

CONTEMPORARY MAGNET SCHOOL SYSTEM: ROLE AND MISSION

**CONTEMPORARY MAGNET SCHOOL SYSTEM:
ROLE AND MISSION**

VIKTORIA BOBYLEVA

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN POLICY STUDIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON BOTHELL
SUMMER 2021

ADVISOR: PROFESSOR JOSEPH FERRARE, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	4
LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Magnet Schools: Segregation and School Choice in the New Century	9
Magnet Schools and Charter Schools: Present-Day School Choice	12
METHODOLOGY	14
Data	15
Data Analysis	17
LIMITATIONS	18
RESULTS	19
School Choice Landscape in Washington State	19
Magnet Schools and School Choice in Washington State	26
CONCLUSIONS	34
REFERENCES	37

Abstract

Using a single case study design, the study attempts to answer the following questions: What are the role and the mission that the magnet schools have in the school choice system today? How are magnet schools positioned within the context of the school choice system in Washington? To answer the questions, document analysis of public school choice review portals, official administrative codes, the state school choice law, and the state register was conducted. Also, a series of interviews with professionals who were the experts in Washington public school choice was conducted. Results of the study indicate that in Washington, there is a number of public school choice types (charter schools, traditional public schools with intra- and inter-district transfers, magnet schools, alternative schools and innovation/innovative schools) that have had the same goal of serving the student body “at risk”, to work with families and local communities, to provide exceptional innovative curricula and to innovate the practice of teaching and learning on the daily basis. Magnet schools are not listed on the *Learning by Choice* law. Even though the magnet school program was eliminated, magnet schools still provide educational services in Washington. Education policy professionals expressed concerns about education equity and financial sustainability, and an urgent need for a social change. They preferred to illustrate their statements with the help of references to the charter school system. They presented opposing points of view about the possibility to improve the system – a claim for social change was paired with concerns for financial sustainability and basic functionality of facilities.

Statement of the Problem

The magnet school system was formally established in 1968, and since then, it has been an important part of the American public education. Originally, magnet schools were created to initiate desegregation and to support diversity in education, to provide high quality innovative curriculum for those students who struggled because of inequity in education. Today, the public education landscape has been changing substantially (Dixson, James-Gallaway, Cardenas, and Perkins-Williams, 2020; Fleming, 2021; Frankenberg, Siegel-Hawley, and Orfield, 2008). A lot of emphasis has been placed on public education efficiency and accountability in terms of its cost and efficient federal funds allocations, quality of instruction, graduation rates and college readiness. In addition to magnet schools, a variety of other (school choice) options now make up the educational landscape. For instance, public charter schools and school voucher programs are the types of school choice options which have been discussed widely and implemented nationwide, with the charter school system staying the center of attention for a decade. These types of schools provide innovative curriculums as well, they attract diverse body of students, and, contrary to the magnet school system, their programs are autonomous and can be easily modified to suit the current educational needs in the ways in which they are constructed and implemented (Polikoff and Hardaway, 2017).

Even though the magnet school system has not been receiving as considerable attention as the charter school system, the scope of its work is impactful. For instance, by the fall of 2017, the public charter school enrollment increased to 6 % (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). The magnet school enrollment constituted a slightly higher percentage – 6.7 % students attended these types of schools (Polikoff and Hardaway, 2017).

As a school choice option, the magnet school system has been receiving very little attention in current scholarship and in education policy and practice reports. Polikoff and Hardaway (2017) state that a basic Google Scholar search of research on “magnet schools” which had been published since 2000 yielded less than a half search results than one on “charter schools”. The citation frequency was evident as well: three “magnet schools” publications were cited over 100 times whereas it was 25 “charter schools” publications that received the same number of citations.

The federal funding status of the magnet school system has been slightly declining; however, the funding for new awards have been at the level of \$91,647,000 in 2015, and at the level of \$91,022,144 in 2016 (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.b). In comparison, the charter school funding has been growing continuously. Thus, in 2015 the new awards funding was at the level of \$125,083,872, and in 2016 the funding level increased to \$177,209,326 (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.a).

Also, the philosophy of desegregation that was originally the cornerstone of the magnet school system is being transformed. Those public school districts that were placed onto desegregation plans either by the courts or with the help of their own intentions, have achieved unity, and today they do not have to strive for desegregation (Fleming, 2012; Goldring and Swain, 2020; Rossell, 2020). Community neighborhoods that required educational justice for students residing in them have changed (gentrified), with different types of residents who receive public education services moving in today.

In these circumstances, the role and the mission of the contemporary magnet school system is unclear, and it requires thorough reconsideration. The purpose of the present study is to explore and explain the contemporary magnet school policy in a specific context of the policy environment,

that is the State of Washington. In particular, the study under consideration attempts to answer the following questions:

- What are the role and the mission that the magnet schools have in the school choice system today?
- How are magnet schools positioned within the context of the school choice system in Washington?

Our state does not participate in the universal school choice system (Edchoice, n.d.). Instead, a carefully measured and controlled charter school program has been implemented in Washington, with 12 public charter schools operating in King County, and with a cap of 40 charter schools during the first five years being placed in the state (Ziebarth, 2021, p. 51). In these circumstances, it becomes vitally important to understand the role and the mission of magnet schools, the original public school system that has been providing choice for families for more than fifty years.

Literature Review

Magnet schools are the specific types of public schools that were created to promote desegregation and diversity in education and to provide high-quality public education concentrated on the in-depth study of specific disciplines or topics for those students who initially were not privileged to receive it. In 1968, the first magnet school in the nation, McCarver Elementary School, appeared in Tacoma, Washington (Wang & Herman, 2017). It was located in a minority neighborhood and accepted students across the entire district, regardless the area of attendance. By mid 1970s there had been a considerable number of magnet schools established around the country, with the federal government playing its role in this process. Between 1976 and 1980, the

amendment to the Emergency School Act Aid (ESAA) allowed for school districts that were undertaking voluntary desegregation to receive around \$30 million per year in total to pursue their goals (as cited in Wang & Herman, 2017).

