

Implications of School of Choice in Michigan

Submitted by

Jaclyn Sadler

Elementary Education

To

The Honors College

Oakland University

In partial fulfillment of the
Requirement to graduate from
The Honors College

Mentor: Dr. Danielle Ligocki

Teacher Development and Education Studies

Oakland University

November 22, 2019

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Abstract	3
Introduction	4
Funding	7
The Market System and Districts' Responses	9
Changing Populations	14
Implications for Districts, Families and Students	19
Conclusion	23
References	25

Abstract

Michigan's school of choice practice is an evolving system. This literature review analyzes the policies involved in Michigan's school of choice and the factors that affect the systemic effects of school of choice. School of choice gives families the opportunity to find more fitting education options for their students beyond their designated public school. However, not every student can feasibly and logistically participate in these choice policies. School of choice has become a very polarizing topic because of the differences between the intended outcomes and the actual outcomes. Since the change in Michigan laws that began school of choice, there have been many unintended consequences for students, families, schools, and the education system. This literature review has compiled these implications to show the trends that have resulted from school of choice in Michigan.

Introduction

School of choice has risen to the forefront of education reform and debate, so it is important to understand the purpose of implementing school of choice, as well as the unintended consequences of its policies. School of choice was created in the early 90s by Michigan's former governor, John Engler, and the state legislature to shift the way that public schools are funded and to give students and families more choices in their schooling options. The policymakers intend to provide alternatives for families to better meet their needs. Choice is also meant to create healthy competition among schools and to give them an incentive to improve.

After Michigan's major school-funding reform in 1994, the majority of school funding dramatically changed so that the funding schools receive is per-pupil and tied to each individual student, no matter what school they attend. Schools are pressured by the market system to compete for per-pupil state funding, so this may lead them to improve because when students leave their home district they take the money with them. The "father of school of choice," Dr. Milton Friedman promoted the idea that "tax dollars should stay with the student, parents should be able to shop competitively for an appropriate school for their child, and market forces and competition will have a positive effect on public schools," (Simonton-Kramer, 2007, p. 3). Public school choice provides options but these options are unequally distributed. They are shaped by racial issues, geographic distance, policy barriers, and the choices parents make to move their students to "more successful" schools. All of these issues may be exacerbating existing disparities in schools.

School of choice was created with the intention of creating greater accountability of the schools to the public and increase parental involvement (Simonton-Kramer, 2007, p. 4).

Proponents of school choice intend for the parents who are more involved to go through the process of moving their students to a school that they desire and be more involved in those schools. However, studies show that less educated and lower income parents are less likely to exercise choice while households with higher levels of income, parental education, and student achievement are more likely to exercise choice (Glazerman & Dotter, 2017). These factors combined are intended to then allow schools to benefit from this parental support and conversely allow the poorly performing schools to be more easily identified. Parental involvement and choice can also create more varieties in mission and focus of schools, providing incentives for schools to reach out to the community and develop new programs that would potentially draw in more students. On the other hand, flight from schools perceived to be “lesser than” can cause increasing disparities between districts, as already poorer districts face a downward spiral in funding, leading to a decrease in program effectiveness which exacerbates the cycle. The threat of losing students can inspire districts to make positive changes to attract more students to their school and thus more funding, but it can also motivate schools to not provide more expensive programs such as special education. If a school is already struggling and losing funding, it is hard for them to continue to budget out money for students that require more resources and additional aides, as these take away from their already limited funding. In addition, choice is constrained by the fact that parents have to be informed consumers, so schools may not publicize information about the rights that parents have to transfer their student.

In 1993, Michigan Governor John Engler called public education a “monopoly” and asserted that “monopolies do not work,” (Simonton-Kramer p. 4). Choice is built upon the hope that parents will choose the better quality schools for their children. School of choice is affecting

a growing number of students and districts: as of 2002 over 83% of Michigan schools participated in school of choice programs. Policymakers use the rules that govern choice to theoretically promote individual freedom and also to nudge choosers into choosing socially desirable outcomes such as social integration and improved economic performance. The different reasons that parents choose one school over another affect the architecture of policies surrounding school of choice. The market-based competition of choice leads schools to have more of the amenities that parents are drawn to, whether the choice is based on convenience, academic performance, peer group or other reasons.

