

2015

Secondary music programs and school choice in Milwaukee 1990-2010: vouchers, charters, and magnets

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/13282>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Dissertation

**SECONDARY MUSIC PROGRAMS AND SCHOOL CHOICE IN MILWAUKEE
1990–2010: VOUCHERS, CHARTERS, AND MAGNETS**

by

DOUGLAS WILLIAM SYME

B.M., Northern Illinois University, 1988
M.M.E., University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point, 1996

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Musical Arts

2015

© 2015 by
DOUGLAS WILLIAM SYME
All rights reserved

Approved by

First Reader

Ronald P. Kos Jr., PhD
Assistant Professor of Music, Music Education

Second Reader

Andrew Goodrich, DMA
Assistant Professor of Music, Music Education

*This project is dedicated to the person who guided and taught me every day of my life
until his passing:*

My father Bill Syme

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the help and contributions of many. I begin with my mother Marion and my sister Cathy. Their constant love and support throughout the course of this project made its completion possible. They've seen me as a student, a performer, an educator, and an academic. Without this support, many of my musical goals would not have been attained.

I was fortunate to have been assigned Dr. Ronald Kos Jr. as my dissertation advisor. Not only was he an expert in qualitative research and APA style but he had also conducted his own research in Milwaukee Public Schools. This experience made his input invaluable as the study developed. He never accepted less than my best and was patient with me throughout the entire process, for that I am forever thankful.

Throughout the entire doctoral process the love and encouragement I received from my extended family at the Milwaukee High School of the Arts has been a constant inspiration. The staff, particularly in the music department, constantly inquired about my progress, listened to my frustrations, and motivated me to continue and complete my education. I am very fortunate to have colleagues who are an amazing combination of dedication, musicianship, intelligence, diligence, and a wonderful artistic temperament.

Finally to the three men who influenced me as a musician and an educator more than any others. First is my high school band director Duane Gandre who once told me "In order to do this job, you have to have a little fight in you." To the professor I was fortunate enough to have an assistantship under in graduate school, Mike Irish, who once said to me "I'll make the band with whomever is on that stage." Finally, to my friend, and

mentor Don Linke, the most quotable man I have ever met who, among other things, once told me “You can’t teach your students anything, if you don’t know anything.”

**SECONDARY MUSIC PROGRAMS AND SCHOOL CHOICE
IN MILWAUKEE 1990–2010: VOUCHERS, CHARTERS, AND MAGNETS**

DOUGLAS WILLIAM SYME

Boston University College of Fine Arts, 2015

Major Professor: Ronald P. Kos Jr., PhD, Assistant Professor of Music, Music
Education

ABSTRACT

In this study I explore the perception of the influence of several school choice initiatives on secondary music programs in Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). In 1990, MPS had fewer than 20 high schools. In 2010, it had close to 60. This increase, coupled with a rapidly expanding voucher program, the influx of charter schools, and a decrease in the number of secondary music programs made MPS an ideal setting for a study of this type.

I conducted a two-stage qualitative study, coupling survey data and 19 interviews with MPS students, teachers, and administrators. The survey revealed data regarding the number of secondary music programs in MPS. In addition, the survey data revealed information regarding the type of programs in existence and what music courses were offered at MPS high schools. The interview data helped me to recognize the perceived influence of these government initiatives. Students, teachers, and administrators discussed course offerings, staffing, funding, the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP), Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI), and charter schools.

Many teacher and student participants had trouble differentiating between the various initiatives but were of the opinion that secondary music education in MPS was

declining. Administrators had more informed opinions regarding the initiatives but—even when they were directly responsible for their implementation—showed very little accountability or willingness to acknowledge that some of these programs were not producing desired results. What was not clear was what individual role, if any, these various governmental policies played. There was a great deal of overlap between these initiatives. There was speculation from some that with MPS facing so many other difficulties, music education may have been placed in a role of secondary importance. Because there is little research coupling school choice with secondary music education, these findings have important implications. This study could aid policy makers, administrators, and governmental officials in making informed decisions regarding secondary music programs and school choice. Too many decisions regarding school music programs are made without the aid of research driven data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
School Choice	2
The Politics of Choice	2
Examples of Choice	8
Rationale	19
Purpose and Research Questions	20
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	22
Vouchers	23
Early Voucher Literature	23
Voucher Educational Outcomes	27
The Peer Group Effect	30
International Vouchers	32
Vouchers and African American Students	35
Milwaukee Voucher Program	37
Summary	42
Charter Schools	42
Charter Schools and the Educational Marketplace	43
Charter School Educational Outcomes	47
Milwaukee’s Charter Schools	53
Magnet Schools	55
Magnet School Educational Outcomes	55
Magnet Schools as a Means to Voluntary Integration	57
Magnet School Summary	60
Public School Funding and Music Programs	61
Summary	62
CHAPTER 3 METHODS	65
Numerical Data Collection and Analysis	66

Interview Data Collection and Analysis.....	67
Participant Selection.....	68
Interviews.....	70
Data Analysis.....	72
Biases of the Researcher.....	73
Summary.....	74
CHAPTER 4 THE STATE OF SECONDARY MUSIC EDUCATION.....	75
IN MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....	75
Enrollment and Access.....	75
Staffing Data.....	77
Course Offerings.....	78
Numerical Data Regarding Course Offerings.....	79
Student and Teacher Feedback Regarding Course Offerings.....	81
Student Charter School Experience.....	82
Summary.....	83
Funding.....	84
Student and Teacher Feedback Regarding Funding.....	84
Administrator Feedback Regarding Funding.....	86
Summary.....	87
Staffing.....	88
Student and Teacher Opinions.....	88
Physical Resources.....	90
Music Education Not Being Made a Priority.....	93
Summary.....	95
CHAPTER 5 MILWAUKEE CHOICE INITIATIVES AND THEIR PERCEIVED INFLUENCES ON MPS SECONDARY MUSIC PROGRAMS.....	97
Music Programs in Small Schools.....	98
Small versus Large Schools.....	99
Decentralization.....	100
Music Program Sustainability in a Small School.....	101
Small School Leadership.....	102
Summary.....	104
Parental Dissatisfaction with MPS.....	105

The Role of Race	105
The Role of Parental Involvement.....	106
Summary.....	108
Responsibility.....	108
Implementation.....	109
Lack of Regulation in Choice Schools	113
Exit Policies.....	113
Funding.....	115
Public Money Being Used for Private Institutions.....	118
The Gates Foundation.....	119
Summary.....	121
Summation	122
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND THE FUTURE OF MUSIC EDUCATION IN MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....	124
Discussion	124
The State of MPS Secondary Music Programs Prior to 1990	125
The State of MPS Secondary Music Programs in 2010	126
Changes to Music Programs from 1990–2010	132
Perceptions of the Influence of Choice.....	135
Conclusions	142
Responsibility	142
Political Compared to Educational Aspects	145
Implications.....	148
Recommendations	149
Suggestions for Further Research	152
The Future of Music Education in MPS.....	155
Reflections.....	158
APPENDIX A: A COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN MPS: 1985–2008	160
APPENDIX B INFORMED CONSENT FORM	162
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR MPS ADMINISTRATORS	164
APPENDIX D INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR MPS MUSIC TEACHERS	166
APPENDIX E INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR A STUDENT SUBJECT	168
REFERENCES	170

CURRICULUM VITAE..... 186

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Enrollment Data for MPS High Schools for the 2009–2010 School Year77

Table 2. Access to MPS Music Programs Based on School Type.....77

Table 3. MPS Music Programs’ Course Selection Based on School Type.....80

Table 4. Secondary Music Program Staffing Based on School Type.....88

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

For over 100 years, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) has included secondary music education in its curriculum. MPS high schools have a long tradition of wind ensembles, marching bands, pep bands, jazz ensembles, choirs, vocal jazz ensembles, show choirs, orchestras, harp programs, Suzuki strings, and African Drumming. In addition, the MPS Biennial Music Festival was in existence for over one hundred years and garnered national attention from VH1's "Save the Music" program in both 2006 and 2008. Partially due to the magnet school trend of the 1970s, Milwaukee created its own arts-based high school, The Milwaukee High School of the Arts (MHSA), in 1985. Beginning in the 1990s, MPS instituted a number of school choice initiatives that may have helped contribute to changes in the district's music programs.

From 1990 to 2010, the music programs in MPS high schools saw many changes in school funding, programs, and educational initiatives. The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP), the charter school movement, and the Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI) brought increased school choice throughout MPS. Although there was a great deal of literature regarding the influence of school choice on educational or fiscal outcomes, there was none regarding secondary music programs. In this study I will examine students', teachers', and administrators' perceptions of school choice and secondary music programs in MPS.

School Choice

With the advent of the MPCP in 1990 MPS saw the beginning of a choice movement. There are several different aspects of choice that will be explored in this study including political, historical, arguments for and against choice, as well as different types of choice. Several reasons cited throughout the literature for school choice will also be explored including freedom of choice, economic influences on educational marketplaces, competition between schools, and increased educational outcomes.

The Politics of Choice

The different perspectives regarding school choice were largely political. As I explored the literature there seemed to be partisan trends regarding school choice but no definitive lines regarding Democrat vs. Republican or Conservative vs. Liberal. There were several questions that could be raised from the literature (e.g. Belfield & Levine, 2005; Gerrity, 2009) and mainstream media portrayal of school choice. There were questions raised about whether choice was about increasing educational outcomes or about money and power. People on both sides of the issues seemed to desire the money associated with school choice. They also seemed to desire the political power that followed having their ideologies implemented. To fully understand school choice, there must be an understanding of each side's political motivations (Witte, 2000).

History of choice. The concept of government offering money for students to attend private schools has existed for over 100 years (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012; Larson, 2002). The earliest forms of choice were designed to give students in rural areas a school to attend within a reasonable proximity of their home. It was not until public schooling

began to dominate the educational landscape in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that choice became an issue not of geographic necessity but ideology (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012).

The Blaine Amendments. The Blaine Amendments are named after a late 19th century representative from Maine by the name of James G. Blaine. He proposed a constitutional amendment prohibiting the use of funds intended for public schools to be used for sectarian ones (Heytens, 2000). The amendment was narrowly defeated but is significant because Blaine amendments exist in many state constitutions prohibiting public funds from use not only in private schools but private colleges, nursing homes, hospitals, and orphanages (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012). During Blaine's time this practice was seen as a way to keep public schools more Protestant in nature and keep the Catholic Church from using any public funds. In more modern times the use of Blaine amendments is a bit different:

The contemporary consequence of this history is that in recent years, opponents of school choice have used Blaine and other constitutional provisions to challenge the creation of private school choice programs. Thus, what began as an anti-Catholic measure has since evolved to become antireligious. (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012, p. 338)

Significant court decisions. As public school systems in the United States grew, private school systems developed concurrently. While not as big as the public school systems there were a steadily increasing number of Catholic, non-Catholic Christian, Jewish, and non-sectarian schools. Funds for these schools were not taken from any part of the public sector but were obtained from private donations, support from a church, or tuition (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012).

Opponents of private school choice made several attempts to hinder the progress of the movement, resulting in several landmark court decisions. In 1923 a statute forbidding the teaching of any language other than English to students who had not completed the eighth grade was challenged in the case of *Meyer v. Nebraska* (1923). The court ruled this statute was in conflict with the 14th amendment and violated both teachers' and parents' rights to control their students' or children's education. Two years later in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* (1925), an Oregon law was struck down which would have required all children to attend public school (O'Scannlain, 2007). Both of these decisions made attempts to hinder the expansion of private schooling in the early part of the twentieth century more difficult. Although these cases helped ensure private schools would continue to exist, they did nothing to increase private school choice. Because no public funds could be used for private schools, only parents of means had the choice of a private school.

The first court ruling to approve the use of public funds for private schooling took place in a small town in New Jersey in 1947. *Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing Township* (1947) allowed townships to reimburse parents of students who used public transportation to attend private schools. The court ruled that the reimbursement was not religious in nature and the same reimbursement was offered to all students.

Everson (1947) laid the groundwork for the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Board of Education v. Allen* (1968). In this case, the court upheld a 1965 law requiring public school districts to loan textbooks to elementary and secondary school students enrolled in private schools. Both *Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing*

Township (1947) and *Board of Education v. Allen* (1968) were significant because they set a precedent for modern private school choice systems in that the money or services were given directly to the students—or parents of students—not the schools themselves.

Arguments regarding school choice. There were many arguments on both sides of the choice issue. Both proponents and opponents spent a great deal of time and resources studying choice issues and looking for a definitive answer as to whether or not choice had an economic impact or a positive influence on the educational climate. Because of this, strong cases were made—in both empirical and theoretical literature—for and against choice, regarding the same issues.

Freedom of choice. Participants in this study stated there were those who believe parents and students should have a right to choose a particular school or program, regardless of whether or not it is a public institution. This choice did not necessarily have to be based on anything substantive. Carpenter and Kafer (2012) indicated choice proponents were shifting their arguments away from freedom towards more specific issues. Freedom to choose a specific school or program is addressed in greater detail in chapters four and five of this project.

Economic effect on educational marketplaces. One of the most prevalent arguments is that school choice would have a positive economic effect on—or help create—an educational marketplace. Proponents of a marketplace said competition would drive costs down (Friedman, 1962). Opponents of a marketplace claimed it would actually escalate costs on public school systems. However, there was great speculation as to the extent of that cost increase (Witte, 2000).

Increased educational outcomes. Perhaps the most widely debated issue surrounding school choice is whether or not it increases educational outcomes, particularly for disadvantaged students. Choice proponents claim there is an increase in educational outcomes and opponents say there is not. Although some research indicates a slight advantage for choice schools, there are circumstances that may influence these outcomes (Carnoy, 2000). Parental involvement and the peer group effect must all be considered when examining educational outcomes (Hastings & Weinstein, 2008). The peer group effect states that a student's education is influenced—at least in part—by their peer group (Ferris & West, 2002). The research regarding the peer group effect and its effect on educational outcomes was largely inconclusive (Epple & Romano, 1998; Ferris & West, 2002).

Competition between schools. Proponents and opponents of school choice claimed it could create competition between schools, both for students and resources. The two sides differ in their opinion of whether or not competition between schools is beneficial.

Proponents of vouchers and tax credits argue that a competitive market approach to the provision of schooling will increase school quality or at least parental satisfaction with their children's schools-and improve the efficiency of public spending on education. (Wise & Darling-Hammond, 1983, p. 9)

Others said competition provided a deleterious influence on the school climate, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world.

With careful attention to various potential threats to validity, we conclude that competition—as perceived by teachers—generated negative effects on the quality of student learning and other aspects of schooling in New Zealand's elementary schools. (Ladd & Fiske, 2003, p. 97)

While strong cases were made on both sides of the competition argument, there was no overwhelming body of evidence presented by either side. There was also research that indicated that in spite of competition for students and resources, an increase in private schools had no influence on public school achievement (Sander, 1999).

Separation of church and state. A great deal of school choice dealt with public monies being used for private schools. Many private schools are religious in nature. As a result, there was a great deal of debate as to whether or not this money was a violation of the separation of church and state. The question was argued in the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971). The court's decision left a great deal of ambiguity regarding the use of public monies for private, parochial education.

The Court in *Lemon* indicated its intention to evaluate programs of state financial aid to parochial schools with careful scrutiny, but voucher plans can pass constitutional muster and provide perhaps the only method to insure that needed alternatives in education are available to all. (Golden, 1972, p. 711)

Privatization. Opponents of school choice claimed it could lead to the privatization of public schools. Some said the privatization of public schools would create greater educational inequities between students of varying socio-economic backgrounds. Carnoy (2000) addressed privatization and stated:

A privatization reform would likely increase educational inequality without improving educational effectiveness. In terms of our core values of social equity and separation of church and state, privatization could also leave the educational system worse off than it actually is, despite all its flaws. (p. 19)

Goldhaber (1999) speculated whether these inequities could be solved with income limits for choice participants. As was true with many of the other issues surrounding choice there was no consensus regarding privatization.

Accountability. Choice opponents were concerned that there was no hard evidence of choice schools outperforming their public school counterparts. The lack of common assessments and fiscal transparency were also seen as a problem. Perhaps the biggest problem regarding a lack of accountability is, given the ever-changing nature of large, urban school systems, a study yielding definitive results would be difficult. Witte (2000) addressed the issue of hard evidence regarding voucher systems:

Large inner-city school districts are constantly reforming, experimenting, and reorganizing their schools and systems, often in reaction to the political pressures they experience. The effect is that change is ongoing, and trying to causally distinguish routine changes from those specifically tied to the onset of a voucher program will be very difficult if not impossible. (pp. 115-116)

Examples of Choice

In Milwaukee, school choice took on many different forms and was implemented through several different initiatives. Vouchers, a small-school initiative, city-wide specialty school, and charters were all part of the MPS choice landscape. Because of the complex, multi-faceted nature of choice in Milwaukee, I provide a brief description of several examples of school choice.

Vouchers. The concept of school vouchers has existed in Europe for several hundred years; vouchers have existed in the United States since 1869 (Larson, 2002). At that time, the state of Vermont adopted a tuition statute that allowed students a voucher to attend a religious institution if their town had no public high school. In 1873, the state of Maine passed the first law that provided state aid for public high schools. In 1903, the Maine legislature passed another law guaranteeing every child a high school education. It further explained that the system would pay the tuition to any school of the parents'

choice, including those schools that were out-of-state (Larson, 2002). The concept of school choice was not widely discussed or implemented until the case of *Brown vs. the Board of Education* brought into question the legality of segregation based on race in schools and other public facilities (Brown v. Board of Education - About the Case, 2004). After *Brown*, in an effort to ensure desegregation and equal opportunity for everyone regardless of race or socio-economic status, some school systems began to entertain the idea of vouchers. These vouchers were largely for magnet schools that were geared toward programs such as the arts, or the gifted and talented. Witte (2000) wrote that vouchers were clearly an attempt to keep white children in their districts to avoid forced bussing and desegregation.

In 1962 the concept of a modern voucher system was outlined by economist Milton Friedman (1962). Friedman proposed that tuition vouchers could be given to the parents of students and would be redeemable at the school of their choice. The government would have only a small role in the program and, as *Everson* (1947) and *Board v. Allen* (1968) required, the aid would be given directly to the parents, not the school.

The first voucher experiment was conducted in Alumn Rock, California in 1972 (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012). Beginning in 1978, voucher referendums were defeated in Michigan, Oregon, California, and Colorado. In 1980, the Maine Department of Education ruled that the state's system would not pay tuition for private school education in a town where a public school was available. Because vouchers had so little public support at this time, President Reagan shifted the discussion from private school vouchers

to public school choice. By doing so, Reagan attempted to convince the public that public school choice was about reforming—rather than dismantling—public schools, and distanced educational choice from its racial and sectarian roots (Molnar, 1999). Reagan submitted vouchers bills to Congress in 1983, 1985, and 1986. Finally, in 1990, Milwaukee began what was, at the time of this writing, the nation’s oldest and largest voucher program. Similar voucher programs were also initiated in Cleveland, Ohio and statewide in Florida (Carpenter & Kafer, 2012).

During the 1990s, the constitutionality of the voucher system was almost continually debated on both the federal and state level. The controversy surrounding MPCP was explained by Witte (2000):

It provides a frontal clash of opposing educational philosophies; it exemplifies the normative clash between fundamental American values of liberty and equality; it potentially involves a lot of money; and it is at the crux of a major constitutional struggle. (p. 23)

By the early 2000s, MPCP was the largest of 12 voucher programs in the United States and was the first choice program that allowed urban parents to send their children to private schools with the entire cost being covered by public funds (Witte et al., 2008).

The person largely responsible for founding the Milwaukee voucher program was a state representative, Annette “Polly” Williams. Williams was an economically disadvantaged, single parent of four on welfare, in the early 1970s. Dissatisfied with MPS, she saved and borrowed to send her children to private school (Revolution In Milwaukee, 2000). Williams was described as an overtly liberal Democrat. She had been Jesse Jackson’s state campaign manager twice and spent time in the late 1980s trying to institute an afro-centric school district in the heart of Milwaukee (Witte, 2000). After the

failure of Wisconsin Bill 816—which would have all private schools, not just non-sectarian ones to participate in a voucher program—Williams introduced a bill in 1989 that then Governor Tommy Thompson supported, making he and Williams unlikely allies. This bill eventually cleared the way for the institution of a “limited and experimental voucher program” (p. 43).

Another leading advocate for school choice in Milwaukee was Dr. Howard Fuller, who served as the Superintendent of MPS from June 1991 until June 1995. Immediately following his tenure as Superintendent, Dr. Fuller founded the Institute for the Transformation of Learning at Marquette University. The Institute promoted school choice, with particular attention being paid to the empowerment of lower-income families (Howard Fuller Ph.D, 2005). Fuller (2002) offered his opinions regarding the mission of his foundation:

Our mission today is to reject apathy and to insist that our children be taught to read, write, analyze and compute, and think for themselves (p. 3).

I do not want to destroy public education; I want to strengthen it by redefining it. It is not in our interest to destroy public schools. It is also not in our interest to continue allowing the public school system to fail to educate our children. It is not in our interest to allow any schools to fail our children (p. 4).

In 1990, the Wisconsin state legislature passed Act 336 (Kava, 2007), which was the nation’s first private-school voucher program. In its initial phase, the program allowed up to 1%—approximately 1,000—of MPS low-income students to attend participating non-sectarian, private schools in the area. Low-income was defined as 175% of the official U.S. poverty line. Children participating in the initial phase of MPCP received a voucher worth \$2,446, an amount equal to the per-pupil state aide offered

MPS at that time. In 1993 the enrollment cap was expanded to 1.5% of the total MPS enrollment and the percentage of voucher students allowed in a school was expanded from 49 to 65% (Witte, 2000).

The program went through several minor changes during its first five years. The Wisconsin state legislature revised the program with Act 27 in 1995. In the year that the initial experiment was due to have ended, per-pupil spending in MPCP jumped from \$2,985 in 1993 to \$4,600 per-pupil in 1995. Also, as of 1995, there was no longer any required research or reports to be filed on MPCP, and Act 27 allowed religious schools to participate (Witte, 2000). Act 27 also increased the percentage of MPS student allowed to participate in the program to 7% in 1995–96 and 15% in 1996–97. Finally, the Act allowed up to 100% of the students attending a private school to be voucher students. All of the 1995 changes were finally enacted after the Wisconsin Supreme Court overturned a lower court's ruling and admitted religious schools to the program in 1998 (Molnar, 1999).

With the advent of Wisconsin Act 125 in 2005, there were significant changes to the MPCP. Prior student restrictions were changed making any student living in Milwaukee potentially eligible for the program. The income cap for continuing choice students was raised to 220% of the poverty line if they had been previously admitted. In addition, Act 125 raised the limit from 15% of the total MPS enrollment ($n = 14,350$) to 22,500 students and imposed new accreditation and testing requirements on private schools (Kava, 2007). Finally, the Legislative Audit Bureau was required to annually review an independent evaluation of MPCP by the School Choice Demonstration Project

(Witte, 2008).

Also in 2005, the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel produced a comprehensive seven-part series profiling MPCP (Borsuk & Carr, 2005). MPCP had been expanding in Milwaukee since 1990. Until this time no single entity took the time to visit the overwhelming majority of the schools involved in the program and make public their findings. The series covered topics including demythologizing popular assumptions about voucher schools in Milwaukee, creating a voucher school, the reasons parents choose a school, the breadth and depth of publicly funded religious education in Milwaukee, Catholic schools re-examining their identity, schools that expand the notion of public education, and a 15-year profile of three schools that have been instrumental in Milwaukee's voucher program.

The reporters visited 106 of 115 MPCP schools, with nine denying them access. The schools encompassed a variety of educational climates. There were religion-based schools that had a wonderful school community, fine academic standards, and student support that continued beyond high school graduation. There was also a school in a basement, with one administrator and only two students who, at the time of the investigation were leaving for a field trip to McDonald's. The reporters summed up their feelings stating:

The large majority of those visited were either conventional parochial schools, with professional staff and clear, well-executed academic programs, or newer schools, both religious and non-religious, some of them very good, some of them mediocre. But it was also clear that there were about 10 to 15 schools where professionalism appeared lacking, facilities were not good, and the overall operation appeared alarming when it came to the basic matter of educating children. (Borsuk & Carr, 2005, p. 2)

I believe there are about 10 schools that ought to be closed immediately and there are about 30 schools that are consistently worthy of children's intelligence and parents' commitment and support," said Robert Pavlik, director of the School Design and Development Center at Marquette University's Institute for the Transformation of Learning. The rest, he said, are in the middle. (as cited by Borsuk & Carr, 2005, p. 3)

It was apparent that a strong commitment to children and the desire to open your own school are not enough to ensure its success. Dr. Fuller agreed and expressed concern as to the difficulties of opening an effective school (Borsuk & Carr, 2005).

Charters. The charter school movement in the U.S. began expanding rapidly in 1991, when increasingly more states began passing legislation that authorized charter schools (Braun, Jenkins, & Grigg, 2006). This history of charter schools in Wisconsin was shorter than its voucher counterpart. In 1993, the State of Wisconsin passed its charter school law to encourage innovative school organization and instruction (Burke, 1993). It was initially an experiment in which 10 districts statewide would be allowed to form up to two schools each. Thirteen schools were formed in the initial year of the program. The program, which was expanded by the state in 1995, gave every district charter capabilities and eliminated the cap on the total number of charter schools. In 1998, the law was changed again, allowing districts to contract with a Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) to operate a charter school providing its location is within the CESA (Merryfield, Informational Paper 31, Charter Schools, 2007). Wisconsin charter schools were exempt from most regulations regarding state public instruction. They did, however, have to meet four state requirements: their teachers had to be licensed

by the DPI, they had to participate in the Wisconsin Student Assessment System,¹ they had to participate in the annual school performance report, and students were to be counted for membership in the local school district.

Charter schools cannot charge tuition and all students in the district must have equal access. Attendance at charter schools in Wisconsin had to be voluntary and the district had to provide an alternative for students who do not want to attend the charter school or were not admitted. This provision also applied if the district entered into a contract where all of its schools were converted to charter schools (Merryfield, 2007).

There were three types of schools that could become charter schools: new schools, converted public schools, and converted private, non-sectarian schools. As of the 2009-10 school year, four entities could authorize charters in the city of Milwaukee: MPS, The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee (UWM), Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC), and the city of Milwaukee itself (Merryfield, 2011).

The teaching credentials required for a charter school were slightly different than those of a public school. To give charter schools more flexibility in staffing, the Wisconsin DPI created a charter school license, which allowed licensed teachers to teach any subject or grade level within the charter school. In addition, there was a provision for a charter school teaching permit that allowed non-licensed people to teach. This permit

¹ “The WSAS was a comprehensive statewide accountability program designed to provide information about what students know in core academic areas. The federal “No Child Left Behind Act” required all states to test all students in reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school (grade 10 under s.118.30 Wis. Stats). These tests were referred to as the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE). Student performance on these assessments was reported in proficiency categories and used to determine the adequate yearly progress of students at the school, district and state levels” (Information for Parents About the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS), 2008).

allowed professionals to teach provided they had subject area expertise, which was defined as a bachelor's degree or proof of mastery in a trade, and were supervised by a licensed teacher. As of 2008, charter school teachers were required to hold either a major or minor in their academic subject matter or pass a qualifying exam in that area (Wisconsin Places New Restrictions on Public Charter School Teachers, 2008).

In Milwaukee, the charter district movement was started in 2001, when then-MPS superintendent Spence Korte met with newly elected President George W. Bush, touting a pro-charter agenda. He claimed that Milwaukee wanted to become the first charter school district in the nation. This idea angered many, as no public hearings had been held on the matter. The Wisconsin Legislative Black and Hispanic Caucus wrote in a letter dated April 10, 2001:

Without consulting the parents, teachers, principals and school communities to whom you purport to grant decision making authority, you took it upon yourself to offer up the Milwaukee Public School District to the federal government as the first charter school district. Furthermore, your comments inappropriately and inaccurately suggested that there is some kind of community consensus behind this measure, when, in fact, this was a unilateral decision made without any community input. (as cited in Pryzbyla, 2003)

This program was never put into place and these actions eventually spelled Korte's political undoing. He resigned as MPS superintendent in 2002 (Pryzbyla, 2003).

Magnets. Magnet schools, like other forms of school choice, were a polarizing entity. Magnet schools were created with three purposes in mind: to promote voluntary integration, to focus on a specialty program such as math, science, Montessori, or the arts, and to give parents and students educational choices. Some felt magnet schools would promote voluntary integration and others believed they would lead to racial

stratification (Archbald, 2004).

Magnet schools began in the late 1970s as an alternative to forced bussing or a way to promote voluntary integration. By the late 1970s, many cities had started magnet programs and the early feedback was quite positive (Rosenbaum & Presser, 1978). There were, however, other studies that suggested the integration touted by magnet schools was merely segregation being moved to the classroom level, as opposed to the school or neighborhood level (West, 1994). Magnet schools are a significant part of this study because across the country, including Milwaukee, a great number of them have an arts specialty. In an era where music programs were being cut extensively, magnet schools may have been one of the only alternatives for students who wanted to participate in music while in high school.

Milwaukee did not refer to any of its schools as “magnet schools,” instead using the term “city-wide specialty school” (Milwaukee Public Schools, 2008). This delineation was most likely due to a subtle distinction made between magnet and specialty schools. “Magnet schools” was a term used for schools that attracted their students based on a desire to attend that particular school. A “specialty school” selected its students based on a skill level in a particular area. This was determined using either standard tests or an audition (Pryzbyla, 2003; West, 1994). The only arts-based secondary school in MPS at the time of this study was the Milwaukee High School of the Arts.

