryland is non-existent.

In the 1960s, many Maryland jurisdictions became dependent on the 1965

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that provided federal funds for

centralized collections of instructional materials. However, under the Reagan

administration (1981-1989), the categorical funding for school library media

programs was consolidated into block grants that allowed local school systems to re-

direct these funds to other programs, such as technology initiatives (i.e., computer

hardware and software purchases for classrooms and labs) and professional

development projects (e.g., salaries, stipends, and substitutes for staff training).

Many Maryland school districts chose to re-direct some of their federal

monies from library media materials to these other educational initiatives. Data

provided by local school systems and gathered during on-site reviews of local

programs conducted by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

document the impact of these reallocations by illustrating how far each local school

system's library media programs are from state guidelines[1] for number of items in

collections and number of recommended library media specialists and assistants per

school (MSDE, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001). In 1998 and 2001, proponents of state

funds for public school library programs used these data to support legislative efforts

to provide state funds to improve school library media programs.

During the 1998 Maryland General Assembly session, the legislature passed

House Bill 1 (HB 1), establishing the School Accountability Fund for Excellence

---

[1] In 1987, the Maryland State Board of Education adopted standards for school library media programs
that included guidelines for collections and staffing based on research studies and expert
recommendations.

(SAFE) as an interim funding program designed to assist local school systems in providing educational services for the growing populations of students considered *at-risk* because of poverty and limited English proficiency. The state planned to replace this funding program with a revised comprehensive school funding formula four years later. In the meantime, the SAFE program was launched to give every district additional funds until state and local leaders could agree on how to allocate state funds to meet the state constitutional requirement "to establish a thorough and efficient system of free public schools" (Maryland Constitution).

HB 1 was an omnibus bill that included funds for Targeted Improvement and Limited English Proficiency grants, as well as for the School Library Enhancement Program. The library media grant component of the bill provided $3 million of state funds each year for four years to update library media collections statewide with new materials. In order to be eligible to receive these funds, local school systems were required to maintain their current local effort and to match the state funds dollar for dollar. With the passage of HB 1, the state provided, for the first time since 1870, categorical funding for school library media programs. But that funding was scheduled to sunset in 2002.

In 2001, legislative members considered House Bill 935 (HB 935), a stand-alone bill as opposed to an omnibus bill, to provide $3 million in grants to local school systems to continue improving their library media collections. Additional provisions of the bill would allow some discretionary spending by local school systems to conduct training to enhance the skills of existing library media staff and to develop partnerships with local universities and colleges to reduce tuition for

interested teachers to become certified library media specialists, and to collaborate

with other agencies to establish a K-12 digital library. The bill died in committee.

Overview of the Study

Case study research methodology was used to explain how and why the

legislative events resulted in a victory for proponents of state funds for school library

media programs in 1998 and a defeat of that support in 2001. The events were

examined from a political perspective using an integrated model that combined the

public policymaking frameworks of Kingdon (1995) and (Mazzoni, 1993). The

resulting framework was used to analyze how various events unfolded during the

legislative process, which actors sought to influence these events, why they chose to

act or not, the resources and strategies they employed to influence the events, and the

impact they had on decision outcomes.

An Integrated Model

A number of scholars have provided conceptual frameworks or models to use

in examining decision-making events in federal and state arenas, (e.g., Allison, 1971;

Easton, 1985; Marshall, et al. 1986; Wirt & Kirst, 1982). Models developed by

Kingdon (1995) and (Mazzoni, 1993) were used in this study to analyze state

policymaking in Maryland in regard to the allocation of resources for school library

media programs for two reasons: (1) Kingdon's model helps to explain the

serendipitous nature of school libraries as an agenda item and (2) Mazzoni's model

assists in unpacking the dynamics of the policymaking processes.

While Kingdon and Mazzoni studied policymaking in two separate arenas, their resulting frameworks are not only similar, but, when used in tandem, enhance the study of state education policymaking. Kingdon studied policymaking in the federal arena and describes the processes involved in public policymaking as *multiple streams* of activities. Three separate streams: problem recognition; generation of policy proposals; and political events operate relatively independently, but converge at particular times to create policy shifts. The key to understanding agenda and policy change is the coupling of the streams (Kingdon, 1995). The coupling usually occurs because one or more skilled, persistent individuals make important connections within and across these streams of activity (Kingdon, 1995). Kingdon labels these players *policy entrepreneurs*; they serve as a signature piece of his policymaking model. In answering the call for testing Kingdon's multiple streams model in other arenas (Malen, 1987), researchers have demonstrated the utility of the model in explaining state education policymaking (e.g., Holderness, 1990; McLendon, 2003; Stout & Stevens, 2000).

Mazzoni studied policymaking in the state education arenas of Minnesota (1993) and several other states (1974, 1976, 1994). His model depicts the dynamics of the policymaking process as sets of power-based interactions that influence decision outcomes. Mazzoni's model provides the tools with which to analyze these power-based interactions as they occur within the multiple streams of activities described by Kingdon. The model recognizes the significance of the setting or system in which the policymaking takes place. Inherent in the setting are forces such as the rules of the game and the availability of revenue that influence the outcome

(Mazzoni, 1991a). The model also identifies the actors involved, the resources available to these various participants, their motivations to use these resources, and the strategies they employ in using these resources to pursue their goals as critical to a clear understanding of the how and why of the policymaking process. Mazzoni makes analysis of power more explicit than Kingdon by providing categories to analyze how power is exercised and how influence is acquired. Mazzoni's power and influence model has proven useful to other researchers in explaining the dynamics of state education policymaking (e.g., Fowler, 1994; Freedman & Hughes, 1998).

Similarities between Kingdon's and Mazzoni's models include: (1) their identification of participants; (2) discussions of how and when these participants influence the policymaking process as well as their resources and incentives for action; and (3) a description of the context and how various sets of institutional and environmental forces can converge to change policy, either by means of a *policy window* (Kingdon, 1995) or an *arena shift* (Mazzoni, 1991a). Besides the compatibility of the models, a key reason to have combined them to examine the two legislative decisions in Maryland during the 1998 and 2001 sessions is that Mazzoni extends Kingdon's multiple streams model by providing the tools to describe the interactions between and among the actors within the streams. By arraying the data in a matrix as shown in Table 1, actor influence on the policymaking decisions is gauged within each process stream. Using a set of inter-related categories derived from Mazzoni's model (setting, participants, goals, resources, motivations, strategies, interactions, and outcomes), this study describes the interactions among the actors.

Influence is gauged initially by examining the decision outcomes (who won, who lost) and analyzing attributional data (who is perceived as influential, who is not, and why). In addition, an analysis of the influence efforts (i.e., how actors use their resources to affect policy change) determines the plausibility of the attributions of influence. The analysis of how and why the school library media funding decisions were made contributed to an understanding about state policymaking process, especially in regard to funding decisions about school library media programs in Maryland.

Data Collection and Analysis

Case study research methodology was used to examine the sets of decisions in Maryland's legislative arena that led to the passage of HB 1 in 1998 and the defeat of HB 935 in 2001. Since case study research methodology is strengthened by the use of a theoretical or conceptual framework based in a discipline and supported by the literature (Merriam, 1998), an integrated policymaking framework using Kingdon's multiple streams model augmented by Mazzoni's *power and influence* model was selected to frame the study. The constructs of the integrated model guided data collection and analysis. Data were collected about the decision events and related developments in what Kingdon (1995) labels the problem, policy, and political streams of the public policymaking process (Kingdon, 1995). Within each stream, information also was gathered about the actors involved; the resources they used to influence the decisions; their motivations to exert power and influence; the strategies the actors used to affect policy decisions; and the interactions and the outcomes of these decision processes (Mazzoni, 1993).

Case study research methodology also requires the use of multiple data sources to lend validity and reliability to the research by basing the findings on a convergence of information from different sources (Yin, 1994). The different sources for this study included interviews with key players and examinations of official documents, as well as relevant newspaper articles, speeches, memoranda, and email messages. Interviews were conducted using established protocols to secure information pertinent to the process and to get at behind the scenes interactions that documents rarely, if ever, reveal but are so essential for getting at the dynamics of the political process (Allison, 1971; Allison & Zelikow, 1999). The informant pool included participants and witnesses to the political process at the various stages of each decision event. Interviewees were selected based on their knowledge of the issues and the policymaking process, as well as their positions in the political system and where they stood on the issue. Official documents, as well as newspaper articles, and email messages were examined to corroborate information gleaned from interviews.

Data were analyzed by developing a case study database that outlines the three streams of policymaking activity identified in Kingdon's multiple streams model (problem recognition, policy development, and political events). Within each stream, the various components of Mazzoni's power and influence model were employed to provide more complete information about the participants, their goals, motivations, resources, strategies, interactions, setting, and outcome in and across each stream. The database is a matrix as shown in Table 1; information gathered from documents and interviews was sorted into the appropriate categories of actors, goals,

motivations, resources, strategies, interactions, setting, and outcomes within each of the streams of problem recognition, policy generation, and political events.

Table 1

Data Matrix

	Problem Stream	Policy Stream	Political Stream
Actors			
Goals/Motivations			
Resources			
Strategies			
Interactions			
Setting			
Outcome			

Contributions of the Study

This study promised to extend knowledge about state education policymaking in several ways. First, it contributed to the policymaking literature on how state funding decisions are made concerning Maryland's school library media programs. The passage of HB 1 in 1998 and the failure of HB 935 represent the only two instances in Maryland's recent legislative history when categorical state funding for school library media programs has been considered. Since this topic has never been examined systematically, this study examined why school library media programs in the state receive modest and undependable support even though research demonstrates that programs with certified staff, materials, technology, and expanded access make a positive impact on student achievement (Didier, 1982; Lance, 1992,

1999, 2000, and 2001; and Smith, 2001). At the same time, the study determined why the school library media funding issue competed successfully in one session but not in a subsequent session with other initiatives that also were linked with student achievement.

Second, the study *tested* the integrated model by generating insights about the influence strategies and contextual conditions that may serve to increase the success of future efforts to secure state funding for school library media programs. Each model has been used independently to study state education policymaking. This study tested the theoretical benefit of combining their properties into an integrated model.

Third, the study helped to close an important gap in state policymaking literature by revealing some information about the politics of educational decisions in Maryland, an under-studied phenomenon. A review of the literature uncovered few studies about education policymaking in Maryland (Stroble, 1975; Shilling, 1984; Stapleton, 2002; Darensbourg, 2003). Half of these studies focus on the views and attitudes of educational leaders and policymakers concerning the key issues facing public education in the 1970s (Stroble, 1975) and their perceptions of the effect of state intervention on education in Baltimore City Public Schools (Darensbourg, 2003). A dissertation by Shilling (1984) examines the influence of the State Board of Education on state educational policymaking and research by Stapleton (2002) describes the influence of the press (*Baltimore Sun*) on education policy in Baltimore between 1990 and 1999. As these studies indicate, however, education policymaking in Maryland has received relatively little systematic attention. By examining the

decision events concerning the allocation of state resources for school library media programs, this study contributes to the limited data on this consequential policymaking arena.

Finally, this study also addressed a gap in the literature on policy decisions about school library media programs and how decisions are made to allocate educational resources to these programs and provides information to use in developing strategies that may affect the chances of securing state funding for school library media programs.

Organization of the Study

The first chapter provides an overview of the study. Chapter 2 reviews the literature related to the proposed study. The theoretical and empirical literature on public policymaking serves as a foundation for the research and grounds the conceptual framework that will guide the study. Chapter 3 describes the research design, the data sources, and the procedures used to collect and analyze the data, as well as the limitations of the proposed study. Chapter 4 describes the context of legislative decision-making in 1998 and 2001. Chapters 5 and 6 describe the dynamics of each decision event respectively. Chapter 7 summarizes the study, synthesizes the findings, develops the conclusions and discusses the implications of this study for research and practice.

Chapter 2: Literature Review and Explication of Conceptual Framework

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature on the policy issue and the policymaking process, including the combined theoretical frameworks this study used to unpack and interpret the dynamics of the two key education policy decisions in the Maryland state legislative arena. The chapter begins with a discussion of the theoretical and descriptive literature on school library media programs, efforts to evaluate their effectiveness as instructional programs, and the status of these programs in Maryland. Then the chapter describes several major theoretical traditions used to analyze policymaking and the theoretical orientation that was used to guide the case study analysis of the 1998 legislative victory for proponents of state funding for school library media programs and the 2001 legislative defeat of funding for those programs.

Policy Issue

The policy issue focuses on dedicated state funding for school library media programs. By providing state categorical funds to assist local school systems in meeting state guidelines for staffing and collection size, advocates sought to increase and improve opportunities for teaching and learning. The following sections describe the major components of the library media program and discuss the findings of several research studies that illustrate the impact of these program components on student achievement.

School Library Media Program Components

Most policymakers and professional educators consider the school library media program to be an important component of the K-12 public school instructional program. These groups have worked together to develop standards, guidelines and policies governing these programs. In addition, some professional organizations representing education administrative and supervisory personnel, as well as principals and technology coordinators have highlighted the importance of the school library media as an educational program (*ASCD Research Brief*, September 2, 2003; *NASSP Bulletin*, 1999; and Cable in the Classroom's *Threshold*, 2004). In these and other ways, professional organizations have tried to keep school library media programs a high priority for state and local policymakers.

To illustrate, professional organizations such as the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) established national standards that outline and define the various components of an effective program (i.e., instruction, collections, staff, and facilities) (AASL and AECT, 1998). States and school districts base policies and regulations for implementing school library media programs in their schools on these national standards. In February 2000, the Maryland State Board of Education revised a regulation originally adopted in 1987 requiring the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) to monitor local compliance with the state's Public School Library Regulation (COMAR 13A.05.04.01) by conducting onsite program reviews and collecting statistical data from individual schools. School districts such as Montgomery County adopted local regulations as a first step towards compliance

with the state regulation (i.e., School Library Media Center Regulation EDA-RA, Montgomery County Public Schools, adopted 1988, revised November 4, 1998).

The state regulation requires each school to have a library media program with specific components (MSDE, 2000). Basic programmatic components include: (1) a diverse collection of instructional materials in a variety of formats; (2) personnel that includes a certified library media specialist with adequate clerical and technical support staff; and (3) a facility with appropriate wiring to provide voice, video, and data resources and services that is conducive to learning. Each one of these components carries a significant price tag, especially if it meets the state guidelines. For instance, a collection of instructional materials alone amounts to an estimated $272,520[2] for an elementary school. This investment is not a one time only purchase. In order to maintain a collection that is current and in good condition, a school or district must provide ongoing financial support. In 2000, a professional library media specialist commanded an average salary of $48,921/yr., not including benefits (MSDE, 2000). If the professional works with the assistance of a clerk or technician to provide support services, the school system assumes an additional cost of an estimated $24,000/yr., not including benefits. The facility is the third component of a library media program and consists of space, furniture, shelving, and technology. While these sorts of capital costs are handled differently than the recurring cost associated with personnel and materials, the facility comes with a hefty price tag. The space alone costs an estimated $439,200 (3600 sq. ft. @$122/sq. ft.) for an

---

[2] This estimate is based on State Board of Education guidelines that specify the minimum number of items in an elementary school collection as 12,000 and *The Bowker Annual and Library Book Trade Almanac* (2003) that notes the average price of an elementary book in 2000 as $22.71 (12,000 x $22.71 = $272,520). The average price of all other hardcover books is $60.84.

average size school of 600 students (MSDE, Public School Construction Program, 2002); routine maintenance and technological updates and upgrades only add to these expenses. In addition to these basic components, other elements include an instructional program in information literacy skills integrated into the curriculum and support of classroom instruction, especially reading for personal and academic success, provided by qualified staff.

In summary, Table 2 illustrates that the total estimated cost for an elementary school library media center is an estimated $784,641; a middle school library media center costs $1,424,721; and a high school library media center price tag is $1,607,241. As a result of these costs, school districts must expend a significant amount of money to establish and maintain a library media program in every school, especially if they want to sustain programs that meet state guidelines for quality collections, certified staff, appropriate space, and technology.

Table 2

Estimated Costs of School Library Media Programs

Program Component	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
Collection	$272,520	$ 912,600	$1,095,120
Personnel	$ 72,921	$ 72,921	$ 72,921
Facility	$439,200	$ 439,200	$ 439,200
Total	$784,641	$1,424,721	$ 1,607,241

According to a number of research studies and program evaluations, the costs required to provide the basic programmatic components may be worthwhile

educational investments because library media programs can have a positive influence on student achievement (Didier, 1984; Lance, et al., 1993, 2000, 2001, 2003; Loertscher, et al., 1987; Rodney, et al., 2002, 2003; Zweizig, et al., 1999). School library media programs, like other initiatives that may enhance student achievement, compete for a share of the state's limited financial resources. The evidence suggests library media programs have not competed very successfully. Statistics collected annually by MSDE demonstrate that school library media programs fall short of state defined standards and limited in their ability to provide adequate resources for the research and reading projects of students and staff (MSDE, 1999, 2000, 2001, MSDE). In 2000, only 22% or 281 of the 1,283 schools in the state that reported information on their school library media programs met the collection guidelines for number of items; only 58% met the professional staffing guidelines because 344 additional library media specialists were needed to meet the staffing guidelines (MSDE, 2001). This last figure (344) represents an increase of 147 additional library media specialist positions necessary to meet state guidelines over the 197 positions required in 1998 and reflects the trend to eliminate professional positions and reduce funding continues.

Maryland is not unique in regard to providing limited funds for library media programs. For example, the American Library Association reports that cuts to state budgets in Alabama and California reduced significantly the funds for new or replacement books. In Alabama, the defeat of a statewide referendum to improve the educational system eliminated all school library media enhancement funds. In March 2003, the California governor cut $11.6 million in funding for school library media

materials in that state, a move that reduced the per pupil allocation from $28 to $1.41 ("School libraries feel state funding losses," 2003). The American Broadcasting Company (Sinatra, 2000) reported that library media specialists in cities such as New York and Philadelphia faced serious problems in providing students and teachers with current and accurate information because per pupil spending for library media materials in these cities in 1999 was $6 and $3 respectively, while the average price of a book was $22. These economic constraints contributed to many library media specialists leaving outdated or damaged books on the shelves. The decrease in funding indicates that an important educational program is not able to meet state standards for these programs; this study explains the politics of these patterns in the Maryland context.

School Libraries and Student Achievement

A review of the literature illustrates the impact that school library media programs can have on student achievement and provides evidence to support the allocation of resources for the successful implementation of these educational programs. Over 60 years of empirical and descriptive research supports the claim that programs aligned with professional standards have a positive influence on student achievement (ASCD, 2003).

For example, Elaine K. Didier (1984) summarizes 38 early research studies that are largely experimental in design. These studies identify the contributions library media programs make to student achievement at both the elementary and secondary levels. Student achievement measures include test results, grade-point averages, or problem-solving abilities (i.e., locate appropriate information). These

measures are analyzed in various studies against specific program components, such as the number and preparation of certified library media specialists, student access to materials, the instructional and curricular roles of personnel, and the impact of socio-economic factors. Between 1959 and 1984, using experimental and control groups in a variety of locations (e.g., Detroit, MI; selected schools in Ohio; Indianapolis, IN; and a school in VA), researchers consistently found that students who had access to library media resources, received library skills instruction, and/or were taught these skills by the classroom teacher in collaboration with a certified library media specialist demonstrated higher achievement scores in a number of different subjects (e.g., arithmetic, science, spelling, language skills, writing), but most notably in reading.

In the early 1990s, a team of researchers headed by Keith Curry Lance investigated the relationship between Colorado's school library media programs and student achievement (Lance, Wellborn, & Hamilton-Pennell, 1993). National standards published in 1987 by the American Association of School Librarians framed the survey questions developed to gather information about the library media programs (e.g., number of items in collections, professional staff, clerical staff, utilization, information literacy skills instruction, information delivery, and expenditures) by surveying library media specialists. The study was replicated several years later by the same researchers using revised program standards and data specific to Alaska, Iowa, Michigan, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Colorado (Lance, et al., 1993, 2000, 2001, 2003; and Rodney, et al., 2002, 2003). In

each statistical analysis, "schools with higher rated school libraries have 10 to 18 percent better test scores than schools with lower rated libraries" (Lance 2004, p. 8).

Scholars point out that the results of these studies about the positive impact school library media programs can have on student achievement when the school libraries meet professional standards. This finding is not explained away by school expenditures per pupil; teacher characteristics (e.g., education, experience, and salaries); teacher/pupil ratio; student characteristics (e.g., poverty, race, and ethnicity; or community differences (e.g., adult education, poverty, and racial/ethnic demographics) (Lance & Loertscher, 2001). Lance, et al. (2003, 2001, 2000, 1993) controlled for these factors through regression analysis and demonstrated that school library media programs with certified library media specialists, a number of materials in a variety of formats, an instructional program that is integrated into the curriculum, and collaborative planning and program implementation between the library media staff and teachers are second only to poverty as predictors of elementary and secondary student achievement in reading.

Several other researchers conducted similar studies in Florida (Baumbach, 2003), Massachusetts (Baughman, 2000), North Carolina (Burgin & Bracey, 2003), and Texas (Smith, 2001) and documented similar results. While the author of the Texas study concurs with Lance, she provides caveats that include an acknowledgement that other factors may be operating to promote student achievement (e.g., information rich environments and extracurricular activities of students). Collectively, these impact studies, conducted in a number of diverse states, provide cumulative data to support Lance's finding that schools with library media

programs aligned with professional program standards produce better reading test scores than schools with lower rated libraries (Lance, 2004).

Thus, studies conducted by doctoral students, independent entities, and state departments of education over the last 60 years that examined the impact of various library media program components or characteristics demonstrate a positive impact on student achievement. The library media specialist is cited frequently as being able to improve student achievement (Lance, 1993, 1999, 2000; Lance, et al., 2000; Smith, 2001; Baumbach, 2002; Baxter & Smalley, 2003; and Rodney, et al., 2003), especially if he/she collaborates with classroom teachers in planning and implementing lessons that integrate information literacy skills into the content areas (Todd, Kuhlthau, & OELMA, 2004). For example, a study conducted among school libraries in Ohio credits credentialed library media specialists with playing a key role in facilitating learning. In schools with library media specialists, students, on average, scored higher on state tests regardless of their socio-economic status, race/ethnicity, per pupil spending, and teacher staffing and education levels. Other characteristics of library media programs that appear to affect student achievement include the size of collections (Lance, et al., 2001), utilization of resources (Lance, 2002; Quantitative Resources, 2003), and information delivery (Burgin & Bracey, 2003).

While library media programs have benefits, they are expensive; therefore, they are vulnerable, especially during tight-budget times. Administrators at state, system, and school levels must make difficult choices among competing priorities (e.g., establishing a technology infrastructure, implementing special programs) and limited resources. Still, a significant body of research describing the contributions

library media programs make to improve student achievement indicates that funding may be a worthwhile investment. State funding may be especially critical in places where programs do not meet state guidelines for collections, certified staff, appropriate clerical and technical assistance, and space. Maryland falls into that category. Since programs in some districts have fallen below standards, the process through which state funding decisions are made warranted examination. Because decision makers must make choices among many worthwhile investments, and since these choices are value-laden, the process through which the decisions are made is political.

Two key decision events in Maryland provide such an opportunity. With local funds challenged and federal monies diminished, library media program advocates looked to the state for supplemental funds in 1998 and again in 2001. This dissertation describes a case study that examined these two legislative decision events in order to enhance our understanding of how the school library media program funding decisions are made in state arenas.

Policy Process

The legislative process resulting in these key decisions was examined from a political perspective. This study employed a theoretical framework not only to guide and structure the research, but also to "bring events into sharper focus, … clarify puzzles, generate insights, and systemize knowledge" (Mazzoni, 1991b, n.p.). This knowledge can, in turn, inform future policymaking activities, especially in regard to the allocation of scarce educational resources, by helping to understand the forces shaping state level policymakers' choices.

26

A political lens was used in this case study because in a democracy, political processes are relied upon to resolve the conflicts over the distribution of scarce resources (Wirt & Kirst, 1982); education policy decisions are the results of these political processes (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Mazzoni, 1991). Lasswell's classic definition of policy decisions defines policy decisions as the outcomes of a political process that determines "who gets what, when, and how" (as cited in Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976, p. 5). This political process pivots on power and influence. The following discussion illustrates how the political process is conceptualized. Following the discussion of these key constructs of power and influence, the chapter discusses some early and more recent conceptual frameworks used to analyze power/influence relationships and defines the framework used to analyze the 1998 decision to provide supplemental funds for school library media programs and the 2001 decision to curb that practice.

Pivotal Constructs: Power and Influence

Geary's 1992 dissertation on Utah's special education funding decisions provides an extensive review of the literature on policymaking as a struggle for power and influence. Geary (1992) demonstrates that most researchers assume that power and influence are key ingredients of the policymaking process and that the policymaking process "represents the distribution and exercise of power, authority, and influence…among actors with competing preferences" (Geary, 1992, p. 9).

While scholars agree that policymaking is a political process that pivots on power and influence, they employ different definitions of *power* and *influence*. For example, according to Jeffrey Pfeffer (1981), "Power is a property of the system at

rest; politics is the study of power in action" (p. 7). In making a distinction between power and influence, Pfeffer describes power as a force, a store of potential influence that can be used to impact the decision-making process through various activities and behaviors. Gary Yukl (1998) supports Pfeffer's definition of power as a potential influence on the attitudes and behaviors of another. Yukl further explains that evidence of attempts at influencing someone else is demonstrated by any one of three behavioral outcomes: commitment, compliance, and resistance. Mazzoni (1999), like Pfeffer and Yukl, acknowledges that power is potential impact and influence is actual impact. He, like other scholars he draws upon, conceives of power as dependent on the control of resources and converted into influence by the skill and will of the actors.

For the purpose of this case study, power is described as *potential influence* on the behaviors and attitudes of others (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 7; Yukl, 1998, p. 177; Blalock, 1989, in Mazzoni, 1991b, n.p.); influence refers to the *actual exercise of power* that shapes or determines decision outcomes (Mazzoni, 1991b, n.p.). In adopting these definitions for this study, this research drew on Mazzoni's power and influence model to unpack the power-influence dynamics surrounding the 1998 decision to provide state funds for school library media programs and the 2001 decision that failed to enhance and extend the dedicated funding program for school library media programs. Thus, power is explained by describing the actors' resources and their influence is gauged by examining the content of decisions, attributions of influence, and actual influence efforts. Some scholars, such as Dahl (1984) and Gamson (1968), have recommended this approach in examining power and influence relationships.

Scholars who focus on state education policymaking have used these indicators to gauge influence in the legislative arenas (Mazzoni, 1991a; Geary, 1992; Malen, 1985).

The content of the decisions as an indicator of influence focuses on whose interests are represented in the decision outcome and whose interests are not reflected in the outcome. The analysis of the content of decisions provides initial clues about the winners and losers in political struggles. While actors who come out on the winning side may or may not have been the influential forces that helped secure a victory, the content of decisions made provides preliminary but useful evidence about who may have been key players in the process (Dahl, 1984; Malen, 1985; Mazzoni & Malen, 1985; Mazzoni, 1991a). A second indicator, attributional data, reveals who is perceived as influential (Gamson, 1968; Dahl, 1984). Those involved in the policymaking process render judgments about the relative power of players. Scholars have incorporated this indicator as a way to gauge influence in various arenas, including state legislatures (Mazzoni & Malen, 1985; Malen, 1985; Mazzoni, 1991a; Geary, 1992). A third indicator, the detailed accounts of actors' efforts to influence the process, help the analyst determine if the judgments based on decision outcomes and attributional data constitute plausible interpretations of political decisions (Gamson, 1968). Again, scholars of state education policymaking have relied heavily on these combinations of indicators to make judgments about influence relationships in state legislative arenas (e.g., Mazzoni, 1976; Geary, 1992; Malen, 1985).

By using a conceptual or theoretical framework, the relationships of power and influence in public policymaking become clearer. The following sections

describe several policymaking frameworks designed to gain insight and knowledge

about the legislative process, and hence, learn more about how power and influence

translate into policy decisions. These policymaking frameworks originated from the

systemic and behavioral approaches first used to analyze policymaking and provide

the foundation for the more recent theories that will be used to guide this study.

Early Conceptual Frameworks

Kanter (1972), drawing on the seminal work of Gamson (1968), identifies two

major theoretical frameworks used to study public policymaking–systemic and

behavioral. She writes:

> The systemic approach considers the system as a whole, the relation
> of system parts to one another, and how the overall system maintains
> itself or disintegrates over time and regulates conflict…The
> behavioral approach considers the interactions and exchanges among
> political actors as they struggle for power and influence (Kanter,
> 1972, p. 78).

A systems orientation to the study of policymaking is one of the first

foundational perspectives used to analyze the policymaking process. The systems

perspective focuses on the institutions in which decisions are made and the broader

environmental forces that impinge on that system. This perspective directs attention

to how inputs, including demands for policy change, are generated and then converted

into outcomes. The characteristics or properties of the political system circumscribe

the political processes used to make decisions about the distribution of material and

symbolic resources. The characteristics include the regularly interacting actors and

the established rules, regulations, norms, and practices that guide and, at times,

govern how actors make decisions. The institution and its properties reside within a

broader environment that is also important because it affects both the supports for

policymaking institutions and the pressures imposed on policymaking systems. Examples of these broader forces include demographic change, fiscal stress, public criticism, and political traditions (Mazzoni & Sullivan, 1985). Using the systems perspective, researchers examine institutional characteristics and environmental dimensions to better understand how as Mazzoni (1993) puts it, the "environmental context along with the structure of the system shapes the way in which politics unfolds on an issue" (p. 359).

Easton's political systems model (1985) is the prime example of how the systems perspective can be used to analyze the policymaking process within an organization or system. Easton identifies the official actors within the political system as the key players responsible for converting issues into policies that regulate conflict surrounding the distribution of scarce resources. Unofficial actors, those outside the system, do not have the authority to make binding policy decisions. However, these unofficial actors can still influence policy choices, especially if they are skilled and tenacious in gaining access to authorities and if they mobilize in efforts to persuade and pressure those who have the formal power to make policy changes. If the various sets of unofficial actors, often termed interest groups, cannot reach the official actors through assorted avenues of influence or sets of connections, they may have little opportunity to impact policy decisions. Conversely, if interest groups forge powerful linkages with key officials, they may be able to affect considerable influence.

Scholars Wirt and Kirst (1982) have used the systems perspective to examine education policymaking in various education arenas. This line of work illustrates the

interdependence of educational institutions throughout the political process. For example, Wirt and Kirst (1982) describe how inputs in one component of the educational system affect change in another element of that system. In their view, when political systems convert inputs (stresses and demands) into public policies (outputs) within the education environment, these outputs can change other systems. The following example further illustrates this interdependence by describing how decisions made in the federal arena impact policy at the state and local school system level.

Based on President Reagan's education policy that emphasized the responsibility of the states and local governments to improve schools, the federal government changed its funding practice from targeting monies for specific educational programs, such as school libraries, to one that gave states and local jurisdictions more decision-making discretion over how they spent monies by consolidating the targeted funds into block grants. At the same time, the trend to incorporate more technology applications into instructional practice placed demands on the states and their local jurisdictions to provide the funds necessary to purchase computers, install networks, and train teachers in their instructional use. As a result, some administrators re-directed funds they previously spent to improve school library media programs to provide technology and reduced capacity of school library media programs to meet the informational and instructional requirements of students and teachers (Morris, 1992).

As this brief discussion indicates, the systems perspective provides a general characterization of the policy process, but does not provide the analytic tools required

to unpack the human interactions that affect how an issue is converted into a policy. Nor does the systems model illuminate how institutional and/or environmental forces condition how the actors may seek to influence the policymaking process other than through formal/institutional arrangements that are pre-determined (Geary, 1992; Mazzoni, 1991b). In short, systems models do not help the analyst get at the dynamic processes through which issues gain attention and get converted into identifiable policy decisions. For that reason, scholars began to blend the systems perspective with models rooted in the behavioral tradition.

For example, Allison's political bargaining model (Allison, 1971; Allison & Zelikow, 1999) incorporates a systems perspective by acknowledging that the environment and the institution in which policymaking occurs impact the process. At the same time, Allison's model emphasizes elements of the behavioral tradition by focusing on the strategy of conflict between and among actors and unpacking the dynamics among the various actors. This model directs attention to the various actors, their positions in the systems and their stands on the issue, as well as the resources they may have at their disposal, the risks they may be willing to take, and the rules of the game that condition their strategies to explain how the political actors actually develop policy. The actors' sources of power are shaped not only by their formal positions within the system or organization and the specific requirements of those positions (i.e., what the players may and must do), but also by "an elusive blend of three elements: bargaining advantages; skill and will in using these bargaining advantages; and other players' perceptions of the first two ingredients" (Allison & Zelikow, 1999, p. 300). The actors' *stakes and stands* (i.e., combination of actors'

interest in the issue and their commitment to the organization's interests) influence the risks they are willing to take. The rules of the game define how the game is played. They shape who plays, who has access to the players, and the power of each player. The system's action-channels provide a structure for the bargaining process (Allison, 1971; Allison & Zelikow, 1999). Thus, policymaking is not a random process. Rather, that process is conditioned by formal and informal rules of the game.

Several scholars have combined the political systems and the political bargaining models to obtain a better understanding of education policymaking in state arenas (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt, 1986; Mazzoni & Malen, 1985; Geary, 1992; Mazzoni, 1993). For example, Campbell and Mazzoni were among the first to combine the systems and behavioral frameworks in their study of state education policymaking. This multi-state examination of education policymaking defined policy decisions as the outcomes of a process that decides, again, using Lasswell's classic phrase, "who gets what, when, and how" within a number of education arenas. Formal and informal actors mobilize their resources to bargain with one another in order to maximize their gains and minimize their losses as they attempt to impact policy decisions. Resources include "anything they control which can be brought to bear on another actor so as to alter the latter's subjective definition of the advantages and disadvantages in a decision situation" (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976, p. 8). The resources available to the actors are dependent on, but not limited to, their positions within the state education policymaking system.

Formal actors (e.g., governor, legislators, state board members, and chief state school officer) are groups of actors that interact on a regular basis to affect state education policy. These formal actors have positional powers that include legal authority, agenda-setting prerogatives, and organizational status. Informal actors (e.g., representatives of teacher organizations, school board organizations, and administrative groups) may not have the same positional powers, but they have other resources that they can bring to bear on the policymaking process. These resources include money, constituencies, expertise, prestige, and other assets that can be used to gain access to the decision arenas, mobilize supporters, or neutralize opponents (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976). The success of both formal and informal groups of actors in using their powers to influence policy change is dependent on how effectively actors deploy their resources and how intensely and persistently they work to influence the process.

Marshall, Mitchell, and Wirt (1986) conducted case studies of the educational policymaking processes in six states (Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Arizona, Wisconsin, Illinois, and California) to determine the power and influence of various state education policy groups. One of their findings described how policymakers use perceptual screens in developing educational policy within their state according to "a shared sense of what is appropriate in action, interaction, and choice" (Marshall, et al., 1986, p. 366). The authors termed these perceptual screens *assumptive worlds* (Marshall, et al., 1986, p.366) and included this concept as a contextual element of educational policymaking along with political culture, informal processes, formal structure, partisan politics, and key actors' values. For example, they argued that

Arizona's policymakers had a shared belief that education policymaking was directly related to the state's overall economic development. Consequently, during the period of their study, the policymaking elite (i.e., legislators, state board of education, and the chief state school officer) worked with business groups to develop education policy. In West Virginia, the state constitution gave education a special status and set the stage for the CSSO to sue the governor for equitable funding and win. Since the assumptive worlds or shared beliefs about appropriate policymaking actions, interactions, and choices differed from state to state, policymaking groups experienced various levels of success in their attempts to impact the education policymaking process.

Other contributions made by Marshall, et al. (1986) focused on the key players in wielding power and influence during the education policymaking process. By analyzing the results of elite interviews, the authors rank ordered different actors according to the power and influence policymakers perceived them to hold.

According to Marshall, et al. (1986), *insiders* were considered the most influential groups of state education policymakers by other groups. Individual legislators or the state legislature as a whole usually occupied this category because of their expert knowledge or experience with educational issues and their positional authority that included the power of the purse.

The *near circle* was the next highest ranking of influential groups and was frequently occupied by CSSOs, state department of education senior staff, teachers' association, and all education interest groups. Those groups occupying the near circle of influence achieved this ranking in part because their full-time occupation involves

education policy. With the exception of education interest groups, these players have additional resources that included "legitimate, expert, and authoritative responsibility for managing state education policymaking" (Marshall, et al., 1986, p. 352). The influence of education interest groups was limited to their ability to combine forces and work as a coalition. According to Marshall et al. (1986), however, governors and their executive staff also occupied the near circle, but ranked behind other groups in their influence. While more recent research (Mazzoni, 1994) places governors in the inner circle, at the time of their study, the policymaking influence of governors was a relatively new phenomenon fueled by the national interest in education as well as their responsibility for education finance reforms. Hence, governors, at that time, may have been less influential on education policy issues than they are currently.

Those groups in the *far circle* are perceived as influential, but not as crucial education policymakers (e.g., SBEs). *Sometime players* are involved, but perceived as less influential (e.g., state board and administrator associations) than the SBE. The *often-forgotten players* included the courts, textbook producers, and the federal government, actors that can influence directly and indirectly, the policy choices in state arenas.

Mazzoni and Malen (1985) expanded the political bargaining model by using it to describe the relative power of special interest groups that apply a strategy of constituency mobilization to influence the adoption of tuition tax credits and deductions in Minnesota. The conceptual framework of the study combined power categories with a systems orientation to analyze how the Minnesota Catholic

Conference and the Citizens for Educational Freedom alliance adeptly used their resources of numbers, organization, information, and access to expand grassroots influence in legislative decision-making. The interplay of influence among competing actors explained how the alliance was successful in applying its resources to affect policy change. Through a sustained and carefully orchestrated effort, a unified interest group overcame opposition to tuition tax credits and deductions for nonpublic school children by keeping the issue continuously on the legislative agenda, persuading sympathetic legislators to support the bill, and activating constituents to sway votes in the legislature. According to the findings of the Minnesota study, constituents swayed legislative votes most effectively by applying pressure and threatening sanctions rather than through persuasion. In fact, "the ballot-box threat [had] the greatest impact" on elected officials' behavior (Mazzoni & Malen, 1985, p. 112).

Geary (1992) illustrates how Allison's political bargaining model augments Easton's political systems model in the analysis of the special education funding decisions in Utah. Easton's political systems model structures the policy conversion process and Allison's political bargaining model provides the descriptive tools required to unpack the dynamics of the policymaking process within the *black box* of the system (Geary, 1992, p. 50). By tethering Allison's political bargaining model to Easton's systems model, Geary is able to uncover the dynamics of policymaking in the system's interior.

Current Policymaking Models

The more recent conceptual frameworks developed by Kingdon (1995) and Mazzoni (1993) add further refinements to the systems and political bargaining models. Their individual works demonstrate that both system and behavioral traditions are important and useful in analyzing the policymaking process. While Kingdon and Mazzoni do not study the same level of government or the same set of issues, they do select and combine various notions of the systems perspective and the political bargaining framework in analyzing the public policymaking process.

Current Models: Kingdon

As earlier noted, Kingdon (1995) studied public policymaking in the federal arena and developed a multiple streams model to illustrate how problems, solutions, participants, and choice opportunities come together at various times and in different combinations to produce dramatic changes in policy (Kingdon, 1995). While the coming together is characterized by seemingly random acts, the process is marked by discernible patterns. Kingdon illustrates these patterns by describing multiple streams of activities (i.e., problem recognition, policy generation, and political events) and by looking at how participants in these streams influence policy developments. Kingdon promotes this model rather than theories of rational decision-making or incrementalism (i.e., gradual changes in policy), because he believes this model captures the realities of policymaking more accurately. Rather than using a linear process that begins with goal-setting and proceeds through a series of stages that include establishing standards of achievement, canvassing for solutions, and developing evaluation methods, participants are more often interacting with other

participants to hook problems to solutions, solutions to politics, and ultimately politics to policies. Kingdon suggests that policy processes have "a loose messy quality to them, not a tight, orderly process that a rational approach specifies" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 78). He notes that policies shift more than incremental theories allow because of "a somewhat accidental confluence of factors" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 78) he describes in his multiple streams model.

According to Kingdon (1995), a problem must be recognized and placed on the agenda if it is to be addressed. Agendas are set by developments in all three streams, as well as by actors who work within and across streams. Kingdon recognizes several categories of participants and describes the ways they might affect how agendas are set and how alternatives get formulated. He identifies the resources that various actors typically have at their disposal, their incentives for action, and the strategies they may use in influencing the policymaking process.

For Kingdon (1995), the participant categories are inter-related and include those who operate inside and outside of government and players who are considered visible or hidden. Insiders tend to represent the administration. They are civil servants, members of Congress and their staffs. Outsiders include interest groups, academics and researchers, members of the media, and broad publics. Those players who are visible, such as the president and high-level appointees, prominent members of Congress, the media, and political parties are well positioned to affect agenda setting. Visible players' most valuable resource in setting the agenda is their positional power. Unlike hidden players who are more likely to generate alternatives than put an issue on the agenda, the visible players are expected to set policymaking

agendas. Visible players such as members of the executive and legislative branches of government are often motivated to act to fulfill their responsibilities as elected officials and to receive publicity that will enhance their re-election or possibilities for higher office (Kingdon, 1995). A strategy often employed by these visible players is to give attention to the problem or issue while campaigning, to include it in the party platform, or to introduce it in a bill. The executive branch has advantages that include formal opportunities to articulate the agenda through the state of the union address and budget proposals. The executive branch also has advantages in advancing the agenda because of its capacity to command media attention in press conferences and to form commissions and task forces that may broaden the arena by engaging other participants or contain the discussion by limiting it to a select group.

Hidden players include academics and researchers, career bureaucrats, congressional staffers, and administrative appointees. The most important resource for the hidden players to use in developing proposals is their expertise in a specific area. Generally speaking, they are motivated by a willingness to be concerned with the minute details required to draft credible proposals for consideration. Interest groups travel between the visible and hidden clusters, but are most often involved in developing alternative proposals. They sometimes get involved in affecting the agenda by petitioning the more visible participants to see things their way. More often, however, they work to influence proposals by blocking initiatives that threaten their interests and by inserting protections in proposed policies (Kingdon, 1995).

An actor of particular importance in Kingdon's multiple streams model is the policy entrepreneur. Kingdon introduces this player as an "advocate for proposals or

the prominence of an idea" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 122). The policy entrepreneur is critical to recognizing or creating opportunities to couple policy alternatives to salient problems and to political developments. Kingdon likens this opportunity to the opening of a window that lets in a policy to address a problem or respond to a political event. Policy entrepreneurs can be highly visible or relatively hidden players who operate inside or outside of government. "[T]heir defining characteristic…is their willingness to invest their resources – time, energy, reputation, and sometimes money – in the hope of a future return" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 122). The policy entrepreneur may be motivated to invest these resources to protect bureaucratic turf. Other reasons for entrepreneurs to advocate proposals are "because they want to promote their values, or affect the shape of public policy, ... they enjoy advocacy, they enjoy being at or near the seat of power, they enjoy being part of the action" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 123). Strategies employed by entrepreneurs to affect policy change include softening up the policy communities by educating other players through speeches, reports, studies, conversations, conferences, and legislative proposals. Additional strategies involve tailoring proposals to meet specific criteria such as "technical feasibility, value acceptability within the policy community, tolerable cost, and/or anticipated public acquiescence" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 131) and/or altering proposals to ensure "a reasonable chance for receptivity among elected decision makers" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 131).

Several researchers have applied Kingdon's multiple streams model of public policymaking at the federal level to the state education arena and found it useful in explaining the outcomes of education policy decision events. Holderness (1990),

42

McLendon (2003), and Stout and Stevens (2000) examined state education issues in New Mexico, Arkansas, Hawaii, Illinois, and Minnesota. Holderness used Kingdon's multiple streams model to study New Mexico's state-level policymaking concerning gifted and talented education. She reported several reasons for the failure of a gifted and talented education fiscal policy as an agenda item: the absence of a policy entrepreneur; failure to recognize gifted and talented education as a problem; a non-existing highly visible participant or crisis event; and an alternative solution or policy accompanied by a proposed budget.