This thesis is a literature review of the current climate of school of choice in Michigan and the implications of choice that were not intended. School of choice was implemented to completely revamp the funding of Michigan public schools which were formerly funded completely by property tax. The funding change was created with the intention of balancing the discrepancies between districts with wide disparities in property taxes. School of choice also would allow parents to choose schools that they want their child to attend based on factors such as convenience, peers, and academic performance. As Michigan's education population shifts, the factors surrounding and shaping choice need to be analyzed so that causes and unintended effects can be disentangled and addressed.

Funding

Under Governor John Engler, Michigan public schools were changed dramatically in the 1990s when the primary funding based on property taxes was cut. This system of funding based on property taxes created frustration over the dramatic inequities in school funding. Schools with high-value property and large businesses could afford to spend a lot on schools while those without could not (Goenner, 2012). These disparities ranged from \$2,000 to \$11, 00 per student. For years, state officials struggled to come up with a solution for the apparent problem that rich schools were getting richer while poorer schools were getting poorer. In 1993, the rural Michigan district of Kalkaska made national headlines by going broke and closing their schools two months before the year was supposed to end. This led Engler to the dramatic step of proposing a 20% cut in the state's property taxes without a way to make up the lost revenue. Democrats opposed this, but one democrat, then state senator Debbie Stabenow, proposed a 100% cut to the property tax. This may have been an attempt to show how ridiculous the tax cut was without specifying new revenues, but it was approved in both the Senate and the House and signed in by the governor. Within a day, the state had eliminated \$6.5 billion in school taxes with no other way to finance schools. This manufactured crisis led to the education system we have today. Government officials used this crisis to create school choice in Michigan and proposed to voters Proposal A.

The abolishment of funding schools with property taxes, a perpetually 'haves versus haves-not system', forced everyone to the education reform table. Engler believed that choice and competition could change the education system and could benefit the education system by creating an outside force that would lead to enhancements. Engler and State Treasurer Doug

Roberts and their team developed the constitutional amendment that would immediately increase sales tax by two cents, permanently eliminate local school operating taxes for all but 35 school districts, earmark all existing and K through 12 revenues to the School Aid Fund, including the lottery, and abolish the State Tax Commission and reform the State Board of Education (Goenner, 2012). On March 15, 1994, Michigan voters passed Proposal A in a 3 to 1 vote. This new education finance system facilitated the development of the state's school choice programs (Ni & Arsen, 2011). Now the only way for schools to increase their revenue is to attract more students, but would this shift in funding lead to enough competition to force Michigan's public educational system to change and if these changes would be improvements?

Engler's creation of portable per student foundation grants gave parents the power to choose their students' schools, not just the false dichotomy of choice between public and private schools, but between public schools themselves. Engler's idea of a minimum foundation grant for each child would also give districts the power to concentrate on teaching instead of worrying about fighting the next millage battle. In his October 5, 1993 speech in front of a joint session, Engler said, "schools will be freed up to concentrate on the only campaign that matters in this state and that is making Michigan children number one," (Michigan State Education, 1993). These per student grants created an immense value on student enrollment populations because school districts depend on this state funding which currently ranges from \$7,000 to nearly \$12,000 per pupil. Enrollment is counted twice each school year. The early October fall count represents 90 percent of state funding for districts (Hopkins, 2014). Districts now earn almost all their discretionary operational revenues in the form of per-pupil foundational grants.

The Market System and Districts' Responses

Reformers have opened up competition through school of choice in the hopes of making education a more consumer-oriented experience. They hope that school of choice can release districts from the burden of bureaucracy and monopoly (Ni, 2009). Under the new funding laws, the finances and survival of school districts relies on their ability to attract and retain students. Since 1994, nearly all of the operating budget for school districts comes from per-pupil funding, so the only way for schools to increase their revenue is to attract more students. This finance system creates the ideal competitive market for schools in Michigan and a zero-sum game where when one school gains a student another loses. When students choose a school or leave a school they are sending “market” signals about these schools and districts.