The Milwaukee High School of the Arts (MHSA) was begun in 1985 with an initial class of approximately 120 students. It was initiated as a city-wide school that would provide academic and artistic training to students in the Milwaukee area. Students

had to take at least two hours a day in their respective art area but were strongly encouraged to seek more training, schedules and time permitting. In addition to a wide variety of artistic offerings there were also a large number of Advanced Placement (AP) offerings. MHSA students had to major in one of five areas: dance, visual art, creative writing, theater, or music. Within the music department there were five major delineations: band, orchestra, vocal, piano, or jazz studies (Wszalek, 2008).

Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative. In November 2003, a project was brought forth that in many ways combined vouchers, charter schools, and large amounts of private funding. The Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI) was a bi-product of a national small high schools campaign brought about, in part, by the Gates Foundation. In November 2003, the foundation presented a 17 million dollar grant to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Association of Commerce (MMAC). This small high school campaign offered \$500,000 in start-up funds, dispersed over four years, to each new “small” high school started that met the Gates Foundation’s approval (Meeting Notes, 2004).

Summation. The secondary schools in Milwaukee represented a broad spectrum of high school models and several types of school choice: traditional high schools, charter schools, specialty schools, and small schools. There were a wide variety of schools including the arts, Montessori, International Baccalaureate, college bound, community service, and business education. Prior to 1990, Milwaukee had 15 comprehensive high schools. All offered a music curriculum, which usually included band, orchestra, and chorus. Founded in 1985, the Milwaukee High School of the Arts (MHSA) was able to

offer these as well as additional studies in piano, jazz, and chamber music (Wszalek, 2008).

In 1990, the nation's first voucher program began in Milwaukee (Kava, 2007). In 2003 the Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI) was begun to increase the number of small high schools in the district (Andreopoulos, 2003). By the 2009—2010 school year, MPS had 59 high schools (Student Enrollment History, 2009). These changes were due to a variety of factors. Secondary students in MPS were spread over a vast array of high schools. With such a wide range of school types and sizes I speculated that many MPS secondary schools might not have been able to retain a traditional music program.

Rationale

There was a significant amount of literature regarding the history and advent of the modern school choice and voucher programs. Because Milwaukee had a long standing and deeply entrenched Parental Choice Program, it had been the subject of a plethora of research and discussion in both the scholarly community and the mainstream media. MPCP was one of the most well-documented and widely studied voucher programs in the country. There was no literature examining whether or not music education had been influenced by school choice. There was no research regarding the influence of MPCP, MHSRI, or charter schools on secondary music programs in MPS. If there was the perception of change in MPS secondary music programs since the influx of charter schools and the advent of MPCP and MHSRI, then there might also be the perception that these initiatives had influenced that change.

MPS high schools—and consequently their music programs—experienced many changes from 1990 to 2010. Because of the unusually large proliferation of new schools during this time, I wanted to explore how this increase in new schools influenced the secondary music programs throughout the district. With Milwaukee having 59 high schools in 2010, I assumed there were not 59 separate band, orchestra, and choral programs. Although it may have been impossible to determine if there was a direct causal relationship between these initiatives, a large number of new schools, and secondary music programs, it was possible to determine if there was a perceived relationship, from MPS students, administrators, and teachers.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions regarding the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, the Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative, charter schools, and magnet—or specialty—schools and perceptions of their influence on secondary music programs in MPS. In this study I explored the following research questions:

1. What was the state of MPS secondary music programs prior to 1990?
2. What was the state of MPS secondary music programs in 2010?
3. What is the perception of MPS administrators, teachers, and students regarding the influence of MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools on secondary music programs from 1990 to 2010?

4. What is the perception of MPS administrators, teachers, and students regarding the funding, staffing, and facilities of MPS secondary music programs? Were there changes from 1990 to 2010?

Given the ever-changing educational environment in MPS since the advent of these various programs, this study explored the relationship between school choice, the changes in secondary music education programs in Milwaukee's public schools, and the perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators as to how they were related.

The remainder of this study is laid out in the following fashion. Chapter two will be a review of the literature. Chapter three will examine the methods used to conduct my research. Chapter four examines the state of secondary music education in Milwaukee Public Schools at the time of this writing. Chapter five examines the various choice initiatives that existed in MPS and their perceived influence on secondary music programs throughout the district. In chapter six I offer a discussion of the research questions, my conclusions, suggestions for further research, implications, a section regarding the future of music education in MPS, and my own personal reflections.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Vouchers and the concept of school choice were first introduced in the United States in the mid-19th century. In the 20th century, the subject came to the forefront with a proposal by economist Milton Friedman (Vliet & Smyth, 1982). In the 1970s the city of Milwaukee underwent a great deal of educational reform and in 1990 implemented what is now the nation's oldest parental choice program (Witte, 2000). There were a number of studies regarding the Milwaukee system and consequently a great deal of literature on the subject as a whole.

Analysis of the literature was complicated by the fact that the majority of the material was written from a partisan perspective (Koppich, 1997). Smith (2005) addressed the idea that school reform literature comes from several different points of view. Smith was of the opinion that even the empirical research on school reform was being done to move forward a particular ideology, instead of being used to drive sound policy decisions. Smith suggested asking the following questions when looking at the literature surrounding vouchers and choice: What is working, why, and how? What is the motivation? What is the method? What is the prescription? Smith concluded that existing school choice literature could be a valuable tool in policy decision-making. Smith also claimed the interpretation of the research was as important as the literature itself. The literature for this study was divided into three categories: vouchers, charter schools, and magnet schools.

Vouchers

Because the city of Milwaukee had a deeply entrenched voucher system (Witte, 2000), the literature regarding this topic was extremely important to this study. There were many studies regarding vouchers written prior to the implementation of a voucher program in Milwaukee. Early voucher literature had limited data from which to draw conclusions. It was more speculative in nature. After the advent of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP)—and several other programs nationwide—a more substantive body of voucher literature emerged. Therefore, the voucher section of this review was divided between early voucher literature and voucher educational outcomes, with several subdivisions.

Early Voucher Literature

Because vouchers were a relatively new and unexplored topic during the latter part of the 20th century, many researchers used theoretical models to predict their outcomes and influence on educational systems. A great deal of this research came from economists. Some felt that in the absence of research conducted using existing voucher systems, an approach using statistical formulas would prove helpful in predicting educational outcomes and aiding educational policy makers in making informed decisions. There was, however, still an understanding that theoretical literature was not a replacement for the empirical study of existing systems. “The advocacy of school vouchers, however plausible, cannot substitute for the more detailed empirical work needed to quantify the scale of these theorized effects” (Ferris & West, 2002, p. 791).

Although there was a voucher system proposed in France in the late 1800s (Vliet

& Smyth, 1982), in the 20th century, the catalyst for the modern voucher system was economist Milton Friedman (Epple & Romano, 1998; Vliet & Smyth, 1982). Friedman (1962) advocated a voucher system or increased educational choice, proposing that non-public schools be funded using vouchers. Those vouchers would be given to parents and would represent a child's share of the state's investment in general education. They would be redeemable by any approved school chosen by the parent. Friedman recognized the need for education in a stable and democratic society and referred to the benefits of education to the greater good as the "neighborhood effect" (p. 86).

Friedman (1962) was in favor of the privatization of public education and suggested there could be certain minimum educational standards for which parents would be responsible. Government's role would be only to enforce these minimal standards. If parents were not fiscally able to meet their child's educational needs, the government would subsidize the cost. Friedman felt vouchers may have afforded economically disadvantaged children a means to attend better schools in more affluent neighborhoods without their families having to relocate. Vouchers would prevent parents from paying twice for education, once through their taxes and again through tuition. Finally, Friedman addressed the subject of teachers' salaries and the way they were structured, and stated:

With respect to teachers' salaries, the major problem is not that they are too low on the average—they may well be too high on the average—but that they are too uniform and rigid. Poor teachers are grossly overpaid and good teachers grossly underpaid. Salary schedules tend to be uniform and determined far more by seniority, degrees received, and teaching certificates acquired than by merit. (p. 95)

Exploring Friedman's theory further, Erickson (1972) stated that alternative funding for education was likely inevitable. Erickson supported a scholarly examination

of the use of vouchers and stated:

If and when a widespread need for alternatives becomes apparent, will well-thought-through policy frameworks be made available for application? Discussion of this topic will center on educational vouchers, both because they exemplify issues important in any approach to financial aid and, more importantly, because they have been scrutinized extensively by scholars. (p. 109)

Erickson briefly reviewed Friedman's voucher proposal, offered some suggestions for improvement, and then some suggestions for application. Friedman's thoughts regarding vouchers were acknowledged, yet Erickson questioned whether vouchers were the proper vehicle for attaining the goals for which they were implemented. Friedman's voucher system would promote school diversification by allowing the children of like-minded parents to attend the same school and stated, "Some important types of diversity may require the school by school specialization that Friedman's vouchers are designed to maximize" (p. 110).

There were court decisions in the 1970s that declared aid similar to vouchers unconstitutional (Golden, 1972). The focus of the article was *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, a case regarding a Pennsylvania program that attempted to avoid church and state issues by reimbursing only for state-approved secular classes. The *Lemon* decision declared the forms of aid in this case unconstitutional. Golden studied how vouchers may have violated the Establishment Clause and the separation of church and state. Included were reviews of several cases where the separation of church and state regarding schooling was tested. These court decisions did not come to a clear consensus regarding the issue. They instead demonstrated the complex and multi-faceted nature of the debate, particularly involving education.

Golden concluded that vouchers, if carefully monitored, could be an effective way of providing valid educational alternatives to all. With careful scrutiny, the debate regarding the separation of church and state could be relegated to a secondary role, with sound secular education for all being the primary benefit. Support for vouchers was summed up by this statement: “Voucher plans can pass constitutional muster and provide perhaps the only method to insure that needed alternatives in education are available to all” (p. 711).

There were critical examinations of early voucher systems (Mason, 1975). The criticisms expressed in the article included:

That they would offer unequal opportunity in choice for rich and poor; that they would increase racial and social segregation; that they would promote false claims and advertising by schools; that parents, especially poor ones, were not equipped to make wise choices; that public schools would be reduced to sinks for drop-outs and hard cases; and that it was unconstitutional to subsidize church affiliated schools. (pp. 162-163)

One of the early voucher experiments examined took place in California involving several middle schools. Using the idea of several small schools within a large school, it was found to increase parental choice, encourage wise decision making for families, and had no adverse effect on integration in these schools. Mason concluded that although there were a variety of different theories about voucher systems, it was difficult to predict their outcomes. Instead there must be a controlled experiment, or several, from which the results could then be studied.

Early voucher research was limited to the vouchers in existence and theoretical models meant to predict their outcomes. Some felt vouchers were a reasonable means to integration and equal educational opportunities for all. Others felt there were a variety of

different theories regarding vouchers and their influence on educational outcomes was difficult to predict. Later research examined voucher influence on educational outcomes. These outcomes were examined from several different angles including racially, socio-economically, and politically.

Voucher Educational Outcomes

A great deal of the voucher literature used models to predict various aspects of voucher influence on educational outcomes. Some voucher literature used quantifiable data to argue voucher effectiveness. Even with the plethora of theoretical and empirical literature regarding school vouchers, there were still a myriad of diverse opinions. The general belief conveyed throughout the literature was that—given the number of variables—a clear consensus regarding voucher effectiveness was difficult to reach.

Throughout the literature, the concept of vouchers was regarded as an idea that could have been beneficial to the educational system as a whole. Many scholars questioned whether there was any research that conclusively showed the system to be effective. According to Witte and Rigdon (1993), “It is not immediately apparent that choice reforms will have a major effect in the near future on what happens in most schools and classrooms” (p. 95). In a review of voucher systems, McEwan (2000) stated:

For some questions, there is a paucity of credible evidence. For others, evidence from non-voucher systems is used inappropriately to forecast the impact of vouchers. The review concludes that empirical evidence is not sufficiently compelling to justify either strong advocacy or opposition to large-scale voucher programs. (p. 103)

Sosniak (1992) added:

We find little support for the argument that public school choice, as currently implemented, is an inventive mechanism for altering the academic lives of students and teachers. (p. 35)

Wise and Darling-Hammond (1983) and Ladd (2002), questioned whether there was credible evidence in favor of—or against—voucher programs. In a review of voucher literature Neal (2002) stated:

I argue that we cannot confidently predict the outcomes that would result from various voucher schemes, and I also stress that debates over vouchers per se are not informative. Details concerning funding targeting and discretion in the use of vouchers should greatly affect the outcomes associated with any particular voucher program. (p. 25)

Witte and Rigdon (1993) examined choice proposals using four variables: school organization, eligibility of students, school autonomy, and funding. They divided choice programs into three large categories: public school choice, public and private school choice, and all choice schools. There was also a lengthy discussion of the MPCP. Witte and Rigdon concluded that although choice programs were likely to expand, given the complex and multi-faceted nature of education, there was little evidence that they would make an appreciable difference in educational outcomes.

Green, Peterson, & Du (1997) compared voucher schools to their public school counterparts regarding cost, and reading and math scores. They suggested that while it was true that test scores in the voucher schools were higher, the reason for the increase was difficult to pinpoint. In their hypothetical model, test scores improved at a level that was statistically significant. They examined previous research and concluded there had never been research on the Milwaukee voucher system that randomly assigned students to avoid selection bias. With a random selection of equal students being nearly impossible,

Green et al. determined a theoretical study of this type was an effective way of examining higher test scores within a voucher system.

Nechyba's (2000) study used "general-equilibrium simulations to explore the role of residential mobility in shaping the impact of different private-school voucher policies" (p. 130). Nechyba felt because of the limited number of voucher programs available for study and the limited scope of theoretical school-finance models there was a great deal of potential for the simulation approach employed in this study. Three types of voucher programs were studied: a general voucher that could be used by any student in a private school, a voucher to be used only by low-income households, and a voucher that pinpoints economically-disadvantaged districts. Nechyba pointed out the role of mobility, both in school-finance debates and in predicting the outcome of voucher programs. Nechyba concluded that student mobility was important when it came to predicting voucher influence on several key educational issues.

In the results presented here, mobility is demonstrated to be important for both the positive analysis attempting to predict the impact of vouchers on the distribution of educational opportunities and the normative analysis evaluating its equity properties. (p. 144)

Barnard et al. (2003) examined voucher educational outcomes in New York City. They used a randomized design and data from The School Choice Scholarships Foundation Program (SCSFP). They employed a model based on principal stratification that accommodated noncompliance and missing data. Barnard et al. concluded vouchers did not create positive educational outcomes for most subgroups. First graders and African American children showed modest gains in math scores.

Ferreira (2007) used a general equilibrium model that simulated two private

school voucher programs in the Chicago area. The model included public, Catholic, and private non-Catholic schools. Two different types of vouchers were simulated: (a) a universal voucher good for any private schools, and (b) a nonsectarian voucher good only in Catholic schools. Ferreyra concluded both voucher types “give rise to some similar effects” (p. 815), but the private school market reacted differently for each. Low-income residents and those who believed most strongly in Catholic education benefitted the least from nonsectarian vouchers. Those who strongly believed in Catholic education showed the largest gains from universal vouchers.

The Peer Group Effect

The peer group effect states that a student’s education is influenced—at least in part—by their peer group (Ferris & West, 2002). The loss of a high-performing peer group due to voucher schools taking the best students from the public school student pool would therefore have a negative influence on the students remaining in the public schools, thereby creating a peer group effect. The peer group effect drew the attention of several researchers who examined its influence on educational outcomes surrounding voucher programs.

Several studies explored the relationship between vouchers and the peer group effect. Epple and Romano (1998) set up “a theoretical and computational model with tax-financed, tuition-free public schools and competitive, tuition-financed private schools” (p. 33). The authors believed student stratification existed most prominently on two levels, income and ability. This resulted in a peer group of higher abilities at heavily subsidized private schools.

The normality of demand for a good peer group leads relatively high-income students to cross subsidize the schooling of relatively high-ability students, producing the latter partition. Private schools attract high-ability, low-income students by offering them tuition discounts, sometimes fellowships. (p. 34)

Epple and Romano explored whether this type of system was more advantageous to higher performing students than disadvantageous to the lower performing.

Our model implies that a voucher program will result in entry of new private schools and movement of students from the public to the private sector. Students remaining in the public sector are those with relatively low income and low ability, and those students experience losses. Because vouchers increase the premium on ability, the greatest proportionate gains from the voucher accrue to low-income, high-ability students. (p. 55)

Zimmer and Toma (2000) examined the peer group effect in the educational process using a variety of data from five countries: Belgium, the United States, Canada, France, and New Zealand. These five countries provided a broad spectrum of funding and enrollment practices for both public and private schools. The data were collected by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). Zimmer and Toma concluded that (a) the peer group effect did indeed exist and was a significant factor in school climate, (b) there was a greater need for policy makers to recognize the peer group effect, and (c) it was more significant regarding low-ability students than high-ability students.

One study explored the peer group effect and its relationship to dropouts (Ferris & West, 2002). In the opinion of Ferris and West, the peer group effect resulted from private schools taking the best students from public schools. “Because the education received by students depends on the quality of their classmates, this loss reduces the quality of education received by those remaining in the public system—the peer group

effect” (p. 774). Ferris and West expanded on Epple and Romano’s research. They set up a theoretical model and offered “additional rationale for voucher use” (p. 776). They then concluded that vouchers could help decrease dropout rates.

Our model suggests that vouchers work by lowering the cost of education to low-income non-conforming students and so increasing their probability of remaining in school. Should voucher use result in education gains to previous dropouts that exceed the peer group losses, there would arise a net equity gain that would reinforce the potential efficiency case usually made for voucher use. (p. 791)

Each of the authors who addressed the peer group effect was of the opinion that it was a real phenomenon and had an influence on educational outcomes. Researchers’ opinions regarding the depth of the voucher influence varied but all seemed to agree it was significant. There was also a consensus that the peer group effect was more significant regarding low, rather than high, income students.

International Vouchers

As stated earlier, voucher systems existed in France in the late 1800s (Vliet & Smyth, 1982). While vouchers became more popular in America during the 1990s (Witte, 2000) they were in place worldwide. There is a body of literature that examined voucher systems in countries other than the United States. The literature regarding international vouchers dealt largely with school competition and educational outcomes.

Hirsch (1995) explored attempts to create markets in international schooling through the use of school choice. A great deal of the information for this study was obtained from a study conducted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The OECD study examined the influence of school choice in six countries: Australia, England, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden and the United

States. Hirsch used this information to examine whether or not there were any benefits of these market-based school choice programs and concluded that, while school markets had problems, they could be minimized with the proper interventions.

School markets have many imperfections, but there is much that can be done through intervention to reduce them. It often runs counter to the instincts of those who are "liberalizing" the rules for choosing schools, and introducing greater autonomy at the school level, simultaneously to intervene to try to make markets work. But without such intervention—for example to improve information, transport options and diversity among schools—there is a strong danger that markets will work poorly and fail to produce desired results. (p. 256)

Mizala and Romaguera (2000) explored the educational outcomes of a voucher system in Chile. The authors examined standardized test results between municipal schools, private fee-paying schools, and private subsidized schools. Mizala & Romaguera concluded that, in urban areas, subsidized schools performed better than municipal schools, and that overall fee-paying private schools performed better than either subsidized or municipal schools. They felt this difference in performance was largely due to the increased financial advantages held by private schools financed by parents. The results in rural areas were slightly different but difficult to quantify because of the small sample size, making the reliability of the results difficult in some cases. They also felt that though sizeable, the achievement gap between different types of schools was steadily narrowing. The authors offered some insight as to why the achievement gap was narrowing and stated:

Although the results gap between subsidized and fee-paying schools is significant, it has tended to narrow over time. This may be due to (i) the extra competition generated by an educational market in which most of the population participates; and (ii) policies to improve educational quality that have been implemented in Chile since 1990, targeted on the worst performing subsidized schools. (p. 409)

There was an examination of the impact of the voucher system in England and Wales (Gorard, Fitz, & Taylor, 2001). England and Wales have a national school system. At the time this study was published, it was the largest study of school choice that had ever been conducted in publicly funded schools. Gorard et al. used multiple data sets that contained data from every school in England and Wales from 1989 to 2000. The first year of choice in England was 1990. They also conducted several interviews with school officials at both the local and school level. What they found was an overall decline in socio-economic stratification in the years after choice was enacted.

Angrist, Bettinger, Bloom, King, and Kremer (2002) studied the educational outcomes of the Columbian voucher system three years after a lottery determined which students were allowed to attend private schools with the aid of a government voucher. The program was called the “Programa de Ampliacion de Cobertura de la Educacion Secundaria (PACES)” (p. 1535). PACES supplied over 125,000 pupils vouchers that covered over half the cost of a private high school. The lottery winners could renew the vouchers only if they made adequate academic progress. Angrist et al. concluded that a program like PACES could be a cost-effective way of increasing educational outcomes in an area with a weak public, but strong private educational system. They found that voucher students were more likely to attend participating private schools, have access to a more expensive school than would previously be attainable, and because of the grade requirement, more likely to work harder academically.

One study examined the influence of school competition on educational outcomes in New Zealand (Ladd & Fiske, 2003). They used survey data from elementary school

principals and teachers. The surveys were administered, to stratified random samples, in 1996 by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER). Topics covered by the surveys included the quality of the children's learning, teaching content, teaching style, relations between teachers and parents, relations between principal and teacher, relations between teachers, and relations with local schools. Ladd and Fiske reported that teachers felt school competition had a negative impact on educational outcomes. Principals' opinions—although less strong statistically—were consistent with teachers' opinions.

The international voucher literature showed their influence to be very similar to that of their American counterparts. Studies regarding international vouchers found they had a more profound influence on low, rather than high, income students and helped create a climate of school competition. There was no clear consensus reached as to whether or not the school competition generated by the voucher systems was positive.

Vouchers and African American Students

Because many voucher programs were centered in large urban areas with a high percentage of African American students (Witte, 2000), there was a body of literature that dealt with the influence vouchers had on African American students and their families. Voucher topics relating to African American students included educational outcomes, standardized testing, parental reactions to vouchers, and graduation rates.

Howell, Wolf, Campbell, and Peterson (2002) conducted a study that attempted to measure the effect of vouchers on the school performance of African American students. They conducted three random field trials, which they felt would help to “eliminate the

self-selection problems that pervade most observational data” (p. 191). Their review of the research showed that although studies had revealed that African American students in voucher schools enjoyed higher graduation rates and arguably higher standardized test scores, there were other factors that could skew these results.

Parents who choose to send their children to private school demonstrate considerable dedication, financial and otherwise, to their children’s education. It remains unclear whether observed achievement differences between public and private school students are due to the quality of private schools or characteristics of the students who attend them (p. 192).

Howell et al. also found that African American children improved at a higher rate than other minorities in voucher schools on the Iowa Basic Skills Test. They hypothesized that this higher rate of improvement may have occurred for several reasons including language needs for other minorities, and public perception of private schools. The data from the three cities in this study—New York, Washington, DC, and Dayton, OH—showed that the incidence of African American students acting inappropriately in private schools was markedly lower than their public school counterparts. They concluded that although African Americans showed significant test score improvement, there was no definitive evidence to show any ethnic group benefited from vouchers (2002).

Extensive interview data was used to determine how African American mothers “engage in the educational marketplace and construct their school choices” (Cooper, 2005, p. 174). Cooper interviewed 14 economically disadvantaged, African American mothers for this study. They differed in age, number of children, employment history, and level of education. Four of the women were grandmothers raising their grandchildren; 12 of the 14 mothers were unmarried. All of the mothers believed in the

power of education to have a positive impact on their children's socio-economic status but expressed discontent with traditional public schools. In the end, all but 3 of the 14 mothers had withdrawn their children from traditional public schools. Cooper concluded that "while the findings from this study cannot be generalized to all African American mothers, the data offer valuable insight and important theoretical implications regarding school choice" (p. 185).

The literature pertaining to vouchers and African American students dealt with a variety of different educational issues. While not an exclusively African American issue, the literature showed vouchers had an influence on African American education, particularly in large urban areas with voucher programs. Vouchers and school choice not only influenced academic but in some cases behavioral performance as well.

Milwaukee Voucher Program

In the fall of 1990 Milwaukee began the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) (Witte, 2000). Because of the size and deeply entrenched nature of MPCP there was a great deal of research done on the topic. The topics regarding MPCP studied were wide-ranging, including educational outcomes, fiscal issues, and private vs. public school achievement.

Witte (1998) provided an overview of the theoretical and research issues surrounding MPCP, a history of the program itself and any changes that occurred in the five years since its inception, who participated in the program and why, and attrition rates. The outcomes studied included the effects on students and their families, the effects on schools, and achievement test scores. A number of data collection methods were used.

From 1990–1995, surveys were conducted via telephone and mail with parents who participated in the MPCP and parents and students who left the program. In addition to the surveys, dozens of case studies conducted during the same time frame. The results of the study, by Witte’s own admission, could be interpreted from several different perspectives:

Studies comparing public and private school achievement have reached varying conclusions. And claims favoring private schools were often questioned because of the problem of unmeasured selection bias. So why, in a program that required random assignment, would one assume that the private schools would work miracles that the public schools could not? (p. 248)

The strongest argument for vouchers in this article is equal opportunity. The program clearly provided an opportunity for some poor families, whose children were not doing well in public schools, to obtain an alternative education that it is unlikely they could have afforded on their own. (pp. 248-49)

Witte (1999) examined the MPCP’s positive aspects, which included increased parental satisfaction, an affordable alternative to public schools for low-income families, an alternative for students who continually struggled for a variety of reasons in MPS, and a slightly higher attendance rate in the voucher schools. Witte also pointed to several flaws in MPCP including the loss of well-educated, active parents for public schools, high attrition in choice schools, financial instability and corruption, and the difficulty in getting an accurate measurement of student success when comparing MPCP and MPS.

Witte (2000) also provided an overview of many elements of MPCP including the legal history of educational choice, MPS test data, participants in the MPCP, schools participating in MPCP, the outcomes both sociologically and academically from MPCP, and the political ramifications of MPCP. MPCP was examined in detail from several different angles. Witte concluded that finding definitive answers, in the in the multi-

faceted, complex world of education reform was a difficult task.

Mueller (2000) evaluated MPCP to the Wisconsin State Legislature. It chronicled the growth of MPCP from its inception to 2000. Mueller also found the lack of common assessments to be problematic, when attempting to measure the effectiveness of the MPCP. In a letter to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee Mueller stated:

Some hopes for the program—most notably, that it would increase participating pupils' academic achievement—cannot be documented, largely because uniform testing is not required in participating schools. (p. 1)

Programs in both Milwaukee and Cleveland were effective at getting vouchers into the hands of low-income, inner-city families (Paul, Legan, & Metcalf, 2007). The researchers used data from the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program and examined differences between three different subgroups of applicants. They examined data that included every student applying for a voucher in Cleveland from 1997-2001. Paul et al. placed applicants in three categories: those who received vouchers and used them, those who received vouchers and did not use them, and those who applied but did not receive a voucher. They then examined the racial makeup and socio-economic status of the applicants in each category. Paul et al. discovered that recipient users and applicant non-recipients were largely non-minority. Conversely, the majority of recipient nonusers were minority.

Chakrabati (2007) conducted a theoretical and empirical exploration of how the changes in MPCP since 1998 have affected MPS. In 1998 schools with a religious affiliation were allowed to participate in MPCP. Data regarding test scores, demographics, and socioeconomic factors were collected from individual schools, the

Common Core Data (CCD), Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), and MPS. Chakrabati divided the school samples into three separate categories based on the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Only elementary schools were studied. Chakrabati found that schools with a lower socio-economic status faced more competition, with more voucher schools being in closer proximity to the students and more students being eligible for MPCP. There was also greater student movement in schools with students of lower socio-economic status. Voucher students showed improvement in reading, science, and language arts test scores after the changes in the MPCP in 1998. There was also an increase in the number of before and after care programs and clinics after 1998. Chakrabati concluded that although voucher systems may not, in and of themselves, promote improvement in public schools, a careful choice of the parameters in which the voucher system is set up can lead to public school improvement.

Chakrabati (2008) also conducted a study that compared the voucher system in Milwaukee prior to 1998 with one in Florida to determine the impact the design of a voucher system has on public school improvement. The Milwaukee program began as an experiment in 1990 and instantly made low-income students eligible for participation. The system in Florida required a school to receive a failing grade twice within three years prior to students' being eligible to participate in the voucher program. The study used school-level test scores, obtained largely from the states' departments of public instruction, from both areas to determine that improvement in the Florida-type program will be greater than those in Milwaukee.

The School Choice Demonstration Project at the University of Arkansas submitted a summary of the baseline reports regarding the MPCP (Wolf, 2008). This report was the last of a comprehensive five-part series. This series comprehensively covers several aspects of MPCP including: its fiscal impact, a report on the schools themselves, and testing results. A random sample of over 3,000 students was examined. In addition, surveys of nearly 3,000 students and parents were conducted via telephone. Wolf found that test scores were similar between MPCP and MPS students with a slight edge going to MPS students in grades 3–5. Parental satisfaction within a particular school was slightly higher among MPCP parents, and MPCP parents had, on average, a higher level of education but lower income level than their MPS counterparts.

A study of the Milwaukee voucher system was conducted to determine if vouchers led to student sorting when coupled with random private school selection (Chakrabati, 2009). Using a theoretical model this study determined that random private school selection—private schools being forced to accept all applicants—and the absence of topping up, which was defined as parents being allowed to pay additional money over that of the voucher, helped to deter sorting based on income. Chakrabati also found that in spite of these factors, sorting based on ability still existed.

Stricter regulations may have led to fewer new schools joining the MPCP (Dickman, Schmidt, & Henken, 2010). Dickman et. al gathered a great deal of information as a result of their annual questionnaire to all schools participating in the program. The majority of MPCP schools had a student racial makeup that was 90% minority and located in the city's most impoverished zip codes. The enrollment in MPCP

was narrower in scope than in previous years with seven schools accounting for most of the enrollment gains. There were similarities when comparing test results of MPCP schools with those in MPS. Dickman compared the achievement of voucher and public school students on standardized tests and stated:

While school-by-school data on student achievement is not made available for MPCP schools, analyses of the achievement of voucher users on the aggregate has found their performance on standardized tests to be similar to that of MPS students (p. 5).

