Laboratory Schools: Stakeholders & Conceptions of Governance

David Bateman-Schieler

Florida State University

December 2021

Introduction

1. What *should* schools be for, and for whom?

2. Whose interests are served and whose *should* be served in a system of compulsory education?

3. What is the nature of the relationship between the interests of the individual, the community, the state, and society?

-- Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990, p. xi

These three questions, found in the preface of *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching*, quickly confront the political nature of education. The goal of this paper is not to examine the origin or individual nature of these questions in academic detail. Rather, this paper will examine the political nature of laboratory schools (as a unique form of chartered school) from the perspective of these questions: What should schools be for, and for whom? Whose interests are served and whose should be served? And, what is the nature of the stakeholder relationships? This paper will be guided by Ehrensal and First's (2008) application of Freeman and Reed's (1983) stakeholder theory within educational administration, as well as Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy's (2003) application of March and Olsen's (1989) conceptions of governance within the politics of education. The paper will begin with an overview of stakeholder theory in education and a brief discussion of laboratory and charter schools, before spending the majority of the pages presenting the politics of the questions as they relate to laboratory schools. Finally, the paper will conclude with my synthesized response/further discussion to the politics as presented. This final section will depart from the traditional academic structure and will only represent my own political views on the topic (as they stand at the time of writing this paper).

Stakeholder Theory

Whether the word is constituent, stakeholder, or interest group, the meaning can be interpreted synonymously as "any identifiable group of individuals who can affect the achievement of an organization's objectives or who is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives" (Freeman & Reed, 1983, p. 91, as cited in Ehrensal & First, 2008, p. 81). Ehrensal and First (2008) discuss the integrative role of school boards, in relation to the input of various stakeholders. Wirt and Kirst (2001) similarly position local school boards as the focusing/synthesizing intermediary between the educational administrators (superintendents and school staff including teachers) and the wider foray of interest groups. This integrative process, as described by Ehrensal and First (2008), Wirst and Kirst (2001), and Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003), reduces diverse opinions into an enforceable and executable objective. But even this seemly representationally straight-forward integrative approach to educational politics is not without detractors who favor an even more direct (yet often more arduous) democratic majoritarian aggregation. Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003) provide a full discussion of the paradigmatic division between integrative and aggregative politics that will be revisited as this paper continues, but the division is ultimately germinated by the same motivating factors that generate tension around the professionalization/deprofessionalization of teaching. Whether integratively or aggregatively approached, some educational stakeholders are: parents and parent-interest groups/associations, taxpayers and business-interest groups, voters and political parties, minority and special interest groups, teachers and teachers unions, students, state and federal policymakers, and external derivative groups such as local media/press, and the education institutional market (in the case of school choice).

Finally[1], it is important to note that the application of stakeholder theory, as done in this paper, is supported by Ehrensal and First (2008), who document the appropriate extension of stakeholder theory beyond the initial "who decides" to "who *should* decide" given their stake in a matter, "who has the *authority* to decide" given their resources, and "who *actually* decides" given their organizational/political power. The reverse construction of "what should schools be for, and for whom?", and "whose interests are served and whose should be served" is possible through investigating stake-in-the-matter claims, along with examining the nature of stakeholder relationships.

From Model School to Charter School

Thus far, this paper has introduced the topic of later discussion as 'laboratory schools (a unique form of charter school)'. This introduction, however, is lacking in the historical depth, carried by laboratory schools. In fact, the first laboratory schools were founded in the United States in the early 19th century – although, at the time they were known as "model schools" (Lamb, 1962). The unifying purpose of "model," "practice," "training," "experimental," and "laboratory" schools was the development of future teachers and the teaching profession (Cucchiara, 2010; Lamb, 1962). The rise and transition from model/practice/training school to experimental/laboratory school matched the rise of progressivism in education through the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century (Wirt & Kirst, 2001; Scribner, Aleman, & Maxcy, 2003; Cucchiara, 2010; see also, de Saxe, Bucknowitz, & Mahoney-Mosedale, 2020). While some laboratory schools are known as such today, they are also sometimes referred to as "professional development schools" or simply, "university schools." The University-ran school movement peaked between the 1960s and 1970s with over 200 university-operated schools, ranging from preschool/early childhood education to high school and secondary education

(Olwell, 2006; Sparks, 2015)[2]. Olwell (2006) suggests that recent increases in laboratory and professional development schools, "can be seen as a movement for schools of education to regain what they lost when they closed university-schools in the 1970s" (p. 5). According to Olwell (2006) "reasons given for closing vary, but folkways about their closing include costs, changing role of education schools, lack of distinctive curriculum, and the need for racial equity" (p. 1). Olwell later states, "the most cited reason for this wave of shutdowns (1960-1990) is fiscal" (p. 1). Cucchiara (2010) also implicated cumbersome and sometimes competing visions for university-schools.

