

Rethink, Reset, Rebuild

A shared vision of performing schools in quality buildings for every child in Detroit



Sharing a mission of change

ABOUT IFF

IFF, the largest nonprofit community development financial institution (CDFI) in the Midwest, provides comprehensive community development across the region through capital solutions, real estate consulting and development, and action-oriented research for nonprofits and institutions serving low-income communities. Metro Detroit is a major focus area for IFF. Since opening its Detroit offices in the Fisher Building in 2014, IFF has lent over forty million dollars throughout southeast Michigan, seventy percent of it in Detroit; supported more than forty-five organizations in the city with long-term facilities planning; and conducted two major research studies on early care and education in the metropolitan area.

As part of IFF's mission to strengthen nonprofits and the communities they serve, IFF Research conducts analyses to facilitate strategic planning and resource allocation for states, municipalities, districts, schools, foundations, and nonprofits throughout the country. Over the course of nearly fifteen years of involvement in K-12 school improvement, IFF Research has developed a signature approach to assessing need in public education.

IFF's needs assessment methodology is distinctive for its spatial analysis of performing capacity at the neighborhood level. Its school studies are also driven by careful examination of the contextual factors that influence the public school landscape. Decision-makers have utilized insights from IFF's education research to inform strategic initiatives such as investments in districts and schools, reallocation or sale of vacant school buildings, facilities planning and site selection, identification of schools for potential turnarounds or as sources of best practices, solicitations and selection criteria for charter schools, and targeted communication regarding public school options.

IFF's education needs assessments evolved out of a partnership with the leadership of Chicago Public Schools. In 2003, the district sought to identify neighborhoods to prioritize for the location of new performing schools. IFF's research enhanced the district's ability to target its school improvement efforts and led to a better distribution of K-12 options for families. IFF's needs assessments have evolved and been adapted to guide policy and practice in many other cities, including Cleveland, Denver, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Washington, DC. IFF has also completed statewide analyses of public school access in Illinois and Indiana and needs assessments for early care and education throughout the Midwest.

IFF Research completed *Rethink, Reset, Rebuild* with financial support from the Skillman Foundation. The project's advisory committee included representatives from Detroit Public Schools Community District, the Detroit Board of Education, the office of the Mayor of Detroit, the American Federation of Teachers, the Governor John Engler Center for Charter Schools at Central Michigan University, EdFuel, Enroll Detroit, the Grand Valley State University Charter Schools Office, the National Charter Schools Institute, and Rock Ventures.

Rethink, Reset, Rebuild

A shared vision of performing schools in quality buildings for every child in Detroit

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND CONTRIBUTORS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the detailed facilities data that Recon Management Group collected at dozens of public schools across Detroit. IFF is grateful to Mark Paliszewski and Jim Jung at Recon for their professionalism and collaboration throughout the project.

Superintendent Nikolai P. Vitti, Ed.D., the leadership of Detroit Public Schools Community District, and Detroit Education Coalition 2.0 have partnered throughout this project to provide feedback on the data and analysis and to prepare to translate its findings into action.

Rob Kimball, Ed.D. at the Grand Valley State University Charter Schools Office and Cindy Schumacher and Janelle Brzezinski at the Governor John Engler Center for Charter Schools at Central Michigan University were instrumental in procuring data on charter schools.

Benjamin Calnin of Dynamo Metrics partnered with IFF to include valuable data on neighborhood conditions around public schools in Detroit.

The partnership of Tonya Allen, Punita Dani Thurman, and the rest of the team at the Skillman Foundation was invaluable for spreading word about the study and engaging core constituencies.

Several IFF staff who contributed hours of time and deep expertise to this project moved to new phases of their career over the course of the study. R. Jovita Baber, Ph.D., was Vice President of Research and Evaluation; Jonathan Thomas was Research Associate; Megan McGowan was Data Analyst; Jess Joseph Behrens was Senior GIS Analyst; and Rick Norton was Managing Director of Regional Real Estate Services. Their many contributions are woven throughout the report.

IFF PROJECT STAFF

Kirby Burkholder, President, Social Impact Accelerator Nicholas V. DiRago, Research Associate Jesse Bakker, GIS Analyst Jordan Brown, Research Analyst, Education Katie Coleman, Corporate Communications Manager

IFF PROJECT ADVISORY STAFF

Joe Neri, Chief Executive Officer Jose Cerda III, Vice President of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs Andrew Alt, Director of School Services Jenny Boyts, School Services Manager Kiae Considine, Director of Resource Development Ja'Net DeFell, Lead Developer, Michigan Alexis Dishman, Director of Lending, Education Gina Martinez, Ph.D., Research Associate Rachel Sikora, Senior Project Manager James Singleton, Senior Owner's Representative

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Roderick L. Brown

Executive Director for Planning, Academic Division, Detroit Public Schools Community District

Kristina Campa-Gruca

Director of Partnerships, Detroit, EdFuel

Don Cooper

Vice President for Policy and Communication, National Charter Schools Institute

Rob Kimball, Ed.D.

Associate Vice President for Charter Schools, Grand Valley State University **Sonya S. Mays** Treasurer, Detroit Board of Education

Maria Montoya Director of Communications and Partnerships, Enroll Detroit

Eli Savit Senior Advisor and Counsel to the Mayor, City of Detroit

Cynthia M. Schumacher Executive Director, Governor John Engler Center for Charter Schools at Central Michigan University

Chris Uhl Vice President of Community Investments, Rock Ventures

Felicia M. Venable-Akinbode Executive Director of Operations and Auxiliary Services, Detroit Public Schools Community District

Kisha Verdusco Director of Enrollment, Detroit Public Schools Community District

Nate Walker K-12 Organizer & Policy Analyst, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

PEER REVIEWERS

Benjamin Calnin Managing Director and Data Scientist, Dynamo Metrics Walter G. Cook Educational Data and Research Manager, New Detroit, Inc.

Jack Elsey, Jr. Executive Director, Detroit Children's Fund

Jason Mancini Director of Public Policy, Governor John Engler Center for Charter Schools at Central Michigan University

Dan Quisenberry President, Michigan Association of Public School Academies

Angela G. Reyes Founder and Executive Director, Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation

Jason Rose, Ph.D. Senior Executive Director of Research, Evaluation, and Analytics, Detroit Public Schools Community District

Craig Thiel Research Director, Citizens Research Council of Michigan

Punita Dani Thurman Program Director, The Skillman Foundation

Jeremy Vidito Senior Executive Director of Finance, Detroit Public Schools Community District

Nikolai P. Vitti, Ed.D. Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools Community District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

Executive Summary	5
Citywide Analysis	9
Grade Span Analysis	33
Recommendations	51
Appendix A: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood	53
Appendix B: Profiles of Highest-Need Neighborhoods	57
Appendix C: Commute Patterns in Detroit Public Schools Community District	77
Appendix D: Aligning Educational Options from Birth through Twelfth Grade	85
Appendix E: Data and Methods	87

MAPS

Map 1: Service Gap, Overall (Grades K-12)
Map 2: Service Level, Overall (Grades K-12)
Map 3: Density of School-Age Children
Map 4: Poverty Level
Map 5: Service Gap, Elementary School (Grades K-5)
Map 6: Service Level, Elementary School (Grades K-5)
Map 7: Service Gap, Middle School (Grades 6-8)
Map 8: Service Level, Middle School (Grades 6-8)
Map 9: Service Gap, High School (Grades 9-12)
Map 10: Service Level, High School (Grades 9-12)
Map 11: Accountability Rating of DPSCD Schools Attended (Grades K-12)77
Map 12: Accountability Rating of DPSCD Elementary Schools Attended (Grades K-5)
Map 13: Accountability Rating of DPSCD Middle Schools Attended (Grades 6-8)
Map 14: Accountability Rating of DPSCD High Schools Attended (Grades 9-12)
Map 15: DPSCD Student Travel Distance to School (Grades K-12)
Map 16: DPSCD Student Travel Distance to Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)
Map 17: DPSCD Student Travel Distance to Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)
Map 18: DPSCD Student Travel Distance to High Schools (Grades 9-12)
Map 18: Service Gap, Early Care and Education (Ages 0-5)
Map 19: Service Gap, K-12 Education

CHARTS

Chart 1: Population and Enrollment in Traditional District Schools in Detroit, 1920-2015	13
Chart 2: Student Enrollment by School Governance and Location	14
Chart 3: Performance of General Education Schools (Grades K-12)	17
Chart 4: Student Enrollment by MDE Accountability Rating	23
Chart 5: MDE Accountability Rating by School Type	25
Chart 6: Poverty and Performance	27
Chart 7: Poverty Concentration and Performance	28
Chart 8: Building Condition and School Performance (Grades K-12)	30
Chart 9: Performance of Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)	33
Chart 10: Building Condition and School Performance, Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)	38
Chart 11: Performance of Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	39
Chart 12: Building Condition and School Performance, Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	44
Chart 13: Performance of High Schools (Grades 9-12)	45
Chart 14: Building Condition and School Performance, High Schools (Grades 9-12)	50
Chart 15: Building Cost Components	90

TABLES

Table 1: Breakdown of Public School Enrollment Within Detroit	12
Table 2: Supply and Demand, Citywide	15
Table 3: Supply and Demand, Highest-Need Neighborhoods	16
Table 4: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, Overall (Grades K-12)	20
Table 5: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)	37
Table 6: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)	43
Table 7: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, High Schools (Grades 9-12)	49
Table 8: Service Gap Comparison, Early Care and Education and K-12 Education	86
Table 9: Building Component Rating System	90

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Reset, Rethink, Rebuild: A Shared Vision of Performing Schools in Quality Buildings for Every Child in Detroit is a study about neighborhoods, educational opportunity, and the conditions of public school buildings. Through a place-based supply-and-demand needs assessment, the report gauges access to performing schools across Detroit and identifies the neighborhoods in which the K-12 education system fails to reach the greatest numbers of children. To inform comprehensive school improvement and community development, the study also evaluates facilities conditions in and around the highest-need neighborhoods. The report and accompanying online tool lay the groundwork for cross-sector, citywide collaboration to boost access to performing public schools in the Motor City; to strategically allocate resources, including facilities; and to seize opportunities to adaptively reuse the sites of former schools to strengthen neighborhoods.

BRIEF METHODOLOGY

At its core, this study is a supply-and-demand needs assessment. It assumes that all children can excel academically and should have access to a **performing public school**. For the purposes of this analysis, a performing school is one that earned a rating of Green or Lime from the Michigan Department of Education.

The study uses enrollment and performance data from academic year 2015-16. In the needs assessment, **demand** is the number of students attending public (district and charter) schools. **Supply** is the capacity of performing public schools. The study calculates the **service gap** – the difference between demand and supply – for the city as a whole and individually for fifty-four neighborhoods. The service gap is presented at the overall (K-12) level and at the elementary (grades K-5), middle (grades 6-8), and high school (grades 9-12) levels. The **service level** – the proportion of students who have access to a performing school – is calculated for the same geographies and levels. The study identifies the ten neighborhoods in which the service gap is greatest as the **highest-need neighborhoods**. A **facilities assessment** then contextualizes the needs assessment. Most active public school buildings in and around the highest-need neighborhoods were surveyed physically in 2017. Ratings of individual building components or systems were weighted and aggregated into a summative designation for each school building: Best, Better, Worse, or Worst. They allow for one-toone comparison of school buildings of varying sizes and grade spans. Designations are relative to the other schools surveyed and not to an external or absolute standard.

KEY FINDINGS

- Four out of five children attending public (district and charter) schools in Detroit in 2015-16 could not access a performing school. To guarantee performing environments for every student, the K-12 system needs to make available approximately seventy thousand additional seats in performing schools.
- Thirty-eight percent of the need for performing public schools in Detroit was concentrated in the ten highestneed neighborhoods, which appeared in three clusters away from the urban core. These neighborhoods, ranked by their service gap, are listed below:

East Side	West Side	Southwest Side		
Finney (#3)	Cerveny/	Chadsey (#2)		
Mt. Olivet (#10)	Grandmont (#1)	Vernor/		
	Evergreen (#5)	Junction (#4)		
	Harmony Village (#6)			
	Mackenzie (#7)			
	Greenfield (#8)			
	Brooks (#9)			

- Although most district and charter schools were underperforming in 2015-16, evidence of positive outcomes is emerging. Twenty-five mid-high- or highpoverty schools provided over thirteen thousand seats in performing environments to Detroit students.
- In and around the highest-need neighborhoods, there is misalignment between building conditions and school performance. Many higher-performing schools are not located in the highest-quality buildings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Root school improvement in place-based strategy.

- Calibrate school improvement efforts and rightsizing strategies to demand for and supply of performing schools and the conditions of academic facilities at the local level.
- Develop strategies for the highest-need neighborhoods, where the most children lack access to performing public schools, to have the greatest impact on the service gap.
- Through ongoing community engagement and transparent decision-making, lay the groundwork for an adaptive reuse strategy for former public school buildings that is driven by communities' needs at the local level:
 - Coordinate rightsizing and adaptive reuse with community and neighborhood planning;
 - Assess need for services and amenities that former school buildings could house;
 - Identify partners and strategies to repurpose buildings that will increase quality of life for existing residents as part of the process of rightsizing.

SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

Coordinate strategic planning for K-12 public education in Detroit within and across school governing bodies.

- Identify areas of policy and practice that can save costs or otherwise provide mutual benefits as initial points of collaboration across school governing bodies. Where possible, codify and institutionalize collaboration.
- Avoid redundancies and cross purposes by coordinating school location decisions across governing bodies.
- Collaborate within and across governing bodies to replicate, expand, and diffuse best practices that have emerged in performing schools and to intervene in underperforming schools.
- Integrate data across governing bodies. Ensure that all public data is available in the same databases for district and charter schools to allow for side-by-side comparisons and comprehensive citywide research on K-12 education.

Base school improvement on transparent, meaningful, and consistent performance indicators.

- Strengthen the school accountability system in Michigan. Implement academically rigorous summative ratings that allow for differentiated strategy and needs assessments. Keep this system in place year over year to allow for meaningful comparisons over time.
- Intervene in all underperforming schools. Prioritize consistently underperforming schools for potential turnaround, reconstitution, or closure. Do not renew the charters of underperforming charter schools.

• Continue integrating national best practices and performance-based standards for quality charter school authorizing.

Efficiently allocate facilities resources so that real estate portfolios are commensurate with student enrollment.

- Secure public and/or philanthropic funding to conduct a detailed review of all open and closed school buildings currently in the portfolios of Detroit Public Schools Community District or any charter operator. Develop precise estimates for the future costs associated with restoring or maintaining safe learning and working environments in each school building.
- Create manageable enrollment and expansion strategies for performing schools in underutilized buildings to maximize the use of space and to increase access to highquality academic programs.
- Identify potential colocation partners in underutilized, quality school buildings that house performing schools.

CITYWIDE ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION: RETHINK, RESET, REBUILD

Seizing Opportunities.

Despite brisk downtown redevelopment, Detroit's residential neighborhoods continue to grapple with the consequences of decades of disinvestment and depopulation. The obstacles to quality education in the city are among the most pressing. Practitioners and decisionmakers in K-12 education are accustomed to troubling headlines about the state of public schools in Detroit.

Sensational soundbites, however, obscure meaningful progress that stakeholders in K-12 education have made in recent years. Many conditions for effective coordination around school improvement in the Motor City are taking root:

- Stakeholders from across sectors district, charter, political, union, nonprofit, neighborhood, parent, business, and philanthropic – have resumed processes of citywide coordination for school improvement.¹
- The traditional district's finances stabilized after the approval of a state plan to retire its debt.²
- For the first time in years, the district is under the management of an appointed superintendent and the governance of an elected school board.³
- Student enrollment in Detroit Public Schools Community District began to stabilize in 2016;⁴ in 2017, enrollment substantially exceeded projections.⁵
- Charter school regulation in Michigan improved in 2016, including requirements that some consistently underperforming charter schools close and stricter standards to ensure high-quality charter school authorizing.⁶

 K-12 school funding in Michigan is higher than ever and poised to continue increasing,⁷ and charter schools' funding streams are approaching parity with those of traditional district schools.⁸

After decades of tumult, the present moment could mark a transition towards stability and quality – a time to **rethink** the city's challenges in K-12 education, to **reset** policy and practice in a coordinated way, and to **rebuild** public education in Detroit.

Rethink, Reset, Rebuild is designed to help stakeholders seize this momentum. Fundamentally, the study is a tool to facilitate a collaborative process of agenda-setting and strategic planning. The data and analysis presented throughout can support stakeholders in understanding and transforming the public school landscape in Detroit. It provides a **common framework** about access to performing schools and a **shared vocabulary** around the factors that shape and intersect it. Leaders at all levels can use this data to differentiate responsibilities without losing sight of their shared goal: to guarantee access to performing public schools in quality buildings for every child in Detroit.

Recognizing Challenges.

Signs of progress in Detroit schools are encouraging and long overdue. The city exhibits some of the broadest and deepest challenges in American K-12 education – and many of them are not new. Educators and other leaders in the Motor City have contended with swings in demographics, finances, and facilities and struggled with academic performance in the city's public schools for decades.⁹

The city's obstacles in the K-12 sphere are well-known, and this study is about solving them rather than merely exposing them. In order to acknowledge the stakes of school improvement efforts, however, the acuteness of challenges in Detroit should be understood:

- Detroit's students demonstrated the lowest levels of math and reading proficiency of any major American city in 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015.¹⁰ Traditional district schools' rates of chronic absenteeism are the highest in the country,¹¹ and many schools struggle to fill teaching vacancies.¹²
- In early 2017, Detroit Public Schools Community District (DPSCD) settled a lawsuit over hazardous facilities conditions across its portfolio.¹³ Even after the oft-contested closure of nearly two hundred school buildings between 2000 and 2015,¹⁴ most of the district's active academic facilities remain underutilized.¹⁵
- The district recently emerged from a protracted period of emergency management and a high-profile settlement to avoid bankruptcy¹⁶ – the latest chapter in a history of discontinuous governance that dates to the 1970s.¹⁷ The superintendent of DPSCD has decried the district's history of financial mismanagement, including under emergency managers.¹⁸
- Michigan's K-12 funding system tends not to close the resource gap for districts with low property values and high proportions of economically disadvantaged students and children with disabilities, such as Detroit.¹⁹ Ensuing funding shortfalls are particularly difficult for the city's traditional district schools, which educate a disproportionate number of children with disabilities and require additional financial resources to meet students' needs in the classroom.²⁰ Additionally, many charter schools have struggled with gaps in revenue relative to their district peers.²¹

• Although some charter schools in Detroit outperform traditional district schools,²² the city's sizable charter sector has contributed to school choice more effectively than to school quality. The accountability system for charter schools was weak for well over a decade,²³ and effective coordination across school governing bodies within Detroit has been rare.²⁴

In the face of these challenges, parents of nearly a quarter of Detroit's public school students send their children to schools outside of the city.²⁵ This outflow of students – and thereby of funding – exacerbates financial and facilities challenges. More fundamentally, however, it demonstrates families' lack of confidence in the public school options in their neighborhoods, district and charter alike.

The intractability of many obstacles to equitable, highquality K-12 education at scale in Detroit should temper desire for quick fixes and panacea. Better schools will not emerge overnight or through siloed interventions. **A long-term, coordinated, cross-sector, multi-level response** is the most promising approach to a crisis borne of years of disinvestment, institutional fragmentation, and mismanagement.

Fortunately, such a response is not out of reach. Over the course of the analysis and stakeholder consultation for this study, IFF brought together a coalition of leaders in the K-12 community. These encounters made one thing clear: **across sectors and organizations, there is talent, passion, and deep expertise at work in Detroit's schools.** The diversity of stakeholders that worked together to shape and review this study is but one example of the ways that leaders in the Motor City are ready to work together to improve opportunities for children.

PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Enrollment Breakdown by School Governance and Type.

The unit of analysis for the needs assessment at the core of this study is the school – not the individual student. The methodology (see Appendix E) uses school-level data to make determinations about educational access at the neighborhood and city levels. In 2015-16, two hundred free public schools served over eighty-eight thousand students in Detroit. This study categorizes schools along three dimensions: governance, service area or authorizer, and programming.

This study is about the demand for and supply of performing public schools that provide a general education curriculum *in Detroit.* The demand side of the equation is based on the number of students placing a demand on a traditional district or charter school located in the city. In other words, the analysis calculates the capacity of schools needed to provide a seat in a performing environment to everyone who currently opts into the city's public school system. Suburban schools of choice and schools that exclusively offered alternative, vocational, or special education curricula were excluded from this analysis and are rendered in gray in Table 1.

Population Change and Enrollment Shifts.