In his study of how the decentralization issue at the higher education level was translated into policy in three different states (i.e., Arkansas, Hawaii, and Illinois), McLendon (2003) illustrates how policy entrepreneurs can be successful advocates if they "push attention to their pet problems or … solutions … when a window of opportunity opens" (McLendon, 2003, p. 487). Each state in McLendon's study had a long-standing conflict over locus of control that converged with the political interests of elected state officials. Because of their diligence and an ability to recognize politically favorable opportunities, policy entrepreneurs in each state were able to influence policy decisions by attaching their favorite solutions to problems floating through government. In Arkansas, a governor's resignation created a power vacuum that provided an opportunity for a senator to rebuild his power base by proposing a decentralization plan adopted from another state. During an economic crisis in Hawaii, a university president was successful in gaining university autonomy by linking decentralization to economic development. He convinced legislators that if freed from bureaucratic oversight, the university would be able to pursue

43

entrepreneurial activities (e.g., partnerships with business and industry) to spur economic development. In Illinois, the idea of decentralization had been considered earlier, but this time "a serendipitous convergence of political and economic forces" (McLendon, 2003, p. 503) resulted in the decentralization issue being placed on the legislative agenda. These forces included the Republican governor's desire to find an education agenda, growing opposition from the Assembly Democrats, the lieutenant governor's public speaking gaffe, and an economic recession.

Stout and Stevens tested Kingdon's model in their study of the defeat of Minnesota's diversity rule that required local school systems to submit education plans and eliminated the State Board of Education (SBE). They described the governor's visible involvement in the issue, identified other actors and the political advantages they might gain from the adoption of this rule and the advantages they might lose in the defeat of the regulation. While the authors argued for expanding the model to explain the power and influence dynamics of the various policymaking actors (i.e., governor, state superintendent, and legislators), they did not identify a policy entrepreneur, a key feature of Kingdon's model. Although Stout and Stevens did not capitalize on the whole model in their efforts to test its application to the defeat of the diversity rule and the elimination of the Minnesota SBE, they did illustrate the importance of highly visible players, notably governors, in setting policymaking agendas and the importance of describing the dynamics within the various streams of the policymaking process in order to see how events unfold.

Current Models: Mazzoni

Mazzoni's power and influence model emerges from his work on state
education policymaking not only in Minnesota (1974, 1985, 1987, 1991a, 1993), but
also in his studies and reviews of education policymaking in multiple states (1976,
1994). Selected readings illustrate that he draws on both political systems and
bargaining models to analyze state education policymaking. Mazzoni derived his
power and influence model initially from the comparative study of state education
policymaking with Campbell (1976) described earlier. In that study, Campbell and
Mazzoni identify formal and informal actors and the functional relationships among
them as key components in the policymaking system. Mazzoni refined the model on
the basis of findings from subsequent studies at times carried out in cooperation with
colleagues and graduate students. A common theme in many of these studies is the
influence of political leaders (governors and key legislators) on the educational
policymaking process. In 1985 after analyzing structured interviews conducted over a
nine-year period and 14 case studies that investigated Minnesota state education
policymaking, Mazzoni concluded that political leaders have greater policymaking
influence than do bureaucrats. Among the players highlighted in his study of state
activism in the 1980s were governors and legislators. Other players included
superintendents and business organizations. Mazzoni identified strategies that these
actors used to influence agenda setting and policymaking (e.g., commission reports,
the bully pulpit, and media publicity).

Evidence of a systems perspective is also seen in Mazzoni's analysis of state
education policymaking. In 1991, Mazzoni analyzed Minnesota's experience with

the school choice issue and concluded that the forum or arena in which the policymaking occurs influences the outcome. In 1993, Mazzoni published a 20-year perspective of Minnesota education policymaking that combines a systems and behavioral orientation to guide the analysis of influence relationships among the key actors – individuals, groups, and coalitions – as demands are converted into decisions. This work explains decision outcomes by illustrating patterns of alignment and accommodation among the competing actors, actors who differ in preferences, resources, and strategies and are channeled and constrained by systemic features – most fundamentally, by the distribution of power and the institutional rules of the game (Mazzoni, 1993) – and by the system's external environment.

Mazzoni's arena model is a further refinement of his earlier power and influence models. He developed the arena model using insights acquired from decades of research on the school choice issue in Minnesota (1987, 1988, and 1991a). In his original arena model, derived from a review of relevant research, Mazzoni emphasized the forum or setting (i.e., legislature, task force, and conference committee) in which policymaking occurs and identified the actors, their resources, and the strategies they might use to affect policy change. He argued, "[a]renas do more than locate decisive sites for decision-making action" (Mazzoni, 1991a, p. 116). The arena determines the participants, establishes the rules of the game, and influences the strength of the participants' resources and strategies and their ability to use them to reach agreements. Mazzoni classified the arena of action into two types: the subsystem and the macro arenas. Participants of the subsystem are actors with specialized interests and limited visibility that use an orderly process of policy

formation, negotiate within relatively narrow boundaries, and forge incremental

changes in education policies (Mazzoni, 1991a). Inside players, who are usually

bureaucrats, state legislators, and/or lobbyists representing established interests,

populate this arena. The actors who are top government officials and populate the

macro arena are much more visible and accessible than those in the subsystem. When

actors who are inside players are losing the inside game, they can choose to shift the

contest to the macro arena to shake up the constellation of power by expanding the

scope of conflict to new players and a broader public. In addition to high visibility,

the actors in the macro arena generally have "positional resources … combined with

their political savvy and protective institutional arrangements" (Mazzoni, 1991a,

p. 127) to use in bringing about a policy change. Change in policy occurs when

actors shift issues from the subsystem to the macro arena. That shift is often

precipitated by a combination of strong external pressure for change and revenue

surpluses.

Mazzoni refined the initial arena model after testing it with data from his

Minnesota studies. In the revised arena model, he added two additional arenas:

leadership and commission arenas that illustrated how the players in each used the

resources and strategies specific to these arenas to affect policy change. He argued

that actors in the leadership arena have resources made available to them by their

position and party, such as authority over staff with technical information and

"unrivaled use of communication media" (Mazzoni, 1991a, p. 130). Similar to a

systems perspective of policymaking where features of the organization determine

who gets involved, the resources they employ, and the strategies they use to affect

policy choices, the forum or arena shapes the actors, the resources at their disposal, the strategies that are possible, and the rules of the game. In the arena model, the top-level elected officials operated to affect policy by using their resources according to established procedures in their specific arena (i.e., committee or legislature) or shifted the problem or issue to a new arena (i.e., commission) where different actors were able to employ a different set of rules.

In both models, Mazzoni made a distinction between the subsystem and the macro level of actors with the most significant difference being the amount of visibility afforded the two groups because of the rules that govern the decision-making process in each arena. For example, members of the macro arena usually have more authority, connections, and access to communication networks than subsystem members. This distinction illustrates how he brings the systems and behavioral traditions of public policymaking analysis together. The emphasis is on the actors and how they use the resources to affect policy change, but those resources are dependent on the arena or forum in which the decision-making occurs and the broader forces that impinge on the decision arena.

Scholars have used Mazzoni's framework to examine education policymaking in other states. In using Mazzoni's arena model to discuss education policymaking in Ohio, Fowler (1994), identified visible participants as leaders actively engaged in promoting the passage of the Ohio School Reform Bill S. B. 140 (1987-89). As was the case in the Ohio study, these leaders sometimes appointed commissions and panels to study issues and make recommendations. Fowler strongly suggested that the people on these commissions and panels, while usually keen advocates or

opponents of issues, most often acted as substitutes for the leaders. By subordinating

the influence of commissions on policymaking, Fowler's finding suggested that

commissions could be a strategy used by governors who appointed them.

In their analysis of Connecticut's education policy development since 1980,

Freedman and Hughes (1998) identified several commissions and panels used to

make significant change in K-12 education, criteria for approval of teacher

preparation programs, and requirements for teacher certification policy. In examining

these commissions and panels of the subsystem arena, they attributed success in

developing policy to the low visibility of the subsystem arena. In contrast,

participants in the macro arena are highly visible. The high visibility of people at the

macro level where players often have different agendas sometimes leads to the

"evolving politics of the theater replacing the pragmatic politics of the meeting room"

(Mazzoni, 1991a, p. 117 in Freedman & Hughes, 1998, p. 2). Freedman and Hughes

agreed with Mazzoni that the energy required for *theater politics* is difficult to sustain

(Freedman & Hughes, 1998, p. 2) so it is often easier to work towards policy change

at the subsystem level. Participants who populate advisory commissions and panels

(i.e., well-established educational leaders and legislators) at the subsystem level are

able to "work together over a longer period of time, negotiate if conflicts arise, and

quietly establish education policy" (Freedman & Hughes, 1998, p. 2). Since

commissions and panels proved to be successful strategies for establishing policy

change, "political and educational leaders in the state not only directly appoint[ed]

members to commissions, but also often participate[d] themselves as members of

commissions" (Freedman & Hughes, 1998, p. 2).

All of the models reviewed here have common elements that are used to explain the outcome of a decision event. These elements include: the setting, arena, or forum; the participants or actors; the resources that participants bring to bear on the process; their motivations for getting involved; the strategies they use to achieve their goals; and the interactions between and among the players in particular contexts.

While both Kingdon's multiple streams and Mazzoni's power and influence frameworks use common elements to analyze public policymaking, the combination of these two models enhanced this investigator's ability to analyze the policymaking processes that resulted in the 1998 decision to fund school library media programs and the 2001 decision to curb that funding. While Kingdon provides a viable framework for examining decision events, Mazzoni provides stronger analytic tools to unpack the interactions between and among the actors within the streams and explicit indicators to gauge actor influence.[3] The researchers' use of common elements in developing their frameworks facilitated combining these two models to form a more complete framework for examining the Maryland general assembly's policy decisions in 1998 and 2001 about funding school library media programs. The complete framework includes categories that decades of research on state level education policymaking demonstrate are important elements of any attempt to understand education policy decisions made at the state level.

---

[3] Mazzoni draws heavily on Kingdon (1984) in his layout of the arena model (Mazzoni, 1991a).

Setting

An examination of the setting facilitates an understanding of how the various contextual features of the decision arena condition and constrain the flow of influence in an issue conflict (Mazzoni, 1993). These various features include the institutional arrangements and the broader environmental trends and forces that surround and impact the decision arena. Institutional arrangements refer to the recognized rules of the game that define the roles and behaviors of the actors according to accepted and expected codes of conduct based on the formally defined powers of an agency or institution and the norms that have evolved over time. These arrangements also may include intergovernmental arrangements (i.e., the formal rules governing how units of government within and across levels of the education policy system relate to each other). Arenas are important because "they legitimate a set of participants, establish the institutional and social context–including the 'rules of the game'–mediate the potency of resources and strategies, and encourage some means (and discourage other means) of reaching agreements" (Mazzoni, 1991a, p. 116).

The characteristics of the decision arena, however, offer only a partial explanation of the policymaking process because that process is nested in a broader socio-economic context. This broader environmental context provides insight into how "politics unfolds on the issue" (Mazzoni 1993, p. 359). The environmental context includes the demographic, socio-economic, and cultural characteristics that contribute to "the unique political context of each state" (Fuhrman, 1988, p. 63). According to Fuhrman (1988), research on state politics indicates "political beliefs and behaviors vary significantly among the states. Those convictions and activities in

51

turn shape the development and nature of policy including the translation of policy into practice" (p.64). While focusing events (e.g., election cycles, political scandals, and natural disasters) in the broader environment sometimes generate issues that influence the policymaking process, a state's political culture is a more consistent influence on the process.

Political culture is "the particular pattern of orientation to political action in which each political system is imbedded" (Elazar, 1984, p. 84). Its significance to the study of state education policymaking is as "the historical source of difference in habits, perspectives, and attitudes that exist to influence political life" (Elazar, 1984, p. 85). To help us understand how a specific political culture can place competing demands on the system, Elazar (1984) described three distinct political subcultures within the United States (i.e., individualistic, moralistic, and traditionalistic). He suggested that the differences in at least three aspects of these political subcultures could affect state education policymaking,

> They are (1) the set of perceptions of what politics is and what can be expected from government, held by both the general public and the politicians; (2) the kinds of people who become active in government and politics, as holders of elective offices, members of the bureaucracy, and active political workers; and (3) the actual way in which the art of government is practiced by citizens, politicians, and public officials in light of their perceptions (Elazar, 1984, p. 90).

States may have elements of all three subcultures, but usually have a prominent orientation to government. For example, citizens and public officials who hold an individualistic view of politics tend to value commerce and want government action to "encourage private initiative and widespread access to the market place" (Elazar, 1984, p. 94). "The moralistic political culture emphasizes the

commonwealth conception as the basis for democratic government" and is inclined to view politics as a "means for coming to grips with the issues and concerns of a civil society" (Elazar, 1984, p. 96). The traditionalistic political culture is usually more concerned with the "continued maintenance of the existing social order" (Elazar, 1984, p. 99). Based on these brief descriptions of the three basic political subcultures by Elazar (1984), analysts might predict that a state with an individualistic political culture might be more inclined to consider school choice and/or vouchers to encourage competition between public and private interests to promote school improvement; one with a more moralistic view towards education policymaking might be more open to equalizing its school funding formula to ensure that every school district has sufficient funds to provide all students with an appropriate education; and a state with a strong traditionalistic political culture would tend to resist change in its educational system in order to maintain its "elite-oriented political order" (Elazar, 1984, p. 99).

Fuhrman, Clune, and Elmore (1988) and Mazzoni and Sullivan (1985) have provided examples of how the political culture of a state influences the choice of educational reforms. Among the findings in Fuhrman and her colleagues' study of six states (i.e., Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania) over a five-year period was that "the educational reforms of the 1980s were strongly reflective of state political context" (Fuhrman, et al., 1988, p. 245).   For example, citizens in states with a dominant traditional culture and/or a strong moralistic strain appeared to trust their leaders as evidenced by their support for the school reform initiatives proposed by their governors and legislators. The legislative packages

"shaped and shepherded" (Fuhrman, et al., 1988, p. 242) by leadership in all six states incorporated implementation strategies (i.e., incentives or mandates) that also reflected the political culture of the state. For example, the moralistic political culture of Minnesota fostered a statewide commitment to education while deferring curriculum implementation to local districts where citizen input could be cultivated more effectively (Mazzoni & Sullivan, 1985). As a result, "[m]ost reforms [were] positively designed to foster school district capability, and …stress[ed] incentives rather than commands to encourage grassroots cooperation (Mazzoni & Sullivan, 1985, p. 188). The political culture serves as a filter for what problems and alternatives may be considered as well as how political dynamics may unfold. Similar to the notion of assumptive worlds (Marshall, et al., 1986, p. 366), a state's political culture may be an important contextual factor that shapes education policy decisions.

According to Elazar (1984), Maryland's political culture is individualistic with a strong traditional strain that is characterized by activities that maintain traditional patterns, such as local control. However, one can see hints of a moralistic tendency with the Thornton Commission's work to equalize state education funding. Since literature on state education policymaking in Maryland is limited, evidence of how the state's political culture may shape policymaking is sparse at best. Policymaking literature does suggest, however, that analysts be sensitive to this dimension of policy context.

Actors

The term *actor* refers to the participant whose actions have an important effect on the process dynamics and the decision outcomes (Allison, 1971; Allison & Zelikow, 1999). An actor may be an individual, or a group, such as a committee, a bureaucracy, a coalition, or even a state (Meltsner, 1972; Mazzoni, 1991b). Policy analysts provide several ways to characterize these various individuals, groups, and entities as actors. Selected examples include: the actors' positions on issues (Meltsner, 1972); their level of visibility during policymaking (Kingdon, 1995; Mazzoni, 1991a); and their degree of influence on the outcome (Marshall et al., 1986).

Both Kingdon and Mazzoni categorize actors as visible and hidden. According to Mazzoni, highly visible top-level officials populate the macro arena and *behind the scenes* operators populate the subsystem. Other researchers make similar distinctions when describing the participants in the public policymaking process who, as highly visible participants, actively engage in the process and use their resources to put issues on or to keep them off the agenda (Fowler, 1994; Freedman and Hughes, 1998; Holderness, 1990; McLendon, 2003; and Stout and Stevens, 2000).

Marshall et al. (1986) categorize players according to their degree of influence on the state education policymaking process. As earlier noted, they identify players who are insiders, near circle, far circle, sometime players, and often forgotten players. According to these categories, the most influential of the state policymaking groups or insiders are individuals considered to have expert knowledge or experience on

educational issues while the players with the least amount of influence are the often-forgotten players because they have very limited knowledge and experience in dealing with the issues.

The policy entrepreneur as an actor warrants special consideration. As mentioned earlier, this actor is a key player in Kingdon's model, and is also recognized by Mazzoni and others as significant in affecting policy change (e.g., Holderness, 1990; Martinez, 2006; McLendon, 1999; Mintrom, 2000; Roberts & King, 1996). The policy entrepreneur can be for or against an issue, a highly visible or hidden player, and/ or reside in the near or even the often forgotten groups of players. Qualities that contribute to an entrepreneur's successes include expertise, political connections and/or negotiating skill, and persistence. What sets entrepreneurs apart from other players is "their willingness to invest their resources—time, energy, reputation, and sometimes money—in the hope of a future return" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 122). Mazzoni acknowledges the important role played by individual policy entrepreneurs during Minnesota's school reform initiative of the 1980s. "These individuals were assertive, tenacious, and skillful on behalf of the choice issue and other components of the restructuring agenda" (Mazzoni, 1993, p. 365). They were capable of "seizing the moment to hook solutions to problems" and "proposals to momentum" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 58).

The following section expands on what we know about various state-level policymaking actors by describing the resources, strategies, motivations, and interactions they employ to affect policy change. The most prominent player to

emerge from the literature on state education policymaking is the governor, followed closely by the legislature.

Governors as Education Policy Actors. Governors have become increasingly active in state education policymaking. Perhaps it is because governors have been pressed by "their rising political responsibility for education, accountability for budgets, and pressure from interest groups (e.g., teacher associations) to be more proactive in their agenda setting in education policymaking" (Marshall, et al., 1986, p. 352). According to Mazzoni, the National Governors' Association ranked higher than the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Education Commission of States, as well as teacher and business organizations in their influence on educational issues. "More than any other state actor, [governors have] the institutional authority, organizational resources, and media access to dramatize need, frame issues, and set agendas" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 61). This finding supports predictions made by Wirt and Kirst (1982) some 12 years earlier that governors were becoming more prominent in state education policymaking and confirms the prediction reported even earlier by Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) in their multi-state review of policymaking for public schools.

Governors are characterized as potentially powerful players due to their extensive positional resources. These resources include: appointive powers; budget authority; and veto powers, as well as patronage; publicity; the promise or threat of campaign support or opposition; possibility of advancement; and the calling of special sessions (Rosenthal, 1990). This characterization echoes the description of governors' resources provided by Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) in their multi-state

examination of educational policymaking. Their research revealed that governors'

resources include control over the budget, veto power, legislative influence, staff

resources, appointment of commissions and task forces, visibility and contact with the

news media, and sometimes, structural control over the SDE. While these formal

powers are significant, informal powers that consist of bargaining and persuasion

skills, prestige of office, popular support, political party affiliation, and access to the

mass media are also important resources used to affect agenda-setting (Rosenthal,

1990) particularly, and other phases of policymaking as well, such as proposal

advancement and decision enactment (Mazzoni, 1991a; 1994).

Fuhrman, Clune, and Elmore (1988), Malen and Campbell (1986), and Fowler

(1994) provide similar examples of how governors use their powers to affect policy

choices. Fuhrman, et al. (1988) describe how governors and legislators play key roles

in initiating educational reform policies by seizing policy opportunities, coordinating

and expanding state policies, and anticipating and actively shaping the state policies.

Sometimes governors take the lead while the legislature lends support. At other

times, governors align their support with legislators to make the difference. Fuhrman,

et al. (1988) found that the California legislative reform package was developed by

the senate education chair and supported by the governor. While Arizona's teacher

career ladder was the product of the legislature, the governor supported it. Georgia's

education reform resulted from a gubernatorial task force. The Pennsylvania State

Board of Education proposed reforms, but the governor provided the substance. In

each case, the governor's active involvement in the process contributed to the passage

of the policy initiative.

Malen and Campbell (1986) describe how the Utah governor was key in that state's reform ventures. By using a familiar strategy of appointing a task force (i.e., the Education Reform Steering Committee (ERSC) to define and promote particular education initiatives, the governor sought to take advantage of the strong "political winds" supporting education as a policy issue. The ERSC used its substantial resources (e.g., stature, expertise, money, a forum, and political connections) to overcome resistance from other groups (e.g., teachers' union). These efforts led to the passage of a key piece of legislation that authorized $15.3 million for a career ladder program (Malen & Campbell, 1986).

Fowler (1994) identifies top-level government officials (i.e., governor and legislators) as key policy actors in her study of state education policymaking in Ohio and credits the governor with a policy change engineered through the appointment of commissions and panels. Even though the actors in the commission arena may represent a number of different stakeholder groups who are persistent, skillful change advocates who can play to the media in backing popular demands for policy change (Mazzoni, 1991a), they are appointed by the top-ranking officials who have more potent resources. These resources are available to them by virtue of their positions and party, authority over staff with technical information, and "unrivaled use of communication media" (Mazzoni, 1991a, p. 130). As a result of having greater resources, the top-level government officials' policy preferences probably will prevail to influence the policy choices. Fowler's finding (i.e., subordinating the influence of commissions on policymaking) is in agreement with that of other researchers (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Malen & Campbell, 1986) who earlier suggested that

commissions can be a strategy used by governors to influence policy choices. By establishing a commission to study an issue or develop a policy, the leadership may keep an issue relatively contained and invisible to the general public while members hammer out issues and hone compromises in the commission meetings. The resulting policy choice also often has the broad based, but partisan support required to pass.

In summary, governors have become more active in state education policymaking and command extensive positional assets that they can bring to bear on the process. If combined with personal resources, including political skill and will, they can be major forces, not only in setting agendas, but also in pressing through the legislation.

Legislators as Education Policy Actors. While governors have become major actors in state education policymaking, "gubernatorial activism is often complemented – or countered – by legislative activism" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 62) that involves specific legislators becoming the "active pilots" in the process (Fuhrman, 1990, in Mazzoni, 1994, p. 62). In fact, Mazzoni reports that "most of the steady work in shaping policy" was done by the legislators while "governors did the high-profile policy work, exerting a more showy influence on selected issues" (1994, p. 62). While less showy than governors, legislatures have grown accustomed to a commanding presence in the field of education policymaking. This presence is due in part to the more sophisticated education committees whose members and staff have developed expertise by working on educational issues over a long period of time (Fuhrman, 1990; Rosenthal, 1974).

Fuhrman's finding is in agreement with that of an earlier conclusion reported by Marshall, et al. (1986) in their case studies of the policymaking dynamics in six states. Other policymaking groups they interviewed considered the legislature to be the most influential of the policy actors because of its expert knowledge and experience in dealing with educational issues. Expert knowledge and experience extend beyond single education policy issues to include budgetary concerns that often impact education policy decisions. Since it is the legislature's role to review and modify the budget, not formulate it, the legislature also has developed resources to use in reviewing the governor's budget that include specialized fiscal staff agencies, computerized fiscal information systems, and revenue-estimating capability (Rosenthal, 1990). The importance of these resources has increased since governors are introducing more and more initiatives through the budgetary rather than the legislative process. When this venue is used, the legislature may be limited in the action it can take once the budget is formulated, especially in Maryland's general assembly where legislators may only approve or decrease items in the operating budget. They cannot add, increase, or transfer items to other categories and/or projects (Rosenthal, 1990). In these instances, the governor's policy choices may prevail; but, the legislators are not without resources they can employ to challenge them.

According to Rosenthal (1990), legislators are motivated to use their resources by their career ambitions in government and politics. "They find public office appealing and the game of politics exhilarating" (Rosenthal, 1990, p. 63). Stout and Stevens (2000) appear to agree with Rosenthal as evidenced by their finding in a

study of the Minnesota diversity rule: the legislature was motivated in its opposition to the rule in order to maintain leadership in education policy circles. Legislators' motivations are not all characterized by narrow self-interest, however. Many view their jobs as elected officials as carrying the responsibility to represent their constituents' interests in the public policymaking process, "even though this may not agree with [their] personal views" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 153). Legislators also may regard themselves as "trustees of state constitutional responsibility for education since statute defines the dimensions and the funding of the educational system" (Fuhrman, 1990, p. 10).

Legislators use their resources not only to develop legislation, but also to plan and implement strategies to block the governor or other legislators by eliminating legislative items during committee, caucus, and floor stages of deliberation (Rosenthal, 1990). They employ strategies such as modifying, delaying, or rejecting legislation. They also have been known to badger and frustrate the executive branch and their legislative colleagues to influence a policy decision (Rosenthal, 1990). Mazzoni (1994) credits many legislators for being successful policy entrepreneurs. "Individual legislators, whose activity generally received far less media coverage than governors, were influential across the states; indeed, their overall impact probably exceeded that of any other single class of actor" (p. 58). One such example was Minnesota House Majority Leader Connie Levi who "adroitly performed the required sensing, formulating, espousing, managing, and linking functions" (Mazzoni, 1991a, p. 128) that provided students with a post secondary choice option. In summary, the legislature has a number of potent institutional resources and strategies, as well as

individual members who either have or develop the skill and will to employ these resources and strategies in the pursuit of public policy change.

State Education Agencies. Other policy actors prevalent in state education policymaking include those associated with state education agencies, such as chief state school officers (CSSO), state boards of education (SBE), staffers, and bureaucrats. Recent studies of the impact of state education officials and staff on education policymaking are rare; but earlier studies provide some limited, dated data to use in examining their influence. The resources of this group of actors include formal authority and information about national, state, and local education programs to use in developing policy (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976). Marshall, et al. (1986) reported that their study respondents considered the CSSO and senior SDE staff as having high influence in the policymaking process because their full-time occupation is in developing education policy. In states where CSSOs are elected, they have additional resources, such as political constituencies and support groups. As elected officials, CSSOs have incentives, such as promoting and protecting their "regime interests" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 62) that motivate them to influence the policymaking process. In states where the SBE appoints the CSSO, the state superintendent of schools is still considered to have more influence than the SBE even though the collective resources of the board members include authority, time, information, cohesion and prestige (Marshall et al., 1986). Generally speaking, it is the CSSO who sets the agendas of both the SDE and SBE (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976). This responsibility allows CSSOs to determine which issues get addressed, but broader forces sometimes intervene to influence the CSSO's agenda-setting authority. Other

issues, such as taxes, welfare, jobs, crime, and/or an economic downturn, may become more predominant and cause education to become less important on the state governmental agenda (Mazzoni, 1994).

While CSSO's as heads of the departments of education are frequently key actors in state education policymaking especially because of their role in setting department and state SBE agendas, staffers and bureaucrats are also important participants in the policymaking process. As a set of actors working for the CSSO, staffers are most important in working on policy alternatives. They have the expertise and often the dedication to work long and hard in detailed negotiations to promote an issue, clarify details of proposals, and do the preparation often required to place a proposal on the agenda. Their primary resource is access to the leadership and special interest groups. Staffers also are considered by other actors in the policymaking process to have high influence because their full-time occupation is developing education policy and, in some cases, they have access to information that other players may not review (Kingdon, 1995; Marshall et al., 1986). Bureaucrats are most important in providing information on how to implement the proposal. Their advice and consultation are seen as critical in developing alternatives because they have expertise, dedication to programs, an interest in their expansion, access to interest groups, and staying power. They often are motivated to act in an effort to protect their turf (Kingdon, 1995), but have a broader set of reasons for involvement. These reasons include recognizing "a policy window" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 165) as an opportunity "to put forward their preferred solutions and maneuver them into enactments" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 59). Their preferred solutions are often based on

their "specialized knowledge" (Mazzoni, 1985, p. 79) and serve to fill in the content of new policy formulated by other actors, such as legislators.

      Interest Groups. Another set of potentially influential actors is interest groups. "An interest group is any association of individuals or organizations, whether formally organized or not, that attempts to influence public policy" (Hrebenar & Thomas, 1993, p. 9). These groups can play an important role in mobilizing support for issues, blocking action, or maybe even initiating proposals (Mazzoni, 1982). Generally speaking, interest groups have three major resources that they can use to impact public policymaking. These resources include electoral advantages, economic influences, and cohesion (Kingdon, 1995). Educational interest groups (EIGs), such as teacher unions and professional organizations representing administrators and boards, may wield influence because of their large memberships (i.e., size and distribution) that represent votes and money (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Hrebenar, 1997). Unity and cohesion can produce political clout if the membership is committed to a lobbying program (Hrebenar, 1997, p. 45) or conversely, their fragmentation can be a reason for their loss of influence.

      Numerous studies document that interest groups can be influential actors on a range of education policy issues. In Connecticut, three (3) EIGs effectively opposed commission recommendations (i.e., outcome-based education and teacher quality) intended to improve schooling. Even though their opposition was for different reasons, the groups overcame their differences to present a united front against the commission's report (Freedman & Hughes, 1998). In Minnesota, a special interest group advocating tax concessions for private school students demonstrated how a

single-issue interest group can be even more of "a potent voting bloc" (Mazzoni &

Malen, 1985, p. 106) than those that represent more fragmented interests. Study

informants noted that legislators found the issue impossible to ignore because of the

group's "narrow focus, disciplined organization, determined membership, and

political activism" (Mazzoni & Malen, 1985, p.106). By contrast, when groups lose

their cohesion due to internal dissensions and competing interests, they jeopardize

their effectiveness in being able to impact decision-making (Kingdon, 1995). For

example, Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) noted in their twelve state comparative study

of educational policymaking that in states where interest groups were divided on

labor-management issues such as salary, certification, and tenure, their ability to

influence other issues had been greatly diminished.

Another important interest group resource is special access to decision makers

or the media. This resource, however, depends on the respect, prestige, and status of

individual members or the general membership (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976;

Hrebenar, 1997). While interest groups experience some success in getting their

issues on the agenda, access to governors and legislators is critical for an initiative to

have a chance of being heard, not to mention, to have a chance of becoming a policy.

For example, big business, an influential force in the 1980s and 90s, achieved success

by forming partnerships with governors (Mazzoni, 1994). Minnesota's Business

Partnership possessed a "potentially powerful status and financial and networking

resources" (Mazzoni & Clugston, 1987, p. 318) and "its influence…did add

significant if not decisive weight to the Perpich forces" (p. 319) in passing

Minnesota's open enrollment legislation, but overall "its legislative clout was

modest" (p. 322) because its efforts to impact other reform legislation failed.

Mazzoni (1994) provides additional examples of big business' modest success in affecting change in education policy in his review of influences and influentials in state policymaking. In his review, he identified some states (e.g., Texas and Georgia) where business interest groups had been able "to have decisively shaped K-12 reform legislation," (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 63), but these successful influence efforts appeared to be the exception rather than the rule. Big business required the "backing of the governors and key lawmakers for its initiatives to have any prospect of passage" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 63) in a number of other states like Arizona, Arkansas, Kentucky, Florida, and South Carolina. Modest success was due in part to several mitigating factors, such as the fractured nature of the business groups, a crowded arena, and the "countervailing power of the teacher unions and other education interest groups" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 64). Sipple's (1999) study of the Michigan Business Roundtable produced similar results. He concluded that various institutions that were already well established limited the effectiveness of the big business group by impacting the Michigan group's activities and confining their efforts to the state level. As a result, local school system policies remained largely unchanged.

     The Media as Policy Actor. The media can be a potent actor in the education policy process because it can draw attention to issues. In addition to selling newspapers or "air time," the media is sometimes motivated by a responsibility to address the problems and/or issues faced by the community (i.e., civic or public journalism). Its resources are primarily the journalists who conduct research and report on issues; the circulation and/or audience who receive the report; and the

credibility or reputation of the media outlet. Strategies employed by the media to "transmit issue salience" (Stapleton, 2002, p. 21) to the public in order to influence policy include: (1) using a critical event for attention; (2) framing an issue to encourage judgment; and (3) limiting the public's choice on the issue by supporting some ideas over others (Stapleton, 2002). The media may interact with other policy actors to frame an issue for the public by writing and publishing/broadcasting editorials, publishing letters to the editor, meeting with other policy actors, and interviewing other players to provide "media coverage" (Stapleton, 2002, p. 15).

The following examples from state education policymaking literature describe how the media have used their resources to influence public policymaking. Stout and Stevens (2000) attribute the 1985 defeat of Minnesota's diversity rule to an opinion piece by a conservative columnist in opposition to the proposed rule. The opinion piece not only drew much public attention to the issue, but also drew an "ideological line in the sand" (Stout & Stevens, 2000, p. 346) and challenged the governor's educational policies. Fowler (1994) gives partial credit to the media for the passage of open enrollment legislation in Ohio because the media initiated a barrage of letters to the editor in opposition to tax increases in response to a newspaper column accompanied by a political cartoon. The public's perceived opposition to any additional taxes required to fund other educational reforms severely constrained those proposals.

While some researchers concede that the media can influence public policy, others argue that the media has only a limited impact. "Mass media clearly do affect the public opinion agenda, [but only minimally because] the press has a tendency to

cover a story prominently for a short period of time and then turn to the next story, diluting its impact" (Kingdon, 1995, pp. 57). The amount and depth of coverage seems to depend more on policymaking drama than on policy substance. "Media writers and producers seem attracted most to issue conflicts that can be personalized as disputes between attractive, repellent, or provocative antagonists" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 371). This attraction was played out during a crisis in Baltimore, Maryland when the city's schools were seen as failing the city's youth and systematic reform of the school system was critical to the city's future. As Stapleton (2000) summarized:

> The newspaper concentrated much of its coverage on the interplay
> between the school system, the mayor, and the state. Part of this had
> to do with the fact that these entities had intense and very public
> disagreements on how Baltimore schools should be run (p. 282).

As a result of its education coverage, the newspaper was given credit for "shin[ing] a light on city schools," but not necessarily improving them (Stapleton, 2002, p. 286).

While this section presents a suggestive rather than an exhaustive review of the actors in the public policymaking process, it does serve to sensitize the researcher to the range of actors who may be influential, the resources at their disposal, their motivations to deploy them, and the strategies they may use to affect state education policy decisions. Based on a review of theoretical and empirical literature about public policymaking, this researcher selected two frameworks to use in combination as an *integrated model* to facilitate the study of two Maryland legislative decision events.

An Integrated Model for Analyzing Two Maryland Legislative Decision Events

As a result of reading and reviewing public policymaking literature, especially about state level policymaking, this investigator identified frameworks that have proven useful to researchers analyzing state policymaking and combined elements from each into a model based primarily on the conceptual frameworks developed by Kingdon and Mazzoni. This integrated model comprises several categories used to analyze Maryland state education policymaking during two key decision events focused on dedicated funding for school library media programs, one in 1998 and the other in 2001. These framework categories are as follows: the actors or players, their goals, motivations, resources, strategies, and the interactions they employ to affect the decision or outcome of the policymaking process in each of the phases or, as Kingdon puts it, streams of policymaking activity: problem recognition, policy generation, and political events.

The integrated framework guiding this study is grounded in Kingdon's multiple streams framework and augmented by Mazzoni's power and influence model. The multiple streams model is a point of departure selected because it is a prominent policymaking model that has proven useful in efforts to understand state education policymaking. Kingdon's model, therefore, helped to explain how the school library media program became a legislative agenda item in 1998 for the first time since 1870 and again in 2001.

Mazzoni's model is an essential addition, not only because it is a framework built from research in state level education policymaking, but also because it complements and extends Kingdon's model of how events unfold in the streams of

problem recognition, political events, and policy generation. Mazzoni's model was employed because its components (actors, goals, motivations, resources, strategies, setting, and interactions) help analysts explicitly examine the dynamics in each stream and because it provides indicators that scholars can use to gauge the influence of key actors (decision outcomes, attributional data, and influence efforts). Taken together, the works of Kingdon and Mazzoni help analysts tell a more complete story of how efforts to pass HB 1 in 1998 led to legislative victory and provided state funds for school library media programs while efforts to pass HB 935 in 2001 resulted in legislative defeat that withheld further funding for these programs. While Kingdon recognizes the impact that various actors have on the policymaking process, especially the policy entrepreneur, it is Mazzoni who provides the tools to describe the interactions between and among the participants and to gauge their influence when exerting power to impact educational policy. These tools include a heuristic for arraying the dynamics to identify influence patterns and relationships that help to build plausible explanations for the policy decisions.

Questions that guided the search for information to develop explanations were based on three indicators of influence: decision content, attributional data, and influence efforts. In examining the content of the decisions, indicators of influence focused on whose interests were represented in each decision outcome and whose interests were not reflected in the outcomes. Attributional data revealed who was perceived as influential. Those involved in the policymaking process rendered judgments about the relative power of players. Detailed accounts of actors' efforts to influence the process helped determine if the judgments based on decision outcomes

and attributional data constituted plausible interpretations of political decisions. In sum, the Mazzoni and Kingdon frameworks served as complementary frameworks for unpacking and interpreting the dynamics of Maryland state education policy decisions in regards to the allocation of resources for school library media programs.

Definitions of Terms

This section lists and defines the terms and categories employed to help clarify the integrated framework used to analyze the legislative events of 1998 and 2001.

Power: The term power is used to describe the potential influence on the behaviors and attitudes of others and is explained by describing an actor's resources.

Influence: The term influence refers to the actual exercise of power that shapes or determines decision outcomes and can be gauged by examining decision content, attributional data, and actual influence efforts.

Problem stream: The problem stream is where problems compete for attention amid a combination of broad forces and human interactions that work to place items on the agenda or block items from being placed on the agenda. Broad forces include focusing events (i.e., crises and disasters) and feedback on existing programs that draw people's attention to a problem on a recurring basis or of sufficient magnitude that the problem refuses to be ignored. Conditions that can impact the placement of a problem on the agenda include the following: budgets can promote or constrain the ability to deal with the problem; government officials and/or the public lose interest, get used to it, or believe that they must do something about it; and/or an important individual promotes the issue (Kingdon, 1995). Human

interactions affect problem recognition as demonstrated by people who work to direct attention to some problems rather than others, work to shape which problems are taken seriously, and work to shape how problems are defined and prioritized.

Policy stream: The policy stream deals with the formation of policy proposals, including the consideration of appropriate alternatives that make giving further attention to the issue or problem more likely. Kingdon likens the dynamics in this process to "biological natural selection" because "many ideas float around, bumping into one another, encountering new ideas, and forming combinations and recombinations" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 200). While the process might seem chaotic and random, analysts may gauge which alternatives are more or less likely to survive and be selected. Proposals that survive tend to meet three criteria: technical feasibility, value acceptability, and ability to overcome possible constraints (i.e., budget, public acceptance, and elected officials' approval). In order to survive, policy proposals must be seen as viable alternatives, a match with community members' values, cost effective, and acceptable to both the public and the policymakers.

Political stream: The process in the political stream "flows along according to its own dynamics and its own rules" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 162) quite independent of the activities in the problem and policy streams. The activities in the political stream, however, are affected by institutional arrangements and environmental conditions such as public climate or mood, election cycles, and interest groups that create shifts or a response to shifts that make some proposals more viable while rendering others "dead in the water" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 149). Analysts must pay attention to these complex dynamics to determine which proposals are likely to succeed or fail.

Policy entrepreneur: The policy entrepreneur is an important actor who as an advocate is willing to invest his/her resources to promote public and/or personal interests or values, to gain electoral benefits, or for the sheer enjoyment of the game (Kingdon, 1995). This individual is usually persistent and will "lie in wait--for a window to open" (Kingdon, 1995, p.181) and, at that time, may play a critical role in coupling the problem, policy, and political streams to affect policy change.

Policy window: Policy window is a phrase used by Kingdon to identify opportunities for policy shifts. Typically, policy windows open when problems press on government and require a solution or when political events require a response. Actors capitalize on these opportunities to reach into the policy stream for an alternative that can be seen as a solution, attach it to problems and events to secure enactment (Kingdon, 1995).

Actors: Actors are individuals, or groups of individuals, who seek to influence the outcome (Mazzoni, 1991b, n.p.).

Goals: The term *goals* refers to the objectives that actors strive to achieve by participating in the policymaking process. These goals "inspire and guide influence attempts" Mazzoni (1991b, n.p.).

Motivations: Motivations refer to the reasons actors are willing "to mobilize resources to influence issue outcomes" (Mazzoni, 1991b, n.p.).

Resources: Resources are "anything controlled by one actor that can be brought to bear on another actor so as to alter the latter's subjective definition of the advantages and disadvantages in a decision situation" (definition adapted from Nuttall, Scheuch, & Gordon by Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976, p. 8).

74

Strategies: The term "strategies" refers to the actors' efforts to influence decision outcomes. According to Mazzoni (1991b), "it is strategic action which converts power and will into decision advantage. Conversely, bungling strategy can fritter away or foul up the most powerful of resources and frustrate the most willful of political actors" (Mazzoni, 1991b, n.p.).

Settings: The setting refers to the institutional and socio-cultural contexts, including the broader trends and forces that surround and impact a decision arena.

Interactions: The term *interactions* refers to the influence relationships among actors that yield decisions on an issue. Influence is gauged by examining the decision content, attribution data, and influence efforts.

Outcome: The term *outcome* refers to the decision reached on an issue.

<u>Research Questions</u>

The test of the integrated model is determined by how well it provides a plausible explanation for specific legislative decision making outcomes. The following sets of research questions were used to unpack the legislative processes that resulted in legislative victory for library media program advocates in 1998 and legislative defeat in 2001.

Problem Stream

- How did school library media funding gain agenda status in the Maryland legislature?

- Who was involved in shaping the agenda and why?

- How did these actors try to influence the agenda?

- What impact did these actor(s) have on the agenda-setting process?

- How did the context condition the ability of the actor(s) to influence the agenda?

Policy Stream

- How did the proposal to fund school library media programs get formulated?

- Who was involved in developing the proposal and why?

- How did these actors try to influence the proposal formulation process?

- What impact did the actor(s) have on the proposal formulation process?

- How did the context condition the ability of the actor(s) to influence the proposal formulation process?

Political Stream

- How did the school library media funding issue get decided?

- Who was involved in the decision event and why?

- How did these actors try to influence the decision-making process?

- What impact did the actor(s) have on the decision-making process?

- How did the context condition the ability of the actor(s) to influence the decision-making the process?

The responses to these three sets of questions provide the basis for a final research question: How did contextual forces and actor relationships converge to explain the passage of HB 1 and the defeat of HB 935?

By conducting case study research and an analysis of the two decisions using an integrated model based on a theoretical policymaking framework developed by Kingdon (i.e., multiple streams) and augmented by Mazzoni's power and influence

model, the study provides a foundation for gauging the validity and utility of the

integrated model.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methods

This research examines two key decision events in the Maryland General Assembly (1998 and 2001) as a political process that pivots on the power of the players, is shaped by developments the problem, policy, and political streams, and is often decisively affected by policy entrepreneurs. The study seeks to uncover the factors that account for the decision to allocate resources to school library media programs in 1998 and not in 2001 and to test the validity and utility of the integrated model. The research questions and the theoretical framework developed to guide the study point to a qualitative, exploratory case study as an appropriate research strategy since prior research on the topic is limited.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design selected and provide a rationale for this choice. The first section of the chapter defends the use of an exploratory case study design. In the second section, reasons for examining the two specific cases are presented. The third section identifies the data sources. Sections four and five explain the procedures employed for data collection and analysis, respectively. The sixth section describes the controls used to minimize bias and error. This chapter concludes with a section on the ethical considerations relevant to this research.

Rationale for Exploratory Case Study Design

Case studies are appropriate when research seeks to understand complex social processes (Yin, 1994) like state education policymaking (Mazzoni, 1991a). Experienced researchers have used case study designs successfully to examine

education policymaking in states as diverse as Hawaii, Minnesota, Ohio, and Utah (e.g., Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Geary, 1992; Holderness, 1990; Malen, 1985; Malen & Campbell, 1985; Mazzoni & Sullivan, 1985; Mazzoni & Clugston, 1987; Mazzoni, 1988; Fowler, 1994; Stout & Stevens, 2000; McLendon, 2003). This research illustrates how various actors influence the policymaking process in regard to issues such as school choice, special education, gifted and talented funding, and the decentralization of higher education.