The literature regarding MPCP revealed no conclusive evidence of increased or decreased educational outcomes. The literature did show that MPCP had an influence on the educational climate in Milwaukee. There were modest gains in some test scores and some parents showed an increased level of satisfaction with voucher schools.

Summary

The literature regarding vouchers revealed several key points. First, due to a lack of substantial data, theoretical research was a useful tool for policy makers, though not a replacement for empirical evidence. Second, equity issues, the peer group effect, and parental involvement influenced voucher programs, yet it was difficult to determine to what extent. Finally, whether or not vouchers produced significant positive educational outcomes was still being debated and no clear consensus was reached.

Charter Schools

Charter schools are non-sectarian, public schools of choice that operate with varying degrees of autonomy from public school districts. The charter is a contract that details the school's mission. The time frame of the charter contracts varies but the majority of contracts span three to five years (U.S. Charter Schools, 2008). Like

vouchers, there was a great deal of literature that dealt with charter school educational outcomes. The charter literature was categorized by studies that examined charter schools related to the educational marketplace and educational outcomes.

Charter Schools and the Educational Marketplace

Within the literature regarding charter schools several different issues were studied. Researchers explored changes in the educational system brought about by charter schools, competition among schools, charter school selectivity, educational outcomes, teacher requirements, and student and parent satisfaction.

Lacireno-Paquet et al. (2002) proposed that because of their history and association, some charter schools are market oriented. Market-oriented charter schools may have been *cropping*, or not admitting students with special needs, as opposed to *creaming* or only taking the best students Lacireno-Paquet et al. compared market-oriented charter schools, non-market oriented charter schools, and traditional public schools in Washington, DC. They hypothesized that market-oriented charter schools admitted fewer students with disabilities than other charter schools. Data was gathered from the Washington DC school system. At that time, Washington, DC had some of the most lenient charter school laws in the country and 25 charter schools in operation. Lacireno-Paquet et al. concluded that market-based charter schools in Washington DC were not skimming the best students but there were large discrepancies in the number of special-education students served in comparison to their non-market based counterparts.

Regarding charter schools, more emphasis should be placed on teachers' skill levels and competence as opposed to whether or not they had achieved state certification

(Hoxby, 2002). Hoxby first examined traditional forms of choice such as private schools. Data from a comprehensive national survey of public and private school teachers and administrators was used to examine how charter schools could help change the traits that have traditionally been desirable in teachers. Hoxby concluded that because choice schools have more flexibility in their ability to pay teachers, they would begin to pay more for certain characteristics they found desirable. Furthermore, the skills most desirable in a teacher were the same skills that made someone in the private sector desirable. Hoxby suggested school choice would reduce the demand for credentials not valued by the broader labor market, such as master's degrees in education and teachers' certification.

School board officials and administrators may not be as opposed to school reform as the public might believe (Wells, Slayton, & Scott, 2002). Wells et al. used interview data from two concurrent but separate studies in California. They concluded that although charter schools were touted as democratic by their proponents—described as largely neoliberal—school board officials and administrators were not as opposed to school reform as the public might believe. The authors explained the concept of neoliberalism stating:

What we have seen is that, particularly in the suburban and suburban-rural communities, school district officials are often nearly as neoliberal as their critics. If nothing else, this helps us to understand just how hegemonic neoliberalism and the understanding of democracy as a means to liberty—as opposed to equality—are in our global capitalist society. (p. 358)

Wells et al. suggested that a free-market educational system would have the same effect on the poor as a free-market economy. This educational climate was described as another

way in which the wealthy and politically powerful would ultimately have control:

As in every aspect of their suburban and relatively privileged situations, they seek a public educational system that is responsive to immediate demands of the consumers—at least those consumers with the economic, political, and social efficacy to make demands. This is how they have come to define democracy. (p. 338)

According to a telephone survey of parents in Washington, DC, charter school parents had a higher rate of satisfaction for the teachers, principals, and facilities than those of their public school counterparts (Schneider & Buckley, 2003). Three models were used to test the difference in parental satisfaction in D.C. charter schools: the naïve model, a standard multivariate regression model, and a model that controlled for self-selection. The naïve model is a simple model that compares the grades of various criteria without controlling for any extenuating factors. A standard multivariate regression model is a model that controls for school and parent variables and inconsistencies in grading. The third was a model that controlled for self-selection. Schneider and Buckley used a propensity score matching method to control for the fact that parents who choose charter schools were more likely to be satisfied with them simply because it was their choice. They found that choice alone did not account for the significantly higher satisfaction rate among charter school parents.

Lubienski (2003) studied competition between charter and public schools. To compile data for this study, a search of the literature was performed highlighting innovation in charter schools. The data was then examined in several different ways. Lubienski anticipated the same market-based competition that created innovation in other areas would do the same for education. The author concluded educational practices—the

things charter schools claimed to reform—may have been the very things kept stagnant by the system itself. Lubienski explained his position on school competition and stated:

In competing for students, schools in these cases tend to emulate established conceptions of schooling rather than use their autonomy to try substantively different approaches. (p. 396)

There appears to be no direct causal relationship—counter to what market advocates have assumed—between bringing market mechanisms to education and inducing educational innovation. In fact, the very causal direction is in question in view of the fact that government intervention, rather than market forces, is the cause of the charters' most frequently acknowledged innovation. (p. 428)

School choice and charter schools may have an influence on white flight (Renzulli & Evans, 2005). Their study drew from the racial competition theory and used data from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the Common Core of Data (CCD). Renzulli and Evans examined the causes of white segregation in charter schools. After examining three decades of charter school research, they concluded that in addition to residential mobility, charter schools had become an option for white flight. They also concluded that “even when whites are the majority in a school district and among their schools, whites who attend schools with non-whites continue to look for options that are even more white” (p. 412). There were three control variables regarding white charter school enrollment that Renzulli and Evans felt warranted further research: the influence of special education, the effect of a race-based clause, and whether or not academic quality was a determining factor.

There are three possible reasons for the creation of charter schools (Renzulli & Roscigno, 2005). Renzulli and Roscigno used data obtained from the Center for Education Reform, the U.S. Census Bureau, the Common Core of Data, and the Private

School Survey. After studying various charter school applications they found that the foundation for many charter schools is embedded in one of three organizational theories: neoinstitutional, population ecology, and resource dependence. The study examined various reasons why charter schools are implemented in various states. Renzulli and Roscigno concluded that “institutional processes, through internal politics and geography, play a role in the adoption of educational policy” (p. 358). They also concluded that adjacent states tend to mimic each other regarding charter school legislation and implementation.

Austin (2008) explored music education in charter schools. Music was incorporated in the curriculum of 70% of the charter schools surveyed. In charter schools, course offerings were more specialized, there was less formal curriculum in place, and a smaller percentage of teachers were highly qualified.

The charter literature examined the educational marketplace surrounding charter schools. This literature examined many important issues: charter school selectivity regarding students with special needs, competition between charter and public schools, charters being an advantage for the wealthy, charter schools influencing change teacher qualifications, and charter schools being an option for white flight. Vouchers and charters were shown throughout the literature to influence the overall educational marketplace and climate as well.

Charter School Educational Outcomes

Prior to the charter school movement of the 1990s there were several studies comparing educational outcomes in public and private schools. This is significant

because many questions regarding charter school achievement—such as the role of parental involvement— were discussed in the studies conducted prior to the charter movement. As charter schools became more popular, there was more literature available that dealt with them specifically. As was true with both vouchers and magnet schools there was a great deal of literature that dealt with their effectiveness in increasing educational outcomes.

Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1982) examined whether private schools brought about higher achievement in basic cognitive skills for students of similar abilities? Coleman et al. used data from a National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) longitudinal study of high school sophomores and seniors to discover if there were differences in educational outcomes between Catholic and public schools. Students in Catholic and other private high schools scored consistently higher in math and vocabulary than their public school counterparts. Reading results were not as conclusive. The slight edge in test scores held by Catholic students virtually disappeared when controlled statistically for family background. Possibly because of a difference in school disciplinary policy, Catholic students did more homework than their public school counterparts, which could affect achievement. Coleman et al. concluded that it was difficult to obtain a fair comparison between public and private school students partially because parents chose to send their children to a private school, thus making them generally more involved.

Cuttance (1983) reviewed Coleman et al.'s (1982) report. Cuttance agreed with Coleman, maintaining there were a variety of factors, such as overall school discipline,

and the school's educational objectives, which made conclusive results in a study of this type difficult.

While the "raw" results which one would obtain from a listing of the examination results, say, for each sector, are likely to suggest quite substantial differences in average outcomes, they would not indicate how a particular individual student would perform in either sector, nor would they indicate how each sector would perform under identical conditions. (Cuttance, 1983, p. 264)

Cuttance questioned the validity and statistical methodology of Coleman et al.'s (1982) findings, questioning whether the size of the sample of private schools was large enough to produce valid results. Cuttance then re-examined the NCES data used in the Coleman study regarding racial integration, parental income, geographic information, curriculum, course offerings, teacher to student ratios, school disciplinary climate, school spirit, student behavior, student attendance, student plans after high school, and student employment after high school. After this re-analysis of the data, Cuttance suggested that there may have been less of a difference between public and private schools than suggested by Coleman et al. "The general conclusion from these re-analyses is that there appears to be no definite evidence that private schools do produce better results" (p. 271).

Two surveys of teachers and administrators were used to study the differences between public and private schools (Chubb & Moe, 1988). Chubb and Moe stated that there was little diversity between public schools because they were directly controlled by a government bureaucracy. Conversely, private schools and charter schools, while not directly controlled by the government, were directly controlled by the market, which promoted a great deal of diversity and accountability. Chubb and Moe discussed several outside influences that could have had an impact on private and public schools including

school boards, unions, parents, staff relations, and principals. They concluded that private schools outperformed their public school counterparts because they were largely free of the outside interference of a governmental bureaucracy. This lack of governmental interference enabled private schools to control their own destiny, create a more teamwork-oriented learning environment, and enforce higher academic and behavioral standards amongst their students.

A study conducted by the United States Department of Education (2004) found a minimal difference in the performance of fourth graders in reading and mathematics attending charter schools versus public. Using a sample of 150 charter schools and over 6,000 public schools it was determined public schools on average scored slightly higher in both reading and mathematics. When the data were broken down in greater detail they found there was no appreciable difference in reading scores when comparing all of the charter and public school students. It was also determined that there was no appreciable difference between the results comparing inner-city to non-inner-city students. Math scores were lower for charter students. In addition, students in inner-city charter schools scored lower than their public counterparts. In non-inner-city schools there was no appreciable difference in test scores.

Braun, Jenkins, Grigg, and Tirre (2006) used hierarchical linear modeling and a sample of 150 charter schools and 6,764 non-charter schools to compare their reading and math scores. The schools were compared in several different ways. When comparing all charter schools to all public schools, charter schools actually performed slightly below public: an average of 5.2 points lower in reading, and an average of 5.8 points lower in

math. When comparing charter schools associated with a public school district there was statistically almost no difference. When comparing charter schools not affiliated with a public school district the charter school results were significantly lower. When the sample was restricted to inner-city schools with a high minority population, the scores were higher in non-charter public schools.

Longitudinal data was used to study the performance and competitive impact of charter schools in Florida. Sass (2006) utilized a longitudinal database that covered all public schools in Florida to study three key charter school issues: the impact of charter schools on student achievement when compared with public schools, the variation of student performance among charter schools, and the competitive impact of charter schools on public schools. Using an econometric model and value added comparisons, Sass concluded charter schools begin with lower educational outcomes than public schools. As they mature, charter schools' performance improves and they are on par with public schools in math and show an advantage in reading scores. Charter schools with high at-risk and special education populations had low student achievement compared when compared with other charters. Competition from charters resulted in slightly increased math scores in public schools.

Charter schools may have an influence on student achievement in North Carolina (Bifulco & Ladd, 2006). The charter school movement in North Carolina began in 1996. This study's data was obtained from the North Carolina Education Research Data Center. This data was used to estimate the impact of charter schools on charter school students. Bifulco and Ladd concluded charter schools had no significant effect on charter or public

school students. They also concluded that the new school effect was present in North Carolina, and the negative effects of charter schools were also present, even for schools that had operated for several years.

Charters may have had a competitive effect on Texas public schools (Booker et al., 2008). Booker et al. examined public school student achievement outcomes after the advent of charter schools. Their data consisted of student, campus, and district level observations from the fall of 1993 to the spring of 2004. The data was obtained from the Texas Education Agency. Booker et al. used a value-added measure of student performance. This was done to ensure that student and school performance were measured as the increase in a student's academic achievement. After controlling for several variables, Booker et al. concluded that charter school penetration had a significant and positive effect on traditional public school educational outcomes.

Gleason, Clark, Tuttle, Dwayer, and Silverberg (2010) conducted an in depth analysis of the impact of charter schools. The authors used a sample of 36 charter schools across 15 states and compared the outcomes of students who were admitted through a lottery—lottery winners—and those who were not admitted via the lottery—lottery losers. Gleason et al. discovered that charter middle schools that had lotteries had little impact on student achievement, behavior, or school progress. They also found that charter schools' impact on student achievement varied a great deal depending on the individual school. In addition, Gleason et al. concluded that a student's socio-economic status was a factor regarding whether the charter school had a positive or negative effect on student test scores. When controlling for these various factors, charter schools fared

no better or worse than their public school counterparts.

New school effect, defined as when a school's performance "starts off low and then declines or remains stagnant during the first few years of operation," may be effected by charter and public schools (Kelly & Loveless, 2012, p. 427). Kelly and Loveless used school-level data from new public and charter schools in 1999, 2000, and 2001. Contrary to Sass (2006) and others, Kelly and Loveless found no definitive evidence of new school effect in either charter or public schools, though they strongly suggested further research in this area.

The literature that dealt with charter schools' influence on educational outcomes was largely inconclusive. It seemed that even when controls were used there were too many outside variables preventing a definitive answer. It was difficult for researchers to determine if any increase in educational outcomes was due to charter schools or a variety of other factors such as parental involvement, new school effect, or socio-economic status. The research that focused on Milwaukee's charter schools had similar results.

Milwaukee's Charter Schools

Since the advent of the Milwaukee High School Reform Initiative in November of 2003, Milwaukee has seen a dramatic increase in its number of charter schools. The money for this program was taken directly from the general state aid fund for public schools. In MPS this increase in charter schools translated to approximately four million dollars being cut from their 2003 budget, due to a decline in enrollment. However, in addition to their per-pupil allotment, charter schools received additional funding from the Gates Foundation, which in 2003 donated 17 million dollars to the Milwaukee

Metropolitan Association of Commerce (Pryzbyla, 2003). One of the directors of the initiative at that time, Marty Lexmond, reported that the district planned on opening up to 30 new small high schools with an enrollment of 400 or fewer students. In addition, there was to be a reorganization of seven large high schools into multiplex campuses (Meeting Notes, 2004). The Gates Foundation was a powerful financial entity with a 28.8 billion dollar endowment; nearly three times that of the next largest U.S. foundation (Miner, 2005).

Witte, Shober, and Schlomer (2007) performed a detailed statistical analysis of charter school performance in Wisconsin. They found that charter schools performed marginally better than their public school counterparts. The results showed an increased performance at the fourth-grade level. Results at the eighth-grade level were mixed. Regarding charter high schools, the results were found more difficult to quantify. This difficulty was due to the high percentage of at risk students in Wisconsin's charter high schools. In addition, charter schools were shown to do a marginally better job of moving non-proficient students to proficiency as opposed to moving already proficient students to an advanced level.

The literature regarding charter schools and school vouchers was similar. It covered many aspects of education including demographics, educational marketplace, competition between charter and public schools, and socio-economic issues. Like the voucher literature, a great deal of the research on charter schools compared their educational outcomes to their public school counterparts, yet there were no definitive answers regarding those outcomes. There was also a large portion of literature that dealt

with the competitive effect of charter schools in the educational marketplace. Some charter-school literature showed a slight advantage to either charter or public schools on many fronts. However, a variety of external factors made consensus regarding charters vs. public schools difficult to determine.

Magnet Schools

Magnet schools were designed to focus on an educational specialty, such as gifted and talented or the arts. The term “magnet” was used with the assumption that the specialty would be so appealing to prospective students that it would attract them, much like a magnet (Doyle & Levine, 1984). The city of Milwaukee had several city-wide specialty schools focused on the arts: an elementary school, two middle schools, one K-8, and the Milwaukee High School of the Arts (MHSA), which opened in 1985 (Wszalek, 2008). The magnet school literature is divided into educational outcomes and magnet schools as a means to voluntary integration.

Magnet School Educational Outcomes

A great deal of the literature for any type of school reform—vouchers, charters, or magnets—had to do with the influence they had over educational outcomes. Starting with the large push towards magnet schools in the United States in the 1980s, researchers began to examine whether magnet schools elevated academic performance as was intended. The overall conclusion for this portion of the literature was that, while it was not the complete answer to educational choice, magnet schools were an important part of the puzzle and were largely successful in their mission.

Early magnet schools may have had a positive influence on educational outcomes

(Doyle & Levine, 1984). Both qualitative and quantitative data were used in this early examination of magnet schools. Doyle and Levine used numerical data from a Department of Education study in addition to several other early studies on magnet schools. They concluded that magnet schools were effective in increasing educational outcomes. Teacher and student morale was higher in magnet schools. While not the complete answer, magnet schools could be a valuable component in educational choice. The authors clarified their position regarding magnet schools and stated:

Magnet schools are not a panacea any more than comprehensive high schools were. Magnet schools are, however, a powerful tool for educational change. They can and do meet the objectives set for them, including higher academic standards and greater integration. (p. 269)

Gamoran (1996) also examined the influence magnet schools had on student achievement. Using data from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey Gamoran was able to examine which type of school would produce the highest achievement from urban students. Three types of schools used studied: magnet, Catholic, and secular private schools. Gamoran found there was no advantage to secular private schools and only a slight edge in math for Catholic schools. Gamoran concluded that magnet schools would do a better job serving disadvantaged students and would have similar academic results as comprehensive public schools.

When comparing the literature regarding educational outcomes in voucher programs and charter schools with outcomes in magnet schools, magnets seemed to show a more positive influence on educational outcomes. While most researchers agreed magnet schools were not the complete answer, many felt they provided a valuable piece of the educational puzzle. The research regarding magnet schools showed high levels of

student, teacher and parental satisfaction, better success in dealing with students with special needs, and overall they showed a great deal of success.

Magnet Schools as a Means to Voluntary Integration

Like charter schools, a great portion of the literature regarding magnet schools had to do with their use in voluntary school integration. Magnet schools were viewed as means to inclusion rather than exclusion (Doyle & Levine, 1984). It was not until the desegregation push of the 1970s that there was a large influx of magnet schools across the country and research regarding their effectiveness as an agent of voluntary integration.

Magnet school literature from the 1970s suggests magnets were a tool used by politicians to deter white flight and to encourage voluntary integration. Because of the push for school integration in the 1970s, Rosenbaum (1978) predicted there would be an increase in the number of magnet schools and stated:

The constitutional imperatives to accomplish integration, the current political sentiment against compulsory integration, the national attention being focused on magnet school approaches, and the encouraging reports from many cities across the United States all suggest that we may be entering a period when there will be a great proliferation of these schools. (Rosenbaum & Presser, 1978, p. 157)

Raywid (1985) conducted a review of the history of public school choice opportunities. Magnet schools became popular as a way to try and use school choice as a means to voluntary integration. Raywid examined the concept of magnet schools being the first attempt to create a system of options as opposed to one or two specialty schools. They were thought of as successful because “They often introduce programs of high quality into areas that have despaired of seeing such change” (p. 450). Raywid concluded

that magnet schools might not have been completely successful as a means to integration. If the school attracted the right mix, it was thought of as a success. If a school attracted too many students of any one ethnic background, it ran the risk of not being as integrated as was intended.

There were benefits from magnet schools being used as a catalyst for voluntary segregation (Rossell, 1988). Using data from a sample of 119 districts, Rossell examined desegregation statistics in magnet programs, concluding that magnet schools made an excellent supplement to a mandatory desegregation plan. Rossell also suggested the desegregating effects of voluntary magnet schools would be longer lasting than those of an involuntary desegregation program. In addition, magnet schools were found to reduce the risk of white flight that could be associated with mandatory integration plans.

The very thing magnet schools were said to help prevent—segregation—was the very thing they may have promoted. West (1994) stated segregation was not promoted from the outside of a school but rather from within. While the buildings may have been desegregated, some magnet schools were operating with segregated classrooms. The two most common reasons cited were grouping by academic ability and discriminatory disciplinary policies. West suggested one way of dealing with segregation within a school is to make sure courts and other agencies examining this issue take a deeper look at the inner workings of the school. West further explained his position and stated:

If the segregation that must be undone is classroom segregation as well as building-level segregation, magnet structures which result in segregated classrooms should be rejected in favor of other desegregation tools more likely to eliminate segregation at both the classroom and building levels. (pp. 2591-2592)

Morrison (1996) analyzed enrollment data from Kansas City, Missouri, a large urban school district, over the course of several years, as magnet schools were being implemented. The most important question studied was whether magnet schools were attracting students from outside the district or merely siphoning off students who already attended school in the district. The court-ordered desegregation plan of 1984 and the subsequent influx of magnet schools into the Kansas City school system were reviewed. Morrison concluded that while magnet schools did not appear to attract a significant number of students from outside the district, they did help with the district's student retention rate. What was not clear was whether they would be able to sustain that retention rate over time. What was also not clear was how such a massive expenditure for the city of Kansas City could produce such minimal results. Morrison questioned the disproportionate return of incoming suburban students when compared to the district's capital outlay and stated:

How could expenditures this massive produce such unremarkable results? The experience to date points toward a troubling conclusion: Even a billion dollars' worth of improvements to a school district like KCMUSD changes few minds outside the district. (p. 144)

Saporito (2003) examined the racial implications of magnet school choice, specifically the types of criteria that were important to different races when choosing a magnet school. Using application data from the Philadelphia school system during the 1990–1991 and 1991–1992 school years, Saporito examined the influence individual choice had on educational segregation in Philadelphia's magnet school program. He concluded whites tended to avoid magnet schools with higher non-white populations and more affluent families tended to avoid magnet schools where the student body was of a

lower income level.

One study found no appreciable difference in desegregation between school districts with magnet-based school choice and those with no choice (Archbald, 2004). Using statistical indices of economic segregation and controlling for district and city demographics, Archbald examined segregation between magnet and non-magnet districts. Data was used from a national study conducted by the U.S. Department of Education in 1990–1991. It consisted primarily of interview data from telephone interviews with officials from 600 school districts nationwide. Archbald examined the use of a liberation model for school choice. The liberation model suggested that choice would liberate low-income families because it gave them an opportunity to attend schools that would otherwise be unattainable financially and geographically. Archbald concluded that segregation for economic reasons occurred regardless of whether or not the district had a magnet program. The reasons for this type of segregation included zoning policies, neighborhood design, influence of realtors, school board attendance policies, and parental choices.

Magnet School Summary

There was a large body of literature that examined the use of magnet schools as a means to voluntary integration. The findings as to whether or not they were successful in that mission offered a variety of answers. There were those who felt magnet schools did help to promote integration. There were also those who felt magnet schools merely moved integration from the school to the classroom level. This differed from the findings

of the magnet literature regarding student, parent, and teacher satisfaction, which was overwhelmingly pro-magnet.

Public School Funding and Music Programs

Public school funding as it applied to music education was a major point of interest throughout this study. There was not a large amount of literature pertaining to music program funding. Of the literature that was available, the majority pointed to a funding crisis or programs being underfunded.

Costa-Giomi (2008) examined elementary music education in a large urban area in Texas. A questionnaire was sent to 54 music teachers whose schools were classified based on the socio-economic status of their students. Costa-Giomi found there were no appreciable differences in teacher preparation or class size between the various types of schools. However, there were major differences in parental support. Schools with populations of higher socio-economic status enjoyed greater support than their economically disadvantaged counterparts.

The results show that, in general, schools with fewer minorities or with lower proportions of economically disadvantaged students had more adequate facilities and instructional resources, more supportive and active parents, and better access to external sources of funding than school with a higher proportion of minority students or disadvantaged students. (p. 25)

A study was conducted to examine the Oklahoma educational community's perception of the importance of music education (Ciorba & Seibert, 2012). A survey modeled after the Music Education Perception Measure (MEPM) was distributed to music teachers, teachers from other subject areas, and administrators. When asked what they would do to improve music education, increased funding was at the top or near the

top of every group's list. Both administrators and music teachers put increased funding at the top of their list. Support staff and non-music teachers placed funding second or third.

Major (2013) examined how funding decisions were made regarding music programs in the Detroit suburb of Lekebery Michigan. This was a case study using interview data that corroborated documents supplied by the district. Major determined the district was committed to offering "a well-rounded education to all of their students and that music education played a large part in that education" (p. 5).

The literature regarding funding most often focused on either a need for increased monies or the fact that districts with a higher socio-economic standing enjoyed a higher level of financial support. There were very few music programs that reported having what they felt were adequate funding levels. Although funding levels were a concern, the literature also indicated they may have been a byproduct of music education being placed in a role of secondary importance.

Summary

Studies regarding voucher, charter, and magnet schools seemed to be indicative of a great deal of the research regarding school choice in all its forms. Much of the literature was hypothetical, and based on complex statistical computations that used existing data. There was no qualitative element to a great number of the studies in this review. There seemed to be a need for research incorporating more qualitative elements.

The literature regarding vouchers and charter schools was similar. While there was no evidence of a significant positive influence on educational outcomes by either charters or vouchers, there was evidence of vouchers and charters having an influence on

the educational climate and marketplace. There was no clear consensus regarding whether or not their influence on the educational marketplace and climate was positive or negative.

Because many magnet schools were initially set up as arts specialty schools there was some literature regarding how this educational reform had influenced school music programs. Magnet schools were more often studied for what they had done to influence school desegregation. There was no literature that mentioned Milwaukee's magnet schools.

The literature regarding music program funding examined the need for increased fiscal support. Music teachers and administrators were the most vocal in their desire to see more funds allocated for music programs but support was offered from regular education teachers and college faculty as well. As is true in other areas of education, schools with high minority populations and lower socio-economic status were shown the least financial support for their music programs.

Nearly all of the literature reviewed for this project dealt with educational issues on a large scale. Hypothetical literature utilized existing data to speculate on the institution of a new policy or educational outcomes. Some of the literature had to do with the influence of school choice on minorities. There was no literature regarding the influence of school choice on secondary music programs.

Because of the lack of literature regarding school choice and secondary music programs, this study could help fill a void in this area of research. It is a study of secondary music programs in a district with a long-standing voucher program, a small-

school initiative, and a large number of charter schools. This study could be a catalyst for a larger body of research on this topic.

CHAPTER 3 METHODS

The purpose of this study was to explore Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) students', teachers', and administrators' perceptions regarding the influence of school choice policies on secondary music programs in MPS. With the number of Milwaukee high schools nearly quadrupling from September 1990 to June 2010 (Student Enrollment History, 2009), I wanted to determine what changes, if any, had occurred in MPS secondary music programs. Prior to 1990 when the district had 15, large, comprehensive high schools the vast majority had band, orchestra, and vocal offerings. In 2010 when MPS had 59 high schools I wanted to determine what, if any, music programs existed in those schools. This study was guided by the following questions:

1. What was the state of MPS secondary music programs prior to 1990?
2. What was the state of MPS secondary music programs in 2010?
3. What did participants see as the changes to music programs from 1990–2010?
4. What were the participants' perceptions of the influence of school choice on MPS secondary music programs?

To answer these questions, I conducted two-staged, qualitative study with multiple data sources. I did not feel numerical data or interviews alone would have been sufficient. In order to create a more complete and accurate picture of the changes in Milwaukee's high school music programs during this 20-year period I felt a two-stage qualitative approach was necessary. I first utilized numerical data, categorization, and mapping, which showed exactly what music—both curricular and extra-curricular—was offered at each MPS high school. It also showed how the music programs were staffed.

Numerical data collection was followed by 19 interviews with a purposive sample of several past and present MPS administrators, music teachers, and music students. The interviews were conducted to gather explanatory data examining their perceptions of how and why changes in secondary music programs had occurred.

Numerical Data Collection and Analysis

The MPS Department of Research and Assessment supplied numerical data regarding enrollment and school openings and closings. These data were then entered into a spreadsheet. These numerical data were necessary to determine how many large and small high schools there were in MPS. From these initial data I was able to determine MPS had 59 high schools during the 2009–2010 school year. I then categorized all 59 into two categories, small or large schools. Data regarding music programs and specific class sizes were not available from MPS central office.

I then conducted a telephone survey of all 59 high schools. Data from this survey showed how many secondary music programs existed in MPS and allowed me to determine staffing in schools that had a music program. The data were also presented during the interviews and used as a catalyst for discussion regarding MPS secondary music programs. I compiled a list of telephone numbers and entered them into a spreadsheet. I then called, and was able to reach, all 59 high schools and asked for the following information: (a) Whether or not the school had a music program; (b) If a program existed, how many part- and full-time music specialists were assigned to that school; (c) If there was a music teacher, what music programs, instrumental or vocal, were offered at the school; and (d) If there was a music teacher, what music courses were

offered at the school. The data was entered into a spreadsheet, combined with the previously acquired enrollment data, and mapped two different ways: whether the school existed pre-1990 or post-1990, and whether it was a large or small high school. MPS defines a small school as any school with 400 or fewer pupils, whereas a large school is defined as any school with more than 400 pupils (Carl, Huiping, Keltz, & Meyer, 2010).