In addition to the eighty-eight thousand students enrolled in Detroit schools, a substantial share of Detroit families' demand for public education extends beyond the borders of the Motor City. Understanding the distribution of demand is crucial to serving students who are currently enrolled in Detroit's public schools. It also helps account for future opportunities and needs if increased school quality draws more Detroiters back to the city's schools. From its peak of nearly three hundred thousand enrolled students in 1966,²⁶ the public education system in Detroit now serves fewer than ninety thousand children across traditional district and charter schools. Enrollment in traditional district schools in particular plummeted by eighty-four percent over the past five decades. **In the last fifteen years, enrollment in traditional district schools declined at over twice the rate of the city's already substantial loss of population.**²⁷

City-level population loss does not fully explain the disproportionate downtick in demand for traditional district schools. While the trend is not completely attributable to school choice, the combined effects of charter schools and suburban schools of choice²⁸ have required traditional district schools to confront unprecedented demographic change and fiscal uncertainty.²⁹ The rapidity and depth of these shifts – and the complexity of managing them – should not be overlooked.

In 2015-16, parents and guardians of nearly twenty-six thousand children living in Detroit opted out of the city's public school system altogether and sent their children to schools of choice in the suburbs.³⁰ Of these, nearly two thirds attended a charter school. Among children whose parents chose Detroit schools for K-12 public education, just under forty-two percent attended a charter. The remaining fifty-nine percent attended a school under the governance of Detroit Public Schools Community District (DPSCD) or the Education Achievement Authority (EAA) of Michigan.

Imprecision around public school enrollment trends can confuse strategies designed to improve access to performing public schools *within the city*. The charter

Governance and		Campuse	:S	Enrollment					
School Types*	# Proportion			#				Proportion	
		Within Governance Type	Overall	Elementary (K-5)	Middle (6-8)	High School (9-12)	Total (K-12)	Within Governance Type	Overall
Traditional District Schools	93	100%	47%	22,585	9,226	13,746	45,557	100%	52%
Neighborhood	61	66%	31%	18,097	6,184	7,236	31,517	69%	36%
Magnet/Selective	22	24%	11%	4,337	2,812	5,548	12,697	28%	14%
Special Program	10	11%	5%	151	230	962	1,343	3%	2%
Alternative/Vocational	5	5%	3%	0	111	644	755	2%	1%
Special Education	5	5%	3%	151	119	318	588	1%	1%
Education Achievement Authority (EAA) Schools	12	100%	6 %	2,046	930	2,772	5,748	100%	7%
General Education	12	100%	6%	2,046	930	2,772	5,748	100%	7%
Charter Schools	95	100%	48 %	19,736	9,442	7,903	37,081	100%	42 %
College/University- Authorized	73	77%	37%	16,496	8,259	7,554	32,309	87%	37%
General Education	66	69%	33%	16,353	8,231	6,508	31,092	84%	35%
Alternative/Vocational	6	6%	3%	0	28	1,046	1,074	3%	1%
Special Education	1	1%	1%	143	0	0	143	0%	0%
District-Authorized	14	15%	7%	2,569	851	169	3,589	10%	4%
General Education	14	15%	7%	2,569	851	169	3,589	10%	4%
RESA-Authorized	5	5%	3%	6	49	180	235	1%	0%
General Education	2	2%	1%	2	27	7	36	0%	0%
Alternative/Vocational	3	3%	2%	4	22	173	199	1%	0%
EAA-Authorized	3	3%	2%	665	283	0	948	3%	1%
General Education	3	3%	2%	665	283	0	948	3%	1%
Grand Total	200		100%	44,367	19,598	24,421	88,386		100%

*See Appendix E for definitions of the school categorizations used in this section.

school sector in Detroit is frequently cited as serving over half of the city's students, a greater market share than in any American city other than New Orleans.³² To be sure, parents and guardians of children in Detroit choose the charter sector at a high rate: forty-six percent of the city's students were enrolled in a charter school in the city or in a suburb in 2015-16, and more Detroit students attended charter schools than attended DPSCD. The majority of



Chart 2: Student Enrollment by School Governance and Location ³¹



children who lived in Detroit and attended public schools, however, enrolled in a district-operated school – mostly in DPSCD (including former EAA schools), with a substantial contingent opting for suburban district schools of choice. Among children who attended public schools *within* Detroit, traditional district schools enrolled nearly a third more students than charter schools.

Responding to Enrollment Trends through Collaboration.

District and charter schools in Detroit share responsibility over K-12 education in the city. Students are enrolled in neighborhood schools, magnet and selective schools, alternative and vocational schools, and charter schools under the jurisdiction of a plethora of authorizers and operators. Charter schools' market share in Detroit has reached the magnitude at which demand for charters typically plateaus.³³ Shared responsibility seems likely to be the status quo for the foreseeable future.

With limited resources for public education, **cross-sector enrollment requires cross-sector collaboration**. District and charter schools are working towards a common goal: increased access to performing schools for Detroit children. Effective networks of coordination between district and charter schools are increasingly a "necessity, not a nicety"³⁴ in cities such as Detroit with broad school choice and declining enrollment.

Throughout the country, cooperation between district and charter schools has had tangible benefits for both sectors.³⁵ Coordination in the areas of accountability, school improvement, enrollment systems, and facilities, among others, have improved the public school landscape in cities such as Baltimore, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Cleveland. Efforts have been particularly effective when executed around an explicit, binding compact. No formal district-charter compact exists in Detroit, and cross-sector coordination has been inconsistent at best in the Motor City.³⁶ Better coordination among governing bodies could have considerable impact on the accessibility of performing schools in Detroit – without compromising any individual body's capacity to innovate and improve internally.

ACCESS TO PERFORMING SCHOOLS

School Performance vs. School Quality.

This study assesses access to performing schools. A school is considered performing if it achieved a rating of Green or Lime from the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) for its performance in academic year 2015-16. At the time, MDE used a tiered, color-coded system to rate schools: Green (highest), Lime, Yellow, Orange, or Red (lowest).³⁷ As of the publication of this report, schools in Michigan will no longer receive a summative performance rating, beginning with data from academic year 2016-17.³⁸

In 2015-16, ratings were derived from scores on up to six components: Assessment Participation, Assessment Proficiency, Graduation, Attendance, Educator Evaluations, and Compliance. Schools were assigned a rating based on the proportion of possible points that they earned across these categories. Ratings could then be lowered based on the outcome of a series of audits. For example, schools could be docked for severely low outcomes in the Attendance, Educator Evaluation, or Compliance categories or for achievement gaps among student subgroups.

The results of the Spring 2016 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) were a primary driver of the color-coded ratings for academic year 2015-16. That year was the second in which the M-STEP was administered. As a result of the lack of historical test data, MDE was unable to include multi-year proficiency averages in its color-coded designations.³⁹ The advisory committee and peer reviewers for this study expressed reservations about using the color-coded system for this reason, but IFF and partners could not reach consensus about a viable alternative. Given available data at the time

Grade Span	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of City- wide Gap
Elementary (K–5)	17	43,523	4,960	38,563	11%	56%
Middle (6–8)	18	19,099	4,430	14,669	23%	21%
High School (9–12)	9	22,211	6,319	15,892	28%	23%
Overall (K–12)	28*	84,833	15,709	69,124	19%	100%

Table 2: Supply and Demand, Citywide

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

of the analysis, the 2015-16 MDE ratings were deemed the best option for defining school performance. **Stakeholders that IFF consulted were in near-unanimous agreement about the need for a better, more rigorous accountability system in Michigan**.

Ultimately, IFF chose to align with the state's standards in order to maximize the report's applicability. Stakeholders in K-12 education are held accountable to MDE's metrics. The color-coded system's six components, if imperfect, are important measures of school effectiveness. Using these ratings to help define levels of need creates resonance between existing standards and the efforts that school leaders and other decision-makers can develop based on the needs that this study uncovers.

Utilizing the color-coded system does not, however, mean that the determinations about access to performing schools throughout this study capture every important function of K-12 education. Beyond merely transmitting basic skills, schools anchor communities. They foster critical thinking, self-understanding, social and emotional learning, cultural competency, citizenship, and wellness. Standardized tests do not measure these vital components of high-quality schools; by the same token, high-quality schools accomplish more than state assessments can capture. A high level of academic performance is a necessary, but not sufficient, component of a high-quality school.

Limitations of external data notwithstanding, by analyzing access to performing schools as defined by the State of Michigan, this report helps lay groundwork for efforts to improve academic outcomes. Detroit's public education system, across district and charter schools, struggles to guarantee access to schools that clear a foundational bar of academic performance. Strengthening this core element of high-quality education is the beginning, not the end, of school improvement. Yet it is a crucial step towards educating the whole child.

Supply and Demand Citywide.

In 2015-16, there were 178 general education public (district or charter) schools in Detroit. Of these, twentyeight were performing (Green- or Lime-rated). The performing schools offered over fifteen thousand seats to students. With about eighty-five thousand students enrolled, however, just under seventy thousand children lacked access to a performing school.

Grade Span	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of City- wide Gap
Elementary (K–5)	5	16,616	1,266	15,351	8%	22%
Middle (6–8)	5	7,059	1,062	5,997	15%	9%
High School (9–12)	2	7,021	2,083	4,938	30%	7%
Overall (K–12)	8*	30,697	4,411	26,285	14%	38%

Table 3: Supply and Demand, Highest-Need Neighborhoods

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

Overall, **four out of every five children enrolled in public schools in Detroit could not access a seat in a performing K-12 school.** Based on the difference between supply (15,709), which gauges the capacity of performing schools, and the number of students who were actually enrolled in performing schools (14,855), there were an estimated 854 unfilled seats in Green- or Lime-rated schools in 2015-16. This marginal allotment of seats represents less than two percent of the citywide service gap.

Access to performing schools in Detroit was greatest for high schoolers and lowest for elementary schoolers.

More than one out of four students in grades nine through twelve in the city could access a performing school in 2015-16, as compared to roughly one out of ten students from kindergarten through fifth grade. Across Detroit, over half of the service gap was concentrated in elementary school; middle and high school each accounted for just under a quarter.

The Service Gap and Highest-Need Neighborhoods (Grades K-12).

Thirty-eight percent of the need for performing public schools in Detroit was concentrated in the ten highestneed neighborhoods, which appeared in three clusters **away from the urban core.** These neighborhoods, ranked by their service gap, are listed below:

East Side	West Side	Southwest Side
Finney (#3)	Cerveny/	Chadsey (#2)
Mt. Olivet (#10)	Grandmont (#1) Evergreen (#5)	Vernor/ Junction (#4)
	Harmony Village (#6)	
	Mackenzie (#7)	
	Greenfield (#8)	
	Brooks (#9)	

Across the highest-need neighborhoods, fourteen percent of students had access to a performing school in 2015-16 – five percentage points lower than the citywide service level. While over thirty thousand students were enrolled across these ten neighborhoods, performing schools provided fewer than five thousand seats therein, leaving a gap of over twenty-six thousand. This gap represents roughly two fifths of Detroit's citywide service gap.



Chart 3: Performance of General Education Schools (Grades K-12)

Across grade spans there is substantial need for performing schools in every neighborhood in Detroit. This diffuse lack of access makes the Motor City somewhat unusual relative to other markets in which IFF has conducted needs assessments for K-12 schools. In many cases, the service gap has been more heavily concentrated in a handful of high-areas. As a result, IFF has often recommended a specific focus on the highest-need neighborhoods to increase the service level and close the service gap.⁴⁰

Addressing the highest-need areas of Detroit will have a disproportionate impact on the service gap. It will not, however, match the scale of the problem. The depth of need for better schools across Detroit means that neighborhood-by-neighborhood strategies must be carried out as part of a broader, systematic effort to increase school performance across the city. Some solutions will take root at the city level, affecting neighborhoods across Detroit. Others may require collaboration with higher levels of government.

Within broader school improvement frameworks, however, there is work to do at the local and neighborhood levels. Furthermore, stakeholders can strengthen broader, ecosystem-oriented planning by grounding it in data and understanding the distribution of need across space. The ranking of neighborhoods by their need for performing seats can facilitate diverse efforts to target school improvement initiatives and develop place-based strategies.

Many **neighborhood stakeholders** want to understand how access to education in their communities compares to that of peers in order to advocate for greater resources. **Nonprofit, philanthropic, and private sector entities** looking to maximize the impact of investments could choose to focus on the highest-need neighborhoods. The highest-need areas can also guide **citywide conversations** – including collaboration among school governing bodies – by allowing for comparisons across Detroit.

In the highest-need neighborhoods, economies of scale are potentially more advantageous, and the impact of performing public schools will be poised to have the most impact. Bearing in mind the citywide context – that four out of five students in Detroit lack access to a performing public school – the highest-need neighborhoods are an actionable guide to identifying areas in which to improve school performance and transform the K-12 landscape.

SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE



Map 1: Service Gap, Overall (Grades K-12)







- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🔴 Red
- No Grade

School Type

- O District: Neighborhood
- > District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

Rank	Need	Neighborhood	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level
		Cerveny / Grandmont	3,888	466	3,422	12%
		Chadsey	3,709	697	3,012	19%
	3	Finney	3,375	321	3,055	10%
	4	Vernor / Junction	3,406	496	2,910	15%
	5	Evergreen	2,956	342	2,614	12%
High Need	6	Harmony Village	2,833	371	2,462	13%
	7	Mackenzie	2,901	467	2,435	16%
	8	Greenfield	2,487	247	2,240	10%
	9	Brooks	2,511	452	2,059	18%
	10	Mt. Olivet	2,631	552	2,078	21%
	11	Denby	2.131	243	1.888	11%
	12	Conner	2 167	412	1 754	10%
	12	Rouge	2,137	382	1 755	18%
	14	Bagley	1.953	218	1.734	11%
Mid-High	15	Burbank	2,124	254	1,870	12%
Need	16	Kettering	1,986	325	1,660	16%
	17	Lower Woodward	1,928	493	1,436	26%
	18	Rosa Parks	2,175	526	1,649	24%
	19	Rosedale	1,727	197	1,530	11%
	20	Pembroke	1,668	195	1,473	12%
		Durfee	1,888	416	1,471	22%
	22	Springwells	2,525	700	1,825	28%
	23	Redford	1,781	204	1,577	11%
Moderate Need	24	Lower East Central	1,875	451	1,424	24%
	25	Davison	1,889	536	1,353	28%
	26	Cody	1,513	226	1,287	15%
	27	Brightmoor	1,467	151	1,316	10%
	28	Middle East Central	1,269	339	930	27%
	29	Condon	1,255	245	1,010	20%
	30	Nolan	1,270	324	947	25%
	31	Winterhalter	1,266	234	1,032	18%
	32	Butzel	1,125	198	927	18%
	33	Tireman	1,395	323	1,072	23%
	34	Middle Woodward	1,654	706	948	43%
Mid-Low	35	Jeffries	1,285	313	972	24%
Need	36	Grant	1,223	310	913	25%
	37	Persning	1,192	489	703	41%
	38	Airport	1,108	348	760	31%
	39		703	155	618	20%
	40	Fairier Faik	601	140	542	1470
	41	Chandler Park	711	149	569	2270
	/3	St. Jean	763	195	568	26%
	44	East Riverside	599	119	480	20%
	45	Boynton	587	198	389	34%
	46	Jefferson / Mack	382	79	302	21%
	47	West Riverfront	479	82	397	17%
Low Need	48	Hubbard Richard	413	61	352	15%
	49	Indian Village	304	53	251	17%
	50	State Fair	293	87	206	30%
	51	Central Business District	196	54	142	28%
-	52	Corktown	154	31	123	20%
	53	Near East Riverfront	82	25	57	30%
	54	Upper East Central	23	11	12	47%

Table 4: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, Overall (Grades K-12)

The Service Level (Grades K-12).

The highest-need neighborhoods are the sections of the city in which the most students cannot access a performing school, but they are not the only places in which a substantial share of students need better public schools. For this reason, the service level – the proportion of children in a neighborhood who could access a Greenor Lime-rated school – is helpful context alongside the service gap. At the K-12 level, access to performing schools was most diminished the northwest and northeast corners of Detroit. There was relatively better access in a handful of neighborhoods around Highland Park and Hamtramck, downtown, and in the southwest corner of the city. Two thirds of Detroit's neighborhoods were clustered between service levels of fifteen and thirty percent.









- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- Red
- No Grade

School Type

- District: Neighborhood
- District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- □ Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

THE SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LANDSCAPE

The core of this study is a supply-and-demand needs assessment. It compares the demand for public education within Detroit to the supply of seats in performing K-12 district and charter schools in the city. At the heart of the analysis are two questions: where do students live, and what are the barriers to performing schools in those places? The maps and data in this section are included in the report to facilitate analysis and dialogue around these questions among stakeholders.

The maps in this section are most powerful in conjunction with other maps that are distributed throughout the rest of the report. IFF invites readers to reference the maps in this section throughout their engagement with the data in this study. In this way, stakeholders can visualize, and make more strategic decisions based on, the relationships among population, poverty, and outcomes in the places that are of interest to them.

Density of School-Age Children.

Although Detroit was the twenty-third most populous city in the United States in 2016, three quarters of the country's largest cities were more densely populated than the Motor City in the same year. Detroit's loss of nearly two thirds of its overall population since the mid-twentieth century has left the school-age population of many neighborhoods sparse. The densest pockets of children in Detroit were in the northeast and southwest.

The most densely populated areas are not the only parts of the city in which better public schools would make a significant impact. Density is an important factor, however, in shaping the way that decision-makers might approach



one place versus another. Population density helps explain how easily school improvement efforts can achieve economies of scale in a particular neighborhood or cluster of neighborhoods. Data on density also contextualizes the service gap in each neighborhood, which is based on the raw number of students who need access to a performing school.

Performance by School Type.

In Detroit in 2015-16, across district and charter schools that offered general education programming, **eighteen percent of students were enrolled in a school that was rated Green or Lime** – the bar to qualify as performing for the purposes of this analysis. There were only two Greenrated schools in the entire city in 2015-16, New Paradigm College Prep and Detroit Achievement Academy; combined, they enrolled 169 students. Nearly half of pupils attended schools in the bottom two categories.



Children Ages 5-17 Per Sq. Mile **MDE Accountability Rating** Green Fewer Than 400 Lime ۵ 401 - 800 Yellow 801 - 1,200 Orange 1,201 - 1,600 Red Greater Than 1,600 No Grade

Map 3: Density of School-Age Children

School Type

- O District: Neighborhood
- Oistrict: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

Master Plan

Park

River

Neighborhoods



Chart 5: MDE Accountability Rating by School Type

Most schools of all types were underperforming. Neither district nor charter schools were creating access to performing public schools at scale in Detroit. Across the four main categories of public schools in the city – neighborhood, magnet and selective, EAA, and charter – there was a dearth of performing (Green- or Lime-rated) options in 2015-16.

Even within an overall underperforming environment, however, there was variation in academic outcomes by school type. Statistically significant differences emerged across the four school types in the proportion of accountability points earned⁴¹ and in schools' overall color-coded rating.⁴² The most salient differences were between neighborhood schools and magnet and selective schools and between neighborhood schools and charter schools.

- District neighborhood schools received ratings of Red over three times as often as charter schools.
- A quarter of charter schools were rated Green or Lime. When schools' proportions of accountability points were ranked against one another, charters' average rank was fifty-six percent higher than that of neighborhood district schools.
- Magnet and selective schools and charter schools were approximately on par with one another with regard to the proportion of accountability points earned and their rate of achieving performing status.

Poverty and Performance.

Even within the Metro Detroit region, which has the highest rates of concentrated poverty in the country,⁴³ **levels of poverty and of poverty concentration stand out**

Map 4: Poverty Level





- MDE Accountability Rating
- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- Red
- No Grade

School Type

- O District: Neighborhood
- District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- □ Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.



Chart 6: Poverty and Performance

Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals

among children entering Detroit's public school system. In academic year 2015-16, four out of five students

enrolled in schools that IFF analyzed for this study were eligible for free or reduced-price meals, meaning that they lived in households with incomes below 185 percent of the federal poverty level. The majority of children living in most Detroit neighborhoods qualified for subsidized meals; in well over half of the city, more than seventy-five percent of students were eligible.

Detroit's schools are embedded in national and state environments that provide unequal opportunities to poor students and to children of color. Decades of research have uncovered diminished academic opportunity in schools with higher proportions of low-income students.⁴⁴ Across Michigan, students who have been eligible for subsidized school meals score significantly lower on state assessments than students who are not low-income.⁴⁵ Race is a factor, too: black students are overrepresented in the state's lowest-performing schools,⁴⁶ and the state's racial achievement gap on standardized tests is wider than poverty levels alone can explain.⁴⁷ Eighty percent of students in the schools analyzed for this study live in low-income households, and ninety-seven percent are children of color. Given national and state trends, a lack of educational opportunity in Detroit *as a whole* is, unfortunately, unsurprising. It likely cannot be addressed fully in the absence of broader political and economic shifts.