Exploratory case study is also appropriate when the topic of interest has not been the subject of exhaustive research (Merriam, 1998) as is the case with the school library media funding issue. By examining a previously under-studied issue, the researcher has an opportunity to search for relevant factors and to provide a descriptive foundation for future research (Merriam, 1998). For these reasons, case study design was selected as the appropriate research strategy to use in developing a descriptive account and an interpretation of the events.

While case studies have advantages, they have been criticized for several reasons: lack of scientific rigor; inability to generalize findings to other cases; the amount of time required to collect rich, thick descriptive data; and for the lengthy documents that others might be hesitant to read (Yin, 1994, and Merriam, 1998). These same criticisms, however, also can serve as "useful precautions for the investigator" (Geary, 1992, p. 71). For example, critics of case study research point to the potential for the investigator to distort the data. However, others counter this critique by noting that the investigator can adopt an analytic stance when gathering evidence, analyzing data, and writing the report (Murphy, 1980). Further,

experienced researchers (Yin, 1994; Merriam, 1998; Murphy, 1980; Shulman, 1988) provide directions and guidelines for novice and less experienced investigators to follow that will enhance the rigor of their work. For example, Guba and Lincoln (1983) identify "tests for rigor," (p. 103) or strategies for minimizing error and bias that focus on establishing the validity and reliability of the findings. These guidelines are addressed in the section describing controls to minimize bias and error followed in conducting this case study research.

The second criticism lodged against case study as a research strategy is the inability to generalize the findings of a single case to specific populations (Yin, 1994). Instead of regarding case study findings as applicable to "populations or universes" (Yin, 1994, p. 10), the investigator's purpose is to generalize to a theory. This study focuses on the pivotal constructs of power and influence using a theoretical framework that combines Kingdon's and Mazzoni's public policymaking models to understand how and why one legislative initiative was passed while the other was defeated. Findings resulting from an exploratory study of the 1998 and 2001 decision events that resulted in different outcomes yield "analytic generalizations" (Yin, 1994, p. 30) that help readers better understand state education policymaking in Maryland and affirm or refine models used to examine the state education policymaking in Maryland as well as in other contexts.

Other criticisms of case study research reflect concerns that collecting and analyzing rich, thick descriptive data is time-consuming and produces lengthy reports that limit the utility of the research (Yin, 1994; Merriam, 1998). While "thick description" may require additional time to write, it contributes to the reader's

80

understanding of the phenomenon under study. When done well, the use of "descriptive text can actually serve as a means by which to engage and maintain the reader's attention throughout the entire length of the document" (Curtis, 2003, p. 32). Geary (1992) also notes that concerns about working with an inordinate amount of data can be addressed by employing "an analytic framework that defines and directs the precise and productive search for categorically relevant data" (p. 73). This study used a framework based on the Kingdon and Mazzoni models to guide data collection, analysis, and report writing. The framework helped make the study manageable for the researcher and the reader. While case study research, like any research method, has its critics, the method can be employed responsibly to produce a credible report.

Selection of the Two Cases

The two policy decisions selected for study are the inclusion of school library media programs in an omnibus funding bill passed by the Maryland legislature in 1998 and the defeat of legislation proposing the continuation of state funds for library media materials as well as program enhancements in 2001. These cases were selected because they represent an entire set of state level decisions on the issue, the Maryland setting is significant, and the topic is of interest to the researcher.

Policy Decisions

The school library media program is considered important and suitable for study for several reasons. First, while numerous studies conducted in other states and at local levels report the positive impact that school library media programs have on

student achievement, no research exists to explain why this potentially promising policy option is inconsistently supported and arguably under-utilized in many states, including Maryland. A study of these cases adds to the literature on school library media programs as a policy issue at the state level.

In addition to being a topic of interest to the researcher, the substance of each case presented an opportunity to test the suitability of the combined frameworks to study state education policymaking by comparing and contrasting two decision events on the same issue that produced different outcomes. The 1998 legislation (HB 1) was an omnibus bill that contained dedicated funds for several programs, including school library media. The outcome of this legislative effort marked the first time since 1870 that the state legislature provided matching funds to local school systems for library media materials. Three years later, the legislature received a stand-alone bill (HB 935) proposing the continuation of these funds for materials and the expansion of monetary support for the recruitment and professional development of library media specialists and the establishment of a K-12 digital library. Study findings provide information about why the first legislative effort was successful and the second was not. This information can be used to examine the utility of the integrated model as a way of understanding the politics of this unexplored issue. It also demonstrates if the application of the model generates insights for proponents about conditions under which particular proposals may succeed or fail.

Maryland as the State Setting

Maryland is considered an appropriate setting for this study because the state legislative arena provides an opportunity to compare and contrast two policy decision

82

events that resulted in distinctly different outcomes for school library media programs. Even though the Maryland SBE recognized the educational value of the library media program when its members adopted a regulation in 1987 that outlined program standards, it did not contain a funding provision to assist local school systems with compliance. As a result, the SBE placed the full responsibility of program funding on local school systems. This lack of dedicated funding was especially problematic because the categorical federal monies previously received through ESEA for school library media programs had been consolidated into block grants. In response to new technology trends and initiatives, local jurisdictions redirected some of these funds to the acquisition of hardware and software and professional development to support technology implementation. At the same time, state program standards outlined requirements for staffing and materials that necessitated continued funding to provide certified library media specialists and current, up-to-date materials for teachers and students to use for teaching and learning. Explaining how and why members of the Maryland legislature decided to provide funds for instructional resources in 1998, 11 years after the SBE adopted the regulation, but not again in 2001, is intended to illuminate state policymaking in regards to funding school library media programs in Maryland.

Another reason to study state education policymaking in Maryland is to contribute to the information on its education policymaking process. Despite the sometimes highly controversial statewide school reform initiatives (e.g., Maryland School Performance Program and local school reconstitution), few studies unpack the dynamic processes through which state officials make education policy choices.

While dissertations exist on the views and attitudes of educational leaders and policymakers (i.e., Stroble, 1975; Darensbourg, 2003) on various topics (i.e., contemporary issues facing elementary and secondary education and state intervention on education in Baltimore City Public Schools) as well as the influence of select actors (i.e., the press) on policymaking (Shilling, 1984; Stapleton, 2002), these studies demonstrate that the state has not been the focus of much state-level education policymaking research.

A final and critical reason to select Maryland as the setting for the study is the potential for access to the data sources. As an individual doing an independent project, it is essential to have access to key data sources; focusing on a proximate setting helps to provide access to relevant documents and informants. In this case, archival records are available in a number of state libraries (i.e., Legislative Reference and Maryland Archives). In addition, documentary evidence such as committee and conference reports, legislation, and newspaper articles are readily available. Moreover, the willingness of the central figures and proximate observers to participate in a small study of the 1998 decision event for a course paper encouraged this investigator to expect a similar response with an expanded study.

Data Sources

A characteristic of case study research is the use of multiple sources of data. This case study research relied on three sources of data in examining each of the decision events (1998 and 2001): (1) official documents; (2) secondary source accounts, and (3) interviews. Because findings and conclusions are more convincing and accurate when based on several different sources of information (Yin, 1994),

multiple sources of data were examined for a convergence of information "on the same sets of facts or findings" (Yin, 1994, p. 78).

Documentary Data

According to several case study experts (e.g., Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Creswell, 1998; and Merriam, 1998), documents provide information on institutional context and broader environmental forces that shape policymaking dynamics. Documents also provide information on the content of decisions, the officials involved, their positions on the issues, and the chronology of actions (Murphy, 1980). Official documents for this study include versions of the bills, department of education reports, and staff memos and emails concerning the bills of interest. These documents were used to provide not only background information to help in constructing case chronologies, but also to identify "an informant pool of official and proximate actors and observers by name, position, and stand on the issue" (Geary, 1992, p. 81) and to correct or corroborate data from other sources.

In addition to these primary source documents, the investigation of the second case was informed by a journal this researcher kept. The journal spanned November 2000 to March 2001. It covered events leading up to and including the decision event of HB 935 and provided a firsthand account of this investigator's involvement with this issue, the events witnessed, conversations with other actors, and participants' interactions. The journal provided a systematic account that could be analyzed like other written records and used to check what otherwise might have been a rather haphazard recollection of events and the experiences.

Secondary Source Data

Secondary sources include books, journal articles, and newspaper accounts. These sources contribute to the investigation in three ways (Geary, 1992). They (1) provide contextual information about the policymaking process by describing Maryland's political cultural and institutional arrangements, (2) give background information on the policy issue at the state and national levels, and (3) identify the actors typically involved in education policymaking,

Interview Data

Several scholars (e.g., Murphy, 1980; Allison & Zelikow, 1999) deem interviewing the best method to use in examining issues of process such as those involved in public policy decision-making and understanding what the results of the decision-making mean to "key participants and influentials" (Murphy, 1980, p. 77). Documents often do not reveal "accurate accounts of the bargaining" that is inherent in the political process. As a result, "information must be gleaned from the participants themselves" (Allison & Zelikow, 1999, p. 312). Interviews were used "to gather descriptive data in the subjects' own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some piece of the world" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 94). To this end, semi-structured interviews were used to gain participant accounts of the process that resulted in the passage of HB 1 in 1998 and the failure of HB 935 in 2001.

Using a set of pre-determined questions based on the theoretical framework, the interview process gathered information about the actors who influence developments in the three policymaking streams. Specifically, this information

identified their goals, motivations, and resources; described the strategies they used to influence decision outcomes; and analyzed the interactions that occurred. Interviewees were individuals with firsthand knowledge of the legislative decision events studied. They were given written assurances of confidentiality and anonymity to increase the likelihood that they would be willing to share information.[4] While some interviewees were central figures and were identified at the outset of the study, others were identified after the study was underway, as data were collected (Murphy, 1980). Interview sources suggested individuals who were especially knowledgeable about the cases; these interviewees were added to the informant pool. A profile of the semi-structured interview informant pool is outlined in Table 3.

---

[4] Written assurances of confidentiality and anonymity are Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements. In providing these assurances, I do not divulge names of individuals I interviewed; I do not attribute quotations included in the report to any individual by name or identifying characteristic.

Table 3

Profiles of Informants for Semi-Structured Interviews

Case	Official Actors	Proximate Actors/Observers
HB 1	Office of Governor Office of State Superintendent of Schools Senate House	Executive Staff Legislative Staff State Education Agency Staff Interest Group Representative Media Correspondent
HB 935	Office of Governor Office of State Superintendent of Schools Senate House	Executive Staff Legislative Staff State Education Agency Staff Interest Group Representative Media Correspondent

In conducting interviews, this investigator followed Leech's (2002) recommendations for conducting *elite interviews*. Elite interviews are "interviews of people in decision-making or leadership roles" and "can be used whenever it is appropriate to treat a respondent as an expert about the topic at hand" (Leech, 2002, p. 663). In order to conduct successful interviews with those who are "highly placed respondents" (Leech, 2002, p. 665), Leech suggests using a semi-structured interview guide that allows respondents a "chance to be the experts and to inform the research" (Leech, 2002, p. 668). The semi-structured interview guide consists of open-ended questions with probes to use as needed. The interviewer lets study participants

describe what happened and uses probes to encourage detailed descriptions of events. The interview guide ensured that this investigator invited informants to cover aspects of the process that they may have omitted in their description of the events.

Procedures for Data Collection

As noted in a previous section, documents and interviews were used to develop a better understanding of state education policymaking in Maryland and to explain the *how* and *why* of two legislative decisions in regards to funding school library media programs.

Documentary Data Collection

Documents were retrieved from several state libraries such as Legislative Reference, Maryland Archives, and *SAILOR, Maryland's Online Information Network* that is available through the State Library Resource Center. Another source of documents is interviewees (Murphy, 1980). For example, agency officials, interest group representatives, legislative staff, and media correspondents were asked to suggest material for further reading or to identify someone who "might have important documents that should be read" (Murphy, 1980, p. 127). Experienced researchers caution, "…documents must be carefully used and should not be accepted as literal recordings of events that have taken place" (Yin, 1994, p. 81; see also Merriam, 1998; Geary, 1992). Even official documents are edited before a final printing. Merriam (1998) provides a list of questions that helped this researcher determine the authenticity of the documents used in the investigation by questioning the origin of the document, the author's credibility, the purpose of the document, and

whether or not it was complete. As noted earlier, documents may serve several useful

purposes in gathering evidence in case study research (e.g., background information,

chronologies, and names of individuals involved in the policymaking process), but

the information contained in documents should be crosschecked with other

documents and corroborated by other methods (Murphy, 1980).

Collecting Interview Data

Central figures and proximate observers on both sides of the issue regarding

state funding of school library media programs provided interview data. Central

figures included members of the executive and legislative branch of state government

directly involved in the decision events as well as interest groups representing

different stands on the issue. The selection of interview sources was based on the

following criteria: "proximity to the decision-making process; potential for diverse

perspectives; reputation for knowledge and candor; accessibility; and willingness to

participate" (Malen, 1985, p. 4). A letter was sent to selected informants introducing

the study and requesting an interview. Follow-up phone calls were used to establish a

date, time, and a place for the interview and to highlight the information that was sent

to them prior to the interview. This information included a written consent form, a

description of the study, and the legislative chronologies (Appendix A).

Murphy and others (Yin, 1994; Merriam, 1998) advise developing an

interview guide to ensure that the researcher covers key issues and asks questions

important to answering the major research questions. This researcher followed this

advice and used semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions (Appendix B).

According to Aberbach & Rockman (2002), elites and other highly educated people

90

"do not like being put in a straightjacket of close-ended questions. They prefer to articulate their views, explaining why they think the way they think" (p. 674). Open-ended questions provide the opportunity for informants to share their recollections of the process. In addition, prompts were included in the interview protocols to encourage detailed responses (Leech, 2002). Probes provided opportunities to add information, to address aspects of the process study participants may not have addressed in their initial response to the open-ended questions, and to capitalize on their specialized knowledge of the process by encouraging them to elaborate on comments made earlier. This approach yielded the detailed information sought and was compatible with the informants' preferences.

Tape-recording the interviews was considered, but determined to be a possible constraint in getting interviewees to reveal information. While Aberbach and Rockman (2002) identified several advantages in tape-recording their interviews that included facilitating a "conversational style" and "minimizing information loss" (p. 675), Woliver (2002), on the other hand, found tape recorders to be "intrusive for her and the interviewee" (p. 678). According to Yin (1994, p. 86), using a tape recorder "is in part a matter of personal preference." While citing the advantage of collecting accurate information, he cautions that it is no "substitute for 'listening' closely throughout the course of an interview" (p. 86). All these reasons for taping the interviews were considered, but dissertation committee members advised against using a tape recorder for the first reason given. As a result, the interviews were not taped and this researcher listened carefully, and took copious notes during the interviews.

91

Data analysis is a systematic process that involves examining and arranging the documents and interview transcripts to increase an understanding of the information they contain (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Analysis requires working with these data to organize them, break them into manageable units, synthesize them, search for patterns, and discover what is important and what is to be learned. "Analysis is [actually] a process of data reduction" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 183) used to discover what is important and what to tell others.

The theoretical framework is the tool employed to analyze the data. The integrated policymaking framework provides the categories used to organize and code the data. Data were analyzed by developing a case study database using Kingdon's three convergent streams of problem recognition, policy development, and political events. Within each stream, the components of Mazzoni's power and influence model (actors, goals/motivations, resources, strategies, interactions, and outcomes) were employed to break the data into more manageable units, to display the political dynamics, and to search for patterns within and across the public policymaking streams. Information gleaned from documents and interviews was arranged in appropriate categories to assess the data. In searching for data that both confirm and disconfirm the themes posited in Kingdon's multiple streams and Mazzoni's power and influence models, this investigator developed each case, sought to confirm and disconfirm data for analysis in each case, and then analyzed the two cases by searching for patterns and comparing and contrasting these patterns. This process involved using the integrated policymaking framework to compare details of the

policymaking processes employed in the legislative victory of HB 1 (1998) against those identified in the legislative defeat of HB 935 (2001).

Controls to Minimize Bias and Error

Criticisms concerning the quality of case study research often focus on what is perceived as a lack of rigor due to opportunities for bias and error to contaminate the research and its findings during the various phases of the research process (i.e., design, data collection, and analysis). This research incorporated recommended for enhancing the accuracy of the data collected. These strategies included explicit criteria for selecting informants, assurances of anonymity and confidentiality, reviews of the report, and an analytic stance towards the research.

According to Goetz and LeCompte (1984), participants are not always reliable because "informants may lie, omit relevant data, or misrepresent their claims" (p. 224). Consequently, it is critical to employ strategies intended to counteract these "informant effects." At the outset of the research process, informants were selected who are knowledgeable about the legislative process and the key decision events under study. They received written assurance of anonymity and confidentiality to promote honest and candid responses (Murphy, 1980).

Informants are not the only people who may contribute to bias and error. The researcher also runs the risk of contaminating a qualitative study because of predispositions that may distort the collection and analysis of information (Murphy, 1980). Like Murphy (1980), Merriam (1998) recommends addressing researcher bias by clarifying the researcher's theoretical orientation and underlying assumptions at the outset of the study to limit the potential for distortions in the research. As

explained earlier, the study employed an integrated framework developed by combining Kingdon's multiple streams model of public policymaking and Mazzoni's power and influence model as the theoretical framework to guide the study of state education policymaking and as a safeguard against bias and error.

In this study, a potential source of bias and error is the proximity of the investigator's professional background to the issue area studied. For a number of years, I occupied several professional roles in the school library media program area. During the 1998 and 2001 Maryland legislative sessions, I served as the branch chief for school library media programs at the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and, as a result, had a vested interest in the outcomes of the legislative decisions. As branch chief, I had program responsibilities that included advocacy and leadership that involved providing program information upon request to the governor's office, the SBE, the state superintendent, and legislators.

As noted by Geary (1992), the close proximity of the investigator to the issue and informants may "increase the potential for bias" (p. 104). At the same time, however, it may enhance access to informants and encourage candid responses. While the informants who know this investigator recognized me as a library media program advocate, the decision events are past and I now have a different role that does not require me to be involved directly in state level policy decisions. During the study, I made a concerted effort to adopt an analytic stance towards the issue under study (Murphy, 1980) and approached the search for evidence in a methodical and rational manner. An interview guide helped to reduce possible effects of researcher bias by focusing the quest for information on the research questions. Additional

94

procedures, such as triangulation, consideration of rival explanations, collegial review, and case study protocol were incorporated to minimize bias and error and to enhance the validity, reliability, and objectivity of the findings.

Validity. Guba and Lincoln (1983) refer to internal validity as the *truth value* of the research that depends on the "degree of isomorphism between the study data and the phenomena to which they relate" (p. 104). In other words, the information is internally valid if it describes a reality that is credible and can be verified by the information sources. The strategies suggested by a number of qualitative researchers (i.e., Creswell, 1998; Guba & Lincoln, 1983; Merriam, 1998; Murphy, 1980; and Yin, 1994) to help ensure the validity of this study included: triangulation, consideration of rival explanations, peer review, and assessment of participant credibility.

Triangulation is a trademark strategy of case study research. It requires using multiple sources of data to confirm the research findings, especially those that involve "assertions" and "key interpretations" (Creswell, 1998, p. 213). According to Guba and Lincoln (1983, p. 107), "when various bits of evidence all tend in one direction, that direction assumes far greater credibility." The investigator minimizes the likelihood of bias and error distorting the study by obtaining information from different sources using different data-gathering techniques (Murphy, 1980). This investigator employed triangulation by conducting interviews, by reviewing documentary evidence, and by examining the information to determine the degree to which different data sources substantiated the themes that emerged, the inferences drawn from the data, and the interpretations rendered.

Considering rival explanations is another strategy used by investigators to help ensure that the findings are accurate. In order to examine other possible and/or rival explanations, this investigator re-examined the data to determine that the findings were plausible (i.e., aligned with theory and corroborated by data) (Merriam, 1998). Yin (1994) advises analyzing the case study by building an explanation through the establishment of a chain of evidence by gradually building ideas that include entertaining other and/or rival explanations. To ensure that rival explanations were considered in this study, data were re-examined throughout the research process for other possible patterns and to make certain that "tentative assertions continued to hold and that the strength of the research assertions coincided with the strength of research data" (Curtis, 2003, p. 46).

Peer review involves asking colleagues to scrutinize the research findings to reduce researcher bias and sharpen the argument (Merriam, 1998; Murphy, 1980). A peer reviewer provides a critical eye to check for "implausible data, holes in the argument, leaps of logic, and alternative interpretations" (Murphy, 1980, p. 71). The role of the peer reviewer is to "ask hard questions about methods, meanings, and interpretations" (Creswell, 1998, p. 202) that will help to ensure the validity of the research. While this study did not have a peer reviewer, members of the dissertation committee served as collegial reviewers to help reduce bias and minimize error.

Reliability. The researcher further seeks to minimize error and bias in a study by employing several strategies that contribute to the reliability of the project. If another researcher were to use the same framework and data and arrive at the same interpretations, the study would be deemed reliable. According to Merriam (1998),

these strategies include: explaining the assumptions and theory behind the study as well as the investigator's position in relation to the phenomenon; triangulating the data; and providing an audit trail. While the first two strategies were used by this investigator to strengthen internal validity, the third technique is unique to reliability as evidenced by Yin (1994) who cites only this strategy as a way to ensure the dependability of the study.

Providing an audit trail requires that the researcher document procedures used so that if the study were repeated, it would produce the same results (Yin, 1994). However, Merriam (1998) argues, "The question…is not whether the findings will be found again but whether the results are consistent with the data collected" (p. 206). Guba and Lincoln (1983) agree, "review or audit would give substantial assurance of any evaluation" (p. 122). Thus, experienced researchers (i.e., Guba & Lincoln, 1983; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994) concur that investigators need to document procedures that include descriptive detail about data collection, category development, and decision-making throughout the study so that subsequent researchers can see how inferences were derived and can check those inferences. According to Yin (1994), "a case study protocol is a major tactic in increasing the reliability of case study research and is intended to guide the investigator in carrying out the case study" (p. 63). This instrument contains the general rules and procedures to be followed in conducting the study, including the interview questions. This investigator developed and employed a case study protocol (e.g., data collection instrument with rules and procedures for its use) to minimize bias and error and to increase the reliability of the case study

research project. In addition, interview notes and documentation are maintained in files to support the evidence.

Ethical Considerations

This exploratory case study research relied on human subjects to provide the primary source of data. Because people were involved in the study, this investigator complied with official guidelines for ethical research that include informed consent and the protection of subjects from harm (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Informed consent documents described the study, explained what would be done with the findings, and included a commitment of no harm to the participants. Participants signed informed consent forms before participating in interviews; and the participants' identities were kept confidential.

Chapter 4: Context of Education Policymaking in Maryland

In order to grasp more completely how and why state education policymakers considered the issue of funding school library media programs in the 1998 and 2001 legislative sessions and made different decisions, the theoretical frameworks guiding this study direct attention to the policy context, to problems competing for attention, to the policy proposals being generated, and to the major political developments that occurred during this time period. The purpose of this chapter is to provide information about these elements by describing the Maryland context of legislative decision-making during the decade leading up to and including the 1998 and 2001 legislative session. This chapter begins with a description of the broad environmental features that surround and impact state education policymaking in Maryland. The focus is on the demographic, socio-economic, and cultural characteristics that provide insight into how and why certain problems become agenda items while others remain unrecognized; how and why particular policy proposals become solutions while others continue to float around policymaking circles; and how and why certain political forces promote or deter policy adoption. The chapter concludes with a section on the implications of the Maryland context for analyzing state education policymaking.

Maryland Education Policymaking Environment

The following section describes Maryland's geography, its people, and how the diversity that exists statewide shapes the political culture and influences state education policymaking.

Demographic Characteristics

Maryland is a very diverse state as evidenced by its geography and its people. Its geography includes a variety of landforms (i.e., mountains, fields, pastures, and forests) and bodies of water (i.e., ocean, bay, and rivers). These landforms and bodies of water have contributed to regional distinctions and divisions within the state: (1) Baltimore City[5]; (2) the suburban areas; (3) Western Maryland; and (4) the Eastern Shore and Southern Maryland (Boyd, 1987). Within each of these regions, the various population characteristics (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion, and education) give these areas a specific identity and shape the overall character of the state. Politics within the state reflects these local differences.

The state's dense, but unevenly distributed, population mirrors the social heterogeneity of the broader United States' (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993). While Maryland's geographical size is relatively small (ranks 42nd), according to the federal census conducted in 2000, Maryland's population is relatively large (ranks 19th) in total population with over five million people, 6th in population density with over 540 persons per square mile (*Maryland Manual Online, 2005*). The majority of people (almost 90 percent) live in the suburbs between Baltimore, the state's most populous city, and Washington, D.C., the nation's capitol. Differences in population density exist across the state as demonstrated by the number of residents in the far western Garrett County (29,846), in Kent County on the Eastern Shore (19,197) and in Baltimore City (754,292) (*Maryland Manual Online, 2005)*.

---

[5] Maryland has twenty-four local jurisdictions: twenty-three counties and Baltimore City. Each district has its own school system.

Other population characteristics that demonstrate considerable variation

include age and race. The state's median age is 36 years while in local jurisdictions

the median age ranges from 33.3 in Prince George's County to 43.3 in Talbot County.

Marylanders 65 years old and over comprise more than 11 percent of the population

and persons 18 years of age and under constitute more than a quarter of the total.

Combined, these groups make up almost 37 percent of the state's total dependent

population, those most likely to be unemployed or most likely not to be economically

self-sufficient. Generally speaking, people in these groups tend to require substantial

government services but are not in a position to contribute significantly to the

economic base necessary to fund these services.

Whites comprise 64 percent of the population and exhibit considerable ethnic

diversity (e.g., English, Irish, Italian, German, Greek, and Polish). The percentage of

Blacks or African Americans (27.9 percent) is more than double the national average

(12.3 percent); Hispanics, Asians, American Indians and Alaska Natives comprise

less than 10 percent of the remaining population. The distribution of racial and ethnic

groups across the state varies. For example, the Black and African American

populations in Prince George's County comprise 62.7 percent of the residents in that

very large suburban county while whites comprise only 27 percent of the county's

total population. In the small southern Maryland county of St. Mary's, whites

comprise 81.6 percent of the population while Blacks and African Americans make

up only 13.9 percent of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Another important characteristic of Maryland's population is its educational

involvement and attainment. The school population approaches almost 1.5 million

students (an estimated 20 percent of the total population) in grades pre-kindergarten through graduate school. For decades, demographers have demonstrated that "The citizens of Maryland are among the most highly educated people in the nation" (Boyd, 1987, p. 11). Nearly 84 percent are high school graduates and over 30 percent of its population aged 25 or older have graduated from college or graduate school (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). While Prince George's (84.9 percent; 27.2 percent) and Montgomery counties (90.3 percent; 54.6 percent) come close to or exceed these state percentages, Baltimore City (68.4 percent; 10.4 percent) and Somerset County (69.5 percent; 11.6 percent) award far fewer high school diplomas and their residents hold a smaller percentage of college or graduate degrees than do the adult residents in other local jurisdictions.

The social heterogeneity of Maryland's population and the regional differences give rise to competing demands on state government. Graduation rate statistics illustrate a disparity among the local jurisdictions in terms of aspirations for schools. While the state may have high aspirations for student achievement, it has a limited ability to fund the pre-K-12 educational program statewide and must rely on local jurisdictions to support the schools.

Socio-Economic Features

The majority of Maryland workers are employed in the service sector. This employment pattern reflects the broad changes in job opportunities that once were available in the agricultural and manufacturing industries. Despite producing low-paying jobs and providing non-taxable services, this shift to service jobs did not impede an improvement in Maryland's overall economic condition in the late 1990s.

A strong national economy supported economic growth in the state and contributed to a large budget surplus, proposals for cutting taxes, and plans for increased spending on education and health care in 2000 (Pear, 2000). Within a year, however, an economic downturn prompted dire predictions of a huge budget shortfall. While significant differences in wealth and income are the norm across the state, especially in the most rural jurisdictions, and while these differences contribute to continued disparities among the districts and promote regional differences, budget shortfalls at the state level had a differential impact on local governments and their ability to fund the school systems. In addition to education, state funds are used to provide a number of other programs and services for which advocates would be seeking continued support by vying for monies from a reduced treasury.

While Maryland's early economy was based on agriculture and on the port city of Baltimore's trade, it later relied on defense contracts, federal government jobs, and the construction industry. More recently, however, a decline in these employment sectors along with the growth of the service sector that produces relatively low-paying jobs contributed to an economic recession in 1990 and 1991. Other factors included a shift in consumer spending from goods to services that are exempt from taxes (i.e., legal, medical, and educational) (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993). By 2001, a majority of the workforce population (82 percent) was employed in the service sector, (i.e., government, transportation, utilities, wholesale trade, finance, insurance, health, law, and education) (*Maryland Manual CD*, 2001).

Rebounding from the economic recession of the early 1990s, Maryland is considered a relatively wealthy state. In 1998, a robust economy produced by a strong

stock market, a dramatic growth in capital gains, and increased tax revenues produced a state budget surplus that surpassed $200 million (Babington, 1998). By 1999, Maryland ranked 5th in the nation as measured by per capita income with $32,465 against the national average of $28,542 (*Maryland Manual CD,* 2001). The economic tide turned, however, and in 2001, fiscal staff projected a $200 million deficit by 2003 (Rosenthal, 2004).

No matter the economic conditions, considerable disparity exists across the state in both wealth and income. For example, the state's Department of Business and Economic Development (*Maryland Manual Online*, 2005) reported the 1998 per capita income in Montgomery County, the largest district and one that is adjacent to Washington, D.C., as $42,393, and the average income of people living and working in smaller, more remote localities such as Garrett and Somerset counties as $18,293 and $16,006 respectively. The disparities in average income illustrate the difficulty that some local jurisdictions may have in providing adequate funding for public education, especially when these same disparities probably result in less money to provide other services (e.g., health and transportation). Consequently, with a healthy economy in 1998, officials not only supported giving local jurisdictions additional funds to address problems associated with educating at-risk students (e.g., Title I, limited English speaking), but also included monies for school library media programs in the School Accountability Fund for Excellence (SAFE)[6]. When the economy shifted several years later, sponsors of various programs that previously had

---

[6] In 1998, local jurisdictions received $2.4 billion in education aid (30 percent of state general fund expenditures. Federal aid comprised only 3.8 percent of total education spending, but combined with the state's share provided an estimated 44 percent of the funding for Maryland's public schools (Rohrer & Liddell, 1997). Local school districts met the remaining costs.

been provided state funds and new initiatives seeking the same were required to compete for diminishing resources.

Political Culture

Political culture is defined by Daniel Elazar (1994) as the "particular pattern of orientation to political action in which each political system is embedded" (p. 219) Elazar as the author or editor of several books on political culture identifies three aspects that are "particularly influential in shaping the operations of the state political systems" (p. 219). These features include (1) the perceptions held by the general public and the politicians about the role of government; (2) the kinds of people who participate in government and politics either as officials, members of the bureaucracy, or political workers; and (3) the way in which governance is practiced in light of the participants' perceptions. In describing Maryland's dominant individualistic political culture with some traditionalistic elements, the following section focuses on the state's patterns of belief, patterns of participation, bureaucracy and governmental intervention (Elazar, 1994).

Patterns of Belief. In the individualistic political culture, the people tend to possess a utilitarian view of government whose purpose is "to handle those functions demanded by the people it is created to serve" (Elazar, 1994, p. 230). In dealing with concerns for a good society, government is mainly concerned with economic development and will interfere in private matters only if the marketplace demands it. Otherwise, government action is restricted generally to areas that encourage private initiative and widespread access to the marketplace (Elazar, 1994).

In the traditionalistic political culture, the people tend to believe that government has a positive role to play, but should limit this role "to securing the continued maintenance of the existing social order" (Elazar, 1994, p. 235). They value legitimacy as reflected in efforts to continue traditional patterns and adjust to changing conditions with the least amount of disruption. New programs are initiated only if they serve the interests of the governing elite. According to Elazar (1994), as people seeking religious freedom and "individual opportunity" (p. 241) first settled in the area, the Middle States demonstrated "a distinctive emphasis on private pursuits" (p. 241); over time, Maryland altered its original individualistic political culture with traditionalistic tendencies as demonstrated by its inclination to elect Democratic officials.

Patterns of Participation. Those who participate in politics in a dominant individualistic culture tend to do so to improve themselves socially and economically. As in the business world, which is ruled by marketplace values, participants who pursue politics as a career in an individualistic culture compete for talent and are rewarded for their accomplishments. Where standards are high, politicians usually provide quality government service and are rewarded with high status and economic benefits; but where standards are not high, politicians may be more inclined to be self-serving and/or to provide patronage to their supporters. Politicians are interested in holding office to control the distribution of the favors or rewards of government rather than as a means of exercising governmental power to advance ideological concepts or programmatic goals.

A political system dominated by an individualistic culture may be prone to corruption (Elazar, 1994) as illustrated in Maryland by the number of instances of state and county officials indicted for crimes such as bribery, tax fraud, kickbacks, and mail fraud. In the late 1970s, the general assembly took several measures to limit corruption: legislators passed an enhanced ethics law that required lobbyists to register; adopted *sunshine laws*; and mandated full financial disclosure by candidates and elected officials. Subsequent gubernatorial elections of Harry Hughes (1979) and William Donald Schaefer (1987) demonstrated that civic virtue and ethical behavior were requirements for holding public office in the state (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993) since many citizens thought of them in terms of honest and hard working public servants.

In political systems with a traditionalistic culture, the tendency is to have a loose one party system if any at all (Elazar, 1994). Maryland's tendencies to elect a predominant number of Democratic state and electoral officials indicate that it has been primarily a one-party state (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993). The Democratic Party has dominated the state with the exception of a few moderate-to-liberal Republican governors and U.S. senators. Seven of the last nine governors have been Democrats; the current U.S. senators are Democrats who have served since 1977 and 1987. The election of Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr. as governor in 2004 illustrates the current swing towards Republican representation in the executive office while the legislature has maintained a Democratic majority.

Bureaucracy and Intervention. States with an individualistic political culture tend to have an ambivalent view of bureaucracy because it may limit political

favors and patronage. At the same time, bureaucracy may enhance governmental efficiency - a marketplace value. Maryland's bureaucracy tends to be large and professional. While the most recent census update (2003) reports that the state workforce is less than four percent of the total civilian workforce (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), down from approximately 11 percent in the early 1990s, many of these people hold managerial, technical, or professional positions (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993). State agencies also are active in lobbying state government for policy changes and/or additional funds for their programs.

Maryland's environment generates a host of issues. The political culture of the state tempers which ones gain prominence and what options are entertained. Reflecting this political culture, the state's formal institutional arrangements further condition how issues will be addressed. The rules for deciding what problems are solved, which issues are attended, and whose interests are met are described in the institutional arrangements between and among the parties responsible for educational policymaking in Maryland.

Institutional Arrangements

The decision-making arena of this study is the legislature in which the Maryland Constitution places the lawmaking powers of the state, including those for education (*Constitution of Maryland*, Article VIII, Section 1). While the legislature, also known as the general assembly, holds formal policymaking authority for education, other key components of the state's education policy system include the State Board of Education, the state superintendent of schools and the Maryland State Department of Education, the Office of the Governor, and special interest groups.

These policymaking participants share institutional arrangements that regulate the policymaking process. Dimensions used to describe these arrangements include the following: characteristics of the legislature, the executive branch, and special interest groups; the roles and behaviors of the various actors in these institutions according to accepted and expected codes of conduct and the recognized rules of the game; and the intergovernmental arrangements between and among these entities.

Legislature

The Maryland General Assembly is divided into two branches – the Senate and the House of Delegates; its membership totals 188, with 47 senators and 141 delegates. One senator and three delegates are elected from each of the 47 legislative election districts to four-year terms, with no limit on the number of terms they may serve. Legislative districts are drawn to promote equal representation by population according to the principle of "one man, one vote" (*Maryland Manual 2001*, p. 24). Consequently, legislative districts may cross county boundary lines and encompass more than one unit of local government, a part of a county or Baltimore City. Following each decennial census, boundaries may be redefined according to population statistics to reapportion senators and delegates as required to uphold the principle of equal representation.

With Democrats firmly in control of both houses of the general assembly during the time period of this study, the membership is characterized as predominantly Democratic (74 percent). The members are mostly white businessmen and/or lawyers. Only 38 percent of the members are women, 18 percent of the membership reports having been a teacher at one time or another (*Maryland Manual*

2001), and 24 percent are retired from full-time occupations (Rosenthal, 2004). All members serve in a part-time capacity; the rank and file members earn between $31,000 and $32,000 a year working 60 or more hours a week during the ninety-day session. Individuals in leadership positions earn slightly more. A number of legislators (29 percent) are experienced public servants having been elected to other public offices (e.g., city or county councils or school boards) prior to serving in the general assembly. While all legislators represent their respective constituencies, a large percentage of Maryland legislators (75 percent) are long-time residents of the communities they represent and have lived in these districts for twenty-five years or more (Rosenthal, 2004).

The general assembly convenes annually on the second Wednesday of January and is in session for ninety days. During that time, it is responsible for passing laws "necessary for the welfare of the State" (*Maryland Manual 2001*, p. 19), including those related to education. The Maryland Constitution cites the state's responsibility to provide public schools. Evidence of the state's commitment in carrying out this responsibility is reflected in the number of commissions and task forces convened in recent years to determine the most appropriate levels of state funding and the formulas for distributing these funds to local education systems (i.e., Civiletti Commission, 1983; Commission on School Performance, 1989; Counihan Task Force, 1998; and Thornton Commission, 2001) (Boyd, 1987).

A caucus of the majority party elects the Senate President and Speaker of the House at the start of each session. In turn, the President and the Speaker appoint a Majority Leader with whom they consult on the selection of a Majority Whip and

Deputy Majority Leader. In both houses, the political party having the fewer number of seats chooses a Minority Leader and Minority Whip. The President and the Speaker have significant influence on the legislative process since they appoint members of standing committees, joint committees, conference committees, and *select* committees as well as the chair and vice-chair of each committee. They also preside over the daily sessions in their respective houses. These responsibilities include assigning legislation to a standing committee, scheduling the hearings, maintaining decorum, and deciding points of order. Standing committees review laws, consider legislative proposals, and deal with non-legislative matters (i.e., rules and executive nominations and protocol). Joint committees deal with issues of concern for both chambers (e.g., legislative policy, ethics, and federal relations). Like other states, Maryland relies on the conference committee structure to resolve differences in versions of the same bill passed by the Senate and the House and to develop and agree upon a single bill. Select committees consist of senators or delegates from that local unit of government and deal with matters from a particular jurisdiction (Boyd, 1987; *Maryland Manual 2001*).

Four standing committees in the Senate and six in the House have the primary function of reviewing proposed legislation. The President or Speaker assigns the bills to the appropriate committee for consideration after the first reading. Education issues in the Senate are usually assigned to the Committee on Economic and Environmental Affairs. The Budget and Taxation Committee considers education proposals requiring new funds. In the House, the Committee on Ways and Means hears bills on education finance or any other education initiative that requires state funds.

Once the bills are assigned, committees hold public hearings to receive testimony from proponents and opponents and to entertain amendments. A bill may then be voted out of committee as favorable or unfavorable, with or without amendments, or left to die in committee. If the House and Senate pass the same bill and the governor signs it, the bill becomes law and is added to the *Annotated Code of Maryland Regulations*.

The Constitution of Maryland requires the general assembly to pass the annual budget bill. The legislature's principal budgetary role is not formulation, however, but review and modification of the governor's budget proposal. A few legislatures may be limited in their action, particularly with regard to increasing the amount of the governor's recommendations, but "Maryland's General Assembly is probably the most restricted in the action it can take" (Rosenthal, 1990, p. 140). It is constitutionally prohibited from increasing the executive budget (Article III, Section 52). The legislative tendency is to trim the governor's budget, not add to it (Boyd, 1987; Rosenthal, 2004). However, certain educational programs are exempt from budgetary cuts by the legislature as well as by the governor. These mandated programs include the state's share of current expense, pupil transportation, school construction funds, the teachers' pension plan, and several others. In addition to these requirements, several federal mandates (e.g., Medicaid, environmental issues, prisons, and disabled individuals) serve to reduce the governor's budgetary power. Despite these constraints, Maryland's governor possesses one of the highest rankings nationwide in terms of budgetary power (Beyle, 1999).

Although the legislature has a very limited role in developing the budget, it has resources it can use to influence the governor's budget. These resources include a fiscal staff, a requirement to balance the budget, capability to bargain with the governor about support for other bills or initiatives, and the power to enact additional appropriation bills after the adoption of the annual budget. The fiscal staff works in the Department of Legislative Services with computerized fiscal information systems that provide revenue-estimating capability. Legislators publish this information to influence the governor's budgetary decisions and to ensure legislative compliance with The Maryland Spending Affordability Act and the constitutional requirement of a balanced budget: "On the basis of a review of economic indicators, primarily personal income, a spending affordability committee decides on a percentage of growth for the state budget" (Rosenthal, 1990, p.156).

Legislative leaders sometimes meet with the governor or a member of his staff prior to budget submission to make their requests known. Legislators also may bargain directly with the governor in an effort to get extra funds included in a supplemental bill and to introduce additional appropriation bills. If the legislation provides a means for raising the funds, the bill passes. If the bill does not include a source of funds, the governor is expected, but not required, to provide the funds in his subsequent budget. The governor can veto the legislation, but the legislators also can override the veto at the start of the next session (Rosenthal, 1990).

A two-thirds majority is required to override the governor's veto. A strategy often used by legislators, including those in Maryland, to garner enough votes to

override a veto, as well as to pass bills, is to make deals with one another by trading votes.

> Legislators naturally trade votes with their colleagues. Most trading is implicit, which is part and parcel of the system of reciprocity in a legislative body. But a considerable number of deals are quite explicit. "I'll support this if you support that." Doubtless, there are a number of votes on which such arrangements play a crucial role in most legislatures (Rosenthal & Fuhrman, 1981, p. 90).

An example of how one Maryland legislator played this game involved backroom deals and vote trading to succeed in getting his bill to support vending machine companies passed on the third reading. One of the legislator's colleagues wanted support for a minority contractor's bill and another needed help on a prison construction bill (Rosenthal, 1981). It is likely that legislators apply similar tactics in the development and passage of other bills, including education bills.

The Maryland legislature uses its resources in a variety of ways to fulfill its responsibility to pass laws necessary for the welfare of the state and to pass certain laws dealing with counties and special taxing districts. It also determines how state funds are allocated and adopts amendments to the state constitution. In meeting these obligations, including education funding decisions and education policy matters, members of the legislature not only must follow specified policymaking rules in the Senate and the House, but also must work with the executive branch of state government.

Executive Branch

The executive branch of Maryland government of relevance to this study about state education policymaking consists of the governor and his staff, the State

114

Board of Education, the state superintendent of schools and her staff, and the State Department of Education.

Governor. The governor in Maryland is elected by popular vote to be the chief executive officer of state government. The responsibilities of this office include: ensuring that laws are executed properly; making appointments as per the constitution or law; submitting an annual budget to the legislature for approval; and commanding the state militia. The governor is assisted in performing these duties by the lieutenant governor, who runs on the same ticket, and a staff the governor appoints to carry out specific tasks. These staff positions include press secretary, legislative aide, chief of staff, and specialists in various areas, such as education, economic development and transportation (Boyd, 1987). The only other elected officials in the executive branch of state government are the attorney general and the comptroller.

The responsibilities of Maryland's governor translate into very strong, formal powers, especially in regards to the official process of developing the annual state budget. These formal powers serve as potent resources to use in influencing legislation: agenda setting, budgetary formulation, and provisional and veto authority. The capacity to set the legislative agenda is both an executive responsibility and a resource. In setting the legislative agenda, the governor can use this resource to direct attention to a few select issues and "chances are that these items will be given top billing by [the] legislature as well" (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 170). A review of the results of Maryland's 2001 legislative session demonstrates how well the Governor Glendening used agenda setting as a resource. He focused on only fifteen

115

administration bills and succeeded in getting most everything he wanted (Rosenthal, 2004).

> His top choices – a ban on racial profiling, gay rights, a 25 percent set aside for minority businesses, and the right of staff to unionize at public institutions of   higher education – were enacted into law, pretty much the way he wanted them. Only his proposal to guarantee buyout money for Maryland tobacco farmers underwent major change. In his eight years as governor, Glendening lost only a few administration bills, but he got one of them on a second try (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 200).