Districts then, in the hope of increasing their funding, respond in different ways to these market signals within education. Some districts have made agreements with one another in the hope of limiting the impact of choice. Some districts work together so that they are not in competition with one another but share a common competing district or work together to form different niche schools that can target specific audiences so that individual schools are not all competing with one another. Others though have entered into vigorous competition with one another for students. Under the market system of education, the idea of “the public” is reconfigured so that instead of trying to spread efforts across the whole state, schools are focused instead on the immediate consumer and their needs. When public schools have to worry about meeting the needs of the public as a whole, which is made up of voters, parents, unions, state regulators, competing interest groups, associations, and more, they often incur conflicts. But instead by streamlining the relationship to consumer-provider, the market system allows schools

to focus on their students' needs. This hopefully leads to less corruption and manipulation from outside forces. The market system then also calls for the consumer, the student, to be able to choose the type of school that best meets their individual needs. Students then sort themselves into defacto clusters with similar common interests and preferences that can then be served more effectively by their school. This dynamic also incentivizes schools to differentiate and form unique missions that will draw students to their school. Instead of being able to rely on their captive resident students, they have to compete for students (Lubienski, 2005a).

Under Michigan's interdistrict choice plan, schools cannot prevent resident students from leaving and enrolling in other districts, but it does allow them to decide whether they want to accept nonresident students or not. Students within metropolitan areas are more likely to participate in choice, but within these areas participation decreases as community income and housing values increase. Some of these districts have opted out of interdistrict choice for fear of attracting students that would alter their schools' racial or class composition and then possibly upset the district residents. Districts can also adopt their own policies regarding choice. They typically deal with placing limits on the number of students who may enter or leave a district within the county. These kinds of collusive policies lead to fewer students enrolling in neighboring school districts and protects vulnerable school districts like Grand Rapids and Flint from extreme loses of students and revenues (Arsen, Plank, & Sykes, 2001).

For most districts the heterogeneous interests of local schools preclude collusive responses to school of choice policies. Districts have thus adopted many different strategies to take advantage of their individual position in the competitive market economy of school choice. Many districts are actively seeking out and attempting to attract students from neighboring

districts. Mid-size Michigan cities like Saginaw, Jackson, Pontiac, Adrian, Inkster, Ecorse, and Hillsdale have all experienced substantial enrollment and revenues losses to neighboring higher-income districts (Arsen, Plank, & Sykes, 2001). Many schools are investing in their marketing to attract new students and revenue. Detroit, home of the largest school district in the state, lost over 10 percent of their students in five years. These students represented a significant amount of their funding and in the hope of stopping that hemorrhaging, district officials committed \$1.5 million to public relations and marketing. Surrounding suburbs are also adopting different marketing strategies based on their geographic, demographic, and market positions. Both Southfield and Royal Oak were feeling the effects of declining enrollment. Both of these districts launched marketing campaigns to attract additional students costing approximately \$100,000 a year each (Lubienski, 2005a). Lansing School District lost ten percent of its student body in the early 2000s and launched a \$120,000 marketing campaign. In contrast a more affluent district that encompasses part of Lansing spent only \$500 on marketing and attracted an additional 308 open enrollment students. The type of information in these advertisements shows what districts assume affects parent and student choice. Almost none of these ads include information on school effectiveness; instead they mainly promote safety considerations, convenience, peers, and extracurricular activities (Lubienski, 2005b). Showing he perceived deciding factors of families determining where to enroll their students in school.