That the deck is stacked against Detroit's schools, however, does not mean that local and school-level implementation cannot help turn the tide. Comparing performance outcomes *among* Detroit's public schools reveals that **some schools are more successfully mitigating the effects of poverty on academic outcomes than others.** Across the



Chart 7: Poverty Concentration and Performance

city, there was no significant correlation between a school's poverty levels and the proportion of accountability points that it earned.⁴⁸ Overall, the poverty level in Detroit's public schools explains less than one tenth of one percent of the variation in the percentage of accountability points that schools earned in 2015-16.

The highest-need neighborhoods in Detroit were not necessarily the poorest. This absence of a tidy relationship between poverty and need is attributable in part to schools that have had success in providing a performing educational environment to a low-income student body. **Twenty-five public schools in Detroit with mid-high or high levels of poverty provided over thirteen thousand seats in performing environments in 2015-16.** These schools are potential important sources of best practices and nodes of intra-city collaboration. They reinforce that poverty is an important but not deciding factor in understanding the distribution of access to performing schools in Detroit at the system level.

FACILITIES CONDITIONS AND ADAPTIVE REUSE

Looking to the Future.

Great schools need safe, accessible buildings to provide students with an optimal learning environment and faculty and staff with a decent workplace. And in order to create the conditions for performing schools in quality facilities, school governing bodies need to ensure that the numbers of buildings in their portfolios are commensurate with demand for their services and their financial capacity to maintain them.

Nearly half of the space in active district school buildings was unutilized or underutilized in 2015-16.

The district-owned schools analyzed for this study had a combined physical capacity to serve over eighty thousand students. They enrolled fewer than forty-five thousand in 2015-16. To address underutilization, over two hundred traditional district school buildings in Detroit were closed between 2000 and 2015.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, most of the district's active academic facilities remained underutilized, often substantially.

In the coming years, the question of K-12 educational facilities appears likely to be increasingly prominent in Detroit. In academic year 2018-19, the district will begin planning its approach to the facilities in its portfolio, preceded by a facility review at the district level.⁵⁰ As of the publication of this report, DPSCD had released two significant requests for facilities-related proposals.⁵¹

Building conditions are included in this analysis as a starting point to stimulate conversations and guide strategic planning around school facilities. Schools from both traditional district and charter governance models are included side-by-side to support place-based decisionmaking that takes into account the ecosystem of public school options in a neighborhood.

The conditions of most schools in or within one mile of the highest-need neighborhoods were surveyed and are presented in the pages that follow. (The scope of the study precluded analysis of all active K-12 public school buildings in Detroit). Moving forward, educational planning and resource allocation in these communities can take facilities into account alongside academic outcomes and other factors that shape access to performing schools in the areas of Detroit where need is greatest. Efforts outside of the highest-need neighborhoods can in turn use lessons learned from those areas as a model for citywide facilities planning.

Facilities Conditions (Grades K-12).

In and around the highest-need neighborhoods, relationships between facilities conditions and school performance were weak.⁵² Better buildings were not associated with better school performance across the board, meaning that some of the city's best-performing schools did not have access to the best buildings. Importantly, however, there were no performing schools and only a few Yellow schools in the buildings with the worst conditions; by and large, the schools in the lowestquality buildings were also substantially underperforming. In the Best, Better, and Worse buildings, there is substantial variation in performance outcomes.



Chart Reading Tips

- Building conditions are divided into four ratings. These ratings are the result of weighting and aggregating the results of a detailed survey of conditions in each school building. They allow for one-to-one comparison of schools of varying sizes and grade spans. These ratings are relative to the other buildings surveyed. The thick horizontal reference line in the chart divides the schools in relatively better condition from the schools in relatively worse condition.
- The percentage of accountability points earned is the primary determinant of the accountability rating that each school received in 2015-16. Schools that received at least seventy percent of their total possible points

 represented by the thick vertical reference line in the chart were eligible for a rating of Lime, but their rating could be lowered based on a series of further audits, e.g. for achievement gaps among student subgroups or compliance issues. Schools earning less than fifty percent of their overall points received ratings of Red.

From Rightsizing to Adaptive Reuse.

Schools anchor communities. More than merely providing venues for the transmission of knowledge, school buildings become hubs of neighborhood life and facilitate the exchange of social and cultural capital. Rightsizing decisions, their fiscal or academic impact aside, can siphon these resources out of communities, exacerbating disinvestment that has crippled lowincome urban areas for decades. Fortunately, research on rightsizing yields insight into factors that can be integrated alongside facilities conditions to strategically mitigate potential negative outcomes.

First and foremost, **rightsizing can, but does not necessarily, improve academic outcomes for students.** Several studies suggest that students who transfer to better-performing schools from closing underperforming schools tend to progress academically.⁵³ Achievement levels of future students who otherwise would have attended the closed school might also improve.⁵⁴ Insofar as there is a paucity of performing options to which to transfer, however, students' academic performance can stagnate or even decline during and after the transition.⁵⁵ Without an increase in the supply of performing schools in Detroit, a rightsizing strategy is unlikely to yield substantial gains in student learning.

Similarly, **the financial benefits of rightsizing for school districts are not automatic.** One national study found that, on average, short-term savings for districts who closed buildings as part of rightsizing efforts were less than one million dollars per closed building.⁵⁶ Detroit's closure of fifty-nine school buildings several years ago, for example, saved the district an estimated thirty-five million dollars in operating costs, or about six hundred thousand dollars per school. Across the country, sales prices for former public school buildings are "frequently well below initial projections." 57

Moreover, rightsizing entails *added* expenses for districts, such as the disposal of buildings' contents and the carrying costs of unused property. Physical deterioration of unused and unsold buildings routinely hampers rightsizing agendas.⁵⁸ Savings for the owning entity ultimately depend mostly on the extent to which teachers are reassigned from closed schools to other buildings and the ability of the owning entity to profitably repurpose the facility.⁵⁹ In a city with a teacher shortage and relatively low demand for real estate in many neighborhoods, the fiscal outlook of rightsizing should be carefully considered.

There are also **important issues of racial and economic equity** to acknowledge with regard to school district rightsizing. School closures overwhelmingly tend to impact low-income neighborhoods and communities of color.⁶⁰ Even similarly performing schools are more likely to be closed if they have higher concentrations of poor and minority students, suggesting that implicit biases often play a role in identifying schools to close.⁶¹ Potential benefits notwithstanding, closures send shockwaves through communities and occasion major disruptions for parents and students alike.⁶² To avoid hoisting the effects of rightsizing disproportionately on marginalized communities, careful checks should be in place to account for perceptions of race and class in decision-making.

Furthermore, **community input into the decisions that emerge from rightsizing processes is often limited.** The salient point in the context of Detroit is not that rightsizing tends to be controversial and contested – though it does. More specifically, rightsizing can erode trust between communities and their public schools. The processes often reveals gulfs between the ways students and families think about their schools and the criteria by which decision-makers evaluate their viability.⁶³

Dozens of school buildings across the city have closed in recent years, meaning that the process of rightsizing remains a relatively recent memory for many Detroiters. With thousands of parents already sending their children to schools outside Detroit, the implementation of rightsizing could be decisive for communities' investment and trust in the city's public schools. By engaging neighborhoods and *partnering* with communities in making decisions about school buildings, strategic planning around rightsizing could strengthen bonds between neighborhoods than schools rather than make them more tenuous – especially if the repurposing of school buildings can add value to communities and improve access to crucial goods and services.

The difficulties associated with successfully implementing a rightsizing agenda underscore the importance of tying rightsizing to adaptive reuse. An inventory of successful adaptive reuse strategies is beyond the scope of this study. Across the country, however, some shrinking urban school systems have been more successful than others not only at disposing of buildings efficiently but at doing so in a way that is equitable and that creates new assets for communities. Some observers, for example, have contrasted Chicago's recent wave of school closures with Kansas City's repurposing initiative.⁶⁴ Whereas the former was mostly adjudicated behind closed doors, the latter was rooted in a yearlong process of gathering community input and technical information. This orientation enabled stakeholders to identify opportunities to reinvest in low-income communities and create new hubs of neighborhood life.

With the right stakeholders at the table, adaptive reuse can **translate the burden of underutilized buildings into meaningful opportunities for community development.** Charter and private schools, government and nonprofit facilities, and residential housing are the most common end uses of former school buildings.⁶⁵ The possibilities, however, do not end at these forms of repurposing.

The facilities data that is included throughout this study is designed to facilitate conversations well beyond buildings, dollars, and cents. A consistent review of facilities conditions and financial viability is a crucial component of adaptive reuse, but it is only part of a constellation that also includes academic performance and community needs. This study provides a baseline by evaluating facilities in Detroit's highest-need neighborhoods and analyzing relationships with academic performance. Moving forward, community-oriented assessments of need for other types of services and opportunities at the local level are indispensable to driving a process of adaptive reuse.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADES K-5)

The Service Gap (Grades K-5).

In 2015-16, there were 133 general education public (district or charter) elementary schools in Detroit. Of these, seventeen were performing (Green- or Lime-rated). The performing schools offered just under five thousand general education slots to students. With nearly forty-four thousand students enrolled, however, over thirty-eight thousand elementary schoolers lacked access to a performing school. Overall, **nine out of every ten children enrolled in public elementary schools in Detroit could not access a seat in a performing school.** Over half of the citywide need for performing schools was concentrated in elementary school. At the elementary school (K-5) level, the highest-need neighborhoods – the parts of Detroit in which the most students lacked access to a performing public school – appeared in the same three clusters at the overall (K-12) service gap: one on the East Side, one on the West Side, and one on the Southwest Side. The same ten communities comprise the highest-need neighborhoods, with a slight shuffling in the order. Focusing on these three clusters will yield a sizable impact on the lack of access to performing elementary schools. Given the disproportionate need for performing K-5 schools across the city, an elementary school strategy rooted in these neighborhoods would in turn have substantial impact on citywide needs.




Map 5: Service Gap, Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)





MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- Red
- No Grade

School Type

- District: Neighborhood
- Oistrict: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

The Service Level (Grades K-5).

The highest-need neighborhoods are the sections of the city in which the most students cannot access a performing school, but they are not the only places in which a substantial share of students need better public schools. For this reason, the service level – the proportion of children in a neighborhood who could access a Greenor Lime-rated school – is helpful context alongside the service gap. With the exception of Boynton on the far southwest, the West Side of Detroit was virtually devoid of neighborhoods in which more than fifteen percent of elementary school students had access to a performing public school. Access was best in the center of the city. The service level on the East Side largely resembled that of the West Side.

> SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE



Map 6: Service Level, Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)





MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
 - Lime
- Yellow

ø

- Orange
- Red
- No Grade

School Type

- District: Neighborhood
- District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter

Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.



Need	Rank	Neighborhood	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent K–12 Gap
		Cerveny / Grandmont	2,145	143	2,002	7%	59%
		Finney	1,945	87	1,858	4%	61%
	3	Vernor / Junction	1,867	115	1,752	6%	60%
	4	Chadsey	1,798	154	1,644	9%	55%
	5	Evergreen	1,574	44	1,530	3%	59%
High Need	6	Harmony Village	1,547	125	1,422	8%	58%
	7	Mackenzie	1,549	158	1,391	10%	57%
	8	Greenfield	1,343	64	1,279	5%	57%
	9	Mt. Olivet	1,484	210	1,274	14%	61%
	10	Brooks	1,365	165	1,200	12%	58%
	11	Springwells	1,381	230	1,151	17%	63%
	12	Burbank	1 127	57	1 070	5%	57%
	12	Redford	1 021	17	1,005	2%	64%
	14	Conner	1 1 / 1	144	007	12%	57%
	15	Rosa Parks	1,000	109	990	10%	60%
Mid-High Need	16	Denhy	1.028		990	r%	<u>د</u> ی%
	17	Bagley	1.036	67	968	7%	56%
	18	Rouge	1.087	131	950	12%	54%
	10	Kettering	1.055	127	028	12%	56%
	20	Rosedale	930	/3	887	5%	58%
	21	Brightmoor	854	-+5	818	4%	62%
	22	Durfee	ب رہ 100	100	801	11%	54%
	22	Cody	821	68	752	8%	54%
	24	Pembroke	770	53	726	7%	10%
	25	Davison	860	154	706	18%	52%
Moderate Need	26	Lower Fast Central	965	267	698	28%	49%
	27	Lower Woodward	818	172	645	21%	45%
	28	leffries	723	81	642	11%	66%
		Tireman	689	70	619	10%	c8%
	30	Grant	681	117	564	17%	62%
	31	Winterhalter	626	71	554	11%	54%
	32	Middle Woodward	807	274	533	34%	56%
	33	Nolan		107	484	18%	51%
	3/	Condon	523		478	8%	47%
	25	Airport	582	125	457	21%	60%
Mid-Low Need	36	Middle East Central	547	141	406	26%	44%
	37	Butzel	471	78	393	17%	42%
	38	Palmer Park	376	34	341	9%	55%
	39	St. Jean	406	84	322	21%	57%
	40	Chandler Park	361	54	307	15%	54%
	41	Pershing	461	165	296	36%	42%
	42	McNichols	325	43	283	13%	46%
	43	West Riverfront	278	25	253	9%	64%
	44	Foch	326	73	252	22%	47%
	45	Hubbard Richard	243	21	222	9%	63%
	46	East Riverside	258	51	207	20%	43%
	47	Boynton	190		113		29%
Low Need	48	Jefferson / Mack	143	32	111	22%	37%
	49	State Fair	120	32		27%	42%
	50	Indian Village	100	19	80	19%	32%
	51	Corktown	63	7	56	11%	46%
	52	Central Business District	56	22	34	39%	24%
	53	Near East Riverfront	42	17	25	40%	44%
	54	Upper East Central	11	4	7	37%	56%

Table 5: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)



Chart 10: Building Condition and School Performance, Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)

Chart Reading Tips

- Building conditions are divided into four ratings. These ratings are the result of weighting and aggregating the results of a detailed survey of conditions in each school building. They allow for one-to-one comparison of schools of varying sizes and grade spans. These ratings are relative to the other buildings surveyed. The thick horizontal reference line in the chart divides the schools in relatively better condition from the schools in relatively worse condition.
- The percentage of accountability points earned is the primary determinant of the accountability rating that each school received in 2015-16. Schools that received at least seventy percent of their total possible points - represented by the thick vertical reference line in the chart – were eligible for a rating of Lime, but their rating could be lowered based on a series of further audits, e.g. for achievement gaps among student subgroups or compliance issues. Schools earning less than fifty percent of their overall points received ratings of Red.

MIDDLE SCHOOL (GRADES 6-8)

The Service Gap (Grades 6-8).

In 2015-16, there were 118 general education public (district or charter) middle schools in Detroit. Of these, eighteen were performing (Green- or Lime-rated). The performing schools offered over four thousand general education slots to students. With nearly twenty thousand students enrolled, however, just under fifteen thousand middle schoolers lacked access to a performing school. Overall, **four out of every five children enrolled in public middle schools in Detroit could not access a seat in a performing school.** At the middle school (6-8) level, the highest-need neighborhoods – the parts of Detroit in which the most students lacked access to a performing public school – appeared in two main clusters: one on the East Side and one on the West Side. Nine of the ten communities with the highest overall need are among the highestneed neighborhoods for this grade span, with a slight shuffling in the order. Focusing on these clusters will yield a disproportionate impact on the lack of access to performing middle schools.









MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🔴 Red
- No Grade

School Type

-) District: Neighborhood
- District: Magnet/Selective
- △ EAA

Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

Charter



The Service Level (Grades 6-8).

The highest-need neighborhoods are the sections of the city in which the most students cannot access a performing school, but they are not the only places in which a substantial share of students need better public schools. For this reason, the service level – the proportion of children in a neighborhood who could access a Greenor Lime-rated school – is helpful context alongside the service gap. Geographically, the service level in middle schools exhibits similar patterns as in elementary school. There were, however, slightly higher service levels on the East Side for middle school than for elementary school. The center of the city was better-served by the middle school system than the East and West Sides. The West Side was a neardesert of performing middle schools.

> SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE





Service Level



MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🔴 Red
- No Grade

School Type

- O District: Neighborhood
- Oistrict: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

Need	Rank	Neighborhood	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K–12 Gap
		Cerveny / Grandmont	909	77	832	8%	24%
		Finney	786	65	721	8%	24%
		Chadsey	943	257	685	27%	23%
	4	Mackenzie	714	91	623	13%	26%
	5	Evergreen	616	26	590	4%	23%
High Need	6	Harmony Village	618	58	560	9%	23%
	7	Mt. Olivet	720	182	538	25%	26%
	8	Greenfield	561	29	531	5%	24%
	9	Brooks	578	93	485	16%	24%
	10	Rouge	542	83	460	15%	26%
	11	Rosa Parks	600	160	440	27%	27%
	12	Vernor / Junction	616	185	431	30%	15%
	13	Rosedale	401	26	376	6%	25%
	14	Davison	610	253	357	41%	26%
	15	Conner	476	128	348	27%	20%
Mid-High Need	16	Durfee	460	114	346	25%	23%
	17	Lower Woodward	491	147	344	30%	24%
	18	Redford	346	15	331	4%	21%
	19	Lower East Central	417	89	328	21%	23%
	20	Brightmoor	341	22	319	6%	24%
		Kettering	421	103	318	24%	19%
	22	Cody	356	45		13%	24%
	23	Bagley	344	35	309	10%	18%
	24	Pembroke	319	28		9%	20%
	25	Tireman	398	116	282	29%	26%
Moderate Need	26	Denby	302	46	256	15%	14%
	27	Middle East Central	351	96	254	27%	27%
	28	Middle Woodward	486	241	244	50%	26%
	29	Grant	353	116	237	33%	26%
	30	Winterhalter	285	55	229	19%	22%
		Jeffries	306		203	34%	21%
				105		35%	20%
				144	178	45%	23%
	34	Butzel			172	22%	19%
Mid Low Need		Burbank		58	171	25%	9%
What Low Need	36	Condon	246	86	160	35%	16%
	37	McNichols	179	36	144	20%	24%
		Pershing		182	141	56%	20%
	39	St. Jean	198	64	134	32%	24%
	40	Chandler Park	144	33	111	23%	20%
	41	Palmer Park	127	20	107	16%	17%
	42	Foch	138	37	100	27%	18%
	43	East Riverside	124	31	93	25%	19%
	44	Indian Village	81	15	66	18%	26%
	45	Jefferson / Mack	73	21	52	28%	17%
	46	Hubbard Richard	70	21	49	29%	14%
Low Need	47	Springwells	341	296	45	87%	2%
	48	West Riverfront	69	32	37	46%	9%
	49	State Fair	56	22	34	39%	17%
	50	Central Business District	45	12	33	28%	23%
	51	Boynton	96	66	30	69%	8%
	52	Corktown	31	11	20	34%	17%
	53	Near East Riverfront	20	4	16	20%	29%
	54	Upper East Central		3			19%

Table 6: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)



Chart Reading Tips

- Building conditions are divided into four ratings. These ratings are the result of weighting and aggregating the results of a detailed survey of conditions in each school building. They allow for one-to-one comparison of schools of varying sizes and grade spans. These ratings are relative to the other buildings surveyed. The thick horizontal reference line in the chart divides the schools in relatively better condition from the schools in relatively worse condition.
- The percentage of accountability points earned is the primary determinant of the accountability rating that each school received in 2015-16. Schools that received at least seventy percent of their total possible points

 represented by the thick vertical reference line in the chart were eligible for a rating of Lime, but their rating could be lowered based on a series of further audits, e.g. for achievement gaps among student subgroups or compliance issues. Schools earning less than fifty percent of their overall points received ratings of Red.

HIGH SCHOOL (GRADES 9-12)

The Service Gap (Grades 9-12).

In 2015-16, there were forty-six general education public (district or charter) high schools in Detroit. Of these, nine were performing (Green- or Lime-rated). The performing schools offered over six thousand general education slots to students. With more than twenty-two thousand students enrolled, however, nearly sixteen thousand high schoolers lacked access to a performing school. Overall, **seven out of every ten children enrolled in public high schools in Detroit could not access a seat in a performing school**. At the high school (9-12) level, the highest-need neighborhoods – the parts of Detroit in which the most students lacked access to a performing public school – appeared in the same three main clusters as the overall highest-need areas: one on the East Side, one on the West Side, and one on the Southwest Side. The number of neighborhoods in the West Side cluster, however, was lower, and additional neighborhoods in the other two cluster appeared that were not high-need at the elementary or middle school levels. Focusing on these three clusters will yield a disproportionate impact on the lack of access to performing high schools.