In an effort to obtain more detailed data regarding school staffing and budget, I then sent an email survey to the 29 full-time MPS high school music teachers that asked the following questions: What courses are offered at your high school? How many music faculty, are they full or part time, or a travelling teacher? How is your program financed? Is there a line item for your program in the school's budget? How many students are enrolled in your program? Is there anything else you would like to add about your program? The survey had a response rate of slightly over 10% ($n = 3$). A follow up email was sent and the response rate did not increase. The teachers' written comments about their respective schools were added to the non-numerical, descriptive data. In spite of the relatively poor response rate, the data from the teacher survey did help to provide a more complete picture of those particular school's music programs.

Interview Data Collection and Analysis

Once the telephone and email surveys had taken place, the interview phase of the project was begun. After the staffing and enrollment data were collected, entered into a spreadsheet, and analyzed, I conducted 19 interviews of student, teacher, and administrative participants. I felt it necessary to complete the telephone and email surveys prior to the interview process so I could use the staffing and enrollment data in

order to gain feedback from the participants. Participants included past and present school board members, administrators, teachers, and students.

Participant Selection

A purposive sample of participants was chosen based on their involvement in MPS secondary music programs, their experience with MPCP, MHSRI, charter schools, or a combination of these factors. I sought participants who were either current or former students involved in an MPS secondary music program, a MPS music teacher with enough experience to have taught in MPS between 1990 and 2010, an administrator who had direct experience with MPS secondary music programs or was instrumental in the implementation of MPCP, MHSRI, or the charter school movement. In the event a selected participant could not be interviewed, every effort was made to find a suitable substitute. I remained flexible. When a viable candidate for participation became available, every effort was made to obtain an interview.

Based on the previously discussed criteria, and after several discussions with colleagues, I created a list of potential participants. I then contacted them via telephone. I briefly informed the potential participants how the interview was structured and that they would be audio taped. After they agreed to participate, I emailed them a copy of the informed consent form (see Appendix B). I then made arrangements to meet with them in person. They were advised that staffing and enrollment data I collected from MPS would be discussed during the interview.

Student and alumni participants. After discussing the matter with the MPS Department of Research and Development it was determined that student participants

would have to be 18 years of age and a current or former student in an MPS music program. MPS also asked that if a current student were to be interviewed the participant be interviewed at an MPS site during normal operating hours. Both the age and location requirement were put in place to minimize any risks involved with using student participants. In order to help ensure a variety of viewpoints, I felt it was necessary to recruit students and alumni who were from a wide variety of age and ethnic groups, socio-economic statuses, and had attended a number of different schools. I interviewed current and former students, colleagues who were former students, the spouses of friends, former students recommended by colleagues at other schools, and friends who had attended MPS high schools.

There were eight current or former MPS music students who participated in this project: four male and four female. Their ages ranged from 18 to 48. Student and alumni participants identified as African, Italian, and Mexican American, and had attended six different MPS high schools including five comprehensive high schools and one small charter high school.

Teacher participants. Teacher participants had to have been a current or former MPS music teacher with experience prior to the influx of choice in MPS during the early 1990s. Prior to 1995 MPCP was a limited experiment (Witte, 2000). I wanted teacher participants to have experience prior to the large scale implementation of MPCP. In addition, the teachers' experience allowed them to provide a first-hand perspective of MPS secondary music programs prior to the large-scale influx of choice and charter schools.

Six current or former MPS music teachers—five males and one female—participated in this project. They ranged in age from their late 30s to early 70s, two were African American, three Caucasian, and one was Mexican American. They had experience at 10 different middle and high schools throughout MPS.

Administrator participants. Administrator participants were selected based on their position within MPS. Although some were former music teachers, I felt it was more important that the administrator participants were in a position that dealt with the influx of choice within MPS. I wanted the input of several high-level administrators to help explain why and how the choice programs were implemented and where they felt music education fit in the overall educational system.

There were five administrator participants; all were male and either current or former MPS administrators. They ranged in age from their early 40s to late 50s. There were two African American and three Caucasian administrator participants. They encompassed a wide variety of administrative experience including principals, assistant principals, curriculum coordinators, school board members, and other high-ranking MPS officials.

Interviews

In total, 19 interviews were conducted. The participants offered their input regarding the numerical data from the MPS central office as well as the phone and email surveys. I also asked questions regarding MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools, as well as their influence on secondary music education in MPS. The questions were designed to encourage spontaneous, free-flowing conversation. As a result, several secondary topics

arose and were also discussed at length. The secondary topics included accountability, the separation of church and state, parental involvement, and new teacher preparation.

Although the numerical data provided valuable information, interview questions that referenced the data helped with its interpretation. Several participants supported and offered an explanation for the numerical data. Depending on their perspective, participants had more insight into a particular time period or series of events than numerical data alone illuminated.

I prepared a preliminary set of questions, specific to each type of participant, prior to the meeting (see Appendices C–E). The questions were asked in the same order for every participant. Prior to commencing the interview, the participants were reminded of the confidentiality of the proceedings and their personally identifiable information. The interviews were semi-structured, with questions that allowed me to follow up and direct the interview as necessary. The extent to which a qualitative study is structured will have some bearing on its flexibility (Maxwell, 2005). A loosely structured interview format still allowed me influence throughout the course of the interview (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). My goal was to obtain the participants' honest opinions instead of trying to manipulate them to yield a particular type of data. According to Maxwell (2005):

The development of good interview questions (and observational strategies) requires creativity and insight, rather than a mechanical conversion of the research questions into an interview guide or observation schedule, and depends fundamentally on how the interview questions and observational strategies will actually work in practice. (p. 92)

Upon meeting, I asked the interviewee to sign an informed consent form (see Appendix B). This form briefly described the nature of the research, identified the

researcher, and once again informed the participant that the interview was to be recorded and transcribed. All records of the interview were kept confidential. In addition, in order to help encourage candor from the participants who did not wish to be identified, the confidentiality of any personally identifiable information was paramount. The participants were under no obligation, incurred no penalty for refusal to participate in the study, and were advised as such.

All interviews were transcribed within a week and participants were allowed to proofread and give final approval to their portions of the study. The 19 interviews only required one correction. This portion of the process, known as member checking (Orcher, 2005), helped ensure that my interpretation was consistent with that of the participants. In an effort to establish a high level of trustworthiness, all of the information regarding the interview process and the nature of the study was explained in simple, concise language during the first phone conversation with the participant, and reinforced in the informed consent form and during our initial meeting.

Data Analysis

The interview data were reviewed and coded using the constant-comparative method of coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The constant-comparative method is a straightforward method of analysis in which the researcher compares interview data for similarities and differences. For example, there were a number of similarities in the opinions of certain groups of participants: teachers, administrators, and students. Conversely, there were many differences in the numerical data between various schools. This method was further explained by Corbin and Strauss (2008):

This type of comparison is essential to all analysis because it allows the researcher to differentiate one category/theme from another and to identify properties and dimensions specific to that category/theme. (p. 73)

To assist me with this process, I used Hyper Research (Researchware, Inc., 2015) to aid in the coding of my interview data. Because the participants came from eclectic backgrounds, it was difficult to anticipate exactly what would be discovered. As the data were amassed and coded, themes and trends began to emerge. These trends and themes became categories. As categories emerged, I had to revisit and recode each interview, sometimes several times. All of the interview data were coded; however, there were categories and information not reported in the findings because they were determined to have no relevance to this study.

The categories were loosely structured, so as the study progressed there was room for expansion or deletion as needed. I also kept a journal to chronicle my thought pattern and track any changes as the study progressed. The goal of the journal was to show gradual changes in my questioning, coding and analysis, and to help me reflect on my natural biases during the course of the study (Ortlipp, 2008).

Biases of the Researcher

Because of my inherent closeness to this study, I felt it necessary to include a section recognizing my own biases. While it was not possible to eliminate my biases, it was possible to keep track of and reflect on them as the study progressed. In this section I will discuss what I did to identify any biases I had and to help ensure they had a minimal influence on this study.

I kept a research journal to monitor my thought process, particularly while engaged in interviewing participants. What I discovered was as the interviews progressed I became more adept at asking questions that encouraged more open-ended responses. This encouraged more candor from the participants. In addition, I also found my coding becoming more succinct and focused on the study's research questions.

In addition to my research journal I also was in frequent communication with my dissertation advisor. My advisor was able to serve as an external auditor, identify potential biases and give me guidance as to how to best avoid them. Whenever possible, the biases was addressed and those parts of the study were rewritten or reorganized to minimize their influence.

Summary

This two-stage, qualitative approach with multiple data sources supplied the data necessary to further examine the relationship between several governmental programs and MPS secondary music programs. The numerical data gave an overview of the enrollment and transient nature of MPS high schools. The telephone and email survey supplied data regarding MPS high school music programs, whether there was a program or not, staffing, and course offerings. The 19 interviews gave voice to students, teachers, and administrators regarding MPCP, MHSRI, charter schools and their perceived relationship with MPS secondary music programs.

CHAPTER 4

THE STATE OF SECONDARY MUSIC EDUCATION IN MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A large amount of data from the surveys and interviews dealt with comparing the current state of secondary music education in Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) with its state prior to the large influx of choice programs in the early 1990s. From that primary topic arose several secondary topics including course offerings, funding, staffing, and physical resources. The telephone survey revealed data regarding enrollment, staffing, and course offerings. The 19 interviews conducted for this project revealed data regarding course offerings, funding, staffing, physical resources, and the general state of secondary music education in MPS from the 1960s through 2010.

Enrollment and Access

With the help of the MPS Department of Research and Assessment, a list of high schools and their enrollment for the 2009–2010 school year was compiled. A telephone survey of each high school was then conducted to obtain information regarding whether or not the school had a music program. If the school did offer music, respondents described the department's course offerings and how many full- or part-time faculty were assigned to that school.

MPS had 59 high schools during the 2009–2010 school year. For the purposes of this study they were categorized in two different ways: pre-1990 or post-1990 and large or small. In the 2009–2010 school year, Milwaukee had 11 pre-1990 high schools and 48 post-1990 high schools. Of those 59 high schools, 64% ($n = 38$) had no music program of any kind. The student population of the 38 schools with no music program was 5,741.

The total MPS school enrollment for the schools in this survey was 25,045 students. Therefore, nearly 23% of the high school students enrolled in MPS had no access to music courses in their respective schools during the 2009–10 school year. Of the 48 post-1990 MPS High Schools, 25% ($n = 12$) offered some type of music program during the 2009–10 school year. In post-1990 schools with music offerings, some of the classes were taught by non-certified teachers, including some with no college degree. By contrast, of the 11 pre-1990 high schools, 9 had music offerings. All of the instructors at the pre-1990 high schools were state certified teachers.

The second way the data were analyzed was by categorizing the MPS high schools as large or small schools. MPS defined any school with an enrollment of 0 to 400 as a small school. Any school with an enrollment over 400 was considered a large school (Carl et al., 2010). During the 2009–2010 school year, Milwaukee had 16 large and 43 small high schools. Just over 81% of the large high schools ($n = 13$) offered music programs. Of the small high schools, only 18.6% ($n = 8$) offered a music program to their students. In addition to the large and small definitions, MPS high schools fit into two different categories: 11 traditional, comprehensive high schools that had existed prior to 1990, and 48 high schools—of various descriptions—that had come into existence since 1990 (See Table 1).

Table 1
Enrollment Data for MPS High Schools for the 2009-2010 School Year

Type of School	Large / Enrollment	Small / Enrollment	Total / Enrollment
Pre-1990 ($n = 11$)	11 / 14,450		11 / 14,450
Post-1990 ($n = 48$)	5 / 4,411	43 / 6,184	48 / 10,595
Total ($n = 59$)	16 / 18,861	43 / 6,184	59 / 25,045

When categorized by percentages, there was a marked difference between the number of students with access to a music program in large compared to small high schools. The total population in large high schools was 18,861. The percentage of students in large high schools with access to music was 88.7% ($n = 15,850$). The enrollment at small high schools with a music program was 1,069. The percentage of students attending small high schools with a music program was 18.6% ($n = 8$) (See Table 2).

Table 2
Access to MPS Music Programs Based on School Type

School Type	Schools With	Students With	Total Enrollment
Charter Large ($n = 1$)	1/1 (100%)	1,038 (100%)	1,038
Charter Small ($n = 17$)	4/17 (23%)	740 (24%)	3,037
Charter All ($n = 18$)	5/18 (28%)	1,778 (44%)	4,075
Pre-1990 ($n = 11$)	9/11 (82%)	11,914 (82%)	14,450
Post-1990 ($n = 48$)	12/48 (25%)	5,005 (47%)	10,595
Large ($n = 16$)	13/16 (81%)	15,850 (84%)	18,861
Small ($n = 43$)	8/43 (19%)	1,069 (17%)	6,184
All ($n = 59$)	21/59 (36%)	16,919 (68%)	25,045

Staffing Data

Music teachers in MPS were divided into two categories: classroom and travelling. Classroom music teachers were licensed faculty who were dedicated to one of the high schools. In addition to employing classroom teachers, the district had a large

travelling music teacher program. Travelling teachers filled several needs within the district including group lessons, supplemental education, and elementary education where the school budget did not support a full-time, or even half or one-quarter time, dedicated music instructor. They were paid by the period taught and had the same benefits package afforded regular-education teachers dependent on the number of periods taught per week (M. Antoniewicz, personal communication, November 22, 2008). The MPS music department reported that during the 2010-2011 school year there were 27 travelling music teachers placed in 13 different high schools throughout MPS. Some of these high schools were also middle schools and many traveling teachers were assigned to different middle schools. As a result, it was difficult to ascertain precisely where they were placed and how much of their day was spent teaching middle school as opposed to high school.

Course Offerings

The data obtained from the telephone and e-mail surveys for this project revealed information regarding course offerings in MPS secondary music programs. The majority of high schools did not have a music program of any kind. The schools that did offer music offered a wide variety of course selections. Curricular course offerings included beginning and advanced band, beginning and advanced choir, International Baccalaureate (IB) Music, composition, technology, music theory, class keyboard, small and large jazz ensembles, vocal jazz ensemble, opera workshop, chamber music, music appreciation, drum corps, drum line, pep band, marching band, rock band, American musical theater, and pop music classes.

In addition to the curricular offerings there were a great number of extra-

curricular courses offered in MPS secondary music programs. These offerings were taught either on the teachers' own time or funded through programs such as the Community Learning Center (CLC). CLCs are after-school programs, funded outside of MPS that operate in cooperation with the school. The list of secondary, extra-curricular music course offerings in MPS included jazz ensemble, chamber choir, DJ club, string ensemble, hand drums ensemble, pop music ensemble, drum line, music production, and musical theater.

Numerical Data Regarding Course Offerings

Although there were a large number of courses offered throughout MPS, a closer examination of the survey data revealed how these classes were distributed. MPS had 11 pre-1990 and 48 post-1990 high schools during the 2009–2010 school year. The wide variety of courses listed above existed only at the nine pre-1990 high schools that offered music programs. Of the nine pre-1990 high schools that offered music, all but two offered a performing ensemble. The others offered a variety of non-performance oriented music appreciation courses. Of the seven pre-1990 high schools that offered performing ensembles, all except one offered more than one choice.

Of the 12 post-1990 high schools that offered music, six offered only band or choir. Four of those had multiple offerings: one offered band, orchestra, and choir, one offered band and choir, one offered band and orchestra, and another offered theory and music production in addition to choir. The other two did not indicate their specific courses selection. Of the 48 post-1990 high schools in MPS, only four offered more than band or choir.

When course offerings at large and small schools are compared, the numbers reveal a wider gap than between pre- and post-1990 high schools. MPS had 16 large and 43 small high schools during the 2009-2010 school year. Of the 14 large high schools offering music, one did not offer data regarding course selection, one offered a variety of music appreciation courses, and one other offered only band. The remaining 11 large high schools offered band and at least one other area, most commonly choir. One small school offered only one type of performance element program (e.g. band). One small school offered music with no performance element. Of the eight small high schools offering music, one did not respond to my request for data regarding course offerings. There was one small high school that offered theory and music production in addition to choir. The remaining six programs were divided, four schools offered choir and two offered band. No small high school had a music program without a performance element. Only one small high school offered more than band or choir. See table 3.

Table 3
MPS Music Programs' Course Selection Based on School Type

<u>School Type</u>	<u>1 – Perf. Offering</u>	<u>1+ - Perf. Offerings</u>	<u>No Perf. Offering</u>
Charter (<i>n</i> = 5)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	0
Pre-1990 (<i>n</i> = 9)	1 (11%)	7 (78%)	1 (11%)
Post-1990 (<i>n</i> = 12)	6 (50%)	4 (33%)	0
Large (<i>n</i> = 13)	1 (8%)	10 (77%)	1 (8%)
Small (<i>n</i> = 8)	6 (75%)	1 (13 %)	0
No data (<i>n</i> = 2)			
All (<i>n</i> = 21)	7 (33%)	11 (52%)	1 (5%)

The second phase of the data collection for this project involved a series of interviews with a purposive sample of current and former MPS students, teachers, and administrators. The participants responded to questions on a variety of topics including,

but not limited to funding, course offerings, staffing, facilities, and resources. The participants also provided their opinions on a variety of governmental and educational programs and issues including: the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP), the Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI), charter schools, and magnet schools. These issues were a catalyst for discussion on a variety of other topics including the separation of church and state, school reform, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), unions, collective bargaining, and accountability for the state of secondary music education in MPS. The interviews were conducted from the fall of 2009 through the winter of 2010.

Student and Teacher Feedback Regarding Course Offerings

Each student and teacher participant was asked a series of questions about the course offerings at their respective schools. The majority of students stated that their high schools offered a curriculum consisting of band, orchestra, and vocal music. The majority of the high schools did not offer music theory. Participants' responses corroborated the survey data, which indicated only two of the 21 high schools with a music program offered theory as a specific course offering. With the exception of the lack of a theory offering, students who attended traditional high schools were generally satisfied with music course offerings at their schools. "The only class I remember falling off was music theory. It wasn't offered all the time," said Dan, a former MPS music student. Jody, another student participant stated:

It would be nice to have music theory. [Teacher] was trying to do it as an independent study with me but in high school that's one of those impossible things. So it would have been nice to have offered music theory. I think it would have helped those kids who were interested.

In addition to dedicated music specialists, MPS supplemented instruction with

travelling music teachers. The travelling music teacher program involved teachers travelling to various schools and either assisting the music specialist, or being placed at a school in lieu of a dedicated music teacher. In addition, several student participants had taken part in MPS Saturday music lessons, a program that offered weekly lessons with an MPS teacher for a nominal fee.

The course offerings described by the teacher participants were similar to those described by the students. There were some discrepancies, which may have been due to the students' reporting on one particular program and the data from teachers offering a bigger picture. Teachers had experienced a wider variety of school music programs than their student counterparts.

Teachers reported a variety of musical activities at their schools. Music faculty from one school expressed an interest in expanding the depth of what was already being offered, especially in the area of music theory. Overall, teachers seemed content with their course offerings. Some teachers would have preferred to offer a wider variety of classes; however, the educational climate was not conducive to that aspiration. This was largely due to budgetary concerns and a lack of instructional time. The administrator interviews did not address issues as school specific as course offerings. As a result, no significant data was available.

Student Charter School Experience

Only one student participant had been enrolled at one of Milwaukee's small high schools. Denise had transferred to the Milwaukee High School of the Arts (MHSA) for her senior year of study. Prior to coming to MHSA, Denise attended one of the several

dozen small, charter high schools in MPS. She described this small school as a project-based charter school located inside a large school building. According to MPS, the total enrollment of the school was 209 pupils. When asked about the music offerings at the school, Denise informed me there was no music instruction and stated:

It was project based so there were no music classes. We had art class, which is surprising. We didn't have any other fun things actually. We just had a bunch of classes. Every class you had a project, in every class which was due every week.

Of the eight students and alumni interviewed for this project, Denise was the only participant who had ever attended one of Milwaukee's charter high schools. The fact that this particular charter school did not offer music is not unusual. As stated earlier, 23% of the MPS small charter high schools offered any music-related courses.

Summary

There were some differences between participant groups regarding their perception of the state of MPS high school music programs. Student participants graduating prior to 1999 were generally very satisfied regarding course offerings. They had positive recollections of their high school music experiences.

With MPS having gone through a decentralization movement in the 1990s, individual schools became largely autonomous. There was no district-wide music curriculum enforced. Program and course offerings were determined by the administration and staff of individual schools. This lack of a district-wide curriculum may have influenced the older participants' perspective regarding course offerings. There may have been more curricular offerings prior to 1999. Unfortunately, MPS was unable to supply any data regarding secondary music course offerings during that time period.

Teacher and student participants under the age of 30 expressed concerns that there was not a wide enough variety of music courses offered and that MPS secondary music teachers' time being severely compromised was a major contributing factor. Differences between schools may have led to conflicting opinions.

Funding

Funding for MPS secondary music programs was a major area of interest for this study. Because music programs can be costly and the political climate seemed to favor a strictly academic approach to education, many participants felt funding played a major role in the district's approach to secondary music education. Administrators and teachers addressed funding in greater depth than current and former students. The funding questions directed towards students and teachers dealt with whether or not they felt their respective program had been funded adequately. For students and teachers funding was primarily addressed in the areas of travel and equipment. Administrator participants addressed the area of funding in greater depth focusing on the funding of secondary music programs as a whole.

Student and Teacher Feedback Regarding Funding

The alumni who were over 30 years of age unanimously felt their programs had been adequately funded when compared to program funding at the time of the interviews. Furthermore, there was very little mention of any fundraising outside of the school budget, with the exception of special circumstances such as band trips. Said former student Dan: "I don't recall ever doing any extra fund-raisers, so whatever programs we put on must have come through the school. Like I said we travelled around." Another

student, Laura, responded to the same question in a similar fashion: “Sure, when we needed equipment we had it. It was an award winning band too.” Peter, a former student who taught for MPS, had this to say when asked to comment on funding levels as a student:

At that time, it seemed to be (adequate). We didn’t have to fundraise. We didn’t have to pay for anything. So in that sense, compared to what we have to do now, I’d say yes. It was adequately funded.

Based on their answers to questions regarding fiscal matters the teachers’ level of satisfaction with the funding for their respective programs was low. Funding levels varied from school to school. There were schools at which the music program had a line in a line-item budget, arts grants from private institutions, or income from MPS Partnership for the Arts matching funds. In many MPS secondary schools, funds were distributed to music programs at the principal’s discretion, rather than being included in the budget. Fund raising within the individual secondary music departments made up a great deal of their discretionary revenue. Some teachers expressed their dissatisfaction with the distraction of near-constant fund raising. Teachers were also concerned about students having to finance their own music educations through departmental fund raising. Former MPS student and teacher Peter stated:

The fact that I have to do all my own fund raising. The fact that all the money I spend is basically earned on the back of my kids. It adds a lot of pressure to my job, a lot of pressure to the kids. It’s a shame that a school like this has to pay its own way. There should be funding for everything we need. Not millions of dollars but just everything we need to run this program successfully. The amount of energy that is spent by the students and myself to secure those funds could be better used in other ways. It’s woefully inadequate.

Administrator Feedback Regarding Funding

A major portion of the administrator interview data dealt with funding. Although there were many different opinions regarding funding—and the many subtopics surrounding it—the one facet all administrative participants agreed upon is that there simply was not enough. The reasons given for this fiscal shortage varied, but followed a consistent theme—costs continued to rise and revenue did not increase at a rate fast enough to keep up.

The general consensus regarding secondary music programs was that with the number of fiscal problems facing MPS, music, art, physical education, and other non-academic subjects were simply not a priority. “You don’t have a strong music section until you have a strong organization” said Ed, a former MPS administrator. All administrator participants felt that while there was community support for secondary music programs—and most felt there was a high level of instruction being delivered in the existing programs—the level of financial support was not adequate.

Several administrators suggested increased private donations from the philanthropic community could help relieve the stress of the fiscal crisis. In an era where public funding was either insufficient or—due to mandates in the current educational climate—was directed towards math and reading programs, some administrators suggested private donations to MPS secondary music programs could have proven a vital component to ensuring their future. Administrators also suggested increased political support and a marketing plan that centered on music education could have complimented increased donations from the philanthropic community. Each administrator that spoke of

those private donations pointed to things being done on a large scale. One administrator, Paul, stated:

We are going to work together aggressively to build a foundation that's as strong as the group in Dallas. If we can get a foundation that's going to support arts education on a city-wide level and has the capacity—like \$100 million, huge—has a lot of resources that we can use to channel, to force our policy makers here to pay attention to the arts in education, then I think we can really make some change.

Summary

The opinions regarding funding varied depending on a number of factors. Student and alumni opinions regarding funding differed a great deal depending on their chronological distance from their high school experience. Students over the age of 30 seemed to recall their high school music experience positively and did not perceive funding, or the lack thereof, as significant. This may have been due to a negativity bias, causing older student participants to forget the minor inconveniences and remember fondly the large part their high-school music program played in their lives. Teachers and younger students may have shared the same opinion because they were the closest to the situation.

Teachers, and the student or alumni participants under the age of 30, seemed to share the opinion that their music programs were being fiscally hampered. In their opinions, this resulted in a great deal of extra fund raising efforts being necessary for their music program's survival. Teachers found this fund raising to be a distraction to the educational process. Administrators realized funding for music programs was inadequate but did not feel music was being singled out. The consensus among administrators was that funding was inadequate for MPS as a whole, not just for music.

Staffing

The survey data for this project also dealt with staffing (see Table 4). All schools with at least one full-time position were staffed by a dedicated music specialist. Schools with less than one full-time position were staffed by a dedicated specialist who was splitting time between two or more schools. In the high schools that had two or more full-time music faculty, each staff member had a different specialty. In most cases there were instrumental and vocal specialists. In one case there was a wind specialist and a string specialist. High schools with more than one full-time faculty were able to offer a wider variety of music courses and more performance opportunities than those with only one full-time music faculty.

Table 4
Secondary Music Program Staffing by School Type

<u>School Type</u>	<u>>1 staff</u>	<u>1 staff</u>	<u>2 staff</u>	<u>3 or <3 staff</u>
Charter (<i>n</i> = 5)	1/5 (20%)	4/5 (80%)	0/9	0/9
Pre-1990 (<i>n</i> = 9)	0/9 (0%)	4/9 (44%)	3/9 (33%)	2/9 (22%)
Post-1990 (<i>n</i> = 12)	4/12 (33%)	6/12 (50%)	2/12 (17%)	0/12 (0%)
Large (<i>n</i> = 13)	0/13 (0%)	6/13 (46%)	5/13 (42%)	2/13 (15%)
Small (<i>n</i> = 8)	4/8 (50%)	4/8 (50%)	0/8 (0%)	0/8 (0%)
All (<i>n</i> = 21)	4/21 (19%)	10/21 (48%)	5/21 (24%)	2/21 (10%)

Student and Teacher Opinions

Similar to funding, in the area of staffing, student participants over the age of 30 expressed contentment with the level and quality of the staffing in their respective programs. This is in contrast to the responses of the students under the age of 30. This can be partially attributed to a negativity bias—older students remembering the positive aspects of their high school music experience and forgetting, or being unaware of, the

inconveniences. Former teacher Kevin spoke of his pre-1990 MPS experience and stated:

I had two jazz bands. I had a woodwind ensemble, a brass ensemble, a percussion ensemble, a wind ensemble of 40-something kids, a symphonic band of 90-something kids, a marching band of 160 and I'm the only adult out there. So it was just monstrous and I was teaching all instrumental music all day long. It was wonderful.

Another former teacher, Mary, offered her recollection of her own school music program in the 1960s:

In elementary school we had a separate band director, a separate choral director, and had a wonderful foundation, which became the hook for us to continue. We had K-8 and then we went right up into High School. In HS we had a vocal instructor and then we had a band instructor, the school at the time did not have strings. For budget cuts, at one point they eliminated the vocal instructor and the band director. Then they brought the vocal person back, so it was back and forth during that period of time. Very progressive, I had extensive music theory in HS so when I took the qualifying test to attend the university I tested out to second semester sophomore year.

There were program that were thriving immediately prior to 1990. Another teacher, Peter, who was an MPS student in the late 1980s, had this to offer:

Subsequent classes that came in every year expanded the music program and particularly the orchestra program in size and quality a lot. By the time I graduated the music program was probably about five times better than when I started and much bigger.

Although the student and alumni participants under the age of 30 felt generally satisfied with the quality of the instruction, they expressed concern with the limitations placed on the teachers' time due to the way programs were structured or funded. The music teachers' compromised time was due to several factors including classroom overcrowding, teachers teaching ensembles out of their area of expertise, and a lack of time for individualized instruction. Former student Lisa said, "[My teacher] can do anything but I think sometimes if he had somebody helping him he could do a lot more

individual work.” Former student Julie said, “But six combos with three going at once with only one staff member? It’s hard to get that individual attention you need to get a lot better.” For some teachers, these difficulties resulted in a great deal of frustration. Former teacher Kevin was of the opinion that non-qualified, ineffective, administration was partially to blame and stated:

The people that are running the schools, and I’m talking about school principals as well as the central office, basically don’t have a clue as to how to deal with the difficulties in the school system. The music programs are the victims of all this ineptitude.

The teachers’ opinions regarding staffing were similar to those expressed by the students. Many teachers expressed a need for more staff in their music programs in order to better serve a more diverse range of needs. To have a band program staffed with adjunct faculty specializing in brass, woodwinds, or percussion was, in the opinion of the teachers interviewed, ideal but not realistic. The teacher participants felt that although they worked hard and were successful, with increased support for a music program, more could be achieved. With the number of secondary music programs in MPS declining, most teacher participants were of the opinion that simply having a music program in every high school would have been an important first step.

Physical Resources

The questions regarding facilities and equipment made up a larger portion of the student and teacher interviews than those of the administrators. All students, alumni, and some teachers commented on the adequacy of the facilities utilized by their music programs. The subject of facilities played no significant part in the data from the

administrative participants. With the number of small high schools that were operating within MPS, and a steady decrease of operating capital, comments regarding the condition of the equipment in MPS secondary music programs were important to this study. The student and alumni comments regarding equipment were both positive and negative. As was the case with facilities, the state of MPS music equipment was of secondary importance for the teachers and administrators.