On the heels of the waning university-school movement, a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst (Ray Budde, 1974) presented a research proposal to the Society for General Systems Research titled, "*Education by Charter*" (Kolderie, 2008). The proposal made little impact until Budde published *Education by Charter: Restructuring School Districts* in 1988 (Budde (1996) attributes his re-engagement in the earlier work to the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983). In the book, Budde "proposed that teams of teachers could be 'chartered' directly by a school board for a period of three to five years… no mention was made of the idea of chartering whole schools" (Budde, 1996, p. 72). This initial idea was quickly mentioned by then American Federation of Teachers (AFT) President Albert Shanker in both an address at the AFT national convention[3] and in a New York Times article, both in 1988 (Budde, 1996; Kolderie, 2008; Kahlenberg & Potter, 2014). Kolderie (2008), who heard the AFT address, took the idea to the Minnesota Citizens' League, which had been invested in education reform in Minnesota since the early 1970s. Over the next three years the Citizens' League worked tirelessly to build and lobby a caucus of Democratic-Farmer-Labor (DFL) state legislators and in 1991, Minnesota became the first state to enact charter school legislation

(Reichgott Junge, 2012; O'Conner, 2011). The legislation authorized the State Board of Education, in conjunction with local school boards, to open independent public charter schools. While Budde (1996) simply describes the resultant legislation as "pushed…in another direction," Kahlenberg and Potter (2014), Kolderie (2008), and Bulkley and Fisler (2003) all name that direction as 'freed from bureaucracy' and increasingly 'autonomous.' Within a decade of the founding of the first charter school, more than 2,400 schools had been chartered, educating more than half a million students annually in 34 states (Bulkley & Fisler, 2003), and within two decades more than 5,600 charter schools were educating more than 2 million students across the country (Reichgott Junge, 2012).

While laboratory schools and charter schools appear to be separate and distinct concepts, they are not. Ryan (2018) outlines four distinct ways that universities and colleges work with public charter schools: "There are:

1. Universities that operate as public charter school authorizers;

2. Universities that operate public charter schools;

3. Universities that design and implement a charter school 'model'; and,

4. Universities that provide higher education opportunities on their campuses in partnership with public charter schools" (para. 2).

And, to lend attention to a specific example of the political and policy interplay between laboratory schools and charter schools—In 1991 the Florida legislature passed the Sidney Martin Developmental Research School Act (FLA. STAT. § 1002.32), which redesignated the P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School (University of Florida Laboratory School) and three other laboratory schools in the state as "independent school districts of choice, providing state funding, and also opening them up to state and federal accountability" (Sparks, 2015). This

status as "independent school districts of choice" was later expanded beyond laboratory schools, when "Florida approved its first charter school law in 1996, and that year Liberty City Charter School in Miami became the state's first charter" (O'Conner, 2011, para. 13)[4]. Following with Ryan's (2018) analysis, between 1996 and 2020[5], universities wishing to sponsor laboratory schools proceeded in a similar manner as other charter-sponsoring organizations when applying for authorization through local districts. This changed however, with the June 6, 2021 passage of SB1028 (FLA. STAT. § 1002.33), when state universities and colleges gained charter authorizing capabilities (Solochek, 2019; FCSA, 2021)[6]. With the additional consideration of dual-enrollment opportunities available in some Florida secondary charter schools, via university-partnerships, all four forms of Ryan's (2018) university-charter relationships are present in Florida.

It should be clear that laboratory schools, first as model schools, then as practice and training schools, before becoming experimental, laboratory, and professional development schools, may have their own history separate from that of charter schools, but politically their tales have become interwoven as stakeholders have attempted to co-opt and promote their own visions of innovation, reform, and progress.

What *should* schools be for, and for whom?