Some schools compete for students by developing innovations geared toward particular types of needs. There is a trend of schools targeting more preferred students because the market-like competition has created not only a hierarchy of schools but a ranking of types of students as well. Districts are effectively ignoring the potentially lucrative groups of students

from failing schools. The incentives districts are responding to here are different from the ones envisioned by the choice reformers. Even though choices have been opened up due to district policies and preferential selection, these choices are less available for students in economically disadvantaged backgrounds and students of color (Lubienski, 2005b). Districts are incentivized to avoid students that are perceived to be risky, costly, or detrimental to their market position. Schools want to attract “better” students to improve their overall quality and test scores.

Vouchers are certificates of government funding that a student receives to use at a school of their choice and grants are given to schools based on the number of recognized students enrolled. And so public schools governed under vouchers, capitation grants, or charters become the domain of the non-choosers and the unchosen, and like public hospitals, they catch the overflow.

Many districts decided that the best way to compete for funding was to spend money on building, renovating and expanding school buildings. In the year following the school funding reform, districts competed in a sort of race to build bigger, better, and newer capital assets that would attract pupils. Central city districts are at a disadvantage in this competition because they lack the space to build that their surrounding growing suburb districts have. These city districts also have to deal with property values, often at a fraction of the wealthiest suburban districts and school millage rates are often much higher. Schools are constantly trying to keep up with one another and outdo each other, creating an inflation in the cost of building new schools as well as total space available for housing student bodies. In this competitive market, schools have no choice but to join in the school construction or they will pay for it in the long run, when families and residential developments choose locations with the best schools (Militello, Metzger, & Bowers, 2008).

Research has shown however that most schools - since the inception of choice - have not implemented or increased their innovative activities in the classroom. In fact, the actual practices in these classrooms are resilient. The teachers are tending toward the familiar and in many cases even employ a reemergence of traditional instructional practices. While there is this unexpected lack of innovation at the core of education, researchers noted a high degree of innovation in areas such as marketing. So while schools may not be doing much to improve their teaching of their students, they are working hard to improve the way they attract their students. This shows that choice may be leading to marketing and advertising, instead of true instructional and systemic innovations.

Changing Populations

The opportunity to choose where to live affords students and families the opportunity to “choose” the school their children attend. However, residential mobility is an opportunity only truly open to the middle class and affluent. Because these parents have the means to move into the higher performing districts that they favor. This is a privilege and opportunity they often take for granted (Brasington & Hite, 2014). The differences in the ability of residents to choose their housing has led to a high degree of racial and income segregation in public schools. The school of choice system should then - in theory - allow students and families to choose a school, even if they cannot reasonably live in the area of that district.

Attending a school of choice can be beneficial for students socially and academically; it has been shown to increase the likelihood that a student will graduate and enroll in college, and be especially beneficial for minority students living in urban areas (West, 2016). The rate of participation in school of choice increases significantly in districts with higher per pupil expenditures but enrollment does not appear to be tied to how districts allocate funds or their instructional operations. Students are also more likely to leave their home district when the district enrolls a high concentration of low-income students. Families are also leaving larger enrollment districts, possibly in preference of smaller and more intimate districts that can be more responsive to their student’s needs. Choice students also move to districts with lower numbers of special education students. Statewide, choice students move to districts with 9.5 percent fewer African American students than their home district and in central city and low-income suburban districts the percentage increases to 39.2 and 30.9 percent lower (Ni & Arsen, 2011). Students are also moving to districts with slightly higher standardized state test

scores. Additionally, students are moving to districts that are academically more efficient when the socioeconomic differences between districts is smaller.

The strategic responses to school of choice are shaped by the five factors of socioeconomic status, socioeconomic diversity, school district enrollment size, population density, and population growth. Throughout Michigan there are many economically and socially diverse districts. These factors combine to create push and pull factors that lead families and students to participate in school of choice. Oakland County is one of the wealthiest counties in America. It also contains a very diverse race-class dynamic from northwest Detroit through increasingly middle-class Southfield and Oak Park neighborhoods, across wealthy and predominantly white enclaves such as Birmingham and Bloomfield Hills, and into the smaller urban area of Pontiac. Pontiac, Southfield, Oak Park, and Detroit are all districts that have lost students while Royal Oak and Berkley are among the ones to have gained. Despite losing over 3,000 students, few options are legally available because northern districts consistently limit access only to students in their county and those that do offer open enrollment do not provide transportation for out-of-district students, making choice unrealistic for many students and their families. Some affluent and prestigious districts such as Birmingham and Bloomfield Hills do not participate in the publicly-funded choice program but instead require interested students to undergo a selection process and if chosen pay the \$11-12,000 per year themselves (Lubienski, 2005). These district policies make it extremely unrealistic for families and students of low-income backgrounds to exercise any choice in their education.