In addition to agenda-setting authority, the governor has substantial budgetary powers. As Rosenthal notes, "Probably no other governor has as much budgetary power vis-à-vis the legislature as does the governor of Maryland" (2004, p. 172). Although the legislature has some means to use in influencing the chief executive's budgetary decisions, once the budget is submitted to the general assembly, legislators can only cut funds.[7] The governor, however, may amend or supplement the Budget Bill to "correct an oversight, provide funds contingent on passage of pending legislation or, [address] an emergency," (Article III. Sec. 52 (5). Because it is an executive budget system, state agencies must submit their requests for funds to the governor who works with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning to decide on specific amounts to include in his budget. So, in addition to his power to appoint department heads, the governor has considerable control over state agencies through the budgetary process (Boyd, 1987).

Provisional and veto authority give governors additional power over the legislature. "Governors have what legislators need. They want a bill passed, a gubernatorial visit, and as much attention as possible" (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 171). The

---

[7] After the annual budget is passed, legislators can introduce supplementary appropriation bills that identify funding sources and pass them with a two-thirds majority (Article III. Sec. 52 (8).

power to provide and the power to deny go hand in hand as tools that a governor can use to reward supporters and punish detractors.

For example, in Maryland, the governor's provisional powers include appointments to cabinet level positions as well as to boards and commissions. *Greenbag* appointments, so named because of the color of the bag used to deliver the appointments to the legislature for approval, are an important source of influence for the governor. It is through these appointments that the governor places allies in key positions of state government. Since Maryland has few independent boards and agencies, appointment power is a significant resource for the governor (Boyd, 1987; Rosenthal, 2004). A board of relevance to this study is the State Board of Education whose members are appointed by the governor. It is then the responsibility of the Board, not the governor, to appoint the state superintendent of schools, the only cabinet level position the governor does not appoint.

The power to deny includes legislative veto power. In most states, governors can reject all or portions of appropriation bills with line item veto power. The Maryland governor does not need veto power with the executive budget since he is the one who creates it, but like his counterparts in 42 other states, he can veto legislation. It takes a three-fifths majority of both houses of the legislature to override the governor's veto and re-enact the measure.

In addition to legislative veto power, the governor can jeopardize legislators' reelection bids by redrawing the boundaries of their districts following the decennial census. "Probably no governor has denial power equivalent to that of Maryland" (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 178) because the initiative for legislative redistricting belongs to

the Governor, not the legislature. Glendening reportedly used this power to his advantage in influencing legislators to support his agendas. For example, in the 2001 and 2002 sessions, he made frequent references to the contours of the legislators' districts and even carried the redistricting maps he was working on with him when he made courtesy calls to members of the House and Senate (Rosenthal, 2004).

In addition to the gubernatorial resources bestowed on the office by the state constitution, incumbents of this office may have other positional assets, notably unity and party affiliation. Unity is the capacity to work independently from the legislature to develop the agenda. As a single unit, the governor can arrive at consensus with greater ease than the 188 legislators in the general assembly who must work with each other to come to agreement on legislative initiatives. "Consequently, although governors have to be sensitive to various constituencies and normally have to consult and even heed advice, they have a far easier time arriving at a consensus than do legislators,..." (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 166). Another unifying feature of a governor's position is that s/he can go directly to the public and speak with one voice. S/He does not have to share the podium with other officials, such as legislators. Glendening capitalized on this resource during his second term when he traveled around the state to garner support for his 2001 budget bill. He admitted that it was "a classical case of using the bully pulpit" (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 168) when he focused on his gay rights bill in his State of the State address and testified before a House committee in favor of its passage (Rosenthal, 2004).

Party affiliation serves as another resource for a governor in promoting his/her agenda. As the leader of the sitting party (i.e., Democratic or Republican Party), the

governor is likely to enjoy the loyalty of fellow party members, especially the legislative leadership (i.e., Senate President and House Speaker) who are expected to support the governor's priority bills over their own legislative initiatives (Rosenthal, 2004). For example, the Senate President supported the governor's antigun legislation during the 1999 session even though a major gun manufacturer's business was located in the Senator's district. "The legislative leader was not happy with the situation, but his greater concern was not allowing a Democratic governor to lose a priority bill" (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 180). As had been the case since 1969, the Democrats were firmly in control of the Senate, the House, and the executive branch of state government during Glendening's administration (Rosenthal 1990, 2004).

A governor's personal resources include skill and will in using the formal and positional powers as chief executive of state government. During his eight years as governor (1994-2002), which includes the period of this study, Parris Glendening was noted for using the powers of his office very skillfully as evidenced by his control over the budget and the success of his legislative priorities (Rosenthal, 2004). Glendening also had a reputation for his willingness to use the gubernatorial resources to influence education policy. Like his counterparts in other states, he took an active interest in education, including the passage of legislation that advanced Maryland's school reform agenda. Literature on the increased role of governors in developing education policy during the nineties attributes several education proposals to the Maryland governor. These proposals include: the state takeover of Baltimore schools; additional funds for school construction, technology in schools, and high

school assessment development; establishment of the Maryland Hope Scholarship Program, and a career to work program (Gittell & McKenna, 1999).

State Board of Education. The Maryland State Board of Education consists of twelve members. The governor appoints eleven of them. Ten are appointed to staggered four-year terms. A student member is appointed to a one-year term. The state superintendent, as the twelfth member, serves as the secretary-treasurer, but does not vote. Membership consists mostly of professional people who are retired from or currently employed in occupations that are similar to those represented in the legislature (e.g., business, education, law, and foundation and association posts). Until recently, men outnumbered women on the board.

The current (2006) membership of the SBE appears to reflect an effort to provide regional representation. Members reside in the southern, central, western, and eastern sections of the state and meet monthly to set policy for the public school system by adopting bylaws that have the force of law, enacting the bylaws and regulations that govern it, and mediating disputes that may arise from the twenty-four local school districts. A major responsibility of the Board is the appointment of the state superintendent of schools. The appointment is for a four-year term and is renewable. During their monthly meetings, the Board consults with the state superintendent and the staff of the Maryland State Department of Education to prescribe basic policy and guidelines for instruction in the public schools, to set standards for teacher certification and other professionals employed in Maryland schools, and to establish high school graduation requirements. The State Board of Education and the state superintendent of schools are empowered to recommend the

withholding of state funds from districts that do not comply with state standards (*Maryland Manual 1994-95*), but the Board "tempers its considerable legal power for the principle of local control of schools. Each of Maryland's 24 school systems has its own board of education" (MSDE, 2005).

While it is rare for the Maryland State Board of Education to withhold state funds from local school systems, the Board has demonstrated its ability to exercise considerable power in the implementation of its school reform initiatives. In 1989, Glendening's predecessor, William Donald Schaefer, charged the State Board of Education with reviewing recommendations made by the Commission on School Performance[8], an official group he had appointed to study public schooling in Maryland. The recommendations called for a comprehensive system of school improvement strategies that included public accountability, an assessment system, a new system of accreditation, and creation of an oversight body. By 1991, the Board had adopted most of the recommendations and launched the state's Schools for Success program setting standards for assessed student knowledge, participation, and attainment (Cibulka & Derlin, 1998).

State Superintendent of Schools. The state superintendent of schools directs the Maryland State Department of Education and executes the policies and enforces the regulations adopted by the Board. As a member of the governor's cabinet, the state superintendent serves on numerous advisory councils, committees, and commissions (*Maryland Manual 1994-1995*). In addition to carrying out the policies of the State Board of Education, the state superintendent is charged with the

---

[8] The commission's report came to be known as the Sondheim Report, named after the commission chairperson, Walter Sondheim.

responsibility to convene conferences of local school officials and other professional personnel to discuss, plan, and act on matters related to school improvement. She also is responsible for preparing and publishing information to "stimulate public interest; promote the work of education; [and] foster professional insight and efficiency in teachers" (*Michie's Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland - Education*, 1999, p. 43).

The state superintendent meets monthly with the local school superintendents to explain state initiatives, to discuss her ideas, and to share concerns. She publishes fact sheets and reports on state programs to inform local school systems and their constituents about their schools' progress in making improvements (e.g., attendance statistics and assessment results) that promote student achievement. Her authority includes: auditing the reports and accounts of local school systems; approving sites, buildings, and construction plans; certificating the professional personnel in each public school; and approving the education programs provided by state institutions, such as the departments of Juvenile Justice and Public Safety and Correctional Services. The state superintendent also may make available instructional materials to facilitate teaching and learning in all subjects by students in schools, institutions, or organizations under the supervision of the State Board of Education (*Michie's Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland - Education*, 1999).

State Department of Education. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) is a cabinet-level department administered by the state superintendent of schools and vested with the general care and supervision of public education (*Maryland Manual* 1994-1995). While the State Board of Education has

overall responsibility for elementary and secondary education in the state, the Board employs professional staff to assist the state superintendent in monitoring local education agencies' compliance with education policies and regulations and developing guidelines for the implementation of statewide projects and programs. Other areas of responsibility include public libraries and rehabilitation services. Public education, however, takes center stage given that the state's only financial obligation besides its debt is education. In addition to establishing basic standards and guidelines for education programs, the Maryland State Department of Education distributes aid to local school systems to support the implementation of the programs according to the established standards and guidelines. While the legislature appropriates state education funds, it is the responsibility of MSDE to disburse the monies. In fiscal 1998, local jurisdictions received education aid totaling $2.4 billion representing over 30 percent of state general fund expenditures.

Basic standards and guidelines outlined in the department's strategic plan for school improvement, Schools for Success, direct local school systems to focus their efforts on several public education priorities: student achievement; instructional improvement; accountability and assessment; and educational leadership. The department staff supports local efforts to address these priorities through grant programs and technical assistance. In fiscal year 1998, the SAFE grant program specifically targeted those students at-risk of failure because they were poor, disabled, and/or non- or limited-English proficient. Other programs provided funds to improve low performing schools, augment programs for gifted and talented students, and

upgrade school buildings with technology for voice, video, and data capabilities (Rohrer & Liddell, 1997).

School Library Media Program Branch. The School Library Media Program Branch lodged within the Maryland State Department of Education, originated in 1968, as the Office of School Libraries and Instructional Materials in the Division of Library Development and Services. In 1998, the branch was reorganized into the Division of Instruction to help local school systems develop and implement library media programs according to standards first adopted by the State Board in 1987 and revised in 2000. *Standards for School Library Media Programs in Maryland* (MSDE, 1987, 2000) direct local school systems to develop plans for library media program improvement to ensure that students and staff become effective users of ideas and information. Standards include indicators for information literacy skills instruction, staffing guidelines for library media personnel, criteria for developing collections of resources and resource services to support curriculum implementation, specifications for appropriate facilities, and procedures for program evaluation. The program standards guide the work of the branch chief and a staff specialist in working with local school system personnel. Of special significance to this case study are the criteria for developing library media collections that were used as guidelines in developing the School Library Enhancement Program as a component of HB 1 (i.e., SAFE) in 1998. These criteria include the number of items recommended for each level (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) and the variety of formats (i.e., books, videos, audiotapes, and online subscription services) required to accommodate students' learning styles.

Interest Groups

In their attempts to influence public policy, "interest groups in Maryland must …struggle for power in the midst of change, complexity, and institutional constraints" (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993, p. 165). Change characterizes the state's economy. In the early 1990s, poor economic conditions highlighted the need for revolutionizing the state's workforce from one with mainly manufacturing and trade skills to one that is able to provide skilled service workers. As this transition continues, a diverse number of different labor groups must compete to influence public policy to maintain jobs and/or to provide training programs.

The great diversity of the state's population lends complexity to interest group efforts.   The different racial, ethnic, and religious groups bring different belief systems to the policy arena and promote "the formation of single-issue interest groups that lobby on such topics as abortion, gun control, and capital punishment" (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993, p. 132). In addition to social heterogeneity and religious diversity challenging the ability of interest groups to be more unified in their pursuit of legislative support, disparity in wealth among state residents adds further complications. Maryland's liberal social contract is stressed to provide services (e.g., health and social programs) for many poor citizens while the middle class continues to demand an array of services, especially "a vast infusion of funds for public schools" (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993, p. 133). As with competing labor groups, the relatively large number of special interest groups sometimes develops into countervailing forces as these groups attempt to influence public policymaking.

The fragmented public education lobby in Maryland is a good example of how a number of special interest groups can dilute further the impact of their efforts on policymaking. Statewide groups, such as the Maryland State Teachers' Association (MSTA) and the American Federation of Teachers, frequently serve as umbrella organizations for local public school councils and associations (e.g., teacher associations and unions and parent teacher councils). Frequently, the local groups focus on the narrow interests of their district membership rather than on those of the larger organization when they lobby the legislature. These actions may serve to compromise the organizations' capacity for political power (Geary, 1992).

There is no guarantee, however, that when the public school groups do coalesce on an issue that they will be successful. On one such occasion during the 2001 legislative session, a number of the public and nonpublic education groups competed for state resources. The Maryland Council of Parent Teacher Associations, MSTA, the SBE and local school boards, the League of Women Voters, and the American Civil Liberties Union lobbied against $8 million in textbook aid to private and parochial schools because public education initiatives, such as the improvement of school libraries, were not adequately funded in the budget (Matysek, 2001). The Maryland Catholic Conference and Orthodox Jews supported the aid because it would benefit their schools by providing a second year of funding for non-religious textbooks at schools where the tuition was $7,100 or less (Rosenthal, 2004). The public school organizations and associations apparently were no match for the nonpublic school groups on this issue. According to a Republican delegate, legislators were persuaded to support $5 million of the original $8 million proposal,

in part because the nonpublic school lobby "flooded Annapolis with thousands of letters, e-mails and phone calls" (Matysek, 2001, p. 3).

Institutional constraints provide additional challenges to interest groups. Normally, a one-party system promotes interest group strength, but that is not the case in Maryland where interest groups are considered to have only moderate strength (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993). The categorization of *moderate strength* is due to institutional constraints that consist of a strong governor, a centralized decision-making process, and a large bureaucracy with a high degree of professionalism and the ability to lobby policymakers. The governor has significant positional powers (i.e., agenda setting, veto, appointments, and budgetary authority), as do the legislative leaders who are responsible for appointing committee members and chairpersons, and for scheduling legislation. This centralized power "presents a formidable obstacle to interest-group dominance of the political system in Maryland" (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993, p. 136). Interest groups have a tendency to concentrate on the legislative leadership and relevant committee members when they lobby state government (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993). The relatively large state workforce presents an additional obstacle to interest group strength. Many of these workers are managers, technical people, and professionals who are active in lobbying the legislature as individuals or through professional associations to fund their programs and projects. Special interest groups, therefore, compete with state agencies for a finite amount of tax revenue.

Despite the obstacles presented by a changing economy, the complexity presented by a diverse population, and institutional constraints, lobbyists and

legislators report, "Interest groups are an active, significant aspect of the political system in Maryland" (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993, p. 163). Legislators appreciate the information that interest group representatives provide as well as their help in solving policy issues. In a survey conducted by Lippincott & Thomas (1993), over 86 percent of the legislators responding to a question about the importance of interest groups in determining public policy in Maryland considered their impact important (41 percent), very important (37 percent), or crucial (9 percent). At the same time, interest group representatives believe that their lobbying activities appear to impact the policymaking process (Lippincott & Thomas, 1993).

Implications of Maryland Context for Analyzing State Education Policymaking

Maryland's environmental features and institutional arrangements influence several processes involved in making legislative decisions as well as who participates and how these actors carry out their various policymaking roles during the processes. The processes involve recognizing problems, forming policy proposals for consideration in addressing the problems, and interacting with various political events and developments occurring at the time of the decision. Participants in the legislative processes include policy elites and special interest groups whose members work to influence the legislative decisions. The following sections discuss various features of the Maryland context in terms of the processes and participants involved in the decision events of 1998 and 2001.

Processes

Problem Recognition. Problems competing for attention in the state
education policymaking arena in the late 1990s focused on student achievement. By
1997, the school reform initiative that was launched by the Sondheim Report in 1991
had drawn attention to a number of disparities across the state in regards to student
achievement, especially the achievement gap between majority and minority students
as indicated by state test results. The consistently poor academic performance of
students in two large school districts (i.e., Baltimore City and Prince George's
County) exemplified this concern. One of the main issues debated during the 1997
legislative session was a proposed partnership between Baltimore City and the State
which would direct more education funds to some of the neediest students while
imposing new management controls on the City in an effort to ensure the appropriate
expenditure of the new monies ($254 million over five years). The partnership also
would help to settle lawsuits brought against the State by the American Civil
Liberties Union for its failure to provide an adequate education for Baltimore City
students (Orr, 2004). Delegate Howard "Pete" Rawlings (D-Baltimore City)
championed the agreement, debated his colleagues throughout the session in an effort
to secure funds for the urban needs of Baltimore City schools and to require the
system to be more accountable (Orr, 1999). According to one editorial, "It [was] all-
out war in Annapolis" ("Maryland schools," 1997, p. A26) as political leaders from
local jurisdictions and members of the general assembly debated one another about
more school funds for Baltimore City amidst entreaties from other districts seeking
additional funds for an increasingly diverse student population in their jurisdictions.

During these debates, other legislators noted that their districts had similar at-risk populations and funding requirements; however, after much deliberation, the City/State Partnership was solidified and legislators acknowledged that there were similar problems across the state.

While legislators recognized a problem with Baltimore City Public Schools, especially a need for additional funds to address its disproportionate number of at-risk students, the deliberations created awareness among legislators that they had to revise the school funding formula. In fact, a pending court case challenging the fairness of the state funding plan loomed on the horizon. The House Speaker "and other legislative leaders conced[ed] that maybe the school aid distribution isn't all that systematic or fair," ("Maryland schools," 1997, p. A24).   While decision makers agreed that Baltimore City required additional funds to address the educational issues of its high percentage of at-risk students (i.e., low socio-economic status, limited English proficient, and special education population), they also recognized that the number of students in these categories was growing in the suburban populations. Consequently, legislators began to seek policy proposals to provide additional funds to other districts for consideration in subsequent legislative sessions.

In the meantime, another education issue to receive attention was the lack of up-to-date materials in school library collections throughout the state. Following the 1997 legislative session, the Governor acknowledged the old copyright dates of library books as he visited schools around the state. During one of his school visits, he took a computer book that was published in the early 1980s off a shelf; he also noted that many of the biography books on sports heroes included only white males.

These experiences may have helped to place school libraries on the agenda of the
1998 legislative session. Two years later in September 2000, the *Baltimore Sun* began
a series of articles highlighting deficiencies in a number of Maryland's school
libraries. For example, a reporter noted that only 17 percent met the state's standards
for library collections and only 52 percent had certified library media specialists on
staff (Libit, 2000, September 10). The SBE suggested a plan for revitalizing school
libraries; its components were crafted into a single bill and proposed in the 2001
session as HB 935: Education – Public School Libraries – Funding.

While elementary and secondary education concerns remained a central focus
throughout the policymaking sessions in 1997 through 2002, other topics also
received attention. The issues included more funds for higher education, Smart
Growth, economic development, health care coverage for low-income pregnant
women and their children, care for disabled adults, public libraries, and pay raises for
state workers. Higher education advocates noted that Maryland's colleges and
universities had not received any new funding in five years. They argued that this
situation would make them less competitive nationally. The governor proposed the
Smart Growth program to combat suburban sprawl by steering new development to
already-developed areas. He also proposed providing health care to approximately
60,000 children in households just above the poverty level and, therefore, not eligible
for Medicaid. Advocates for disabled adults who were required to wait for long
periods of time before receiving appropriate services fought to shorten this wait. At
the same time that these funding proposals were submitted, some legislators argued
for tax cuts (Babington, 1998). Thus, elementary and secondary education problems

and proposals competed with a number of other important issues for policymakers' attention.

Policies. Kingdon's (1995) model directs attention not only to problems competing for attention, but also to solutions that can be attached to salient problems. He posits that actors are developing pet proposals and waiting for opportunities to advance them. Two sets of proposals were part of this policy stream. According to Kingdon (1995), if these proposals were to survive, they would need to be technically feasible, financially acceptable, and generally aligned with people's values (Kingdon, 1995). Because each jurisdiction wanted its share of education funds, the solution to provide additional funds to school districts had to be considered fair and equitable by the majority of the 24 districts.

In responding to questions about how to make the solution technically feasible, support commonly accepted values, and overcome objections from other school districts, Governor Glendening and House Speaker Taylor established the Task Force on Education Funding Equity, Accountability, and Partnerships (i.e., the Counihan Commission). The charge of the task force was to conduct "a comprehensive review of K-12 education funding to ensure that students throughout Maryland have an equal opportunity for academic success" (Task Force Report, 1998, p. 3). At the conclusion of their study, the task force members recommended additional funds to provide more assistance for at-risk students (i.e., limited English proficiency, professional development, Extended Elementary Education Program), repair aging school facilities, and construct new school buildings throughout the state.

Policymakers incorporated these recommendations, along with enhancement funds for school libraries that were part of the governor's Thriving by Three initiative, into an administrative bill and introduced the legislation in the 1998 session as HB 1: School Accountability Funding for Excellence (SAFE). Policymakers considered the legislation a temporary solution to the school funding issue as evidenced by their acceptance of the task force's other recommendation to add a *sunset* clause that ended the targeted improvement grants and aging schools program after June 30, 2002.

The legislature sought a more permanent solution to improving Maryland's school funding formula through another study conducted by the Commission on Education, Finance, Equity, and Excellence and chaired by Alvin Thornton. In 1999, the legislature charged the Thornton Commission to identify "the appropriate level of funding necessary to assure that students have adequate resources to meet the State's high performance expectations" (Grasmick, 2001, p. 1). For almost two and a half years, the commission applied two different approaches to its study of the *appropriate funding* problem. It studied over 50 of the most successful schools in the state (i.e., the successful schools approach) and convened several groups of educational experts (i.e., professional judgment approach) to recommend a formula that provided an additional $1.3 billion a year to public education with a focus on economically disadvantaged and special needs children (Visionary plan, 2002). Each district's per capita wealth determined the amount of state funds to be distributed to the jurisdiction. The legislature passed the education package during the 2002 session.

Politics. Institutional arrangements and environmental conditions are contextual features that shape the politics that unfold as the actors advance their interests and ideals. These features can have a powerful effect on the policymaking process (Kingdon, 1995). Maryland's institutional arrangements are characterized by centralized decision-making that places responsibility and concentrates power in the executive and legislative branches of government. As earlier noted, the governor has significant budgetary power and was willing to spend money on education during his tenure. According to his press secretary in 1998, "… the governor's first priority is that we fund programs in education and higher education at levels that will bring about significant, positive changes." (Babington, 1998, p. B1). State legislators and local officials, such as mayors and county executives, also considered education issues a top priority. Their receptivity to education issues provided a favorable climate for funding of school libraries. This favorable climate also signaled competing demands for money from within the education sector.

Environmental conditions further influence policy debate by contributing to circumstances that favor or detract from the consideration of the particular issues. Several circumstances made consideration of additional funds for education feasible. Public mood or opinion, the economic conditions, and election cycles often serve to influence the placement of education issues on the agenda. Generally speaking, Maryland citizens believe elementary and secondary education is important. Other than taking care of its debt, the Maryland Constitution (Article VIII, Section 1) obligates its government to educate the children. In general, the public is receptive to

proposals that might enhance the quality of education; therefore advocates of a funding bill could appeal to those favorable dispositions.

Another circumstance that creates favorable or unfavorable conditions is the status of the economy. Maryland was experiencing a robust economy during most of Glendening's years in office. Property and gas tax receipts were "swelling" (LeDuc, 1999, p. C8) to create surpluses in general budget and transportation funds. State fiscal analysts predicted that the surplus amount would total approximately $449 million. By 2000, surplus projections reached $940 million and a lucrative legal settlement with tobacco companies added more monies to the state treasury (Montgomery, 2000).

> Circumstances play a most significant role, and none are more important than economic conditions. When times are good and revenues are mounting, governors have the wherewithal to propose far-reaching policy agendas. Surpluses allow for innovative programs, shortfalls do not. (Rosenthal, 1990, p. 98).

Because Maryland was continuing to experience a thriving economy, numerous projects, including public school construction ($262 million) and a first-ever textbook subsidy ($6 million) for nonpublic school students, were funded in the 2000 legislative session,.

By 2001, however, lawmakers became apprehensive about a possible economic slowdown when budget officials announced slower revenue projections. Some legislators even suggested "freezing funds for some of Glendening's projects for six months, until they could get a better picture of the economy" (Mosk, 2001, p. B1). Education remained a focus of the Governor's, however, because he believed it to be "a 'sensible investment' even if times turn sour" (Mosk, 2001, p. B1).

Education initiatives, like other proposals, however, would be susceptible to economic factors as well as political dynamics.

Election cycles also have a tendency to impact the legislative agenda and the legislative actors. In an election year, legislators usually support popular policies. Near the close of the 1998 legislative session, a delegate summed it up as follows:

> Republicans might grumble about the big-spending Democrats, but few have dared to vote against Glendening's proposals for schools, water quality and other initiatives. With all 188 legislative seats up for election in November, … Republicans and Democrats alike want to go home and say we've done good things for education, for the environment… No matter how partisan you are, you don't want to go home and say, "I didn't vote for these popular items." (Babington, 1998, p. A01).

During the time period of this study, several features of Maryland's political stream had the potential to impact significantly the education policymaking process. These features included: a centralized decision-making process that gives budgetary power to the Governor; a strong economy in 1998 that became weaker by 2001; and an election cycle that included a year (1998) in which the governor was seeking re-election and all legislative seats were up for election and a non-election year (2001). In addition to the different levels of gubernatorial support for school library funding between 1998 and 2001, contrasting environmental conditions (i.e., economy and elections) appeared to contribute to the passage of school library media funds in 1998 and to the defeat of a similar measure in 2001.

Participants

Unfortunately, systematic studies of politics surrounding education policy issues in Maryland are rare. However, journalists' comments and other anecdotal evidence highlight how various participants engage in the education policymaking

process. Key participants in the legislative processes under study were highly visible players that included the governor, specific members of the legislature (i.e., House Speaker and committee chairs), the state superintendent of schools, and special interest group representatives, including local officials. Each player was motivated to employ various resources, strategies, and interactions to achieve a goal - a policy change that would provide more funds to address the learning requirements specific to at-risk students. These traits often were features of the actors' positions in state or local government.

In addition to being motivated to fulfill their responsibilities as elected or appointed officials, the officials brought to their governance tasks a commitment to meet their constitutional obligation to provide every child an adequate education. In some instances, such as one involving the governor, a factor that may have motivated him to support education funding was personal experience. Governor Glendening referred often to "how education was his ticket out of poverty" (Nakashima, 1998, p. B1). Throughout his gubernatorial career, Glendening used his budgetary powers to provide funds for educational projects. He established task forces and commissions to study the issues and develop plans. As a strategy, these commissions were successful in grappling with school funding issues and developing compromises that were acceptable to all stakeholders (i.e., Counihan Commission and Thornton Commission).

In the 1998 legislative session, House Speaker Cas Taylor made his top priority the development of a statewide education program to aid poor children. He made this commitment after contentious debate during the previous session about

providing additional funds to Baltimore City to help the district meet the learning

requirements of its at-risk population ("What's fair," 1997). Speaker Taylor may

have identified with the issues of poor children because of the low socio-economic

levels in his own Western Maryland district. In any case, he used his positional

powers as legislative leader to introduce the first proposal of the 1998 session. HB 1

(SAFE) was a comprehensive education package designed to help students at-risk of

failing in school because they were poor, spoke with limited English proficiency,

and/or were from highly mobile families.

Strategies used by the late Delegate Howard "Pete" Rawlings, Chair of the

Appropriations Committee and a Baltimore City representative, to influence the

passage of education bills are illustrated by his efforts to establish the City/State

partnership in 1997 and promote the SAFE legislation in 1998. Sometimes behind

the scenes and sometimes on the legislative floor, Rawlings urged support for these

proposals. He accused the county executives of threatening a bill that was "critical to

education in Baltimore City and using slick promotion to obscure the facts"

(Abramowitz & Montgomery, 1997, p. B1). At the same time, local delegates

countered that Rawlings warned them that local projects and leadership positions

were in jeopardy if they did not support the plan. These exchanges exemplify the

pulling and hauling (Allison & Zelikow, 1999) that frequently occurs between

participants during the policymaking process.

Appointed state superintendent of schools by the Board in 1991, Nancy S.

Grasmick is not only the first woman in Maryland to serve in this position, but also

"is one of the longest-serving Democratic state school chiefs in the nation" (Richard,

2001, p. 20). Grasmick has stated that she is motivated to engage in policymaking to make a difference for children. Not surprisingly, she has been quoted as saying, "I'm not in this to have a job. I'm in this to help kids" (Green, 2005, p. B1). Because the State Board of Education appoints the superintendent, Grasmick claims that she does not have to consider electoral politics when engaging in education policymaking. According to a local newspaper, she manages an activist state department from which many of the ideas about education policy originate (Green, 2005, p. B1). Her resources are many. As the state superintendent of schools, she has led the education department staff in developing and implementing an education reform program that has been recognized by President Clinton and the National Governor's Association. In addition to her leadership skills, she is credited with cultivating support for her initiatives from the legislature, local school superintendents, business leaders, and major newspapers. Strategies that she uses to develop support include the *bully pulpit* and frequent meetings with stakeholders. Besides delivering speeches and addresses and conducting press conferences to emphasize the importance of *staying the course*, Grasmick meets often with groups to explain her ideas and to hear their concerns. By discussing plans and negotiating with stakeholders early in the policymaking process, she takes steps to ensure that many of the likely divisive issues do not become major problems (Cibulka & Derlin, 1998).

While the "evidence of interest group influence remains mixed in state and local decision arenas" (Malen, 2001, p. 170), local officials in Maryland demonstrated their ability to influence education policymaking during the school funding debates in the 1997 legislative session by making their case for additional

education funds for their districts. Executives from six of Maryland's largest

jurisdictions formed an alliance with the Baltimore City mayor to develop a proposal

to be submitted by their legislative delegations. The proposal supported the

City/State partnership on the condition that all counties would receive additional

funds the following year to help them address the needs presented by their at-risk

student populations. The political strength of the alliance proved to be an effective

strategy in influencing public policymaking. The City/State partnership was

established in 1997 and in the following year, HB 1 (SAFE) provided additional

funds statewide for at-risk students ("It's up to Gov.," 1997; "What's fair," 1997;

"What's ahead," 1997; and Wilson, 1998)

The highly visible participants in Maryland's education policymaking process

under study demonstrate a commitment to meet their obligation according to the state

constitution to provide an adequate education for all children in the state. They

demonstrate their commitments by using their resources of positional power and

leadership skill to place education on the legislative agenda. Strategies they employ

to achieve their goals include commissions and task forces, stakeholder meetings,

media communications, alliances, and sometimes, coercion. While this section

presents a broad sketch about how key individuals participated in education

policymaking events, this study seeks to provide details concerning how these actors

and others interacted to influence the decision to fund school libraries in 1998 and the

decision not to fund them in 2001.

Chapter 5: Policymaking Process of House Bill 1, 1998

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the dynamics of the legislative

decision making in Maryland's 1998 General Assembly session that resulted in the

passage of House Bill 1 (HB 1) with a provision of funds for school library media

programs. This bill established the School Accountability Funding for Excellence

(SAFE) Program mainly to provide monies to local school systems to improve

learning opportunities for at-risk students. The SAFE legislation included funds for

elementary school library media programs and marked the first time that state funds

had been dedicated for school libraries since 1870.

Following a brief description of how data sources will be cited, the chapter

includes a summary of the policymaking decision events, and using the conceptual

framework described in Chapter 3, analyzes the policymaking process. The

framework outlines the legislative action according to three major streams of activity:

problem recognition; policy formulation; and political interaction. The analysis

examines these streams of activity and the actors who were motivated to use their

resources to implement various strategies that influenced the decision outcome. The

final section of the chapter interprets the policymaking process to explain how the

contextual forces and actor relationships resulted in the passage of HB 1 and the

provision of state funds for school library media programs.

Data sources included interviews and documentary evidence. Interviews were

conducted with members of the executive staff, legislators, legislative staff, interest

group representatives, media correspondents, and state education agency staff

involved with the legislative process. In order to maintain their anonymity in reporting information, interview participant citations were coded as (a) ExecS for executive staff, (b) Leg for legislator, (c) LegS for legislative staff, (d) IGRep for interest group representative, (e) MC for media correspondent, and (f) SEA for state education agency staff. Primary and secondary source documents were examined for information about the policymaking process that resulted in the passage of House Bill 1 and cited directly since they are part of the public record.

Summary of Legislative Decision Events

On May 21, 1998, the Governor signed into law HB 1: School Accountability Funding for Excellence (SAFE) authorizing the Maryland State Department of Education to distribute an additional $186 million in state education funds over a four-year period (FY 1999-2002) to local school systems for programs serving students at-risk of failing in school. In addition to the funding of *targeted improvement* grants to assist school systems in addressing learning problems faced by students who are poor and who experience a high rate of mobility, the legislation provided funds for programs to help students who were limited-English proficient and who would benefit by attending a pre-kindergarten program. Another component included a Teacher Development Program and a Provisional Teacher Support Program to give school systems additional resources to help ensure that at-risk students had successful learning experiences with competent teachers. Other funding categories included an effective schools program for Prince George's County, elementary school libraries, and school construction (MSDE, 1998).

The core of the legislation resulted from the work of a twenty-eight (28)

member task force (i.e., Counihan Commission) appointed jointly in 1997 by the

Governor and Speaker of the House "to undertake a comprehensive review of

education funding and programs in grades K-12 to ensure that students throughout

Maryland have an equal opportunity for academic success" (MSDE, 1998, p. 2-1).

Other funding categories, such as the one establishing a grant program for the

enhancement of elementary school libraries, were not among the recommendations of

the task force but were provisions of the bill when it became law.

In establishing the School Library Enhancement Program, the SAFE

legislation provided assistance to local school systems in updating "elementary

library book and other resource collections" (Article 5-206, subsection H). The

legislation directed the Governor to include $3 million in the operating budget each

year beginning in FY 1999 to provide grants to local school systems to improve their

school library collections. In order to receive the grant funds, local school systems

were required to match the amounts allocated for each jurisdiction based on full-time

enrollment data with "new local school board funds" (Article 5-206). The legislation

defined *new funds* as monies provided by local school boards for elementary school

libraries in excess of what they had provided in FY 1998.

Problem Stream

This section explores how school libraries became a legislative agenda item

during the 1998 General Assembly session. It includes information on the actors who

were involved, explains why they initiated and/or supported this provision, and

describes what they did to get the item on the agenda. This section also describes the

setting or context that made it possible for the school library media funding issue to become an agenda item and offers information on the interactions of the players during the agenda setting process.

Actors, Goals, and Motivations

Primary and secondary source documents and semi-structured interview data identified several categories of actors involved in initiating the provision to include funds for the state's elementary school library media programs in HB 1. These categories included executive, legislative, interest group, and state education agency actors. The governor requested that Speaker of the House Cas Taylor (D-Allegany County) introduce the SAFE legislation[9], including an enhancement program for the state's elementary library media programs. Seventy-three (73) of the 141 delegates had signed on as sponsors by the First Reading of HB 1 on January 14, 1998. Senate President Mike Miller (D-Calvert and Prince George's counties) introduced a cross-filed bill (SB171) on January 23, 1998, with the support of 32 of the 47 senators. In addition to the executive and legislative leaders who officially introduced the legislation, other individuals became involved in the provision of funds for the elementary school library media programs.

Executive Actors. According to several interview respondents, HB 1 was "leadership driven." Not only was the bill submitted "at the request of the administration," but the inclusion of school library media funds was noted by one

---

[9] The Speaker of the House proposed the legislation at the request of the governor as documented by the manner in which the bill was listed: "The Speaker (By Request of Administration)." Listing a bill in this manner indicates that it is proposed by the Governor and his agencies and is not a proposal of the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, the Minority Leader, or the respective Committee Chair. The bill must be listed with the official title of a legislator rather than the Governor to meet state constitutional requirements (http://mlis.state.md.us/#indx. Accessed December 16, 2006).

executive staff member to be the governor's "pet project" (ExecS2). Informants

pointed to several personal experiences that may have motivated the governor to

update library media center collections. Several reported that by volunteering in his

son's elementary school and visiting school library media centers throughout the

state, the governor had the opportunity to see firsthand the outdated condition of

library media collections. He had been reading to students in the library media center

at University Park Elementary School library in Prince George's County every

Monday morning since his son had been a kindergarten student. As a result of this

experience and visits to other school libraries, he understood the need to update

collections. For example, in statements to reporters, he said, "All of the jobs and

opportunities of the future are based on information and knowledge" (Haddad, 1997,

p. 1B). During visits to a number of schools, "he was astonished to see how outdated

the books were in the school libraries" (ExecS5). Informants concurred that after

seeing the poor condition of these school library collections, "school libraries

[became] his priority" (ExecS5). He asked the Speaker "to include [the funds for

school libraries] in the bill to fulfill some of the discussion throughout the campaign"

(Exec3).

According to some members of the executive staff, State Superintendent

Grasmick was a member of the executive branch who supported the inclusion of

funds for school library media programs in the legislation (ExecS2). Like the

governor, Grasmick wanted to address the "obsolescence of books" (ExecS4) in

Maryland's school libraries. Updating the collections with newer and more relevant

materials, she believed, would improve learning opportunities, especially for students considered at-risk.

Legislative Actors. Executive staff interviewed also noted that legislative leaders saw the bill and liked it (ExecS2). The Speaker introduced the bill and included funds for library media programs to "lift up other parts of the state" (ExecS5), Chairs of the Appropriations, Budget & Taxation, and Ways & Means committees supported the inclusion of funds for school libraries in the SAFE legislation. Delegate Rawlings (D-Baltimore City), Chair of the Appropriations Committee, was considered by one respondent as "pretty much the leader in developing HB 1" (ExecS4). Apparently, "he recognized school library media programs as another basic [educational] need" (ExecS1) and saw the inclusion of funds for school library media programs as a way to provide more resources to the local school districts while requiring the districts to be more accountable in the use of the funds. Rawlings was known for using the "carrot and the stick approach" (ExecS4). He believed that if the state gave jurisdictions the funds to implement programs, they would be more willing to be accountable for student achievement. Senator Barbara Hoffman (D-Baltimore City and Baltimore County), Chair of the Budget & Taxation Committee, also recognized school libraries as a basic educational priority, especially in providing support for local efforts in raising reading scores statewide (ExecS1). Delegate Sheila Hixson (D-Montgomery County), Chair, Ways & Means Committee, known to be a supporter of libraries, "openly voiced strong support for including funds for school libraries in HB 1" (ExecS2) and probably saw

the inclusion of funds for school libraries as a means to improve library services statewide (Leg4).

Interest Group Actors. Some executive staff members who participated in the interviews identified other actors who supported the inclusion of funds in HB 1 for school libraries. These players included county executives who lobbied heavily for the bill (ExecS4) because they saw this component as "another way to get money for education through local government" (ExecS3). Education organization leaders (e.g., teacher and superintendent associations), who enjoyed a close relationship with the governor, joined county leaders in supporting the inclusion of funds for school library media programs as a way to get more money for education (ExecS3).

According to one interview respondent, little, if any, dissension about including a provision for school library media programs within the SAFE legislation occurred because "libraries are like apple pie and motherhood" (Leg4). Others noted that while "no one is a violent opponent of school funding" (IGRep2), the Senate President and budget director were concerned about the "long term commitment of funds" (ExecS3). However, the Senate President demonstrated his eventual support for the legislation, including funds for school libraries, by submitting a similar bill in the Senate.

Resources and Strategies

Individuals used several resources and strategies appropriate to their policymaking positions to get the school library media program on the legislative agenda. The funding provision for school library media programs was a component of the bill when it was pre-filed on November 15, 1997. This move signaled significant

147

support from both executive and legislative leadership for the inclusion of these funds

in the SAFE bill since the Speaker sponsored the bill on behalf of the Administration

(i.e., the governor); since Maryland has an executive budget, the governor's

budgetary responsibilities are a key resource to use in influencing legislation. As one

legislator explained, "When the governor puts money in a bill, no one speaks against

it" (Leg1). A legislative staff member referenced the Maryland governor's budgetary

powers as a valuable resource used to influence others to support putting school

library media programs on the agenda when he said, "The power of the purse strings

cannot be overestimated" (LegS_2). While these comments about the governor's

interest and budgetary power made library media funding sound like a certainty, the

governor also used the bully pulpit to reinforce the importance of the inclusion of

funds for school libraries in the SAFE legislation by "picking up an old book,

carrying it around, and using it in his speeches to promote one of his projects –

money for school libraries" (SEA1). The governor, therefore, made the key move to

get school libraries on the agenda by putting money in the budget. This strategy

positioned the initiative for advancement in the process and his advocacy efforts

helped to ensure its success. Even though school library funding was an uncontested

issue, the governor's involvement was important because as Kingdon's (1995) model

predicts, executives are key to getting an idea on the agenda.

Setting

The ability to get an issue on the agenda or the ability to keep an issue off the

agenda may be influenced by the context. While competing issues at the time might

have fueled resistance or made it more difficult to get school library media programs

on the agenda, several circumstances and events helped the governor and other supporters overcome the competition to help get school library media programs on the legislative agenda. For example, welfare costs have always competed with education for funds (Leg1), but the desire of the legislature to put more funds into elementary and secondary education in 1998 helped focus attention on the SAFE legislation (LegS1_1). According to several interview respondents, a number of other concerns that enabled proponents to get the SAFE bill on the legislative agenda with a provision for school library media programs included the importance Marylanders place on education, issues about equitable education opportunities for all children, and an initiative proposed by the governor to improve education and health for children (Babington, 1997). In addition to concerns about education that made conditions favorable for the consideration of school library media program improvement as essential for effective schooling, a budget surplus allowed lawmakers to think about providing funds to update collections, and the election cycle prompted them to demonstrate how they would provide their districts with additional education funds.

Education Issues. According to one of the media correspondents interviewed, education generally is considered the most important issue in Maryland (MC2). In addition to the state constitution requiring that all children receive an adequate education, Marylanders appear to take this requirement seriously as demonstrated by the high percentage of high school and college graduates in the state. An interest group representative reported, however, at the time the SAFE Act was introduced, the public was frustrated about getting enough money to provide students

with an effective education in every school district (IGRep1). An executive staff member remembered that people were starting to worry about providing and sustaining help to a growing number of students considered at-risk, especially when the state had set achievement standards for all students (ExecS4). As noted by another interest group representative, a debate at the federal level about providing schools with the resources educators required to deliver appropriate educational opportunities had intensified (IGRep4). For example, education stakeholders identified technology as an essential resource and wanted to close the *digital divide* between students who have access to computers and the Internet and those who did not have access to these electronic resources (IGRep8). The school library media program was viewed as a means to providing these instructional resources (i.e., access to books, computers, and the Internet) to all students.

Second, as reported by a legislative staff member, concerns about providing equitable educational opportunities throughout the state by allocating each district with its fair share of state education funds were present. The legislature had passed a bill in the previous session that gave additional education funds to Baltimore City because its student population was adversely impacted by high rates of poverty and mobility. This move left the remaining jurisdictions wanting their share of additional state education funds. According to one legislative staff member,

> HB 1 was the *perfect storm* of an education bill. It was all about smoothing over ruffled feathers from the passage of the *partnership bill* (SB 795) in the 1997 legislative session that gave Baltimore City an additional $254 million over the course of 5 years (LegS2).

Legislators from other districts came to the 1998 session with the goal to acquire similar funds for their school systems.

A third development that helped to put education, including school library media programs, on the legislative agenda was the governor's launching of Children First, a campaign to promote education and health care for children (ExecS1). With the governor promoting these issues, conditions were favorable for legislators to seek his support in providing additional funds for education statewide, especially to improve the quality of the library books in elementary schools.

Circumstances and Events. Other conditions in the Maryland context that influenced the ability of proponents to get the issue on the agenda included revenue projections and the election cycle. According to one executive staff member, the timing was good for school library media funding to be considered as a provision of the SAFE bill "because budget revenues were continuing to grow and the income tax cut was not *kicking in* yet" (ExecS1). In fact, another executive staff member reported that the state had a billion-dollar budget with surpluses during the governor's third and fourth years in office (ExecS3). An interest group representative noted that the surplus revenues made the situation especially conducive to funding programs like school libraries. Simply put, people were willing to spend money in 1998 because they had money to spend (IGRep3).