It is not too much to speak on the structure of education, without naturally coming to ask: 'What is this for? And for whom?' Opinions on this differ from workforce development (FCSA, 2021; Smith, 2021) and inter-demographic equity/resource redistribution (Provinzano, Riley, Levine, & Grant, 2018; Cucchiara, 2010), to community development (Villarrreal & Rodriguez, 2011; Berryhill & Morgan, 2018; Myran, 2018) and democratic enculturation and renewal (Lynch & Badiali, 2019; Ehrensal & First, 2008; Bair, 1938). The existence of the Philosophy of

Education as a professionalized field of study further indicates the breadth of purpose contained within education as an institutionalized process. One contributing factor to this diversity in purpose may be the diversity of individuals and groups "affected by the achievement of (education's) objectives(s)" (Ehrensal & First, 2008)- especially when those objectives remain open to definition by the very groups perceiving their own affect. Said differently, the purpose of education is defined by the person or group who believes they are affected by it (the definition). If employers believe education affects the employability of future employees than workforce development becomes an employer defined purpose of education. If marginalized populations believe education has a positive effect on experiences of marginalization, then inter-demographic equity/resource redistribution becomes a purpose of education. This pattern continues for every self-defined/self-perceived stakeholder until all are included.

Bair (1938) provides helpful direction, on how political ideology may be used to administratively make sense of this plurality of stakeholders:

"(Educational) Administration, then may be thought of as concerned with two processes: the determination of a plan of action, and the execution of that plan. … the tendency of authoritarian societies is to exaggerate the importance of the executive process and to minimize the deliberative; that of democracies, to exaggerate the deliberative and to minimize the executive" (p. 182).

Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003) similarly discuss the ways in which educational administrators have made sense of stakeholder plurality- whether it be aggregative or integrative, as well as the specific philosophical and/or sociological paradigms they draw from. Notably, Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003) find several points of initial alignment with Bair (1938). Perhaps of greatest importance in the progress of this paper and its application of stakeholder

analysis, as enriched by Epstein's (1987) overlapping spheres of influence, Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003) share: "To the degree each group understands its own thought as central to advancing the field and essentially unassailable, the arguments will be unproductive and the field balkanized and stagnant."

Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003) do not deny the affect perceived by each potential stakeholder. However, it is the deliberative democratic ideal, outlined by Bair (1938), that Scribner, Aleman, and Maxcy (2003) emphasize when they describe a necessary degree of mature depersonalization of political affect[7], to arrive at a temporary solution to the integrative-aggregative dialectic. Wong (1994) describes the preference of some educationally significant stakeholders within this dialectic, placing special interests, unions, and educational professionals nearer the authoritarian and integrative end, while a lay majority, including parents, students, and non-educational employers/employees occupy the space nearer the deliberative and aggregative end.

In the case of contemporary laboratory schools many of the bureaucratic processes that undergird the deliberative democratic or aggregative approach are intentionally circumvented. Cucchiara culminated her 2010 article on the history of university-run schools by implicating present university-school administrators: "It is striking… that several of the universities mention that their school's charter status will enable them to sidestep such bureaucratic hurdles" (p. 104). This deliberate avoidance of aggregating institutions is celebrated as the leading hallmark of the broader charter school movement (which includes modern laboratory schools) by Bulkley and Fisler (2003). Here, we may answer our question: What *should* schools be for, and for whom? In the case of modern laboratory schools, controlling interest appears to lie with the school administrators, not the wider public[8]. These administrators enforce schools as sites of research

and development, where professional inquiry and expertise dominates lay opinion. Said differently, schools as laboratories fulfill the purposes of researchers, not students[9].

Whose interests are served and whose *should* be served?

Using the integrative-aggregative dialectic (Scribner, et al., 2003), Wong's (1994) placement of significant stakeholders along a similar political spectrum of ideology, as well as Ehrensal and First's (2008) application of stakeholder theory and analysis within educational administration, we may begin to see the forces at play which answer the question, "Whose interests are served, and whose *should* be served?" Already, just above, it has been suggested that modern laboratory schools' preference the interest of researchers, while downplaying the interests of students, parents, and other lay stakeholders, this section will dive further into those causes.

Beginning by returning to the first explicated list of stakeholders within this paper: 'parents and parent-interest groups/associations, taxpayers and business-interest groups, voters and political parties, minority and special interest groups, teachers and teachers unions, students, state and federal policymakers, and external derivative groups such as local media/press, and the education institutional market (in the case of school choice),'it can be confirmed, by direct knowledge of educational institutionalism in the United States, that the vast majority of stakeholders are not formally trained or experienced in the academic and professional field of teaching[10]. Thus, movement closer toward an aggregative political approach is also movement away from professionalized legitimacy (necessary for integrative rule; Scribner, et al., 2003). However, the aggregative political approach may bring with it democratic legitimacy[11].