Families that have sufficient resources are able to take advantage of school of choice policies. They are able to buy housing in new more affluent suburban developments as well as

provide transportation for their children to nearby districts. In the Lansing School District, enrollment dropped from 22,000 in 1987 to 16,780 by 2004. The demographics of Lansing have shifted in the period from about 60% White to 40%, suggesting that the white flight phenomenon might explain this downward enrollment. The majority of these students leaving Lansing are going to neighboring suburban districts which are benefiting from the plight of the Lansing District. Research shows that 32% of past parents reported switching their children in search of a better education and 20% for a safer environment. Another interesting statistic is that past parents tend to have higher education levels, with 38% having at least a college degree compared to 25% of parents of current students. These past parents also had higher income levels. The nearby suburban district of Holt has been one of the biggest winners in the school of choice system, attracting many new students from the Lansing District. Holt District Superintendent Tom Davis said “we’re able to take the best children from Lansing [...] We’re getting great kids, we’re getting funding for those kids, the tax dollars are coming right out of Lansing to here, and we’re able to at least stay stable instead of decline,” (Militello, Metzger, & Bowers, 2008, p. 46). For now, this influx of urban children is able to help keep suburban districts afloat, but it is not a permanent life line for them, as they will soon be facing the financial problems the districts like Lansing are currently experiencing as costs are rising faster than state funding.

Many choice programs are taking the students that represent the cream of the crop financially and leaving behind the more costly students. As school of choice grew, many experts were worried that it would result in schools refining their student bodies to the best students academically and with the most involved parents, but instead districts seem to be attracting students based on the cost to educate them. Because the state pays them the same amount for

each student, it is more cost efficient to enroll students that require less resources. Special education students experience difficult challenges when participating in school of choice to navigate Michigan's laws about choice and special education laws, as well as overcoming special education funding limitations. The constraints on funding interfere with the ability for students with special needs to participate in school of choice and disincentivize districts from welcoming these costlier students into their schools. A nonresident school does not have a duty to provide special education services, and under IDEA and Michigan's own statutes, the home district only has to provide special education programs when the student is within that district. The cost of supplemental services that a special education child requires and the source of that funding creates issues that prevent special education students from genuinely having the ability to exercise choice. Michigan's School of Choice Act requires districts to create written agreements on the cost of education for the student and needed special education services but there is no requirement that the school districts actually reach an agreement before the child is enrolled (Simonton-Kramer, 2007). This leads to the exclusion of special education students from participating in choice from constraints inherent in Michigan's special education funding process, where special education students have to give up their right to a free and appropriate education if they want to participate in choice.

Since the inception of school of choice families and students have been navigating these new policies to try to get the best education for their students. Many families seem to be incentivized to move districts for social reasons such as demographics and number of students enrolled. But some of the school of choice policies make it fundamentally onerous for certain groups to exercise their choice. Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds

experience difficulties in many of the logistics that are required to exercise choice. It is also challenging for students with special needs to transfer out of their home district and still receive the services that they need in order to receive an appropriate education. Districts tend to not enroll students that are more costly and require special services. This means that certain districts are continually losing students that are able to leave and go to districts that are more desired, but this is not true for all families.