The general consensus among students was that many of the MPS facilities were acceptable but aging. Many of the districts music programs were forced to rehearse in areas never designed as a rehearsal space. Stories of rehearsals being held in basement areas, storage rooms, and antiquated stage areas were commonplace. Said Julie:

I remember freshman year we were playing in that room across the hall and it was like a storage room which wasn't the most conducive because you couldn't hear everything and people are easily distracted when there's god knows what in the room: stuff from old theater programs, parts of pianos, broken music stands and everything.

When asked to comment on the facilities at her high school, Jody stated:

[My teacher's] room is like a big basement room that used to be a shop classroom. So it's in the basement and it's so hot all the time. You throw 45 kids into that small space so it's pretty miserable sometimes. It's a basement.

Our auditorium's OK. It's a really live auditorium so sometimes it's hard to hear when you're on stage. It's better for if you're soloing in there. For orchestra sometimes you can't even hear the cello section and you're a first violin sitting there.

There are no practice rooms. There are rooms in [My Teacher's] room that are used for storage. When we have sectionals we'd go in there but they're not practice rooms.

The teachers and administrators had similar input to the students and alumni regarding the music facilities in MPS. Those who did comment on their facilities found

ways to deal with their inherent shortcomings. The majority of the participants' comments dealt with being forced to use facilities never initially designed for a music program. With the numerous other deleterious issues that faced MPS music programs, the state of their facilities seemed to be of low priority.

The students' feedback regarding the condition of the equipment supplied by MPS for their music programs was largely positive. With one exception, the general consensus was that the equipment was adequate for the needs of the particular department. Alumni participants over the age of 30 were of the opinion there was adequate equipment necessary to accomplish the tasks assigned. Student and alumni participants under the age of 30 commented on the increased use of hi-tech equipment—most notably recording facilities—they felt were a great attribute to their secondary music programs. All student and alumni participants agreed that, both in years past and today, the quality of electronic equipment, including amplifiers and keyboards, were adequate. One student participant, Kyle, who had attended more than one MPS high school commented:

I think compared to other programs at other schools; yeah we had nice equipment and stuff . . . I think for what we did it was. For the jazz thing we had pretty nice stuff. I had a nice Fender amp. The horns the school had were good enough, the violins were good enough.”

The one exception to the student level of satisfaction came from Jody, a string player who went on to study music education after graduation:

I know that [my teacher] had to do a ridiculous amount of fundraisers to get anything. I was brought up on good instruments, so to walk into MPS and see the instruments that kids are forced to play on sometimes. Sometimes it's so bad, it's like those aren't real instruments. It's just plywood with some strings on it. So I feel like if they had more money and could buy better instruments then kids might

be more interested because a better instrument can make a kid who doesn't know how to play sound better. If they sound better, they're going to want to play more.

There was only one administrator, Bob, who commented on the music department equipment. Bob felt the district was doing its best to ensure all teachers were supported with the proper equipment, but that it had become a struggle to provide it. When Bob began teaching he had a classroom and very few physical resources. Bob expressed concern that the same scenario should not be perpetuated with a new teacher. As a result district spending on instruments was increased and there was an increased effort to get instruments in the hands of elementary students in order to rebuild the MPS music program from the primary level.

The differences in participants' perception regarding physical resources had a great deal to do with the students' limited scope of experience. Both teachers and administrators had more experience than the students, and had worked in a wider variety of different schools. As a result, teachers and administrators were able to offer a more detailed and complete picture of MPS physical resources regarding its music programs. Students seemed to place physical resources higher on their list of music education priorities than the teachers and administrators. Similar to the way they viewed staffing, teachers and administrators seemed to view problems with physical resources as something directly related to a lack of proper funding.

Music Education Not Being Made a Priority

Many participants discussed a perceived decline in secondary music education throughout MPS. One suggested reason for this decline was music education's not being made a priority. This is an issue that played a part in nearly everything else discussed

regarding the decline in music programs. If the district or the administration of a particular school made it a priority, many of the problems facing music education could have been alleviated.

Ed addressed this lack of prioritization by stating: “Presently there are one, two, maybe three schools that can be pointed to for success.” Ed also expressed concern with the district’s lack of a clear mission and felt music education was suffering as a result. “MPS doesn’t know what it’s doing. Music education is the least of its problems right now” he stated. When asked what would have to change to bring MPS music programs back to their previous level Ed replied:

That is dependent on how visionary the music educators are and how they can bring school leadership on board with whatever initiative they come up with. They have no way to say that “this school is going to look like that school” in terms of the program because all of the educational programs are so different. Because the educational programs are so different you can’t have one pattern that fits all of the schools but it has to be . . . people going in and taking a look at the schools and figure out how can I impact this student body with music education based on the new technology, based on the traditional technology and what comes in between that.

The lack of prioritization regarding music was a sentiment echoed by others, as well. Bob discussed the mandates that were driving educational practice. When asked if these mandates worked against music education, Bob expressed his opinion stating:

At times it does. If your mandates are based off of state standards and then this is a district in need of improvement then you have to show results to the state standards. The traditional way administration has dealt with that is that if kids are not doing well in reading, let’s give them more reading. When you do that it takes away from other areas. Then if you’re not doing well in math, well, the kids have to have more math. There is another chunk taken away. Then science, there is another chunk taken away. These were driven by the mandates. We find now that we’re being driven by mandates.

Michael offered this regarding the state of music education in MPS:

You're right I'm not real close to music ed. but I think art education in general and music education is not often thought of as highly valued. I think that's probably a fair way to characterize it. I think I should define it a little bit, I think from individuals I think it's important but in terms of the pressures on the organization to produce improvements in reading and math that's what gets attention, that's where we put our energy, that's where we put our money so other things suffer by default, feel like they're less important, and I think music falls into that.

Summary

Due to the students' limited experience level within MPS music programs, they were not asked to comment on the state of secondary music education system-wide. Instead, they offered insight into the particular programs in which they participated. The teacher and administrator interviews began with questions regarding the state of music education within MPS. All participants agreed that secondary music education had gone through a difficult period and significant changes were needed to restore the programs' vitality. Responses varied regarding the causes and solutions of this crisis. There was speculation from some participants that secondary music programs in MPS may have "bottomed out" and were in danger of ceasing to exist. When asked whether MPS music programs had bottomed out, one former teacher and administrator, Ed, stated, "It is at the very bottom. I see outside organizations—arts organizations—really taking leadership in music education." One other former teacher, Kevin, commented, "Oh, well, it's disappeared. It's a disaster. With a few exceptions it doesn't exist." Another former administrator, Walter, offered, "Well, there's a lot of quality going on. The problem is the quantity. What is out there is of quality but obviously with budget cuts and fiscal restraints we've had to make cuts."

Secondary music education was given a great deal of moral support during the

interviews for this project but was never discussed as being a primary mission in MPS. Increased academic performance—including literacy and standardized test scores—student homelessness, teen pregnancy, and graduation rates were all mentioned during the administrator interviews as being some of the problems that faced MPS and its students on a daily basis. No respondent seemed to focus the blame for the problems facing secondary music programs directly on school choice. While choice was discussed at length during the interviews—and many viewed it negatively—there was not enough evidence of its having a direct effect on secondary music programs for their opinions to be an indictment of the choice movement. It was viewed by administrators, teachers, alumni and students as something that added to the chaos of what many participants already described as a “chaotic” district. The decline of secondary music education was viewed as an unfortunate byproduct of a system facing larger, more pertinent, difficulties.

CHAPTER 5
MILWAUKEE CHOICE INITIATIVES AND THEIR PERCEIVED
INFLUENCES ON MPS SECONDARY MUSIC PROGRAMS

From 1990 until 2010, several different programs and initiatives regarding school choice were initiated in the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). Starting with the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) in 1990, and continuing with the development of the Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI) and charter schools in the late 1990s, MPS implemented a great deal of school choice in a relatively short time. The primary focus of this project was to examine the perception of how much influence, if any, school choice had on secondary music education in MPS during this time period. A number of participants held high-level positions in MPS during the advent of these programs and, as a result, were able to offer a great deal of insight as to their implementation and development.

The numerical data collected for this project revealed information regarding the number of programs that were in existence in MPS high schools. The interview data indicated that some participants were not well informed about the various choice initiatives that had been a part of MPS since the 1990s. As a result, they offered little feedback regarding MPCP, MHSRI, charter, or magnet Schools. Those offering feedback, with few exceptions, had a negative reaction to the programs. Some felt they helped to create a chaotic atmosphere in the district, which may have played a part in shifting the district's focus away from the arts.

The confusion regarding these various initiatives is understandable as these programs were not mutually exclusive. The literature and data for this project indicated

these programs worked together towards the ultimate goal of increased school choice.

The MPCP, or voucher system, was the funding mechanism that helped allow a small or charter school initiative to exist. The MHSRI was an initiative that allowed numerous small high schools to open in MPS. Charter schools, along with select private, religious schools, were the vehicle that allowed individuals or groups to take advantage of public money being made available.

From the participants' discussions regarding these programs several themes emerged. They expressed opinions and had questions about many issues including disparities in opportunities between different types of schools, parental dissatisfaction with MPS, and accountability. Interview data, combined with the numerical survey data, helped show the perception of MPS students, teachers, and administrators regarding the influence of school choice initiatives on secondary music education.

Music Programs in Small Schools

For the purposes of this project, the 59 MPS high schools that existed in 2010 were broken down two different ways; small versus large, and pre-1990 versus post-1990. Small was defined by MPS as any school less than 400 students (Carl et al., 2010). When the numerical data was examined I found the more striking disparity was not pre-versus post-1990 but when comparing large schools to small. Most pre- and post-1990, large high schools were able to offer music programs. The majority of small high schools did not offer music programs.

Small versus Large Schools

The numerical data regarding large and small high schools indicated large schools were more likely to have a music program. Eighty-one percent ($n = 13$) of large high schools had a music program in 2010 compared to 19% ($n = 8$) for small schools. The disparities in music programs based on school size were addressed in several interviews, particularly those with administration.

Although the majority of pre-existing and large high schools had music programs, they were almost non-existent in the small, choice high schools. Several participants pointed to a lack of accountability on the part of the voucher schools as being part of the reason. Wisconsin Administrative Rule PI 8.01(2)(j) (2012) states, “Music instruction including general music, vocal music, and instrumental music shall be available to all pupils in grades 7–12 and shall be taught by a licensed music teacher.”² Although a state statute, very little was done in the way of enforcement. When asked why there was no music program in approximately 81% of the MPS small high schools one administrator, Bob, stated:

There is no accountability. That’s the quick answer to it. That adapts even to the chaos theory. We’re going to have too many initiatives and too many different programs to follow up on them, and we need to manage them. Normal companies that can’t be accountable and can’t be managed correctly, they go bankrupt. We’re getting to a state of bankruptcy right now.

The majority of participants who discussed small schools versus large schools felt music programs were not sustainable in small schools due to financial constraints. Their

² This Wisconsin Administrative rule is a more detailed explanation of WI State Statute 121.02 (1) (j) (2012)

responses differed when discussing whether or not a school needed a music program to be successful. Some felt every student should have access to music as an elective, following state law. Others felt students who wanted a music program should seek out a school that provided that service.

Decentralization

Another reason given for the lack of music programs in MPS small high schools was the decentralization movement of the late 1990s. According to one administrator, the board of directors and superintendent at that time were school choice advocates. There was considerable effort for an aggressive initiative to decentralize the district.

Decentralization put a great deal of power and decision making latitude into the hands of principals at individual schools. Decentralization meant that the implementation or maintenance of a music program was left up to the principal at each individual school.

When asked to comment on the decline of high school music programs throughout the district, one high-level administrator, Paul, stated:

I've seen the decline of music around the district. There are several issues that have to do with Milwaukee as a district. One of the issues is decentralization. In the 90s the board—especially the board that came into power in the late 90s—headed by people who were pro-privatization, pro-voucher, pro-charter—forces wanted to decentralize decision making to the schools, and in that kind of environment that's where the arts began to experience real painful cuts. The instruction of art was pretty much decentralized. The district, under the guise of returning money to the classroom, gave more money to the schools to decide what to do with and cut the number of central positions.

With principals and administrative teams being given more autonomy throughout the 1990s—with the exception of the DPI regulation—there was no mandate for schools to offer a music program. As a result, many schools elected not to offer music as part of

their curriculum. Several participants felt this autonomy and decentralization were factors in the lack of secondary music programs in MPS.

Music Program Sustainability in a Small School

The sustainability of a music program in a small school was discussed in several interviews. One argument in favor of small schools was that smaller schools fostered a stronger sense of community. There were participants who felt there were less disruptive ways to obtain the same results. They felt that regardless of the size of the school, reducing class sizes could have brought about a more productive teacher–student relationship. They also felt a larger overall student body was needed to maintain a music program, something they did not believe to be possible at a small school. Former student

Julie stated:

It's an "economies of scale" I think is the term. You're not gonna spend all this money on just 100 kids. You need to have more kids than that to make it worth it. I think if you have more staff in a bigger school, then that would be the ideal situation because then you'd have the opportunity for all these personal connections, which I think is a real benefit about having a small school. You could have the sense of community in a large school too.

Another participant, Kevin, recognized the need for a larger student body to maintain a music program and stated:

I suppose the best answer would be they have one teacher per student and go that way. Maybe they're thinking they can solve the problem by having smaller schools, but basically in doing so, you do away with the music program and if you see the music program as a fill then it doesn't matter. I don't see it as a fill. I see it as a very important aspect to developing the self-esteem of students, and keeping them in school, and part of their cultural education.

There was one administrator participant, Michael, who discussed how a district in the western United States still sustained a music program while shifting the entire district

to a small school concept. The district created zero and after school hours to accommodate a large music program that encompassed all of their schools. Busses would run from zero hour to school and from school to the after school program for students needing transportation. When I asked why this type of thing had not been initiated in Milwaukee, several small schools sharing one common music area, Michael responded:

I couldn't get people's heads around it. In terms of small school folks, their heads around it too. Everybody wants to own their thing. This is quite the culture of MPS where we set schools up to be in competition rather than to be in collaboration, or to blend those two things so that can we get a music program that runs across ten small high schools but lives in one place so all the kids have to get there for it. . . . I couldn't get anybody to like, get that idea and then want to put money into it.

Many participants discussed the difficulty in sustaining a music program with a small student body. They felt music, art, theater, and physical education programs were more likely to be successful under the umbrella of a large school. The lack of secondary music programs in small schools was seen as an unfortunate circumstance resulting from MPS's small school initiative.

Small School Leadership

Whether they supported or opposed the small school initiative, most participants felt the most important factor in the success or failure of a school was leadership. There was a great deal of data regarding unqualified people being allowed to open schools. Many participants denounced the lack of supervision and regulation in the implementation of Milwaukee's small schools. Part of the blame for unqualified people being allowed to open and run a school was placed on the lack of regulation regarding staff certification. This was especially true regarding charter schools. One teacher, Ralph,

explained that the lack of regulation gave charter schools some desirable freedoms, but also created some questions regarding their leadership.

In general, I think they have an advantage in that they don't have to abide by some of the parameters that the rest of the district has to abide by. However, that can lead to unqualified people teaching in those schools, unqualified people leading those schools, and it is hard to keep quality control with regard to staffing when there's no real requirement about the certification of your staff. I think that's the biggest problem with charter schools. They're run often by people who don't have an educational background.

When a school was successful, it was the opinion of many participants that strong leadership was the largest factor in that school's success. Regardless of the mission or focus of the school, without strong leadership they felt the school would have little chance for success. Julie, who later completed a degree in public policy at a prominent Midwestern University, stated:

A lot of times it's just that some charter schools are started by people who are so passionate about making their model work, that it's the individuals that are making the school work, not necessarily the theory.

Because participants felt so much of the success of a particular school was tied to its leadership, the sustainability of the successful small schools was brought into question. Several participants commented as to what would happen to a school when successful leadership was replaced. One administrator participant, Walter, pointed to this as a flaw in the design of MHSRI.

Out of the ashes of the high school redesign, we probably have about a dozen successful schools out of that model—which is good—but we also have some other schools that have fallen off the bandwagon. What that has taught us though is that this model relied too much on individuals, and when the individuals that were enthusiastic about the program left, then it did have an impact on the sustainability of those schools.

Paul also commented on the sustainability of Milwaukee's small schools:

Some schools have done well, but generally speaking the ones that have done well are the schools that have a very strong force in their leadership. I wonder how sustainable those schools are once their strong leader goes. What's going to happen to those schools? I see a lot of question marks.

A great deal of the interview data pointed to strong leadership as a major component of a successful small school. This was interesting because the majority of the focus during the implementation of MHSRI was the school's mission or specialty. During the interviews, the administrators who led this initiative did not speak of school mission or specialty as having had a large part in the success or failure of a particular school. The problem seemed to be in finding and retaining enough strong leaders to head the dozens of small high schools that were a part of the MPS landscape.

Summary

Regarding music programs, the issue surrounding small school leadership was whether or not there was a commitment to creating and sustaining a music program. The survey data for this project—81% of small high schools not having a music program—indicated there was very little support for music education throughout MPS. With the leadership of MPS small schools being allowed to pick and choose which programs existed at their respective schools it seems music programs were simply not a priority. Although there may have been a number of other reasons and justifications for the lack of secondary music programs, it is difficult to overlook the lack of prioritization on behalf of the small school leaders.

Parental Dissatisfaction with MPS

Many participants expressed opinions that parental disenfranchisement with MPS may have been a major contributing factor to the advent of choice initiatives in MPS. According to these participants parental dissatisfaction was a problem MPS tried to rectify with the implementation of several choice initiatives. Some participants described MPCP as a political tool or ploy to placate disgruntled parents. These participants did not feel choice should have been initiated solely for that purpose. They felt there was not enough evidence to show these initiatives would be effective.

The Role of Race

According to former MPS administrator, Ed, a long-standing negative view of MPS—amongst a portion of Milwaukee’s African American population—may have been partly responsible for the growth of school choice in MPS. Ed stated there was an African American population in Milwaukee that had never believed in public education and attended either Catholic or other private institutions. Many of them became parents. For them, MPS was a system of which they had never been a part, and one of which they wanted no part. This particular group of parents did not feel their children could be successful with an education from MPS. In Ed’s opinion, this group of knowledgeable, involved parents wanted nothing to do with MPS. The remaining public school parents were of a lower socio-economic standing and less involved both at a political and school level. They had no means to send their children to private school without the aid of a voucher system.

There was no consensus among participants regarding the role of race in the implementation of school choice in MPS. It was the opinion of at least one participant that there was an African American population in Milwaukee that had distanced themselves from MPS and wanted an alternative for their children. Although it is difficult to quantify, I felt the influence of this particular population regarding school choice in Milwaukee should be acknowledged.

The Role of Parental Involvement

Before discussing parental involvement, a distinction should be made between positively involved parents and negatively vocal parents. Positively involved parents visibly participate in the educational efforts surrounding their children. Active participation may include attending concerts, chaperoning off-campus field trips, supporting fund-raisers, attending conferences, assisting with transportation for off-campus activities, providing private music lessons or instruments, and maintaining constructive interaction with staff and like-minded parents. Conversely, negatively vocal parents—while visible within the school—contribute virtually nothing positive and can have a negative influence on school climate.

Several participants expressed the opinion that positively involved parents were more effective than non-involved parents at achieving their preferred outcome. This was not because the outcome was necessarily the best choice for all involved. It was because they were so adamant and persistent in getting what they felt best for their children. These participants felt the children of involved parents would be better students regardless of where they went to school due to increased parental involvement, not

educational methods or strategies. Ralph commented on parental involvement in school choice:

Those parents who have clearly figured out how to get money to pay for their children to go to private school, are fairly involved enough in their children's education to guarantee some form of success for their students educationally, whether they were originally MPS students or not.

Those children are enjoying parental support and they are enjoying a free private-school education at the expense of the public tax dollar, the public taxpayers. And, a student body in general that is less in the core schools of Milwaukee Public Schools are the high-mobility students, the students of high special needs, the students who are at risk, the students who have other major emotional disturbances etc.

Julie suggested school districts were placating more vocal parents by giving in to their demands:

The kids that are going to private school, not necessarily, but they're coming from families with parents that are more involved and they're more vocal about what they want for their kids. It's easier to set up a program that only serves a couple people but serves the most vocal people than it is to spend all this time and energy to serve kids whose parents aren't making a fuss about things.

There were comments from many participants regarding increased parental involvement in choice schools. Many teachers felt lack of parental involvement in their child's education was a larger problem than where the child attended school. Kevin offered this statement regarding parental involvement and school choice:

Again, the schools were dealing with the problems of the family structures and the community. A school shouldn't have to be able to deal with this. I know students come from the community, of course, and bring their problems with them. I never saw the voucher program as being an answer to anything.

Whether or not participants were in favor of school choice, all agreed parental involvement was an important aspect of a student's educational success. Many participants also felt that parental dissatisfaction with MPS was a contributing factor to

the implementation of school choice. It was difficult to determine what influence parents had and whether they were a positive or negative regarding school choice.

Summary

Regarding both small school leadership and parental satisfaction there was no data or literature pertaining to secondary music programs. This lack of data in the scholarly literature was substantiated by interview data that indicated music education was simply not a priority for many people. The lack of data pertaining to parental satisfaction and small school leadership was also brought up in both the literature (Gerrity, 2009) and interview data. When asked what the biggest obstacle facing music education in MPS, Bob stated, “The lack of a mission. The lack of a vision. That’s our largest obstacle.” There is research that suggests school music programs may be disconnected with the music community as a whole (Jones, 2006). This community disconnect may have an indirect impact on the lack of parental involvement in ensuring all students have access to a music program in secondary school.

Responsibility

Discussion of responsibility was prevalent during the interview process. Participants questioned and commented on just who was responsible for the many issues surrounding school choice including implementation, the lack of regulation, the lack of common assessments, funding, and exit policies. Responses regarding implementation were largely negative. Participants raised many questions, and admittedly did not fully understand, who was responsible for choice in MPS.

Implementation

Many participants understood the reasons for school choice but felt the programs had been poorly implemented. In many cases they felt MPS had rushed to put programs in place before their effectiveness was properly researched. Participants felt poor implementation minimized the programs' chances of being effective and were most likely using revenue that could have better been spent elsewhere.

MPCP. Several participants pointed to the lack of a clear vision or mission for MPCP as being a major problem. Although participants commenting on MPCP agreed it gave parents a choice as to where their children would attend school, there were those who felt the program should have focused on improving educational outcomes. Participants felt MPCP was not set up with educational outcomes in mind. It was implemented to give students and their families a choice, allow new schools to open, and allow people to bypass a failing public school system if they so desired. It was anticipated that these new schools would show increased educational performance and create competition that would force public schools to offer a better educational product. Many participants felt the program created more chaos in an already chaotic public school system. There were differing opinions among participants as to whether MPCP had increased educational outcomes. One high-level MPS administrator, Walter, had this to say:

Having the parental choice program hasn't boosted the achievement of any of the kids in our community. In fact it may be leading to some of the academic problems that the community has, because of the mobility of all the kids and the lack of consistent curriculum among all the options. It's there, in a way I do like the idea of parents having some choices, but I think it's a very complicated question. I don't think the designer of the program had enough vision and

fortitude to really design it in a way that would meet the best educational needs. It was designed to give parents choices but it wasn't designed to improve educational outcome. If that would have been the case, I believe they would have designed the model better.

One former music teacher, Kevin, claimed MPCP should have been modeled after successful programs already in existence. Kevin said there was no reason to reinvent an effective educational system but that MPS should have put their energy into researching existing successful programs. Instead, MPS tried a number of different approaches, none of which—in Kevin's opinion—were effective.

They're kind of staggering around in the dark trying to offer solutions, but the solutions seem to be out there already. There are effective programs. If the people around here studied those—and then adapted those—I would think that would be an answer.

MHSRI. There were some participants that were more informed and polarized regarding MHSRI and the concept of small schools. This was due in large part to some having been an integral part of the design and implementation of MHSRI, and some having been opposed to the idea from its outset. Those who opposed MHSRI felt it took away from the mission and focus of the district. Bob questioned whether or not some of the small schools should even have been considered high schools. “There are places that have been allowed to open and exist and it's a crapshoot.” Ed went so far as to call MHSRI “a dismal failure of the worst kind.”

The lack of quality control and the poor implementation of MHSRI was a major cause of concern for many participants. They felt that although the concept of small schools might have been sound, proper design and implementation would have been the key to its success. In their opinion, because MHSRI was poorly designed and

implemented, there were many schools operating in MPS that should have never been allowed to open. As a result, students were denied a proper education. Ed further explained his position and stated:

[MHSRI] had the lack of a real vision in terms of design. It had a lack of knowledge about identifying professionals who had the knowledge, expertise, and skill to open or develop an educational program, and then to implement that program, and set that program.

Yet, in spite of all of that, they put groups of people in schools who submitted a piece of paper, and were allowed to take charge of the well-being, safety too, as well as educational needs of some of our most needy kids at a point in their lives where they were poised to step out into the real world, and it has been devastating. Not only was it devastating in terms of the school. Presently, there are one, two, maybe three schools that can be pointed to for success. The decline of the traditional high school, alongside the implementation of poor quality small high schools, created a high school environment that somebody should go to jail for.

Participants in favor of MHSRI felt it had yielded interesting results and helped foster more positive relationships between teachers and students. They felt the program was still in its formative stages and had to be given more of a chance to yield positive educational outcomes. With innovation they felt a certain amount of failure was to be expected. More than one administrator quoted Bill Gates, saying, "Innovation is 90% failure." Regarding the success rate of MHSRI, Michael stated:

It's mixed. We're probably 50/50 in terms of success. There are a number of them that came on the books that never opened. There probably should have been more of them that didn't open.

When asked the same question, Walter stated:

Well, we know we've closed a bunch of them. I think out of that actually maybe only 40% of the schools were successful. Bill Gates would say when you innovate you should expect 90% failure. We can't have that with our kids. I was hoping for about a 70% success rate and I think we're probably finding about a 40% success rate.

According to Michael—a former high-ranking MPS official—the mission of MHSRI was to get all students into a school that best fit their needs and learning style. He felt every child's needs were different and therefore, in order to best serve the students of MPS, a wide variety of schools and programs should be offered. Not every school would offer everything, but somewhere in the district there would be a school offering a program that would best meet a student's individual interests and needs. Michael felt if the students were more interested and engaged in the learning process, more academic rigor would be applied, and educational outcomes would increase. He stated:

As you get kids to build things that are engaging or interesting for them, and once they're engaged and interested, you can push them harder. You can obviously get more rigor. So that's where the action is going on with fewer kids, and then in a large system to build an interesting and diverse ecosystem.

As was the case with MPCP, several participants were of the opinion that the poor implementation of MHSRI was one of its biggest downfalls. Some felt the widespread implementation of MHSRI was the district chasing funding from the Gates Foundation. Many participants doubted that a small school initiative could increase educational outcomes throughout the entire district. Many of these same participants felt, due to small student populations, small schools could not sustain a successful music program.

Lack of proper planning or poor implementation were consistently mentioned by participants regarding choice initiatives. In the opinion of many participants, MPCP, MHSRI, charter schools, and magnet schools were programs that could possibly work but had been poorly implemented by MPS. They felt the success rate of some of these initiatives would have been improved had MPS spent more time planning and regulating these programs.

Lack of Regulation in Choice Schools

Another issue that was questioned and commented upon a great deal was the lack of regulation in choice schools. At their inception, choice schools did not have to follow the same set of regulations as their public counterparts. As a result, it made a meaningful measurement of educational outcomes nearly impossible (Witte, 2000).

Lack of common assessments. The lack of common assessments between choice and public schools was an area where many participants expressed concern. They felt it was important to have an “apples to apples” comparison in order to fairly assess Milwaukee’s choice initiatives. Instead, many participants felt MPS was avoiding any direct comparisons. Michael also commented on the lack of data comparing public and private schools:

I think the new requirements—and I do agree with these—that all schools should participate in some similar assessment system so we can compare apples to apples or at least have another data where the type of attrition, kind of people can do the work to make it all look like they’re apples. To have some reliable comparison then I’m looking forward to that, and then it becomes the growth, so when you start doing value added across all schools, then you get interesting comparisons.

It would seem difficult to assess the effectiveness of an initiative such as MPCP without some common assessments between voucher and public schools. While not the only way to judge the program’s effectiveness it would have been one of the most telling. Instead, the evidence regarding MPCP was largely anecdotal.

Exit Policies

One of the major differences between an MPS charter high school and a traditional high school is that charters are allowed to have a student exit policy. If a student’s performance is unacceptable, either behaviorally or academically, the charter

school is able to have the student reassigned with less bureaucratic resistance. This is not true in a traditional, comprehensive MPS high school. The concept of an exit policy was addressed by both advocates and opponents of charter schools. All agreed it was an unfair advantage given to charter schools. Not only did the public school have to enroll the student who had been removed from the charter school, but the funding allocated for that student often was not reallocated to the expelled student's new school. The student not only disrupted the educational process by entering in the middle of a school year, but also created a financial burden on the rest of the school because there was no funding allocated for their education. Kevin commented on charter schools using an exit policy:

What I also saw was that if a student had a behavior problem then the charter school would kick them out. So they could get rid of the problems that way and then who gets the student? Well, the public school gets them back and the money has already been allocated. So the charter school has the money, and the public school has the kid and no money for it. I see that as ineffective.

When asked why some charters schools were so successful, Michael stated:

I think some of it is because they're focused. They're mission driven. They have high expectations. They're not playing around. They also have some advantages that MPS doesn't have. They have to take the kids that sign up so it's not a selection of kids, but they can dismiss kids. They don't service a full range of special needs kids so that's a problem I have with it. And it's nothing I object to because I get it. High performing schools are mission driven, and when they're not on mission at [school] they get kicked out. That's part of what makes it successful. But we're the public school system and we have the obligation to make sure those kids are served because they're part of the public. So we have to pick up those kids.