In the case of majoritarian aggregatism: "schools belong to their communities" (Villarreal & Rodriguez, 2011, para. 1); "…schools and their communities are inextricably linked…"

(Myran, 2018, p. 126); and, "…effective [sic] school-family-community alliances can enhance student and school (and community) outcomes" (Berryhill & Morgan, 2018, p. 277). These may be hard statements to object to, but as previously stated, aggregation also works to delegitimize the teaching profession, including university professional development programs (English, 2003). And, related, when the lay and popular majority become co-opted by a narrowly integrative educational administrator, the teaching profession itself can be exposed to deprofessionalizing pressures (de Saxe, Bucknowitz, & Mahoney-Mosedale, 2020)[12]. The present diminished professional stature of teachers is most clearly drawn out when comparing their public resource allocation patterns to highly professionalized fields such as law or medicine. Not dissimilarly, teachers are expected to comply with somewhat capricious public referenda, and legislatively imposed curricula, whereas the judicial and medical fields operate more autonomously[13] from lay interference. Myran (2018) writes extensively about the negative effects of externally imposed forms of teaching, advocating instead for "placemaking that empowers the local educators to see themselves as co-constructors of new knowledge, re-contextualizing and re-presenting existing knowledge to discover for themselves what works in the local context" (p. 126).

While some may overrespond to this critique of democratic aggregation (including integrative co-optation of a lay majority) with a further assertion of the esoteric, artistic, or impossibly-so-professional (and thus, again, integrative) status of teaching – launching from Myran's (2018) identity-claim that teachers are epistemic agents through Watson, Buchanan, Hyman, & Seal's (1992) case study on teacher empowerment (the outline of a similar proposal can be found in Kahlenberg and Potter, 2014) – stakeholder theory requires such an overresponse to be seen as equally exclusive; Authoritarianism is, to the same degree, as objectifying to the

individual as majoritarianism. If, as suggested earlier, via Bair's (1938) democratic appeal, the goal of education contains an element of stakeholder subjectification, then the will of the individual (regardless of stakeholder group status) must be protected, from both dialectical extremes.

Villarreal and Rodriguez (2011) present a strong picture of a more ideal balance within stakeholder interests: "…a more inclusive community governance model where parents and students play four major roles:

- (1) as co-designers;

- (2) as partners and critical friends in the educational process;

- (3) as pro-active feedback providers; and

- (4) as gatekeepers and guardians of success" (para. 4).

Villarreal and Rodriguez's (2011) sentiment is echoed across much of the school-university-community-collaborative (SUCC) research (Smith, 2021a; Smith, 2021b; Berryhill & Morgan, 2018; Myran, 2018; Provinzano, et al., 2018). It is also featured within specific literature on laboratory schools; "laboratory schools can enhance the educational experience for students who attend by **working with** parents" (Erickson, Gray, Wesley, & Dunagan, 2012, p. 6, emphasis added). It is the necessity of simultaneously regarding the professionalized nature of education and its democratic process quality that appropriately confers dialectical status to the relationship between the integrative and aggregative political approaches.

With this balance outlined, the answer to this section's question: Whose interests are served and whose *should* be served?, is able to further grow from the answer arrived at in the previous section. Laboratory schools most directly serve the interests of the university, through research and development. However, this section has shown us that to accomplish this goal most

effectively, laboratory schools *should* dedicate some attention also to the interests of other

stakeholders (such as parents and community members at-large). Bair (1938) argued, "Are not

boards and superintendents responsible *to* public opinion, responsible, also, in considerable

degree, *for* public opinion -- that it shall be informed and maturely considered?" (p. 191);

Berryhill and Morgan (2018) by way of the Parent and Teacher Leadership Academies, enacted

Bair's (1938) argument:

> "The PTLA (Parent & Teacher Leadership Academies) partnership model is designed for
>
> parents and teachers to team together to support academic achievement, school climate,
>
> and/or family-school partnerships. The University's role in the PTLA is to provide the
>
> structure for educators and parents to develop effective relationships that focus on
>
> meeting their schools' needs" (Berryhill & Morgan, 2018, p. 270).[14]

What is the nature of stakeholder relationships?