Implications for Districts, Families and Students

When policies such as school of choice become so widely and heavily debated, they easily become black and white issues. Encouraging both sides to maintain single-minded positions, either the policies are good or they are bad. But whether the policies are good or bad depends a great deal on the local context in which the policies are implemented as well as the rules and incentives that govern choices of parents and school districts (Arsen, Plank, & Sykes, 2001). When topics such as this become so polarizing, the efforts of those who wish to reform and better these policies are greatly hindered. Those who argue for or against often get caught up in the jargon of the debate and trying to make their point heard louder instead of listening to the other side and coming together in the middle to see the positives that should be preserved, as well as what needs to be changed for the common good. It is also hard for those in the community to get unbiased information about these school of choice policies when everywhere they go for information has a strong stance and invested interest in the debate. Families and students as well as school districts are making life changing decisions based on the information they are able to procure and so they deserve to have all the information about these policies and their rights.

The funding of public schools in Michigan changed drastically in the 1990s and the far reaching effects are still being uncovered. Some argue that the market-like incentives that drive an economy are corrupted when applied to schooling, because public education is a quasi-public good, so the incentives that reformers had intended to drive school improvement fail. The theory of public choice is centered on self-interest of the individual. It is hard for bureaucrats and politicians to suddenly and unnaturally lose this motivation when in the public realm. This often

leads bureaucracies to do a poor job of looking after public interest (Lubienski, 2005a). Because it is easy for them to reorient toward their own interests and to be susceptible to influence by other large groups that can sway their decisions such as special interest groups in educational policy making.

The market-based school reform can arguably also undermine the very concept of school as a common good. The opportunity for choice in practice is not encouraging citizens to make their voice heard, to draw attention and call for action to improve dysfunctional schools as some had hoped. Instead, the most privileged citizens are utilizing their ability to choose to find the most advantageous schools for themselves. So instead of aiding in the identification and improvement of less successful schools “choice systems could lead to less equity and greater racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic stratification,” (Militello, Metzger, & Bowers, 2008, p. 31-32). As those who are experiencing certain privileges use these privileges to further improve their position and secure an education that they deem more advantageous for their students. At the same time other students who are at a disadvantage are unable to exercise choice or are limited in their choice for various reasons and circumstances. Similarly, schools that are already thriving are able to continue to make advancements. They are shown to draw in more students for increased funding and continued growth. While failing schools continue to lose students and funding and therefore their ability to make any improvements.

School districts, students, and families are trying to make high stakes decisions often based on the limited information that is available to them. This is extremely important because the very term “choice” is mediated by the knowledge of parents to be informed consumers. Districts are now in competition with each other for students as a matter of survival. They are

using everything they can to attract new students and retain the ones that they have. This includes building new and updating existing school buildings, creating new programs to entice specific demographics, as well as general ad campaigns. But these all cost money, putting limitations on schools that are already suffering to try and improve and allowing districts that are doing well to grow and widen the gap between them. It is not inherently true that choice will lead to districts increasing their quality of services. Many wealthy suburban districts are surrounded by districts that are not equipped to pose any real competitive threat and in rural areas the potential market for schooling is too narrow to support any new entrants. So these schools can continue doing basically the same thing they have always been doing and continue to have a steady number of enrolling students. However, there are some districts like Lansing - who after experiencing years of decline - developed new initiatives that have been able to draw in new students and produce stable enrollments and budgets. Other Michigan urban districts have not been so lucky, however and the overwhelming burden of choice policies has led to an accelerated decline. Unable to respond to the influences of the market system, the conditions of districts like the Detroit Public Schools have become even bleaker (Arsen, Plank, & Sykes, 2001). This shows the market system is not helping to improve the opportunities for the students that are economically disadvantaged and if policy makers aim to enhance their status they must develop new strategies for these schools.

Some promising patterns have been shown to come from students that have exercised their ability to choose their school. This is predominantly true with urban minority students. Attending a school of choice for students living in urban areas has been found to benefit them academically with both test score gains as well as being far less likely to drop out of school than

their peers who did not participate in school of choice. As well as in some instances creating higher levels of “social capital” in schools with more tight-knit communities that students are choosing to go to. But the efforts of legislatures to litigate educational opportunities and to entice districts to provide more equitable opportunities through market-like competition appears to have failed. Districts are responding to these incentives in ways that protect their own positions by targeting particular types of students and therefore limiting the opportunities of others, namely students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, minorities and students with special needs. So the districts that show improvements in academic performance may be a result of attracting “better” students and not necessarily because they do a better job of educating students.