The concept of an exit policy was employed not only by charter schools but by some private and voucher schools as well. Because MPS was the Local Education Agency (LEA) for the area, and every student was entitled to a public education, students removed from institutions with an exit policy were sent back to a school without an exit

policy. Exit policies were discussed in relation to music programs as well. Teachers expressed concern that without exit policies chronic disruptors could prove a negative influence throughout a program. They also felt a policy of this type could also help safeguard against music programs becoming a “dumping ground” for students that administration had a difficult time placing.

Funding

One of the most pressing concerns regarding charter schools in MPS was the lack of transparency in the area of school finance and funding. The budget for MPS was a matter of public record. Several participants expressed frustration that the same was not true for area choice schools and claimed it was difficult to understand and track their funding. The most consistent concern regarding choice school finances was that they were not responsible for the same expenditures as public schools. Many participants felt this lack of fiscal responsibility gave them an unfair advantage. Transportation costs, special education services, and the fact that some choice schools do not have to deal with collective bargaining and unions were all topics of discussion.

A high-level administrator, Paul, detailed the inequities regarding transportation costs. He explained that because MPS is the federally recognized LEA for the Milwaukee area, they had to pay the cost of transporting students to and from charter schools. Because other charter licensing agencies—UW Milwaukee and the city itself—did not have to share in those costs they were able to offer their services at a lower cost. Paul stated:

My argument has been that as UWM and the city offer more charters and authorize charters that they should have to pay a proportion and measure of costs

because they are the LEA for those charter schools students. When you have 20,000 school students taking advantage of the voucher to attend private schools that chunk of change becomes pretty intense. I believe the city and UWM need to pay their proportionate share of those costs. Because they don't, they're able to offer their chartering services at a lower rate than MPS does, which now is pushing more schools to UWM and the city because they don't want to pay extra money to MPS. It's a totally, completely unfair system. This law needs to be changed.

Michael felt not having the constraints of a teachers union or collective bargaining was an advantage for some charter schools. He felt schools without unions would be able to offer a wider variety of programs, including music, and be more creative regarding scheduling and course selection. In Michael's opinion these schools had still been quite successful without these traditional bargaining agreements He stated:

Costs go up revenue doesn't, so you've got to reduce services to balance your budget. Without a significant shift in cost 80% of cost in education is salary and benefits. That's got to come down or we won't be able to add opportunities. There are examples of charter schools that aren't in the traditional bargaining agreement, choice schools there are some examples there that don't have these negotiated salary and benefit packages which I appreciate and are doing very well by the way. Schools that don't have those kinds of bargained employees tend to have more offerings. So you'll see more music programs in those schools and art teachers and more after school activities.

Bob felt the lack of funding had brought music education close to a level where it would not be sustainable. He stated:

I think the last two years we've kind of gotten close to bottom, and when I say music education I'm looking at education period. Based on what we've talked about and the different initiatives that we have it's clear that music education and art have taken a big blow. I think we're close to the bottom, I don't know if we're at the bottom that is all based on our philosophy and how we budget. If our budget gets better, and there's a better management of funding then you'll see things go back on the rise. Until then, until we figure out the funding mechanism and things like that, it's always going to be in this state of flux. It's going to always fluctuate, good and bad.

Ed added input regarding funding and instability: "That's why I said you have to

set a course because everybody wants a piece of this district. This district is a moneymaker. There are funds flowing and coming from everywhere.” Bob felt funding and convincing administration that the arts were a key component in academic success was important.

Well number one is funding. It always boils down to the funding. The ways things are going with the budget they’re not looking at the arts as being a major component. They’re looking at academic scores. Unless somebody can come in and convince them to start with the funding to keep this program going because it’s going to show results in academics as well.

None of the teacher participants in this project opposed charter schools. Many viewed the MPS implementation of charter schools negatively. Teacher participants thought MPS should have researched, identified, and copied successful charter models. Kevin felt charters were strictly being used as a tool for business.

Again, I saw that as a business opportunity. Someone had the bright idea of how to make education effective and how to make money for themselves. But I also saw that it was taking money away from the public schools.

Administrator opinions were split regarding choice schools. There were several administrators who felt that MPS had been through a series of choice-friendly superintendents and boards. They felt this had undermined public education in Milwaukee, both fiscally and philosophically. There were administrators who felt there were too many choice schools in Milwaukee. Their negative feedback regarding these schools most often revolved around money being diverted from MPS. Some felt this was a major cause of music funding being drastically cut. Several administrators felt choice created more chaos in MPS. Ed explained how the poor implementation of the choice program was used to gain a financial advantage by the first round of MPS choice schools:

When the schools decentralized its budget, they were able to go in and check things out that they decided they didn't want to pay for. For one, two, or three years they were getting money that other schools were having to pay to maintain functions at central office. It took about three years for the district to realize that, even though they were not buying these services back.

The administrators in favor of choice schools felt they created a more diverse educational climate in MPS. These participants felt choice helped foster educational innovation and creativity, which in turn could spark student interest and increase district enrollment and educational performance. They felt charters were an underutilized tool.

Walter commented on charter schools:

Charter schools probably aren't as much of an innovation as they were set out to be, but charter schools allow for greater flexibility. It leads us to look at that flexibility for all of our schools, which leads from all the types of flexibility we get. It also helps us with our enrollment, which is a good thing. So I think the district needs to use that tool because we know declining enrollment is a financial question that we've had before.

Public Money Being Used for Private Institutions

A number of participants expressed concern regarding private schools being funded using public money. Some felt the funding was manipulated by giving the choice money to parents as opposed to directly paying the schools. Teacher participant, Ralph, offered his opinion on the separation of church and state and stated:

There is a thinly veiled method of circumventing the separation of church and state whereby the state sends the check to a family, and the family then remits tuition to the school. So the argument is that the state isn't directly supporting private school education.

Ed had this to say regarding the use of public money for private institutions:

That's an interesting question. Because my indifference with voucher schools had less to do with funds and how they were funded and more to do with the quality of education that they were receiving. Also, the fact that the schools that were popping up did not have to meet the same set of regulations and standards that the

public schools had to meet, yet they were educating and getting money from the public arena. So I didn't have a problem with the funds going there if they were public school kids whose parents were paying taxes like everybody else. I had no problem with that. I had a problem with not knowing that they compared this school to this school, that they could be compared equally.

Like exit policies, fiscal matters regarding choice schools were the catalyst for a great deal of discussion from participants. Most agreed there were inequities in the fiscal regulations between private and public schools. Some participants viewed these inequities as an opportunity for increased choice school success. They felt that with less governmental regulation, choice schools had greater control over their own financial affairs. As a result, money could be spent increasing educational outcomes for that particular school.

The Gates Foundation

The Gates foundation donated a great deal of money to MPS at the outset of MHSRI in an effort to get the program started. They offered \$50,000 in the year prior to a school's opening, and \$150,000 a year for the first three years of a school's existence, for a total of \$500,000 for each new school (Pryzbyla, 2003). Many teacher and administrator participants offered opinions on the Gates Foundation's grants and whether or not they were in the best interest of MPS. Some felt it was the district chasing funds and altering its mission and focus to procure temporary funding. These administrators claimed this type of activity was a "dangerous slope" for MPS. Some participants felt the Gates Foundation was helping to dictate educational policy simply because they had donated large amounts of money. Paul felt the superintendent went back on a promise not to chase private funds.

When he became superintendent, he said he was not going to chase private funds. He was not going to change our policy in order to chase private funds, and then he went ahead and did that when the Gates money became available. That was a fad that I believe was unfortunate because it refocused the board, took focus away from the things we were doing well, changed some structures, with really marginal success.

There were participants who felt the Gates Foundation grants were an opportunity for MPS to help fund school reform. These participants felt there was a strong need for something new at the high school level. In their opinion, the Gates Foundation gave MPS the opportunity to implement the small school initiative. They were also prompted to believe, by Bill Gates himself that innovation could result in a high level of failure, though they admitted this was not acceptable when dealing with educational outcomes.

Former administrator Michael stated:

In the general marketplace—and I was talking with Bill Gates about this and I've heard him give this speech —innovation is 90% failure. And if you're really working at it, you find the 10% of your efforts that produce stunning results. You can't do that in education. You can't have a 90% failure rate.

The funding from the Gates Foundation helped afford MPS the opportunity to experiment with the small high school concept. At the same time, there were other MPS initiatives, most notably the neighborhood schools initiative that seemed to work against MHSRI. When asked whether or not these two initiatives worked with each other,

Michael continued:

Not the way we've built it, not in Milwaukee, at least not so far. Some of that is in the way Milwaukee has perceived high school education for a long time. All high schools have to be citywide. Now we're doing some transportation zone stuff that limits that, but it's minimal at best. We don't have any kind of real feeder pattern so we didn't think about small high schools and wanting to create systemic diverse options with small high schools geographically.

In an era where lack of funding was a large problem in MPS, the Gates' Foundation provided some relief. However, it was not made clear during the interview process why the funding was procured. It may have been because there was a strong belief in the small school initiative. However, fiscal matters may have been such a dire problem that any outside funding seemed attractive.

Summary

As stated earlier, choice schools were a very polarizing entity among the participants of this project. Most viewed charters positively, however, like MPCP and MHSRI, most viewed their implementation negatively. Several participants expressed concern that vouchers were drawing money away from public schools. Many of these same participants felt choice schools enjoyed several advantages not afforded public schools: the ability to avoid transportation costs, an exit policy for students with disciplinary problems, and the ability to avoid collective bargaining and teachers unions. "Charter schools have to follow state law but they're exempt from a lot of board policy," Paul stated.

As was the case with some of the other programs mentioned in this project, student and teacher participants were not well-informed regarding choice schools. This was most likely due to the fact that, with one exception, the student participants had little primary experience with choice schools. The teachers' responses to questions of school choice were largely negative. Like most of the students and alumni, none of the teachers had any first-hand experience in Milwaukee's choice schools. It is possible this lack of experience contributed to their negative viewpoint.

The administrators' opinions regarding choice schools were based on a variety of factors: their political beliefs, their direct experience with choice schools, and a desire to be innovative while at the same time increasing educational outcomes, were all part of their answers. All administrators agreed the educational system was not working. Where they disagreed was whether or not school choice was part of the answer. Some felt choice could help to diversify MPS's educational offerings and improve academic performance. Some felt the choice movement in MPS was ill-conceived, poorly implemented, and was extremely harmful to MPS educational climate.

Participants in favor of choice schools cited their flexibility and unique educational philosophies as some of their advantages. These same participants felt the fiscal and regulatory advantages held by choice schools could be used to help increase educational outcomes and improve the school climate. They felt there could be increased curricular and extra-curricular course and program offerings with less bureaucratic regulation.

Summation

The overwhelming majority of participants felt vouchers and the small school initiative were failures. Even those who were optimistic about the small school initiative were tempered in their responses when asked about its success. These participants felt that because the initiative was new and innovative, some failure was to be expected. There was feedback indicating choice had improved student attendance and graduation rates, but had not increased academic performance

The most difficult aspect of data analysis for this project was the overlap between MPCP, MHSRI, and the charter school movement. All had their own unique characteristics, yet all were intertwined via their function within MPS and in the interview data provided. It was difficult to speak of one without mentioning one of the others or all three. With so much overlap it became apparent that many participants could not differentiate between MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools. Many commented during the course of their interview that they did not understand the difference between choice and charter, what a voucher was, or whether or not all the small schools created by MHSRI were charter. It was not readily apparent that there was a need to separate those three entities, as they all had a place in each other's inner workings.

This study was ultimately about school choice as it related to secondary music programs. Although school choice was successful in providing options, the consensus of the participants of this project was that it had a negative influence on secondary music programs in MPS. There was little discussion of the quality of MPS music programs but rather on their very existence. When asked direct questions regarding the state of MPS music programs, all participants had varying degrees of negative reactions. No participant had a positive reaction to questions about the state of MPS music programs. The consensus among all participants was that MPS music programs were—to varying degrees—troubled and in need of help.

CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND THE FUTURE OF MUSIC
EDUCATION IN MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In this study I explored the perceived relationship between Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) secondary music programs and various educational initiatives including the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP), the Milwaukee High School Redesign Initiative (MHSRI), charter schools, and magnet schools. There is no other research regarding this relationship. Given the influx of small schools, charter schools, and school choice in MPS I wanted to explore how this much upheaval in a relatively short time influenced its secondary music programs.

This is a qualitative study with multiple data sources. I first conducted a telephone survey of all 59 MPS high schools to find out whether they had a music program and how many music teachers were on their faculty. I then conducted 19 interviews with MPS administrators, teachers, and students. During the interviews, the participants offered their opinions on a variety of issues dealing with MPS secondary music programs and school choice. I coded the data using the constant comparative method of coding. The remainder of this chapter contains a discussion of the research questions, my conclusions, the study's implications, suggestions for further research, the future of music education in MPS and my own personal reflections.

Discussion

There were many changes, both politically and educationally, that took place in MPS from 1990 until 2010. This study was guided by four research questions:

1. What was the state of MPS secondary music programs prior to 1990?

2. What was the state of MPS secondary music programs in 2010?
3. What did participants see as the changes to music programs from 1990–2010?
4. What were the participants' perceptions of the influence of school choice on MPS secondary music programs?

Many participants had been with MPS for many years and had a great deal of experience from the classroom level through the highest levels of administration.

The State of MPS Secondary Music Programs Prior to 1990

Participants active within MPS prior to 1990 felt secondary music programs were still adequate but already in a state of decline by 1990. They claimed while there were still programs of quality in 1990, many had fallen off and were in danger of being discontinued. There were participants who said the programs in the outlying areas were still thriving, while the music programs in the inner city were beginning to show signs of deterioration. Other participants cited bussing, the implementation of specialty schools, and the demise of a neighborhood school feeder program as some of the reasons for the programs' decline prior to 1990.

Teachers who had been in MPS for many years prior to 1990 considered it a more idyllic time when music programs were thriving and growing at a rapid pace. For example, Kevin taught numerous instrumental ensembles for the entire day. Former teacher Marion recalled different teachers for each separate area of music. Former teacher and student Peter recalled the expansion of his music program throughout high school

These findings were consistent with the literature. Snider and Averitte (1984) explored music programs in urban areas. They concluded that at the time of the study,

while music programs were not a high priority, most schools were able to retain their music specialists. They also discovered a large number of music specialists in urban areas splitting time between different schools because one school could not support that position.

Both the interview data and the literature indicated that music programs have always struggled with certain issues. A brief survey of literature pertaining to music programs prior to 1990 showed that many of the same concerns regarding music programs have been consistent since the 1940s. Music programs being a low priority, material being taught that contained little artistic integrity, fiscal concerns, and a lack of uniform standards were concerns that surfaced several times throughout the literature (Friedo, 1969; Hanson, 1948; Mills, 1960).

The State of MPS Secondary Music Programs in 2010

The majority of participants felt there were far fewer music programs than in years past, many were declining in quality, and MPS had not made music education a priority in 2010. Many participants believed district mandates, decentralization, and fiscal concerns led MPS music programs to having nearly “bottomed out.” The most positive response was that MPS music programs had not reached their full potential but were on the upswing.

The teachers’ feedback was based on their experience within MPS. Teachers had limited experience regarding school budgets or other fiscal matters. Because all of the teachers interviewed had at least ten years teaching experience, they were able to recognize changes and trends within the MPS music department and the district as a

whole. All of the teachers I interviewed stated that both the number of programs that existed in MPS and the quality of those programs were in decline. All teacher participants were advocates for music education, not just for its musical benefits but, in their opinions, the contribution music education made to the school climate as well.

Teamwork, the ability to concentrate, increased self-esteem, increased study skills, and improvement on standardized test scores were all mentioned as secondary benefits of a well-run music program.

The teacher participants cited numerous problems with secondary music education in MPS. A lack of funding was their most pressing concern. In addition to fiscal concerns, changing student attitudes, non-qualified or non-concerned administration, the inability of music education to keep up with current musical trends, and the lack of an effective feeder system were all listed as problems associated with the secondary music programs.

Teachers expressed that their time was compromised a great deal and that various governmental policies, initiatives, programs, and requirements distracted them from their primary mission: educating children. Student and alumni participants echoed these sentiments as well. The opinion of the teacher participants in this project was that their time would have been best spent getting to know the students on a musical and personal level. Research indicated that students and parents felt it was important for music teachers to know a student's musical and personal background in order to best educate them, particularly when dealing with at risk students (Shields, 2001).

The administrator participants offered a point of view that took into consideration

the district as a whole, not just the music department. They agreed with the teachers that the MPS music programs had declined and that fiscal problems were the greatest cause for concern. Administrators felt without increased fiscal support that no amount of philosophical support from the school board or the community could be effective. They expressed concerns that the pressures placed on the district by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation—and its mandate to increase reading and math scores—had resulted in music education being placed in a role of secondary importance.

There were administrators who felt because of the educational climate in MPS, the music program had not yet reached its full potential. They pointed to increases in elementary programs as a positive step towards building secondary programs back to their previous levels. Former teacher and administrator Bob noted that the MPS Biennial Music Festival had grown from 330 participants in 2001 to 1,350 participants in 2010. He then remarked that the number of elementary programs had grown, and as a result, more elementary-aged students were being exposed to regular music education.

There was data indicating that one of the biggest obstacles facing the expansion of these programs was a lack of consistency throughout the district. The decentralization movement of the late 1990s made it difficult for the MPS music department to create a comprehensive, cohesive program throughout the district. Music education in each school was left up to individual principals and funding was inconsistent from school to school.

There was no mention of music education anywhere in the literature regarding MPS school choice. The fact that there was not discussion regarding music education in MPS reiterates a point made by several participants: MPS had more pressing concerns

ving for its attention. All participants agreed that music education in MPS had declined. Most felt that a lack of fiscal support was the primary reason for that decline. The participants disagreed about whether or not they felt secondary music programs in MPS would recover. There were those who felt they were recovering. Some were of the opinion that, at some point, secondary music programs in MPS would cease to exist.

The opinions and concerns expressed by the administrator participants of this project are consistent with a nationwide survey of public and private secondary school principals regarding music programs in their schools. Abril and Gault (2008) reported that while 98% of the secondary music courses were taught by certified instructors, only 34% of those schools required music and only 25% of the students elected to participate in music. Fiscal concerns and increased pressure to increase standardized test scores were given as reasons for the decline in secondary music programs nationwide. This was in spite of the fact that principals in this survey felt music teachers and their programs were doing a good job of meeting educational goals for their students.

Student and alumni participants under the age of 30 expressed frustrations that problems were not corrected when, in their opinion, they were readily apparent. Perhaps due to a lack of understanding as to how a school system operates, they did not offer a great deal of insight as to why these problems existed or how they could be rectified. The opinions of the student participants were a reaction to their experiences within their MPS secondary music programs. They expressed concerns that their programs were not being funded adequately. The reasons for this were unclear. This uncertainty resulted in a number of questions being raised and their expressing a great deal of frustration. Students

and alumni questioned why, if the district knew there was a funding crisis, it was not simply corrected.

Teacher participants reported a decline in music education in MPS that had existed for many years. While fiscal constraints were most commonly listed as one of the primary reasons for this decline, changing student attitudes, along with poor central office, school board, and parental support were also discussed at length. All teacher participants expressed frustration with MPS's seeming inability to stop this downward trend. Being asked to maintain a program at a previously high level while at the same time having resources continually slashed had a demoralizing influence on teachers. One former teacher described it as "being the brakeman on a roller coaster." Several participants predicted that secondary music education in MPS would cease to exist at some point.

The administrator participants felt the problems facing secondary music programs were complex. To bring the level of participation back to the high level of the 1960s and 70s would be a daunting—if not nearly impossible—task. All administrator participants agreed financial constraints seemed to be the largest contributing factor to the demise of secondary music programs. Their differences lay in the level of music education they felt necessary for the district. There were those who felt it was an absolute necessity for every student and those who felt it should be made available only to those students who sought it out. Even though many of these participants held influential positions in MPS there was little accountability for the diminishing secondary music programs. All agreed secondary music programs had gone through difficult times, yet none claimed any responsibility.

Many administrator participants were very cautious in their responses.

The data supplied by the administrators offered informed—yet conflicting—opinions regarding solutions to the problems faced by secondary music education in MPS. Smith (2005) discussed the divisiveness of educational reform and concluded:

Scholarly studies cannot decide what is the "best" or "right" ideology of education, no matter how hard partisans on both sides of the debate attempt to extract favorable “oughts” from the “is” of empirical studies. Academic policy analysts have served the education debate poorly by not stressing this point. Academic policy studies may clarify political choices, but they can never depoliticize them. (p. 295)

Given the frequency with which administrators gravitated from one position to another, either within MPS or in and out of the district, it was difficult to determine if MPS was searching for a long-term solution to the problems facing secondary music education. Perhaps, given the numerous other concerns surrounding the district, it was viewed as an issue too difficult and complex to be placed in a role of primary importance. Gerrity (2009) suggested that principals often gave verbal or philosophical support to music programs in an effort to be politically correct, regardless of their true feelings about their schools' music programs.

The dichotomy between principals' attitudes and the relative importance they assign to music study may be explained by political correctness. Indeed, music is among the most visible academic programs within a school. Music programs have historically enjoyed widespread community support and often have their own parent support groups. Furthermore, music and the other arts are a source of great pride for many of our nation's schools. As such, principals may find it politically correct to support music even if they do not truly believe in music's benefit to students, schools, and communities. Regardless of their true beliefs, principals have found it increasingly difficult to offer anything more than verbal support for music. (p. 179)

Throughout the interview process, there were virtually no positive remarks about

the overall condition of MPS music programs. There were, however, many positive remarks about the district's teachers and the students of MPS. Most participants felt the declining state of MPS music programs in 2010 was due to an increasingly unfriendly political climate, decreased funding, and various governmental policies and mandates that caused the district to lose focus, not only on music but the arts in general.

Changes to Music Programs from 1990–2010

The participants saw MPS music programs change in several different ways from 1990–2010: The number of programs, the quality of existing programs, the lack of proper funding, increased governmental regulation, and music's not being a high priority for MPS were all discussed throughout the interview process. All participants who responded to the questions regarding change from 1990–2010 were of the opinion there had been a great deal of change. There were varying degrees of negative but no positive responses regarding changes.

Programs disappearing. A number of participants saw the number of programs disappearing as one of the biggest changes in MPS secondary music education from 1990–2010. Some spoke of thriving music programs at large, comprehensive high schools in MPS. Both programs and schools that now ceased to exist. Some expressed concern that the quality of the remaining programs had diminished greatly. Bussing, lack of focus on the arts, and the demise of an effective feeder system were all mentioned as part of the reason for the disappearance of many programs.

Lack of funding. According to many participants, as the district lost its focus on maintaining quality music programs, funding for those programs steadily decreased. Lack

of stable funding meant a lack of stable music programs. Bob speculated there would be no stability in music education until there was some degree of fiscal stability. Ed stated that to some degree this instability was caused by so many funds coming and going from so many sources that were not properly tracked. MPS administrator Michael felt there would be more money available for music programs if schools were not hampered by having to collectively bargain with teachers' unions. Teacher Kyle felt there would be more funding for music if administrators realized music education would pay dividends academically. The literature showed the same budgetary issues that were problematic in MPS also problematic nationwide. Although Scafidi (2012) found the evidence to be inconclusive regarding school choice and public school budgets, Abril and Gault (2008) stated budgetary issues were frequently mentioned as being an obstacle. Because of the individual school autonomy created by choice, tracking fiscal issues and how they relate to those schools' music programs is difficult.

Literature dating back to the 1950s ("Music Buildings," 1955; Wright, 1951) addressed the need for proper facilities and equipment for secondary music programs. Lack of proper equipment and facilities were mentioned as a source of frustration and a reason for teacher attrition and migration, particularly in urban areas (Abril & Gault, 2008; Kuntz, 2011). Mixon (2005) stated:

Because of high poverty levels, large urban school districts often need to provide musical instruments for students. The problem is that there are almost never enough instruments for interested students. (p. 16)

These findings are consistent with the data collected for this study. Teachers and students expressed frustration with aging, inadequate facilities. The lack of updated

equipment seemed to be a concern for teachers, both for those interviewed in the literature and those interviewed for this project. Students in both the literature and interview data were generally satisfied with the equipment supplied them.

Noticeable decline in schools prioritizing music. Music education's not being made a priority was a change from 1990 to 2010 for many participants. Several felt the district had been forced to focus on government mandates and standardized testing. When asked if these mandates worked against music education in MPS, Bob stated that the way administration traditionally dealt with poor reading or math scores was to give students more of those subjects. This practice could cut into the amount of time allotted for music. Michael stated that while music was a priority for individuals, it was not a priority overall.

Others felt decentralization helped to weaken the prioritization of music education in MPS. Decentralization gave more authority to administrators and left the decision of whether or not to have a music department in their hands. Some participants saw this being a problem because there weren't enough administrators who valued music programs in their schools.

Ed stated because of the decline in the district's music programs and no apparent initiative to bring them back, the decision regarding music education in MPS had already been made. He commented that MPS did not know what it was doing and lacked vision. Not only would music have to be made a priority, there would also have to be some innovative thinking in order to have an effective music program in the wide variety of high schools throughout MPS.

Nearly every participant with a great number of years working in MPS felt the emphasis that was placed on testing and increasing reading and math scores had a detrimental effect on music programs throughout MPS. There was also a consensus that although there was a great deal of individual support, a unified, cohesive strategy to return MPS music programs to previous levels had not been implemented. As a result, although there were some individual successes, the overall lack of prioritization regarding music programs had a negative influence on the district's music programs.

In their survey of principals, Abril and Gault (2008) found that while over 90% of the principals surveyed felt music was an indispensable part of a well-rounded curriculum, one third of elementary aged children did not receive and arts instruction and only 25% of high school students were taking any arts classes. Administration plays an important part in whether or not a school has a successful arts, or more specifically, music program.

Perceptions of the Influence of Choice

This study was about school choice as it relates to secondary music programs. The participants offered a great deal of feedback regarding how choice had influenced secondary music programs. There were three initiatives that sparked the most dialogue: MPCP, MHSRI, and Charter Schools.

MPCP. MPCP was an unknown to many of the student, alumni and teacher participants. Those who did have a substantive opinion regarding MPCP held a negative view. They claimed the same educational objectives could have been reached with a less expensive, less disruptive program. There were those who were of the opinion that the

money spent on the MPCP could have been better spent improving public schools. There were also several comments regarding the lack of any real evidence showing that choice schools were improving educational outcomes consistently in MPS. The negative reaction may have been because very few of the student or teacher participants had any first-hand experience with the MPCP. Their opinions were largely based on anecdotal evidence and reports from the local media.

Administrators were split in their opinions regarding the MPCP's effectiveness. All agreed it had grown into something very different from the way it was conceived. What began as an experiment in the early 1990s had grown significantly. Some administrators were concerned the MPCP was taking money away from traditional high schools and using it in schools that had no quality control, proper facilities or strong leadership. There seemed to be no guarantee that students in the voucher schools would receive a quality education. In their opinion the MPCP's implementation had been hasty and this caused a high level of discomfort in many administrator participants. The administrators also raised numerous questions raised about: the lack of common assessments between choice and public schools, the lack of special education services offered at choice schools, the lack of transparency in the funding of choice schools and the lack of a consistent curriculum throughout choice schools.

Many participants were of the opinion that parental dissatisfaction with MPS was a catalyst to the inception of the MPCP. There was a great deal of feedback, from a wide variety of participants, regarding the MPCP being implemented as a political ploy to placate disgruntled parents. This was not viewed positively by this project's participants.

It was felt that while not easy or popular, making a stronger commitment to public education would have been a better solution to MPS's shortcomings. MPCP was viewed as being hastily constructed and poorly implemented and as a result was ineffective in increasing educational outcomes in MPS.

Parental dissatisfaction was a difficult piece of the school choice puzzle to understand for the participants of this project. Many felt parental involvement had a greater influence in a student's success than any governmental program or school. It was difficult to ascertain where a parent's influence ended and a school's or program's began. In the literature regarding school choice there was a great deal of material regarding parental influence. Belfield and Levine (2005) spoke of parents' freedom of choice and stated:

This goal places a heavy emphasis on the private benefits of education and the liberty to ensure that schools are chosen that are consistent with the child-rearing practices and preferences of families. (p. 551)

Brighthouse (1997) felt vouchers allowed parents too much influence over their child's education.

Parents are not their children. When they make choices concerning their children's education they are not making choices about how to live their own lives, but about how someone else will end up living his or her life. Granting them choice does not grant them power over themselves, but power over someone else. (p. 505)

Howell et al. (2002) examined voucher effectiveness, particularly along racial lines.

Parents who choose to send their children to private school demonstrate considerable dedication, financial and otherwise, to their children's education. It remains unclear whether observed achievement differences between public and private school students are due to the quality of private schools or characteristics of the students who attend them (p. 192).

At the time of this writing there was no literature regarding the influence of vouchers on secondary music programs. The same concerns regarding a lack of evidence that vouchers were improving educational outcomes for Milwaukee's children—that were brought out during the interview process—were echoed in the literature as well. The early examinations of MPCP claimed the program was too small to have a direct effect on MPS (Witte, 2000). One of the most prevalent criticisms of MPCP throughout the literature was the lack of common assessments between public and voucher schools. Witte (1999) and Mueller (2000) both listed the lack of common assessments as a concern when comparing choice and public schools. Hill (2005) warned “Growth can bring dangers if choice is implemented carelessly” (p. 141). Witte (2000) also added:

At a crucial point of change in the program in 1995 (when parochial schools were added), the evaluations were removed from the legislation altogether, which seems to me to be a critical error. (p. 194)

A review of several Milwaukee studies found no evidence of vouchers improving educational outcomes for Milwaukee students (Shaul, 2001). Another report felt that Milwaukee's version of the voucher system, that was repeatedly referred to as “voucher shock” may not have been the best choice for the city (Chakrabarti, 2008).