As may be becoming clear, tension often exists between stakeholders, particularly when

they perceive themselves as having opposing interests (even if those interests are not factually

oppositional) (Wirt & Kirst, 2001). These moments of political tumult can have lasting effects on

the relationships between stakeholder groups. Conversely, environments can be created which

nurture interest convergence and leverage overlapping spheres of influence (Epstein, 1987). The

growing body of SUCC research literature serves to prove this concept; "[SUCC] partnership

clearly advances individual (Institutes of Higher Education [IHE], Community-Based

Organizations [CBO], and [community school]) interests, but more importantly it signifies the

collective power groups have to advance shared short and long-term goals for community

schools" (Provinzano, et al., 2018, p. 99).

However, with as many stakeholders as can be inclusively self-perceived as being affected (or affecting) self-defined educational objectives, only the most generalized statements regarding their relationships en masse can persist: "school politics is a complex web of [sic] relationships" (Berkman & Pultzer, 2013). More specifically, and with attention to laboratory schools, the dynamics of professionalized control, contrasted against charter-movement and charter-school politics, and a highly variable treatment of lay stakeholders, all come together and interact to create a relational context that is politically significant, yet often unaddressed. Lynch and Badiali (2019) illude to this contextual inattention, "Professional development schools and school-university partnerships started as a political ideology, yet a survey of the literature today leads one to believe that the movement appears apolitical" (p. 4). Wirt and Kirst (2001) describe the same willful mythologizing of an apolitical education. "Many professionals and parents would prefer to think of schools as 'apolitical,' having nothing to do with politics" (Wirt & Kirst, 2001, p. 29).

Unfortunately, the political nature of the charter school movement has grown fiercely antagonistic, particularly between charter-teachers and charter-administrators, and between charter schools more broadly and traditional public schools:

"Proposed to empower teachers, desegregate students, and allow innovation from which the traditional public schools could learn, many charter school instead prized management control, reduced teacher voice, further segregated students, and became competitors rather than allies, of regular schools" (Kahlenberg & Potter, 2014, para. 5).

Ted Kolderie, one of the first people to contribute to the charter school legislative lobbying efforts (begun in Minnesota in 1989), hinted at one long lasting seed of relational antagonism within the charter school movement; Kolderie (2008) opens his reflective article on the early

lobbying efforts with, "How this happened is an important story, interesting both as education policy and as a process of stem change -- a citizen organization working effectively for the common good in a field long dominated by experts" (p. 5). Kolderie discursively identifies the citizen organization as non-experts, while simultaneously asserting their greater familiarity with the common (majoritarian) good. Kolderie firmly positions the broader charter movement in the arena of lay choice and obligates the lay majority to defend that choice by delegitimizing the professionalism of teaching (the inference that change *from* a long domination by experts yielded "good").

Much of this is contrasted (or at least diminished) in laboratory-charter schools, where academic and educational expertise continues to serve as the prevailing interest. The latter half of this paper's previous section's answer, (whose interests *should* be served?), encouraged a more equitable balance in the relationship between integratively- and aggregatively-biased stakeholder groups. SUCC research literature was used to support this more equitable and ideal balance: "Community-based organizations (CBOs) and institutes of higher education (IHEs) see the local neighborhood school as the core institution for community engagement, and as such can provide them with resources to advance their coordinated work" (Provinzano, et al., 2018, p. 95); "…my collaborators and I sought to build authentic partnerships that involved all stakeholders…" (Myran, 2018, p. 107); and, "…partnerships to improve the P-20 system now incorporate business leaders and workforce groups, non-profit agencies, community leaders, and policy-makers…" (Smith, 2021, p. 126).

Whether modern laboratory schools are seen by stakeholders as being more-like a charter school or more like a historical model/ practice/ or training school is likely to have a significant influence on their perception of strife in their stakeholder relationships. Being able to accept a

laboratory school's status as neither and both is congruent with this paper's earlier appeal to the dialectic nature of the integrative and aggregative conceptualizations of governance. Further, the ability for educational administrators (in particular) to move freely within the relational context aligns well to the outcome of Ehrensal and First's (2008) application of stakeholder theory within educational politics:

> "Stakeholder theory, then repositions the school board in the school district organization. As the board is the entity charged with balancing various stakeholder interests, board roles and relationship would need to alter. Board members could no longer be the conduit of state policy and legislation" (p. 82).