In 1985, the Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) was established through the amended Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (What is Magnet Schools Assistance Program, 2000). It was distributing grants to school districts to set up magnet school programs both on voluntary and on court-ordered basis. To qualify for a MSAP grant for a voluntary desegregation plan, a school district had to be approved by the Secretary of Education and to comply with standards of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Maloney, 1986; Pack, 2017; Wang & Herman, 2017). The U.S. Department of Education estimates that over all these years MSAP grants have been distributed in a total of \$75 million in 1984, \$108 million in 1994, \$108 million in 2004, and \$100-\$110 million in 2004-2010 (as cited in Wang & Herman, 2017).

In general, magnet schools have been following their five core principles: by fulfilling the mission of desegregation, by maintaining family and community partnerships, by providing an innovative curriculum and unique methods of instruction to ethnically diverse student body that is attracted to these schools across large residential neighborhoods (in urban areas, mainly), regardless districts' mandated areas of attendance (Goldring & Swain, 2017; Pack, 2017; Wang & Herman, 2017).

Magnet schools and programs build their curriculums around a central theme. The most frequent ones are the sciences (STEM, math, etc.), social studies (including health/medicine), general academics, multi-lingual education, Montessori, automotive industry, visual or performing art (Goldring & Swain, 2020; Wang & Herman, 2017). The enrollment campaign for magnet schools is usually highly competitive, and it is scheduled one year before the actual classes start.

Depending on the type of a magnet school, the procedure has a lottery format, a first-come first-serve format, or it can become a selective admission process during which tests scores and/or quality of a portfolio presented by each prospective student to the office of admissions are evaluated and measured carefully (Dixon, James-Gallaway, Cardenas & Perkins-Williams, 2020).

Authors describe magnet school structures (or types of desegregation) and state that they may affect students significantly (Goldring & Swain, 2020; Rossell, 2017; Smrekar, 2020). Some magnet schools are whole-school attendance zone magnets, others are dedicated magnet schools. A third type of a magnet school structure (or a type of desegregation) is a so-called program within school (PWS) which is located inside a traditional public school. The first type of a structure is a successful tool for desegregation. It has a neighborhood attendance zone, so that neighborhood students mainly are assigned to such types of magnet schools. The dedicated magnet school is the most successful tool for desegregation: it is the most common magnet school structure, and it has no neighborhood attendance zone. Instead, it has students who have volunteered to attend it.

One of the most interesting aspects about magnet schools that attracts a lot of attention and generates a lot of discussions about their effectiveness is the aspect of outcomes, or academic achievements (Betts & Cao, 2020; Goldring & Swain, 2020; Hamilton & McEachin, 2020; Rossell, 2017).

Academic achievements at magnet schools and programs have been a challenging point which has brought very controversial (and mixed) evaluation results. Of all the possible mixed academic achievement results reported, magnet school students seem to have significantly better scores on math tests and on reading tests. Betts and Cao (2020) conducted a meta-analysis of studies on student achievements at magnet schools and found that the available literature reflected this aspect of education quite vaguely. Overall, the authors argued that, as their research findings

indicated, one year of magnet school enrollment can yield a gain of achievements of one percentile point (Betts& Cao, 2020, p. 282).

Magnet Schools: Segregation and School Choice in the New Century

Segregation in American public education has been a center of attention for more than 70 years. As Frankenberg, Ee, Ayscue and Orfield (2019) indicate, today White and Latino students are considered the most segregated groups of student population. White students are enrolled in schools in which 69 % of the students are White, Latino students are enrolled in schools in which 55 % of student population are Latino. Black students are enrolled in schools in which 47 % of student population are Black. Black students are enrolled in schools in which their combined average enrollment with Latino students is approximately 67 %. At the same time, White and Asian students are exposed to the combined ratio of Latino and Black students only at the rates of 22% and 34 % respectively (Frankenberg, Ee, Ayscue & Orfield, 2019, p. 4).

Present day racial composition of students enrolled into magnet schools is more diverse than that of those enrolled into traditional schools. The National Center for Education Statistics reports that in the 2013-2014 school year, of those students enrolled into magnet schools, 29.90 % were White students, 33.42% were Hispanic students and 27.31 % were Black students. In comparison, in the same school year, of those students enrolled into traditional public schools, 52.51 % were White students, 23.99% were Hispanic students and 14.18 % were Black students (as cited in Wang & Herman, 2020).

Still, desegregation in education has been critiqued, with the magnet school system facing it throughout its history of operation. Despite the fact that magnet schools were originally created to eliminate segregation and to provide good quality education to diverse students, authors have

been stating that their research findings indicate various mechanisms of segregation that lurk into magnet schools (Davis, 2014; Dixon et al., 2020; Goldring & Swain, 2020; Rossell, 2017). In addition, the 2007 Supreme Court decision in *Parents Involved In Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1* (2007) made all school districts be limited in the use of race to provide school choice assignments for students.

Authors state that at present the magnet school system does not provide the mechanism that could be good enough to eliminate segregation (Dixson et al., 2020). Initially, nearly half of all magnet schools were historically positioned in urban school areas with large enrollments of minority student from low-income families (Goldring & Swain, 2020). At the same time, located in such neighborhoods, magnet schools had a purpose of attracting higher income students of various ethnic backgrounds and neighborhoods (Betts & Cao, 2020). However, middle-class parents are very motivated and are well aware of their options and choices, and of their capabilities to provide good education for their children. For this reason, they do not have to focus on magnet school attendance for their children or on magnet schools and programs that are located in particular areas only (Dixson et al., 2020; Goldring & Swain, 2020).

Also, a different type of an educational setting is possible withing the magnet school system. One of them is within the classroom context: while segregation inside the school building may not occur, it may be present inside the classroom, when principals can pick particular families to participate in programs without rationalizing their choices (Davis, 2014). Another one is about the admission process: since admission to some of these programs (mostly to the highly competitive ones) is based on the test results and/or portfolio evaluation, some magnet schools can attract more children from middle class families with high income and resources to support their children. In general, families with White students prefer to attend dedicated magnet schools in

minority neighborhoods rather than whole school attendance zone magnet schools where the White flight happens most frequently (Davis, 2014; Dixson et al., 2020; Wang & Herman, 2017).

Finally, segregation can start occurring once districts on court-ordered desegregation plans become unitary (Goldring & Swain, 2020; Rossell, 2020). In this context, for a school district to become unitary, it requires to have a narrowing gap in student achievement and to achieve racial balance in students, teachers and staff hired and assigned. In such circumstances, once the unitary is achieved and there is no court oversight, it becomes extremely difficult for school districts to maintain racial diversity in schools and in programs.