Conclusion

The students and families that are able to exercise their choice seem to have no long term identifiable negative effects and the districts that are gaining students are benefiting from their increased revenue - at least for the time being. But the problem is that not every family has the opportunity to utilize the school of choice program. There are significant barriers in the way that include lack of knowledge, acquired expenses, and logistics that stand in the way of many children being able to choose a school that would be most beneficial for them. And what happens to these districts that suddenly lose hundreds of students and thousands of dollars in funding? The schooling system is an incredibly complex bureaucratic machine. When combined with the laws of a free market, the idea of free education for all children can be corrupted and we see the system break apart. It is also not clear if schools have to actually improve their quality of education services in order to survive the emerging market for schooling. So it is important to examine all of the implications of school of choice - whether they were intended or not -- and how they are affecting families, students, districts, and the education system as a whole.

Michigan schools were developed to provide an equitable education for all students, but economic incentive and politics can create a dynamic that inhibits this. School of choice in Michigan is not something that will easily go away, so those involved in and surrounding the issue must move past the debate of whether school of choice is good or bad and onto what about these policies works and what mechanisms need to be modified. One thing that is certain by looking at school of choice across the country: the rules matter and different rules create different incentives and different outcomes (Lewin, 1999).

The five dimensions of local context which are socioeconomic status, socioeconomic diversity, school district enrollment size, population diversity, and population growth are also very important factors that impact the outcome of choice policies. The response to choice policies also varies depending on how school accountability is measured on how much weight individual systems such as market forces and standards are given. Therefore the systemic effect of school of choice depends on the interaction between the fundamental policies and the features of the local ecology and these factors need to be understood and addressed in order to create a better system of choice for districts and all students and families.

References

- Arsen, D., Plank, D. N., & Sykes, G. (2001). A work in progress: Michigan's potent combination of interdistrict choice and charter schooling is forcing traditional public schools to take notice. whether they respond is often a different story. *Education Next*, 1(4), 14.
- Brasington, D. M., & Hite, D. (2014). School choice: supporters and opponents. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 32(1), 76+.
- Glazerman, S., & Dotter, D. (2017). Market signals: Evidence on the determinants and consequences of school choice from a citywide lottery. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39(4), 593-619. 10.3102/0162373717702964
- Goenner, J. N. (2012). The origination of Michigan's charter school policy: An historical analysis. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection database.
- Hopkins, C. (2014, October 19). Oakland County student enrollment reflect district changes, choice. *The Oakland Press*.
- Lewin, B. T. (1999). In Michigan, school choice weeds out costlier students. *New York Times* (1923-Current File)
- Lubienski, C. (2005). Public schools in marketized environments: Shifting incentives and unintended consequences of Competition-Based educational reforms. *American Journal of Education*, 111(4), 464-486. 10.1086/431180
- Lubienski, C. (2005). School choice as a civil right: District responses to competition and equal educational opportunity. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 38(4), 331-341.

Militello, M., Metzger, S. A., & Bowers, A. J. (2008). The high school "space race":

Implications of a school-choice market environment for a michigan metropolitan region.

Education and Urban Society, 41(1), 26-54.

Ni, Y., & Arsen, D. (2011). School choice participation rates: Which districts are pressured?

Education Policy Analysis Archives, 19(29), 29.

Ni, Y. (2009). The impact of charter schools on the efficiency of traditional public schools:

Evidence from michigan. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(5), 571;584;-584.

Simonton-Kramer, B. A. (2007). Michigan's school of choice act: A comment on the exclusion

of the special-needs child. *Thomas M. Cooley Law Review*, 24(2), 425

West, M. R. (2016). Schools of choice: expanding opportunity for urban minority students.

Education Next, 16(2), 46+.

"Michigan State Education Reform." *CSPAN*, 5 Oct. 1993.