

# TECHNICAL APPENDIX





## **AUTHORS**

Sarah Winchell Lenhoff

Ben Pogodzinski

Jeremy Singer

Walter Cook

## **OUR THANKS TO**

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Skillman Foundation and the Kaplan Collaborative at Wayne State University's College of Education. We especially would like to thank the steady guidance and encouragement of Siobhan O'Laoire, our program officer at the Skillman Foundation. We would also like to thank Dr. William Hill, our assistant dean. We express our sincere appreciation for the feedback, support, and engagement of Katie Rae Stolper and Stephanie Young of the Community Education Commission; Molly Sweeney, Jamila Martin, and the leadership team of 482Forward; Reverend Larry Simmons, Christine Bell, and the steering committee of Every School Day Counts Detroit; Cindy Eggleton of 313Reads; and a special shout out to Terry Whitfield of the Skillman Foundation. Thanks to Elizabeth Orr Jones, who designed this report.

## **RESEARCH NOTE**

This research result used data collected and maintained by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and Michigan's Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI). Results, information, and opinions solely represent the analysis, information, and opinions of the authors and are not endorsed by – or reflect the views or positions of – grantors, MDE, and CEPI or any employee thereof.

## **WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU**

This report provides an overview of student exit, mobility, and absenteeism in Detroit. Our future reports will go deeper into these issues to explore questions that community members need answered to contribute to educational improvement in Detroit. We will provide our interpretation of this research, based on data, studies from other cities, and the historical and contemporary Detroit context. But we are not the only experts. Detroit students, parents, educators, and advocates are in the best position to help us understand what our findings mean and how to act on them in policy and practice. To that end, we want to hear from you. Please go to <http://tinyurl.com/WSU-education-research-survey> to give us your feedback.

## **REFERENCE FOR THIS REPORT**

Lenhoff, S. W., Pogodzinski, B., Singer, J., & Cook, W. (2019). Student Exit, Mobility, and Attendance in Detroit. Retrieved from Wayne State University website: [go.wayne.edu/DetEdResearch](http://go.wayne.edu/DetEdResearch)