The role of race as it pertained to MPS and school choice was also discussed during the interview process. Some participants discussed the idea that there was a segment of Milwaukee's African American population that wanted nothing to do with MPS and therefore welcomed a voucher system and an alternate choice. This may have been one of the leading factors that led to the initial implementation of the MPCP.

The opinions regarding race and vouchers were consistent with the voucher

literature. African Americans were at the forefront of the implementation of school choice in MPS. A major criticism of MPCP is that it was a system implemented by African Americans for African Americans (Witte, 2000). Quinn (2006) reported that a majority of African Americans were in favor of government supported school vouchers.

School vouchers are very clearly a Republican concept of school reform. Yet, by framing vouchers as a solution to the problem of school equity, voucher proponents have successfully attracted support from African Americans, one of the most consistent voting blocs for Democrats. (p. 4)

Witte (2000) also suggested that race played a role in the voucher debate and brought up several theoretical issues.

The basic question is whether choice is a method of enhancing educational opportunities and achievement for racial minorities or for securing and protecting schools primarily benefiting whites. More specifically, is race used politically to initiate programs, which later expand and have quite different racial consequences? (pp. 24-25)

Regarding race and music education there are factors that may come into play.

The lack of concern regarding music programs may have been the result of a perceived cultural disconnect between the African American community and what was being taught in school music programs. This is consistent with the literature as well. Jones (2006) felt school music programs had to increase their cultural connection with their communities in order to be more effective.

MHSRI. Like MPCP, the MHSRI was also a largely unknown entity to many of the teacher, student, and alumni participants; largely due to a lack of first-hand experience with the MHSRI. The students, alumni, and most of the teachers knew very little about the MHSRI. The teachers that had some knowledge of the program itself had no first-hand experience in a small school. Therefore all of their evidence about the day-

to-day operations of these schools was second-hand and largely anecdotal.

With few exceptions, the administrators' opinions regarding the MHSRI were similar to the ones voiced about the MPCP. They claimed the idea itself had interesting possibilities but its implementation within MPS was poor. Even those who were strong MHSRI advocates admitted it was not as successful as they would have liked, but felt there were some high-performing schools and positive things that sprang out of the initiative. There was no literature regarding the MHSRI specifically. There was literature that will be discussed in the next section, regarding Milwaukee's charter schools.

Charter Schools. As was the case with both MPCP and MHSRI, many participants regarded charter schools as an idea that, in theory, had some merit. There were participants who expressed the opinion that the increased flexibility offered by charter schools gave MPS the opportunity for more diverse educational offerings. However, the majority of participants claimed charters had been so poorly implemented in MPS that their full potential had not been reached. There was a strong feeling among many participants that charter schools were given several unfair advantages not afforded their public school counterparts, particularly in the 1990s when the movement began in MPS. Some participants stated charters were allowed to deny essential services, had exit policies for students who were behavior problems, and many said they were exempt from paying for student transportation.

Exit and other disciplinary policies were discussed in the literature as well. There seemed to be a correlation between strong disciplinary policies and positive educational outcomes. In their study of public and private schools, Coleman et al. (1982) and Chubb

and Moe (1988), found strong school discipline policies could have a positive impact on educational outcomes.

There was almost no research regarding charter schools and secondary music education. There was also very little regarding Milwaukee charter schools. Witte et al. (2007) reported that Milwaukee charter schools fared slightly better academically than their public school counterparts and offered more educational choices. There was no mention in the article regarding arts or extra-curricular offerings in Milwaukee's charter schools. The numerical data gathered for this project indicated that smaller schools, many of them charter, offered almost no music.

The overwhelming consensus among participants was that none of these policies or initiatives had a positive impact on secondary music education in MPS. There was a feeling that music education was not a priority. The district was under pressure to increase standardized test scores and work within increasingly stringent financial constraints. As a result of these increased pressures and with the district's focus being diverted to the various policies and initiatives that were in place, participants stated that secondary music education had been relegated to a role of secondary importance throughout the district. Opinions differed as to whether or not secondary music in MPS would regain its previous levels, cease to exist all together, or be outsourced to various community groups and not remain a part of the public school curriculum.

MPS was not the only district experiencing problems from 1990–2010. Abril and Gault (2008) reviewed several national polls and studies and found that while there was overwhelming public support for music education there were still declines in instructional

time, music teachers, and student involvement. These decreases were largely attributed to two factors, budget cuts and an increased focus on testing.

Perhaps part of the reason for a lack of support from administration lies in the idea that there is no definitive evidence of music education's influence on educational outcomes. A study conducted by Johnson and Memmett (2006) showed music programs had no significant influence on educational outcomes. While administrators and school boards offer verbal support to music education perhaps, in some way, they are looking for more return on their investment.

Conclusions

This project utilized a two-staged, qualitative design, combining interview with numerical data. Because of the qualitative nature of this study, my conclusions were based on my perceptions of the interview data, my interpretations of the numerical data, and any consensus that may have been reached between the interviews of one or more participants. The themes I identified in the data were divided between responsibility, differing levels of informed opinions regarding participants, and political vs. educational outcomes.

Responsibility

Part of my mission in conducting this study was to show who was responsible for the implementation or perpetuation of the various governmental policies explored in this project. In this study, I explored the implementation of these initiatives, some of the possible reasons they existed for many years, and who was responsible for their implementation and perpetuation. I also examined the perception of MPCP, MHSRI,

charter schools, and whether music programs were a concern during the implementation of these initiatives.

I did not expect any level of responsibility from student, alumni, or teacher participants. It is not within the scope of a student, alumni, or teacher's responsibilities or abilities to have an influence regarding initiatives of this type. I anticipated, through the course of the interviews, that administrator participants would provide answers regarding their role and responsibility regarding Milwaukee's school choice initiatives; however, by and large, they did not. Although most administrator participants had at least some negative opinions regarding MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools, none admitted or assigned responsibility to anyone specifically. There were general comments directed at a school board or superintendent at a particular time but no one offered a definitive opinion as to why these reforms and initiatives were created and continued to exist. While many believed music education had been influenced by these initiatives, no one mentioned whether or not they were a consideration during their planning or implementation. There could be several reasons for this lack of conviction on the administrators' part.

Caution in answering. Administrators were generally cautious while answering questions during the interview process. Their responses were well crafted and careful. Although administrators were certainly passionate about the subjects being discussed, they did not let this passion interfere with giving me a cautious response.

Confusion as to responsibility. Administrators themselves may not have known who was responsible for these programs or initiatives. This explanation would lend itself to what one administrator called "the chaos theory;" that MPS would intentionally create

a level of chaos to deflect attention away from other issues. Again, many administrator responses to questions of responsibility were very general and non-committal.

Complexity of the initiatives. The issues surrounding MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools may have been too complex and multi-faceted to be answered simply and succinctly. This complexity could have influenced administrators' responses to be vague and non-committal. This could tie in with administrators being cautious while responding.

A denial of their own responsibility. The fact that several administrators were instrumental in the creation and implementation of some of these initiatives, and that some of these initiatives were under such close scrutiny, may have led to a denial of their own responsibility. It would be a difficult thing for anyone to admit their work was failing or being questioned. There were quite possibly unforeseen circumstances or directives contrary to the administrators' intentions when carrying out their assignments regarding these initiatives. These circumstances or directives could have changed the intent of an administrators' work, turning it into something for which they no longer wanted to be responsible.

The question of responsibility is complex. The answer to who is responsible is most likely a combination of all of the above reasons. Administrators may not have wanted to admit their own work had failed or may have had unintended consequences. They may not have been equipped to handle the difficulties of an ever-changing, chaotic, more fiscally restrained workplace. They may have been guarded in their responses for political reasons. There was a great deal of activity in the area of school choice and its

influence on secondary music programs from 1990–2010.

The creation of a chaotic environment. There was a great deal of discussion, from the participants, regarding the chaotic environment that seemed to permeate MPS. Some participants felt the chaos may have been intentionally created to distract the public from incompetent actions, particularly regarding budgetary concerns. Some participants felt it was simply non-intentional chaos created by the incompetence of MPS administration. Whether it was deliberate or not the overwhelming consensus was that this chaos existed and was detrimental to the district's primary mission of educating students.

There was literature that suggested administrators might have used choice to their advantage because there are fewer regulations when compared to traditional public schools. Jennings (2010) indicated that administrators used several methods to ensure their schools maintained a high-achieving student body including counseling out problem students, creating relationships with families of high-achieving students during the recruitment process, using school data systems to target potential students, and creating partnerships with middle schools. The data for this study indicated that many schools employed these tactics when competing for high-achieving students. Jennings also indicated that administrators formed a very close network which aided them in navigating the choice system. This was consistent with my findings.

Political Compared to Educational Aspects

One of the ways I examined my findings regarding these initiatives was by dividing them into two categories: political and educational. My findings, based on the

data I gathered, is that there was more discussion of the political activity surrounding MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools than there was of educational outcomes. These were highly debated issues in the Milwaukee area and spawned a great deal of political divisiveness.

Political aspects. Of the issues examined in this project, MPCP and charter schools were the most discussed politically. The expansion of voucher systems and charter schools to other areas of the state besides Milwaukee was frequently reported on and debated in the media. Neither side seemed to offer anything substantive supporting or condemning the expansion of vouchers and charters in Wisconsin. The evidence offered regarding vouchers and charters in the media was largely anecdotal and highly politicized. If mentioned at all, music education was generally lumped in with art, physical education, drama, and extra-curricular activities.

The participants discussed the political aspects of these initiatives more often than their influence on educational outcomes. In many ways these discussion surrounded control of the MPS budget and school choice. These issues were political and had nothing to do with educational outcomes. Some participants did not understand why the political aspects seemed to overshadow the educational. It seemed the politics surrounding these initiatives interfered with any productive discussion regarding their proposed educational benefits.

There was a significant amount of literature and data from one participant regarding the role of race and school choice. While there was never a definitive answer as to how much race influenced Milwaukee's choice initiatives, it was clear many, both in

the literature (Bush, 2004; Witte, 2000) felt it played a part. Ed, the participant who discussed race at length, stated the political pressure placed on policy makers by a specific segment of Milwaukee's African American community had a strong influence on the initial implementation of Milwaukee's school choice initiatives.

Educational outcomes. Throughout the school choice literature and the interview process it was not clear whether the primary objective of MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools was to increase educational outcomes—which is an educational benefit—or to offer an educational choice—which is a political benefit. This sentiment was echoed by several participants. They felt the initiatives' primary objective should have been increased educational outcomes for all students. Instead, the focus seemed the opposite, with choice being the primary objective and educational outcomes being relegated to a role of secondary importance.

There was almost no literature regarding vouchers and charters and their influence over music education. In spite of this lack of research-based evidence, MPS continually expanded its voucher and charter programs from 1990–2010. Increasing choice without any research to back up the validity of these programs seemed, to me, irresponsible. There was too much at stake—both financially and educationally—to be hasty or non-detail oriented regarding the implementation of initiatives of this magnitude. The body of literature pertaining to vouchers, charters and their educational outcomes was largely inconclusive. There was very little literature that discussed music education and its relationship with voucher or charter schools. Several studies (Braun, Jenkins, Grigg, & Tirre, 2006; Chakrabarti, 2007, 2008, 2009; Ferreyra, 2007) used various statistical

modeling to predict the outcome of school choice yet produced no definitive results either favoring or condemning school choice.

A study conducted in Tulsa, Oklahoma suggested that, because of district and state level mandates regarding student discipline and transfers, administrators may have had less options, regarding school choice, than one might expect. As a result, choice was not a factor in their management style.

Choice proponents argue that market forces and competition result in better schools (and by extension, better student outcomes) because they encourage heightened innovation, entrepreneurship, and increased efficiency. But very little research indicates that choice results in alterations to administrator behaviors or management approaches that promote these improvements. (Rabovsky, 2011 p. 93)

Administrator participants of this study had many of the same frustrations as the administrators interviewed for Rabovsky's study. This could help explain why they also viewed choice as something to be tolerated as opposed to an initiative to be embraced.

Implications

The purpose of my study was to examine the influence of various governmental policies on secondary music education in MPS. This study could have implications for teachers, administrators, politicians, music education advocates, and education students. To my knowledge no one had explored voucher, small school, and charter school influence on secondary music education. With Milwaukee having had such a turbulent political nature, and the large voucher, small school, and charter initiatives it was fertile ground for a study of this type. With this project I was able to explore political, educational, local and national issues, and their influence on MPS secondary music education.

The data collected for this project, both numerical and interview, indicated MPS music programs had declined a great deal from 1990 to 2010. The participant perception was that initiatives such as MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools had a negative impact on secondary music education in MPS. While it may not be a direct influence, the data indicated that the indirect influence of these initiatives was profound. I would argue that cutting music programs in favor of unproven initiatives which may, or may not, improve educational outcomes should not have been acceptable to the community, yet it went on with surprisingly little outcry. School officials and politicians could have been, but were not, held accountable, by the voters, for decisions made and programs implemented without first being properly researched. Kos (2007) commented:

It is important that policy makers and policy implementers are made aware that sacrificing students' opportunities for a broad education is not an acceptable solution to improving achievement in only a few core subject areas. (p. 209)

This project could serve as a catalyst for important discussions regarding small schools and secondary music education. The numerical and interview data indicated that small schools had trouble creating and maintaining a music program. Eighty one percent of MPS small high schools had no music program. Some participants suggested that perhaps several small schools could combine programs. There was also discussion that perhaps traditional band programs could be replaced with guitar, or other less expensive, programs. This study could help begin a discussion as to how to best rectify this situation.

Recommendations

This study could help MPS administration to renew its commitment to music education. To my knowledge there has been no study of the influence of choice on music

programs in MPS. The data shows strong evidence, both numerically and anecdotally, that the problem is, at least in part, a lack of prioritization regarding music education, both fiscally and philosophically. This evidence could supply administration with ammunition needed to advocate for increased prioritization of music education. Perhaps just seeing the evidence would be enough to make some administrators rethink their commitment to music education. Because all of the participants for this project spent considerable time working in or around MPS music programs, it is possible their input will carry some weight regarding policy decisions, regarding music education, within MPS.

Throughout this project there was a great deal of discussion regarding music programs requiring a fresh approach and being more innovative. This may be the perfect time for secondary music programs to be rebuilt with a new, more modern approach. The use of technology, non-traditional ensembles, guitar programs, and pop / rock groups were all largely unexplored. The expansion of these types of programs, as well as the use of popular music as an educational vehicle, could modernize music programs and help aid with their expansion. This study could be a catalyst for the expansion of secondary music education to include these elements on a much larger scale.

Music teachers need to advocate first for their own programs and secondly for the entire spectrum of music education. They need to be given the tools to create programs that are best suited for their schools, thereby having the greatest chance for success. Music programs should be set up in a manner most beneficial to the culture of that particular school. For example, if the student population of a particular school was

largely Hispanic, Latin music could be used as the educational vehicle as opposed to traditional band music.

A music teacher—for all practical purposes—has two jobs, teaching music and that of a publicist or public relations advocate for their department. Music teachers should be partly responsible for creating a program that is indispensable to their school. I say partly responsible because excellent collaborative skills are also paramount for music educators. There is evidence throughout the literature indicating that there can be no stronger advocate for a program than the instructor. Jorgensen (2003) wrote, “Teachers...need to be more skillful as politicians, willing to work with their colleagues to demand and secure appropriate support, recognition, and remuneration for their work....It cannot be left to others to defend” (p. 117). Abril and Gault (2008) wrote “Teachers might serve as agents for change most effectively when informed with an understanding of the ways in which people in the educational community think about music in schools” (p. 80). This advocacy places a great deal of responsibility and pressure on the individual but the rewards and successes are also theirs. This translates easily to other art areas, such as visual art or theater.

Music teachers cannot, however, be the only advocates for music education in our schools. School administrators and policy makers must see the value in a multi-faceted, well-rounded education for all students. This may be the most daunting task of all because—as the data for this project revealed—not all school leaders and administrators prioritize music education in their schools. Every participant offered support of secondary music education but did not necessarily make it a priority. While they may have claimed

to have been advocates of music education, their actions often indicated the contrary. Gerrity (2009) warned of this exact phenomenon. Music and other arts programs cannot be a consistent afterthought. They need to be an integral part of the planning and initial implementation of any well-rounded, complete, and effective curriculum.

Suggestions for Further Research

I often remarked while gathering data for this project that because of the constant changes surrounding MPS, if I did not set limits, this could have been a study that never ended. Therefore, the first suggestion would be that this study could be continued and repeated within MPS as many times as is necessary to gather the data needed for informed policy-making decisions. The numerical data changed yearly, sometimes quite drastically, and there was no shortage of participants in a large, urban district like MPS.

A similar study could be conducted in other art areas such as visual art, dance, and theater. Music is not the only art area suffering tremendous cutbacks and lack of advocacy. An exploration of other art areas is needed to paint a more complete picture of the state of arts education in our schools.

This study could also be replicated in other major urban areas that are implementing the same type of educational reform as was being done in Milwaukee. Cleveland, San Antonio, New York, Chicago and countless other areas could benefit from a study of this type. The comparison between what has happened in Milwaukee and other areas could be quite illuminating.

A study, or studies, could be conducted in a smaller, rural area that has a large number of small schools and where voucher systems are beginning to gain popularity.

This could offer an interesting comparison between urban and rural areas, their respective music programs, and the perceived influence of school choice on both. While this would technically not be a replication, it would most certainly yield interesting and valuable results.

A study could be conducted in an area that offers a great deal of school choice but is, at the same time, well-funded. The most daunting part of a study of this type may be finding such a district or area. A study of this type could help determine how many problems with music programs were caused by school reform and how many were caused by a simple lack of funding.

In an effort to delimit this study, I did not examine any non-public, voucher schools. The comparison between non-public, private, and religious schools, and MPS schools could add more data that could aid in the debate regarding public versus private schools. What are the arts programs like in these non-MPS schools? Is music regarded as an integral part of their curriculum or a superfluous afterthought? How many of the areas private, voucher schools have music programs? Is there any staff dedicated to music and the arts, or is it outsourced, and treated as an extra-curricular offering?

This study could inspire policy makers to increase the inclusion of teachers, students, and music program alumni in the decision-making process regarding music education. There was a significant amount of interview data containing strong opinions from participants with a great deal of experience in secondary music education. These were educated opinions that could add a practical voice to decisions being made regarding music education.

If this study were to be repeated an expansion of the numerical data, phone survey of all MPS high schools might prove beneficial. A more thorough survey would have yielded more intricate data that could have led the interviews towards more definitive answers. Adding some more information on the goals for the school's music program or—for those schools with no music program—if there were any plans to initiate one at some point would also help to make the study more thorough. In addition, a follow up survey to check on the progress of those goals or whether or not some schools had started music programs could expand findings.

At several points throughout this project I pointed out the confusion regarding the participants' ability to separate voucher, charter, and small school initiatives. It was difficult to pinpoint where one ended and another began and there was a great deal of overlap. If this study was to be repeated a more detailed explanation of each initiative could be offered as well as a way of showing the separation and overlap between each. It is unclear to me whether this would offer clarity, or simply underscore the utter chaos and confusion of the system.

Finally, there also seems a need for more research regarding educational outcomes and school choice. The data was inconclusive and quite often, politically motivated. Policy makers need to put aside their agendas and become more objective regarding educational decisions. They need to become much more active in consulting educators before making decisions regarding education. Policy decisions of this magnitude that influence the lives of thousands of students daily, should be made

utilizing thorough, non-partisan research, not special interest propaganda. Kos (2007)

commented on the responsibility of policy makers:

Policy may be able to produce more intended outcomes and fewer unintended outcomes if policy makers include mechanisms that encourage democratic implementation or that can influence the implementers' beliefs or values so that they will implement the policy more effectively. (pp. 212-213)

The Future of Music Education in MPS

One of the final questions I asked participants was to give their view on the future of secondary music in MPS. These questions elicited some of the most candid responses of the entire interview process. There was a great deal of discussion and speculation as to whether or not secondary music programs had reached the bottom and were going to come back, or whether there were still more budget cuts and program losses in the future. No participant claimed secondary programs would cease to exist entirely, however, many felt there could still be several years of fiscal and political restraints that could hamper and meaningful growth. Former administrator Walter stated:

I don't see things growing because I just don't see any financial hope here. I see some more slashing and burning here over the next 2-3 years. We could be lucky to hang on to what we have. That would be my goal. That may not be very visionary or optimistic but I think right now, how can we fight to get what we have to have?

Former teacher and administrator Bob added:

I think we're close to the bottom, I don't know if we're at the bottom that is all based on our philosophy and how we budget. If our budget gets better, and there's a better management of funding then you'll see things go back on the rise. Until then, until we figure out the funding mechanism and things like that it's always going to be in this state of flux. It's going to always fluctuate good and bad.

Ed felt things had nearly bottomed out and outside arts organizations were beginning to take over areas previously covered by school music programs.

The reason that's going to happen is because the schools will not have the resources or staff, nor will it have the organizational structure through most of the schools that can deliver a system that will allow for large performing groups within a school. Small performing groups are not sustainable because of the ratio of students to teachers. Unless they began to bring in outside teachers who are adjunct. There would have to be some changes in the rules.

There were no participants who were overwhelmingly optimistic regarding the future of MPS music programs. There were varying degrees of negativity surrounding the topic. All participants were of the opinion that increased funding would be necessary to revive struggling music programs. Former administrator Peter stated:

I think they just need to bounce more money into it. They need to emphasize to little kids to get going. My class of kids were really involved in music. I happen to know that [school] and [school], it's not the same anymore. Just because it's just not as important. I think maybe it's just a mid-90s thing.

They need to keep the funding going. I know there are schools that are cutting band. I know there are schools where they just don't care. I haven't gone to those schools really but I've heard about them and that's a shame. It's not like all the kids who have musical ambitions are in two high schools, or three or four. They're all across but they just don't get exposed to it.

Former teacher Kevin added:

Well number one is funding. It always boils down to the funding. The ways things are going with the budget they're not looking at the arts as being a major component. They're looking at academic scores. Unless somebody can come in and convince them to start with the funding to keep this program going because it's going to show results in academics as well.

Teacher participant Ralph stated:

It's very evident that the funding for music in elementary schools and even middle schools to some extent is non-existent. The lack of music education in the younger grades, it's really only for a very few, depending on what school they go to. I think because of that we are not bringing up the next generation of students who want to be musicians. There's no nurturing or growing of music in these schools so we're starting to see it in terms of our school because there are only so many schools that we can recruit our kids from. Even though there's probably 30 middle schools in the city we only get students from maybe six? I think that shows that if we want music to start thriving in the district we that we needs to

start nurturing it at the elementary level, then continue that up through the high school level.

The primary issue discussed regarding the future of music education in MPS was funding. Participants all felt there would have to be a funding increase, and a commitment to maintain that funding, in order for the programs to come back to previous levels, or survive altogether. Regardless of any other concerns or issues surrounding secondary music's future the discussion always seemed to return to fiscal matters. The general consensus was that all the passion and innovation in the world could not make up for programs that were underfunded.

Lack of funding for secondary music programs was also a primary concern throughout the literature. When asked to list the primary obstacles to fully supporting music programs at their schools, principals across the country listed financial concerns first, with scheduling coming a distant second (Abril & Gault, 2008). Many authors (Costa-Giomi, 2008; Hinckley, 1995; Mixon, 2005) pointed to inequities in music programs between schools. They expressed a need for increased funding in impoverished schools due to lack of parental support and monetary resources in the students' homes. Mixon (2005) and Keast (2011) encouraged music teachers to improve their grant writing skills to help overcome insufficient funding.

There was also discussion of music education changing to attract more students through the use of technology or a more non-traditional approach. Recording, guitar, and keyboard classes were all gaining popularity nationwide. There was feedback indicating that in addition to funding many participants felt a fresh, more innovative approach to music education was needed to help rejuvenate failing programs. While a fresh approach

may not replace adequate funding there was feedback indicating the two go hand in hand. If schools had music teachers who were energetic and innovative it may help to convince administrators that there was value to a thriving music program in their schools. Former MPS administrator Michael commented:

Schools start to see the value they'll put the money there. That takes really effective people who really know how to build a program and those are hard to find. You can find music educators but it's hard I believe to find those who know how to build a program from the ground up.

This sentiment was echoed during several interviews. Participants felt part of the solution was convincing administrators of the benefits of a strong music program.

The question of whether MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools were initiated to offer an educational choice or to increase educational outcomes was examined in this study. There was also speculation as to whether these initiatives were created to procure funding or whether funding was procured to create initiatives. These questions were explored but not answered either in the data gathered for this study or in the literature. MPCP, MHSRI, and charter schools were all initiated to help education in MPS. The data from this study have neither confirmed, nor refuted, their success, or failure, regarding that mission, although there was a great deal of discussion regarding all.

Reflections

Throughout the course of this study I asked myself whether I found what I expected, or were some of my findings a surprise. I reflected on what areas should have been expanded and which ones could have been diminished or deleted altogether. I realized some of the unexpected outcomes were connected to my own limitations as a

neophyte researcher.

While conducting my research, I observed several things that I felt were less than ideal. I was cautioned at the very beginning of this entire process that because I was close to this project, and passionate about the subject matter, that I had to remain objective.

While I do feel I maintained objectivity to the best of my ability, it was at times difficult to do so. There were problems that, in my mind, did not require a fiscal solution but could have been addressed from a humanistic standpoint, utilizing better communication skills.

It was frustrating to not be able to address these problems or offer a solution. These frustrations were likely caused by my passion for this subject, the students involved, and my desire to see music education in MPS, and as a whole, move forward and grow.

Education should never be—but too often is used as—a political tool. Our students deserve more.

**APPENDIX A:
A COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN MPS: 1985–2008**

1985

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Harold Vincent High School | 9. Marshall High School |
| 2. Washington High School | 10. Bay View High School |
| 3. Pulaski High School | 11. Boys Tech High School |
| 4. South Division High School | 12. The Milwaukee High School of
the Arts |
| 5. North Division High School | 13. Riverside High School |
| 6. Madison High School | 14. Rufus King High School |
| 7. Custer High School | 15. Juneau High School |
| 8. Hamilton High School | |

2008

- | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. ALAS | 12. Cornerstone | 23. Kilmer |
| 2. Alliance | 13. Custer | 24. Rufus King |
| 3. Assata | 14. D.I.A.L. | 25. Lad Lake |
| 4. Audubon High
School | 15. Du Bois | 26. Lady Pitts |
| 5. Bay View | 16. El Puente | 27. Loyola |
| 6. Banner Prep | 17. Foster &
Williams | 28. Madison
Academic
Campus |
| 7. Bradley Tech | 18. Genesis | 29. Marshall |
| 8. Career Youth | 19. Grandview | 30. Marshall
Montessori |
| 9. Carmen | 20. Hamilton | 31. M.A.T.C. –
Project Hold |
| 10. CITIES | 21. HR Academy | 32. Metropolitan |
| 11. Community
High School | 22. International
Peace Academy | |

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 33. Milw. Aviation Academy | 43. NOVA | 57. Transition High School |
| 34. Milw. African Immersion | 44. Preparatory School | 58. Truth Institute |
| 35. Milw. Business | 45. Professional Learning Institute | 59. SUPAR |
| 36. Milw. County Youth | 46. Project School-To-Work | 60. Veritas |
| 37. Milw. Entrepreneurship | 47. Project STAY | 61. Vincent |
| 38. Milw. Learning Lab | 48. Project Stay – Senior | 62. WCLL |
| 39. Milw. High School of the Arts | 49. Pulaski | 63. WHS – Expeditionary Learning |
| 40. Milw. School of Languages | 50. Reagan | 64. WHS – Law, Education & Public Service |
| 41. New School – Community Service | 51. Riverside | 65. WHS – Technology |
| 42. Northwest Secondary | 52. Shalom | 66. Wisc. Career Academy |
| | 53. South Division | 67. Wings |
| | 54. Spectrum | 68. Wisc. Transition |
| | 55. Spotted Eagle | 69. WORK |
| | 56. St. Charles | |

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title: Secondary Music Programs, School Reform and School Reorganization: Vouchers, Charters and Magnets

Principal Investigator: Douglas Syme / 414-545-2386

Dissertation Advisor: Ronald P. Kos, Jr., Ph.D. / Assistant Professor, Music Education Department, Boston University School of Music / 855 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, MA 02215 / 617-358-5178

12-2-08

Any participant in this study will receive a duplicate cop of this signed form. This study will involve descriptive (numerical) and qualitative (interview) data. It will examine the influence of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) and other policies as they relate to the music programs in the area's public and choice high schools.

- The duration of each interview should be approximately thirty minutes to one hour.
- The researcher will first contact the participant via the telephone or E-mail.
- The researcher will set up the interview at the participant's convenience.
- During the initial telephone conference the researcher will explain the basic structure of the interview to eliminate any surprise on the part of the participant.
- The participant will have final approval of the transcription of their interview.
- The participant will have final approval of their portion of the study.
- The participant is under no obligation, and will incur no penalty as a result of failure to agree to participate in this study.
- As the interview is about the nature of education in the Milwaukee area, and will be reliant on the participant's observations and opinions, there is no foreseeable discomfort or risk to the participant.
- All records of these proceedings will be kept confidential unless expressed written and verbal consent is received from the participant or required by law or regulation.

- Interview and questionnaire data will be stored in locked files, or password protected electronically, and destroyed at the end of the research.

If you have any questions regarding the research or your participation in it, either now or any time in the future, please feel free to ask. Contact Douglas Syme who may be reached at 414-545-2386. You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling _____, who is the Coordinator of the Institutional Review Board for Human Subject Research of the Boston University Charles River Campus, at 617/353-4365. If any problems arise as a result of your participation in this study, including research-related injuries, please call the Principal Investigator, Douglas Syme immediately.

I give Doug Syme my consent to use my name and to quote me in the above-mentioned study. I understand that I will have final approval of all materials involving my participation before any information will be released. I also understand I am free to cease participating in this study at any time.