Some executive staff members who were interviewed pointed out that this legislative session was also the last one before the election (ExecS2) and "[I]n an election year, politics comes to the forefront" (ExecS3). A media correspondent believed that "HB 1 was about providing additional money to local districts for education" (MC1). By providing districts with more funds, the governor and the legislators likely would please the voters and enhance their chances of re-election.

Additional developments and situations in the Maryland context that respondents cited as having affected how the school library media program was placed on the legislative agenda included the recent work of the Counihan Commission and legislative frustration with the State Board of Education for failing to request funds for education and libraries. The Counihan Commission had just spent a year examining the state's school funding formula to determine if students throughout Maryland had an equal opportunity for academic success (Task Force Report, January 1998). The task force recommendations called for additional funds to address funding inequities, especially for students considered at-risk of failing in school. According to one state education staff member, "the library program was at the right place at the right time" (SEA1) for consideration of state funds because it provided more resources for teaching at-risk students. An interest group representative also cited the task force study as a contributing factor in the consideration of funds for school libraries: "This bill came on the heels of the Counihan Commission" (IGRep2) and may have been propelled by the commission's work.

Although Marylanders' basic commitment to education had not waned and education remained a leading issue statewide, the general interest in promoting quality programs was necessary, but not sufficient for school libraries to be an item on the general assembly's legislative agenda. Legislators' interest in meeting the constitutional requirement to provide an adequate education for all students combined with a number of enabling and energizing forces (Mazzoni, 1994) to place school library media programs on the state legislative agenda in 1998. These forces included:

a governor-sponsored program promoting better education and health care for children; a budget surplus; an approaching election year; and a task force recommending additional funding for at-risk students that had been jointly appointed by the governor and the Speaker. The budget surplus enabled lawmakers to consider funding school libraries since state funds were available for a four-year commitment to the program. At the same time, the executive's Children First program, an upcoming election, and task force recommendations identifying the need to increase funds for educating at-risk students energized lawmakers to support school library funding for the first time in decades.

Interactions and Outcomes

According to several interview participants, a couple of influence relationships at the leadership level (i.e., executive and legislative branches, as well as the state education agency) were critical in getting school libraries placed on the legislative agenda. In each of these relationships, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) played a role. As one informant put it, "the point people at MSDE … were effective in gaining support for the school library media funding issue" (MC1). However, a number of respondents attributed the most influence to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

A member of the executive staff noted that "a good collaboration with MSDE" was particularly effective … We would sit down with the budget director and determine if Senator Hoffman, chair, Budget & Taxation Committee, and Delegate Rawlings, chair, Appropriations Committee, were *on board* [with the proposal]" (ExecS1). Another executive staff member noted that State

Superintendent Grasmick and Rawlings talked with each other every day during this time period. A state education staff member described "an extremely unique relationship" between the superintendent and the Appropriations chairman by saying that "they relied heavily on one another" and "had daily conversations" (SEA1) about education issues. An executive staff member credited Rawlings with forming "a strong alliance with House Speaker Taylor, Governor Glendening, and State Superintendent Grasmick to make certain that local school systems had the resources to support student achievement" (ExecS4) as the general assembly studied the state education funding issue. Interactions between and among state leadership members that contributed to school library media programs being on the legislative agenda included meetings to discuss education issues, daily conversations about how to best support student achievement, and the formation of an alliance focused on how to provide the appropriate resources.

Policy Stream

This section explains who was involved in taking school library media programs as a legislative agenda item and developing a proposal to include funds for this program, what these actors hoped to accomplish by their involvement, and what they did to influence the proposal formulation process. This section also includes a discussion of the contextual developments that influenced the inclusion of school library media programs during the formulation of the SAFE legislation.

Actors, Goals, and Motivations

While the Governor had asked the Speaker to include school libraries in
House Bill 1: School Accountability Funding for Excellence (SAFE), multiple
interview respondents identified several members of the general assembly leadership,
as well as the state superintendent, as primary actors in developing the proposal.
These players included House Speaker Cas Taylor, House Appropriations Committee
Chairman Pete Rawlings, Senate Budget & Taxation Committee Chairperson Barbara
Hoffman, and State Superintendent Nancy Grasmick.

The Speaker represented a rural district that struggled as much as the
Baltimore City did to provide sufficient educational resources. According to one
media correspondent, Cas Taylor "pushed for money for the classroom" (MC1) to
make instructional materials available for students in Allegany County Public
Schools. Additional reasons given by an interest group representative, an executive
staff member, a legislator, and a state education agency staffer for the Speaker's
willingness to include school library media funds in the SAFE proposal included the
program's contribution to gaining universal acceptance by members of the legislature
for the bill and winning the Governor's support for the legislation. By including funds
for school libraries, HB 1 would provide more money for educational purposes to the
rural parts of the state as well as to large jurisdictions like Montgomery County in the
Washington metropolitan area. The legislature was looking for ways to help these
counties address the learning requirements of their fast-growing at-risk populations
and to secure their support for the larger proposal. Because the school library media
funds would be distributed per capita (i.e., directly proportional to enrollment) and by

155

that indicator, give each jurisdiction its *fair share*, legislators agreed that it was advantageous to the success of the bill to include this component (ExecS4; IGRep2; Leg1; SEA2).

Including the school library media component in the bill also was seen as a way to gain the governor's support for the SAFE legislation. By honoring the governor's issue preference, the Speaker gained his support for the broader SAFE bill. According to one interest group respondent, the governor and the Speaker were not "talking at all" to one another in 1998 (IGRep4). Therefore, "the Speaker embraced including school libraries to get the governor more on board with the proposal (i.e., HB 1)" (ExecS5). At the same time, another interest group representative reported that "school libraries gave the governor a very good ability to find concrete ways to advance his program (i.e., Children First)" (IGRep4). In this case, the school library proposal was a way to help both leaders achieve their legislative goals.

Several interview participants reported that in addition to the Speaker, chairpersons of two important legislative committees were very involved in formulating the proposal to include school libraries in the SAFE bill. Rawlings and Hoffman, both Baltimore City delegates, were keenly aware of the disparities in education funding across districts in the state and had concerns about inequities in the initial SAFE proposal (LegS1_1). These concerns centered on Baltimore City's allocation being smaller than that of other districts due to the funds received the previous year as part of the City/State partnership agreement. According to one interest group representative, these legislators believed that these equity issues could

be addressed by allocating funds to all districts to improve school libraries (IGRep8).

A member of the executive staff saw these particular legislators as "really strong education [supporters], especially in Baltimore City" (ExecS1). A legislative staff member describes them as "having a passion for education" (LegS1_1); they demonstrated this interest by serving on commissions, reading about education, and attending conferences on education topics (LegS1_1). According to the same staff member, Senator Hoffman's specific interest was in early brain development. Consequently, she also worked to direct the school library media funds to the purchase of books for elementary school libraries in order to support reading initiatives in the early grades (LegS1_1). The credibility in dealing with education topics as well as their perceived standing in the legislature reportedly gave these legislators considerable power and influence in the policymaking process.

Along with the legislative leadership, State Superintendent Grasmick was reported by a state education staff member as being instrumental in developing the SAFE proposal (SEA2_1). An executive staff member reported that Grasmick "has always offered strong support for library media programs and believes that they are integral to a school" (ExecS4). She also recognized that "a lack of consistency in library media programs existed statewide" (ExecS4). Informants claimed her motivation for supporting the inclusion of a funding component for school libraries was to promote the library media program as an instructional program rather than merely as an information resource (ExecS4). An interest group representative also believed that the superintendent supported the inclusion of school library media funds "because there was a major push to improve math and reading scores" and updated

resources provided through the library media program could be viewed as supporting

the teaching and learning of these subjects (IGRep1). The involvement of these

different players brought multiple, but arguably complementary reasons for being

engaged in this issue.

Resources

As state legislative and education leaders, Taylor, Rawlings, Hoffman, and

Grasmick also brought different, but relevant and complementary resources to the

proposal formulation process. One legislative staff member identified several

resources that these individuals used exceptionally well in crafting HB 1: "positional

power; skill to work with other people; expert knowledge about education; and a

willingness to work hard" (LegS1_1). As legislative leaders, Taylor, Rawlings, and

Hoffman had positional power (e.g., committee chairmanships, committee

appointments, hearing agendas, and discussion leaders) which would serve them well

during the political process, but of particular importance during the formulation of the

policy proposal were their skills in working with other people, their expertise about

education topics (e.g., teaching reading skills), and their perseverance in dealing with

the issues. Taylor was described as a *policy wonk* by one legislative staff member

(LegS1_1) because he was willing to study an issue. In this case, he worked closely

with the state superintendent in developing the policy proposal. This focus on policy

development served him well in working with Grasmick, Rawlings, and Hoffman in

crafting the SAFE bill that might have universal appeal among the legislative

membership. The Speaker also was known by executive staff for his ability to make

deals and compromises even if it meant disagreeing with his constituents as he did

when he voted for bills prohibiting the sale of certain guns and discrimination against

gay people (ExecS3).

According to an interest group representative, Rawlings worked well with

other people to find solutions to both the substantive policy problem as well as the

strategic political problem as demonstrated by his ability to craft coalitions (IGRep3).

Within these alliances, he most always would succeed in developing a proposal with

broad appeal. For example, he was credited by an executive staff member with

forming "a very important alliance with Cas Taylor, Parris Glendening, and Nancy

Grasmick to make certain that local school systems had the resources to support

student achievement" (ExecS4). He was reputed to be a very effective legislator who

was considered by staff members to be both a smart policy person and a skilled

politician (LegS3) willing to make "hard decisions" (LegS2). As a chairperson of one

of the powerful budgetary committees, Rawlings frequently would be asked to make

hard decisions. According to a member of the executive staff, "if you are an effective

Appropriations Committee chair, you know that means you will be saying *no* to some

things, otherwise you would be saying *yes* to everything" (ExecS3). Despite the fact

he had to say *no*, he still had a lot of interpersonal capital.

Since Grasmick is state superintendent of schools, it is not surprising that

informants referred to her as the state's education leader. In addition to the respect

afforded persons in that position, Grasmick was reputed to be highly regarded by

legislators in dealing with education issues. According to one state education agency

staff member, members of the general assembly respected Grasmick for her

"credibility and integrity" and her vision for education (SEA1). Multiple interview

respondents commented on her political skills which she brings to bear on the state education policymaking process. Along with coalition building, she is adept at engaging stakeholders in discussing plans, listening to their ideas and concerns, and incorporating their feedback in the final proposal. One legislative staff member considered her "probably the most influential politician in the State of Maryland and one of the better skilled ones" (LegS3). An interest group representative also noted the superintendent for her "political savvy" (IGRep2).

Strategies

Executive, legislative and education leaders used their considerable resources to influence the policy formulation of the SAFE legislative proposal to make certain that it would provide additional funds to local jurisdictions in a manner acceptable to the general assembly. Several strategies they employed to ensure the acceptance of the proposal by their colleagues included: a task force report; an important label on the bill; a sunset provision; delayed disbursement of funds; and a sufficient amount of money to satisfy the requirements of most jurisdictions.

Convening a task force to study an issue is a strategy sometimes used by governors, legislators, and education leaders to broaden the arena of support by engaging stakeholders in deliberating the issue and promoting media attention (Mazzoni, 1991a). A task force also serves to hammer out differences before a proposal comes to the legislature (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Malen & Campbell, 1986; and Fowler, 1994). The governor and the Speaker appear to have employed this strategy to develop a solution for the inadequate school funding formula and to provide support for its revision. Following the 1997 legislative session during which

the legislature developed and passed a bill establishing the City/State Partnership that awarded the Baltimore City Public Schools an additional $254 million, the governor and the Speaker appointed a task force (i.e., Counihan Commission). The charge of the task force was "to undertake a comprehensive review of education funding and programs in grades K – 12 to ensure that students throughout Maryland have an equal opportunity for academic success" (MSDE, 1998, p. 2-1). The task force had broad support from the legislature because of its leadership and structure. The governor and the Speaker jointly convened the task force and appointed members from a variety of stakeholder groups: the House, other state and local government offices, and education and business communities. They met over the course of six months to study the funding gaps in the current formula (APEX). At the end of this period, the commission made recommendations about providing additional state funds to address the special learning requirements of at-risk students and requiring local school districts to develop a comprehensive plan for accountability purposes (Task Force Report, ppt., 1998). According to one interest group representative, the Counihan Commission experienced "built-in momentum" (IGRep2) to support the policy proposal because member stakeholders would have an interest in the results of their work.

Labeling the proposal *House Bill 1: School Accountability Funding for Excellence* gave the proposal significance on two levels. The first level involved the bill number. Giving the bill the number "one," signaled it was the Speaker's priority (SEA1; MC1). The second level of significance was in the wording of the bill. By including the words *accountability* and *excellence*, members of the general assembly

might be more inclined to support a funding proposal that promotes responsibility for the expenditure of state funds and high achievement standards. *Accountability* and *excellence* were hot-button terms at the time. These concepts were embedded in the state school reform plan; linking to these notions might help create a favorable reaction to the bill.

Including a sunset provision in the bill was another strategy that leadership used to formulate a proposal with more appeal for the general assembly. Because the funds would be committed for only a four-year period, legislators might be more inclined to support the policy. In addition to the sunset provision that limited the period of funding, other sections made it clear that the monies would not be distributed until the following year. According to multiple interview respondents, "It is easier to pass a bill that does not have an immediate fiscal impact" (ExecS3; IGRep3).

The policymakers included a significant amount of additional funds in the proposal to satisfy the local districts by helping them meet the learning requirements of their at-risk students and gain the acceptance of their representatives. In order to provide sufficient funds, they included a provision for elementary school libraries that allocated money to each local school district according to student enrollment. Since state enrollment is a familiar basis for allocating funds, this provision was perceived as giving each jurisdiction its fair share of the state education funds. According to one interest group representative who visited the Appropriations Committee chairman during the session, Rawlings emphasized the importance of providing each district an equitable amount of funds. To demonstrate this requirement, he created charts

identifying what each jurisdiction would receive and he would show these charts to his visitors (IGRep3).

Several other interview respondents held the same perception about the rationale for including school libraries in the proposal. One legislative staff member suggested that including funds for elementary school libraries in HB 1 "could have been one of the ways the pot was sweetened" (LegS2). An executive staff member also reported that the inclusion of funds for school libraries "would help other delegates and senators feel good [about the policy proposal]" (ExecS1) and a state education staff member simply said, "This was another way to provide money" (SEA2), especially to those districts that did not have large numbers of at-risk students.

Thus, in the policy formulation process, enhanced funding for elementary school libraries served as a strategy for providing broad support for the comprehensive school reform bill. Additional strategies used to ensure acceptance of the proposal by the legislature included establishing a task force, giving the bill a salient label, including a sunset provision, delaying disbursement of funds, and providing enough money to satisfy local requirements for educating their at-risk students.

Setting

During the policy formulation process, the contextual elements that conditioned the ability of the actors to include school library media programs in the SAFE proposal were the favorable economic conditions and public sentiments about

the City/State Partnership Agreement passed by the general assembly during the previous session.

In 1998, Maryland was experiencing a robust economy that produced a budget surplus of over $200 million (Babington, 1998). Several executive staff respondents noted that these revenue projections made it possible to consider allocating more funds for education at this time. As noted by one of these individuals, "We were in a position to spend more money rather than to redistribute it" (ExecS1). Since the bill required only temporary allocations, the legislators would be more inclined to consider it.

In addition to experiencing a budget surplus, general assembly members and their constituents were seeking policy proposals to enhance education funding to districts other than Baltimore City in response to the legislation (SB 795) passed in 1997 that awarded the City an additional $254 million to help meet the learning requirements of its large at-risk population. Residual resentment existed among all but Baltimore City legislators over the infusion of funds in that district while many other districts were experiencing similar difficulties in addressing the needs of their growing at-risk populations (i.e., students who did not speak English and/or were impacted by poverty). An executive staff member summed up the efforts of these legislators by saying, "SAFE was almost for everybody but Baltimore City because they 'got theirs' with the City/State Partnership Agreement in 1997" (ExecS1). One media correspondent added that "the [SAFE proposal] was about coming back in 1998 with broader money to local education agencies for education and to make everyone feel better" (MC1) about the distribution of state education funds.

Interactions and Outcomes

Within this favorable context, the influence relationships that contributed to the development of the SAFE proposal and the inclusion of school library media funds were concentrated at the leadership level. Once again, interview respondents from multiple perspectives identified the Speaker, the Appropriations Committee chair, Budget and Taxation Committee chair, and the state superintendent of schools as the principal actors who worked closely together in "a policy community" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 117) to craft HB 1. As noted earlier, however, the governor played a significant role in the inclusion of a provision for school library media programs when he asked the Speaker to make the improvement of elementary school library collections a component of the omnibus bill. According to one legislator, "the Speaker and the committee chairs negotiate with the governor [to develop proposals] and there is always a little *horse trading* [that goes on during the legislative process]" (Leg1). The reference to horse trading refers how the governor negotiated with the Speaker for his support of the larger bill in exchange for the inclusion of library media program funds. According to one informant (IGRep4), Speaker Taylor and the Governor Glendening were not on speaking terms at this time, but by granting this concession to the governor, the Speaker gained his support for the SAFE Act and the governor found a way to advance his initiative (i.e., Children First).

Interactions among other participants also linked their interests in improving education opportunities for all students with the idea of allocating districts school library media funds to update their collections. Participants conducted meetings, engaged in consensus-building activities, and held discussions behind the scenes to

determine whether or not the idea could meet what Kingdon (1995) terms "criteria for survival" (p. 131). These criteria include technical feasibility, value acceptance, tolerable cost, and a reasonable chance of receptivity among the legislative community. An executive staff member explained that the budget director would have had to have met and worked with both budget committee chairpersons to devise a strategy to include school library media funds in the proposal that was both cost effective and technically possible (ExecS1). At the same time, other participants, such as the politically skilled superintendent, were meeting with local district leaders and professional organizations to discuss the proposal, listen to their ideas, and use their feedback in refining the details to ensure acceptance within the broader community. In addition, interest group representatives noted that Grasmick worked closely with Taylor and Rawlings behind the scenes to develop the bill (IGRep2; IGRep3). Rawlings' ability to craft an unusual consensus in the legislature with Grasmick was noted by one interest group representative as making a significant contribution to the successful formulation of the proposal (IGRep3) as evidenced by the policy community's receptivity of the final proposal.

Political Stream

When HB 1 ultimately came to a vote, funding for elementary school library media programs was included. This section explains how this issue finally was decided, identifies the people who were involved, explains why they were involved, and describes what they did to influence the decision-making process. Contextual developments that may have influenced the outcome are described along with

166

interactions to explain how participants linked certain trends and forces with the policy proposal.

Actors, Goals, and Motivations

According to primary source documents such as the House and Senate hearing schedules, copies of the testimonies submitted, and multiple interview respondents, the SAFE bill received overwhelming support from the legislature, the Maryland State Department of Education, and a number of special interest groups. Only one special interest group (American Federation of Teachers) testified in opposition to the proposal because its representatives believed that Baltimore City Public Schools should receive more funds than the amount allocated in the bill. Not only was the SAFE proposal sponsored by state leadership, but also within each legislative house, the bill received significant backing. The Speaker, along with 73 other delegates who signed on to the proposal, advanced House Bill 1 for the administration. The number of delegate co-sponsors was slightly more than half of the 141 in the House. The Senate President, along with 31 of the 47 senators as co-sponsors, submitted a cross-filed bill (SB 171) for the Administration.

During the hearings on January 21 and March 4, 1998, a significant number of state and local leaders and interest groups presented or submitted testimony in support of the proposal, including the funds for school library media programs. State leaders included the state superintendent of schools and appropriate Maryland State Department of Education staff. Among the local leaders testifying were the county executives from three of the largest districts: Baltimore, Montgomery, and Prince George's counties. Each executive testified in support of the legislation by citing

167

how these funds would help his school district meet the learning requirements of the fast-growing at-risk populations and called on the general assembly to re-examine the state education funding formula.

The special interest groups that testified included the Maryland Association of Counties, the Maryland Library Association, and the Maryland Association of Boards of Education, the Maryland Council of Parent/Teachers Association, and the Maryland State Teachers Association. Only the American Federation of Teachers presented testimony in opposition to the proposal as written in order to encourage the consideration of additional funds for Baltimore City. While some of the other groups listed themselves as proponents, they also suggested amendments that would give Baltimore City an equal amount of funds from the Targeted Improvement Program component. At least two groups recommended providing local school systems more flexibility in spending the monies to meet the learning requirements of at-risk students and agreed with the county executives who testified that the funding formula should be revised.

Resources

Resources used to impact the policymaking process include positional powers that influence participants' decisions, institutional arrangements that channel the actions, and participants' individual skills deployed to affect a desired outcome. State leadership has considerable positional power to use in influencing the passage of a bill. As reported from multiple interview perspectives, but summed up succinctly by a legislative staff member, "sponsorship by House leadership and the Administration, it doesn't get much better than that" (LegS2). Delegates feel obligated to sign on as co-

sponsors (Leg2), and Senators take notice. A leadership-sponsored bill signals the other house that support is expected (i.e., quid pro quo) for the legislation (Leg1). By giving the Senate a bill sponsored by a majority of the House, the Speaker indicated that Delegates would be receptive to a Senate bill. In this case, the Senate President returned the favor by submitting a similar bill that was co-sponsored by two-thirds of the Senate.

In addition to resources available through position, institutional arrangements contribute to leadership's authority and influence in the Maryland General Assembly. The committee system is an arrangement that influences members' decisions. A legislative staff member noted that "there is a tremendous amount of power and influence entrusted in a committee chairman" (LegS3). Legislators are expected to follow the lead of their committee chairmen, especially if they want continued support for their own ideas and initiatives. Consequently, as one legislator stated, "Members must support the committee system" (Leg1). Otherwise, their proposals are likely to *die in committee*.

Individual skills can make a significant contribution to the success of proposals, especially if they are deployed competently. The state superintendent of schools and her staff from the Maryland State Department of Education had credibility with the legislature because of their expertise with education issues. Grasmick, however, had considerable influence with the general assembly. According to one legislator, "Nancy Grasmick could pretty much get what she wanted. She was politically astute and when she came before the committee, she was so professional

and so well-versed" [on the issues] (Leg2). These skills served her well in gaining the support of the legislature to adopt the SAFE legislation.

Strategies

While several interview respondents used the phrase "motherhood and apple pie" (Leg4; MC1; MC2) to describe the appeal that the school library media program component had with the legislators, according to one legislative staff member, "the school library media component was more about politics. It provided a way for counties to get enough money to vote for the bill" (LegS2). While the additional funds lubricated the bargaining process during proposal formulation, they also greased the wheels for passage in the enactment phase. By including funds for local school library media programs that addressed the interests of multiple constituents with more monies for education, the policymakers secured the passage of HB 1. Every district now would receive what prior practices had deemed a more equitable share of funds since the disbursements were based on their total student enrollments.

At the same time, a strategy employed to get funding for school library media programs was to include the program in the SAFE legislation. According to one of the legislators, "it is best to put a single initiative, [such as enhancing school library media programs,] in a bill with a big fiscal note to avoid closer scrutiny" (Leg2). As reported by a member of the executive office, the Governor used this strategy to secure state funds for school library media programs in 1998 by asking the Speaker to include the provision in the SAFE bill to avoid close examination (ExecS3). At the same time, he took advantage of the favorable reception the SAFE bill was experiencing with the legislature and their constituents to "sweeten the pot" (LegS2).

Setting

Timing can be important in deciding issues (Kingdon, 1995) and a number of interview respondents from multiple perspectives (i.e., ExecS; LegS; IGRep; and SEA) identified one particular development within the Maryland context that made it easier to commit state funds to school libraries during this time period. As earlier noted, the state fiscal conditions were favorable to passing legislation for increased education funding. In 1998, the revenues had improved considerably since the recession of the early 1990s (ExecS5). In addition to the good economic climate, other enabling conditions may have contributed to the passage of the bill with the inclusion of state funds for school libraries as noted by interview respondents. One of these factors was the emphasis Maryland's citizens and their legislators placed on education, especially about improving reading skills (IGRep1). This condition combined with the election cycle to provide a favorable context for the passage of the SAFE bill with funds for school library media programs. According to several respondents, elementary education was a good issue to support in an election year (ExecS; IGRep2; MC). As one interest group representative suggested, "Funding schools is a winner for everyone" (IGRep2).

Interactions and Outcomes

During the political process, the heavy line up of authorities (i.e., the governor and the legislators) augmented by the alliance of interest groups provided effective influence relationships that were key to the passage of HB 1 with the provision of funds for school library media programs. These influence relationships were visible in the testimonies presented by a variety of interest groups that supported the passage

171

of the SAFE bill. Members of the executive staff who were interviewed noted that

several county executives formed a coalition that was particularly effective in

influencing the legislators to pass the SAFE bill. According to one respondent, "The

counties came together in an alliance" (ExecS3). The county executives from the

three largest counties (i.e., Baltimore, Montgomery, and Prince George's)

demonstrated their alliance by delivering together their testimony in support of the

legislation. Another executive staff member noted that these local leaders "lobbied

the legislature heavily" (ExecS4). The education community demonstrated a high

degree of consensus in support of HB 1 during the political phase of the policymaking

process.

Interpretation of the Policymaking Process

The evidence gathered from interviews as well as from primary and secondary

source documents and categorized according to the conceptual framework provides a

plausible explanation for the passage of the SAFE legislation with a provision of state

funds for school library media programs: The policy outcome reflects not only the

power of the governor, but the significant role he played as the policy entrepreneur in

the process. While the governor was a key actor, the case suggests that he was not

sufficient in securing state funds for school libraries. During the agenda-setting

phase, he was important in recognizing the problem of the outdated condition of

school library collections. During the policy formulation phase, he also was

important because he coupled the problem with a viable solution when he asked the

Speaker to include school library funding in the SAFE Act. Other participants come

into play, however, during the policy formulation and enactment to ensure monies for

172

school libraries. This interpretation of the policymaking process is based on research

used to assess the power and influence of actors by examining data on decision

outcomes, attributions, and influence efforts to render a plausible interpretation of the

political process.

In addition to the important roles played by various actors in securing state

funds to improve elementary school library collections, the context provided both

"enabling and energizing forces" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 57) throughout the policymaking

process that resulted in the passage of HB 1 with the inclusion of school library media

funding. Of particular importance was the availability of money made possible by

more than a $200 million budget surplus. These surplus revenues coupled with a

statewide concern about the special requirements of educating at-risk students made

policymakers willing to allocate additional funds to local school districts especially

when the bill contained a sunset clause. Other positive forces included the

uncontested nature of the issue (i.e., Legislative respondents likened school libraries

as an issue to motherhood and apple pie.) and an election cycle that prompted elected

officials to demonstrate their skills in providing resources for their constituents in

order to enhance their ability to be re-elected.

Decision Outcomes

As an indicator of influence, the decision outcome points to the actors whose

interests are represented and whose interests are not reflected in the outcome. In the

case of HB 1, the interests of multiple groups were met with the passage of this

legislation to provide additional education funds to all local jurisdictions to help them

address the teaching and learning requirements of their at-risk students. While some

173

controversy existed over the amount of funding that the Baltimore City Public School system was allocated because of funds that it had been given previously, no school system lost money in this process. Every district received an infusion of new monies along with stricter accountability requirements.

This new policy was based largely on the recommendations of the Counihan Commission. One of the few modifications that was made to the bill included $3 million in additional funds for Maryland's public school libraries. Other modifications included new distribution formulas for the Extended Elementary Education Program and teacher development funds. Because the school library media program provision was not among the original recommendations of the task force convened to study the gaps in the state funding formula, the inclusion of school library media funds in the legislation directs attention to the governor as the key player responsible for including this provision in the SAFE Act. His advocacy efforts coupled with the strategy for including this single program in the larger bill were critical, but not sufficient. This interpretation is consistent with Kingdon's (1995) research in which he notes that executives have tremendous agenda-setting influence, but it is often up to the Congress or legislature to consider the policy alternatives and vote on the final outcome. As demonstrated by the policymaking efforts of the state superintendent of schools in working with legislative leaders and interest groups, multiple players acted in concert to include school library funding as a component in the larger bill.

Attributions

A means for gauging influence in the legislative arena is the examination of documentary evidence and interview results to determine who is perceived as influential. Newspaper articles during this time period and interviews with those involved in the policymaking process identified the governor as instrumental in securing funds for school libraries. While other high profile leaders were reported to have supported the proposal to include the program in the SAFE bill for a variety of reasons: to provide appropriate instructional materials; to support reading initiatives; to update library media collections; and to secure approval for the larger bill, the governor was the player who first brought attention to the problem of obsolete library media materials and emphasized the merits of providing more current resources.

Newspaper articles described the governor's visits to schools where he promoted reading to students in the school library and covered other occasions when he voiced his dismay about the poor condition of the collections. Multiple interview respondents identified the governor as being responsible for inserting the library media funding provision in HB 1. Illustrative comments from the executive office include: "The [provision] was his pet" (ExecS2); "The governor gained interest in school libraries through personal experience" (ExecS5); "The governor wanted to address the obsolescence of books" (ExecS3); and "The governor's priority was school libraries. He was astonished to see how the books were outdated on the school library shelves in schools he visited" (ExecS5). In order to "fulfill some of the discussion throughout the campaign" (ExecS3), the governor made efforts to influence legislation to secure state funds for school libraries. These efforts included

aligning his interests with those of legislative leaders such as the "House Speaker who embraced school libraries to get the governor more on board with HB 1" (ExecS5). By aligning his interests with those of the Speaker, the governor's influence effort provided an important step towards securing dedicated state funding for school libraries.

Influence Efforts

As the key actor in securing funds for school libraries, the governor was a highly visible policy entrepreneur who was willing to contribute his significant resource of positional power to put school libraries on the agenda and to propose it as a solution to the problem of providing additional education funds for at-risk students. Policy entrepreneurs have been characterized as assertive, tenacious, and skillful on behalf of the issue (Mazzoni 1993); and accounts of the governors' use of his powers to influence the policy proposal to include a library media provision provide evidence that he exhibited these traits in serving as the policy entrepreneur for this issue.

He demonstrated assertiveness when he asked the Speaker to include a provision for school libraries in the SAFE bill. Funds for school libraries were not among the recommendations of the Task Force on Education Funding Equity, Accountability, and Partnerships; but, by the time a presentation was given for the hearing of the cross-filed bill (SB 171) before the Senate Budget & Taxation Committee, "$3 million in additional funds for Maryland's public school libraries" (Task Force Report, p. 15) were included in the recommendations.

As the policy entrepreneur for the school library issue, the governor also was tenacious. School libraries and the role they played in promoting literacy were a

176

long-standing issue with Parris Glendening. The *Baltimore Sun* documented accounts that he had been reading to students in the library at a local elementary school for approximately 13 years (Price, 1997). During visits to schools throughout the state, he noticed that many of the books were out-of-date and he commented on the importance of providing current and authoritative materials for students to use in becoming knowledgeable and critical thinkers (Haddad, 1997). The governor used his ability to command media attention with the bully pulpit and the State of the State speech in 1998 to promote awareness of the school library issue.

The governor as policy entrepreneur demonstrated his political skill by asking the Speaker to include school libraries in the SAFE bill, not only to avoid closer scrutiny of a first-time program by the legislature, but also to ensure its passage. As reported by a member of the executive office, "The importance of the lead sponsor can make a difference in the success of the bill; Cas Taylor, House Speaker, was very powerful" (ExecS3). By linking school libraries to the SAFE proposal in the policy formulation phase, the governor made a "critical coupling" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 183) of the problem with a feasible solution.

In summary, this case provides a plausible interpretation of the policymaking process by illustrating the interplay of several factors throughout the multiple streams of the public policymaking process. A key factor was the involvement of the chief executive as the policy entrepreneur who deployed his power and influence resources in advocating for school libraries and negotiating with legislative leadership to hook the problem to a viable solution. While the governor's involvement was important in achieving the desired outcome, this case also demonstrates the significant

contributions made by other participants whose influence efforts were aligned with those of the governor. With the official alignment of gubernatorial and legislative interests as well as the support of special interest groups, HB 1 had virtually no opposition. In addition to the efforts of the actors, a favorable context energized and enabled participants to pass the omnibus bill with dedicated funds for school libraries. Statewide concerns about educating at-risk students coupled with a budget surplus in advance of an election encouraged legislators to seriously consider the school library funding provision. As a result of the convergence of high-level actor relationships and favorable contextual forces, House Bill 1 provided dedicated state funds for Maryland's public school libraries for the first time since 1870.

Chapter 6: Policymaking Process of House Bill 935, 2001

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the dynamics of the legislative decision making process in Maryland's 2001 general assembly session that resulted in the defeat of House Bill 935 (HB 935). Entitled – Public School Libraries – Funding, House Bill 935 sought to increase funding for the supplemental elementary public school library grant program (HB 1) that was legislated in 1998 as part of the SAFE Act. In addition to the continuation of the funds for library books provided by the School Library Enhancement Program, the bill sought to increase monies for local school boards to enhance elementary, middle, and high school library collections with current, up-to-date materials; to purchase statewide online information database licenses; to establish onsite review teams to recommend improvements at public school libraries; to provide grants to assist local school systems to implement improvements; to enhance professional development opportunities for library media specialists; and to establish a tuition assistance program for individuals seeking certification as library media specialists.

Following a brief description of how data sources will be cited, the chapter includes a summary of the policymaking decision events and an analysis of the streams of activity and the actors who sought to influence policy development. The final section of the chapter explains how the contextual forces and actor relationships resulted in the defeat of HB 935 and ended state funds for school libraries in 2003.

As earlier noted, interviews were conducted with members of the executive staff, legislators, legislative staff, interest group representatives, media correspondents, and state education agency staff involved with the legislative process.

In order to maintain their anonymity in reporting information, interview participant citations were coded as (a) ExecS for executive staff, (b) Leg for legislator, (c) LegS for legislative staff, (d) IGRep for interest group representative, (e) MC for media correspondent, and (f) SEA for state education agency staff. Primary and secondary source documents were examined for information about the policymaking process that resulted in the defeat of House Bill 935 and cited directly as part of the public record.

Summary of Legislative Decision Events

House Bill 935 (HB 935) was introduced and read for the first time on February 9, 2001. At that time, the bill was assigned to the Appropriations Committee and to the Ways & Means Committee but later was reassigned to Ways & Means and Appropriations on February 16, 2001[10]. During the legislative session, House action included one hearing with Ways & Means on March 7, 2001, followed by an unfavorable committee vote and report. On March 23, 2001, the Appropriations Committee Chair, Delegate Howard P. Rawlings (D-Baltimore City), sent a letter to Delegate Sheila E. Hixson (D-Montgomery County), Chair, Ways & Means Committee, to inform her that Appropriations Committee members had given HB 935 an unfavorable vote. On March 28, 2001, the Ways & Means Committee gave the bill an unfavorable report. The Senate did not take any action. As a result, state funds for the school library media program ended when the School Accountability Funding for Excellence program expired in 2003.

---

[10] Bills requiring new funds are assigned to Ways & Means; therefore, HB 935 was reassigned because it would require an annual increase of $1.5 million over and above the $3 million in state funds for school libraries that were scheduled to end with the sunset of HB1 in 2002.

When HB 935 received an unfavorable vote, the legislature signaled that dedicated state funds for school libraries would end in 2002 with the sunset of the School Library Enhancement Program that had been established with the SAFE legislation in 1998. As a result, local school districts would not be able to supplement their local funds in updating "elementary library book and other resource collections" (Article 5-206, subsection H). The legislative defeat of HB 935 also denied the Maryland State Department of Education and local school districts funds to upgrade additional program components such as staffing, professional development, curriculum, and technology.

Problem Stream

This section explores how school libraries became a legislative agenda item during the 2001 General Assembly session. It includes information on the actors who were involved, explains why they initiated and/or supported the legislation, and describes what they did to get the item on the legislative agenda. This section also describes the setting or context that made it possible for the school library media funding issue to become an agenda item and offers information on the interactions of the players during the agenda setting process.

Actors, Goals, and Motivations

Primary and secondary source documents, semi-structured interview data, and Journal made by this study's author identify several categories of actors involved in recognizing the problem with Maryland's school libraries. These categories include executive, state education agency, and media correspondent actors. This section also

includes information about their goals and motivations for building support for the

school library media program issue that eventually leads to the development of a

legislative proposal requesting funds for program improvements.

Executive Actors. Executive actors involved in recognizing the substandard

condition of Maryland's school library media programs and advocating corrective

action included the State Board of Education, the superintendent of schools, and state

education agency staff. According to one interest group representative (IGRep1) and

a state education department staff member (SEA1), the *Baltimore Sun* made the State

Board members aware of the poor condition of many of the state's school library

media programs, especially those in Baltimore City, with a series of editorials that

provided examples of school libraries without a certified library media specialist, a

sufficient number of up-to-date books, or an effective instructional program

(Editorials, *Baltimore Sun*, September 1, 5, 16, 26, 2000). These editorials

highlighted the contributions that school libraries can make to student achievement by

supporting the "skills coveted by MSPAP[11] -- problem-solving, decision-making and

reasoning" ("Lost," 2000, p. 16A) and gave the SBE reasons to endorse requests for

state funding. In response to these *Baltimore Sun* articles, the SBE requested that the

education department's school library media programs branch chief develop a plan to

"fix school libraries" (Journal, September 26, 2000; SEA3, personal communication,

---

[11] MSPAP (Maryland School Performance Assessment Program) is an assessment or testing program
with the primary purpose to provide information that can be used to improve instruction in schools.
The MSPAP measures the performance of Maryland schools by illustrating: how well students solve
problems cooperatively and individually; how well students apply what they have learned to real world
problems; and how well students can relate and use knowledge from different subject areas
(http://www.mdk12.org/mspp/mspap/what-is-mspap/intro.html, Accessed March 3, 2007).

September 12, 2000). Other articles cautioned the SBE and the State Superintendent, not to "shrink from asking [the governor] for what's needed to give Maryland's children a quality education [because] libraries are critical to students' success," but to request state funds that would begin to "revive" school libraries ("School libraries deserve priority label," 2000, p. 22A).

In a news article reporting on the October 2000 State Board of Education meeting, the *Baltimore Sun* quoted a SBE member as saying, "We need to do more for the [school] libraries because so many of them are in bad shape" (Libit, 2000, October 25). This statement underscored his request to the state superintendent and her staff to help local school districts improve school libraries.

State Superintendent Grasmick responded that she would seek additional monies. "We want to work with the local systems to improve the ways that libraries can help student achievement. We'll ask for an increase, and hopefully the General Assembly and the governor will support it" (Libit, 2000, October 25, p. 4B). The same article reported that a spokeswoman for Governor Parris Glendening emphasized that education was a "top priority" for the governor and that he would consider the SBE's request along with all other spending requests for the next year (Libit, 2000, October 25, p. 4B).

On the surface, the school library media funding issue looked promising. Several key executive actors, such as the SBE and State Superintendent, not only voiced support for statewide library media program improvement, but directed education department staff to develop a plan to improve school libraries and to identify the costs associated with the plan. At the same time, the governor seemed

183

receptive and, given the budgetary power of that office, school library media program advocates were hopeful.

State Education Agency Staff. As the branch chief for School Library Media Programs, this study's author was the primary state education agency staff member involved in the problem recognition phase of the school library media funding issue. Since the branch chief is responsible for monitoring local compliance with the Public School Library Regulation (COMAR 13A.05.04.01), she and her staff specialist in school library media annually provided data on how well local school systems met state guidelines for collections, staffing, facilities, and technology. Upon receiving a request for information on the current status of school libraries, the public information officer referred a *Baltimore Sun* editorial staff writer to the branch chief. The branch chief and reporter first met in May 2000; the reporter's questions focused on the school library media program standards, the role of local school systems in achieving the program standards, and the responsibility of the state for ensuring that local programs have the appropriate resources and in sufficient quantity to comply with the regulation (Journal, November 27, 2000).

The branch chief and reporter met several more times over the next three months to discuss the program, clarify the reporter's understandings, and talk more about the state's responsibility. Throughout the interviews, the reporter asked why the library media programs were not adequately funded. For instance, she asked, "Can't superintendents and principals see the connection between quality school libraries and reading achievement?" In addition to questioning whether administrators had a complete understanding of the positive impact an effective library media

program can have on student achievement, the branch chief explained that competition among various programs, such as gifted and talented, all-day kindergarten, and school libraries, for limited resources, as well as a strong tendency towards local control, impacted the MSDE's ability to enforce the school library media programs regulation. Shortly before the newspaper published the first editorial on September 1, 2000, the reporter informed the branch chief that the article would be calling for the state to assume more responsibility for the library media program (Journal, November 27, 2000).

About the same time that the editorial staff began writing articles about the importance of state funding for school libraries, an education reporter interviewed the branch chief about the School Library Enhancement Program that had been established as part of the SAFE Act. He focused his questions on the lack of full participation by the 24 local school systems in this state funding program. His article appeared on the front page of the *Baltimore Sun* a week after the first editorial and generated interest in the topic in the Baltimore metropolitan area and beyond as evidenced by articles published in other newspapers, such as some on the Eastern Shore and in Western Maryland.

The newspaper editorials and articles brought unprecedented attention to the school library media programs as an issue and called for state leadership to take action to improve school libraries. This stance, however, annoyed the state superintendent because the newspaper placed blame on the MSDE and did not identify local school systems as responsible for the condition of these programs. According to the author's Journal, the education department's public information

officer cautioned the school library media program's branch chief during this time period that "adverse publicity would not be well received by the superintendent" (Journal, November 4, 2000) and insisted that local superintendents often "had to make tough decisions between [hiring] reading teachers or library media specialists" (Journal, November 4, 2000). Any information contrary to this message would contribute to the branch chief being "perceived as something less than a *good soldier*" in advancing the department's school improvement goals (Journal, November 4, 2000). Clearly, the school library media issue lacked salience with the state superintendent during the initial phase of the problem recognition stage. However, she eventually agreed to ask the governor for additional funds for school library media programs improvement.

Media Actors. As noted earlier, the *Baltimore Sun* published prior to the 2001 general assembly session a series of editorials describing the substandard condition of Maryland school libraries. An editorial staff writer explained that the purpose of these editorials was to explore school libraries from the perspective of the newspaper's Reading by Nine series (Journal, November 4, 2000). The *Baltimore Sun* began this series in 1997 and published news and feature articles, editorials, and letters to the editor over a five-year period to increase public awareness about the importance of being able to read by age nine, to hold parents and schools accountable, and to recognize performance gains (Stapleton, 2002). The school library media editorials were an example of the newspaper's commitment "to provide a regular series of editorials that stress the need for commitment to the goal of children reading by nine; to solicit letters to the editor on reading to create a dialog; to print staff

columns and commentaries from educators and librarians about reading; and to encourage students to write the paper about school and learning to read" (Thomas, 1997, In Stapleton 2000, p. 272). According to Stapleton (2002), the *Baltimore Sun* engaged in civic journalism with this series by defining the reading problem in Baltimore City, taking ownership of the problem, and contributing to the solution with information. In addition to identifying how school libraries with up-to-date collections and certified staff contribute to higher reading scores, the editorials challenged state leaders to take responsibility for ensuring that students statewide had effective school libraries with editorials titled: "Lost: school libraries" (September 1, 2000, p. 16A); "School libraries deserve priority label" (October 6, 2000, p. 22A); and "Library leadership starts at the top" (September 26, 2000, p. 14A). Through the publication of articles and editorials about school libraries, the newspaper demonstrated that it was motivated to address a problem faced by the community.

Resources and Strategies

The State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Schools, and the state education agency staff used resources and strategies embedded in their policymaking positions to get the condition of school libraries recognized as an issue. In the case of the *Baltimore Sun*, the editorial staff used resources and strategies characteristically available to newspapers to influence policymaking, such as headlines, editorials, and letters to the editor to dramatize the issue and to create a groundswell of support for school library media program improvement.

As the entity responsible for establishing policy and guidelines for instruction in Maryland public schools, the State Board of Education used its authority to identify

school library media programs as a key issue and called for the state superintendent

and education department staff to develop a plan to guide program improvement. One

particular board member and former auditor for Baltimore City Public Schools, the

late Reggie Dunn, promoted the school library issue. According to one state

education agency staff member, "Reggie Dunn wanted to help disadvantaged kids.