Chart 13: Performance of High Schools (Grades 9-12)





Service Gap (Ranked)



MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- Red
- No Grade

School Type

- District: Neighborhood
- District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter

Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.



The Service Level (Grades 9-12).

The highest-need neighborhoods are the sections of the city in which the most students cannot access a performing school, but they are not the only places in which a substantial share of students need better public schools. For this reason, the service level – the proportion of children in a neighborhood who could access a Greenor Lime-rated school – is helpful context alongside the service gap. Compared to elementary and middle school, patterns in access to performing schools shifted at the high school level. The areas with the most diminished access were clustered in the southern portion of the city. The service level across the board, but on the West Side in particular, was higher at the high school level than at the elementary or middle school levels.

> SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE



Map 10: Service Level, High Schools (Grades 9-12)

Service Level



MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🕨 Red

۲

No Grade

School Type

- District: Neighborhood
- > District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- Charter



Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.

Need	Rank	Neighborhood	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K–12 Gap
		Vernor / Junction	923	197	726	21%	25%
		Chadsey	969	286	683	29%	23%
		Denby	791	144	648	18%	34%
	4	Springwells	803	174	629	22%	34%
	5	Burbank	768	139	629	18%	34%
High Need	6	Cerveny / Grandmont	835	246	588	30%	17%
	7	Evergreen	766	271	494	35%	19%
	8	Harmony Village	668	189	479	28%	19%
	9	Finney	644	169	475	26%	16%
	10	Bagley	573	116	458	20%	26%
	11	Pembroke	570	114	457	20%	21%
	10		570	172	437	2070	21/0
	12	Creenfold	620 - ² /	1/3	44/	2070	31%
	13	Greenneid	584	154	430	26%	19%
	14	Viattoring	030	21/	421	3470	1/%
Mid-High Need	15	Kettering	510	96	414	19%	25%
	16	Conner	550	142	409	26%	23%
	17	Lower East Central	492	95	397	19%	28%
	18	Brooks	568	194	374	34%	18%
	19	Condon	487	114	372	24%	37%
	20	Butzel	433	70	362	16%	39%
	21	Rouge	508	168	340	33%	19%
	22	Durfee	527	202	325	38%	22%
	23	Davison	419	130	289	31%	21%
	24	Nolan	382	112	270	29%	29%
Moderate Need	25	Middle East Central	371	102	269	27%	29%
	26	Rosedale	396	128	268	32%	18%
	27	Pershing	408	141	267	35%	38%
	28	Mt. Olivet	427	160	267	38%	13%
	29	Winterhalter	356	108	248	30%	24%
	30	Boynton	301	55	247	18%	63%
	31	Redford	413	172	241	42%	15%
	32	Cody	336	113	223	34%	17%
	33	Rosa Parks	477	257		54%	13%
	34	Foch	228	38	190	17%	35%
Mid-Low Need	35	McNichols	258	76	182	30%	30%
	36	East Riverside	217	37	180	17%	38%
	37	Brightmoor	272	94	179	34%	14%
		Tireman	308	137	171	45%	16%
	39	Middle Woodward	361	191	171	53%	18%
	40	Palmer Park	217	46	170	21%	28%
	41	Chandler Park	206	56	151	27%	26%
	42	Jefferson / Mack	166	27	139	16%	46%
	43	Jeffries	256	129	127	50%	13%
	44	Airport	204	79	125	39%	17%
	45	Grant	190	77	113	41%	12%
	46	St. Jean	160	48	112	30%	20%
Low Need	47	West Riverfront	131	25	106	19%	27%
	48	Indian Village	124	19	105	15%	42%
	49	State Fair	118	33	85	28%	41%
	50	Hubbard Richard	101	20	81	20%	23%
	51	Central Business District	95	20	75	21%	53%
	52	Corktown	60	13	47	22%	38%
	53	Near East Riverfront	19	4	15	19%	27%
		Upper East Central	7	4		53%	25%

Table 7: Supply and Demand by Neighborhood, High Schools (Grades 9-12)



Chart Reading Tips

- Building conditions are divided into four ratings. These ratings are the result of weighting and aggregating the results of a detailed survey of conditions in each school building. They allow for one-to-one comparison of schools of varying sizes and grade spans. These ratings are relative to the other buildings surveyed. The thick horizontal reference line in the chart divides the schools in relatively better condition from the schools in relatively worse condition.
- The percentage of accountability points earned is the primary determinant of the accountability rating that each school received in 2015-16. Schools that received at least seventy percent of their total possible points

 represented by the thick vertical reference line in the chart were eligible for a rating of Lime, but their rating could be lowered based on a series of further audits, e.g. for achievement gaps among student subgroups or compliance issues. Schools earning less than fifty percent of their overall points received ratings of Red.

Root school improvement in place-based strategy.

- Calibrate school improvement efforts and rightsizing strategies to demand for and supply of performing schools and the conditions of academic facilities at the local level.
- Develop strategies for the highest-need neighborhoods, where the most children lack access to performing public schools, to have the greatest impact on the service gap.

East Side	West Side	Southwest Side
Finney (#3)	Cerveny/	Chadsey (#2)
Mt. Olivet (#10)	Grandmont (#1)	Vernor/
	Evergreen (#5)	Junction (#4)
	Harmony Village (#6)	
	Mackenzie (#7)	
	Greenfield (#8)	
	Brooks (#9)	

- Through ongoing community engagement and transparent decision-making, lay the groundwork for an adaptive reuse strategy for former public school buildings that is driven by communities' needs at the local level:
 - Coordinate rightsizing and adaptive reuse with community and neighborhood planning;
 - Assess need for services and amenities that former school buildings could house;
 - Identify partners and strategies to repurpose buildings that will increase quality of life for existing residents as part of the process of rightsizing.

Coordinate strategic planning for K-12 public education in Detroit within and across school governing bodies.

- Identify areas of policy and practice that can save costs or otherwise provide mutual benefits as initial points of collaboration across school governing bodies. Where possible, codify and institutionalize collaboration.
- Avoid redundancies and cross purposes by coordinating school location decisions across governing bodies.
- Collaborate within and across governing bodies to replicate, expand, and diffuse best practices that have emerged in performing schools and to intervene in underperforming schools.
- Integrate data across governing bodies. Ensure that all public data is available in the same databases for district and charter schools to allow for side-by-side comparisons and comprehensive citywide research on K-12 education.

Base school improvement on transparent, meaningful, and consistent performance indicators.

- Strengthen the school accountability system in Michigan. Implement academically rigorous summative ratings that allow for differentiated strategy and needs assessments. Keep this system in place year over year to allow for meaningful comparisons over time.
- Intervene in all underperforming schools. Prioritize consistently underperforming schools for potential turnaround, reconstitution, or closure. Do not renew the charters of underperforming charter schools.
- Continue integrating national best practices and performance-based standards for quality charter school authorizing.

Efficiently allocate facilities resources so that real estate portfolios are commensurate with student enrollment.

- Secure public and/or philanthropic funding to conduct a detailed review of all open and closed school buildings currently in the portfolios of Detroit Public Schools Community District or any charter operator. Develop precise estimates for the future costs associated with restoring or maintaining safe learning and working environments in each school building.
- Create manageable enrollment and expansion strategies for performing schools in underutilized buildings to maximize the use of space and to increase access to highquality academic programs.
- Identify potential colocation partners in underutilized, quality school buildings that house performing schools.

APPENDIX A: SUPPLY AND DEMAND BY NEIGHBORHOOD

			A	LL GRA	DES (K-1	2)	ELEMENTARY (GRADES K-5)						
Need	Overall Rank	Neighborhood	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Rank	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K–12 Gap	
		Cerveny / Grandmont	3,888	466	3,422	12%		2,145	143	2,002	7%	59%	
	2	Chadsey	3,709	697	3,012	19%	4	1,798	154	1,644	9%	55%	
	3	Finney	3,375	321	3,055	10%	2	1,945	87	1,858	4%	61%	
b	4	Vernor / Junction	3,406	496	2,910	15%	3	1,867	115	1,752	6%	60%	
Ne	5	Evergreen	2,956	342	2,614	12%	5	1,574	44	1,530	3%	59%	
gh	6	Harmony Village	2,833	371	2,462	13%	6	1,547	125	1,422	8%	58%	
Ϊ	7	Mackenzie	2,901	467	2,435	16%	7	1,549	158	1,391	10%	57%	
	8	Greenfield	2,487	247	2,240	10%	8	1,343	64	1,279	5%	57%	
	9	Brooks	2,511	452	2,059	18%	10	1,365	165	1,200	12%	58%	
	10	Mt. Olivet	2,631	552	2,078	21%	9	1,484	210	1,274	14%	61%	
	11	Denby	2,131	243	1,888	11%	16	1,038	54	984	5%	52%	
	12	Conner	2,167	413	1,754	19%	14	1,141	144	997	13%	57%	
-	13	Rouge	2,138	382	1,755	18%	18	1,087	131	956	12%	54%	
leed	14	Bagley	1,953	218	1,734	11%	17	1,036	67	968	7%	56%	
Ч Ч	15	Burbank	2,124	254	1,870	12%	12	1,127	57	1,070	5%	57%	
His	16	Kettering	1,986	325	1,660	16%	19	1,055	127	928	12%	56%	
۱id-	17	Lower Woodward	1,928	493	1,436	26%	27	818	172	645	21%	45%	
2	18	Rosa Parks	2,175	526	1,649	24%	15	1,099	109	990	10%	60%	
	19	Rosedale	1,727	197	1,530	11%	20	930	43	887	5%	58%	
	20	Pembroke	1,668	195	1,473	12%	24	779	53	726	7%	49%	
	21	Durfee	1,888	416	1,471	22%	22	901	100	801	11%	54%	
	22	Springwells	2,525	700	1,825	28%	11	1,381	230	1,151	17%	63%	
	23	Redford	1,781	204	1,577	11%	13	1,021	17	1,005	2%	64%	
eed	24	Lower East Central	1,875	451	1,424	24%	26	965	267	698	28%	49%	
e Z	25	Davison	1,889	536	1,353	28%	25	860	154	706	18%	52%	
erat	26	Cody	1,513	226	1,287	15%	23	821	68	753	8%	58%	
lode	27	Brightmoor	1,467	151	1,316	10%	21	854	36	818	4%	62%	
Σ	28	Middle East Central	1,269	339	930	27%	36	547	141	406	26%	44%	
	29	Condon	1,255	245	1,010	20%	34	523	44	478	8%	47%	
	30	Nolan	1,270	324	947	25%	33	591	107	484	18%	51%	

	M	IDDLE (G	RADES 6	5-8)		HIGH SCHOOL (GRADES 9-12)							
Rank	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K−12 Gap	Rank	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K−12 Gap		
	909	77	832	8%	24%	6	835	246	588	30%	17%		
3	943	257	685	27%	23%	2	969	286	683	29%	23%		
2	786	65	721	8%	24%	9	644	169	475	26%	16%		
12	616	185	431	30%	15%		923	197	726	21%	25%		
5	616	26	590	4%	23%	7	766	271	494	35%	19%		
6	618	58	560	9%	23%	8	668	189	479	28%	19%		
4	714	91	623	13%	26%	14	638	217	421	34%	17%		
8	561	29	531	5%	24%	13	584	154	430	26%	19%		
9	578	93	485	16%	24%	18	568	194	374	34%	18%		
7	720	182	538	25%	26%	27	427	160	267	38%	13%		
26	302	46	256	15%	14%	3	791	144	648	18%	34%		
15	476	128	348	27%	20%	16	550	142	409	26%	23%		
10	542	83	460	15%	26%	21	508	168	340	33%	19%		
23	344	35	309	10%	18%	10	573	116	458	20%	26%		
35	229	58	171	25%	9%	4	768	139	629	18%	34%		
21	421	103	318	24%	19%	15	510	96	414	19%	25%		
17	491	147	344	30%	24%	12	620	173	447	28%	31%		
11	600	160	440	27%	27%	33	477	257	220	54%	13%		
13	401	26	376	6%	25%	26	396	128	268	32%	18%		
24	319	28	291	9%	20%	11	570	114	457	20%	31%		
16	460	114	346	25%	23%	22	527	202	325	38%	22%		
47	341	296	45	87%	2%	4	803	174	629	22%	34%		
18	346	15	331	4%	21%	31	413	172	241	42%	15%		
19	417	89	328	21%	23%	17	492	95	397	19%	28%		
14	610	253	357	41%	26%	23	419	130	289	31%	21%		
22	356	45	311	13%	24%	32	336	113	223	34%	17%		
20	341	22	319	6%	24%	37	272	94	179	34%	14%		
27	351	96	254	27%	27%	25	371	102	269	27%	29%		
36	246	86	160	35%	16%	19	487	114	372	24%	37%		
32	298	105	193	35%	20%	24	382	112	270	29%	29%		

			A	LL GRA	DES (K-1	2)	ELEMENTARY (GRADES K-5)						
Need	Overall Rank	Neighborhood	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Rank	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K—12 Gap	
	31	Winterhalter	1,266	234	1,032	18%	31	626	71	555	11%	54%	
	32	Butzel	1,125	198	927	18%	37	471	78	393	17%	42%	
σ	33	Tireman	1,395	323	1,072	23%	29	689	70	619	10%	58%	
Vee	34	Middle Woodward	1,654	706	948	43%	32	807	274	533	34%	56%	
Ň	35	Jeffries	1,285	313	972	24%		723	81	642	11%	66%	
J-Lo		Grant	1,223	310	913	25%	30	681	117	564	17%	62%	
Mic	37	Pershing	1,192	489	703	41%	41	461	165	296	36%	42%	
	38	Airport	1,108	348	760	31%	35	582	125	457	21%	60%	
	39	McNichols	763	155	608	20%	42	325	43	283	13%	46%	
	40	Palmer Park	719	101	618	14%	38	376	34	341	9%	55%	
	41	Foch	691	149	542	22%	44	326	73	252	22%	47%	
	42	Chandler Park	711	142	569	20%	40	361	54	307	15%	54%	
	43	St. Jean	763	195	568	26%	39	406	84	322	21%	57%	
	44	East Riverside	599	119	480	20%	46	258	51	207	20%	43%	
	45	Boynton	587	198	389	34%	47	190	77	113	40%	29%	
g	46	Jefferson / Mack	382	79	302	21%	48	143	32	111	22%	37%	
Nee	47	West Riverfront	479	82	397	17%	43	278	25	253	9%	64%	
ž	48	Hubbard Richard	413	61	352	15%	45	243	21	222	9%	63%	
Ľ	49	Indian Village	304	53	251	17%	50	100	19	80	19%	32%	
	50	State Fair	293	87	206	30%	49	120	32	87	27%	42%	
	51	Central Business District	196	54	142	28%	52	56	22	34	39%	24%	
	52	Corktown	154	31	123	20%	51	63	7	56	11%	46%	
	53	Near East Riverfront	82	25	57	30%	53	42	17	25	40%	44%	
	54	Upper East Central	23	11	12	47%	54	11	4	7	37%	56%	

	M	IDDLE (G	RADES	5-8)		HIGH SCHOOL (GRADES 9-12)							
Rank	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	Percent of K–12 Gap	Rank	Demand	Supply	Service Cap	Service Level	Percent of K−ı2 Gap		
30	285	55	229	19%	22%	29	356	108	248	30%	24%		
34	221	49	172	22%	19%	20	433	70	362	16%	39%		
25	398	116	282	29%	26%	38	308	137	171	45%	16%		
28	486	241	244	50%	26%	38	361	191	171	53%	18%		
31	306	103	203	34%	21%	43	256	129	127	50%	13%		
29	353	116	237	33%	26%	45	190	77	113	41%	12%		
38	323	182	141	56%	20%	27	408	141	267	35%	38%		
33	322	144	178	45%	23%	44	204	79	125	39%	17%		
37	179		144	20%	24%	35	258	76	182	30%	30%		
41	127	20	107	16%	17%	40	217	46	170	21%	28%		
42	138	37	100	27%	18%	34	228	38	190	17%	35%		
40	144	33	111	23%	20%	41	206	56	151	27%	26%		
39	198	64	134	32%	24%	46	160	48	112	30%	20%		
43	124	31	93	25%	19%	36	217	37	180	17%	38%		
51	96	66	30	69%	8%	30	301	55	247	18%	63%		
45	73	21	52	28%	17%	42	166	27	139	16%	46%		
48	69	32	37	46%	9%	47	131	25	106	19%	27%		
46	70	21	49	29%	14%	50	101	20	81	20%	23%		
44	81	15	66	18%	26%	48	124	19	105	15%	42%		
49	56	22	34	39%	17%	49	118	33	85	28%	41%		
50	45	12	33	28%	23%	51	95	20	75	21%	53%		
52	31	11	20	34%	17%	52	60	13	47	22%	38%		
53	20	4	16	20%	29%	53	19	4	15	19%	27%		
54	6	3	2	59%	19%	54	7	4	3	53%	25%		

APPENDIX B: PROFILES OF HIGHEST-NEED NEIGHBORHOODS

CERVENY GRANDMONT (Highest-Need Neighborhood #1)



- **MDE Accountability Rating**
- Green
- Lime
- Yellow Orange
- Red No Grade



- District: Magnet/Selective \Diamond
 - EAA
- \triangle Charter



High Need (1 - 10) Mid-High Need (11 - 20) Moderate Need (21 - 30) Mid-Low Need (31 - 40) Low Need (41 - 54)

Best



1³

15

	GENERAL INFORMATION												
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment							
1	Burns Elementary-Middle School	EAA			K-8	468							
2	Coleman A. Young Elementary	District: Neighborhood			K-5	336							
3	Communication and Media Arts High School	District: Magnet/Selective			9-12	602							
4	Cooke Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			К-6	259							
5	David Ellis Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Bardwell Group	K-8	364							
6	Detroit Achievement Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Self-managed	K-3	94							
7	Detroit Innovation Academy	Charter	Central Michigan University	EQUITY Education	K-8	341							
8	Dossin Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			К-8	366							
9	Edison Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	268							
10	Foreign Language Immersion & Cultural Studies	District: Magnet/Selective			K-8	697							
11	John R. King Academic & Performing Arts Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-8	837							
12	Lincoln-King Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Cornerstone Charter Schools	K-8	577							
13	Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Self-managed	K-8	401							
14	Old Redford Academy - High	Charter	Central Michigan University	Innovative Teaching Solutions	9-12	728							
15	Renaissance High School	District: Magnet/Selective			9-12	1,154							
16	Rutherford Winans Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Solid Rock Management Co.	K-5	210							
17	University YES Academy	Charter	Bay Mills Community College	New Paradigm for Education	K-11	911							

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	1	3	2,145	143	2,002	7%	5%
Middle (6-8)	1	2	909	77	832	8%	6%
High School (9-12)	6	2	835	246	588	30%	4%
Overall (K-12)	1	5*	3,888	466	3,422	12%	5%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

3%









FACILITIES			PERFORMANCE		DEMOGRAPHICS							NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS 🔅	
46,000	65%	Worst	37%	Red	High Poverty	90%	0%	5%	100%	0%	0%	Moderate	
67,800	47%	Better	42%	Red	High Poverty	76%	0%	13%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger	
79,450	79%	Worse	81%	Lime	Mid-High Poverty	63%	0%	3%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
45,184	62%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	75%	0%	14%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
27,000		Worse	53%	Orange	High Poverty	88%	0%	8%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
22,000		Worse	100%	Green	High Poverty	95%	0%	0%	98%	0%	1%	Strongest	
			63%	Yellow	High Poverty	97%	0%	11%	100%	0%	0%	Stronger	
48,808	75%	Better	45%	Red	High Poverty	81%	0%	15%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
42,533	56%	Better	33%	Red	High Poverty	79%	0%	15%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
92,010	67%	Better	79%	Lime	Mid-Low Poverty	41%	0%	4%	98%	1%	0%	Strongest	
133,580	63%	Better	43%	Red	High Poverty	79%	0%	18%	98%	1%	0%	Stronger	
86,900		Worse	81%	Yellow	High Poverty	94%	0%	9%	93%	1%	1%	Strongest	
30,180		Best	79%	Lime	Mid-High Poverty	72%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
75,000		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	88%	0%	9%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate	
295,523	99%	Best	86%	Lime	Mid-Low Poverty	42%	0%	1%	99%	1%	1%	Strongest	
			67%	Yellow	High Poverty	92%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	Stronger	
			74%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	74%	0%	12%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	