An analysis of current scholarship on the magnet school system has been revealing the context in which authors make brief and concise statements about the changing nature of the magnet school system. These statements are mostly focused on the facts that today the magnet schools are being utilized by school districts as a tool to implement school choice within the public school system, or that magnet schools are currently seen as a market-based school choice option, in general (Dixson et al., 2020; Goldring & Swain, 2020). These statements may be prompted new by objectives and strategies that the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) has added to its policies: for its new grant cycles, the MSAP emphasizes the value of academic improvements, and, most importantly, the value of educational innovations that should be present in a magnet school or a magnet school program (as cited in Wang & Herman, 2017). At present, the claim for an innovative curriculum is becoming the most emphasized aspect of magnet schools that are being called “Incubators of Innovation” (Pack, 2017, p. 183).

In addition, several authors are emphasizing different dynamics of the magnet school system discourse: they claim that all discussions about school improvements and closure of achievement gaps are ignoring magnet schools, and, instead, they are focusing on charter schools

or on voucher programs as efficient tools to improve education (Goldring & Swain, 2020). Specifically, it is stated that it is the charter schools and their innovative curricula that are considered innovative.

Magnet Schools and Charter Schools: Present-Day School Choice

Today, school choice policies have become both one of the most debated ones and a “central focus of contemporary education reform” (Ferrare & Setari, 2017, p. 34). When school choice is discussed, market-driven reforms are always the first aspect that is mentioned.

School choice policies allow parents to make their choice and to place their child(ren) into the type of a school that can serve the child(ren)’s needs in the best possible way. School choice can be implemented in several ways (Dixson et al., 2020). Charter schools is one of them, the second way of implementation is a so-called voucher program. Both ways of structuring secondary education are considered disrupting for the public education infrastructure, as they divert funds from a traditional public school system. The third way is the magnet schools which are a part of the public school system and were originally designed for the purposes of desegregation.

As magnets, charter schools may belong to the system of public education as well; however, the mode of their operation differs a lot. The debate for charter schools and their value for public education have been controversial as charters have been attracting a lot of attention: charter school are viewed both as innovative and as market-oriented entities (attracting a lot of funding from private foundations and draining a lot of funding from the public education) (Betts & Cao, 2020).

The National Center for Education Statistics estimated 2.6 million students who attended magnet schools in 3,237 schools and in 600 school districts around the nation, in the year of 2017.

The Urban Institute at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte has systematic statistics, as it estimated the 2016 magnet school enrollment identifying these school on the state-by-state basis: 3.5 million students attended 4, 340 magnet schools across 46 states and the District of Columbia. 51 % of these schools were elementary schools, 31 % were middle schools and 18 % were high schools (as cited in Smrekar, 2020).

In comparison to magnets, charter schools are a recent invention. The National Alliance of Public Charter Schools (NAPCS) estimates that in 2017-2018, around 7,000 charter schools were operating across 44 states. The demographic data for students attending charter schools state that 33 % of students were White, 27 % were Black, 32 % were Latinx and 8 % were Asian students (Ziebarth, 2021).

In the way in which they are organized, both public charter schools and magnet schools provide choice for students by opening enrollment outside the mandatory attendance zone. However, public charter schools are managed independently, and they have a large number of exemptions from the educational code of the state in which they operate, whereas magnet schools are administered by public school districts, and they have to follow all the procedures and educational codes. Due to their ability to reduce administrative intervention and the bureaucracy associated with it, charter schools can focus on developing and maintaining innovative curricula and on making changes in them as soon as they are required (Betts & Cao, 2020). At the same time, charter schools, including public charter schools, have been receiving a lot of criticism associated with their connections with major private philanthropic organizations that lobby their interests and attempt to transform education through these types of schools (Ferrare & Setari, 2017).

Consequently, this literature review presented a variety of opinions and statements that authors made in order to describe the magnet school system and its position within the school choice system, in general. The literature review provided the definition of a magnet school, a historic reference to its emergence, its core principles and types of organization and curriculum contents, racial composition as related to traditional public schools and charter schools. The literature review attempted to provide critique of the desegregation practice and to depict the changing nature of contemporary magnet schools.

Originally, the philosophy of the magnet school system was based on a different understanding of the school choice: magnets can provide an opportunity for a *controlled choice* by setting racial and/or socio-economic quotas and by limiting options of choice that are available for parents of children in specific geographic locations (Goldring & Swain, 2020). In the given circumstances, magnet schools have been redefining their goals and missions to provide high quality education. For this reason, the study under consideration attempts to answer the following question: What are the role and the mission that the magnet schools have in the school choice system today? In the state of Washington, in which the magnet school system originated, the universal school choice system has never been established. Instead, so-called public school choice has been the choice for the majority of families. In this context, the present study attempts to answer another question: How are magnet schools positioned within the context of the school choice system in Washington?

Methodology

The study followed a single case study design due to the holistic vision of the situation (Yin, 2003). As it has been mentioned, in general, magnet schools have not been a popular focus

of attention among education policy scholars. Neither have been the magnet schools in the state of Washington. For this reason, the single case study design was selected as a means to explore and reveal the current situation with these types of public schools.

Since first magnet schools appeared in Tacoma, Washington, it was decided to dedicate a research project to the analysis of the current situation in the same state and to evidence any considerable changes in the ways in which magnets schools operate in Washington today. Also, since the state of Washington does not participate in the school choice system with the private charter schools and school vouchers being other options for education, it became vitally important to analyze the ways in which school choice was administered through other public school choice options, such as the magnet school system. The present study attempted to answer the following questions: What are the role and the mission that the magnet schools have in the school choice system today? How are magnet schools positioned within the context of the school choice system in Washington?

For the purposes of this study, the case study research design had the deductive process of literature review being an opening framework that set the stage for the research. In particular, the literature review section explored the historic aspects of the magnet schools establishment and implementation in the country, followed by a review of the current public education system navigating towards different public school choice options. The literature review attempted to present various existing scholarly points of view reflecting the role, the mission and the place of the magnet school system within the American public education.

Data

Data collection took place from two types of sources so that different evidence could be presented. Documentation analysis and interviews provided evidence for this case study.

First, utilizing the graduate school networking opportunities, informative interviews were conducted to learn about the school choice system in Washington. Upon the completion of informative interviews, three new (potential) candidates (stakeholders) were identified that could be contacted to provide information about the magnet school system in Washington.