He was …always pushing [to get more] resources for students" (SEA3). While the

SBE usually depended on the state superintendent to prioritize the issues, this board

member pre-empted the state superintendent's priority setting role by calling for her

to present a solution to the problem of inadequately funded school libraries with a

school library improvement plan. The SBE, particularly one member, was

instrumental in generating interest in making school libraries an issue during the

problem recognition phase.

As state superintendent of schools, Grasmick's responsibilities included

directing the Maryland State Department of Education staff and executing the policies

and enforcing the regulations adopted by the SBE. In directing education department

staff, specifically, the School Library Media Programs Branch personnel, to develop a

plan to fix school libraries she met SBE expectations by responding to members'

request for an improvement plan for their consideration. In this instance, however,

she strayed from the usual routine of prioritizing board agenda items for the SBE.

Instead, the Board members made school libraries an agenda item long enough to

insist on the development of an improvement plan summarized for them by the state

superintendent at their monthly meeting on October 24, 2000. While the state

superintendent did not distribute copies of the plan to SBE members, she indicated

that she would share the plan with them at an appropriate time. In the meantime, she

would be asking the governor for an increase in state funds for school libraries. The

SBE members seemed satisfied with her summary of the plan's contents and the news

that she would be requesting approximately $8.7 million to support school library

improvements (Journal, November 4, 2000).

In the case of the school library media issue, the *Baltimore Sun* published

editorials to make the case to state education leadership for improving school libraries

to support teaching and learning, especially in the area of reading. Over 2,000 words

long, the first editorial on September 1, 2000, covered the entire editorial page; the

editorial staff continued to publish an article on the topic every few weeks until

February 1, 2001. In the view of some observers, the *Baltimore Sun* deserves "much

of the credit" for getting "Maryland's top political leaders…talking seriously about

how to fix [school libraries] (Glick, 2001). A state education agency staff member

corroborated the importance of the newspaper's role in bringing school libraries to the

attention of SBE members when he notified the school library media programs branch

chief that the state superintendent had agreed at the request of the Board to include

school libraries on the September agenda, "The Board's interest was prompted by the

editorial and article in the *Baltimore Sun*" (SEA3).

While the newspaper had been successful in getting the attention of state

education leaders, the articles failed to generate as much interest about the condition

of school library media programs among the general public. The editorials prompted

only a few readers to respond with letters to the editor. Of those people who did

respond, only school librarians wrote about the value of school libraries, while other

writers directed attention to unmet requirements in public libraries or school facilities. In fact, one writer insisted that "schools should be happy to receive used books" (Letter to the editor, September 27, 2000) not demand new ones.

In addition to the editorials, a couple of *Baltimore Sun* reporters wrote articles on the topic. One ran on the front-page ("School Libraries of Poor Quality," 2000) and disclosed that while only 17 percent of the school libraries met state standards for collection size, several school districts declined state funds due to a local match requirement. Issue awareness went beyond Baltimore City as a result of the front-page article; the school library media programs branch chief received calls from local papers in other districts asking about the condition of school libraries in their areas and the amount of funds required to improve these programs. These inquiries, however, did not produce a groundswell of support for additional state funds. In the month following the initial *Baltimore Sun* editorial and article, local newspaper reporters in Prince George's (Abadjian, September 13, 2000), Talbot (Nicholson, September 29, 2000), and Washington (Reilly, September 19, 2000) counties wrote articles focusing attention on the number of items that the MSDE recommends for school library collections and the percentage of school libraries in their paper's jurisdiction that did not meet these guidelines. Only in the Allegany County article (Shawver, September 22, 2000) did the reporter note that local leadership was making an effort to raise funds to meet the local match requirement to take advantage of the state grant funds.

These limited examples of media attention on the school library funding issue illustrate Kingdon's characterization of "the press's tendency to cover a story

prominently for a short period of time and then turn to the next story, diluting its

impact" (Kingdon, 1995, pp. 58). For several months, the *Baltimore Sun* used its

resources to evoke interest in the topic of school libraries. Editorial and reporting

staff interacted with policy actors, such as the SBE and the state superintendent, to

frame the issue as substandard school libraries ("A rallying cry," 2000; Grasmick,

2000). Through its publishing and circulation resources, the newspaper explained the

program's impact on teaching and learning and attempted to elicit a response from the

community with frequent editorials. The attention was short-lived, however, since

these strategies did not produce a rallying cry from the general community or even

the library community to fuel continued media coverage for school library media

funding.

Setting

Context often influences the ability to get an issue on the agenda or the ability

to keep an issue off the agenda. Specific conditions in the Maryland context that

influenced proponents' ability to get school library media programs on the agenda

included concerns about school improvement and the capacity of local jurisdictions to

improve student achievement.

As evidenced by the continued deliberations of the Thornton Commission, a

panel established in 1999 by the General Assembly to study the state's school

financing system, state education leaders recognized two elements of Maryland's

education system: (1) every school district failed to meet state standards for

educational performance and (2) the wide variation in local funding that existed

across jurisdictions contributed to the difference in education quality (Shin & Hill,

191

n.d.). Education reform in general and school finance reform in particular had gained agenda status.

The poor performance of Maryland's students on state assessments focused legislators' attention on low achievement scores across the state. The Maryland School Performance Program had established a goal of 70 percent satisfactory achievement on the various components of the state assessment program. These components assessed students on their ability to perform proficiently on criterion-referenced tests based on learning outcomes in reading, mathematics, writing, language usage, science, and social studies in grades 3, 5, and 8. By 2001, "state performance standards were not met for any of the academic areas tested at the 8th grade level" (Shin & Hill, n.d., p. 4).

According to the Thornton Commission, the wide variance in local education funding "contributed to the disparity in quality education across jurisdictions" (Shin & Hill, p. 5). For example, the Maryland Budget and Tax Policy Institute reported that "per pupil spending in 2001-2002 in Montgomery County was nearly four times that of Caroline County, and at least twice as high as spending in more than half of Maryland's local jurisdictions" (Shin & Hill, p. 5). The commission studied these data about student achievement and the state's school financing system to make recommendations "to ensure that all students receive an adequate education, independent of the jurisdiction in which they live" (Shin & Hill, p. 2).

In addition to its considerations of the state share of education funding in kindergarten through grade twelve, the commission examined how to replace several education aid programs that were set to expire in 2002 by giving local jurisdictions

more flexibility in how they spent state funds to provide an adequate education. According to two interest group representatives, the Thornton Commission met during the 2001 legislative session and "the content of those meetings focused on future funding issues and influenced the consideration of not having categorical funding programs" (IGRep5; IGRep6). One of those categorical funding programs was the School Library Enhancement Program that had been established in the 1998 SAFE Act. By framing the issue within the context of student achievement, especially the low reading scores reported on state tests of many Baltimore City students, the *Baltimore Sun* lent salience to school libraries as a school improvement issue and prompted the SBE and the state superintendent to respond to the editorials with a school library media improvement plan. At the same time, other forces framed the matter of specific program funding as a local control issue and promoted the spending flexibility at the local level – a salient concept in the Maryland context.

Interactions/Outcomes

According to interview participants and Journal, the media influenced the SBE and the state superintendent to consider school libraries as an agenda item by publishing editorials and articles about the inability of local school systems to meet state school library media program guidelines. An interest group representative credited the newspaper with capturing the SBE members' attention "by writing editorials about the poor condition of school libraries in Baltimore City" (IGRep1). A state education agency staff member (SEA3) provided further evidence of the newspaper's influence when he sent the school library media program branch chief an email message requesting information about the proposed school library media

193

initiatives for the next SBE meeting and stating, "the Board's interest was prompted by the editorial and article in the *Baltimore Sun*" (SEA3, personal communication, September 12, 2000). Another state education agency staff member agreed that "the newspaper articles created some awareness about the issue" (SEA1). Over a period of several months, these editorials and articles highlighted the problems and succeeded in securing the notice of the SBE.

Their interest in correcting the situation convinced State Superintendent Grasmick to ask the school library media program branch chief and staff specialist to develop an improvement plan immediately instead of waiting until spring 2001 at the conclusion of tentatively scheduled onsite program reviews. In an interview with the editorial staff writer on October 25, 2000, the superintendent reiterated her commitment made the previous day during the SBE meeting to seek state funds to support implementation of the school library media improvement plan she summarized for the board members. Following the interview, Grasmick reinforced her support of the plan and her commitment to ask for state funds in an op-ed article to the *Baltimore Sun* explaining that the funds were necessary to "resuscitate" school libraries (Grasmick, 2000).

As evidenced by comments she made to the school library media program branch chief (Journal, November 4, 2000), the state superintendent did not support state dedicated funds for school libraries when the first editorials appeared in September 2000 because she considered the program a local responsibility. Several months later, however, the SBE's interest (SEA3, personal communication, September 12, 2000) and the frequent press coverage of the issue convinced her to

194

voice her support and write of her commitment to ask the governor for additional

program improvement monies. The op-ed article of the *Baltimore Sun* began with an

acknowledgement of the newspaper's attention to the problem, "Much has been

written in *The Sun* recently about the state of Maryland's school libraries and how the

community – primarily the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) – can

resuscitate them" (Grasmick, 2000). Clearly, the *Baltimore Sun* began a series of

interactions that resulted in school library media improvement as an agenda item.

Policy Stream

This section explains who was involved in taking school library media

programs as a legislative agenda item and developing a proposal to include funds for

program improvements, what these actors hoped to accomplish by their involvement,

and what they did to influence the proposal formulation process. Also included in

this section is a discussion of the events that influenced the development of HB 935.

Actors, Goals, and Motivations

Following the State Board of Education's acknowledgement that the

improvement of Maryland's school libraries could contribute to local school

improvement efforts and the members' request for a comprehensive plan to correct

the problem, several different actors played a role during the proposal formulation

process to develop the plan and turn it into a legislative proposal. These participants

included the state superintendent of schools, education department staff, and Delegate

Hecht.

Executive Actors. According to an executive staff member, Grasmick was

motivated to seek additional funds by supporting the development of a school library

bill from a "policy point of view" (ExecS4). She wanted local school systems to

understand that school libraries could be an integral component of the school's

instructional program if they consisted of qualified staff, updated collections, and

appropriate technology. In an op-ed article she authored, Grasmick explained that the

school library of today

> … is a place where students and teachers engage in activities that help
> them become effective users of ideas and information; where certified
> school librarians work with teachers to plan and implement activities
> that support reading and other specific instructional goals; where
> current resources can be found in a variety of formats so that they meet
> students' diverse learning needs; and where students and staff can go
> just about anytime – including before and after school – to get help
> and materials (Grasmick, 2000, p. 27A).

For these reasons, she stated that she would "seek to almost triple state spending on

[school libraries]" (Libit, 2000, October 25, p. 1B). By describing the important role

the school library can play in teaching and learning, Grasmick framed the issue in the

context of student achievement and tied the program funding request to an already

popular movement, namely school improvement.

State Education Agency Actors. Education department staff members

involved in the development of the plan to improve school libraries were Gail Bailey,

Branch Chief, School Library Media Programs, and this study's author and Michelle

Conaway, Specialist, School Library Media Programs, who also participated in the

development of the plan. These two staff members based the plan on revised

program standards approved by the SBE in February 2000, data submitted annually

by local school systems to report their compliance with guidelines established for collections, staffing, and technology, and the results of several onsite program reviews. The branch chief and specialist analyzed the information to identify what resources would assist local schools systems to meet state guidelines. The Public School Library Regulation (COMAR 13A.05.04.01), required the education department to monitor local compliance of the regulation; the responsibility for carrying out this requirement by conducting program reviews, collecting data, and providing technical assistance to support local implementation of the standards belonged to the branch chief and library media specialist.

As noted by Kingdon (1995), "Implementation is one major preoccupation of career bureaucrats. … Through feedback from the operation of programs, however, implementation can lead to innovation. If bureaucrats find a program is not going well in some particular, that recognition might feed into a policy change" (Kingdon, p. 31). In the case of the school library media program regulation, the branch chief and library media staff specialist were advocates for continued state funding to assist local school systems in implementing state library media program standards. As state bureaucrats, they used their expertise and institutional resources (i.e., state reports) to identify gaps in local compliance with the public school library regulation and proposed a statewide plan. The plan consisted of activities and strategies that required continued state financial support to improve local school systems' ability to meet program guidelines. Until the SAFE Act (1998) included the School Library Enhancement Program, school library media funding statewide depended entirely on local school system spending decisions. According to the author's Journal, the school

library media branch chief and specialist worked with their assistant superintendent to develop a plan that would expand state support for the program and extend this support beyond the SAFE Act scheduled to end in 2001 (Journal, November 4, 2000).

Legislative Actors. Once the school library media staff developed the program improvement plan, they needed legislative staff to turn the proposal into a bill and a legislator to submit the bill to the legislature for consideration. As a legislator, Delegate C. Sue Hecht (D-Frederick County) represented the interest of a constituent by agreeing to sponsor legislation to support the school library improvement plan when asked by a local library media specialist to support the program (Leg2). In early January 2001, Delegate Hecht approached the Department of Education's legislative liaison about writing legislation to include secondary schools in the current funding program.[12] At the same time, she expressed her willingness to submit other legislation for school libraries based on the plan developed by education department staff (Journal, January 7, 2001).

Delegate Hecht's colleagues viewed her as a popular, progressive legislator (ExecS3). According to her biography on the Maryland General Assembly Web site, Delegate Hecht has been involved in seeking funds for the Maryland School for the Deaf, securing affordable housing; providing comprehensive services for victims of domestic violence, rape/sexual assault and child abuse; and advocating for retarded citizens. Obviously, the delegate supported causes and viewed school libraries as one worthy of her support. While a relative newcomer to the general assembly during the

---

[12] HB 1 had limited the distribution of state funds to elementary school libraries.

period under study[13], Hecht served on the Appropriations Committee, a committee of importance in determining support for bills with budget implications.

Delegate Hecht's sponsorship of HB 935 not only satisfied a constituent's request that she sponsor a bill based on the proposed plan to improve school libraries (Leg2; SEA1), but also helped position the delegate favorably against her Republican rivals in Western Maryland (ExecS2). According to several interview respondents, "school libraries as an issue had considerable merit" (ExecS3) and "no opposition" (IGRep2). Since the delegate was considering a run for the Senate in 2002 (Leg1), the Democratic leadership wanted to support her efforts to gain visibility in her district. A legislative staff member indicated that the Democratic Party approved her sponsorship of HB 935 because it "had a desire to *shore up* Sue Hecht in her position in Frederick County" (LegS2) and sponsoring this "feel good bill" (LegS2) would enhance those efforts. According to Kingdon (1995), "advocating policy initiatives and introducing bills…is a useful way to be taken seriously as an aspirant for higher office" (Kingdon, p. 38).   The delegate's incentives for sponsoring a bill to increase state funding for school libraries included satisfying a constituent's request, gaining some favorable publicity, and supporting educational opportunities for students.

Resources and Strategies

The major players involved in developing the legislative proposal to improve school libraries were the state superintendent of schools, school library media programs staff, and Delegate Hecht. Each actor had institutional resources and

---

[13] C. Sue Hecht was first elected to the House of Delegates in 1994 and served two terms. She ran for State Senate from her Frederick County district in the 2002 election, but was defeated. In 2006, she was re-elected to the House of Delegates.

strategies to use in developing the proposal: the state superintendent of schools had the power and influence of her position as state education leader to advise the SBE and set its policy agenda; the school library media program staff had library media program expertise and information to use in developing the plan to promote school libraries statewide; and the delegate had legislative staff and access to the legislative arena. In addition to resources and strategies inherent in the duties and responsibilities of their positions, each participant in the policymaking process used her individual skills to contribute to the development of the proposal.

Many people considered the state superintendent to be one of the most powerful and influential state education policy leaders. An interest group representative characterized Grasmick as "one of the most powerful and influential members of the State of Maryland [government]" (IGRep1). She led the education department staff in developing and implementing a nationally recognized education reform program (i.e., Maryland School Performance Program). The state superintendent exercised her authority and leadership in directing the staff to develop a plan that would satisfy the SBE's request. Following the announcement in the *Baltimore Sun* that the education department was developing a plan (Libit, 2000, October 25), an editorial called her "a leader in the fight to rescue Maryland's distressed public school libraries" ("Rallying cry," 2000, p. 22A); components of the plan appeared in an op-ed article several weeks later (Grasmick, 2000).

The education staff had resources typically available to bureaucrats, such as longevity, program expertise, and relationships with interest groups (Kingdon, 1995).

As education department personnel, the school library media program branch staff used these resources in developing a proposal to improve school libraries. Their expert knowledge about school library media program requirements, their own previous school library experiences, as well as their local program monitoring activities generated information for the plan. They used the state library media advisory committee to inform the stakeholders about the proposal.

The branch chief and staff specialist were career library media specialists and program advocates. While the staff specialist had joined the branch recently, the branch chief had been working at the education department with school library program projects and initiatives, including the implementation of state program standards, for a number of years. These bureaucrats used information gleaned from statistical reports as well as onsite program reviews to identify collection, staffing, and technology as components requiring upgrades statewide. As a result, they proposed a plan that, if adopted, would continue state funds for collections with a local match requirement, establish a digital library, offer tuition assistance for interested teachers to become certified library media specialists, and provide professional development opportunities for local school system personnel. They communicated this information to their counterparts in the local school systems through email (J. Henderson, personal communication, February 14, 2001) to inform them and to gain their support for the plan. As a result of these communications and the inadequacies in her own school system's library media program, a local library media specialist approached her delegate, C. Sue Hecht, to ask her to sponsor a bill based on the proposed plan.

Delegate Hecht and her staff used their institutional resources and strategies to draft HB 935: Education – Public School Libraries – Funding based on the proposed plan. The Department of Legislative Services (DLS) is a branch of state government that provides legislators and their committees with research assistance, policy analysis, fiscal review and bill drafting. Once legislators introduce a bill, DLS produces a fiscal note to explain the purpose of the bill and its fiscal impact on state and local budgets. Legislators and others use this information during the political phase to determine their support for the proposed measure. For example, the Department of Budget and Management used the increased general and state aid funding requirements identified by DLS to explain its opposition to the bill in testimony submitted by its legislative liaison at the March 7, 2001, hearing (Maryland Department of Budget & Management, Position Statement on House Bill 935, March 7, 2001). Despite the hefty price tag identified by DLS, as the bill's sponsor and a member of the Appropriations Committee, Delegate Hecht secured the support of 58 other delegates, including Rawlings, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, prior to introducing the bill in the House on February 9, 2001.

Setting

As earlier noted, the on-going deliberations of the Thornton Commission competed with the issue of dedicated funding for school library media programs. In addition, a proposal to continue a nonpublic schools textbook assistance program supported by Governor Glendening further challenged legislators' consideration of HB 935. The governor's proposal sought to extend the original $6 million textbook subsidy awarded the previous year and expand it with an additional $2 million for a

total of $8 million in textbook aid to nonpublic school students. According to a newspaper reporter, legislators narrowly supported the first proposal and only because it was using monies from a recent tobacco settlement and was to be a one-time only relief for cash-strapped families; however, the governor wanted to increase educational opportunities for all Maryland students (Wheeler, 2000). Opponents of nonpublic schools aid, especially public education supporters such as the president of the Maryland State Teachers Association, noted that too many unmet needs existed in public schools to consider directing state funds to nonpublic school students. Of particular concern were the "deplorable conditions" in public school libraries where books were "so far out of date" (Wheeler, 2000, 1B). A Baltimore City delegate reported that "she had visited schools where [the books] still [identify] Jimmy Carter as president" (Koenig, 2001, p. 1B); therefore, it was important to provide monies to update collections.

While the public school library advocates provided numerous examples during formal testimonies to describe how far away public school library collections were from meeting state guidelines, nonpublic schools textbook aid supporters, especially Catholic school parents, teachers, and students, directly lobbied their legislators. As reported in *The Catholic Review*, "Catholic families had visited their representatives nearly every day during the first two months of the General Assembly to urge lawmakers to support textbook aid. They also flooded Annapolis with thousands of letters, e-mails and phone calls…" (Matysek, 2001, p. 3). According to a Baltimore County delegate, the lobbying efforts of this group influenced legislators to change their support in favor of nonpublic schools textbook aid, "If we get 20

letters on an issue, that's a big issue. On textbook aid, my office received about 500

letters. The impact was huge for legislators – that's what turned some of those votes

around" (Matysek, 2001, p. 3). The groundswell of legislative support for nonpublic

schools textbook aid created by the special interest group outweighed the state

superintendent's efforts to gain executive or legislative consideration for additional

state funds for school libraries, especially since the public school library media

community provided only limited support with testimonies at formal hearings.

Interactions/Outcomes

The influence relationships contributing to the development of the Public

School Libraries – Funding proposal were concentrated at the department of

education and legislative levels and did not include the governor's office. While the

state superintendent published her support for a plan to improve libraries and her

intention to seek state funds to implement it, she never met with the governor or his

staff to inform them of her request or to gain their support for it.

Shortly after the op-ed article appeared, the branch chief asked the

superintendent if she could share the improvement plan with Major Riddick, the

governor's chief of staff. Riddick had demonstrated his support for the program by

including a large school library media exhibit in several annual Maryland Technology

Showcases held in the Baltimore Convention Center. As a result of his previous

support, the branch chief viewed him as a conduit for communicating the plan with

the governor. Grasmick agreed to share the information with Riddick when she met

with him to discuss the department of education's budget. Since the MSDE had not

included school library funding in its original budget request submitted in August

2000 for fiscal year 2002, it was necessary to request supplemental funding. The meeting was scheduled, cancelled by the governor's office, but never re-scheduled (Journal, January 2, 2001). A crucial meeting to gain gubernatorial support for the school library improvement plan never occurred. In addition, Major Riddick left the governor's office before the session ended to launch his own campaign for executive in Prince George's County. His departure left school libraries with one less potential advocate in the executive branch during the 2001 legislative session (Journal, February 9, 2001).

At the legislative level, Delegate Hecht approached the superintendent through the MSDE's legislative liaison and agreed to sponsor the plan as a legislative proposal. As earlier noted, a library media specialist from the delegate's district requested that she sponsor a bill based on the school library improvement plan. The constituent knew that the delegate was not in a leadership position, but she was aware that she was on the Appropriations Committee where the members make many budgetary decisions (Leg2). The school library media branch chief discussed the plan with a member of the delegate's staff and gave her a copy to use in drafting legislation that she presented to the Ways & Means Committee on March 7, 2001.

According to an executive staff member, "The sponsor probably did not *check in* to know where the governor stood on the issue" (ExecS1). As in the case of the state superintendent's effort, the legislator missed making a critical contact with the governor's office in her endeavor to secure state funding for school library media program improvement. Given Glendening's legislative successes in the 2001

session,[14] his backing would be essential for a bill's survival, and without it, "even if the bill was attractive, he would not support it" (IGRep4).

Political Stream

While the school library media issue achieved legislative agenda status with a proposal, other pressures would work against its survival. When it ultimately came to a committee vote, HB 935 received an unfavorable vote in the House Ways & Means Committee. This section explains how this issue was decided, the people who were involved in the decision event, why they were involved, and what they did to influence the decision-making process. Developments or situations that may have influenced the outcome also are described.

Actors, Goals, and Motivations

According to primary source documents such as the House hearing schedule, copies of the testimonies submitted, and multiple interview respondents, HB 935 received support from at least 59 legislators, the State Superintendent of Schools, local superintendents, and a number of special interest group representatives. Only one person, a representative from the Department of Budget and Management, signed up to testify in opposition to the bill. While the bill had several important supporters in the education community, it had limited support in the executive and legislative branches of state government. Competing demands for limited resources made it more difficult to secure dedicated state funding for school libraries without backing from state executive and legislative leadership.

---

[14] According to an interest group representative and education advisor, "Only one of the governor's initiatives (i.e., a bill on above-ground septic systems) did not pass in 2001" (IGRep4).

Executive Actors. The state superintendent of schools was the only visible supporter for HB 935 in the executive actor category. Superintendent Grasmick demonstrated her support for statewide school library funding when she testified at a House Ways & Means Committee meeting as a proponent of HB 935: Public School Libraries – Funding. Her testimony was consistent with her earlier op-ed article in describing the possible and beneficial impact of school libraries on teaching and learning:

> The enactment of HB 935 would provide state leadership and support to enable local school systems to improve their library media programs with high quality materials, automation projects, professional personnel, additional support staff, and better instruction to enhance student learning (Grasmick, HB 935, Testimony in Support, March 7, 2001).

While no one from the governor's office overtly opposed school library funding during the session, the governor's legislative priorities had changed; he no longer actively supported statewide funding for school libraries as he had during the 1998 legislative session. According to an executive staff member, the governor had shifted his policy attention during the 2001 session to other causes, such as the environment and higher education (ExecS1) as well as aid to private schools. An initiative that demonstrated the shift in the governor's attention to the environment was Smart Growth, a program designed to combat suburban sprawl by steering new development to already-developed areas. As suggested by an executive staff member, "Smart Growth was a good brand for the governor" (ExecS1) who would be leaving office the following year and pursuing new endeavors.

In addition to requesting funds for new initiatives, constituents often place competing demands on a finite amount of state monies by asking to continue existing

programs. In the case of HB 935, school library advocates wanted the initial program

to continue providing funds to purchase up-to-date library books while expanding the

program to include additional funds for other library media initiatives. The governor,

however, believed that he had met his original campaign promise to improve school

libraries. An interest group representative who had asked the governor's staff about

his lack of support for school libraries during the 2001 session reported,

> Glendening was very good about meeting his campaign promises,[15] and once
> he met those promises, he must have believed that he had to move on to other
> things, such as Smart Growth. He knew that he could not meet the many
> demands made each legislative session. (IGRep7).

An executive staff member noted that the governor "could have pushed a lot harder

[to support school libraries], but the fiscal situation and legislative support lined up

differently in 2001" (ExecS3). According to the same staff member, "The opposition

[to school library funding] was of a different type. The drumbeat was about budget

shortfalls; there were no new initiatives except for Thornton" (ExecS3).

Consequently, the governor turned out to be an ally in word only. While he embraced

the goal of effective school libraries, he did not lend his support to overcome

concerns about budget shortfalls and the competing demands made by other

education funding issues (i.e., Thornton and nonpublic schools textbook aid).

Legislative Actors. Delegate C. Sue Hecht from Frederick County sponsored

HB 935 and provided testimony to promote its passage. A member of the executive

staff described Hecht as "a minor delegate; she was not a committee chair and was

from a rural district, not Baltimore or another powerhouse" (ExecS6_935). A

legislative staff member viewed her as well-intentioned in sponsoring the school

---

[15] In 1997, Governor Glendening had included funds for school libraries among his campaign
promises.

library funding bill and successful in getting 58 other legislators, including the powerful Appropriations Committee chairman, Pete Rawlings, to sign on, but implied that these delegates agreed to support the bill because HB 935 was a *feel good bill* (LegS2). According to the same legislative staff member, it was unusual for Rawlings to sign on to a bill but not vote for it. She guessed that the chairman signed onto the bill to support one of his committee members (LegS2), but the reason he changed his support to opposition is unclear. As he has since died, this question remains unanswered.

Resources and Strategies

During the final phase of the policymaking process, State Superintendent of Schools Grasmick used her political savvy to promote HB 935 during legislative hearings and interviews with newspaper reporters, especially when questioned about her support for the governor's proposed second year of textbook aid for nonpublic schools. Delegates Hecht, Rawlings, and Hixson used legislative procedures and their own personal skills to influence the decision outcome.

Executive. As state superintendent of schools, Grasmick represented the interests of public schools statewide and took the opportunity to promote public school libraries when asked by the Department of Legislative Services to agree or disagree with the budget analyst's recommendation to eliminate the governor's $8 million proposal for nonpublic school textbook aid. According to a state education agency staff member, the superintendent's response "conveyed the sentiment of the Board as follows" (SEA5_935):

> The State Board is concerned that Maryland's public school library media programs are not adequately funded. Fewer than one in five school libraries

statewide meet the State's minimum standard for books on the shelf and media materials available for students. In October, the State Board recommended an $8.7 million supplemental request for public school libraries. These funds would be used to purchase books and electronic databases, conduct research, and provide training for media specialists. (SEA5_935, personal communication, January 22, 2001).

While she used the resources of her position as state superintendent of schools to promote public school libraries, Grasmick was subjected to certain constraints as a member of the governor's executive staff. The governor expected her to support his proposals. As noted by a MSDE executive team member, "As a state agency, we have to be careful about recommending against the governor's allowance [for nonpublic schools]" (SEA5_935, personal communication, January 22, 2001). Despite this caution, Grasmick testified against the nonpublic schools textbook aid and cited several deficiencies of Maryland's school libraries, such as numerous outdated books and facilities that have been closed for 3 years (Journal, January 25, 2001).

Legislative. As a relatively new House member with no special status, Delegate Hecht had limited resources at her disposal because "she was still learning the rules" (Leg2). While she was on an important budgetary committee, she was not a committee chairperson (IGRep4). The leaders in the House other than Speaker Taylor were Pete Rawlings and Sheila Hixson, committee chairs of Appropriations and Ways & Means, respectively. According to an executive staff member, Rawlings was a powerful leader especially in regard to funding decisions, "Rawlings absolutely controlled the budgetary process from beginning to end" (ExecS3). His decision often held sway and it appeared that he was not willing to jeopardize political capital to support HB 935 as evidenced by a quote given to a *Baltimore Sun* reporter in

regard to another bill, "I'm not willing to send out a budget issue that's going to get killed on the floor of the House" (Rawlings cited in Koenig, 2001, January 26, p. 1B). According to a legislative staff member, "HB 935 never, ever had a chance because it was not compelling enough to compete with the comprehensive approach to education funding presented by the Thornton proposal" (LegS2). Consequently, Rawlings recommended against bringing it to a vote.

Several interview respondents reported that Sheila Hixson was a champion of public and school libraries (IGRep7; IGRep8) and a supporter of HB 935 but she knew that she could not push for it (ExecS5). The bill had been assigned to Ways & Means and Appropriations. The joint committee assignment made the process more complicated because both committees had to approve the bill for it to move forward.

As earlier noted, many people viewed Rawlings as a leader in the legislature (ExecS3; ExecS4; IGRep5; IGRep6) and "a strong chairman" (ExecS5). Other representative comments further characterize the Appropriations Committee chairman:

Rawlings was very influential (IGRep5)

Rawlings was the kingpin in the House on education funding, then Hixson

(SEA4)

Pete Rawlings was very effective; he was shrewd (ExecS3)

He would play real games with us to get our vote. He bullied you into a vote or took advantage by not giving you information. He was aggressive and competitive. In most cases, however, he did the right thing. (Leg2)

If you wanted your bills to pass, you followed his lead. His committee's unfavorable report advised the Ways & Means Committee to cast a similar vote (Rawlings Letter,

March 23, 2001). An executive staff member suggested that "assigning the bill to two committees could have been a strategy for keeping the bill on the slow track" (ExecS5). Therefore, the dual committee assignment signaled early on that the bill was in trouble and its embrace by some legislators, including Rawlings, was symbolic.

Setting

Timing can be important in deciding issues. Certain developments that occurred in the Maryland context made it difficult to commit state funds to school library media programs during the 2001 legislative session. These developments included the on-going work of the Thornton Commission and a statewide economic slowdown. A number of interview respondents from multiple perspectives attributed the lack of legislative support for expanding school library media funding to these factors. According to one legislative staff member, "HB 935 came to the legislature in the middle of the Thornton [Commission] deliberations" (LegS2). As a result, the issue could not get any traction because it was overshadowed by Thornton. The commission was meeting during the 2001 legislative session to consider the "larger issue" (ExecS4) of the state's education finance system to support an adequate education for all students. Its members recommended collapsing categorical funding programs, including the School Library Enhancement Program established in 1998, into one funding stream. As a single program bill, HB 935 presented only a "piece of the larger issue" (ExecS4); legislators did not want to look at funding outside the Thornton framework (IGRep5; IGRep6). Other respondents provided similar reasons for the legislature's reluctance to support funds for school libraries at this time: the

state education funding formula needed revision; the formula required a large amount of money; and a concession to local control required school systems to be more accountable. Representative comments included:

There were few new initiatives [during the session] except for Thornton (ExecS3).

Thornton remained important because education is the only thing the Constitution has required us to do. Pre-K-12 funding comes out of the general fund and something has to give (Leg3).

The idea was to have a comprehensive approach to education [funding] (LegS2).

The Thornton proposal [would] involve a huge amount of money; former categorical [program] decisions made at the state level were to be made by local decision makers (IGRep4).

Despite testifying at commission hearings about the funding requirements for school libraries and the program's contributions to teaching and learning, advocates could not tether the school library bill to the Thornton Commission's recommendations. According to one executive staff member (ExecS4), the reason for the failure to include school library funding in the recommendations was concern about fiscal resources to implement the recommendations. "Smaller [funding] commitments would impinge on the big commitment [since] the Thornton revenue sources have always been in question" (ExecS4).

As a result of the overwhelming support to find a funding solution to carry out its constitutional requirement to provide an adequate education for every Maryland student and to continue deliberations within the commission arena, the legislature proposed SB 719: The Education, Finance, Equity, and Excellence Act of 2001. The bill was introduced in the Senate on February 2, 2001, and a cross-filed bill was

introduced in the House a week later. The Senate bill passed on April 6, 2001, with a

unanimous vote (46-0) and was signed by the governor on May 15, 2001. SB 719

provided an interim solution until the Thornton Commission finalized its

recommendations for a new state education funding formula in November 2001,

seven months after the 2001 general assembly session.

Another factor impacting the consideration of state funds for school libraries

was an anticipated budget shortfall. An executive staff member explained, "The tax

cut was passed and the economy was slowing. We were just about on the other side

of the *revenue bubble*" (ExecS1). As one legislator described the situation,

> We were running into a little more of a problem with finances. Money was
> becoming tighter and Thornton was to be fully funded in 2008; therefore,
> there were fiscal restraints and the political will for opposing funds for school
> libraries (Leg1).

Other interview respondents reiterated concerns about the economy and the state's

ability to support a revised education funding formula that called for additional

monies to explain why legislators decided not to support HB 935 even though, as one

executive staff member noted, "The school library bill was a good idea. We loved it,

but fiscally it was a very *tight time*" (ExecS3). Representative comments included:

Times were direr economically (ExecS2).

Times were tight (ExecS6_935).

Thornton was looming extremely large in 2001 (IGRep7).

No one was in the mood to pre-empt Thornton (LegS2).

Election cycles also are known to have an impact on the legislative agenda

(Kingdon, 1995). According to one interest group representative, "election cycles

play a role in making legislators responsive to bills with money. The last session

before an election tends to be a good year to go in with requests to the general assembly because the members are thinking about their re-election" (IGRep7) and they want to demonstrate that they supported popular causes (Babington, 1998), such as school libraries. Since another session would be held before the next general election in fall 2002, the issue was not popular enough to counter the preliminary Thornton Commission recommendation to eliminate categorical programs or to overcome growing concerns about the slowing economy.

Interactions/Outcomes

While certain influence relationships during the previous phases of the policymaking process helped advance the school library media issue from problem recognition through policy development, the political phase lacked sufficient positive interaction among the actors, especially at the leadership level, for the bill to receive a favorable committee vote. As a result, HB 935 never made its way to the House, let alone the Senate, for consideration by the general assembly. As earlier noted, advocates failed to gain the governor's support for HB 935. Neither the superintendent nor the delegate sought the governor's support for the school library media funding issue. His support might have made its passage possible given the budgetary powers of the office, but the absence of any influence relationship between the bill's sponsor, its advocates, and the governor definitely hindered any chance of the bill overcoming competing demands, such as a revised state education funding formula that would grant local school systems additional monies with more spending autonomy and funds for nonpublic schools textbook aid. As one legislative staff member stated,

215

The legislature put aside categorical programs to give more flexibility to school systems and let the Thornton review process work itself out. As a result, every legislative public education funding proposal was dead on arrival during the 2000 and 2001 sessions (LegS3).

The committee system as an institutional arrangement further constrained any opportunity for consideration of the proposal by other members of the general assembly. The bill was assigned to dual committees making it even more complicated for it to move forward because both committees would have to approve the proposal (ExecS2; ExecS5). In addition, Rawlings, the powerful Appropriations Committee chair presented a formidable obstacle to the bill's passage.

In regard to education funding, public school advocates considered him the kingpin; Hixson followed in her ability to influence decisions in this area (SEA4). Other interview respondents from multiple perspectives (ExecS3; LegS2; IGRep5; and IGRep6) concurred about Rawlings' ability to influence the budgetary process, but an executive staff member's description provides the full impact of Rawlings' power: "Pete Rawlings was very effective. He absolutely controlled the budgetary process from the beginning to end" (ExecS3). As part of that control and a belief in the necessity of a well-functioning committee system, "Rawlings expected committee members to uphold committee recommendations, and he insisted on deference to committees from members of his leadership team, mainly the six committee chairs," (Rosenthal, 2004, p. 97); Hixson was one of these chairpersons. Because revenue projections were bleak and the state constitution required the legislature to balance the budget, Rawlings considered it fiscally irresponsible to obligate new money during the 2001 session (Rosenthal, 2004). As a result, shortly after the sponsor's testimony on March 7, 2001, Rawlings, as chairman of the Appropriations

Committee, sent a letter dated March 23, 2001, to Hixson informing her that his committee gave HB 935 an unfavorable vote. Despite Hixson's reputation for supporting libraries, her committee followed Rawlings' lead and gave the bill an unfavorable report on March 28, 2001.

The absence of influence relationships at the leadership level as well as the constraints of certain institutional arrangements worked against the passage of HB 935. Without the governor's support, the bill had little chance against the impressive power and influence of the Appropriations Committee chairman and, therefore, died in committee. Rawlings' commitment to fiscal responsibility and adherence to a strong committee system prevented any serious consideration by the general assembly of the school library media funding proposal.

Interpretation of the Policymaking Process

The evidence gathered from interviews, primary and secondary source documents, as well as a journal kept by this investigator, and categorized according to the conceptual framework provides a plausible explanation for the defeat of HB 935: Public School Libraries – Funding. The policy outcome not only reflects the influence that legislative leadership had on decision making, especially in the absence of gubernatorial involvement, but the significant impact that context had on making it difficult to commit funds to a single education program.

Decision Outcome

As an indicator of influence, the decision outcome points to the actors whose interests are represented and whose interests are not reflected in the outcome. In the

case of HB 935: Public School Libraries – Funding, the proposal represented the interests of advocates for a single education program by addressing the funding requirements of a specialized program, not one with broad appeal for multiple groups. According to staff members from the executive office as well as the state education agency, the school library proposal was a "stand alone initiative"; not a component of a larger bill which might have helped in forming a stronger coalition of support (ExecS3; ExecS6_935; SEA5_935). While several of the advocates managed to place the issue on the legislative agenda after the *Baltimore Sun* highlighted the substandard condition of Maryland's school libraries, they failed to overcome several obstacles to secure state funds for school library media program improvement during the 2001 legislative session.

In addition to the *Baltimore Sun,* advocates included: the SBE that insisted on a school library improvement plan; the school library media branch chief and specialist who developed the plan; the state superintendent of schools who promoted the plan with the press to upgrade school libraries and opposed the governor's nonpublic schools textbook aid program; the delegate who sponsored the legislation to secure state funds to implement the plan; and individuals who testified or submitted testimony in favor of the bill's passage. In making the case for school library media funding, however, the various advocacy efforts lacked sufficient potency to achieve the bill's passage.

While a member of the executive staff reported that the failure of the bill had nothing to do with its merit, he identified the economy as one reason why the effort to secure library media funding failed, "Fiscally, it was a very tight time" (ExecS3). As

earlier noted, in addition to the economic slowdown, other obstacles to serious

consideration of the proposal included the continued deliberations about revising the

state education funding formula and competing projects (i.e., nonpublic schools

textbook aid).

The economic situation prompted legislators to act with caution in approving

any new funding requests during the 2001 legislative session, and as the HB 935

Fiscal Note (2001) detailed, the bill would require an increase of $5.7 million in fiscal

2002 and an annual increase of $4.2 million beginning in 2003. At the same time, the

governor proposed an $8 million aid program to subsidize nonpublic schools textbook

purchases for fiscal year 2002 that Catholic school parents heavily lobbied their

legislators to pass. The limp coalition behind the school library bill got out-

maneuvered by the aggressive nonpublic schools special interest group. In addition,

the governor's proposal added pressure to the legislature's constitutional obligation to

balance the budget while revenues projections were down.

Concurrently, the Thornton Commission continued its deliberations about

revising the state education aid formula to give local school systems additional funds,

allow them greater discretionary expenditure power, but require more accountability

for their spending decisions. One of the strategies recommended by the commission

to achieve its goals included eliminating categorical funding programs, such as the

School Library Enhancement Program established in 1998 and folding the funds into

the new formula. As one interest group representative characterized the situation for

the school library media funding proposal, "HB 935 was a single issue bill caught in

the economic squeeze with Thornton" (IGRep4). As a result of the legislators'

interest in developing a comprehensive education aid formula amid reports of a slowing economy, HB 935: Public School Libraries – Funding died in committee during the 2001 general assembly session.

Attributions

A means for gauging influence in the legislative arena is the examination of documentary evidence and interview results to determine who is perceived as influential. Newspaper articles and Journal written during this time period and interviews with those involved in the policymaking process identified various actors instrumental in each phase of decision making about the funding proposal for school libraries. Newspaper editorials and articles as well as the author's journal acknowledged the significant roles played by the *Baltimore Sun* and the SBE in calling attention to the substandard condition of Maryland's school libraries and recognizing the problem as an impediment to the teaching and learning processes. These same sources credited the state superintendent and her staff with responding to requests made by these initial actors with an improvement plan. Journal and interview reports included passages identifying Delegate Hecht as the actor responsible for transforming the plan into a legislative proposal and submitting HB 935 for consideration by the House Ways & Means and the Appropriations committees.

While Delegate Rawlings, Appropriations Committee chairman, was the key actor in denying the funding request when he reported his committee's unfavorable vote during the political phase of the process, other actors through their noninvolvement, contributed to the unsuccessful attempt to secure state funds for

school libraries during the 2001 session by failing to obtain the governor's support. Given the governor's budgetary powers, his support might have influenced the Appropriations Committee chairman to provide a favorable vote for HB 935. Even with gubernatorial support, however, prospects for the bill's passage would have remained uncertain due to the economic constraints and the Appropriations Committee chairman's commitment to fiscal responsibility. An executive staff member noted and other respondents (IGRep7) agreed, "Without the support of the Head of Appropriations, the bill could not have gotten anywhere" (ExecS4). According to another executive staff member, "Rawlings frequently disagreed with the governor who was an old-fashioned liberal and liked to spend money" (ExecS3). At the same time, this interview respondent characterized Rawlings as "an effective Appropriations Committee chairman because he was willing to make difficult decisions. He had to say, 'No,' to some things, otherwise he would have been saying, 'Yes,' to everything" (ExecS3). In fact, as the executive staff member included in his comments about the fiscal situation and its influence on the proposal's failed passage, "Delegate Hecht was willing to *fall on the sword* knowing that the leaders of the House and Senate had to say, *No* [to the funding proposal]" (ExecS3).

Certain hot-button funding issues, such as a new education aid formula that would require larger sums of money and a gubernatorial proposal for nonpublic schools textbook aid with a proactive constituency (SEA4; Matysek, 2001), exacerbated the impact of the economic slowdown by committing a large part of available revenue and further prevented any serious consideration of HB 935. According to interview respondents from multiple perspectives (IGRep4; IGRep7;

221

Leg3; LegS2; ExecS2), the legislature estimated that the Thornton Commission's recommendations, would require "a huge amount of money" (IGRep4) to implement. As suggested by an executive staff member, some policymakers, especially Rawlings, probably viewed a single initiative bill, such as HB 935, "as fragmentation because it only [addressed] a piece of the larger issue" (ExecS4). Consequently, proponents of the school library media funding bill during the 2001 legislative session did not succeed in overcoming the formidable obstacles presented by the fiscal constraints of an economic slowdown and a new state education aid formula as well as competing issues, such as the governor's nonpublic schools textbook aid proposal, to expand and extend the School Library Enhancement Program initiated in 1998.