Dedicating a party to the balance of stakeholder interests, to the maintenance of positive, working, political relationships, has additional support: "Having parents and community as partners and critical friends with educators requires recognition of the value and contributions of each stakeholder in making the education enterprise a success" (Villarreal & Rodriguez, 2011, para. 7); "Researchers consistently conclude that successful partnerships among educators, families, and community entities are vital for student success, enhancing school climate, and promoting parental school engagement across all geographic locations (Berryhill & Morgan, 2018, p. 262); and, "Boards of education, no less than professional school administrators, need to commit themselves, in their governing convictions, more far-sightedly to the democratic thesis, exercising their legally representative powers to enlarge the area of deliberately shared purposes in their communities" (p. 188). This final quote captures the necessity for educational administrators, including those within laboratory schools, to become and remain stewards of the political process of education.

Further Discussion

In summary, this paper has suggested that laboratory schools work (primarily) to advance the research and development interests of universities (specifically colleges of education and teacher preparatory programs); This mission is supported by recognizing (and supporting) the interests of various stakeholders; And finally, that this recognition is best made possible by assigning relational stewardship obligations to a balanced board of lay and professional educational administrators (school boards).

While the first response above (what are schools for?) is specific to laboratory schools, it is plausible that the second (whose interests should be served?) and third (what is the nature of the stakeholder relationships?) responses can be applied in different educational contexts. And while future literature could be reviewed to further explore this plausibility, my response, here, asks instead about the possibilities of expanding laboratory schools to the size of entire districts of super-district/regions, as well as the potential political affects such a decision might have. It may seem fantastical to suggest such an expansion, but the supportive SUCC research literature, as well as the growth of university-sponsored, -authorized, and/or -operated charter schools, including the entire Muncie Public School District by Ball State University in Indiana (Seltzer, 2018), reduce such apparent fantasticism. Given the (until recent) Florida statute that limited state university-sponsorship to one laboratory-charter school each (FLA STAT. § 1002.33), the greatest number of charter schools authorized by a single university outside of Florida may seem extreme – "As of January 2007… the largest (authorizer) was Central Michigan University, with 57 charter schools" (Bierlein Palmer, 2009).

Further, the expansion of charter schools through universities, and accompanied by adequately supportive and consolidated state bureaucratic services (Zinth, 2011)[15], could not

only meet the greatest present Outcomes-Based Typology of P-20 Partnerships (P-20 Partnerships to Improve Workforce Readiness; Smith, 2021b), but it could do so in a way that encouraged the establishment of a new Typology, P-20 Partnerships to Improve Democracy. By eliminating school boards, as they are presently known (Ehrensal & First, 2008), and replacing them with balanced boards of lay and professional members, and having those members be representative of key stakeholder groups, such as: teachers (unionized and not) (see also, Bair, p. 193; and, Watson, et al., 1992), district support staff (unionized and not), family/parent association leaders (and at large family members), community organization and business leaders, and students, broadly elected and responsive to their representative local electorate[16] – but authorized and legitimized by the university (or college), rather than the (consolidated) state board of education (Ehrensal & First, 2008)[17] (which would be the source of legitimacy of the university or college) – progress, or educational reform, may begin to be deliberated. It's important to hear within this response both pro-charter/aggregative inspiration and professional/integrative inspiration. As this paper has hoped to make clear, aggregative or integrative extremes will result only in reform stagnation.

The ultimate driving motivation- the best possible educational system (for and defined by all), maintained through incremental and research-informed, sustainable change- must always be kept in the political and policy foreground:

> "…no matter their scope, P-20 partnerships ultimately seek positive change along the P-20 spectrum, from pre-school to the workforce" (Smith, 2021, p. 126).

NOTES

[1]The word, "finally" may be incorrect, as a richer discussion of stakeholder theory and analysis is readily possible and likely advisable. One such point, yet unmentioned, are the ways Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1979), Epstein's (1987) overlapping spheres of influence, and Morris and McClurg Mueller's (1992) social movement theory, when applied to stakeholder theory, further describe the interrelationships and interactions between stakeholder groups.

[2]The first laboratory school opened in Florida in 1934 as the P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School (Sparks, 2015).

[3]Kahlenberg and Potter (2014) suggest that Shaker did not specifically refer to Budde's work or to the concept of 'charters' in his 1988 AFT convention address and that Shaker's first explicit public support for 'charters' was in the New York Times column.