One interviewee was a representative from a board of education in Washington who had experience in providing authorization to public choice schools in the state and who conducted a lot of legislative research in this field. Another interviewee was a representative from a local social justice office in Snohomish County who had a lot of experience both teaching in public schools and in representing a large regional school district in a variety of legal aspects in the court system. The third interviewee was a representative from a school choice commission in Washington who had a lot of experience authorizing public choice schools in the region and supervising their performance.

The three interviewees were the elected/appointed/hired education policy officials and professionals who represented public education at the state level or/and who had a lot of professional experience representing public education at the level of a specific school district headquarters.

The specific types of professionals and education policy officials were identified for an interview based on their level of professional experience and on the specific field (of public education) in which they had worked. Information about public school choice, and, in particular, about the magnet school system, is specific, and, therefore, a limited number of professionals may be able to speak on this topic. These potential candidates were contacted utilizing their contact information available on public display. The average time of professional experience in the field of education policy for the respondents was 19.3 years.

Second, upon completion of the IRB process, it was decided to analyze any official documents that would provide relevant information about the present-day magnet school system in Washington.

Third, a series of interviews were conducted with the three stakeholders identified above. An attempt was made to utilize a snowball sampling technique: it was decided to ask each interviewee for a reference to other stakeholders whom they knew and who may be in possession of valid information.

The snowball sampling technique was utilized purposefully. The research project was aimed at collecting the type of information that may not be easily available. Even though a number of potential interviewees were identified, it was not evident if other professionals possessing information about magnet schools may be available to share their knowledge. Unfortunately, no further points of reference were established upon the completion of the three interviews.

Data Analysis

In order to answer the research questions, both documentation analysis and interview data analysis were centered around two questions:

1. How is the magnet school system defined in Washington state?
2. What type of space do magnet schools occupy within the public school choice system in Washington?

Among the documents available for analysis were identified: 1) a public school review portal that contained statistical information related to the magnet school system; 2) an official manual issued by OSPI that described the public school choice system in Washington; 3)

Washington State administrative codes for several public school choice options; 4) a website for school choice options available both nationwide and in the state of Washington.

A letter of consent that guaranteed complete confidentiality of information distribution was sent before an actual interview could be scheduled. During an unstructured interview session, within 15 to 20 minutes five open-ended questions and one demographic question were asked in order to receive the information. The interviews took place both over the phone and via a Zoom session. All the respondents were excused from the audiotaping process, and, therefore, detailed handwritten notes were taken to record the answers as fully as it was possible. The questions were asked about the respondents' opinion on the efficiency of the magnet school system and on any alternative types of school systems that are available at the moment.

Limitations

The present research project is both of exploratory and of descriptive nature, and it is not focused on establishing causality. For this reason, no factors have been identified that would put forth a potential threat to the project's internal validity.

Instead of focusing on statistical generalizations, case studies are focused on analytic generalizations (Yin, 2003). At the same time, the present research project is a single case that attempts to explore and to describe the situation with the magnet school system in one particular state. The findings may not be available for generalization that applies to the existing magnet school system in other states. For this reason, this study may have a potential threat to its external validity.

Also, the limitations imposed on this research are bound by a time frame of 1 month within which the case study must be conducted. Additional limitation is set by a worldwide COVID-19

pandemic which may potentially set inevitable barriers in terms of access to interviews with key stakeholders who could share valuable information about the magnet school system.

Results

School Choice Landscape in Washington State

Documentation

Washington does not offer school choice in its original meaning (universal school choice) for which Milton Friedman advocated in the 1970s (Edchoice, n.d.). According to this definition, “school choice allows public education funds to follow students to the schools or services that best fit their needs – whether that is to a public school, private school, charter school, home school or any other learning environment families choose” (Edchoice, n.d.). The types of universal school choice are school vouchers, education savings accounts, tax-credit scholarships, individual tax credits and deductions, and tax-credit education savings accounts (ESAS).

Instead, the state of Washington offers a list of enrollment options that families can choose through so-called public school choice: a range of opportunities for traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, online academies, homeschooling options and so-called learning pods (Edchoice, n.d.). Families can also choose enrollment at private schools and provide their own tuition payments for these educational services, as no private school choice programs are provided in Washington. The online database of the public school choice for the state reports that Washington has no magnet schools. (Edchoice, n.d.).

Public school choice has been continuously emphasized in a range of official documents. In general, the mission of public school choice is defined as an attempt to “level the playing field between students of different backgrounds by making it possible for all families to have access to

a city's high quality public schools – whether students live near these schools or not” (Jochim, Gross, & McCann, 2019, p. 1).

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction in Washington describes provisions of the *Learning by Choice* law that were entered in 1990 by the state Legislature in order to identify public school choice options (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014). The law has three major components: family choice describes the pathways for parents to choose the most appropriate public school for their child; running start allows those who are 11th and 12th graders to enroll in programs at community colleges, tribal colleges and selected public universities free of charge; seventh and eighth-grade choice options allow students to collect credit for high school classes.

The provisions mention a range of options that are available for students through public school choice in Washington (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014). The options include both different *school types* (public schools, charter schools and alternative schools) as well as a variety of *official procedures* that a student can utilize in order to develop his or her educational pathways (the Interstate Military Compact, dual enrollment, online learning alternative learning experience, and so on).

According to the Washington State rules and regulations, students can access public schools with the help of inter- and/or intra-district transfers, they can attend charter schools and alternative schools (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014). In Washington, public charter schools are operated by non-profit organizations, can be authorized either by the Washington Charter School Commission (those charter schools that are located anywhere in the state) or by the State Board of Education (those charter schools that are located within a specific district) (Charter Schools (RCW 28A.710); Charter Schools (WAC 180-19)).

Alternative schools are the types of public schools in Washington that provide “a number of approaches to teaching and learning other than mainstream or traditional educational approaches” (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014, p. 33). These schools have smaller class sizes, more collaboration between teachers and students, sustained sense of a community (Alternative Educational Service Providers – Student Eligibility (RCW 28A.150.305)).