* This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



CHADSEY (Highest-Need Neighborhood #2)

			GENERAL INFORMATIO	N			
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment	
1	Academy of the Americas	District: Magnet/Selective			К-10	803	
2	Bennett Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	443	
3	Blanche Kelso Bruce Academy - West (Cecil Site)	Charter	Wayne RESA		5-8	25	
4	Cesar Chavez Academy Intermediate	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Leona Group	3-5	434	
5	Cesar Chavez High School	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Leona Group	9-12	725	
6	Cesar Chavez Middle School	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Leona Group	6-8	585	
7	Escuela Avancemos	Charter	DPSCD	Sanga Consulting, Inc.	K-5	274	
8	Harms Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	410	
9	Hope of Detroit Academy	Charter	Ferris State University	Leona Group	K-8	570	
10	Munger Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	889	
11	Neinas Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-6	258	
12	Priest Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	657	
13	Roberto Clemente Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-5	718	
14	Southwest Detroit Lighthouse Charter Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	EAS Schools	K-7	426	
15	Universal Academy	Charter	Oakland University	Hamadeh Educational Services	K-12	732	
16	Voyageur Academy	Charter	Ferris State University	American Promise Schools	K-8	617	
17	Voyageur Consortium High School	Charter	Ferris State University	American Promise Schools	9-12	428	

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	4	1	1,798	154	1,644	9%	5%
Middle (6-8)	3	2	943	257	685	27%	5%
High School (9-12)	2	1	969	286	683	29%	3%
Overall (K-12)	2	3*	3,709	697	3,012	19%	4%

12%

18%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

14%





or reduced-price meals English less than very well

eak Children who have changed ry well residence in the past year



78%



	FACILITIES		PERFORI	MANCE			DEMC	GRAPH	ICS			NEIGHBORHOOD
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS 🔅
97,929	78%	Worst	60%	Yellow	Mid-Low Poverty	38%	86%	10%	3%	95%	1%	Stronger
67,144	64%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	87%	70%	7%	4%	85%	10%	Strongest
			30%	Red	High Poverty	100%			96%	4%	0%	Stronger
39,500		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	100%	80%	13%	3%	92%	5%	Strongest
40,000		Better	85%	Red	High Poverty	94%	51%	9%	5%	91%	4%	Strongest
40,403		Best	84%	Lime	High Poverty	97%	60%	10%	2%	92%	5%	Stronger
32,117		Worst	71%	Red	High Poverty	99%	72%	4%	6%	87%	7%	Strongest
44,933	60%	Better	74%	Yellow	High Poverty	94%	69%	7%	5%	86%	7%	Strongest
			84%	Lime	High Poverty	95%	72%	12%	7%	92%	1%	Moderate
111,090	84%	Best	63%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	60%	65%	10%	14%	73%	12%	Stronger
52,771	52%	Worse	63%	Red	High Poverty	87%	57%	22%	9%	76%	11%	Strongest
117,502	57%	Worse	73%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	63%	62%	11%	19%	60%	20%	Stronger
86,000	83%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	96%	67%	10%	3%	88%	8%	Stronger
			78%	Yellow	High Poverty	82%	46%	9%	31%	63%	6%	Weaker
58,000		Best	69%	Yellow	High Poverty	100%	64%	4%	2%	3%	94%	Stronger
25,300		Worse	82%	Red	High Poverty	82%	2%	6%	70%	24%	6%	Moderate
101,900		Best	81%	Lime	High Poverty	91%		14%	86%	11%	3%	Moderate

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



🛆 EAA

Charter

FINNEY (Highest-Need Neighborhood #3)



Mid-High Need (11 - 20)

Moderate Need (21 - 30)

Mid-Low Need (31 - 40)

Low Need (41 - 54)



	GENERAL INFORMATION											
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment						
1	Carleton Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	307						
2	Detroit Merit Charter Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	National Heritage Academies	K-8	737						
3	East English Village Preparatory Academy	District: Neighborhood			9-12	1,613						
4	Eman Hamilton Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Educational Partnerships, Inc.	K-8	254						
5	J.E. Clark Preparatory Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-8	661						
6	Marquette Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			К-8	589						
7	Marvin L. Winans Academy of Performing Arts	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Solid Rock Management Co.	K-5	437						
8	Ronald Brown Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-6	629						
9	Wayne Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	283						

Yellow

Orange

Red No Grade

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	2	0	1,945	87	1,858	4%	5%
Middle (6-8)	2	0	786	65	721	8%	5%
High School (9-12)	9	0	644	169	475	26%	3%
Overall (K-12)	2	o*	3,375	321	3,055	10%	4%

20%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.







	12%			Citywi
	1370			Finne
A	dults witl bachelor	h at least 's degree	ta e	
		0		

15%

FACILITIES			PERFORM	MANCE	DEMOGRAPHICS						NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS ‡
52,134	48%	Worst	50%	Orange	High Poverty	91%		13%	98%	0%	1%	Strongest
46,462		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	91%		9%	97%	0%	1%	Weakest
221,000	115%	Best	46%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	73%		25%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger
51,373		Worst	42%	Red	High Poverty	89%		11%	100%	0%	0%	Stronger
56,852	84%	Worst	48%	Red	High Poverty	78%		15%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger
92,618	48%	Worse	29%	Red	High Poverty	81%		18%	99%	0%	1%	Strongest
			63%	Yellow	High Poverty	86%			100%	0%	0%	Moderate
122,415	54%	Better	48%	Red	High Poverty	76%		17%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger
43,470	47%	Worse	40%	Red	High Poverty	83%		20%	100%	0%	0%	Stronger

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



VERNOR JUNCTION (Highest-Need Neighborhood #4)

			GENERAL INFORMAT	ION			
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment	
1	Academy of the Americas	District: Magnet/Selective			K-10	803	
2	Bennett Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	443	
3	Cesar Chavez Academy Intermediate	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Leona Group	3-5	434	
4	Cesar Chavez High School	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Leona Group	9-12	725	
5	Cesar Chavez Middle School	Charter	Saginaw Valley State University	Leona Group	6-8	585	
6	Clippert Academy	District: Magnet/Selective			5-8	514	
7	Earhart Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			К-8	670	
8	Escuela Avancemos	Charter	DPSCD	Sanga Consulting, Inc.	K-5	274	
9	Harms Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	410	
10	Hope of Detroit Academy	Charter	Ferris State University	Leona Group	K-8	570	
11	Maybury Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	338	
12	Neinas Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-6	258	
13	Phoenix Elementary-Middle School †	EAA			K-9	196	
14	Roberto Clemente Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-5	718	
15	Southwest Detroit Lighthouse Charter Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	EAS Schools	K-7	426	
16	Voyageur Academy	Charter	Ferris State University	American Promise Schools	K-8	617	
17	Voyageur Consortium High School	Charter	Ferris State University	American Promise Schools	9-12	428	
18	Western International High School	District: Neighborhood			9-12	1,778	

† Closed after academic year 2015-16.

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	3	3	1,867	115	1,752	6%	5%
Middle (6-8)	12	4	616	185	431	30%	3%
High School (9-12)	1	2	923	197	726	21%	5%
Overall (K-12)	4	5*	3,406	496	2,910	15%	4%

78%

52%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

20%







12%



Vernor Junctior

64

l	FACILITIES		PERFOR	MANCE			DEMC	GRAPH	ICS			NEIGHBORHOOD
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS 🔅
97,929	78%	Worst	60%	Yellow	Mid-Low Poverty	38%	86%	10%	3%	95%	1%	Stronger
67,144	64%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	87%	70%	7%	4%	85%	10%	Strongest
39,500		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	100%	80%	13%	3%	92%	5%	Strongest
40,000		Better	85%	Red	High Poverty	94%	51%	9%	5%	91%	4%	Strongest
40,403		Best	84%	Lime	High Poverty	97%	60%	10%	2%	92%	5%	Stronger
46,194	82%	Worse	83%	Lime	High Poverty	89%	70%	3%	3%	93%	4%	Strongest
111,090	63%	Best	81%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	70%	53%	17%	21%	70%	9%	Strongest
32,117		Worst	71%	Red	High Poverty	99%	72%	4%	6%	87%	7%	Strongest
44,933	60%	Better	74%	Yellow	High Poverty	94%	69%	7%	5%	86%	7%	Strongest
			84%	Lime	High Poverty	95%	72%	12%	7%	92%	1%	Moderate
45,322	62%	Worse	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	85%	69%	9%	13%	81%	6%	Strongest
52,771	52%	Worse	63%	Red	High Poverty	87%	57%	22%	9%	76%	11%	Strongest
	22%		75%	Lime	High Poverty	82%	41%	9%	15%	60%	22%	Stronger
86,000	83%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	96%	67%	10%	3%	88%	8%	Stronger
			78%	Yellow	High Poverty	82%	46%	9%	31%	63%	6%	Weaker
25,300		Worse	82%	Red	High Poverty	82%	2%	6%	70%	24%	6%	Moderate
101,900		Best	81%	Lime	High Poverty	91%		14%	86%	11%	3%	Moderate
299,630	75%	Better	74%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	54%	56%	11%	21%	72%	6%	Strongest

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



EVERGREEN (Highest-Need Neighborhood #5)



 • • •
High Need (1 - 10)
Mid-High Need (11 - 20)
Moderate Need (21 - 30)
Mid-Low Need (31 - 40)
Low Need (41 - 54)



	General Information										
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment					
1	Charles Wright Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-4	473					
2	Cooke Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-6	259					
3	Cornerstone Health School	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Cornerstone Charter Schools	9-12	426					
4	Detroit Service Learning Academy	Charter	Lake Superior State University	Self-managed	K-8	923					
5	Emerson Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	596					
6	Ford High School	EAA			9-12	435					
7	Ludington Magnet Middle School	District: Magnet/Selective			5-8	336					
8	Madison-Carver Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Cornerstone Charter Schools	K-8	507					
9	Michigan Technical Academy Elementary	Charter	Central Michigan University		K-4	493					
10	Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse of Detroit †	Charter	Central Michigan University		K-8	142					
11	Old Redford Academy - Elementary	Charter	Central Michigan University	Innovative Teaching Solutions	K-5	718					
12	Old Redford Academy - High	Charter	Central Michigan University	Innovative Teaching Solutions	9-12	728					
13	Old Redford Academy - Middle	Charter	Central Michigan University	Innovative Teaching Solutions	6-8	369					
14	Rutherford Winans Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Solid Rock Management Company	K-5	210					
15	Weston Preparatory Academy	Charter	Oakland University	CS Partners	K-8	312					

† Closed after academic year 2015-16.

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	5	0	1,574	44	1,530	3%	4%
Middle (6-8)	5	0	616	26	590	4%	4%
High School (9-12)	7	1	766	271	494	35%	3%
Overall (K-12)	5	1*	2,956	342	2,614	12%	4%

24%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

3%









FACILITIES			PERFORMANCE		DEMOGRAPHICS							NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS 🔅	
94,991	64%	Better	71%	Yellow	High Poverty	87%		15%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
45,184	62%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	75%		14%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
52,721		Better	76%	Lime	High Poverty	84%		10%	94%	1%	0%	Strongest	
87,575		Better	52%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	73%		11%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate	
82,203	38%	Worse	48%	Red	High Poverty	90%		12%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
150,000	23%	Better	81%	Red	High Poverty	84%		18%	98%	0%	0%	Strongest	
95,591	30%	Better	76%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	70%		21%	98%	1%	1%	Strongest	
77,130		Better	62%	Yellow	High Poverty	86%		8%	93%	1%	0%	Strongest	
			57%	Orange	High Poverty	87%		7%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
			73%	Yellow	High Poverty	100%		14%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
57,674		Better	63%	Yellow	High Poverty	91%		6%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger	
75,000		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	88%		9%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate	
36,360		Best	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	88%		11%	99%	0%	1%	Stronger	
			67%	Yellow	High Poverty	92%			100%	0%	0%	Stronger	
32,000		Worse	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	77%		14%	97%	2%	1%	Strongest	

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



HARMONY VILLAGE (Highest-Need Neighborhood #6)

MDE Accountability Rating

Green

- Lime
- Yellow Orange
- Red
- No Grade



- District: Neighborhood
- District: Magnet/Selective
- 🛆 EAA
- □ Charter



High Need (1 - 10) Mid-High Need (11 - 20) Moderate Need (21 - 30) Mid-Low Need (31 - 40) Low Need (41 - 54)



	GENERAL INFORMATION										
	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment					
1	Bagley Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-6	347					
2	Burns Elementary-Middle School	EAA			K-8	468					
3	Coleman A. Young Elementary	District: Neighborhood			K-5	336					
4	David Ellis Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Bardwell Group	K-8	364					
5	Flagship Charter Academy	Charter	Central Michigan University	National Heritage Academies	K-8	716					
6	Foreign Language Immersion & Cultural Studies	District: Magnet/Selective			K-8	697					
7	John R. King Academic & Performing Arts Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-8	837					
8	Joy Preparatory Academy	Charter	Ferris State University	Leona Group	3-8	137					
9	Lincoln-King Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Cornerstone Charter Schools	K-8	577					
10	Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Self-managed	K-8	401					
11	Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary-Middle School	EAA			K-8	532					
12	Mumford High School	EAA			9-12	742					
13	Noble Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	491					
14	Palmer Park Preparatory Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-8	482					
15	Paul Robeson, Malcolm X Academy	District: Magnet/Selective			K-8	370					
16	Renaissance High School	District: Magnet/Selective			9-12	1,154					
17	Schulze Academy for Technology and Arts	District: Neighborhood			К-6	492					
18	Thurgood Marshall Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	540					
19	University YES Academy	Charter	Bay Mills Community College	New Paradigm for Education	K-11	911					

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	4	3	1,547	125	1,422	8%	4%
Middle (6-8)	6	3	618	58	560	9%	4%
High School (9-12)	8	1	668	189	479	28%	3%
Overall (K-12)	6	4 ^{**}	2,833	371	2,462	13%	4%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

3%



or reduced-price meals







79%



FACILITIES			PERFORMANCE		DEMOGRAPHICS							NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS 🔅	
54,317	58%	Worst	39%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	74%		14%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
46,000	65%	Worst	37%	Red	High Poverty	90%		5%	100%	0%	0%	Moderate	
67,800	47%	Better	42%	Red	High Poverty	76%		13%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger	
27,000		Worse	53%	Orange	High Poverty	88%		8%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
43,951		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	96%		9%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate	
92,010	67%	Better	79%	Lime	Mid-Low Poverty	41%		4%	98%	1%	0%	Strongest	
133,580	63%	Better	43%	Red	High Poverty	79%		18%	98%	1%	0%	Stronger	
100,000		Worse	78%	Lime	High Poverty	78%		14%	99%	0%	1%	Moderate	
86,900		Worse	81%	Yellow	High Poverty	94%		9%	93%	1%	1%	Strongest	
30,180		Best	79%	Lime	Mid-High Poverty	72%			100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
82,149	47%	Worse	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	99%		6%	100%	0%	0%	Moderate	
148,400	49%	Best	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	79%		13%	98%	0%	0%	Strongest	
143,605	48%	Worst	52%	Orange	High Poverty	82%		26%	98%	1%	0%	Moderate	
160,261	43%	Worse	55%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	73%		19%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
48,500	49%	Worse	74%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	70%		8%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger	
295,523	99%	Best	86%	Lime	Mid-Low Poverty	42%		1%	99%	1%	1%	Strongest	
94,991	66%	Best	43%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	74%		14%	98%	1%	1%	Strongest	
90,905	69%	Worse	48%	Red	High Poverty	84%		26%	99%	0%	1%	Moderate	
			74%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	74%		12%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing 68 market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



MACKENZIE (Highest-Need Neighborhood #7)

GENERAL INFORMATION										
nt										
-										
Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap			
--------------------	---------------------------	--------------------	--------	--------	-------------	---------------	-------------------			
Elementary (K-5)	7	0	1,549	158	1,391	10%	4%			
Middle (6-8)	4	0	714	91	623	13%	4%			
High School (9-12)	14	0	638	217	421	34%	3%			
Overall (K-12)	7	o*	2,901	467	2,435	16%	4%			

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

1%







FACILITIES			PERFORMANCE				DEMC	GRAPH	ICS			NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS ‡	
46,000	65%	Worst	37%	Red	High Poverty	90%		5%	100%	0%	0%	Moderate	
43,951		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	96%		9%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate	
166,000		Worse	67%	Yellow	High Poverty	77%		12%	100%	0%	0%	Moderate	
111,090	98%	Best	41%	Red	High Poverty	78%		16%	98%	0%	1%	Stronger	
143,605	48%	Worst	52%	Orange	High Poverty	82%		26%	98%	1%	0%	Moderate	

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



GREENFIELD (Highest-Need Neighborhood #8)

\bigcirc EAA \bigtriangleup

- District: Magnet/Selective
- Charter

50% 25% **Accountability Points Earned** Service Gap (Ranked) High Need (1 - 10) Mid-High Need (11 - 20) Moderate Need (21 - 30) Mid-Low Need (31 - 40) Low Need (41 - 54)

17

6 🛑 1 🛑 4

Best

Better

Worse

Worst

Building Condition

<u>_</u>13

. . . .

3

19 🔵

11 15

8

14 📃

10

.