[4]Liberty City Charter School's status as the 'first' charter school in the state of Florida (1996) is only true by way of excluding the laboratory schools, operating since 1934 and made "independent school districts of choice" in 1991, five years earlier.

[5]Briefly in 2006, the Florida state legislature established "the Florida Schools of Excellence Commission, a statewide independent charter board. School districts challenged the Commission's constitutionality. A lower court ruled that, indeed the Commission violated a constitutional provision… the ruling was never appeal. The Commission was dissolved before ever receiving a charter school application" (Zwara, 2020, para. 4; Solochek, 2019).

[6] SB1028, authorizes "state universities and Florida College System institutions to solicit applications and sponsor charter schools under certain circumstances" (2021), such as "to meet workforce demands" (FCSA, 2021).

[7]This concept is approximately related to Biesta's (2011) concept of 'maturity.' It is also (although less so), connected to this quote, "The crisis in America today is a crisis in the extension of freedom to include all the processes of our living" (Bair, 1938, p. 189), which negatively frames the positive conception of freedom (freedom to), with an inferred preference toward the negative conception of freedom (freedom from). For a fuller discussion on freedom/liberty, see Berlin (2002).

[8]The question at hand is admittedly, "What *should* education be for?" and this answer fails to meet the expected threshold of an adequate value judgement. Such a judgement can be found in the 'Reponse' section, later in the paper.

[9]Hopefully a keen reader will understand this as a blatant oversimplification for the sake of the argument being made. The truth of the matter could be expected to vary with contextual factors and would likely include an 'balance' that favors the integrative approach.

[10]Teaching is not education, nor is it learning. But for the sake of this paper teaching is used as the primary educational institution-condition for learning. For a more full discussion on these differences, see: Davis, 2004.

[11]There is a strong body of literature discussing the source of political legitimacy, particularly within direct and representative democracies. See: Pettit, 2012; Christiano, 2009; Estlund, 2009; and, Cohen, 1989.

[12]As a historically feminized profession, the integrative and patriarchically-dominanted scientific management movement of the early progressive era (Wirt & Kirst, 2001; Scribner, et al., 2003) delayed modern teaching professionalization (de Saxe, Bucknowitz, & Mahoney-Mosedale, 2020).

[13]'Autonomous' here is used to suggest separation from lay interference, whereas earlier it was used (with charter schools) to suggest separation from professional interference. The difference in use is significant.

[14] "Empowering parents to lead and train other groups of parents makes use of the cultural resources parents from different backgrounds bring into schools" (Provinzano, et al., 2018, p. 94).

[15] "The 2002 rewrite of the [Florida] education code created the K-20 Education Code. However, a successful 2002 constitutional amendment created the Board of Governors to oversee the State University System; these changes were codified in 2003 and subsequent legislation" (Zinth, 2011, para. 2).

[16] "A community governance structure assumes that the responsibility for education rests in shared accountability to ensure equity and excellence…" (Villarreal & Rodriguez, 2011, para. 11).

[17]"…these (SUCC Relationship) efforts were often overshadowed or negated by shifting local and state priorities, state sanctions and mandates, competing organizational norms/expectations" (Myran, 2018, p. 107).

REFERENCES

Berkman, M. B., & Plutzer, E. (2013). The Politics of Education. In V. H. Gray, R. L. Hanson, and T. Kousser (Eds), *Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis*, 375-404. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 10th edition.

Berlin, I. (2002). *Liberty.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bierlein Palmer, L. (2009). The Potential of 'Alternative' Charter School Authorizers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(4), 304-309.

Biesta, G. (2011). The Ignorant Citizen: Mouffe, Rancière, and the subject of democratic education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 30,* 14-153.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development.* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Budde, R. (1996) The Evolution of the Charter Concept. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(1), 72-73.

Bulkley, K., & Fisler, J. (2003). A Decade of Charter Schools: From theory to practice. *Educational Policy, 17*(3), 317-342.

Christiano, T. (2009). *The Constitution of Equality: Democratic authority and its limits*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, J. (1989). Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy. In A. Hamlin & P. Pettit (Eds.) *The Good Polity: Normative analysis of the state*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Cucchiara, M. (2010). New Goals, Familiar Challenges?: A brief history of university-run schools. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 96-108.