Finally, public school choice for “traditional” public schools is described as access through two types of transfers – inter-district or intra-district types (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014, p. 6-8). The *Learning by Choice* law does not mention magnet schools as school choice options in the state of Washington at all. Instead, the document states that a request for transfer to a non-residential district can be denied if there are no special hardship conditions affecting the child’s attendance in the residential district, there is no better access to education in residential district, there is no improvements in student’s financial educational conditions in the residential district, there is no student’s enrollment into an online course or program offered by a different non-residential district provider, or it the transfer “adversely affects the district’s desegregation plan” (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014, p. 7; Intradistrict Enrollment Options Policies (RCW 28A.225.270); Attendance in School District of Choice – Impact on Existing Cooperative Arrangements (RCW 28A.225.310)).

Interviews

Data collected through interviews provided an opportunity to review the opinions that the education policy professionals, who are the senior specialists in the field, considered of vital importance to express about public school choice, in general. Even though all the respondents utilized different language to express themselves, there were some commonalities that could be

traced in the types of viewpoints that they expressed. A separate mention should be made of the fact that while some respondents spoke directly about issues, others preferred to utilize a great number of generalizations, and they seemed to be very cautious about every idea that they were presenting, which made it complicated to understand the type of an opinion that they were attempting to express, and, in several instances, if they were attempting to express an opinion at all.

Upon the revision of the notes that were taken during the interview process, the following themes emerged:

A “mess” and a “nightmare”

All the respondents expressed the opinion according to which the school choice system, in general, is an extremely complicated system based both on the way in which it is set up and on the way in which it has been functioning - both nationwide and in the state of Washington. One respondent who represented a board of education in Washington called it a “mess”; another respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County expressed the opinion in a more emotional manner when he/she called the system a “nightmare”.

“Traditional system is not as responsive...”

At the same time, when describing school choice in Washington, two respondents were stating that it is still a highly required system because, as a representative from a school choice commission in Washington stated, “‘one size fits all’ just does not work”. Another respondent who represented a board of education in Washington added that the system is needed because of its “positive curricular philosophy”. A respondent who represented a school choice commission in

Washington mentioned that the school choice system gives an opportunity for “differentiation” which is urgently needed, and because of the “strong national movement” to accommodate diverse groups of students who do not fit the “traditional” definition of the purpose of education that at the moment, we are all evidencing. This respondent also mentioned that “traditional system is not as responsive.” He/she emphasized the specific feature of school choice in the state by stating that “in Washington we don’t have vouchers”.

“Not really well-coordinated...”

Two respondents stated that there were different reasons for which the system has not been working properly. One respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County replied that, in Washington, the present system “lacks that individual approach to each student”. Another respondent who represented a school choice commission in Washington said that the system is “not very-well coordinated”, “it is a huge machine” that does not take into account the needs of families and their children. The respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County mentioned that “given all the freedom that they have”, school choice is still unsuccessful because “we take what is existing already and just moving it to the next system” implying that the same type of philosophy and vision is applied towards every new system of education without any proper investigation of the environments and the types of educational needs that students may have.

“You see, those charters started out really well...”

When speaking about school choice options, for two respondents, the first choice was the charter school system that they preferred to mention. One respondent who represented a local

social justice office in Snohomish County stated that “you see, those charters started out really well...”, that “Geoffrey Canada, he had a hundred percent graduation rate in his school”. Another respondent who represented a school choice commission in Washington said that in Washington the school choice system did not spread “that far – charters, private and traditional public schools” are the options that are available, that “charters are the public school alternatives, and they are open to all students.”

At the same time, in addition to talking about charter schools, two respondents were mentioning specific schools or educational systems when discussing school choice in Washington. One respondent who represented a school choice commission in Washington mentioned “place-based education, technical education” while another one who represented a board of education in Washington mentioned “all the skills centers – 9 or 10 now”, “Lincoln Elementary in Olympia”, “Aviation School”, and so on.

“The system is a real problem...”

All the respondents expressed their opinions very clearly that there can be changes implemented to the present situation with the school choice. One respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County stated that the current system should go through significant modifications in order to be improved, implying an urgent need for social transformations. The respondent asked a rhetorical question, “Why do we spend so much money on this system when we could fix it instead?!” Expanding on his/her point of view, the respondent stated that “in this country, we are very good at keeping people scared of dark skin”, and that for this reason, we all have a “short-hand version of reality.” “The system is a real problem” and “the system has to change” because “the revolution is coming...,” said this respondent. The responded

also mentioned that there should be an “individualized approach towards each student,” and that for students of color it is a requirement in order for their opportunity gap to be closed.

Another respondent, who represented a school choice commission in Washington, simply stated that should there be any changes in the current school choice system, charter schools can be an alternative to traditional public schools. A respondent who represented a board of education in Washington replied that “sustainability is a reason for which some programs stop operating” thus implying that any types of changes in the system can occur upon the decision about program sustainability are made. However, this type of a reply does not provide any details on the definition of sustainability in the context of education.

Therefore, school choice landscape in Washington is a complicated phenomenon. As evident from the results of the documentation analysis, Washington does not offer universal school choice; instead, public school choice is available with such options as intra- and inter-district transfers (which can be denied for reasons of desegregation), traditional public schools, charter schools and alternative schools. Different databases provide contradicting information about magnet schools as a school choice option in Washington: one database claims that there are no magnet schools in this state. During the interview process, professionals claim that the school choice system in Washington is extremely complex, and still, its presence is required a lot to serve the diverse population of students. At the same time, professionals state that the school choice system does not take into account individual needs of students, and, overall, a fundamental change of educational philosophy is required to improve the system.

Magnet Schools and School Choice in Washington State

Documentation

As it was mentioned in the previous section, in this text a magnet school is defined as a specific type of a public school that was created in the past to promote desegregation and diversity in education and to provide high-quality public education concentrated on the in-depth study of specific disciplines or topics for those students who initially were not privileged to receive it.

Magnet schools established five core principles: to fulfill the mission of desegregation, to maintain family and community partnerships, to provide an innovative curriculum and unique methods of instruction to ethnically diverse student body that is attracted to these schools across large residential neighborhoods (in urban areas, mainly), regardless districts' mandated areas of attendance (Goldring & Swain, 2017; Pack, 2017; Wang & Herman, 2017).

Magnet School Program and Magnet Schools. When attempting to define the current purpose and mission of magnet schools in the state of Washington, Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) provides basic information about magnet schools through the access to archival documents.