Influence Efforts

Detailed accounts of actors' efforts to influence the process help determine if the judgments based on decision outcomes and attributional data constitute plausible interpretations of political decisions. In the case of HB 935, the actors' efforts to influence the policymaking process in favor of the proposal failed to overcome constraining forces presented by the state's faltering economy, the preliminary funding recommendations reported by the Thornton Commission, and the salience of a competing issue for nonpublic schools. During the different phases of the policymaking process, various actors took the lead in recognizing the problem of substandard school libraries and drafting a legislative proposal to submit to the general assembly for state funds, but none succeeded in securing the governor or any other high-level legislator as a champion for school library media program improvement (ExecS1). Their efforts lacked persistence and follow-through.

The *Baltimore Sun* raised awareness about the inferior quality of a number of Maryland's school library media programs long enough to capture the attention of the SBE and then the state superintendent of schools, but the newspaper did not persist in following through on its initial efforts to obtain state funds for the program. Once the SBE and state superintendent announced their intentions to develop an improvement plan and seek state funds to implement it, the editorial staff began covering other education issues. In fact, prior to the start of the 2001 general assembly session, an editorial recommended education funding projects for the legislature's consideration, but did not include school library media program improvements. Instead, editorial staff identified pre-school programs (i.e., Judith Hoyer Centers) and all-day kindergarten programs as important (Journal, January 7, 2001). Only two articles about school library programs appeared in the newspaper after the publication of the prioritized list. One article focused on the importance of technology upgrades for school libraries ("Using technology in school libraries," 2001). The newspaper published the last editorial after the state superintendent testified in opposition to the nonpublic schools textbook aid and called on the governor to rescue school libraries by including $8 million in his supplemental budget ("Governor must bridge gap," 2001). According to Kingdon's research (1995) and corroborated by a media correspondent interview (MC1), the media tends to focus attention briefly on the issues it addresses, thereby limiting its impact. The *Baltimore Sun's* treatment of the school library issue provided another example of the press's limited ability to affect policymaking decisions due to its lack of follow-up in covering issues that do not attract a groundswell of support.

While the SBE responded to the *Baltimore Sun's* editorials by insisting that the superintendent provide a school library improvement plan, it did not maintain its advocacy efforts by lending further support to secure the required funding for implementation. In fact, the SBE members relied on the state superintendent to follow through on the initiative. They did not ask to review or approve the plan, but appeared satisfied with the superintendent's summary of the document and her statement of intent to ask the governor for an increase in state funds for school libraries (Journal, October 24, 2001). As one interview respondent explained the SBE's lack of involvement in the political phase of the policymaking process, "It was a *pat* response for the SBE to say, 'Give us a plan'" (SEA3) in reacting to the newspaper editorials.

As noted earlier, the state superintendent of schools and the legislative sponsor did not contact the governor's office to make the case for school library funding. While the superintendent had told the school library media branch chief that she would meet with the governor's chief of staff to share the plan and discuss the funding request with him, the governor's office cancelled and did not reschedule the meeting (Journal, January 2, 2001). In addition, respondents from multiple perspectives suggested that Delegate Hecht, as the sponsor, did not "check in with the governor to know where he stood on the issue" of school library media funding (IGRep7; ExecS1) even though one executive staff member reported that the governor liked the delegate and called her a "personal friend" (ExecS3). Consequently, the school library funding proposal lacked an important advocate during the policymaking process.

Those who testified during the House Ways & Means Committee hearing represented education stakeholder groups and organizations, such as the Public School Superintendents' Association, Maryland Association of Boards of Education, Advocates for Children and Youth, Eastern Shore of Maryland Educational Consortium, Maryland Library Association, and Harford and Frederick County Public Schools. While these groups represented some influential people within the education community who described "good school libraries [as] an integral part of the school's curriculum," (Advocates for Children and Youth, March 7, 2001), they did not include local governmental leaders, such as county executives and mayors, who had formed an earlier alliance in lobbying for the successful passage of HB 1 in 1998 (i.e., SAFE Act) (ExecS4).

According to Kingdon's research at the national level, "the administration is a player to be reckoned with in the policy formation process" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 22). This information applies to state level policymaking in helping to explain the failure of HB 935. Absent a champion, such as the governor or the highly influential Appropriations Committee chair, the school library funding proposal faced insurmountable odds during the 2001 general assembly session because the declining revenues did not allow legislators to fund or consider funding all education projects requesting state monies. At the same time, state and local leaders supported revising and increasing the state education funding formula. One executive staff member suggested that the only way HB 935 could have passed would have been if Delegate Hecht "provided a funding mechanism or had an advocacy capable of taking something out of the governor's budget" (ExecS2). Another executive staff member

supported this assessment of the situation in commenting on the impact of the economy on the decision outcome, "The success of HB 935 depended on the availability of the money. It was clearly about money" (ExecS1).

Although these respondents may have oversimplified the reasons for the bill's failure with their perception of limited funds, in reality, multiple factors impacted the outcome. These factors included the limited power and influence of the actors who played an advocacy role as well as the potential power and influence not exercised by those who did, the faltering economy exacerbated by a recent tax cut, and competing education funding issues such as the Thornton recommendations and textbook aid to nonpublic schools.

Of the actors who exercised their power and influence to advocate for school libraries, none held a key position in the legislative process. The *Baltimore Sun* used its resources to heighten the SBE's awareness of the school library media program funding issue, but while the SBE oversees education policy and regulation, it does not have the budgetary power to correct these problems without gubernatorial or legislative support. The state superintendent and delegate who sponsored the legislation failed to follow-through in securing gubernatorial support and the special interest groups provided only nominal backing with their testimony. Consequently, an advocacy coalition powerful enough to overcome the unfavorable economic conditions or the competing pressure of the nonpublic schools lobby did not exist.

In summary, the convergence of the relative power and influence of the players, their degree of willingness to use their skills and resources, the constraining

forces presented by the economic slowdown, and competing issues prevented the

passage of HB 935: Public School Libraries – Funding in 2001.

Chapter 7: Summary of Study, Synthesis of Findings, and Conclusions

The purpose of the research was (a) to determine what factors account for the legislative decision outcomes resulting in the allocation of state funds for Maryland's school library media programs in 1998, and the denial of continued funding in 2001, (b) to test the capacity of an integrated policymaking model to account for legislative victory and defeat, and (c) to add to the limited literature on state education policymaking in Maryland and school library media funding decisions in state arenas. Following a brief summary of the study, this chapter revisits those broad purposes. It provides a brief synopsis of the legislative processes that resulted in victory and defeat, synthesizes the key findings, illustrates the utility of the integrated model, and highlights insights for research and practice in Maryland.

Summary of Study

This study focused on the policy issue of providing dedicated state funds for school library media programs in Maryland because qualitative and quantitative research studies conducted during the past 60 or more years suggest that school library media programs can make positive contributions to teaching and learning (Didier, 1984; Lance, et al., 1993; Lance, 1999; Lance, et al., 2000). Despite the evidence of how library media programs may support student achievement, state and local governments frequently do not provide adequate funding to fully implement these programs. For example, a large percentage of Maryland's school library media programs do not meet state guidelines for staffing, collections, and facilities even

though the State Board of Education adopted program standards in 1987 and updated the standards to align the program with its school reform initiative in 2000. This study explains the politics of these funding patterns in the Maryland context by examining two recent legislative decision making events, the School Accountability Fund for Excellence Act in 1998 and the Public School Libraries – Funding in 2001.

Few studies detail education policymaking in Maryland. Studies completed by doctoral students cover topics such as the views and attitudes of educational leaders and policymakers about key issues in the 1970s, leaders' perceptions of the impact of state intervention in the Baltimore City public education system, and the influence of the State Board of Education on policymaking. This study contributes to the limited knowledge of state education policymaking in Maryland by disclosing some information about the politics of state level education decisions in the domain of school library media programs.

This study employed frameworks developed by Kingdon (1995) and Mazzoni (1993) to examine each legislative decision making event as a political process influenced by the power of the players and shaped by developments in three distinct phases of the policymaking process that Kingdon (1995) terms *streams* (problem recognition, policy formulation, and political events). The streams provide manageable units of analysis to help explain the serendipity of school libraries as an issue, identify the policy entrepreneur, and illustrate how forces converge to shape decision outcomes. In this study, Mazzoni's (1993) power and influence model augmented Kingdon's multiple streams model by providing the tools to describe the dynamics of the interactions between and among the participants and to gauge the

229

actors' influence on education policy decisions. In combination, these two frameworks helped to analyze how efforts to pass HB 1 in 1998 led to legislative victory for school library advocates and a legislative defeat for those interests in 2001.

This investigation employed an exploratory case study to render a provisional interpretation of the 1998 and 2001 legislative decision events regarding state funds for school library media programs. The exploratory case study design was determined to be appropriate for several reasons. First, case studies are appropriate methods to use in trying to understand complex issues (Yin, 1994) such as state education policymaking processes (Mazzoni, 1991a) that require in-depth study and produce rich, thick descriptive data. Second, exploratory case study is an appropriate method when the topic of interest has received limited research attention as is the case with the school library media funding issue. The exploratory case study design provided an opportunity to search for factors that account for these decision events and to develop a descriptive foundation for future research (Merriam, 1998).

The data sources for this exploratory case study consisted of official documents, a professional journal, secondary sources, and interviews. Official source documents, such as the legislative bills, corresponding fiscal notes, and committee memoranda, outlined the actions taken by the policy actors across the streams and documented formal decisions. Using this information, this researcher identified key participants in the policymaking processes, tracked the chronologies of the cases, and gained an understanding of the institutional arrangements that shape the rules of the game. In addition to the official documents involving HB 935, this investigator

created a professional journal to record notes describing various aspects of the case as they unfolded between November 2000 and March 2001 to track her direct and indirect involvement in this case and to develop a written account of her role and the roles of other actors. Secondary source documents included published books and professional articles, task force reports, newspaper articles and editorials, email messages, and state education agency reports and implementation guidelines. These data sources provided a description of the policymaking context, including critical junctures in the timeline, background on the policy issue, and the names and positions of key actors.

Semi-structured, in-depth formal interviews completed between December 28, 2005, and July 24, 2006, provided the primary data for this research. Using a set of pre-determined questions based on the conceptual framework, this researcher conducted interviews with 27 individuals identified as having firsthand knowledge of the legislative decision events under study and representing multiple perspectives (e.g., executive, legislative, state education agency, interest group, and media). All interviewees received written assurances of confidentiality and anonymity to increase the likelihood that they would be willing to share information.

The interview guide consisted of open-ended questions to provide informants the opportunity to share their recollection of the process (Aberbach & Rockman, 2002). Prompts were included in the interview protocols to encourage detailed responses and to ensure that the interviewer probed for additional information and benefited from the individual informants' specialized knowledge of the process (Leech, 2002). This researcher conducted the interviews using established procedures

to minimize bias and error. In addition to verbal and written assurances of confidentiality and anonymity, these procedures included a description of the study and legislative chronologies to assist recall of events, efforts to establish rapport as well as the use of a reflective, non-evaluative listening style (Geary, 1992). The responses were carefully recorded along with pertinent field notes that contributed to the interpretation of the events being investigated (Merriam, 1998; Murphy, 1980; Woliver, 2002). The resultant information was coded according to the appropriate power and influence model categories (i.e., actors, goals/motivations, resources, strategies, interactions, and setting) and arranged within one of the three convergent streams of problem recognition, policy formation, and political events as soon as possible following each interview. The data were examined for consistent patterns and themes to form plausible explanations for the decision outcomes in each case and then across the cases. As explained in Chapter 3, data analysis also included recommended procedures to minimize bias and error as well as to enhance the validity, reliability, and objectivity of the findings.

The Legislative Process

This section draws on the case studies to examine the politics of what was, for advocates of school library funds, a legislative victory in 1998 and a legislative defeat in 2001. It also discusses those findings in light of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2.

Problem Stream: How did school library media funding gain agenda status in the Maryland legislature?

In both HB 1 and HB 935, central findings point to two significant factors that impacted the ability to get school library media funding on the legislative agenda: (1) the key role played or not played by the governor and (2) contextual forces that either enabled or constrained advocacy efforts. These findings are consistent with research conducted by Kingdon (1995) at the federal level as well as the results of studies carried out by education policymaking investigators at the state level (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Wirt & Kirst, 1982; Marshall, et al., 1986; Fuhrman, 1988; and Mazzoni, 1991a, 1993, 1994).

Case Findings. In the case of HB 1, the governor played a major role in placing school library media funding on the legislative agenda. This judgment is based on three lines of evidence: the decision outcome; attributional data; and actors' influence efforts. Simply stated, a decision outcome as an indicator of influence identifies who won and who lost, whose goals were achieved and whose goals were not accomplished. Politics, however, is never that simple. A correspondence between what actors advance and what decisions are rendered is a clue to who may have been partially influential. However, that clue by itself is not sufficient. Assessments of influence require analysts to examine other lines of evidence, specifically attributional data and influence efforts. As noted in Chapter 2, analysts can gauge the relative power of actors by examining these three indicators of influence (Gamson, 1960; Mazzoni, 1976; Malen, 1985; and Geary, 1992).

The governor is clearly tied to the decisions about including school libraries on the state education policy agenda in 1998 and 2001. Multiple informants from a

variety of perspectives describe the governor as a critical presence in 1998 and a critical absence in 2001. In 1998, he recognized and publicized that outdated school library collections were a statewide problem that impacted teaching and learning effectiveness. Newspaper articles and speeches also contained references he made about the importance of updating these materials. Of particular significance is the inclusion of school library improvement as an initiative in the 1998 State of the State speech. By including the issue in this speech, the governor signaled the legislature that he intended to include school libraries in his annual budget. Since the Maryland governor's budgetary power is considerable, this influence effort had an important impact in getting school libraries on the legislative agenda and getting legislative leaders behind the priority.

The executive's use of the bully pulpit, coupled with his significant budgetary powers, gained public support and informed legislators of his goal to improve school library collections with an annual infusion of $3 million in state funds along with a local matching requirement. Glendening articulated the importance of updating these resources in his 1998 State of the State speech and called for legislative support "to modernize our school libraries and make them among the best in the nation" (*Washington Post* Archives accessed September 29, 2007). With these actions, the governor signaled the legislature and the state superintendent that he was willing to target state funds to improve school library collections. Because Maryland's executive budgetary process requires the governor to develop the budget and allows the legislature to delete, not add items, the governor has considerable agenda-setting influence in the legislative process. These influence efforts demonstrate Glendening's

advocacy for school libraries as instrumental in placing the funding issue on the legislative agenda in 1998.

While the governor played a proactive role in getting school libraries on the agenda in 1998, he remained virtually silent in the case of HB 935 three years later. An executive office spokeswoman responded to the *Baltimore Sun's* editorial efforts to place school libraries on the legislative agenda in 2001 with only a noncommittal statement. Clearly, the governor's priorities for education had changed. Instead of emphasizing K-12 public education, he focused attention on higher education issues and nonpublic schools textbook aid. As a result, school libraries had to rely on secondary players, such as the news media, the State Board of Education, and the state superintendent of schools, to get the issue on the legislative agenda. Whereas each one of these actors played a role in furthering the cause of school library media program improvement in Maryland by publishing editorials and op-ed articles, and by developing a plan that would translate eventually into a legislative proposal, none possessed the power or the skill and will required to get the issue on the agenda.

Table 4

Comparison of factors impacting legislative agenda-setting in 1998 with factors in

2001

1998	2001

• High-level actor involvement
   o Governor with House Speaker and committee chair support
 	
• High Proposal viability
 	
• Enabling and energizing forces
   o Budget surplus
   o Baltimore City/State partnership, 1997
   o Public support for at-risk students
	• Proximate actor involvement
	   o Media; State Board of Education; State Superintendent of Schools; and Delegate
	
	• Low proposal viability
	
	• Constraining forces
	   o Budgetary concerns
	   o Competing issues
	     • Thornton
	     • Nonpublic Schools

The Governor as a Key Factor in the Problem Stream and the Agenda-Setting

Process. The finding on the key role of the governor in agenda-setting is aligned with

Kingdon's (1995) policymaking model that underscores the relative power and

influence of the executive branch in agenda-setting. Kingdon argues that institutional

and organizational resources give chief executives a relative power advantage during

this phase of policymaking. They can veto legislative proposals. Chief executives also

control commissions, task forces, and board appointments as well as hire and fire

staff. Another resource available to the executive is "a command of public attention

which can be converted into pressure on other governmental officials to adopt [his]

agenda" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 25). The bully pulpit allows the president to focus the

public's attention on certain issues and to communicate the importance of these

matters to other policymaking participants. Consequently, congressmen and

legislators, their staffs, and often their constituents want to be in good standing with the chief executive to gain favor and maintain support for the advancement of their own goals.

These observations about the relative power advantage of the chief executive in public policymaking appear to transfer to state level executives. As the study demonstrates, the Maryland governor has extraordinary budgetary powers. State education policymaking research demonstrates the impact of governors' influence efforts on state education policy when they choose to get involved (Campbell & Mazzoni, 1976; Wirt & Kirst, 1982; and Mazzoni, 1994). According to Mazzoni (1994), governors as state education policymaking actors are unmatched in the resources (i.e., authority, organization, and media access) they can bring to bear on agenda-setting. While the press of other state issues, such as taxes, employment, welfare, health care, and crime, sometimes displaces education as a legislative priority, when governors decide to address education topics, they have an array of relevant resources to use in getting education issues on the policy agenda.

For example, the governor can appoint commissions or task forces to study issues. This strategy focuses public attention on the topic, facilitates proposal development, and helps to achieve consensus on the issue. Organizational resources as well as media access also give governors the means to conduct "issue campaigns" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 61). As a promotional strategy, the campaign may include speeches, tours, slogans, endorsements, and even advertisements as tactics to use in gaining wide public appeal for the issue and achieve agenda status.

Whether the governor is present or absent in the agenda-setting process, Kingdon's (1995) research findings support the concept of the chief executive as a key figure in establishing the legislative agenda: "[T]here is little doubt that the president remains a powerful force in agenda setting, particularly compared to other actors" (p.23) because of the significant resources embedded in that branch of government. While Kingdon references the president, his assessment of the power and influence of the position translates easily to the governor given their similar institutional resources. When chief executives choose to be involved, they have the institutional power base to be extremely influential.

As this study demonstrates, Glendening was proactive in promoting school libraries as an issue in 1998. He not only described the impact of outdated collections in his speeches in various settings (e.g., school visits and interviews), but also went beyond "the *pro forma* mention" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 26) when he announced in the State of the State his intent to follow through on his commitment to improve school library collections by including funds in the budget specifically for this purpose. This strategy also served to get other key actors in line with his agenda. In 2001, however, the governor's level of involvement declined dramatically, and without him as an active player, the school library issue was relegated to the State Board of Education's agenda until the policy formulation phase when it would receive only brief legislative consideration.

Contextual Forces as Critical Factors in Recognizing and Responding to Policy Issues. While the governor played a significant role, contextual forces influenced the ability to get dedicated state funding for school library media on the legislative agenda and through the legislative channels in 1998. Contextual forces also

238

contributed to the very different policy decisions made in 2001. Reflecting the research findings of Kingdon (1995) and Mazzoni (1994), this study indicates that both favorable and unfavorable settings can make a significant difference on policy decisions.

According to Kingdon (1995), "a shift in climate … makes some proposals viable that would not have been viable before, and renders other proposals simply dead in the water" (p. 149). Kingdon (1995) explains that proposal viability depends on several qualities: "technical feasibility, value acceptance, tolerable cost, public acquiescence, and a reasonable chance for receptivity among elected decision makers" (p. 131). While HB 1 met all of these criteria, value acceptance and tolerable cost made the climate particularly conducive to placing school library media programs on the public policymaking agenda. In 2001, the school library media program funding issue met only one criterion – value acceptance. Whereas legislative informants were consistent in voicing appreciation for school libraries as evidenced by comparisons they made in both cases with the program and "motherhood and apple pie" (Leg1; Leg 4), the budget surplus in 1998 presented a more favorable climate for the serious consideration of the issue. However, in 2001, when the budget was tight and a number of issues competed for a finite amount of state resources, this proposal could not secure approval.

Mazzoni (1994) refers to "enabling" and "energizing" (p. 57) characteristics of certain forces in the climate that can advance a proposal, especially if aligned with "[c]ommission reports, pulpit exhortations, media publicity, and high-profile advocates" (p. 57) as they were in 1998 for HB 1. The absence of these forces (e.g.,

economic prosperity, statewide interest in education issues, and non-competing issues) often constrains policymakers from considering proposals as was the case in 2001 with HB 935. An economic slowdown made it difficult to support all the legislative proposals seeking funds that year. Among those proposals were bills supporting other education initiatives, such as the revised state funding formula and nonpublic schools textbook aid that displaced school libraries as a legislative agenda item.

The contextual differences in the two cases focused mainly on the available fiscal resources, the key issues of the day, and the election cycle. As Kingdon (1995) notes, "a complex *combination* of factors is generally responsible for the movement of a given item into agenda prominence" (p. 76); these factors combined quite differently in each case.

In 1998, a budget surplus and a statewide concern with the teaching and learning requirements of the growing at-risk student population enabled the governor, the state superintendent of schools, as well as the legislature to consider including funds to improve elementary school library collections in HB 1. At the same time, the upcoming election in fall 1998 served to encourage the executive and legislative leaders to support the school library media component so that they could demonstrate for constituents their ability to provide state resources to address local issues.

Three years later, however, the situation was very different. The economy had slowed and a tax cut initiated in 1998 had begun to reduce revenues. As a result, fiscal officers raised concerns about being able to fund new initiatives. At the same time, two key issues competed with school libraries for agenda status: preliminary

recommendations of the Thornton Commission and nonpublic schools textbook aid. In addition, a misaligned election cycle did not provide sufficient motivation for legislators to overcome these constraining forces to support school library media funding. While the state remained steadfast in its support of education issues, the new commission recommended a different strategy for allocating state funds to local districts. In addition to increasing the allocations for each jurisdiction, the commission suggested eliminating categorical programs and giving local school systems more spending authority. Once this idea was under discussion, the widespread appeal for local control served as an additional constraining force on the legislature and inhibited any serious consideration of targeting funds to improve school libraries.

Policy Stream: How did the proposal to fund school library media programs get formulated?

Central findings related to the policy formulation processes involved with HB 1 and HB 935 direct attention to two key factors: (1) the critical role played or not played by the governor in concert with other key actors (i.e., legislative leaders and state superintendent) and (2) contextual forces that either enabled or constrained consideration of the policy proposal. These findings are consistent with Kingdon's research (1995) as well as the results of studies conducted by researchers investigating state education policymaking (e.g., Marshall, et al., 1986; Mazzoni, 1991).

Case Findings. In the case of HB 1, the governor's continued involvement with the issue accompanied by legislative support helped to advance school library

media funding from agenda status to a policy proposal. During the formulation of HB 935, the absence of any significant involvement of the governor and only limited support by the legislators contributed to the proposal's lukewarm reception by the Appropriations and Ways & Means committees. As Table 5 outlines, in the case of HB 1, an important factor in the development of a proposal to establish state funding to improve school library collections was the role played by the chief executive as the policy entrepreneur. In this role, the governor deployed his power and influence resources in advocating for the issue and negotiating with legislative leadership to hook the problem of outdated school library collections to a viable and popular solution. By asking the Speaker to include a school library funding component in the SAFE proposal, the governor played the role of a policy entrepreneur when he made an essential connection between the problem and proposal streams.

While the governor's involvement as a policy entrepreneur was quite significant in achieving the desired outcome for HB 1, the inclusion of school library media funding in the larger proposal was not an individual accomplishment. This case also demonstrates the important contributions made by other participants whose influence efforts were aligned with those of the governor. As noted by Mazzoni (1994), "Effective education governors were back-stage actors as well, drawing upon the tactics of insider politics to strike accords with other influentials – or to persuade or pressure them into cooperating" (p. 61). Glendening illustrated this strategy when he asked the House Speaker to include school library media funding in the larger bill. According to an executive level informant (ExecS3), the governor made the request to avoid the close scrutiny often given single program bills. According to other

informants (ExecS5; IGRep2; IGRep4), the Speaker cooperated with this request to gain the governor's support for the SAFE bill. This *quid pro quo* interaction fits the description of Maryland politics (Rosenthal, 2004).

Kingdon (1995) also reports that while chief executives "may be able to dominate and even determine the policy agenda, [they are] unable to dominate the alternatives that are seriously considered" (p.23) without the support of other high ranking officials. It is clear that without the support of legislative leaders, such as the Speaker and committee chairs important to the budgetary process (i.e., Rawlings, Hoffman, and Hixson), who had their own motives for including the funds in the bill, school libraries would not have been included in HB 1. In addition, the favorable context that existed during the agenda-setting phase continued and energized and enabled participants to consider the inclusion of school library media funding in the SAFE bill.

Whereas the governor played an important role during the policy formulation phase of the policymaking process of HB 1 to include school library funding, he made no contribution to the development of HB 935. In addition to his lack of involvement, certain contextual elements inhibited serious consideration of the single program bill by members of the legislature in 2001. While Delegate Hecht managed to have 58 other delegates including the powerful and influential Appropriations Committee chair sign the proposal, several constraining forces, such as an economic downturn, competing issues, and a misaligned election cycle, prevented legislators from supporting funds for school libraries with anything more than their signatures. Thus, HB 935 did not gain much traction during the proposal formulation phase.

Table 5

Comparison of policy stream features in 1998 and 2001

1998	2001

• Governor as policy entrepreneur with strong legislative support
 	
 • Budget surplus
 	
 • Concern for at-risk students
      ○ SAFE Act
      ○ School libraries as an uncontested issue
	• Limited legislative support
	
	 • Economic downturn
	
	 • Concern for at-risk students presents competing issues
	      ○ Thornton recommendations
	      ○ Nonpublic schools textbook aid

The Role of the Governor in the Policy Stream. As a key actor in the policy

formulation phase that resulted in the inclusion of school library media funds in HB1,

the governor played the role of a policy entrepreneur by advocating for school library

media funding and negotiating with the Speaker to include the proposal in the SAFE

bill. The success of these actions and the tactics used by the governor are consistent

with Kingdon's (1995) and Mazzoni's (1994) research describing how policy

entrepreneurs are "ready, willing, and able to seize the moment to 'hook solutions to

problems'" (Mazzoni, 1994, p. 58). However, according to Kingdon (1995):

> An item's chances for moving up on an agenda are enhanced considerably by
> the presence of a skillful entrepreneur, and dampened considerably if no
> entrepreneur takes on the cause, pushes it, and makes the critical couplings
> when policy windows open (p. 205).

These findings are consistent with the research reviewed in Chapter 2. For

example, McLendon (2003) describes policy entrepreneurs as "issue opportunists"

(p. 506) who connected decentralization of higher education in several states as a

solution to various problems. In the case of HB 1, the Maryland governor was an

issue opportunist who connected school library media funding to the larger SAFE proposal. In linking the problem of school library media program improvement to a proposal designed to improve the education opportunities for at-risk students, the governor provided funds to update school library collections and helped legislative leadership gain universal acceptance for the SAFE proposal. By including school libraries in the larger bill, the governor helped to ensure serious consideration of funds for this single program because HB 1 addressed the interests of multiple groups and its prospects for passage were good. At the same time, the inclusion of school library media funds within the SAFE Act helped the library media issue avoid the close scrutiny usually given first-time proposals and gain broad acceptance among the legislators with additional financial resources for all school systems. In contrast, Holderness (1990) explains what happens when "a policy entrepreneur [is] critically missing on the scene" (Holderness, 1990, p. 20) as the governor was during the policy formulation phase of HB 935. In her study about the issue of gifted and talented education in New Mexico, the absence of a policy entrepreneur severely limited public policymakers' ability to consider this issue just as the absence of the governor's involvement hindered the ability of library media interests in Maryland to acquire state resources for their program.

Contextual Forces in the Policy Stream. In 1998, the idea of including funds for school library media programs was introduced when Maryland was experiencing a budget surplus. Also, policymakers were seeking a way to equalize education funding for school districts other than Baltimore City and lawmakers were facing the next election cycle. In 2001, however, the projected budget shortfall undercut the

245

viability of the proposal and public policymakers were focused on two other major issues: (1) Thornton Commission recommendations suggesting that local school systems be given discretion in allocating funds to various programs and (2) a nonpublic schools textbook aid proposal being lobbied heavily by a massive Catholic schools constituency. Consequently, the school library media funding proposal had formidable obstacles to overcome if it was to survive the events in the political stream.

These findings about the importance of a favorable context for the serious consideration of a policy proposal are consistent with the research of Kingdon (1995) and Mazzoni (1994). According to Kingdon's multiple streams model, a proposal's viability enhances its chance for survival. But a proposal's viability is contingent on features of the context such as the fiscal resources available to support initiatives, the values shaping policy choices, election cycles, policy precedents, and the public mood. As noted earlier, the Maryland context allowed if not encouraged legislators to consider the inclusion of categorical funding for school libraries in HB 1. According to Mazzoni's (1994) research, "a surge of revenues flowing into state coffers" (p. 57) enhanced the viability of the school library media funding proposal as a component of the SAFE legislation by providing an enabling force. Concerns about providing updated instructional resources for all students, but especially those considered at-risk for learning, served to energize legislators in support of school library funding. Low proposal viability combined with constraining forces (i.e., budget slowdown and competing issues) rather than energizing and enabling forces, negatively impacted consideration of the funding issue in 2001.

Political Stream: How did the school library funding issue get decided?

In both HB 1 and HB 935, essential findings point to two factors in determining how the school library media funding issue was decided: (1) the important role played by the governor, who secured support from other key actors in one case, but not in the other, and (2) the impact of certain contextual forces that can energize and enable or constrain legislators in their ability to enact legislation to secure funds for school library media programs.

Case Findings. When the legislature enacted the SAFE bill in 1998, it contained the School Library Enhancement Program of $3 million in state funds for four years along with a local match requirement for the improvement of school library collections. While the governor was a key player in securing targeted funds to update school library collections, the alignment of the governor's interests with the motivations of legislative leadership helped to secure funding for school libraries. In addition to the complimentary alignment of gubernatorial and legislative interests in improving school library collections and equalizing educational opportunities for Maryland's at-risk students, a favorable setting promoted serious consideration of the proposal by the legislature. As earlier noted, Maryland was experiencing a budget surplus and education investments had public support. An upcoming election also prompted officials to consider how constituents might favor their re-election if they provided additional state funds for local education programs.

As Table 6 illustrates, the situation was vastly different in 2001. Gubernatorial support was non-existent and legislative support was weak. Since no high ranking policymaking official championed the proposal to continue funding

school library media programs, contextual forces took over. Due to a combination of factors, including a projected budget shortfall, the recommendation to eliminate categorical programs in the revised education funding proposal, a non-public schools textbook aid proposal with a highly effective lobby, and no election cycle requiring legislators to demonstrate their skill and ability to provide still more funds for local projects, HB 935 died in committee after receiving an unfavorable vote from the Appropriations Committee and an unfavorable report from the Ways & Means Committee.

Table 6

Comparison of political events in 1998 with political events in 2001

Politics 1998	Politics 2001

• Centralized decision making
   o Support of governor and legislature
 	
• Energizing forces
   o Public acceptance of education proposals
   o Alignment of election cycle
 	
• Enabling force
   o Budget surplus
	• Centralized decision making
	   o No support from governor
	   o Limited support from legislature
	
	• Energizing force
	   o Public acceptance of education proposals
	
	• Constraining forces
	   • Budget shortfall predicted
	   • Misaligned election cycle
	   • Thornton recommendations
	   • Nonpublic schools textbook aid

Role of the Governor in the Political Stream. The case reflects a pattern of centralized decision making where the Maryland governor's significant budgetary power allows him to dominate the process with his priorities (Rosenthal, 2004). While the governor exercises a significant amount of control over the process,

legislative support helps to ensure a proposal's success. The case also illustrates how governors in a centralized system can operate as a policy entrepreneur who influences policy decisions within each of the process streams.

As the key actor in securing state funds for school library media programs in 1998, the governor exhibited three qualities Kingdon (1995) identifies as contributing to the policy entrepreneur's success: (1) a claim to a hearing; (2) political connections or negotiating skill; and (3) persistence. According to Kingdon, the source of a person's claim to a hearing may be: (1) expertise; (2) ability to speak for others; or (3) "an authoritative decision-making position, such as the president or a congressional committee chairmanship" (p. 180). As noted earlier, Kingdon's findings about the relative power advantage of the president translate easily to the governor. The Maryland governor's authoritative decision-making position allows the occupant of that office to be heard in a variety of circumstances. Glendening's State of the State speech was a particularly important hearing that the governor used to secure state funds for school libraries. This speech went beyond the usual *pro forma* speeches given during school visits and other similar occasions because it signaled to the legislature Glendening's willingness to support the issue by putting money in the budget.

Successful policy entrepreneurs also are known for their political connections and their negotiating skills. In promoting the issue of state funds for school libraries, Glendening used both his political connections and negotiating skills when he asked the Speaker to include school library media funding in the SAFE proposal. In exchange for providing broader support for the omnibus bill, the governor helped the

school library funding proposal avoid closer legislative scrutiny often given first-time single programs.

According to Kingdon (1995), probably the most important quality of a successful policy entrepreneur is persistence. Glendening exhibited this trait in 1998 in his willingness to expend political capital in promoting the school library media funding issue. Previously, as county executive, Glendening demonstrated his support for school libraries as a frequent guest reader in his son's local elementary school library. As governor, he spoke often about the importance of providing students with up-to-date and authoritative sources of information so that they could become knowledgeable and critical thinkers (Haddad, 1997).

Used in combination, Glendening's abilities to speak from an authoritative position, utilize political connections and negotiating skills, and exercise persistence contributed to the governor's success as a policy entrepreneur for school libraries in 1998. In 2001, however, the governor was not only absent as a policy entrepreneur, but also silent about school libraries throughout the entire policymaking process.

Contextual Forces in the Political Stream. In Kingdon's terms, advocates of state funds for school library media programs had a window of opportunity in 1998, but not in 2001. The governor's and legislators' efforts to include school library media program funds in HB 1 were aided by both energizing and enabling forces (Mazzoni, 1994). The education community was focusing its attention on providing additional resources to improve educational opportunities for at-risk students. Funds to provide more up-to-date books for elementary school library collections supported this goal. The budget surplus enabled legislators to seriously consider adding monies

to the SAFE proposal and the election cycle promoted their desire to demonstrate for constituents an ability to provide state funds for local concerns.

Instead of presenting conditions favorable to the consideration of continued state funding for school libraries, contextual forces in 2001 presented constraints. As was evident in the problem and proposal formulation phases, concerns about an economic slowdown, legislative consideration of the elimination of categorical funding programs, as well as a proposal targeting funds to provide textbook aid for nonpublic schools trumped any serious consideration of continuing dedicated state financial support for school library media programs.

How did contextual forces and actor relationships converge to explain passage and defeat?

As the preceding observations make clear, several contextual and actor forces converged to explain the passage of HB 1 with the inclusion of school library media funding and the defeat of HB 935 as an effort to provide continued state funding for the program. In Kingdon's terms, the context provided a favorable window of opportunity in one case but not in the other. Further, an astute policy entrepreneur, notably the governor, helped fashion a viable proposal that could be moved through the formal channels in one case but not the other. While each of these sets of factors existed in the case of HB 1, none was present during the policymaking process involving HB 935. By their presence in the first case and their absence in the second case, these factors demonstrate why the efforts to provide state funds for school libraries were successful in 1998, but not three years later in 2001.

The Integrated Model

The case study illustrates the utility of the integrated model in explaining state education policymaking. As the previous section and related tables detail, Kingdon's framework provides broad analytic categories as manageable units of analysis, but it does not provide the analytic tools required to get at the dynamics within those policymaking processes. However, Mazzoni's framework provides the analytic tools required to map out the dynamics of the processes, to identify the influential actors, and to array and to assess the resources and strategies that allow them to acquire influence. For example, while Kingdon's model accounts for the serendipitous nature of the legislature including school library media funding in HB 1 through "an accidental confluence of factors" (Kingdon, 1995, p. 78), it is Mazzoni's (1993) model that details the critical couplings that resulted in categorical funding for school libraries for the first time since 1870. So, taken together the integrated model helps the analyst create a rich picture of political dynamics and develop an explanation for why issues may be embraced at one moment in time and dismissed at another moment in time.

Table 7

Contributions of Kingdon and Mazzoni to the integrated model

Kingdon's Model	Mazzoni's Model
• Identifies broad categories (streams) • Provides manageable units of analysis • Identifies the policy entrepreneur as a critical player • Illustrates with the window of opportunity how forces may converge to shape the outcomes and how serendipity shapes policy agendas and policy choices	• Provides tools to unpack dynamics of process in each stream • Identifies influential actors, including the policy entrepreneur • Examines actors' use of resources and strategies • Identifies energizing, enabling, and constraining forces

Kingdon's (1995) research on public policymaking shows how the presence of a favorable context can be a window of opportunity that allows a policy entrepreneur to hook a viable solution to a problem. A favorable context often consists of both energizing and enabling forces (Mazzoni, 1994) that promote the consideration of one solution over another and render others dead on arrival. Energizing and enabling forces that promoted the passage of HB 1 with a school library media funding component included a budget surplus, a statewide concern about educating students at-risk of learning because they were poor or could not speak English, the uncontested nature of providing updated library books for elementary school students, and an election cycle that prompted officials to demonstrate for their constituents an ability to provide funds for local projects and programs. In the absence of these same favorable conditions in 2001, the passage of

HB 935 was constrained by a projected budget shortfall, two competing issues, and the misalignment of the election cycle.

In addition to a favorable context for the successful passage of a bill, policy success also depends on how well the proposal meets critical standards for survival. These criteria include technical feasibility, value acceptance, tolerable cost, and a reasonable chance of receptivity among the legislative community (Kingdon, 1995). In the case of HB 1, the proposal to include school library funding in the SAFE Act met all the criteria while HB 935 met only one: value acceptance. According to a couple of interview respondents, "the bill had merit" (ExecS3 and LegS2), but it did not meet the tolerable cost criteria with an $8 million annual price tag because it was a particularly tight budget time.

The success of HB 1 and the failure of HB 935 underscore the importance of Kingdon's concept of the policy entrepreneur who makes critical couplings between problems and solutions during the public policymaking process. This concept allows one to characterize the unique roles and responsibilities of the influential actors and serves to refine Mazzoni's broad categories of actors. For example, Governor Glendening illustrated in his advocacy for school libraries during the 1998 general assembly session the contributions that an astute policy entrepreneur may make toward the successful passage of a bill. He was ready with the issue (i.e., outdated school library collections) and was prepared to recognize the window of opportunity (i.e., convergence of contextual forces, such as a budget surplus and a focus on serving the requirements of teaching at-risk students) to link the problem with a viable solution (i.e., SAFE proposal). Through these couplings, the governor as

policy entrepreneur played a key role in securing state funds for school libraries in 1998. Three years later, school libraries gained only brief agenda status as a legislative proposal and died in committee. The failure of the proposal to become policy was due in part to the lack of support from the governor and other legislative leaders.

The cases and related literature also point to the usefulness of integrating the two policymaking models to examine actors' goals and motivations and the strategies they use in deploying their resources to affect policy change. Whereas Kingdon's model outlines broad categories, it is Mazzoni's power and influence model that provides the tools to uncovering the dynamics of the story and gauging influence in the policy process.

Implications for Understanding Education Policymaking in Maryland

Maryland's activist education community is under-represented in the state education policymaking literature, yet its policies present a number of important topics for further study. An obvious subject would be a history of its school reform initiative or a detailed examination of any one of its school reform decisions, such as school reconstitution or the recently revised graduation requirement that links the passage of high school assessments to receiving a diploma. However, a topic that is highlighted in this investigation, but not explored in any depth, is state education aid to nonpublic schools. If examined more closely, the results could provide policymaking participants with useful information. While the state constitution does not prohibit providing funds to nonpublic schools, an obvious concern of public school advocates is the already existing high cost of public schooling. An

255

examination of how funding nonpublic schools impacts funding public school programs would inform state education policymaking decisions on these topics.

Implications for Policymaking Practice

This study generates insights that might help those who are interested in influencing education policy issues in Maryland. Two observations that may be especially relevant for advocates of school library media programs are highlighted here: (1) policy entrepreneurs often play a key role in securing the passage of legislation and (2) a well-mobilized grassroots effort by a special interest group might make a critical difference in the success of a proposal in a centralized decision-making state such as Maryland.

The important role of the policy entrepreneur is noted over and over throughout the study. Thus, it behooves policy advocates to identify an entrepreneur and to work with this individual to advance their cause from problem recognition to proposal formulation, and finally to policy enactment.

The school library community might benefit from lessons learned in observing the success of the nonpublic schools' special interest group in mobilizing as a massive lobby to promote and secure the passage of a nonpublic schools textbook aid proposal. For example, the Maryland Catholic Conference successfully organized its constituents in a grassroots lobbying effort to secure state funds for nonpublic schools textbooks two years in a row. In a concerted effort, the members wrote numerous letters to their legislators about the merits of providing funds to help nonpublic school students, especially those living in low income neighborhoods, buy textbooks. According to a quote in *The Catholic Review*, (Matysek, 2001), the numerous letters

256

received and the daily visits made to legislators convinced the policymakers to vote for the bill's passage. While that account may be an oversimplification, the fact that a well-organized interest group received funds for private schools in a climate of fiscal constraint suggests that advocates of school library media programs and other educational initiatives might learn from an interest group that achieved success in a highly competitive arena.

This study sought to explain the legislative policymaking processes resulting in the allocation of dedicated state funds for Maryland's school library media programs in 1998, and the denial of continued categorical funding in 2001. The study used an integrated model incorporating Kingdon's multiple streams model with Mazzoni's power and influence model to examine the convergence of contextual forces and actor relationships to provide a plausible explanation for two distinctly different decision outcomes regarding dedicated funding for school library media programs in Maryland. By identifying factors impacting decision outcomes that held across cases, the integrated model proved to be a useful framework for studying state education policymaking and providing a foundation for future investigations at the state level. With its focus on state education policymaking in Maryland about dedicated funding for school library media programs, this study has added to the literature on Maryland's public policymaking processes about education and specifically school library media programs. It provides a framework that advocates could use to map the political landscape in Maryland and to generate insights regarding strategies they could use to influence education policy developments here and perhaps elsewhere.

Appendix A: Case Chronologies

CONSENT FORM

Project Title	Allocating State Funds to School Library Media Programs: A Case Study of Education Policymaking in Maryland
Purpose	This is a research project being conducted by Gail Bailey in the Department of Education Policy and Leadership at the University of Maryland, College Park. We are inviting you to participate in this research because you participated in the legislative processes under study. The purpose of this research is to test the policymaking framework that combines John Kingdon's multiple streams model with Tim Mazzoni's power and influence model by examining the legislative processes that resulted in state funding for Maryland's school library media programs in 1998, but not in 2001.
Procedures	The procedures involve an individual interview for approximately an hour in a private office during which you will be asked questions about the legislative processes that resulted in the passage of HB 1 in 1998 and the defeat of HB 935 in 2001.
Confidentiality	We will do our best to keep your personal information confidential. To help protect your confidentiality, your name will not be used. The researcher will code all interview notes so that the data file folders have no individual identification clues on them, store them in a secure location, and shred them five years from the date of the publication of the report. The data you provide will be grouped with data provided by others in the policymaking system (e.g., legislator, state education agency staff, interest group representative, or media correspondent) or attributed to other non-identifiable referents such as study participant, respondent, or informant.
Risks	There are no known risks associated with participating in this study.
Benefits, Freedom to Withdraw, & Ability to Ask Questions	The study is not designed to help you personally, but the results may help the investigator learn more about the education policymaking process in Maryland. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or discontinue your participation at any time, or you may refuse to answer any questions that you find invasive or objectionable.
Contact Information Of Investigator	Gail C. Bailey, 5409 Sweet Air Road, Baldwin, MD 21013; (telephones) 410-592-2356 (H), 301-279-3217 (W), (410) 925-4035 (c); (email) Gail_C_Bailey@mcpsmd.org
Contact Information of Institutional Review Board	If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact: **Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742; (e-mail) irb@deans.umd.edu; (telephone) 301-405-0678.** This research has been reviewed according to the University of

	Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human subjects.
Statement of Age of Subject and Consent	Your signature indicates the following: you are at least 18 years of age; the research has been explained to you; your questions have been fully answered; and you freely and voluntarily choose to participate in this research project.
	NAME OF SUBJECT	
	SIGNATURE	
	DATE	

Allocating State Funds for Public School Library Media Programs:
A Case Study of Education Policymaking in Maryland

Project Description

Purpose. The purpose of this study is to examine the legislative processes that resulted in state funding for Maryland's school library media programs in 1998, but not in 2001. The study comprises and examination of the 1998 School Accountability Funding for Excellence Act (HB 1) that included state funds for elementary school library media programs and an examination of HB 935 submitted in 2001 to request continued funding for school library media programs and specific program enhancements. The Legislature denied HB 935.