Signed _____ Date _____

I give Doug Syme my consent to quote me anonymously in the above-mentioned study. I understand that I will have final approval of all materials involving my participation before any information will be released. I also understand I am free to cease participating in this study at any time.

Signed _____ Date _____

**APPENDIX C:
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR MPS ADMINISTRATORS**

Doug Syme

Title: Secondary Music Programs, School Reform and School Reorganization: Vouchers, Charters and Magnets.

1. Name
2. Current title
3. Previous positions held at MPS.
4. Please tell me about your professional history.
5. Please give me your thoughts on music education in MPS.
6. How has music education changed in MPS since your career began?
7. Please give me your thoughts on the following:
 - a. MPCP
 - b. MHSRI
 - c. Charter schools
 - d. Magnet schools
8. Is MPS doing all it can to promote music education in the district? If not what could be done differently?
9. What are some positive elements to music education in MPS at this time?

10. What are the biggest obstacles facing music education in MPS at this time?

11. As difficult as it is to predict the future. What do you see for music education in MPS 2 years from now? 5 years? 10 years?

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR MPS MUSIC TEACHERS

Doug Syme

Title: Secondary Music Programs, School Reform and School Reorganization: Vouchers, Charters and Magnets.

1. Name
2. Tell me about your educational background.
3. Tell me about your professional background.
4. In what ways is the program you taught different from your high school music experience? How was it similar?
5. Besides teaching for MPS, of what other musical activities are you a part?
6. Why is music education important in MPS?
7. Tell me how you feel the MPS music department has changed from the beginning of your career until the present day.
8. What are your thoughts about the following:
 - a. MPCP
 - b. MHSRI
 - c. Charter Schools
 - d. Magnet Schools (which MPS refers to as “specialty”)
9. Did (or do) any of those entities influence your music program? If so, how?

10. What would you suggest MPS do to help ensure the future of music education in the district?

APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR A STUDENT SUBJECT

Doug Syme

Title: Secondary Music Programs, School Reform and School Reorganization: Vouchers, Charters and Magnets.

1. Name?
2. School Attending or Attended?
3. In which musical activities (and in what capacity) did you participate?
4. What are your plans for the next phase of your life, and for the rest of your life?
 - a. Do they include music?
 - i. In what capacity?
5. Describe your general experience throughout your high school career. Did the program change during your time in high school?
6. Do you think your high school's music program was / is funded adequately? Why or why not.
7. Did (does) your high school music program do an adequate job meeting your musical needs?
8. Is there anything else you would have liked your high school music program to offer? Explain.
9. If you could improve things in your high school's music program, where would you start?
10. Why is music important in high schools?
11. Describe what you know about the voucher program, charter schools, revenue caps, and the high school redesign initiative.

12. What would you suggest MPS do to help ensure the future of music education in the district?

REFERENCES

- Abdulkadiroglu, A., & Sonmez, T. (2003). School choice: A mechanism design approach. *American Economic Review*, 93(3), 729-747. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/000282803322157061>
- Abril, C., & Gault, B. (2008). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(1), 68-81. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022429408317516>
- Adderley, C., Kennedy, M., & Berz, W. (2003). "A home away from home": The world of the high school music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(3), 190-205. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3345373>
- Administrative Rule PI 8.01(2)(j). (2012). *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, 21. Madison, WI, USA: The State of Wisconsin. Retrieved August 13, 2012
- Andreopoulos, W. (2003). *The Blueprint for Milwaukee's New Vision High Schools*. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Schools.
- Angrist, J., Bettinger, E., Bloom, E., King, E., & Kremer, M. (2002). Vouchers for private schooling in Colombia: Evidence from a randomized naturalized experiment. *American Economic Review*, 92(5), 1535-1558. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w8343>
- Archbald, D. (2004). School choice, magnet schools, and the liberation model: An empirical study. *Sociology of Education*, 77(4), 283-310. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003804070407700402>
- Assembly Bill 11. (2011). *2011 Wisconsin Act 10*. Madison, Wisconsin, USA: State of Wisconsin.
- Austin, J., & Russel, J. (2008). Charter schools: Embracing or excluding the arts. In L. K. Thompson, & M. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Diverse Methodologies in the Study of Music Teaching and Learning* (pp. 183-200). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Baker, V. (2007). Relationship between job satisfaction and the perception of administrative support among early career secondary choral music educators. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 77, 77-91. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10570837070170010111>

- Barnard, J., Frangakis, C., Hill, J., & Rubin, D. (2003). Principal stratification approach to broken randomized experiments: A case study of school choice vouchers in New York City. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462), 299-311. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1198/016214503000071>
- Beck, D. E. (1993). Jenkins vs. Missouri: School choice as a method for desegregating an inner-city school district. *California Law Review*, 81(4), 1029-1057. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3480892>
- Belfield, C., & Levine, H. M. (2005). Vouchers and public policy: When ideology trumps evidence. (L. Bosetti, Ed.) *American Journal of Education*, 111(4), 548-567. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/431183>
- Benson, J. T. (1998). *Wisconsin Charter Schools 1998*. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Education Options Team. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Bice, D. (2013). Membership in public worker unions takes a hit under act 10. *The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, pp. 1-2. Retrieved July 22, 2013, from The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: <http://www.jsonline.com/watchdog/noquarter/membership-in-public-worker-unions-takes-a-hit-under-act-10-b9957856z1->
- Bifulco, R., & Ladd, H. (2006). Institutional change and coproduction of public services: The effect of charter schools on parental involvement. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(4), 553-576. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muj001>
- Bifulco, R., & Ladd, H. (2006). The impacts of charter schools on student achievement: Evidence from North Carolina. *Education, Finance and Policy*, 1(1), 50-90. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/edfp.2006.1.1.50>
- Board of Education v. Allen, 660 (United States Supreme Court June 10, 1968).
- Booker, K., Gilpatric, S., Gronberg, T., & Jansen, D. (2008). The effect of charter schools on traditional public school students in Texas: Are children who stay behind left behind? *Journal of Urban Economics*, 64, 123-145. Retrieved from www.elsevier.com/locate/jue
- Borsuk, A., & Carr, S. (2005). A Question of Accountability. *Milwaukee Journal / Sentinel*.
- Braun, H., Jenkins, F., & Grigg, W. (2006). *A Closer Look at Charter Schools Using Hierarchical Modeling*. U.S. Department of Education, International Center for Education Statistics. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Braun, H., Jenkins, F., Grigg, W., & Tirre, W. (2006). *A Closer Look at Charter Schools Using Hierarchical Modeling*. U.S. Department of Education, International Center for Education Statistics. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Brighouse, H. (1997). Two philosophical errors concerning school choice. *Oxford Review of Education*, 23(4), 503-510. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305498970230406>
- Brown v. Board of Education - About the Case*. (2004). (Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research) Retrieved 2008, 3-November from In Pursuit of Freedom and Equality: Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka: <http://brownvboard.org/summary>
- Bruenger, S. (2010). Why select new music teachers chose to, or chose not to, apply to teach in an urban school district. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(2), 25-40. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1057083709346787>
- Burke, M. (1993). Charter schools OK'd. *The Journal Times*. From http://journaltimes.com/news/local/charter-schools-ok-d/article_2658da75-ccc3-5528-884a-bdbf05650dc8.html
- Bush, L. V. (2004). Access, school choice and independent black institutions. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(3), 386-401. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021934703258761>
- Carl, B., Huiping, E., Keltz, J., & Meyer, R. (2010). *A Comparison of Selected Outcome Measures Across High School Types in the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS)*. University of Wisconsin-Madison, Value Added Research Center, Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved August 22, 2012, from <http://mpsportal1.milwaukee.k12.wi.us/portal/server.pt>
- Carnoy, M. (2000). School choice? Or is it privatization? *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 15-20. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029007015>
- Carpenter, D., & Kafer, K. (2012). A history of private school choice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 87(3), 336-350. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2012.679587>
- Chakrabarti, R. (2007). *Can increasing private school participation and monetary loss in a voucher program affect public school performance? Evidence from Milwaukee*. Staff Report, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York.
- Chakrabarti, R. (2008). *Impact of voucher design on public school performance: Evidence from Florida and Milwaukee voucher programs*. Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports, Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

- Chakrabati, R. (2008). *Impact of voucher design on public school performance: Evidence from Florida and Milwaukee voucher programs*. Federal Reserve Bank of New York. New York: Federal Reserve Bank of New York.
- Chakrabati, R. (2009). *Do vouchers lead to sorting under random private-school selection? Evidence from the Milwaukee voucher program*. Federal Reserve Bank of New York. New York: Federal Reserve Bank of New York.
- Chapman, L. (2005). No child left behind in art? *Art Education*, 58(1), 6-16. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/103200/aepr/106/2/3-20>
- Chubb, J., & Moe, T. (1988). Politics, markets, and the organization of schools. *American Political Science Review*, 82(4), 1065-1087. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1961750>
- Coleman, J., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). Cognitive outcomes in public and private schools. *Sociology of Education*, 55(2/3), 65-76. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2112288>
- Collins, T. L. (2008). *Milwaukee parental choice program homepage*. Retrieved 2008, 4-December from Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction: http://sms.dpi.wi.gov/choice_programs
- Colwell, R. (Ed.). (2006). *MENC handbook of research methodologies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Colwell, R., & Richardson, C. (Eds.). (2002). *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, C. W. (2005). School choice and the standpoint of African American mothers: Considering the power of positionality. *Journal of Negro Education*, 74(2), 174-189. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10/1080/09574049408578211>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Costa-Giomi, E. (2008). Characteristics of elementary music programs in urban schools: What money can buy. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 177, 19-28. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319449>
- Costrell, R. (2008). *The fiscal impact of the Milwaukee parental choice program, in Milwaukee and Wisconsin, 1993-2008*. The University of Arkansas, Department of Education Reform. Fayetteville: School Choice Demonstration Project.

- Cotton, K. (2001). *New small learning communities: Findings from recent literature*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, School Improvement Program. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. From <http://www.mountbensonschool.ca/pac/upload/nlsc.pdf>
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. C. D. Laughton (Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Curren, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Philosophy of education: An anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cuttance, P. (1983). Review: Public and private schools, tax credits and tuition vouchers: A review of a comparison of the performance of public, Catholic and private schools in America. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 4(3), 263-273. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/228818>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). New standards and old inequalities: School reform and the education of African American students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(4), 263-287. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2696245>
- Dickman, A. (2010). *New Regulations Impacting School Choice Program: School Closures Up, Number of New Schools Down*. Retrieved 2010, 10-February from Public Policy Forum: www.publicpolicyforum.org
- Dickman, A., Schmidt, J., & Henken, R. (2010). *Research Brief: New regulations impacting school choice program: School closures up, number of new schools down*. Milwaukee: Public Policy Forum. From <http://publicpolicyforum.org>
- Doyle, D., & Levine, M. (1984). Magnet schools: Choice and quality in public education. P. D. International (Ed.). *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66(4), 265-270. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20387313>
- Epple, D., & Romano, R. (1998). Competition between private and public schools, vouchers, and peer-group effects. *American Economic Review*, 88(1), 33-62. From <http://www.jstor.org/stable/116817>
- Erickson, D. (1972). Education vouchers: Nature and funding. *Theory Into Practice*, 11(2), 108-116. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405847209542380>
- Everson v. Board of Education of the Township of Ewing et al., 52 (United States Supreme Court February 10, 1947).

- Farrell, W. C., & Mathews, J. (2006). The Milwaukee school voucher initiative: impact on black students. *Journal of Negro Education, 75*(3), 519-531. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/bejeap-2012-0037>
- Ferreya, M. (2007). Estimating the effects of private school vouchers in multidistrict economies. *American Economic Review, 97*(3), 789-817. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.97.3.789>
- Ferris, S., & West, E. (2002). Education vouchers, the peer group problem, and the question of dropouts. *Southern Economic Journal, 68*(4), 774-793. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1061492>
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). A mixed methods portrait of urban instrumental music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 59*(3), 229-256. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/0.1177/0022429411414912>
- Forster, G. (2006). *Segregation Levels in Milwaukee Public Schools and the Milwaukee Voucher Program*. Milton and Rose D. Friedman Foundation. Milton and Rose D. Friedman Foundation.
- Fowler, F. (2002). The great school choice debate. *Clearing House, 76*(1), 4-7. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781410603173>
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Friedo, D. (1969). A young teacher's thoughts on music education. *Music Educators Journal, 55*(7), 87-92. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3392472>
- Fuller, H. (2002). Educational Choice, a Core Freedom. *Journal of Negro Education, 71*(1/2), 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3211220>
- Gamoran, A. (1996). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive and private city high schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(1), 1-18. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1164227>
- Gerrity, K. (2009). No child left behind: Determining the impact of policy on music education in Ohio. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 179*, 79-93. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/e565302006-003>
- Gleason, P., Clark, M., Tuttle, C., Dwoyer, E., & Silverberg, M. (2010). *The evaluation of charter school impacts*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington D.C.: National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. New York, NY: Longman.

- Golden, C. (1972). Education vouchers: The fruit of the lemon tree. *Stanford Law Review*, 24(4), 687-711. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1227819>
- Goldhaber, D. (1999). School choice: An examination of the empirical evidence on achievement, parental decision making, and equity. *Educational Researcher*, 28(9), 16-25. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189x028009016>
- Gorard, S., Fitz, J., & Taylor, C. (2001). School choice impacts: What do we know? *Educational Researcher*, 30(7), 18-23. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189x030007018>
- Gratto, S. (2002). Arts education in alternative school formats. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 103(5), 17-24. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632910209600300>
- Gray, N., Wolf, P., & Jensen, L. (2008). *Milwaukee longitudinal school choice evaluation: Annual school testing summary report*. University of Arkansas, Department of Education Reform. Fayetteville: School Choice Demonstration Project.
- Green, J., Peterson, P., & Du, J. (1997). *Effectiveness of school choice: The Milwaukee experiment*. University of Houston, Center for Public Policy. Cambridge: Center for Public Policy. From http://heartland.org/sites/all/modules/custom/heartland_migration/files/pdfs/3573.pdf
- Guggenheim, D. (Director). (2010). *Waiting for Superman* [Motion Picture].
- Hancock, C. (2008). Music teachers at risk for attrition and migration: An analysis of the 1999-2000 schools and staffing survey. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(2), 130-144. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022429408321635>
- Hanson, H. (1948). The scope of the music educator program. *Music Educators' Journal*, 34(6), 7-8, 54, 56-57. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3388626>
- Hastings, J., & Weinstein, J. (2008). Information, school choice, and academic achievement: Evidence from two experiments. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(4), 1373-1414. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2008.123.4.1373>
- Hetzner, A., & Walters, S. (2008). Funding deal reached for virtual schools. *Milwaukee Journal / Sentinel*. From www.jsonline.com
- Heytens, T. (2000). School choice and state constitutions. *Virginia Law Review*, 86(1), 117-162. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1073957>

- Hill, P. (2005). Doing school choice right. *American Journal of Education*, 111(2), 141-150. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/426835>
- Hinckley, J. (1995). Urban music education: Providing for students. *Music Educators Journal*, 82(1), 32-35. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3398883>
- Hirsch, D. (1995). School choice and the search for an educational market. *International Review of Education*, 41(3/4), 239-257. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf01255555>
- Howard Fuller Ph.D. (2005). Retrieved 2008, 22-November from Marquette University College of Education:
http://www.itlmuonline.com/_incoming/Fuller%20Bio%20current%206-26-08.pdf What is that weird font?
- Howell, W., Wolf, P., Campbell, D., & Peterson, P. (2002). School vouchers and academic performance: Results from three randomized field trials. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(2), 191-217. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pam.10023>
- Hoxby, C. (2002). Would school choice change the teaching profession? *Journal of Human Resources*, 37(4), 846-891. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w7866>
- Information for Parents About the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS)*. (2008,). Retrieved 2008, 5-December from Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction: <http://dpi.wi.gov/oea/parents.html>
- Jennings, J. (2010). School choice or schools' choice? Managing in an era of accountability. *Sociology of Education*, 83(3), 227-247. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0038040710375688>
- Johnson, C., & Memmott, J. (2006). Examination of relationships between participation in school music programs of differing quality and standardized test results. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 54(4), 293-307. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002242940605400403>
- Jones, P. (2006). Returning music education to the mainstream: Reconnecting with the community. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 7, 1-9. Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/v7n1/visions/Jones%20Returning%20Music%20Education%20to%20the%20Mainstream.pdf>
- Jorgensen, E. (2003). *Transforming music education*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Kane, E. (2013). *Comparisons with Detroit and residency rules not a good thing*. Retrieved July 23, 2013, from onmilwaukee.com:
<http://onmilwaukee.com/buzz/articles/detroitresidencyrules.html>
- Kaptchuk, T. J. (2003). *Effect of interpretive bias on research evidence*. Retrieved 2008, 5-December from BMJ: <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/reprint/326/7404/1453>
- Kava, R. (2007). *Milwaukee parental choice program*. Informational Paper #29, Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau, Madison.
- Keast, D. (2011). I don't need a million-dollar grant--\$5,000 will do! *Music Educators' Journal*, 98(1), 77-81. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0027432111414586>
- Kelly, A., & Loveless, T. (2012). Comparing new school effects in charter and traditional public schools. *American Journal of Education*, 118(4), 427-453. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/666370>
- Keyes, W. (2007). *American educational history: School, society, and the common good*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452232331>
- King, K., Houston, I., & Middleton, R. (2001). An explanation for school failure: Moving beyond black inferiority and alienation as a policy making agenda. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 49(4), 428-445. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8527.t01-1-00186>
- Kisida, B. L. (2008). *The Milwaukee parental choice program: Baseline descriptive report on participating schools*. University of Arkansas, Department of Education Reform. Fayetteville: School Choice Demonstration Project.
- Koppich, J. (1997). Considering nontraditional alternatives: Charters, private contracts and vouchers. *Future of Children*, 7, 96-111. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1602448>
- Kos, R. J. (2007). *Incidental change: The influence of educational policy implementation on music education programs and practice*. The University of Wisconsin at Madison, Music. Madison: The University of Wisconsin.
- Kuntz, T. (2011). High school students' participation in music activities beyond the school day. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 30(1), 23-31. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/8755123311418478>

- Lacireno-Paquet, N., Holyoke, T. T., Moser, M., & Henig, J. R. (2002). Creaming versus cropping: Charter school enrollment practices in response to market incentives. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(2), 145-158. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737024002145>
- Ladd, H. F. (2002). School vouchers: A critical view. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(4), 3-24 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/089533002320950957>
- Ladd, H., & Fiske, E. (2003). Does competition improve teaching and learning? Evidence from New Zealand. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(1), 97-112. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737025001095>
- Larson, L. (2002). *School vouchers*. Minnesota House of Representatives, Research Department. St. Paul: Minnesota House of Representatives.
- Lemon v. Kurtzman, 43 (United States Supreme Court June 28, 1971).
- Lubienski, C. (2003). Innovation in education markets: Theory and evidence on the impact of competition and choice in charter schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(2), 395-443. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312040002395>
- Madsen, C., & Hancock, C. (2002). Support for music education: A case study of issues concerning teacher retention and attrition. *Journal for Research in Music Education*, 50(2), 6-19. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3345689>
- Malin, M. (2012). Life after Act 10?: Is there a future for collective representation of Wisconsin public employees? *Marquette Law Review*, 96(2), 623-658. Retrieved from <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr/vol96/iss2/7>
- Mason, P. (1975). Educational vouchers under test. *Oxford Review of Education*, 1(2), 159-167. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305498750010207>
- Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design, An interactive approach* (Vol. 41). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- McEwan, P. J. (2000). The potential impact of large-scale voucher programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(2), 103-149. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543070002103>
- McLaughlin, M., Henderson, K., & Ullah, H. (1996). *Charter schools and students with disabilities*. Center for Policy Research. Alexandria: U.S. Department of Education.

- Meeting Notes. (2004). *Meeting notes*, 1-4. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin PK-16 Leadership Council.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merryfield, L. (2007). *Informational paper 31, Charter Schools*. Madison: Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau.
- Merryfield, L. (2011). *Charter schools*. Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau. Madison: Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau.
- Meyer v. Nebraska, 325 (The Supreme Court of Nebraska June 4, 1923).
- Mills, C. (1960). An objective look at our music education program. *Music Educators Journal*, 46(5), 80-81. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3389360>
- Milwaukee Public Schools*. (2008). Retrieved 2008, 4-December from Milwaukee Public Schools: www.mpsportal.milwaukee.k12.wi.us
- Miner, B. (2003). *Vouchers: Special ed students need not apply*. Retrieved 2008, 4-December from Rethinking Schools Online: http://www.rethinkingschools.org/special_reports/voucher_report/v_vouc182.shtml
- Miner, B. (2005). *The Gates Foundation and small schools*. Retrieved 2008, 6-December from Rethinking Schools Online: http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/19_04/gate194.shtml
- Mixon, K. (2005). Building your instrumental music program in an urban school. *Music Educators' Journal*, 91(3), 15-23. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3400071>
- Mizala, A., & Romaguera, P. (2000). School performance and choice: the Chilean experience. *Journal of Human Resources*, 35(2), 392-417. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/146331>
- Molnar, A. (1999). *Educational vouchers: A review of the research*. University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation, Milwaukee. From <http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/CERAI>
- Morrison, P. (1996). Forecasting enrollments during court-ordered desegregation. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 15(2), 131-146. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf00126131>
- Mueller, J. (2000). *An evaluation: Milwaukee parental choice program*. The State of Wisconsin, Legislative Audit Bureau. Madison: Legislative Audit Bureau.

- Mueller, J. (2010). *Test score data for pupils in the Milwaukee parental choice program*. The State of Wisconsin, Legislative Audit Bureau. Madison: The State of Wisconsin.
- Neal, D. (2002). How vouchers could change the market for education. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(4), 25-44. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/089533002320950966>
- Nechyba, T. (2000). Mobility, targeting and private school vouchers. *American Economic Review*, 90(1), 130-146. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w7239>
- Orcher, L. T. (2005). *Conducting research*. Glendale, California: Pycszak Publishing.
- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695-705. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-4/ortlipp.pdf>
- O'Scannlain, D. (2007). From Pierce to Smith: The Oregon connection and Supreme Court religion jurisprudence. *Oregon Law Review*, 635-656.
- Paul, K., Legan, N., & Metcalf, K. (2007). Differential entry into a voucher program: A longitudinal examination of families who apply to and enroll in the Cleveland scholarship and tutoring program. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(2), 223-243. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013124506295005>
- Percy, S., Haider-Markel, D., McDonald, T., & Maier, P. (2001). *Are school revenue limits limiting learning?* The Institute for Wisconsin's Future. Milwaukee: The Institute for Wisconsin's Future.
- Phelps, R., Sadoff, R., Warburton, E., & Ferrara, L. (2005). *A guide to research in music education* (5th ed.). Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press.
- Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 583 (United States Supreme Court June 1, 1925).
- Politics*. (2014). Retrieved March 16, 2014, from Merriam Webster: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/politics>
- Pryzbyla, D. (2003). *Voucher leaders direct Milwaukee's "small high school" experiments*. Retrieved 2008, 3-December from ednews.org: <http://www.ednews.org/articles/109/1/Voucher-leaders-direct-Milwaukeees-quot-small-high-schoolquot-experiments/Page1.html>

- Quinn, R. (2006). *The politics of school vouchers: Analyzing the Milwaukee parental choice plan*. Stanford University, School of Education. Stanford: Stanford University School of Education. Retrieved from http://caselib.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/cases/Quinn_case.pdf
- Rabovsky, T. (2011). Deconstructing school choice: Problem schools or problem students? School choice as a public administration puzzle. *Public Administration Review*, 71(1), 87-95. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02309.x>
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York, New York, USA: Basic Books.
- Raywid, M. A. (1985). Family choice arrangements in public schools: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 435-467. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543055004435>
- Renzulli, L. (2005). Organizational environments and the emergence of charter schools in the United States. *Sociology of Education*, 78(1), 1-26. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003804070507800101>
- Renzulli, L., & Evans, L. (2005). School choice, charter schools, and white flight. *Social Problems*, 52(3), 398-418. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sp.2005.52.3.398>
- Renzulli, L., & Roscigno, V. (2005). Charter school policy, implementation, and diffusion across the United States. *Sociology of Education*, 78(4), 344-365. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003804070507800404>
- Reschovsky, A. (2007). The funding of public education in Wisconsin: Is a crisis brewing? Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Revolution In Milwaukee*. (2000). Retrieved 2008, 13-November from CNN: <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2000/democracy/privateschools.publicmoney/stories/pspm/index.html>
- Richards, E. (2013). MPS residency requirement (officially) ends. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, p. 1. Retrieved July 23, 2013
- Rod, D. (2000). The right staff: the true key to arts-focused schools of choice. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(6), 33-37. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632910009599967>
- Rosenbaum, J., & Presser, S. (1978). Voluntary racial integration in a magnet school. *School Review*, 86(2), 156-186. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/443404>

- Rossell, C. (1988). How effective are voluntary plans with magnet schools? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(4), 325-342. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737010004325>
- Sander, W. (1999). Private schools and public school achievement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 34(4), 697-709. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/146413>
- Saporito, S. (2003). Private choices, public consequences: Magnet school choice and segregation by race and poverty. *Social Problems*, 50(2), 181-203. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sp.2003.50.2.181>
- Sass, T. (2006). Charter schools and student achievement in Florida. *Education, Finance and Policy*, 1(1), 91-122. Retrieved from https://www.aeaweb.org/assa/2005/0109_0800_0301.pdf
- Scafidi, B. (2012). *The effects of school choice programs on public school districts*. Indianapolis: The Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice.
- Schneider, M., & Buckley, J. (2003). Making the grade: Comparing DC charter schools to other DC public schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(2), 203-215. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737025002203>
- Shaul, M. (2001). *School vouchers: Public funded programs in Cleveland and Milwaukee*. United States General Accounting Office. Washington DC: United States General Accounting Office.
- Shields, C. (2001). Music education and mentoring as intervention for at-risk urban adolescents: Their self-perceptions, opinions, and attitudes. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49(3), 273-286. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3345712>
- Shuler, S. (2001). Music and education in the twenty-first century: a retrospective. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 102(3), 25-36. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.847354>
- Simonaitis, P. (2013). Wisconsin schools chief blasts voucher expansion. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, pp. 1-2. Retrieved July 23, 2013
- Smith, K. (2005). Data don't matter? Academic research and school choice. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(2), 285-299. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s1537592705050218>
- Snider, M., & Averitte, R. (1984). A comparison of music education programs in urban districts. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 63-69. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40317871>

- Sosniak, L. A. (1992). When public school "choice" is not academic: Findings from the national education longitudinal study of 1988. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14*(1), 35-52 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737014001035>
- Strauss, V. (2013). Ravitch on Rhee. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/01/09/ravitch-on-rhee/>
- Student Enrollment History. (2009). *Official third Friday reports*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA: Milwaukee Public Schools.
- U.S. Charter Schools. (2008). Retrieved 2008, 5-November from U.S. Charter Schools: http://www.uscharterschools.org/pub/uscs_docs/o/index.htm
- United States Department of Education. (2004). *The nation's report card, America's charter schools: Results from the NAEP 2003 pilot study*. U.S. Department of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Vliet, W., & Smyth, J. (1982). A Nineteenth-century French proposal to use school vouchers. *Comparative Education Review, 26*(1), 95-103. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/446266>
- Von Seggern, M. (1990). Magnet music programs: A look at the issues. *Music Educators Journal, 76*(7), 50-53. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3401038>
- Waggoner, C. (2005). *Communicating school finance: What every beginning principal needs to know*. Lincoln, Nebraska: iUniverse.
- Weil, D. K. (2002). *School vouchers and privatization: A reference handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Wells, A., Slayton, J., & Scott, J. (2002). Defining democracy in the neoliberal age: Charter school reform and educational consumption. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(2), 337-361. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312039002337>
- West, K. (1994). A desegregation tool that backfired: Magnet schools and classroom segregation. *Yale Law Journal, 103*(8), 2567-2592. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/797056>
- WI State Statute 121.02 (1) (j). (2012). Retrieved August 13, 2012, from Wisconsin Legislative Documents: <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/121/II/02>

- Wisconsin places new restrictions on public charter school teachers.* (2008). Retrieved 2008, 4-December from US Charter Schools: <http://www.charterschoolcenter.org>
- Wise, A., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1983). Educational vouchers: Regulating their efficiency and effectiveness. *Educational Researcher*, 12(9), 9-12 + 17-18. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189x012009009>
- Witte, J. (1998). The Milwaukee voucher experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20(4), 229-251. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737020004229>
- Witte, J. (1999). The Milwaukee voucher experiment: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(1), 59-64. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20439585>
- Witte, J. (2000). *The market approach to education*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Witte, J. F., Wolf, P. J., Cowen, J. M., Fleming, D. J., & Lucas-McLean, J. (2008). *MPCP longitudinal educational growth study baseline report*. University of Arkansas, Department of Education Reform. Fayetteville: School Choice Demonstration Project.
- Witte, J. W., Shoher, A., & Schlomer, P. (2007). The performance of charter schools in Wisconsin. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26(3), 557-573. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pam.20265>
- Witte, J., & Rigdon, M. (1992-1993). Education choice reforms: Will they change American schools? *Publius*, 23(3), 95-114. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3330844>
- Wolf, P. J. (2008). *The comprehensive longitudinal evaluation of the Milwaukee parental choice program: Summary of baseline reports*. University of Arkansas, Department of Education. Fayetteville: School Choice Demonstration Project.
- Wszalek, C. (2008). *Milwaukee High School of the Arts*. Retrieved 2008, 4-November from Milwaukee High School of the Arts: www.milwaukeehighschoolofthearts.org
- Zimmer, R., & Toma, E. (2000). Peer effects in private and public schools across countries. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 19(1), 75-92. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1520-6688\(200024\)19:1<75:aid-pam5>3.0.co;2-w](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1520-6688(200024)19:1<75:aid-pam5>3.0.co;2-w)

CURRICULUM VITAE