One document is chapter 392-330 WAC – State Magnet School Program that was repealed in 2019 (WSR 19-24-046 (2019)). This code was originally created in 1993 “for the administration of the magnet school projects grant program, including the establishment of criteria for the award of grants to eligible school districts” (WSR 19-18-086 (2019), p. 1). The grant program had a purpose to support magnet schools in Washington “in reducing, eliminating and assisting in preventing racial imbalance in schools” (WSR 19-18-086 (2019), p. 1). As Washington State Register states, the grant program that was authorized in the operating budget of 1993-1995, provided approximately \$3.5 million to OSPI to be distributed upon the

recommendation of the superintendent of public instruction. The Chapter was repealed, and, therefore, the magnet school grant program stopped existing, as the grants were discontinued in 1995-1997 and were never renewed.

Even though the magnet school program was discontinued, certain databases provide information on the current state of magnet schools in Washington. Today, the state is a home for 50 magnets, with the total enrollment of 14, 803 students (Public School Review, n.d.). Of all the magnet schools listed, 6 (12%) are skills/service centers. 57 % of the students who are enrolled are of diverse ethnic backgrounds (mainly Hispanic) which is a higher percentage than the average for Washington public schools (46 % students). The data source also indicates that the level of academic achievements is measured by proficiency both in math (48%) and in reading (58 %). In comparison, in Washington public schools, the average math proficiency score in math is 50%, in reading – 61 %.

As different types of public school choice options in Washington were analyzed, it became evident that they were all implemented in order to target certain groups of population. In this context, all the types of schools described below have innovative curricula and teaching methods, target students who do not fit the “traditional” framework of schooling, work in close connection with local communities and partnerships, and may enroll students outside the zones of attendance.

This fact makes an attempt to define the role and mission of magnet schools within the public school choice system in Washington a challenge. Moreover, in a few instances noted below some schools may be assigned titles in two (or more) public school choice options simultaneously which significantly complicates an opportunity to clearly define the roles and the missions that those types of schools have, and, most importantly, it complicates an opportunity to define the role and the mission of magnet schools even further.

Alternative Schools in Washington. Of all the 50 magnet schools which are listed in Washington, 15 (30%) are alternative schools (Public School Review, n.d.). This school choice option is presented in the Learning by Choice law in Washington (Dorn, Kanikeberg, & Burke, 2014).

Upon careful examination, a definition of an alternative school is stated as one that describes other schools, alternative educational programs outside the district, skills/education centers, dropout prevention programs, and so on, that are contracted by school district boards of directors in order to provide education for eligible students - those who are suspended or are academically at risk, those who are to be expelled and/or those who have behavioral problems (Alternative Educational Service Providers – Student Eligibility (RCW 28A.150.305)).

Unfortunately, within the scope of the capstone project, there was no opportunity to explore the process (or any policies) by which public schools can be prescribed several categories of school choice at the same time. However, the rules and regulations clearly state that for those students who require an educational approach that can be different from the mainstream one, alternative schools can provide this opportunity. For the purposes of this study, the demographic data and/or academic achievements data for those students who attend alternative schools in Washington were not available for analysis.

Charter Schools in Washington. As noted in the previous sections, charter schools are the school choice option mostly discussed in the context of secondary public education (Charter Schools (RCW 28A.710)). In Washington, charter schools started operating thirty years ago (Washington State Board of Education, n.d., p. 10). They are public schools that are administered by private non-profit organizations; however, since they are funded publicly, this process has been attracting a lot of attention. Several controversial events related to the charter school law in

Washington have occurred since the original establishment of charter schools; today charter schools are operating as educational organizations with a constitutional status in the state (Washington State Charter School Commission, 2015).

Local charter schools have been striving to improve academic experience and achievements for students who are considered to be “at risk” and “systemically marginalized” including ELL students, students who are at risk of dropping out, or students with high disciplinary sanctions applied towards them, students with special needs and students from families with low socio-economic status (Washington State Board of Education, n.d., p. 3, 5, 7, 9). These types of schools are alternatives to traditional schools, they are open to all children by choice, and they admit students by age, grade, and enrollment only. Public charter schools are supervised by key state educational agencies, and they employ professionals based on the same criteria of selection that are applied towards employment of educators in the Washington public schools.

Washington had a cap of 40 charter schools for the initial five years of operation (Ziebarth, 2021, p. 51). In 2018-2019, there were 3,352 students enrolled into public schools: 38 % were White, 29 % were Black, 16% were Hispanic, 4% were Asian students. The academic achievements that public charter school students demonstrate are measured by ELA assessment, math assessment and science assessment. In 2018-2019, ELA assessment for 3rd to 10th grade students accounted for 60.1 % proficiency rate, as compared to traditional public schools which accounted for 57.1%; math assessment for 3rd to 10th grade students accounted for 46.5 %, as compared to traditional public schools which accounted for 43.1% proficiency rate; science assessment for 4th to 8th grade students accounted for 52.2 %, as compared to traditional public schools which accounted for 45.1 % (Washington State Board of Education, n.d., p. 57-65).

Innovative schools/Innovation schools in Washington. Finally, a mention should be made of one type of schools which are not included into school choice descriptions of the Learning by Choice law in Washington. In 2011, OSPI began to create and support zones of innovation, and innovative schools that are associated with them (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, n.d.).

Innovative/innovation schools in Washington have not been receiving a lot of attention; however, these types of schools are truly unique phenomena (Innovation Schools – Identification – Web Site – Publicity (RCW 28A.300.550)). All innovative schools serve (target) certain student populations located in different geographical areas of Washington by providing innovative curricula, engaging students into the lives of their communities, working with parents and families and addressing the needs of the student population who may not fit the traditional frame of public education services. Majority of innovative schools utilize their own unique models of education created specifically for the educational purposes and to suit the school mission. Some innovative schools utilize commercially created products (kits, software programs) to pursue their innovative goals of education. Several schools utilize models of education which are registered trademarks (Big Picture Learning, No Excuses University (NEU)).

Of 34 innovative schools, 4 (12.5%) facilities are magnet schools (Public School Review, n.d.). In this context, a hypothetical statement is possible that magnet schools can be quoted as innovative schools in the state of Washington.

A characteristic feature of innovative schools is that they are allowed to develop and to implement their own systems of education. For instance, Lincoln High School in Tacoma School District, one of the most diverse schools in the region, utilizes the principles of charter school

organization and curriculum implementation offered through such programs as Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) and Harlem Children's Zone. Lincoln High School is not a charter school.