85%

100%

70%

#NameTypeAuthorizerOperatorGrade SpanEnrollment1Bow Elementary-Middle SchoolDistric: NeighborhoodIIK.8520I2Colema A. Young ElementaryDistric: NeighborhoodIIK.5336I3Cooke Elementary SchoolDistric: NeighborhoodIIK.6359I4David Elins AcdemyCharterDPSCDBardwell GroupK.894I5Detroit Achievement AcademyCharterGrand Valley State UniversitySelfmangedK.394I6Emerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistric: NeighborhoodIIK.994I7Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistric: Magnet/SeletiAmerican Provise Schools9-124918Jahn Rose Leadership AcademyCharterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Provise Schools8.83719John K. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistric: NeighborhoodICentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Provise Schools8.837110March Ming Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelfmangedK.8393111March Ming Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelfmangedK.84011112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook LearningK.449311 <th></th> <th colspan="12">GENERAL INFORMATION</th>		GENERAL INFORMATION											
1Bow Elementary-Middle SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIndex endKanspoSpo2Oleman A. Young ElementaryDistrict: NeighborhoodIndex endNathKs3gSpo3Cooke Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIndex endSedSpoSpoSpo4David Elins AcdemyChaterDPSCDBardwell GroupKsSpoSpoSpo5Detroit Achievement AcademyChaterCrand Valley State UniversitySelf-managedKsSpoSpoSpo6Emerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodInterventCardar Valley State UniversityKsSpoSpoSpoSpo7Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StutiesDistrict: NeighborhoodInterventAmerican Promise SchoolSp149SpoSpo9John K. King AcademyChaterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise SchoolSp149Sp1Sp110Lincoln-King AcademyChaterCentral Michigan UniversityConterson Chatter SchoolsKsSp1Sp1Sp111Matrin Luher King Jr. Education Center AcademyChaterDPSCDSelf-managedKsSp1Sp1Sp112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryChaterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchook LearningKsSp1Sp1Sp113Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityMatchook LearningSp1Sp1Sp	#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment						
2Coleman A. Young ElementaryDistrict: NeighborhoodIndexSecondK-5336Second3Cooke Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodPSCDBardwell GroupK-85645644David Ellis AcademyChaterGrand Valley State UniversitySelf-managedK-394565Detroit Achievement AcademyChaterGrand Valley State UniversitySelf-managedK-394566Emerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIncernerK-859657577Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-12419619John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyOtstrict: NeighborhoodCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-124195710Lincoln-King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyOtstrict: NeighborhoodCentral Michigan UniversityComerstone Chater SchoolsK-85776111Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyChaterOtschlügan UniversityMachbook LearningK-44936112Michigan Technical Academy FlementaryChaterCentral Michigan UniversityInovative Teaching Solutions9-1272872872813Mumford High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityInovative Teaching Solutions9-1272872872872814 <td>1</td> <td>Bow Elementary-Middle School</td> <td>District: Neighborhood</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>K-8</td> <td>520</td> <td></td>	1	Bow Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	520						
3Cooke Elementary SchoolDistric: NeighborhoodPSCDBardwell GroupK-6259544David Ellis AcademyCharterOPSCDBardwell GroupK-85454545Detroit Achievement AcademyCharterGrand Valley State UniversitySelf-managedK-394546Errerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistric: NeighborhoodI-CantalK-8595657567Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistric: Nagnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-1241957678Jalen Rose Leadership AcademyDistric: NeighborhoodCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-1241957	2	Coleman A. Young Elementary	District: Neighborhood			K-5	336						
4David Ellis AcademyCharterDPSCDBardwell GroupK-89645Detroit Achievement AcademyCharterGrand Valley State UniversitySelFmanagedK-39416Emerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIIK-859617Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveIMerican Promise Schools9-1241918Jalen Rose Leadership AcademyCharterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-1241919John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodGrand Valley State UniversityCorrestone Charter SchoolsK-8837110Lincoln-King AcademyCharterGrand Valley State UniversityCorrestone Charter SchoolsK-8912419111Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelFmanagedK-89171112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchook LearningK-449311113Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-1272721114Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-121,15411115Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/Selective <td< td=""><td>3</td><td>Cooke Elementary School</td><td>District: Neighborhood</td><td></td><td></td><td>K-6</td><td>259</td><td></td></td<>	3	Cooke Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-6	259						
5Detroit Achievement AcademyCharterCrand Valley State UniversitySelf-managedK-394946Emerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIncome ManageK-859617Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-1241918Jalen Rose Leadership AcademyCharterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-1241919John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodComerstone Charter SchoolsK-8337110Lincoln-King AcademyCharterCrand Valley State UniversityComerstone Charter SchoolsK-8377111Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelf-managedK-8401112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook LearningK-4493113Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12728728114Old Redford Academy - HighDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-121,154115Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5210116Rutherford Winans AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodDPSCD <td>4</td> <td>David Ellis Academy</td> <td>Charter</td> <td>DPSCD</td> <td>Bardwell Group</td> <td>K-8</td> <td>364</td> <td></td>	4	David Ellis Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Bardwell Group	K-8	364						
6Emerson Elementary-Middle SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIndexterK-859617Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveIndexterK-869718Jalen Rose Leadership AcademyCharterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-1241919John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodIncolm-King AcademyK-8837110Lincoln-King AcademyCharterCrand Valley State UniversityCorrestone Charter SchoolsK-8577111Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelf-managedK-8401112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook Learning5-1274274213Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions5-12728114Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions5-12728115Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Nagnet/SelectivePSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5200116Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDistrict: NeighborhoodFSolid Rock Management CompanyK-6492117Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodFSolid Rock Management CompanyK-6492 <td< td=""><td>5</td><td>Detroit Achievement Academy</td><td>Charter</td><td>Grand Valley State University</td><td>Self-managed</td><td>K-3</td><td>94</td><td></td></td<>	5	Detroit Achievement Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Self-managed	K-3	94						
7Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural StudiesDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveIncome SecondsK-8697Seconds8Jalen Rose Leadership AcademyCharterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-12419Seconds9John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodContractCornerstone Charter SchoolsK-8577Seconds10Lincoln-King AcademyCharterCrand Valley State UniversityCornerstone Charter SchoolsK-8401Seconds11Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelf-managedK-4493Seconds12Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook LearningS-12742Seconds13Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12742Seconds14Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12728Seconds15Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectivePSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5210Seconds16Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-6492Seconds17Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodFSolid Rock Management CompanyK-6492Seconds18University YES AcademyCharter <td>6</td> <td>Emerson Elementary-Middle School</td> <td>District: Neighborhood</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>K-8</td> <td>596</td> <td></td>	6	Emerson Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	596						
8Jalen Rose Leadership AcademyCharterCentral Michigan UniversityAmerican Promise Schools9-12419199John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodK-R8578571010Lincoln-King AcademyCharterCharterOrand Valley State UniversityCornerstone Charter SchoolsK-85771011Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelf-managedK-84011112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook LearningK-44931113Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-127421114Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-127281115Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-121,1541116Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-52101117Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-52101118University YES AcademyCharterBay Mills Community CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-119111119Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodInterStreet Mic	7	Foreign Language Immersion and Cultural Studies	District: Magnet/Selective			K-8	697						
9John R. King Academic and Performing Arts AcademyDistrict: NeighborhoodIncolne <td>8</td> <td>Jalen Rose Leadership Academy</td> <td>Charter</td> <td>Central Michigan University</td> <td>American Promise Schools</td> <td>9-12</td> <td>419</td> <td></td>	8	Jalen Rose Leadership Academy	Charter	Central Michigan University	American Promise Schools	9-12	419						
10Lincoln-King AcademyCharterCharterGrand Valley State UniversityCorrestone Charter SchoolsK-8577Control11Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelf-managedK-8401Control12Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchook LearningK-4493Control13Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityMatchook Learning9-12742Control14Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12728Control15Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-121,154Control16Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5210Control17Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-6492Control18University YES AcademyCharterBay Mills Community CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-11911Control19Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodControlK-6225ControlControl	9	John R. King Academic and Performing Arts Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-8	837						
11Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center AcademyCharterDPSCDSelf-managedK-840112Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook LearningK-4493613Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12728614Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12728615Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-121,154616Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5201017Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodPotSelf-maningtrope CentralK-6492118University YES AcademyCharterBay Mills Community CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-11911119Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodCentral King KingtoreK-62251	10	Lincoln-King Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	Cornerstone Charter Schools	K-8	577						
12Michigan Technical Academy ElementaryCharterCentral Michigan UniversityMatchbook LearningK-449349313Mumford High SchoolEAACentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-1274274214Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-1272872815Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-121,1547416Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-520010117Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodFortureSolid Rock Management CompanyK-649210118University YES AcademyCharterBay Mills Community CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-1191110119Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodCenterK-6225101	11	Martin Luther King Jr. Education Center Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Self-managed	K-8	401						
13Mumford High SchoolEAAInnovative Teaching Solutions9-1274274214Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-12728115Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveImageSolid Rock Management Company9-121,154116Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5210117Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodFormunity CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-11911119Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodContertSolid Rock Management CompanyK-6225Solid Rock Management Company	12	Michigan Technical Academy Elementary	Charter	Central Michigan University	Matchbook Learning	K-4	493						
14Old Redford Academy - HighCharterCentral Michigan UniversityInnovative Teaching Solutions9-1272815Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveCSolid Rock Management Company9-121,154116Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5210117Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodInnovative Teaching SolutionsK-6492118University YES AcademyCharterBay Mills Community CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-11911119Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodInternationalInternationalK-6225International	13	Mumford High School	EAA			9-12	742						
15Renaissance High SchoolDistrict: Magnet/SelectiveIncome9-121,154Income16Rutherford Winans AcademyCharterDPSCDSolid Rock Management CompanyK-5210Income17Schulze Academy for Technology and ArtsDistrict: NeighborhoodIncomeNew Paradigm for EducationK-6492Income18University YES AcademyCharterBay Mills Community CollegeNew Paradigm for EducationK-11911Income19Vernor Elementary SchoolDistrict: NeighborhoodIncomeIncomeK-6225Income	14	Old Redford Academy - High	Charter	Central Michigan University	Innovative Teaching Solutions	9-12	728						
16 Rutherford Winans Academy Charter DPSCD Solid Rock Management Company K-5 210 101 17 Schulze Academy for Technology and Arts District: Neighborhood Image: Schulze Academy for Technology and Arts District: Neighborhood K-6 492 Image: Schulze Academy for Technology and Arts Schulze Academy for Technology	15	Renaissance High School	District: Magnet/Selective			9-12	1,154						
17 Schulze Academy for Technology and Arts District: Neighborhood Image: Comparison of the compari	16	Rutherford Winans Academy	Charter	DPSCD	Solid Rock Management Company	K-5	210						
18 University YES Academy Charter Bay Mills Community College New Paradigm for Education K-11 911 19 Vernor Elementary School District: Neighborhood For the second secon	17	Schulze Academy for Technology and Arts	District: Neighborhood			K-6	492						
19 Vernor Elementary School District: Neighborhood K-6 225	18	University YES Academy	Charter	Bay Mills Community College	New Paradigm for Education	K-11	911						
	19	Vernor Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-6	225						

Lime

Yellow

Orange

Red No Grade

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	8	3	1,343	64	1,279	5%	3%
Middle (6-8)	8	2	561	29	531	5%	4%
High School (9-12)	13	1	584	154	430	26%	3%
Overall (K-12)	8	4*	2,487	247	2,240	10%	3%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

1%

3%







72

FACILITIES			PERFORMANCE		DEMOGRAPHICS							NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS 🔅	
59,100	65%	Worse	52%	Orange	High Poverty	75%		15%	98%	1%	0%	Stronger	
67,800	47%	Better	42%	Red	High Poverty	76%		13%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger	
45,184	62%	Better	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	75%		14%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
27,000		Worse	53%	Orange	High Poverty	88%		8%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
22,000		Worse	100%	Green	High Poverty	95%			98%	0%	1%	Strongest	
82,203	38%	Worse	48%	Red	High Poverty	90%		12%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
92,010	67%	Better	79%	Lime	Mid-Low Poverty	41%		4%	98%	1%	0%	Strongest	
38,000		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	87%		15%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
133,580	63%	Better	43%	Red	High Poverty	79%		18%	98%	1%	0%	Stronger	
86,900		Worse	81%	Yellow	High Poverty	94%		9%	93%	1%	1%	Strongest	
30,180		Best	79%	Lime	Mid-High Poverty	72%			100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
			57%	Orange	High Poverty	87%		7%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
148,400	49%	Best	64%	Yellow	High Poverty	79%		13%	98%	0%	0%	Strongest	
75,000		Better	76%	Yellow	High Poverty	88%		9%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate	
295,523	99%	Best	86%	Lime	Mid-Low Poverty	42%		1%	99%	1%	1%	Strongest	
			67%	Yellow	High Poverty	92%			100%	0%	0%	Stronger	
94,991	66%	Best	43%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	74%		14%	98%	1%	1%	Strongest	
			74%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	74%		12%	100%	0%	0%	Strongest	
44,608	53%	Worse	67%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	72%		8%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



 \triangle EAA

Charter

BROOKS (Highest-Need Neighborhood #9)

Worse 6 **°** Worst 25% **50**% **70**% **8**5% Accountability Points Earned Service Gap (Ranked) High Need (1 - 10)

Mid-High Need (11 - 20) Moderate Need (21 - 30) Mid-Low Need (31 - 40) Low Need (41 - 54)

Best



.

100%

	GENERAL INFORMATION											
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment						
1	Burns Elementary-Middle School	EAA			K-8	468						
2	Carver Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	324						
3	Cody Academy of Public Leadership	District: Neighborhood			9-12	315						
4	Detroit Innovation Academy	Charter	Central Michigan University	EQUITY Education	K-8	341						
5	Detroit Institute of Technology at Cody	District: Neighborhood			9-12	269						
6	Detroit Premier Academy	Charter	Grand Valley State University	National Heritage Academies	K-8	725						
7	Dossin Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	366						
8	Gardner Elementary School	District: Neighborhood			K-5	228						
9	Henderson Academy	District: Neighborhood			K-8	695						
10	Medicine and Community Health Academy at Cody	District: Neighborhood			9-12	407						

Yellow

Orange

No Grade

Red

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	10	1	1,365	165	1,200	12%	3%
Middle (6-8)	9	1	578	93	485	16%	3%
High School (9-12)	18	0	568	194	374	34%	2%
Overall (K-12)	10	1*	2,511	452	2,059	18%	3%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

3%









FACILITIES			PERFORMANCE		DEMOGRAPHICS							NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS ‡	
46,000	65%	Worst	37%	Red	High Poverty	90%		5%	100%	0%	0%	Moderate	
67,102	49%	Better	42%	Red	High Poverty	80%	6%	11%	88%	5%	6%	Stronger	
286,752	15%	Worst	52%	Red	High Poverty	77%		29%	99%	0%	1%	Stronger	
			63%	Yellow	High Poverty	97%		11%	100%	0%	0%	Stronger	
	13%		57%	Red	Mid-High Poverty	66%		45%	97%	1%	1%	Stronger	
53,278		Worse	81%	Lime	High Poverty	95%		9%	96%	2%	1%	Stronger	
48,808	75%	Better	45%	Red	High Poverty	81%		15%	99%	0%	0%	Strongest	
92,178	57%	Worst	60%	Yellow	High Poverty	78%	28%	8%	61%	2%	37%	Stronger	
109,000	69%	Worst	36%	Red	High Poverty	84%		17%	96%	1%	2%	Moderate	
	19%		73%	Yellow	Mid-High Poverty	74%		29%	97%	1%	2%	Stronger	

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.



MT. OLIVET (Highest-Need Neighborhood #10)

	GENERAL INFORMATION										
#	Name	Туре	Authorizer	Operator	Grade Span	Enrollment					
1	Brenda Scott Academy for Theatre Arts	EAA			K-8	835					
2	Dove Academy of Detroit	Charter	Oakland University	Choice Schools Associates	K-8	440					
3	Fisher Magnet Lower Academy	District: Magnet/Selective			K-4	586					
4	Fisher Magnet Upper Academy	District: Magnet/Selective			5-8	456					
5	Law Elementary School	EAA			K-8	585					
6	Osborn Academy of Mathematics	District: Neighborhood			9-12	266					
7	Osborn College Preparatory Academy	District: Neighborhood			9-12	200					
8	Osborn Evergreen Academy Of Design & Alternative Energy	District: Neighborhood			9-12	327					
9	Pulaski Elementary-Middle School	District: Neighborhood			K-8	456					
10	Trix Performance Academy	Charter	Education Achievement Authority of Michigan	Performance Academies	K-8	397					

Grade Span	Neighborhood Rank (of 54)	Performing Schools	Demand	Supply	Service Gap	Service Level	% of Citywide Gap
Elementary (K-5)	9	1	1,484	210	1,274	14%	3%
Middle (6-8)	7	1	720	182	538	25%	4%
High School (9-12)	27	0	427	160	267	38%	2%
Overall (K-12)	9	1*	2,631	552	2,078	21%	3%

* Because some schools overlap grade spans, the number of performing schools does not sum.

3%









FACILITIES		PERFORMANCE		DEMOGRAPHICS							NEIGHBORHOOD	
Area (Sq. Ft.)	Utilization	Conditions	Points Earned	MDE Rating	Poverty Level	FRLP	ELL	SPED	Black	Latino	White	CONDITIONS ‡
147,620	76%	Better	48%	Red	High Poverty	83%	2%	5%	97%	0%	0%	Moderate
49,000		Worse	84%	Lime	High Poverty	98%		9%	97%	0%	2%	Stronger
95,098	54%	Best	41%	Red	High Poverty	99%		14%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate
147,620	53%	Best	41%	Red	High Poverty	87%		26%	98%	0%	0%	Moderate
125,995	48%	Better	43%	Red	High Poverty	89%		11%	99%	0%	0%	Stronger
201,884	52%	Worst	52%	Red	High Poverty	80%		24%	98%	0%	0%	Moderate
201,884	52%	Worst	38%	Red	High Poverty	77%		22%	99%	0%	0%	Moderate
201,884	52%	Worst	24%	Red	High Poverty	78%		37%	97%	1%	0%	Moderate
60,966	48%	Worse	52%	Orange	High Poverty	95%		12%	97%	0%	1%	Stronger
			62%	Yellow	High Poverty	79%		13%	97%	0%	0%	Strongest

‡ This data point is Dynamo Metrics' Neighborhood School Index, which accounts for the following factors: occupancy, parental involvement, housing market, housing condition, violent crime, and vacant lots. Ratings are relative to other current and former sites of public schools in Detroit.

APPENDIX C: COMMUTE PATTERNS IN DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS COMMUNITY DISTRICT

Map 11: Accountability Rating of DPSCD Schools Attended (Grades K-12)





MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- YellowOrange
- OrangeRed
- No Grade
- No Grade

Students in Neighborhood





Four schools that closed following academic year 2015-16 are included on this map: Allen Academy, Experiencia Preparatory Academy, Nataki Talibah Schoolhouse, and Phoenix Elementary-Middle School.



Map 12: Accountability Rating of DPSCD Elementary Schools Attended (Grades K-5)



MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🔴 Red
- No Grade

Students in Neighborhood







Map 13: Accountability Rating of DPSCD Middle Schools Attended (Grades 6-8)

Service Ga	p (Ran	ked)
------------	--------	------



MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🔴 Red
- No Grade

Students in Neighborhood





Mt. Olivet Grant Volar Pembroke Greenfield Γ Den Burban State Bagle Fair Evera Conne Cerveny / Grandmont Airport McNichols V) Harmony Village St. Jean Chandle -Park Kettering Durfee Jpper East Central efferson Mack Mackenzie 1 00 Middle East East Riverside 96 Brooks \square lower Butze Tireman effries East Riverfront Corktown Central Chadsey Business Springwells 0 Vernor / 6 West Riverfront

Map 14: Accountability Rating of DPSCD High Schools Attended (Grades 9-12)



River

MDE Accountability Rating

- Green
- Lime
- Yellow
- Orange
- 🔴 Red
- No Grade

Students in Neighborhood





Map 15: DPSCD Student Travel Distance to School (Grades K-12)



Service Gap (Ranked)



Student Commute Distance

- Less Than 1 Mile
- 1 3 Miles
- 3 7 Miles
- 7 12 Miles
- / 12 WINES
- Greater Than 12 Miles

Students in Neighborhood







Map 16: DPSCD Student Travel Distance to Elementary Schools (Grades K-5)

Service Gap (Ranked)



Student Commute Distance

- Less Than 1 Mile
- 🗕 1 3 Miles
- 3 7 Miles
- 7 12 Miles
- Greater Than 12 Miles

Students in Neighborhood







Map 17: Student Travel Distance to Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)



Master Plan Neighborhoods

Park

River

Student Commute Distance

- Less Than 1 Mile
- 1 3 Miles
- 3 7 Miles
- 7 12 Miles
- Greater Than 12 Miles •

Students in Neighborhood









Service Gap (Ranked)



Student Commute Distance

- Less Than 1 Mile
- 🗕 1 3 Miles
- 3 7 Miles
- 7 12 Miles
- Greater Than 12 Miles

Students in Neighborhood





APPENDIX D: ALIGNING EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS FROM BIRTH THROUGH TWELFTH GRADE

Map 18: Service Gap, Early Care and Education (Ages 0-5)



Map 19: Service Gap, K-12 Education



Neighborhood	ECE Service Gap			ervice Gap K-12 Service Gap				
	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	Overall	Overall	Elementary	Middle	High School	
			(Ages 0-5)	(Grades K-12)	(Grades K-5)	(Grades 6-8)	(Grades 9-12)	
Cerveny / Grandmont	565	343	908	3,422	2,002	832	588	
Finney	582	384	966	3,055	1,858	721	475	
Chadsey	897	781	1,678	3,012	1,644	685	683	
Vernor / Junction	603	464	1,067	2,910	1,752	431	726	
Evergreen	510	305	815	2,614	1,530	590	494	
Harmony Village	480	263	743	2,462	1,422	560	479	
Mackenzie	554	189	743	2,435	1,391	623	421	
Greenfield	324	103	427	2,240	1,279	531	430	
Brooks	797	417	1,214	2,059	1,200	485	374	
Mt. Olivet	571	428	999	2,078	1,274	538	267	
Conner	447	324	771	1,754	997	348	409	
Burbank	567	358	925	1,870	1,070	171	629	
Denby	600	395	995	1,888	984	256	648	
Bagley	213	63	276	1,734	968	309	458	
Rouge	674	477	1,151	1,755	956	460	340	
Rosa Parks	338	45	383	1,649	990	440		
Springwells	573	386	959	1,825	1,151	45	629	
Kettering	224	59	283	1,660	928	318	414	
Redford	329	99	428	1.577	1.005	331	241	
Rosedale	204	69	273	1.530	887	376	268	
Durfee	374	171	545	1.471	801	346	325	
Lower Woodward	157	-121	36	1.436	645	344	447	
Pembroke	203	20	223	1.473	726	291	457	
Brightmoor	222	77	410	1 216	818	210	179	
Cody	272	150	F22	1 287	752	211	222	
Davison	273 26r	220	504	1,207	755	257	225	
Lower Fast Central	102	42	225	درد، ا	608	228	203	
Tireman	202	10	202	1,072	610	282	171	
Winterhalter	- 75	10	303	1,072		202	248	
Condon	200	41	241	1,010	478	160	240	
Leffries	175	11	186	072	642	202	127	
Nolan	225	184	510	9/2	484	103	370	
Middle East Central	320	-80	16	947	404	193	270	
Crant	90	-00	10	930	400	204	209	
Middle Woodward	->>	-82	06	915	504	23/	171	
Butzel	1/9	-03	90	940	202	172	1/1	
Airport	100	40	150	927	393	172	302	
Delmer Derk	100	-133	>>	700	45/	1/0	12)	
Painer Park	5/	-95	-30	700	341	107	1/0	
MaNiahala	300	344	/30	/03	296	141	20/	
Chandler Dark	151	7	158	508	283	144	182	
Chandler Park	260	106	300	509	307		151	
St. jean	130	-29	107	500	322	134	112	
Focn	92	4	96	542	252	100	190	
East Riverside	109	10	119	480	207	93	180	
West Riverfront	39	-115	-76	397	253	37	106	
Boynton	162	10	172	389	113	30	247	
Hubbard Richard	41	-12	29	352	222	49	81	
Jetterson / Mack	73	-5	68	302	111	52	139	
Indian Village	1	-29	-28	251	80	66	105	
State Fair	166	34	200	206	87	34	85	
Central Business District	-35	-172	-207	142	34	33	75	
Corktown	-3	-71	-74	123	56	20	47	
Near East Riverfront	8	-31	-23	57	25	16	15	
Upper East Central	-33	-138	-171	12	7	2	3	

Table 8: Service Gap Comparison, Early Care and Education and K-12 Education

METHODOLOGY

School Classifications.