Approach. The study focuses on the participants, the legislative processes, and the policy outcomes for each of the cases. Information will be gathered from documents, media accounts, and interviews with participants and observers.

Examiner. Gail Bailey, a doctoral student in the Department of Education Policy and Leadership at the University of Maryland, College Park, who has been a school library media specialist and state education staff member, and is currently a local school district program administrator, is conducting the study.

Report. The study will be reported as a doctoral dissertation that will be available through the University of Maryland library to study participants and other interested persons.

For further information contact: Gail Bailey
                                         5409 Sweet Air Rd.
                                         Baldwin, MD 21013
                                         410-925-4035
                                         Gail_C_Bailey@mcpsmd.org

Case Chronology: House Bill 1, 1998

Bill introduced and cross-filed with Senate Bill 171 to establish a School Accountability Funding for Excellence Program to provide the following:

Programs serving "at-risk" students in public school systems of the State Allocations of specified funds, subject to specified formulas and conditions, to various programs
Requirements of specified annual reports to the General Assembly
Termination of the Act

Sponsors: Cas Taylor, The Speaker (Administration) and 73 others

January 14:   1.   First Reading
                 2.   Assigned to Ways and Means Committee

January 21:   3.   Hearing before House Ways and Means Committee

                         Proponents
                         Nancy Grasmick (State Superintendent of Schools)
                         Gene Counihan (Task Force Chairman)
                         County Executives Panel (Wayne Curry, Prince
                         George's; Doug Duncan, Montgomery; and C.A. Dutch
                         Ruppersburger, Baltimore Co.)
                         Joan Roache (Maryland Education Coalition)
                         Matthew Joseph (Advocates for Children and Youth)
                         Tony Marchione (Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore
                         County)
                         W. Gregory Wims (Committee for Montgomery
                         County)
                         Karl Pence (Maryland State Teachers Association)
                         Bob Zinsmeister (Prince Georges Chamber of
                         Commerce)
                         Schiller (Interim CEO, Baltimore City)
                         Carl Stokes (New Baltimore City Board of School
                         Commissioners)
                         Sue Buswell (Maryland Association of Boards of
                         Education)
                         Sandra French (Howard County Board of Education)

                         Terry Greenwood (Public School Superintendents
                         Association of Maryland)
                         Lou Bograd (American Civil Liberties Union)
                         Steven Dobrosielski (Interfaith Action Committee)
                         Reverend Jeffrey McKnight (Interfaith Action
                         Committee)

Robert Slade (Deputy Superintendent of Schools for Prince George's County)
Tom Hendershot
Sharon Cox (Montgomery County Council of Parent-Teacher Associations)

Opponents
Betty Pitt (American Federation of Teachers, Maryland Chapter and Baltimore Teachers Union)

January 26	4.	Favorable with Amendments Report by Ways and Means
January 27	5.	Roll Call Votes: Favorable with Amendments Report Adopted Floor Amendment (Delegate Morgan) Withdrawn Floor Amendment (Delegate Ports) Rejected (30-95) Floor Amendment (Delegate Ports) Rejected (21-100)
January 28	6.	Special Order (Delegate Flanagan) Adopted Floor Committee Amendment Adopted Floor Amendment (Delegate Fulton) Adopted Second Reading Passed with Amendment
January 30	7.	Third Reading Passed (129-5)
February 2	8.	Senate: First Reading SB171 Assigned to Budget and Taxation Committee
April 5	9.	House concurs with Senate Amendments that require funds for school libraries to be spent to enhance elementary libraries, local school systems to match new funds, and unmatched funds to revert to the State; lists distribution fund amounts to local school sytems Third Reading Passed (136-1) Passed Enrolled
April 9	10.	Favorable with Amendments Report by Budget and Taxation
May 21	11.	Signed by the Governor, Chapter 565

Case Chronology: Senate Bill 171, 1998

Bill introduced and cross-filed with House Bill 1 to establish a School Accountability Funding for Excellence Program to provide the following:

February 2	1. First Reading
	2. Assigned to Budget and Taxation Committee
March 30	3. Favorable with Amendments (McFadden)
April 9	4. Favorable with Amendments Reports by Budget and Taxation
	5. Favorable with Amendments Report Adopted
	6. Second Reading Passed with Amendments
	7. Motion 2rdgs same day Const/Rule 24 (Senator Hoffman) Adopted
	8. Third Reading Passed with Amendments (45-1)

Case Chronology: House Bill 935, 2001

Bill introduced to provide additional State funding for public school libraries to accomplish the following:

Expand the grant program to include secondary schools
Require the Governor to include State budget funds to purchase new databases
Provide for on-site review of and improvements for library media programs
Provide for professional development opportunities for library media specialists
Establish a specified tuition assistance program

Sponsors: Delegate C. Sue Hecht (District 3) et al. (58 others)

February 9   1.   First Reading
     2.   Assigned to Appropriations & Ways and Means Committees

February 16   3.   Reassigned to Ways and Means & Appropriations

February 21   4.   Hearing March 7 at 1:00 p.m.

Proponents
Sue Hecht, Delegate, District 3
Nancy Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools
Gail Bailey, School Library Media Programs Branch Chief, Maryland State Department of Education
Jack Dale, Superintendent of Schools for Frederick County – expand program to include secondary schools
Maryland Association of Boards of Education – expand program to include secondary schools

Sharan Marshall, Chair, Legislative Committee of the Maryland Library Association – information literate students
Advocates for Children and Youth (with amendments not penalizing school districts without adequate resources to match state funds)
Allan Gorsuch, Director, Eastern Shore of Maryland Educational Consortium – provide more local flexibility
James Lupis, Executive Director, Public Schools Superintendents' Association of Maryland (received after the hearing) – expand program to include secondary schools, purchase of information databases, and tuition assistance
Terry LaPorte, Library Media Supervisor, Harford County Public Schools (received after the hearing)

Opponents
Jill Porter, Department of Budget and Management
(testimony submitted) – Requires significant increase in
general fund expenditures and state aid to local school
systems

February 29	5.	Unfavorable Report by Ways and Means
March 23	6.	Unfavorable Report by House Appropriations Committee

Appendix B: Interview Procedures

Categories Guiding Data Collection

Problem Stream

       Broad forces and human interactions that worked to place or block items from being placed on the agenda (e.g., competing priorities, revenue strains, public sentiments)

       Actors who initiated or supported legislation; actors who opposed or blocked legislation (e.g., executive staff, legislators, legislative staff, state board of education members)

       Goals actors hoped to accomplish (e.g., career ambitions, representation of constituents' interests)

       Resources and strategies, skill and will used by actors to influence the legislative agenda (e.g., political skill and will, expertise, political constituencies, formal authority, information and interest group pressure)

Policy Stream

       The formation of policy proposals, including the consideration of appropriate alternatives based on technical feasibility, values acceptability, and cost effectiveness

       Actors who were involved in developing policy proposals (e.g., executive and legislative staff, department of education, interest groups, district officials, and professional organizations)

       Goals actors hoped to accomplish (e.g., career ambitions, representation of constituents' interests)

       Resources and strategies, skill and will used by actors to influence the proposal formulation process (e.g., expertise and blocking, modifying, or rejecting legislation)

Political Stream

       Complex dynamics of institutional arrangements and environmental conditions (e.g., climate, mood, election cycles, and interest groups)

       Actors involved in deciding the issue (e.g., members of the executive and legislative staff, state department of education, interest groups, district officials, and professional organizations)

Goals actors hoped to gain or accomplish (e.g., career ambitions, representation of constituents' interests)

Resources and strategies, skill and will used by actors to influence the outcome (e.g., position, skill, expertise, interest group pressure, compromises)

Interview Guide

Case 1: House Bill 1/Senate Bill 171, 1998

Informant Code: _____Interview Date: _____
Stand: _____Time: _____ to _____
Position/
Affiliation: _____

Problem Stream

1. In 1998, House Bill 1 was introduced in the House by The Speaker, Cas Taylor, and supported by 73 other delegates. One of the provisions of HB 1 was an enhancement program for the state's elementary library media programs. Though these legislators officially introduced the bill, were other individuals or groups involved in initiating this provision to include funds for the state's elementary school library media programs?

   If yes:
   a. Who was involved?
   b. Why do you think they initiated/supported this provision? (Probe for goals and motivations, e.g., what did they hope to accomplish or gain by including school library media funds in this bill; what problem were they trying to address by introducing this provision into the legislation?)
   c. Was anyone else involved? (Probe for other actors, e.g., executive staff, other legislators, legislative staff, and/or state board of education, state superintendent, state department of education staff, interest groups, district officials, professional organizations.)
   d. Why were these individuals involved? (Probe for goals and motivations, e.g., what did they hope to accomplish or gain by introducing this provision into the bill?)

2. What did these individuals/groups do to get the school library media program on the legislative agenda? (Probe for resources and strategies, e.g., how did these individuals/groups try to influence the legislative agenda; what resources did they use to persuade others to support this provision; and what strategies did they employ to get other individuals or groups to support this legislation?)

3. Who was particularly effective in gaining support for the school library media funding issue? Why do you think they were effective in gaining support for this issue? (Probe for the resources they used and the strategies they employed to influence others to support putting school library media programs on the agenda.)

268

4. Were there individuals or groups who opposed including a provision in the legislation for school library media program funding?

    If yes:
    a. Who was involved?
    b. Why do you think they opposed the bill? [Probe for goals and motivations, e.g., What did they hope to accomplish or gain by opposing this bill?]
    c. Was anyone else involved? (Probe for other actors.)
    d. Why were these individuals or groups involved? (Probe for goals and motivations.)

5. What did they do to resist putting school library media programs on the legislative agenda? [Probe for the resources and strategies used by the opposition to lock/defeat/modify this legislation.]

6. Was anyone particularly effective in opposing the bill?   If so, why do you think they were effective? If not, why?

7. The ability to get an issue on the agenda or the ability to keep an issue off the agenda may be influenced by the context. As you think back on this time period, what events might have helped to get the school library media program on the legislative agenda? What competing events might have fueled resistance or made it more difficult to get this issue on the agenda?

    a. Were there other urgent issues/priorities that helped or hindered the ability of proponents to get the bill on the legislative agenda?
    b. Were there any specific conditions (e.g., revenue patterns or projections) in the Maryland context that influenced the ability of proponents to get the issue on the agenda or the ability of opponents to block the issue?
    c. Were there any other developments/situations in the Maryland context that may have affected how this issue was initiated and placed on the legislative agenda?

Policy Stream

8. HB 1 was originally formulated to help local school systems address the special requirements of students identified as being "at risk" because of their low socio-economic status or limited English proficiency. How did this provision of funds for school library media programs get attached to this legislation?

    a. Who was involved in developing the school library media funding proposal?

b. Why was [were] the above actor(s) involved in developing the proposal? [Probe for goals/motivations.] What did this [these] actor(s) hope to accomplish?
c. Were others involved in developing the proposal? [Probe for members of the executive and legislative staff, as well as the state department of education, interest groups, district officials, and professional organizations.]
d. Why were these individuals or groups involved? What were these actors hoping to accomplish by working on this proposal? [Probe for goals and motivations.]

9. What did these individuals do to influence the proposal formulation process? [Probe for resources and strategies used by these individuals to influence the formulation of the policy proposal, e.g., expertise and interest group pressure.]

10. Who was particularly effective in developing the school library media funding proposal?
Why do you think he/she was particularly effective? [Probe for resources and strategies.]

11. As you think back on the 1998 session and any deliberations over the school library media funding issue, did any individual or group try to change the original proposal?

If yes:
a. Who was involved?
b. Why do you think they tried to change the original proposal?
c. Was anyone else involved?
d. Why were they involved? What did they hope to accomplish by changing the legislation?

12. What did they do to influence a change in the proposal? [Probe for resources, strategies, and interactions.]

13. Was anyone particularly effective?
a. If so, who?
b. Why do you think this individual or group [these individuals or groups] were particularly effective?

14. Was there opposition to these changes?

If yes:
a. Who was involved?
b. Why do you think they opposed the changes?
c. What did they do to resist changes to the proposal?

15. As you think back on this time period, what events might have influenced the formulation of the school library media funding proposal? In other words, how, if at all, did the context condition the ability of the actors to influence the proposal formulation process? [Probe for competing priorities, revenue strains, and public sentiments.]

Political Stream

16. When HB 1 ultimately came to a vote, funding for elementary school library media programs was included. How did this issue finally get decided?

    a. Who was involved in deciding the issue?
    b. Why was [were] this [these] individual(s) involved? [Probe for goals/motivations.]
    c. Was any other individual or group involved in deciding the issue? [Probe for members of the executive and legislative staff, as well as the state department of education and interest groups.]
    d. Why were they involved?

17. What did these individuals do to influence this final phase of the decision-making process? [Probe for resources and strategies used by these individuals to influence the decision, e.g., position, skill, and interest group pressure.]

18. Who was particularly effective in deciding the school library media funding issue? Why do you think they were particularly effective? [Probe for resources and strategies.]

19. Were there any compromises required to pass the bill (i.e., include the school library media program issue in HB 1/SB 171)?

    a. If so, what were they?
    b. Who was involved in developing the compromises?
    c. How did the compromises get made?
    d. Who was especially effective at this stage and why?

20. In your judgment, which individual(s)/group(s) were most responsible for the final decision? Why?

21. Some people think that timing is important in deciding issues. Were there any developments that occurred in the Maryland context that made it easier or harder to commit state funds to elementary school library media programs during this time period?

22. Is there anything else that you would like to add that might help me understand how HB 1, which included state funds for elementary school library media programs was passed?

23. Are they any other individuals that you would recommend I contact?

Adapted from: Malen (1983); Geary (1992)

Interview Guide

Case 2: House Bill 935, 2001

Informant Code: _____Interview Date: _____
Stand: _____Time: _____ to _____
Position/
Affiliation: _____

Problem Stream

1. In 2001, House Bill 935 entitled Education – Public School Libraries – Funding was introduced in the House by Delegate Sue Hecht and supported by 58 other delegates. Though these legislators officially introduced the bill, were other individuals or groups involved in initiating this provision to include funds for the state's school library media programs?

   If yes:
   a. Who was involved?
   b. Why do you think they initiated/supported this bill? (Probe for goals and motivations, e.g., what did they hope to accomplish or gain by initiating this bill to provide state funds for school library media programs; what problem were they trying to address with this legislation?)
   c. Was anyone else involved? (Probe for other actors, e.g., executive staff, other legislators, legislative staff, and/or state board of education, state superintendent, state department of education staff, interest groups, district officials, professional organizations.)
   d. Why were these individuals involved? (Probe for goals and motivations, e.g., what did they hope to accomplish or gain by introducing this bill?)

2. What did these individuals/groups do to get the school library media program on the legislative agenda? (Probe for resources and strategies, e.g., how did these individuals/groups try to influence the legislative agenda; what resources did they use to persuade others to support this legislation with a provision; and what strategies did they employ to get other individuals or groups to support this legislation?)

3. Who was particularly effective in gaining support for the school library media funding issue? Why do you think they were effective in gaining support for this issue? (Probe for the resources they used and the strategies they employed to influence others to support putting school library media programs on the agenda.)

4. Were there individuals or groups who opposed legislation for school library media program funding?

    If yes:
    a. Who was involved?
    b. Why do you think they opposed the bill? [Probe for goals and motivations, e.g., what did they hope to accomplish or gain by opposing this bill?]
    c. Was anyone else involved? (Probe for other actors.)
    d. Why were these individuals or groups involved? (Probe for goals and motivations.)

5. What did they do to resist putting school library media programs on the legislative agenda? [Probe for the resources and strategies used by the opposition to keep the issue from being addressed with legislation]

6. Was anyone particularly effective in opposing the bill? If so, why do you think they were effective? If not, why?

7. The ability to get an issue on the agenda or the ability to keep an issue off the agenda may be influenced by the context. As you think back on this time period, what events might have helped to get the school library media program on the legislative agenda? What competing events might have fueled resistance or made it more difficult to get this issue on the agenda?

    a. Were there other urgent issues/priorities that helped or hindered the ability of proponents to get the bill on the legislative agenda?
    b. Were there any specific conditions (e.g., revenue patterns or projections) in the Maryland context that influenced the ability of proponents to get the issue on the agenda or the ability of opponents to block the issue?
    c. Were there any other developments/situations in the Maryland context that may have affected how this issue was initiated and placed on the legislative agenda?

Policy Stream

8. HB 935 was formulated to increase funding for the supplemental public school library grant program (HB1) that was legislated in 1998 as part of the SAFE Act; expand the grant program to include secondary schools; and provide state funds for information databases, provide for on-site review of and improvement for library media programs, provide for professional development opportunities for library media specialists, and establish a specified tuition assistance program. How did provisions of funds for school library media programs get attached to this legislation?

a. Who was involved in developing the library media funding proposal?
b. Why was [were] the above actor(s) involved in developing the proposal? [Probe for goals/motivations.] What did this [these] actor(s) hope to accomplish?
c. Were others involved in developing the proposal? [Probe for members of the executive and legislative staff, as well as the state department of education, interest groups, district officials, and professional organizations.]
d. Why were these individuals or groups involved? What were these actors hoping to accomplish by working on this proposal? [Probe for goals and motivations.]

9. What did these individuals do to influence the proposal formulation process? [Probe for resources and strategies used by these individuals to influence the formulation of the policy proposal, e.g., expertise and interest group pressure.]

10. Who was particularly effective in developing the school library media funding proposal?
Why do you think he/she was particularly effective? [Probe for resources and strategies.]

11. As you think back on the 2001 session and any deliberations over the school library media funding issue, did any individual or group try to change the original proposal?

   If yes:
   a. Who was involved?
   b. Why do you think they tried to change the original proposal?
   c. Was anyone else involved?
   d. Why were they involved? What did they hope to accomplish by changing the legislation?

12. What did they do to influence a change in the proposal? [Probe for resources, strategies, and interactions.]

13. Was anyone particularly effective?
    a. If so, who?
    b. Why do you think this [these] individual(s) or group(s) were particularly effective?

14. Was there opposition to these changes?

   If yes:
   a. Who was involved?
   b. Why do you think they opposed the changes?
   c. What did they do to resist changes to the proposal?

15. As you think back on this time period, what events might have influenced the formulation of the school library media funding proposal? In other words, how, if at all, did the context condition the ability of the actors to influence the proposal formulation process? [Probe for competing priorities, revenue strains, and public sentiments.]

Political Stream

16. HB 935 was assigned to Ways and Means & Appropriations and received an unfavorable report from Ways and Means. How did this issue get decided?

    a. Who was involved in deciding the issue?
    b. Why was [were] this [these] individual(s) involved? [Probe for goals/motivations.]
    c. Was any other individual or group involved in deciding the issue? [Probe for members of the executive and legislative staff, as well as the state department of education and interest groups.]
    d. Why were they involved?

17. What did these individuals do to influence this final phase of the decision-making process? [Probe for resources and strategies used by these individuals to influence the decision, e.g., position, skill, and interest group pressure.]

18. Who was particularly effective in deciding the school library media funding issue? Why do you think they were particularly effective? [Probe for resources and strategies.]

19. Were there any compromises offered? (i.e., reduce amount of funds requested or narrow the focus)?

    a. If so, what were they?
    b. Who was involved in developing the compromises?
    c. How did the compromises get made?
    d. Who was especially effective at this stage and why?

20. In your judgment, which individual(s)/group(s) were most responsible for the final decision? Why?

21. Some people think that timing is important in deciding issues. Were there any developments that occurred in the Maryland context that made it easier or harder to commit state funds to elementary school library media programs during this time period?

22. Is there anything else that you would like to add that might help me understand how HB 935, which included state funds for school library media programs was defeated?

23. Are there any other individuals that you would recommend I contact?

Adapted from: Malen (1983); Geary (1992)

Interview Request Letter

Date

Address

Dear (Informant):

     As a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership at the University of Maryland, College Park, I am conducting a study of the policymaking processes involved in funding school library media programs in Maryland. I am looking, in particular, at Maryland's House Bill 1 and its companion Senate Bill 171 in 1998 that resulted in state funds for elementary library media programs and House Bill 935 in 2001 that requested similar aid, but did not pass. While an obvious purpose for the study is to determine why the effort to allocate resources to the school library media programs was successful in 1998 and not in 2001, another is to add to the literature on state education policymaking in Maryland and school library media funding decisions in state arenas.

     Through my review of official documents, I have learned that you were a (legislator/interest group representative/media reporter/state agency staff member) at the time of the (1998/2001) legislation, and that you were (a participant in/in a position to observe) those legislative processes. Therefore, I am writing to request an interview with you to get your perceptions of the legislative processes surrounding this issue. If you agree to an interview, I will meet you at a time and place that is most convenient for you. I also guarantee your anonymity and will treat the information you provide as confidential.

     I will follow-up with you in the next few days via telephone to determine your willingness to participate in the research. I have enclosed a brief description of the project and a chronology of events from the House and Senate files for your information. Should you have any questions before we discuss the possibility of an interview, please feel free to contact me by phone at 410-925-4035 or by email Gail_C_Bailey@mcpsmd.org. Thank you in advance for any consideration you give to participating in this project.

     Sincerely,

     Gail Bailey
     5409 Sweet Air Rd
     Baldwin, MD 21013
     410-925-4035

Enclosures

Informant Recruitment Statement

Hello, my name is Gail Bailey. I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership at the University of Maryland, College Park. I am conducting a study of the policymaking processes involved in funding school library media programs in Maryland. I am looking, in particular, at Maryland's House Bill 1 and its companion Senate Bill 171 in 1998 that included state funds for elementary library media programs and House Bill 935 in 2001 that requested similar aid, but did not pass.

I have sent you a letter requesting an interview to discuss (HB 1/HB 935). I am calling to follow-up on that request and to ask if I can arrange an interview with you. As stated in the letter, I would like to get your perceptions of the legislative processes surrounding this issue. If you agree to the interview with me, I guarantee your anonymity and will treat the information you provide as confidential. Any quotes I use will not be attributed to you, but to a generic group (e.g., executive, legislative, or state agency actors) or through other non-identifiable referents such as study participant, respondent, or informant.

If yes: (Set a time and place for the interview.)
I will send you a letter in the next few days to confirm our appointment. I will enclose a consent form. Should you have any questions before we meet, please feel free to contact me by phone at 410-925-4035 or by email at Gail_C_Bailey@mcpsmd.org

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this project.

If uncertain: Could I send you some information that describes the project and the conditions of participation to help you get a better sense of whether or not you can be of help to me in this study? I will call you again after you have had some time to review the information.

If no with explanation that he/she was not an active participant or close observer: Is there anyone who may have been more involved that you suggest I contact?

If no: Thank you for your time.

DATA MATRIX

	Problem Stream	Policy Stream	Political Stream
Actors	1a; 2; 4; 5	1a.; 1 c.; 2a.; 3a.; 3b.; 4	1b; 1c; 3 b; 4
Goals/Motivations	1b; 2a; 4	1b; 2c; 3c	1b
Resources	3; 4b; 5b.	2b; 3d; 4b;	2b
Strategies	3; 4b; 5b	3d	2b
Interactions	4a; 4b; 5b; 5c	2a; 2b; 3b; 3d; 4a; 4b	2a; 2b; 3a; 3c; 5
Setting	5a; 5b; 6a; 6b	5; 5a	6
Outcome	4 a; 5c	3	2a; 5

References

Aberbach, J. D. & Rockman, B. A. (2002). Conducting and coding elite interviews. *PSOnline* (pp. 673-676). Retrieved from www.apsanet.org/.

Abadjian, M. (2000, September 13). Libraries lag behind student boom. *Journal*. Retrieved September 13, 2000, from http://jrnl.net/news.

Abramowitz, M. & Montgomery D. (1997, April 8). School aid divisive for lawmakers; Maryland politicians predict election repercussions. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Advocates for Children and Youth. (2001, March 7). Testimony before the House Ways & Means Committee: House Bill 935 – Education – School Library Funds with an amendment.

Allison, G. T. (1971). Model III: Governmental politics. In Author, *Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis* (pp. 162-181). Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Allison, G. T. & Zelikow, P. D. (1999). Model III: Governmental politics. In Author, *Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban missile crisis* (2nd ed.) (pp. 255-324). NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

American Association of School Librarians (1998). *Information power: Building partnerships for learning.* Prepared by the American Association of School Librarians and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Chicago: Author.

Association of Supervisors and Curriculum Developers. (2003, September 4). School libraries and their impact on student achievement. *ASCD Research Brief, 1,* 18.

Babington, C. (1998, December 27). Glendening budget seeks biggest increase in years. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Babington, C. (1997, June 24). Glendening to emphasize children in a modest election year agenda. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Baughman, J. (2002). School libraries and MCAS scores, (preliminary edition). A paper presented at a symposium sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Simmons College. Boston, MA.

Baumbach, D. (2002). *Making the grade: The status of school library media centers in the sunshine state and how they contribute to student achievement.* Spring, TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Baxter, S. J. & Smalley, A. W. (2003). *Check it out! The results of the school library media program census, final report.* St. Paul, MN: Metronet.

Beyle, T. (1999). The governors. In V. Gray, R.L. Hanson & H. Jacob (Eds.), *Politics in the American states* (7th ed., pp. 191-231). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Bogart, D. (Ed.). (2003). Table 3/ U. S. Hardcover Books: Average Prices and price indexes, 2000-2002. *The Bowker annual: Library and book trade almanac* (48th ed.). Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyd, L. V. (1987). *Maryland government and politics*. Centreville, MD: Tidewater Publishers.

Burgin, R. & Bracy, P. B. (2003). *An essential connection: How quality school library media programs improve student achievement in North Carolina.* Spring, TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Buy the book [Editorial]. (2000, September 16). *Baltimore Sun*, n.p.

Campbell, R. F. & Mazzoni, T. L. Jr. (1976). *State policy making for the public schools.* Berkley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Corporation.

Cibulka, J. & Derlin, R. (1998, August). Accountability policy adoption to policy sustainability: Reforms and systemic initiatives in Colorado and Maryland. *Education and Urban Society*, *30*, 4, 502-515. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Constitution of Maryland. Retrieved March 26, 2006 from http://www/mdarchives.state.md.us/.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Curtis, K. (2003). *The politics of school finance reform: A case study analysis of Vermont's Act 60.* Unpublished draft dissertation proposal. University of Maryland.

Dahl, R. A. (1984). *Modern political analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Darensbourg, A. G. (2003). *Maryland legislators' perceptions of the effect of state intervention on education in the Baltimore City Public Schools System (Maryland).* (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University).

Didier, E. K. (1984). Research on the impact of school library media programs on student achievement – Implications for school library media professionals. In S. I. Aaron and P. R. Scales (Eds.). *School library media annual* (1984), Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, 25-43.

Easton, D. (1985). *Political science in the United States past and present: International political science review, 6*, 133-152. International Political Science Association.

Elazar, D. J. (1984). The states and political culture. *American federalism: A view from the states*. (3rd. ed.) (pp. 84-126). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Elazar, D. J. (1994) *The American Mosaic: The Impact of space, time, and culture on American politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Facts about school library media programs in Maryland, 2000-2001. (2002). Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education.

Facts about school library media programs in Maryland, 1999-2000. (2001). Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education.

Facts about school library media programs in Maryland, 1998-1999. (2000). Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education.

Facts about school library media programs in Maryland, 1997-1998. (1999). Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education.

Fowler, F. C. (1994). Education reform comes to Ohio: An application of Mazzoni's arena models. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis 16*, 3, 335-350.

Freedman, H. E. & Hughes, A. L. (1998, April). The development of educational policy in Connecticut. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Fuhrman, S. H. (1990, March). *Legislatures and education policy.* Paper prepared for the Eagleton Institute of Politics for the Symposium on the Legislature in the Twenty-First Century (April 27-29, 1990) Williamsburg, VA.

Fuhrman, S. H. (1988). State politics and education reform. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson (Eds.), *Politics of education association yearbook 1988*, (pp. 61-75). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis, Inc. Ltd.

Fuhrman, S.H., Clune, W. H., & Elmore, R. F. (1988). Research on education reform: Lessons on the implementation of policy. *Teachers College Record, 90*, 2, 237-257.

Gamson, W. A. (1968). *Power and discontent*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Geary, L. S. (1992). *The Policymaking process resulting in fiscal policy for special education in the state of Utah*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.

Gittell, M. & McKenna, L. (1999, September). Redefining education regimes and reform: The political role of governors. *Urban Education, 34*, 3, 268-291. Corwin Press, Inc.

Glendening, P. (1998, January). *State of the state speech*. Annapolis, MD. Retrieved September 29, 2007, from *The Washington Post Archives*.

Glick, A. (2001, February). 'Sun' shines on school libraries. *SLJ Online News*. Retrieved February 27, 2001, from file://Temp\SLJ Online News 'Sun' Shines on School Libraries (2).htm.

Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Assessing ethnographic design. *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (pp. 233-245). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Governor must bridge gap in library funding [Editorial]. (2001, February 1). *Baltimore Sun,* p. 10A.

Grasmick, N. (2000, November 22). Changing libraries [Letter to the editor]. *Baltimore Sun*, p. 27A.

Grasmick, N. (2001, June 19-20). Commission on Education Finance, Equity, and Excellence [Memorandum]. Maryland State Department of Education.

Green, A. (2005, October 1). Supporting policies, not politics. *Baltimore Sun,* p. B1.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1983). Naturalistic solutions to methodological problems. *Effective evaluation* (pp. 85-127). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Haddad (1997, May 1). School to get state funds. *Baltimore Sun.* Retrieved December 16, 2006 from http://proquest.umi.com.

284

Haycock, K. (1999, March). Fostering collaboration, leadership, and information literacy: Common behaviors of uncommon principals and faculties. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*, 605, 82-87.

Holderness, S. T. (1990, October 26-28). *The politics of state educational policymaking: Usefulness of the Kingdon model.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.

House Bill 935: Education – Public School Libraries – Funding. Retrieved from http://mlis.state.md.us/1998rs/billfile/HB0001.htm.

House Bill 1: School Accountability Funding for Excellence. Retrieved from http://mlis.state.md.us/2001rs/billfile/HB0935.htm.

Hrebenar, R. J. (1997). *Interest group politics in America*. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Hrebenar, R. J. & Thomas, C. S. (Eds.). (1993). *Interest group politics in the northeastern states*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

It's up to Governor Glendening now [Editorial]. (1997, March 27). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Kanter, R. M. (1972). Two traditions of political analysis. *Sociological inquiry*, 42, 77-92.

Kingdon, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives and public policies.* New York: HarperCollins.

Koenig, S. (2001, January 26). Book aid for schools challenged. *Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved January 26, 2001, from www.sunspot.net.

Lance, K. C. (2003). *Powering achievement: The impact of school librarians on academic achievement.* [Powerpoint]. Colorado State Library & University of Denver.

Lance, K. C. (2004). Libraries and student achievement: The importance of school libraries for improving student test scores. *Threshold*, *1*, 2, 8-9.

Lance, K. C. & Loertscher, D. V. (2001). *Powering achievement: School library media programs make a difference – the evidence.* San Jose, CA: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Lance, K. C., Wellborn, L., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (1993). *The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement.* Spring, TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Lance, K. C., Wellborn, L., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (1999). *Information empowered: The school librarian as an agent of academic achievement in Alaska schools.* Anchorage, AK: Alaska State Library.

Lance, K. C., Rodney, Marcia J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000). *How school librarians help kids achieve standards: The second Colorado study.* Spring, TX: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Lance, K. C., Wellborn, L., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2001). *Good schools have good librarians: Oregon school librarians collaborate to improve academic achievement.* Terrebone, OR: Oregon Educational Media Association.

Lance, K. C., Wellborn, L., Hamilton-Pennell, C., & Rodney, M. J. (2000). *Measuring up to standards: The impact of school library media programs and information literacy in Pennsylvania schools.* Greensburg, PA: Pennsylvania Citizens for Better Libraries.

LeDuc, D. (1999, June 6). Surplus up; Glendening pushes school spending. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Leech, B. L. (2002). Asking questions: Techniques for semi-structured interviews. *PSOnline*, 665-668. Retrieved from www.apsanet.org/.

Libit, H. (2000, September 10). School libraries of poor quality. *Baltimore Sun.* Retrieved September 11, 2000, from www.sunspot.net.

Libit, H. (2000, October 25). State school chief seeks library aid. *Baltimore Sun*, pp. 1B, 4B.

Library leadership starts at the top [Editorial]. (2000, September 26). *Baltimore Sun*, p. 14A.

Lippincott, R. C. & Thomas, L. W. (1993). Maryland: The struggle for power in the midst of change, complexity, and institutional constraints. In R. J. Hrebenar & C. S. Thomas (Eds.). *Interest group politics in the northeastern states* (pp. 131-165). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Loertscher, D. V., Ho, M. L., & Bowie, M. M. (1987). 'Exemplary elementary schools' and their library media centers: A research report. *School library media quarterly, 15*, 3, 147-153.

Lost: school libraries [Editorial]. (2000, September 1). *Baltimore Sun*, p. 16A.

Making the most [Editorial]. (2000, September 5). *Baltimore Sun.* Retrieved from
www.sunspot.net on September 12, 2000.

Malen, B. (1985). Enacting competitive incentives for K-12 education tuition tax
concessions in Minnesota. *Journal of Education Finance, 11*, 1, 1-28.

Malen, B. (1987). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies.* John W. Kingdon.
Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1884. Essay review, *Educational
administrative quarterly, 23*, 96-106. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications,
Inc.

Malen, B. (2001). Generating interest in interest groups. In H. Mawhinney & C. Lugg
(Eds.), *The 2000 Politics of Education Association Special Issue on Interest
Groups in United States Education, Educational Policy, 15,* 168-186.

Malen, B. & Campbell, R. (1986). Public school reform in Utah: Enacting career
ladder legislation. In V. D. Mueller & M. P. McKeown (Eds.). *The fiscal,
legal, and political aspects of state reform of elementary and secondary
education* (pp. 245-275). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Marshall, C., Mitchell, D., & Wirt, F. (1986). The context of state–level policy
formation. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 8,* 4, 347-378.

Martinez, D. (2006). *Interest group goal formation: The response to charter schools
by NCLR and LULAC.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of
Pennsylvania

Maryland manual 1950: A guide to Maryland government. Annapolis, MD: State
Archives of the State of Maryland.

Maryland manual 1994-95: A guide to Maryland government. Annapolis, MD: State
Archives of the State of Maryland.

Maryland manual 1996-1997: A guide to Maryland government. Annapolis, MD:
State Archives of the State of Maryland.

Maryland manual 2001: A guide to Maryland government [CD version]. Annapolis,
MD: State Archives of Maryland.

Maryland manual 2001: A guide to Maryland government. Annapolis, MD: State
Archives of Maryland.

Maryland manual online. (2005). Retrieved March 13, 2005, from
http://www.msa.md.gov/msa/mdmanual/01glance/html/.

Maryland State Department of Education (2002). *Public school construction program, capital improvement program for FY02.* Baltimore.

Maryland State Department of Education (1998). *School accountability funding for excellence: Guidelines for developing the SAFE comprehensive plan and funding application, 1999-2002.* Baltimore.

Maryland State Department of Education. (1987). *Standards for school library media programs in Maryland.* Baltimore.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2000). *Standards for school library media programs in Maryland.* Baltimore.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2005). *State board.* http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/stateboard/Board_Members.htm. Accessed June 19, 2005.

Maryland schools: Who's paying? (1997, April 18) [Editorial] *The Washington Post.* Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Matysek, G. (2001, April 5). Textbook funding wins approval. *The Catholic Review*, p. 3.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1974). State policy making for the public schools of Minnesota: A comparative analysis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED090690).

Mazzoni, T. L (1982). Education interest groups and state school policymaking. *Planning and Changing, 13,* 3, 158-71.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1988). State policy making and public school choice in Minnesota: From confrontation to compromise. *Peabody journal of education, 63,* 4, 357-379.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1991a). Analyzing state school policymaking: An arena model. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 13,* 2, 115-138.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1991b). *A framework for political (power-influence) analysis of issue conflicts.* Unpublished manuscript. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1993). The changing politics of state education policy making: A 20-year Minnesota Perspective. *Education evaluation and policy analysis, 15,* 4, 357-379.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1994). State policy-making and school reform: influences and influentials. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.). *The study of educational politics. 1994 Commemorative yearbook of the politics of education association (1969-1994)* (pp. 53-73). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Mazzoni, T. L. & Campbell, R. F. (1976). Influentials in state policymaking for the public schools. *Educational administration quarterly*, *12,* 1, 1-26.

Mazzoni, T. L. & Clugston, R. M. (1987). Big business as a policy innovator in state school reform: A Minnesota case study. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 9*, 4, 312-324.

Mazzoni, T. L. & Malen, B. (1985). Mobilizing constituency pressure to influence state education policy making. *Educational administration quarterly, 21*, 2, pp. 91-116.

Mazzoni, T. L. & Sullivan, B. (1986). State government and educational reform in Minnesota. In V.D. Mueller & M. P. McKeown (Eds.). *The fiscal, legal, and political aspects of elementary and secondary education. Sixth annual yearbook of the American education finance association (1985)* (pp. 169-201). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

McLendon, M. K. (2003). Setting the governmental agenda for state decentralization of higher education. *The journal of higher education.*

Meltsner, A. J. (1972, November-December). Political feasibility and policy analysis. *Public administration review, 6*, 859-867.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Michie's Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland – Education, 1999. Charlottesville, VA: Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.

Mintrom, M. (2000). *Policy entrepreneurs and school choice.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Montgomery, L. (2000, April 5). Maryland budget passes with 10% increase; Glendening shaped $19.5 billion plan. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Morris, B. J. (1992). School library to media center. In *Administering the school library media center* (pp. 1-18). New Providence, NJ: R.R. Bowker.

Mosk, M. (2001, January 24). Glendening plans record budget; $1.5 billion proposal focuses on education, environment. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Murphy, J. T. (1980). *Getting the facts: A fieldwork guide for evaluators and policy analysts*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Nakashima, E. (1998, October 5). Pluses, minuses of Glendening's education policy series. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Nicholson, L. (2000, September 9). State of area's school libraries deserves more attention now. *The Star Democrat*. n.p.

Orr, M. (1999). *Black social capital: the politics of school reform in Baltimore, 1986-1998*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Orr, M. (2004). Baltimore: The limits of mayoral control. In Henig, J. R. & Rich, W. C. (Eds.), *Mayors in the middle: politics, race, and mayoral control of urban schools* (pp. 27-58. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pear, R. (2000, January 5). States gather big surpluses, benefit of a strong economy. *New York Times*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Assessing power in organizations. *Power in organizations*. Boston: Pitman Publishing.

Price, D. (1987, December 6). Pupils teach Glendening a lesson in reading. *Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved December 16, 2006, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly, 1867, v. 133, pp. 3414-3415. *Archives of Maryland Online*. Retrieved on March 6, 2004, from http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us.

Quantitative Resources, LLC. (2003). *Show-me connection: How school library media center services impact student achievement, 2002-2003*. Jefferson City, MO: Missouri State Library.

Rallying cry for school libraries [Editorial]. (2000, November 1). *Baltimore Sun*, p. 22A.

Reilly, T. (2000, September 18). State says county's school libraries are substandard. *Herald-Mail*. Retrieved September 19, 2000, from http://www.herald-mail.com.

Richard, A. (2001, September 12). Crossing party lines. *Education Week.* Retrieved June 21, 2005, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2001/09/12/02stjour.h21.html.

Roberts, N. C. & King, P. J. (1996). *Transforming public policy: Dynamics of policy entrepreneurs and innovation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rodney, M. J., Lance, K. C., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2003). *The impact of Michigan School Librarians on academic achievement: Kids who have libraries succeed.* Lansing, MI: Library of Michigan.

Rodney, M. J., Lance, K. C., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2002). *Make the connection: Quality school library media programs impact academic achievement in Iowa.* Bettendorf, IA: Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency.

Rohrer, J. & Liddell, L. (1997). *Structure of school finance in Maryland.* Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Department of Legislative Services.

Rosenthal, A. (1974). *Legislative performance in the states: explorations of committee behavior.* New York: Free Press.

Rosenthal, A. (1990). *Governors and legislators: contending powers.* Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Rosenthal, A. (2004). *Heavy lifting: The job of the American legislature.* Washington, D. C.: CQ Press.

Rosenthal, A. & Fuhrman, S. (1981). *Legislative education leadership in the states.* Washington, D. C.: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

School libraries deserve priority label [Editorial]. (2000, October 6). *Baltimore Sun*, 22A.

School libraries feel state funding losses. (2003, December) *American libraries, 34*, 11, 17.

School libraries work!: Research foundation paper. (2006). Danbury, CT: Scholastic Library Publishing, Inc.

Session Laws, 1860, v. 133, p. 517. *Archives of Maryland Online*. Retrieved March 6, 2004 from http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us.

Session Laws, 1902, v. 476, p. 347. *Archives of Maryland Online*. Retrieved March 6, 2004 from http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us.

Shawver, S. (2000, September 22). County commissioners may provide library funds. *Cumberland Times-News*, p. 1A.

Shin & Hill. Back to the basics on Thornton: Why it was needed and what it does, *Maryland policy reports*, 5, 1.

Shulman, L. S. (1988). Disciplines of inquiry in education. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.). *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 3-17). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Sinatra, Amy. (2000, February 7). Misinformation services: Nation's school libraries desperate for funding. *ABCNews.com.* Retrieved July 5, 2003, from http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/school_libraries000203.html.

Sipple, J. W. (1999). Institutional constraints on business involvement in K-12 education policy. *American educational research journal*, *36,* 3, 447-488.

Shilling, J. L. (1984). *The impact of legislative action by the State Board of Education on the governance of elementary-secondary education: the Maryland experience.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1984). Dissertations Abstracts International, 46 (02), 322A.

Smith, E. G. (2001). *Texas school libraries: Standards, resources, services, and students' performance.* Austin, TX: Texas State Library and Archives Commission.

Stapleton, K. R. (2002). *Urban education, the policy process, and the press: A case study on the relationship between the 'Baltimore Sun' and education policy in Baltimore, Maryland.* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 2002). Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (9), 3343A.

Stout, K. E. & Stevens, B. (2000). The case of the failed diversity rule: A multiple streams analysis, *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 22,* 341-355.

Stroble, R. E. (1975). *An analysis of the attitudes of selected educational and political leaders in the state of Maryland concerning key contemporary public elementary and secondary education issues.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1975).

Supplement to the Maryland Code, Containing the Acts of the General Assembly, Passed at the Session of 1870, v. 386, p. 145. *Archives of Maryland Online.* Retrieved March 6, 2004, from http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us.

Task Force Report on Education Funding Equity, Accountability, and Partnerships (January 1998). Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Department of Legislative Services.

Todd, R. J., Kulthau, C., & OLEMA. (2004). *Student learning through Ohio school libraries: The Ohio research study*. Columbus, OH: Ohio Educational Library Media Association.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000*. Retrieved April 2, 2005, from http://factfinder.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau (2003). *Table 456. State and local government employment and average earnings by state: 1993 and 2003*. Retrieved May 12, 2005, from http://www.census.gov/govs/www/apes.html.

Using technology in school libraries [Editorial]. (2001, January 14). *Baltimore Sun*, p. 2M.

A visionary school plan in Maryland [Editorial]. (2002, April 30). *New York Times*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

What's ahead for Governor Glendening [Editorial]? (1997, August 21). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

What's fair for Maryland schools [Editorial]? (1997, April 13). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Wheeler, T. (2000, December 13). Glendening to boost book subsidy. *Baltimore Sun*, p. 1B.

Wilson, S. (1998, February 10). Counties cautious in raising school spending. The Washington Post. Retrieved February 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.

Wirt, F. M. and Kirst, M. W. (1982). *Schools in conflict*. (2nd ed.). Berkley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Corporation.

Woliver, L. R. (2002). Ethical dilemmas in personal interviewing. *PSOnline* (pp. 677-678). Retrieved from www.apsanet.org/.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Sources of power and influence*: *Leadership in organizations*, (pp. 175-206). NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Zweizig, D. L. & Hopkins, D. M. (1999). *Lessons from library power*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.