Interviews

Two respondents expressed their points of view on the magnet school system in Washington.

“What is a magnet school?”

Respondents may require a definition of a magnet school to begin a conversation about magnet schools' mission and role. Before expressing an opinion on the efficiency of magnets in Washington, one respondent who represented a board of education in Washington asked a direct question, “What is a magnet school?” This respondent stated that the question of efficiency of magnet schools is “a complicated question” and described it using such word combinations as “different teaching philosophy”, “different curriculum philosophy”, “highly academic schools”, expanding on the idea that an efficient magnet school system has “collaborations among its partners”, it is aimed at “creating a set of choices, it has value” and it works in the direction of “rationalizing the curriculum.”

Another respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County stated directly that magnet schools are not efficient because “they get to select their students and provide things for them only” which is a type of an idea that may be in opposition to the original mission of the magnet school system. She/he also added that “they should have 100 % success, and they don't!” emphasizing elitism that these choice schools establish by introducing the lottery system into their admission process and still not achieving the highest graduation rates.

“Magnet schools can pick and choose...”

When discussing the advantages of the magnet school system in Washington, one respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County stated that “...the idea is great, but we need to acknowledge in the US education system that only the advantages for White students are there...” and that “it is all about systemic inequity” because “magnet schools can pick and choose...” implying that today magnet schools have a different vision of their purpose.

Another respondent who represented a board of education in Washington replied that the advantages of the magnet school system are the same as ones of the charter school system when she/he added that “charter is a good way to do it” as well. Also, this respondent said that in relation to the terminology of school choice options, and, in particular, in relation to the term of a magnet school, “in our state, we do not use this term very much.”

“...Different communities center around different issues...”

When asked a question about improvements in the magnet school system, both respondents presented very opposing points of view. The first respondent who represented a local social justice office in Snohomish County called for immediate action to transform the existing system and to introduce equity in education for all categories of students. This respondent stated, “If you are going to have success in the system, you are going to do more than just show up and teach!”

He/she also added, “Get rid of all of these...Fund it differently...Taxes are paid by everybody, divide them equally! Charter schools were doing well in the beginning. But they ended

up where they are now. We haven't changed the system! It is about systemic inequity. We just moved the location, so to speak." When speaking about magnets, this respondent referenced charter schools only and prioritized "individual approach toward each student" because "if my students failed, wait a minute, I know it is my failure!"

Another respondent who represented a board of education in Washington exercised a totally different approach when discussing improvements in the magnet school system. He/she was not certain about any urgent needs for changes and mentioned that he/she was "...not sure, different communities center around different issues..." Still, the respondent said that since "sustainability is a big concern", if "comprehensive schools are able to do things," a decision can be made about a certain type of a school or a program to stop operating.

As evidenced both from the document analysis and from the interview content, a variety of public choice schools are operating in the state, and they all serve the same purpose under different titles. The magnet school program is eliminated; however, 50 magnet schools continue to operate in the state, with some education databases either stating directly that magnet schools do not exist in Washington, or simply not listing them as an option on the school choice law. Professionals prefer to talk about school choice in general – without direct reference to magnet schools. Their opinion on this school option varies – claims are made either to completely eliminate the whole public school choice system and to build one that does not contribute towards systemic oppression, or to exercise rational thinking and to think about magnet schools (as any other public school choice options) in terms of their sustainability.

Conclusions

The literature review presented in this study attempted to highlight all the key aspects associated with the magnet school system (the purpose of desegregation, the five core principles of magnet school organization, types of curricula and types of desegregation, student achievements and ,challenges of desegregation), the history of its origin and development, and the challenges which are linked to its implementation paired with comparison (and associated tendency of confusion) with charter schools. At the same time, the actual study of magnet schools that exist in Washington revealed specific aspects that could not be grasped in the literature review.

In Washington, there are a number of public school choice types (charter schools, traditional public schools with intra- and inter-district transfers, magnet schools, alternative schools and innovation/innovative schools) that have been operating to pursue *the same types of goals* – to serve the student body “at risk”, to work with families and local communities, to provide exceptional innovative curricula and to innovate the practice of teaching and learning on the daily basis. Neither magnet schools nor innovation schools are listed on the *Learning by Choice* law. Even though the magnet school program was eliminated in this state, public magnet schools still provide educational services in Washington. However, their role and mission are difficult to define within the complicated landscape of the school choice system in this state.

Education policy professionals who agreed to express their opinions on the issue based on their deep knowledge of the school choice landscape in Washington, pointed to a variety of challenges that the system had been producing. They noted the “mess” of the system, and yet, they emphasized the fact that the system is so much required to serve the needs of the population. The professionals expressed concerns about education equity, financial sustainability, and an urgent need for a social change. Simultaneously, they provided quite broad definitions of a magnet

school, if any. When discussing the magnet school system, the professionals preferred to illustrate their statements with the help of references to the charter school system. In general, they presented very opposing points of view about the possibility to improve the system – a claim for social change was paired with concerns for financial sustainability and basic functionality of facilities.

Policy Recommendations and Future Research

The main purpose of the present study was to explore and describe the role and mission that contemporary magnet schools are assigned in the context of the school choice system, and, in particular, in the context of the school choice system in the state of Washington in which they originated. As it was stated, today the answer to the research question is challenging to articulate.

Based on the results of the study, the main policy recommendation that could be identified is related to the establishment of policy that guides the multiple status assignment to public choice schools. As it was reported, document analysis yielded for a variety of public-school choices that exist in Washington, which, in turn, can allow schools to receive several different status assignments. At the same time, interview analysis revealed that professionals advocated either for the reduction of systemic oppression in education or for sustainability and financial justification of expenses. During the interview process, it was also claimed that the main problem both with the magnet school system and with the public-school choice, in general, was due to the fact that the system was never challenged or changed to better suit the needs of the population. For this reason, it would be beneficial to develop a code or a regulation (policy) that could explain the processes and protocols of status assignments for magnets, alternative schools, innovation schools, charter schools and traditional public schools with inter- and intra-district transfers. Such a policy could explain the reasons for which financial investments should be made into a specific type of a school.

It also could explain the reasons for which a specific type of a public choice school is selected to better serve a specific population, and, consequently, to reduce systemic oppression.