The unit of analysis for the needs assessment at the core of this study is the school – not the individual student. The methodology uses school-level data to make determinations about educational access at the neighborhood and city levels. In 2015-16, many types of free public schools served students in Detroit. **This study categorizes schools along three dimensions: governance, service area or authorizer, and programming**.

Below is the terminology used to describe the first level of categorization, schools' **governance**:

- Traditional district schools are governed by the city's traditional local educational agency (LEA), Detroit Public Schools Community District (DPSCD).
 DPSCD assumed the educational responsibilities of Detroit Public Schools (DPS), a separate legal entity that is now responsible exclusively for retiring schools' accumulated debt, in July 2016.⁶⁶ In common parlance, "DPS" often refers to DPSCD. DPS oversaw K-12 operations through the academic year that this study analyzes. For clarity and to align with contemporary terminology, this report refers to Detroit's traditional LEA as DPSCD.
- The Education Achievement Authority (EAA) of Michigan was a statewide turnaround district that in 2011 assumed managerial responsibility over some of the state's lowest-performing public schools, including fifteen in Detroit.⁶⁷ EAA disbanded after the 2016-17 academic year and delegated governance of the Detroit schools formerly under its jurisdiction to DPSCD.⁶⁸

- Charter schools, officially "public school academies" in Michigan, are publicly funded, free schools.69 An independent operator manages charter schools under the terms of a contract (charter) with a public or nonprofit authorizer, which has the power to open, regulate, and close charter schools. Charter schools enjoy substantial flexibility and autonomy in exchange for high levels of academic performance. (Effective authorizing is crucial to ensuring this balance).⁷⁰ In academic year 2015-16, DPSCD, EAA, Wayne Regional Educational Service Agency (Wayne RESA), and nine public postsecondary schools authorized K-12 charter schools in Detroit. Per 2016 regulations, however, only three authorizers - Grand Valley State University, Saginaw Valley State University, and Central Michigan University - are legally able to charter new schools as of the publication of this report.71
- Schools of choice in Michigan are public schools that are open to students from outside of the geographical boundaries of the LEA that governs them.⁷² Thousands of children who live in Detroit attend traditional district and charter schools of choice throughout Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties.⁷³

Schools are then further categorized based on one of two criteria:

• Enrollment criteria are used to categorize traditional district schools. Neighborhood schools are open to students within a geographically defined attendance boundary. Magnet or selective schools are open to students across the city and/or by examination; they do not have a geographically defined attendance boundary. Special program schools enroll particular subgroups of students.

• Authorizing institutions are used to describe charter schools, which do not have attendance boundaries or entrance examinations.

Finally, schools are categorized based on the **programming** that they offer. Only general education schools with full enrollment and performance data were integrated into the needs assessment.

- General education schools are those that do not focus primarily on vocational, special, or alternative education.⁷⁴ They primarily offer traditional curricula, even though many provide targeted support for particular student subgroups. Magnet and selective schools are considered general education schools for the purposes of this analysis, even though many have specialized curricular themes.⁷⁵
- A special education school "focuses primarily on special education—including instruction for students with any of the following conditions: autism, deafblindness, developmental delay, hearing impairment, mental retardation, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, serious emotional disturbance, specific learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, visual impairment, and other health impairments" and "adapts curriculum, materials, or instruction for students served."⁷⁶
- A vocational school "focuses primarily on providing formal preparation for semiskilled, skilled, technical, or professional occupations for high school-age students who have opted to develop or expand their employment opportunities, often in lieu of preparing for college entry."⁷⁷

• An alternative school "(1) addresses needs of students that typically cannot be met in a regular school, (2) provides nontraditional education, (3) serves as an adjunct to a regular school, or (4) falls outside the categories of regular, special education, or vocational education."⁷⁸

Needs Assessment.

At its core, this study is a supply-and-demand needs assessment. The methodology calculates the number of seats available in performing public schools in a neighborhood and compares it to the number of children living there who are participating in the public school system. School performance is constitutive of the determinations that the needs assessment makes. Fundamentally, however, the report is about communities' access to performing schools in the aggregate, not about individual schools.

The base geographical unit for the needs assessment is the neighborhood. To convey meaningful information to decision-makers and stakeholders in K-12 education, the geographies into which the needs assessment divides the city need to balance several competing criteria. The neighborhoods must be small enough to be the foci of locally-calibrated school improvement efforts but large enough to constitute a significant portion of the K-12 ecosystem. At the same time, the neighborhoods should resonate with geographies that city planners, education leaders, and community organizations already recognize and integrate into their strategic initiatives.

IFF's needs assessment for early care and education (ECE) in Detroit, published in 2015,⁷⁹ balanced these demands by using the names and boundaries of the fifty-four neighborhoods that the Detroit City Council adopted in 2009 as part of the city's Master Plan of Policies.⁸⁰ Conversations with stakeholders, including this report's Advisory Committee, confirmed that the Master Plan neighborhoods would be appropriate boundaries for *Rethink*, *Reset*, *Rebuild*. The geographic consistency between this report and IFF's ECE needs assessment has the added benefit of facilitating alignment between ECE and K-12 planning and programming in Detroit (see Appendix D).

In the needs assessment, **demand** is enrollment in general education schools located in Detroit in academic year 2015-16. **Supply** is an estimate of the capacity of performing schools, i.e. schools rated Green or Lime by the Michigan Department of Education, located in Detroit in the same year. For traditional district schools, capacity is the average of schools' enrollment from academic years 2011-12 through 2015-16; for charter schools and EAA schools, capacity is the maximum of schools' enrollment over those years.

The spatial distribution of demand and supply into neighborhoods and attendance boundaries is proportional to school-age population. For traditional district schools and EAA schools with an assigned attendance boundary, each school's enrollment is distributed spatially throughout the boundary. For magnet schools and others that accept students from all of Detroit, enrollment is distributed throughout the city. For charter elementary and middle schools, one half of the school's demand or supply is distributed within a 1.78-mile radius, and the remaining half in a radius of 1.82 miles beyond the inner radius. For charter high schools, one half of the school's demand or supply is distributed within a 2.3-mile radius, and the remaining half in a radius of 3.2 miles beyond the inner radius. These radii are based on the results of a national survey of commute patterns.81

Once supply and demand are calculated, the service gap and service level are computed at the neighborhood level for individual grade spans: elementary (grades K-5), middle (grades 6-8), and high school (grades 9-12). The service gap is the difference between supply and demand; the service level is the quotient of supply over demand. The former represents the number of students who cannot access a seat in a performing school; the latter represents the proportion of students who can access a seat in a performing school. Neighborhoods are ranked by their service gap within each grade span. A composite ranking is then created from the average of each neighborhood's elementary, middle, and high school rankings. The ten neighborhoods with the highest composite ranks are identified as Detroit's highest-need neighborhoods.

Facilities Assessment.

IFF's third-party partner, Recon Management, surveyed most of the school buildings in or within one mile of the highest-need neighborhoods in 2017. Usually with assistance from a school building's engineer or another employee familiar with facilities systems and components, Recon used a facilities survey that IFF Research developed in consultation with IFF's Real Estate Services department.

The survey evaluated the following elements: known environmental concerns; signs of water damage; foundation material and condition; exterior walls material and condition; roof material and condition; weatherproofing and condition of exterior doors and windows; glazing type; fire alarm and sprinkler systems; age and condition of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning components; water heather type and condition; condition of plumbing fixtures; conditions of restrooms; condition of electrical systems and wiring type; materials and conditions of interior floors, walls,

Rating	Description	Percent of Replacement Cost	
Pristine	New or like new. Requires only standard/routine maintenance.	0%	
Good	Not new but fully functional. Requires routine maintenance and may need minor repairs.	10%	
Borderline	Serviceable but needs repairs and/or has significant deferred maintenance/ monitoring.	50%	
Unsustainable	Reached expected life. Requires substantial repairs or continuous maintenance/ monitoring.	90%	
Critical	Surpassed useful life. Immediate safety condition.	100%	

Table 9: Building Component Rating System

roofing structure, doors, millwork, flooring, and paint; and condition of elements for students with disabilities.

Recon rated building systems or components on a scale, with each rating corresponding to an estimated proportion of the cost of replacing the system or component in full (see Table 9 above).

IFF relied upon two scales to aggregate ratings into a summative score for each building. The first was the average costs per square foot of new construction activity for public school buildings across Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan: \$199.08 for elementary schools, \$246.43 for middle schools, and \$318.21 for high schools.⁸² Based on enrollment ratios across the corresponding grade spans (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12, respectively), a school was assigned an estimated cost per square foot. For example, if a school's enrollment was half elementary schoolers and half middle



schoolers, its estimated cost per square foot would be \$222.76. The building's estimated cost per square foot was multiplied by the area of the building (in square feet) to arrive at a rough estimate of the cost of constructing a school building of its size and type in 2017.

The second scale is the average distribution of construction costs across various building components, based on a national survey of elementary and secondary school building construction.⁸³ Those ratios are detailed in Chart 15. They do not include heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, which are included as a separate per-square-foot cost.⁸⁴ The estimated percent of replacement costs for each component are multiplied by their proportion of the overall cost. The resulting product is then multiplied by the overall estimated cost for the building to arrive at an estimated cost for each component.

All components' estimated costs are summed to arrive at an estimated total cost for each building. Overall estimated costs are divided by their square footage and normalized based on their per-square-foot cost to allow for one-to-one comparisons between dissimilar buildings. Each school is assigned a *z*-score based on its normalized score. Schools with a *z*-score score greater than one (i.e. the highest estimated costs) received a rating of Worst; schools with a *z*-score between zero and one received a rating of Worse; schools with a *z*-score between zero and negative one received a rating of Better; and schools with a *z*-score less than negative one received a rating of Best.

Statistical Tests.

All statistical tests were conducted with a significance level of five percent ($\alpha = .05$).

Commute Analysis.

Analyses of student commute within Detroit Public Schools Community District (DPSCD) utilize anonymized student address data that DPSCD provided to IFF. To estimate students' travel distance to school, an origindestination (OD) cost matrix was developed to identify the most efficient pathway from students' address to their school based on factors such as road width and speed limit.

DATA

Data Sources.

City of Detroit Department of Planning and Development Shapefiles (neighborhoods, roads, parks, etc.)

Detroit Public Schools Community District

Anonymized Student Address Data Attendance Boundary Shapefiles Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (2016)

Dynamo Metrics Neighborhood School Index

Esri 2015 Population Estimates

Michigan Department of Education / Center for Educational Performance and Information Accountability Scorecard Educational Entity Master Student Counts Student Assessment

National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data Public School Directory Public School Membership

U.S. Census Bureau

American Community Survey 2015 Five-Year Estimates

Works Cited.

- "2016 Michigan School Scorecards." Michigan Department of Education, 2016. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html.
- Abramson, Paul. "20th Annual School Construction Report: National Statistics, Building Trends and Detailed Analysis." School Planning & Management, February 2015.
- Alix, Jay, Deborah DiRezze, Adam Figueiredo, Leah Martin, Karen Morgan, and Carol Weaver. "Report & Recommendations Presented to Judge Steven Rhodes, DPS Transition Manager." Detroit Public Schools Transition Team, June 17, 2016. http://detroitk12.org/admin/dpscd/#transition-team.
- Allensworth, Elaine M., Paul T. Moore, Lauren Sartain, and Marisa de la Torre. "The Educational Benefits of Attending Higher Performing Schools: Evidence from Chicago High Schools." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 39, no. 2 (June 1, 2017): 175–97. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716672039.
- "America's Largest Charter Public School Communities and Their Impact on Student Outcomes." A Growing Movement. Washington, DC: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, November 3, 2016. http://www.publiccharters.org/ publications/growing-movement-americas-largest-charter-public-school-communities/.
- "Annotated Bibliography: The Impact of School-Based Poverty Concentration on Academic Achievement & Student Outcomes." Washington, DC: Poverty & Race Research Action Council, n.d. http://school-diversity.org/researchbriefs/.
- Baber, R. Jovita, Moira O'Donovan Warnement, and Emily Sipfle. "Quality Schools: Every Child, Every School, Every Neighborhood: An Analysis of School Location and Performance in Washington, DC." Chicago: IFF, January 2012. http://www.iff.org/our-services/research/.
- Baber, R. Jovita, and Cristina Silva. "The Shared Challenge of Quality Schools: A Place-Based Analysis of School Performance in Indianapolis." Chicago: IFF, March 2013. http://www.iff.org/our-services/research/.
- Baber, R. Jovita, Cristina Silva, and Rachel Koch. "A Shared Responsibility: Ensuring Quality Education in Every Cleveland Neighborhood." Chicago: IFF, 2015. http://www.iff.org/our-services/research/.
- ———. "The System We Need: A Neighborhood Snapshot of Early Education in Detroit." Chicago: IFF, 2015. http://www. iff.org/our-services/research/.

- Batdorff, Meagan, Larry Maloney, Jay F. May, Sheree T. Speakman, Patrick J. Wolf, and Albert Cheng. "Charter Funding: Inequity Expands." Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Department of Education Reform, April 2014. http:// www.uaedreform.org/charter-funding-inequity-expands/.
- Belsha, Kalyn. "In Kansas City, a Lesson in Transforming Closed Schools." *The Chicago Reporter*, January 24, 2017. http://chicagoreporter.com/in-kansas-city-a-lesson-in-transforming-closed-schools/.
- "Better Together: Ensuring Quality District Schools in Times of Charter Growth and Declining Enrollment." Seattle: Center on Reinventing Public Education, September 2017. https://www.crpe.org/publications/better-togetherensuring-quality-district-schools.
- Binelli, Mark. "Michigan Gambled on Charter Schools. Its Children Lost." *The New York Times Magazine*, September 5, 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/05/magazine/michigan-gambled-on-charter-schools-its-children-lost. html.
- Bross, Whitney, Douglas N. Harris, and Lihan Liu. "The Effects of Performance-Based School Closure and Charter Takeover on Student Performance." Technical Report. New Orleans: Education Research Alliance for New Orleans, October 17, 2016. https://educationresearchalliancenola.org/publications/extreme-measures-when-and-howschool-closures-and-charter-takeovers-benefit-students.
- Brummet, Quentin. "The Effect of School Closings on Student Achievement." *Journal of Public Economics* 119 (November 2014): 108–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.06.010.
- Burdick-Will, Julia, Micere Keels, and Todd Schuble. "Closing and Opening Schools: The Association between Neighborhood Characteristics and the Location of New Educational Opportunities in a Large Urban District." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 35, no. 1 (February 2013): 59–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12004.
- Bytof, Amy. "Michigan Charter School Facts." *MAPSA Blog* (blog), September 26, 2016. http://www.charterschools.org/ blog/2016/09/29/michigan-charter-school-facts.
- Carlson, Deven, and Stéphane Lavertu. "Charter School Closure and Student Achievement: Evidence from Ohio." *Journal of Urban Economics* 95 (September 2016): 31–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2016.07.001.
- Chambers, Jennifer. "Number of Students Enrolled at DPS Jumps over Last Year." *The Detroit News*. September 6, 2017. http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/detroit-city/2017/09/06/number-students-enrolled-dps-jumps-last-year/105320746/.

- "Charter School Performance in Michigan." Stanford, CA: Center for Research on Education Outcomes, January 11, 2013. https://credo.stanford.edu/research-reports.html.
- "City of Detroit Master Plan of Policies," July 2009. http://www.detroitmi.gov/Government/Departments-and-Agencies/ Planning-and-Development-Department/Master-Planning.
- Deeds, Vontrese, and Mary Pattillo. "Organizational 'Failure' and Institutional Pluralism: A Case Study of an Urban School Closure." *Urban Education* 50, no. 4 (June 2015): 474–504. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085913519337.
- DeGrow, Ben. "School Funding in Michigan Reaches All-Time High." *The Mackinac Center Blog* (blog), May 19, 2017. https://www.mackinac.org/school-funding-in-michigan-reaches-all-time-high.
- Dixon, Jennifer. "Michigan Spends \$1B on Charter Schools but Fails to Hold Them Accountable." Detroit Free Press, June 22, 2014. http://www.freep.com/story/news/local/michigan/2014/06/22/michigan-spends-1b-on-charter-schools-but-fails-to-hold/77155074/.
- Dowdall, Emily. "Closing Public Schools in Philadelphia: Lessons from Six Urban Districts." Philadelphia Research Initiative. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts, October 19, 2011. http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-andanalysis/reports/2011/10/19/closing-public-schools-in-philadelphia-lessons-from-six-urban-districts.
- Dowdall, Emily, and Susan Warner. "Shuttered Public Schools: The Struggle to Bring Old Buildings New Life." Philadelphia Research Initiative. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts, February 11, 2013. http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/researchand-analysis/reports/2013/02/11/philadelphia-and-other-big-cities-struggle-to-find-uses-for-closed-schools.
- "DPSCD Continues Upward Trend of Stabilized Enrollment." Detroit Public Schools Community District, October 7, 2016. http://detroitk12.org/content/2016/10/07/dpscd-continues-upward-trend-of-stabilized-enrollment/.
- "DPSCD Welcomes Newly Elected Board Members." Detroit Public Schools Community District, November 9, 2016. http://detroitk12.org/content/2016/11/09/dpscd-welcomes-newly-elected-board-members/.
- Einhorn, Erin. "A Year after the Tearful Demise of a Proposed Detroit School Oversight Commission, Backers Seek Another Way to Bring Order to Detroit Schools." *Chalkbeat*, July 6, 2017. https://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/ detroit/2017/07/06/a-year-after-the-tearful-demise-of-a-proposed-detroit-school-oversight-commission-backersseek-another-way-to-bring-order-to-detroit-schools/.
- ———. "In a District Full of Empty Classrooms and Darkened Hallways, Can Detroit Find a Way to Keep Its Schools Open?" *Chalkbeat*, May 4, 2017. https://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/detroit/2017/05/04/in-a-district-full-of-emptyclassrooms-and-darkened-hallways-can-detroit-find-a-way-to-keep-its-schools-open/.

- ———. "On Detroit's First Day of Class, Unusual Staffing Problems Hobble Some Schools and Draw Parent Protests." *Chalkbeat*, September 5, 2017. https://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/detroit/2017/09/05/on-detroits-first-day-of-classunusual-staffing-problems-hobble-some-schools-and-draw-parent-protests/.
- ———. "'Possible, but Daunting': Inside Nikolai Vitti's Early Effort to Transform Detroit's Battered Public Schools." *Chalkbeat*, September 11, 2017. https://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/detroit/2017/09/11/possible-but-daunting-insidenikolai-vittis-early-effort-to-transform-detroits-battered-public-schools/.
- Engberg, John, Brian Gill, Gema Zamarro, and Ron Zimmer. "Closing Schools in a Shrinking District: Do Student Outcomes Depend on Which Schools Are Closed?" *Journal of Urban Economics* 71, no. 2 (March 2012): 189–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2011.10.001.
- Finnigan, Kara S., and Mark Lavner. "A Political Analysis of Community Influence over School Closure." *The Urban Review* 44, no. 1 (March 2012): 133–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-011-0179-9.
- "Fiscal Year 2016-17 and FY 2017-18 Foundation Allowance, At Risk, and High School Estimated Payments Conference Report for House Bill 4313 (CR-1)." Michigan Senate Fiscal Agency, September 14, 2017. http://www.senate. michigan.gov/sfa/Departments/DataCharts/DCk12_DistrictImpact.pdf.
- Gallagher, Megan, and Amanda Gold. "Subtracting Schools from Communities." Washington, DC: Urban Institute, March 23, 2017. http://www.urban.org/features/subtracting-schools-communities.
- Garcia, Daniela, Earl Poleski, Amanda Price, and Al Pscholka. Public school academy; organization; operation; bodies authorized to issue contract; application to obtain contract; contents; oversight; suspension of powers; fees; presumption of legality; intergovernmental agreement to issue public school academy contracts; public school academy located within community district., Michigan Compiled Laws § 380.502 (2016). http://legislature.mi.gov/ doc.aspx?mcl-380-502.
- ———. Public school academy; scope; powers; definitions., Michigan Compiled Laws § 380.501 (2016). http://legislature. mi.gov/doc.aspx?mcl-380-501.
- Good, Ryan M. "Histories That Root Us: Neighborhood, Place, and the Protest of School Closures in Philadelphia." *Urban Geography* 38, no. 6 (July 3, 2017): 861–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1182286.
- ———. "Invoking Landscapes of Spatialized Inequality: Race, Class, and Place in Philadelphia's School Closure Debate." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39, no. 3 (April 3, 2017): 358–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2016.1245069.