Davis, B. (2004). *Inventions of Teaching: A genealogy.* Milton Park, UK: Taylor & Francis.

de Saxe, J., Bucknowitz, S., & Mahoney-Mosedale, F. (2020). The Deprofessionalization of Educators: An intersectional analysis of neoliberalism and education 'reform.' *Education and Urban Society, 52*(1), 51-69.

Ehrensal, P. A. L., & First, P. F. (2008). Understanding School Board Politics: Balancing public voice and professional power. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (eds.) *Handbook of Education Politics and Policy.* New York, NY: Routledge; 73-88.

English, F. W. (2003). Cookie-Cutter Leaders for Cookie-Cutter Schools: The teleology of standardization and the de-legitimization of the university in educational leadership preparation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 2*(1), 27-46.

Epstein, J. L. (1987). Toward a Theory of Family-School Connections: Teacher practices and parent involvement. In K. Hurrelmann, F. Kaufman, and F. Loel (Eds.), *Social Intervention: Potential and Constraints (*pp. 121-136). New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.

Estlund, D. (2009). *Democratic Authority: A philosophical framework.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Florida Charter School Alliance [FCSA] (28 May 2021). 2021 Education Bill Expands Public Ed Choice. *Florida Charter School Alliance.*

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. A. (Eds.). (1990). *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kahlenberg, R. D. & Potter, H. (2014). Restoring Shanker's Vision for Charter Schools. *American Federation of Teachers.*

Kolderie, T. (2008 June). How the idea of 'chartering' schools came about: What role did the Citizens League play? *Minnesota Journal*, 5-6.

Lamb, P. M. (1962). The Laboratory School: A historical perspective. *The Journal of Educational Research, 56*(2), 107-109.

Morris, A. D. & McClurg Mueller, C. (1992). *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Myran, S. (2018). Too Many Cooks in the Kitchen: Struggling for voice and sense of place in a rural school-university-community collaboration. In R. M. Reardon & J. Leonard (eds.) *Innovation and Implementation in Rural Places: School-university-community collaboration in education.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, pp. 107-131.

O'Conner, J. (28 September 2011). From Minnesota to Miami: The history of Florida charter schools. *StateImpact Florida.*

Olwell, R. B. (2006). The Closing of Laboratory Schools and the Changing Role of University Schools of Education: The case of the University of Michigan. *American Educational History Journal, 33*(2), 1-6.

Pettit, P. (2012). *On the People's Terms: A republican theory and model of democracy.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Provinzano, K., Riley, R., Levine, B., & Grant, A. (2018). Community Schools and the Role of University-School-Community Collaboration. *Metropolitan Universities, 29*(2).

Reichgott Junge, E. (11 June 2012). Reclaiming the Origins of Chartered Schools. *Education Week.*

Ryan, T. (2018 September 21). Collaborators: How universities and colleges work with public charter schools. *Idaho Ed News.*

Scribner, J. D., Aleman, E., & Maxcy, B. (2003). Emergence of the Politics of Education Field: Making sense of the messy center. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(1), 10-40.

Seltzer, R. (8 March 2018). A University-run School District? *Inside Higher Ed.*

Smith, E. E. (2021a). Categorizing P-20 Partnerships, In E. E. Smith (ed.) *P-20 Partnerships: A Critical Examination of the Past and the Future,* Minneapolis, MN: Lexington Books, pp. 103-116.

Smith, E. E. (2021b). The Outcomes-Based Typology of P-20 Partnerships, In E. E. Smith (ed.) *P-20 Partnerships: A Critical Examination of the Past and the Future,* Minneapolis, MN: Lexington Books, pp. 117-126.

Solochek, J. S. (25 April 2019). Florida House Okays Universities, Colleges as Charter School Authorizers. *Tampa Bay Times.*

Sparks, S. D. (2015 February 24) Amid Changing Landscape, Lab schools search for new roles. *Education Week.*

Villarreal, R. & Rodriguez, R. G. (2011 March). Expanding School Governance through Participatory Community Engagement. *IDRA Newsletter.*

Watson, A., Buchanan, M., Hyman, H., & Seal, K. (1992 February). A Lab-School Explores Self-Governance. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 57-60.

Wirt, F. M. & Kirst, M. W. (2001). *The Political Dynamics of American Education* (2nd Ed.). Richmond, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 29-62.

Zinth, J. D. (2011). P-20 Governance. *Education Commission of the States*.

Zwara, J. (24 February 2020). At Last? Will Florida finally get more charter school authorizing options? *National Association of Charter School Authorizers.*