Also, two steps associated with further course of research action can be suggested. The first step can be a thorough analysis of the reasons, processes and outcomes that influence a decision for a public school to obtain (or to be assigned) multiple statuses. For instance, it would be beneficial to explore the reasons, processes and outcomes that influence the decision for a magnet school to obtain statuses of an innovation school and an alternative school.

Another step can be direct engagement with one of the newest magnet schools that have recently opened in the region. This type of a study requires considerable time investments in order to prepare for this process, as engagement with a public school district must follow certain protocols that are mandatory prerequisites even to a basic public school building access. For instance, it can be beneficial to look into the system of education that is offered through Tesla STEM High School. The facility is located in one of the most prestigious regions of the state, and it has a brand name in its title. It would be beneficial to explore the student/teacher demographic information as well as key school policy aspects related to the school mission statement, enrollment and admission, curriculum development, methods of instruction, community and family engagement.

References

- Alternative Educational Service Providers – Student Eligibility (RCW 28A. 150. 305)
- Attendance in School District of Choice – Impact on Existing Cooperative Arrangements (RCW 28A. 225.310)
- Betts, J., & Cao, C. (2020). Magnet school outcomes In M. Berends, A. Primus & M. Springer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school choice* (pp. 273 – 284). New York, NY: Routledge
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Charter Schools (RCW 28A. 710)
- Charter Schools (WAC 180-19)
- Davis, T. (2014). School choice and segregation: “Tracking” racial equity in magnet schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 46(4), 399-433
- Dixson, A., James-Gallaway, Ch., Cardenas, N. & Perkins-Williams, R. (2020). Critical perspectives on school choice: An examination of race, class, and gender in school choice policies. In M. Berends, A. Primus & M. Springer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school choice* (pp. 73 – 86). New York, NY: Routledge
- Dorn, R., Kanikeberg, K., & Burke, A. (2014, July). *Learning by choice. Student enrollment options in Washington*. Retrieved from Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction website:<https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/generalinfo/pubdocs/learningbychoice2014.pdf>
- Duncheon, J. & Relles, S. (2019). “A ditcher and a scholar”: Figuring college-going identities in the urban magnet high school. *Teachers College Record*, 121(2). Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>

- Edchoice (n.d.). *School choice*. Washington. Retrieved from <http://edchoice.org/school-choice/state/washington>
- Ferrare, J., & Setari, R. (2017). Converging on choice: The interstate flow of foundation dollars to the charter school organizations. *Educational Researcher*, 47(1), 34-45
- Fleming, N. (2012). Magnets adjust to new climate of school choice. *Education Week* 31(30), 1-16.
- Frankenberg, E., Ee, J., Ayscue, J., & Orfield, G. (2019). *Harming our common future: America's segregated schools 65 years after Brown*. The Civil Rights Project/Center for Education and Civil Rights, UCLA. Retrieved from www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu
- Frankenberg, E., Siegel-Hawley, G., & Orfield, G. (2008). *The forgotten choice? Rethinking magnet schools in a changing landscape*. The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles UCLA.
- Goldring, E., & Swain, W. (2020). Perspectives on magnet schools. In M. Berends, A. Primus & M. Springer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school choice* (pp. 241 – 258). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hamilton, L., & McEachin, A. (2020). Accountability and school choice. In M. Berends, A. Primus & M. Springer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school choice* (pp. 287 – 301). New York, NY: Routledge
- Innovative Schools – Identification – Web Site – Publicity (RCW 28A. 300. 550)
- Intradistrict Enrollment Options Policies. (RCW 28A.225.270)
- Jochim, A., Gross, B., & McCann, C. (2017, November). *Making school choice work for families: DC school reform now's high quality school campaign*. Retrieved from Center on Reinventing Public Education website:

https://www.crpe.org/publications/all?field_rel_issues_nid=14&field_author_nid_nid=A

II

Magnet Schools of America (2018). *Snapshot of magnet schools report*. Retrieved from

<http://magnet.edu/resources/research-studies/snapshot-of-magnet-schools-report>

Maloney, J. (1986). Magnet schools: An attractive desegregation alternative. *Journal of Legislation*, 13(48), 55-71

National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). *Fast facts. Charter school*. Retrieved from

<http://nces.ed.gov>

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (n.d.). *Designated existing innovative schools*.

Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us>

Pack, G. (2017). The case for magnet schools. In R. Fox & N. Buchman (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of school choice* (pp. 194 – 214). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons

Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, 555 U. S. 701 (2007).

Polikoff, M., & Hardaway, T. (2017, March 16). *Don't forget about magnet schools when thinking*

about school choice. (Brookings Institution Report). Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu>

Public School Review (n.d.). Top Washington Magnet Schools. Retrieved from [www.](http://www.publicschoolreview.com)

[publicschoolreview.com](http://www.publicschoolreview.com)

Rossell, C. The case against magnet schools. In R. Fox & N. Buchman (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of school choice* (pp. 180 – 193). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons

Siegel-Hawley, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2012). *Reviving magnet schools: Strengthening a successful choice option*. [research brief] Los Angeles, CA: Civil Rights Project/Proyecto

Derechos Civiles

- Smrekar, C. (2020). The social context of magnet school programs: How choosing schools intersects with district policies to influence racial integration. In M. Berends, A. Primus & M. Springer (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school choice* (pp. 259 – 272). New York, NY: Routledge
- U.S. Department of Education (n.d.). *Charter Schools Program State Educational Agencies (SEA) Grant. Funding status*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov>
- U.S. Department of Education (n.d.). *Magnet schools assistance. Funding status*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov>
- Wang, J., & Herman, J. (2017). Magnet schools: History, description, and effects. In R. Fox & N. Buchman (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of school choice* (pp. 159 – 179). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons
- Washington State Board of Education (n.d.). *Charter school report: 2019-2020*. Retrieved from Washington State Board of Education website: [charter schools annual report \(wa.gov\)](http://charter-schools.wa.gov)
- Washington State Charter School Commission (2015, December). *Washington State Charter School Commission legacy report*. Retrieved from Washington State Charter School Commission website: <https://charterschool.wa.gov>
- What Is the Magnet Schools Assistance Program? 34 C.F.R. § 280.1 (2000).
- WSR 19-18-086 (2019).
- WSR 19-24-046 (2019).
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Ziebarth, T. (2021). *Measuring up to the model: A ranking of state public charter school laws*.

Washington, D.C.: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Retrieved from publiccharters.org