- Green, Terrance L. "We Felt They Took the Heart out of the Community': Examining a Community-Based Response to Urban School Closure." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 25, no. 21 (March 13, 2017). https://doi.org/10.14507/ epaa.25.2549.
- Grover, John, and Yvette van der Velde. "A School District in Crisis: Detroit's Public Schools 1842-2015." Detroit: LOVELAND Technologies, 2016. https://makeloveland.com/reports/schools.
- Guerra, Jennifer. "Michigan Dumps Its School Ranking System in Favor of 'Dashboard." *Michigan Radio*, July 23, 2017. http://michiganradio.org/post/michigan-dumps-its-school-ranking-system-favor-dashboard.
- Gujral, Sabrina. "RFP-17-0152-0-2017/SAG Facilities Assessment and School Facility Planning Services." Detroit Public Schools Community District Office of Procurement and Logistics, September 30, 2017. http://www.michiganbids. net/government-agencies/wayne/detroit-public-schools---office-of-procurement-and-logistics-902753/8094423rfp---facilities-assessment-and-school-facility-planning-services.html.
- ———. "RFP-18-0004-0-2017/SAG Property Securing Services." Detroit Public Schools Community District Office of Procurement and Logistics, October 18, 2017. http://www.michiganbids.net/government-agencies/wayne/detroitpublic-schools---office-of-procurement-and-logistics-902753/8136798-rfp---property-securing-services.html.

Gustafson, Joey. "Charter Authorizers Face Challenges." Education Next 13, no. 3 (2013): 32-37.

- Hammer, Peter J. "The Fate of the Detroit Public Schools: Governance, Finance and Competition." *The Journal of Law in Society* 13, no. 1 (Fall 2011): 111–54.
- Han, Chunping, Margaret E. Raymond, James L. Woodworth, Yohannes Negassi, W. Payton Richardson, and Will Snow. "Lights Off: Practice and Impact of Closing Low-Performing Schools." Stanford, CA: Center for Research on Education Outcomes, 2017. http://credo.stanford.edu/closure-virtual-control-records.
- Higgins, Lori. "EAA's End Returns Schools to Detroit Fold." *Detroit Free Press*. April 29, 2017. http://www.freep.com/story/ news/education/2017/04/29/detroit-schools-education-achievement-authority/100278366/.
- ————. "In an Already Struggling District, Detroit Schools Deal with Extreme Teacher Shortage." *Detroit Free Press*. May 20, 2017. http://www.freep.com/story/news/education/2017/05/21/teacher-vacancies-detroit-schools/331628001/.
- ———. "Nikolai Vitti Is the Choice for Detroit Superintendent." Detroit Free Press. April 18, 2017. http://www.freep.com/ story/news/education/2017/04/18/detroit-school-board-superintendent-vitti/100618710/.

- Hollenbeck, Kevin, Timothy J. Bartik, Randall W. Eberts, Brad J. Hershbein, and Michelle Miller-Adams. "The Road Toward K-12 Excellence in Michigan: How an Upgraded Financing System Can Better Support Enhanced Student Achievement." Upjohn Institute Technical Reports. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, May 26, 2015. https://doi.org/10.17848/rpt215.
- Huffman, Alice, Michael Curry, Hazel Dukes, Scot X. Esdaile, James Gallman, John Jackson, Derrick Johnson, et al. "Quality Education for All... One School at a Time." Hearing Report. Task Force on Quality Education. Baltimore: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, July 2017. http://www.naacp.org/latest/naacp-taskforce-quality-education-report/.
- "Interlocal Agreement between the Board of Regents of Eastern Michigan University and the School District for the City of Detroit Creating the Education Achievement Authority," 2011. https://www.michigan.gov/documents/snyder/ EducationAchievementAuthorityAgreement_356040_7.pdf.
- Keaton, Patrick. "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2010–11." Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, October 2012. https://nces. ed.gov/pubs2012/pesschools10/glossary.asp.
- Kemple, James J. "High School Closures in New York City: Impacts on Students' Academic Outcomes, Attendance, and Mobility." New York: Research Alliance for New York City Schools, November 2015. http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/ research_alliance/publications/hs_closures_in_nyc.
- Kirshner, Ben, Matthew Gaertner, and Kristen Pozzoboni. "Tracing Transitions: The Effect of High School Closure on Displaced Students." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 32, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 407–29. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373710376823.
- Kirshner, Ben, and Kristen M. Pozzoboni. "Student Interpretations of a School Closure: Implications for Student Voice in Equity-Based School Reform." *Teachers College Record* 113, no. 8 (2011): 1633–67.
- Kneebone, Elizabeth, and Natalie Holmes. "U.S. Concentrated Poverty in the Wake of the Great Recession." Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, March 2016. https://www.brookings.edu/research/u-s-concentrated-poverty-in-the-wake-of-the-great-recession/.
- Lake, Robin. "The Charter Movement's 'Tipping Point' Strategy Isn't Working. What Now?" *Flypaper* (blog), September 20, 2017. https://edexcellence.net/articles/the-charter-movements-tipping-point-strategy-isnt-working-what-now.
- Lake, Robin, Sarah Yatsko, Sean Gill, and Alice Opalka. "Bridging the District-Charter Divide to Help More Students Succeed." Seattle: Center on Reinventing Public Education, January 2017. https://www.crpe.org/publications/ bridging-district-charter-divide.

- Larsen, Matthew F. "Does Closing Schools Close Doors? The Effect of High School Closings on Achievement and Attainment." Unpublished Working Paper, October 2014. http://www.tulane.edu/~mflarsen/research.html.
- Lewis, Shawn D. "Detroit Worst in Math, Reading Scores among Big Cities." *The Detroit News*. October 28, 2015. http://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/detroit-city/2015/10/28/national-assessment-educational-progress-detroit-math-reading-results/74718372/.
- Mead, Sara, Ashley LiBetti Mitchel, and Andrew J. Rotherham. "The State of the Charter School Movement." Slide Deck Report. Sudbury, MA: Bellwether Education Partners, September 10, 2015. https://bellwethereducation.org/ publication/state-charter-school-movement.
- Michelmore, Katherine, and Susan Dynarski. "The Gap within the Gap: Using Longitudinal Data to Understand Income Differences in Student Achievement." Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, July 2016. https://doi.org/10.3386/w22474.
- "Michigan Charter Schools Questions and Answers." Michigan Department of Education, January 2016. http://www. michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-6530_30334_40088---,00.html.
- "Michigan Education Finance Study." Denver: Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, June 2016. https://www.michigan.gov/ documents/budget/Michigan_Education_Finance_Study_527806_7.pdf.
- Mirel, Jeffrey. *The Rise and Fall of an Urban School System: Detroit, 1907-81.* 2nd ed. Ann Arbor Paperbacks. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Moselle, Ben, ed. National Building Cost Manual. 41st Edition. Carlsbad, CA: Craftsman, 2016.
- "On the Road to Better Accessibility, Autonomy, and Accountability." State Policy Analysis. Chicago: National Association of Charter School Authorizers, 2015. http://www.qualitycharters.org/research-policies/archive/2015-state-policy-analysis/.
- "On the Road to Better Accountability: An Analysis of State Charter School Policies." State Policy Analysis. Chicago: National Association of Charter School Authorizers, 2014. https://www.charterschoolcenter.org/resource/roadbetter-accountability.
- "On the Road to Great Charter Schools." State Policy Analysis. Chicago: National Association of Charter School Authorizers, 2016. http://www.qualitycharters.org/policy-research/state-policy-agenda/2016-spa-report/.

- Paino, Maria, Rebecca L. Boylan, and Linda A. Renzulli. "The Closing Door: The Effect of Race on Charter School Closures." *Sociological Perspectives* 60, no. 4 (August 2017): 747–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121416674948.
- Pratt Dawsey, Chastity. "In Detroit, Only a Mighty Few Can Open New Charter Schools." *Bridge* (blog), April 6, 2017. http://www.bridgemi.com/children-families/detroit-only-mighty-few-can-open-new-charter-schools.
- "Preventing Missed Opportunity: Taking Collective Action to Confront Chronic Absence." Attendance Works and Everyone Graduates Center, September 2016. http://www.attendanceworks.org/research/preventing-missedopportunity/.
- "Public School Enrollment Trends in Detroit." Memorandum. Lansing, MI: Citizens Research Council of Michigan, June 2016. https://crcmich.org/enrollment_trends_detroit-2016/.
- "Racial and Ethnic Achievement Gaps." The Educational Opportunity Monitoring Project. Stanford, CA: Center for Education Policy Analysis, n.d. http://cepa.stanford.edu/educational-opportunity-monitoring-project/ achievement-gaps/race/.
- Sanburn, Josh. "Inside Detroit's Radical Experiment to Save Its Public Schools." *Time*, September 6, 2016. http://time. com/4390000/detroit-public-schools-charters-debt/.
- Santos, Adella, Nancy McGuckin, Hikari Yukiko Nakamoto, Danielle Gray, and Susan Liss. "Summary of Travel Trends: 2009 National Household Travel Survey." Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration, June 2011. http://nhts.ornl.gov/publications.shtml.
- Schumacher, Cindy. "Charter School Authorizing: An Introduction to Authorizing in Michigan and the CMU Model." Presented at the Detroit Education Coalition 2.0 Citywide Planning Committee, Detroit, August 10, 2017.
- Stackhouse Flores, Shannon. "Quantifying the Achievement Gap: Baseline Characteristics of African-American Student Achievement in Michigan." Lansing, MI: Michigan Department of Education, May 2014. https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Quantifying_the_Achievement_Gap_473719_7.pdf.
- "SVSU Office Receives Accreditation Recommendation." *The Midland Daily News*. May 1, 2017. http://www.ourmidland. com/business/article/SVSU-office-receives-accreditation-recommendation-11111265.php.
- The State School Aid Act of 1979, Pub. L. No. 94, § 388.1705, Michigan Compiled Laws (2008). http://legislature.mi.gov/ doc.aspx?mcl-388-1705.

- Torre, Marisa de la, and Julia Gwynne. "When Schools Close: Effects on Displaced Students in Chicago Public Schools." Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research, October 2009. https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/ when-schools-close-effects-displaced-students-chicago-public-schools.
- "Urban Charter School Study: Report on 41 Regions." Stanford, CA: Center for Research on Education Outcomes, 2015. http://urbancharters.stanford.edu/summary.php.
- Valencia, Richard R. "The School Closure Issue and the Chicano Community: A Follow-up Study of the *Angeles* Case." *The Urban Review* 16, no. 3 (September 1984): 145–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01207499.
- Vitti, Nikolai. Interview by Chastity Pratt Dawsey, September 5, 2017. http://www.bridgemi.com/talent-education/nikolaivitti-loves-challenge-he-has-one-detroit-public-schools.
- Zaniewski, Ann. "Detroit Teachers, School District Settle Suit over Building Problems." *Detroit Free Press*. January 12, 2017. http://www.freep.com/story/news/education/2017/01/12/school-building-lawsuit-settled/96501140/.

Notes.

¹ Einhorn, "A Year After."

² Sanburn, "Inside Detroit's Radical Experiment."

³ "DPSCD Welcomes Newly Elected Board Members"; Higgins, "Nikolai Vitti."

⁴ "DPSCD Continues Upward Trend of Stabilized Enrollment."

⁵ Chambers, "Number of Students Enrolled at DPS Jumps over Last Year."

⁶ "On the Road to Great Charter Schools," 69–71; Schumacher, "Charter School Authorizing."

⁷ DeGrow, "School Funding."

⁸ See "Fiscal Year 2016-17 and FY 2017-18 Foundation Allowance."

⁹ See Mirel, *Rise and Fall*; Grover and van der Velde, "School District in Crisis."

¹⁰Lewis, "Detroit Worst in Math, Reading Scores among Big Cities."

¹¹"Preventing Missed Opportunity."

¹² See Higgins, "In an Already Struggling District"; Einhorn, "On Detroit's First Day of Class."

¹³ Zaniewski, "Detroit Teachers, School District Settle Suit over Building Problems."

¹⁴ Grover and van der Velde, "School District in Crisis."

¹⁵ Einhorn, "In a District."

¹⁶ Sanburn, "Inside Detroit's Radical Experiment."

¹⁷ Hammer, "The Fate of the Detroit Public Schools," sec. V.A.

¹⁸ See Vitti, interview; Einhorn, "Possible, but Daunting."

¹⁹ Hammer, "The Fate of the Detroit Public Schools"; Hollenbeck et al., "The Road Toward K-12 Excellence in Michigan," 46; "Michigan Education Finance Study," 68–80.

²⁰ "Public School Enrollment Trends in Detroit," 10–12.

²¹ Batdorff et al., "Charter Funding," 211–20.

²² "Charter School Performance in Michigan"; "Urban Charter School Study," 29–33.

²³ See, for example, Dixon, "Michigan Spends"; "On the Road to Better Accountability," 64–65; "On the Road to Better Accessibility," 77–78.

²⁴ See Huffman et al., "Quality Education for All," 25–26; Pratt Dawsey, "In Detroit, Only a Mighty Few"; Binelli, "Michigan Gambled"; Lake et al., "Bridging the District-Charter Divide," 9–10.

²⁵ "Public School Enrollment Trends in Detroit."

²⁶ Mirel, *Rise and Fall*, 457–63.

²⁷ "Public School Enrollment Trends in Detroit," 2.

²⁸ "Better Together," 4–5.

²⁹ Hammer, "The Fate of the Detroit Public Schools"; Grover and van der Velde, "School District in Crisis."

³⁰ Grover and van der Velde, "School District in Crisis."

³¹ These enrollment figures include all K-12 students attending public schools in Detroit and all Detroit residents attending public school outside of the city.

³² See, for example, Mead, LiBetti Mitchel, and Rotherham, "The State of the Charter School Movement," 40; Bytof,

"Michigan Charter School Facts"; "America's Largest Charter Public School Communities," 6-8.

³³Lake, "The Charter Movement's 'Tipping Point' Strategy."

³⁴Lake et al., "Bridging the District-Charter Divide," 8.

³⁵ Lake et al., 18–26.

³⁶ See Huffman et al., "Quality Education for All," 25–26; Pratt Dawsey, "In Detroit, Only a Mighty Few"; Binelli, "Michigan Gambled"; Lake et al., "Bridging the District-Charter Divide," 9–10.

³⁷ See "2016 Michigan School Scorecards."

³⁸Guerra, "Michigan Dumps Its School Ranking System."

³⁹ "2016 Michigan School Scorecards," 17.

⁴⁰ See, for example, Baber, O'Donovan Warnement, and Sipfle, "Quality Schools"; Baber and Silva, "The Shared Challenge of Quality Schools"; Baber, Silva, and Koch, "A Shared Responsibility."

⁴¹ A Kruskal–Wallis test revealed statistically significant differences in the proportion of accountability points earned across the four school types, $\chi^2(3, N = 178) = 36.9$, p < .001. Levene's test confirmed homogeneity of variance (F = 1.70, p = .169). A pairwise post-hoc analysis with a Bonferroni correction revealed a statistically significant difference in the average ranking of accountability points between neighborhood schools and magnet and selective schools (p < .001) and between neighborhood schools and charter schools (p < .001). It did not reveal statistically significant differences between magnet and selective schools and charter schools (p = 1.00) or between EAA schools and schools of any other type ($p \ge .128$).

⁴² A chi-square test of independence revealed statistically significant associations among the five color-coded performance ratings and the four school types, $\chi^2(12, N = 178) = 42.1, p < .001$.

⁴³ Kneebone and Holmes, "U.S. Concentrated Poverty in the Wake of the Great Recession."

⁴⁴ For a review of the literature on concentrated poverty and academic outcomes, see "Annotated Bibliography: The Impact of School-Based Poverty Concentration on Academic Achievement & Student Outcomes."

⁴⁵ Michelmore and Dynarski, "The Gap within the Gap."

⁴⁶ Stackhouse Flores, "Quantifying the Achievement Gap."

⁴⁷ "Racial and Ethnic Achievement Gaps."

 $^{48}r(178) = -.030, p = .695$

⁴⁹ Grover and van der Velde, "School District in Crisis."

⁵⁰ Vitti, interview.

⁵¹Gujral, "RFP-18-0004-0-2017/SAG"; Gujral, "RFP-17-0152-0-2017/SAG."

⁵² In and around the highest-need neighborhoods, there is a weak but statistically significant inverse correlation between the extent of a building's facilities needs and the percentage of possible accountability points that a school earned, r(87) =-.216, p = 0.45. A Kruskal-Wallis test did not reveal statistically significant differences in the extent of facilities needs across the five accountability ratings, $\chi^2(4, N = 87) = 3.56$, p = .469.

⁵³ See Brummet, "The Effect of School Closings on Student Achievement"; Bross, Harris, and Liu, "The Effects of Performance-Based School Closure"; Carlson and Lavertu, "Charter School Closure and Student Achievement"; Allensworth et al., "The Educational Benefits of Attending Higher Performing Schools"; Han et al., "Lights Off," chap. 6.

⁵⁴ See Kemple, "High School Closures in New York City."

⁵⁵ See de la Torre and Gwynne, "When Schools Close"; Engberg et al., "Closing Schools in a Shrinking District"; Larsen, "Does Closing Schools Close Doors?"

⁵⁶ See Dowdall, "Closing Public Schools in Philadelphia," 5–6.

⁵⁷ Dowdall and Warner, "Shuttered Public Schools," 1.

⁵⁸ Dowdall and Warner, 15–16.

⁵⁹ Dowdall, "Closing Public Schools in Philadelphia," 5–6.

⁶⁰ See Burdick-Will, Keels, and Schuble, "Closing and Opening Schools"; Gallagher and Gold, "Subtracting Schools from Communities"; Good, "Invoking Landscapes of Spatialized Inequality"; Paino, Boylan, and Renzulli, "The Closing Door."

⁶¹Han et al., "Lights Off," chap. 4.

⁶² See Valencia, "The School Closure Issue and the Chicano Community"; Kirshner, Gaertner, and Pozzoboni, "Tracing Transitions"; Deeds and Pattillo, "Organizational 'Failure' and Institutional Pluralism"; Good, "Invoking Landscapes of Spatialized Inequality"; Green, "We Felt They Took the Heart out of the Community."

⁶³ Kirshner and Pozzoboni, "Student Interpretations of a School Closure"; Finnigan and Lavner, "A Political Analysis"; Deeds and Pattillo, "Organizational 'Failure' and Institutional Pluralism"; Good, "Histories That Root Us"; Green, "'We Felt They Took the Heart out of the Community."

⁶⁴ See Belsha, "In Kansas City."

⁶⁵ Dowdall and Warner, "Shuttered Public Schools," fig. 4.

⁶⁶ Alix et al., "Report & Recommendations."

67 "Interlocal Agreement."

68 Higgins, "EAA's End."

⁶⁹ Garcia et al., Public school academy; scope; powers; definitions.; "Michigan Charter Schools."

⁷⁰ Gustafson, "Charter Authorizers Face Challenges."

⁷¹Garcia et al., Public school academy; organization; operation; bodies authorized to issue contract; Pratt Dawsey, "In Detroit, Only a Mighty Few"; "SVSU Office Receives Accreditation Recommendation."

⁷² The State School Aid Act of 1979.

⁷³ "Public School Enrollment Trends in Detroit."

⁷⁴ This definition borrows from the definition of a "regular school" as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics. See Keaton, "Numbers and Types," B4.

75 Keaton, B3.

76 Keaton, B4.

77 Keaton, B5.

⁷⁸ Keaton, B1.

⁷⁹ See Baber, Silva, and Koch, "The System We Need."

⁸⁰ "City of Detroit Master Plan of Policies," 67–212.

⁸¹ See Santos et al., "Summary of Travel Trends."

⁸² Abramson, "20th Annual School Construction Report," 31.

⁸³ Moselle, National Building Cost Manual, 44–55.

⁸⁴ Moselle, 239.



333 South Wabash Avenue Suite 2800 Chicago, IL 60604 iff.org