**Figure 1: Map of Detroit Neighborhoods**



1	AIRPORT SUB	40	DETROIT GOLF	78	GREENWICH	118	MORNINGSIDE	156	RIVERDALE
2	ARDEN PARK	41	DEXTER-FENKELL	79	GRIXDALE FARMS	119	MOROSS-MORANG	157	RIVERTOWN
3	AVIATION SUB	42	DEXTER-LINWOOD	80	HAPPY HOMES	120	MOUNT OLIVET	158	ROSEDALE PARK
4	BAGLEY	43	DOWNTOWN	81	HARMONY VILLAGE	121	NW GOLDBERG	159	ROUGE PARK
5	BARTON-MCFARLAND	44	EAST ENGLISH VILLAGE	82	HAWTHORNE PARK	122	NARDIN PARK	160	RUSSELL INDUSTRIAL
6	BELMONT	45	EAST VILLAGE	83	HENRY FORD	123	NEW CENTER	161	RUSSELL WOODS
7	BENTLER-PICKFORD	46	EASTERN MARKET	84	HERMAN KIEFER	124	NEW CENTER COMMONS	162	SCHAEFER 7/8 LODGE
8	BERG-LAHSER	47	EDEN GARDENS	85	HISTORIC ATKINSON	125	NOLAN	163	SCHOOLCRAFT-196
9	BLACKSTONE PARK	48	ELIJAH MCCOY	86	HUBBARD FARMS	126	NORTH CAMPAU	164	SCHULZE
10	BOSTON EDISON	49	ELIZA HOWELL	87	HUBBARD RICHARD	127	NORTH CORKTOWN	165	SEVEN MILE-ROUGE
11	BOYNTON	50	ELMWOOD PARK	88	HUBBELL-LYNDON	128	NORTH END	166	SHERWOOD
12	BREWSTER DOUGLAS	51	EVERGREEN LAHSER 7/8	89	HUBBELL-PURITAN	129	NORTH ROSEDALE PARK	167	SHERWOOD FOREST
13	BREWSTER HOMES	52	EVERGREEN-OUTER DRIVE	90	HUNT	130	NORTHEAST CENTRAL DISTRICT	168	SOUTH OF SIX
14	BRIGHTMOOR	53	FAR WEST DETROIT	91	INDIAN VILLAGE	131	NORTHWEST COMMUNITY	169	SOUTHFIELD PLYMOUTH
15	BRUSH PARK	54	FARWELL	92	ISLANDVIEW	132	NORTOWN	170	SOUTHWEST DETROIT
16	BUFFALO	55	FISKHORN	93	JAMISON	133	O'HAIR PARK	171	SPRINGWELLS
17	BUTLER	56	FITZGERALD	94	JEFFERSON CHALMERS	134	OAK GROVE	172	STATE FAIR
18	CADILLAC COMMUNITY	57	FIVE POINTS	95	JEFFRIES	135	OAKMAN BLVD COMMUNITY	173	TECH TOWN
19	CADILLAC HEIGHTS	58	FOREST PARK	96	JOSEPH BERRY SUB	136	OAKWOOD HEIGHTS	174	THE EYE
20	CAMPAU/BANGLATOWN	59	FOX CREEK	97	JOY COMMUNITY	137	OLD REDFORD	175	TRI-POINT
21	CARBON WORKS	60	FRANKLIN	98	JOY-SCHAEFER COMMUNITY	138	OUTER DRIVE-HAYES	176	UNIVERSITY DISTRICT
22	CASTLE ROUGE	61	FRANKLIN PARK	99	KRAINZ WOODS	139	PALMER PARK	177	VIRGINIA PARK
23	CHADSEY CONDON	62	GARDEN VIEW	100	LASALLE COLLEGE PARK	140	PALMER WOODS	178	VON STEUBEN
24	CHANDLER PARK	63	GATEWAY COMMUNITY	101	LASALLE GARDENS	141	PAVEWAY	179	WADE
25	CHANDLER PARK-CHALMERS	64	GOLD COAST	102	LAFAYETTE PARK	142	PEMBROKE	180	WARREN AVE COMMUNITY
26	CLAYTOWN	65	GRAND RIVER-196	103	LITTLEFIELD COMMUNITY	143	PENROSE	181	WARRENDALE
27	COLLEGE PARK	66	GRAND RIVER-ST MARYS	104	MAPLERIDGE	144	PERSHING	182	WATERWORKS PARK
28	CONANT GARDENS	67	GRANDMONT	105	MARINA DISTRICT	145	PETOSKEY-OTSEGO	183	WAYNE STATE
29	CONNER CREEK	68	GRANDMONT #1	106	MARTIN PARK	146	PIETY HILL	184	WE CARE COMMUNITY
30	CONNER CREEK INDUSTRIAL	69	GRANT	107	MEDBURY PARK	147	PILGRIM VILLAGE	185	WEATHERBY
31	CORE CITY	70	GRATIOT TOWN/KETTERRING	108	MEDICAL CENTER	148	PINGREE PARK	186	WEST OUTER DRIVE
32	CORKTOWN	71	GRATIOT WOODS	109	MELVERN HILL	149	PLYMOUTH-HUBBELL	187	WEST SIDE INDUSTRIAL
33	CORNERSTONE VILLAGE	72	GRATIOT-FINDLAY	110	MEXICANTOWN	150	PLYMOUTH-196	188	WEST VILLAGE
34	CRARY/ST MARYS	73	GRATIOT-GRAND	111	MICHIGAN-MARTIN	151	POLETOWN EAST	189	WEST VIRGINIA PARK
35	CULTURAL CENTER	74	GREEN ACRES	112	MIDTOWN	152	PRIDE AREA COMMUNITY	190	WESTWOOD PARK
36	DAVISON	75	GREENFIELD	113	MIDWEST	153	PULASKI	191	WILDEMERE PARK
37	DAVISON-SCHOOLCRAFT	76	GREENFIELD PARK	114	MILLER GROVE	154	RAVENDALE	192	WINSHIP
38	DELRAY	77	GREENFIELD-GRAND RIVER	115	MILWAUKEE JUNCTION	155	REGENT PARK	193	WOODBIDGE
39	DENBY			116	MINOCK PARK			194	YORKSHIRE WOODS
				117	MOHICAN REGENT				



## ANALYTIC APPROACH

### STUDENT EXIT: SINGLE-LEVEL LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS

To explore student exit, a series of regressions were estimated modeling the likelihood of attending a school outside of Detroit during the 2017-18 school year as a function of student characteristics. Our analytic sample was confined to students living within the geographic boundaries of the city who did not attend either a juvenile detention facility or a virtual school. Because the outcome variable ( $Exit_i$ ) is binary (i.e., 0 = no exit; 1 = exit), we estimated a set of single-level logistic regressions, with the following model representing our general analytic approach:

$$\ln\left(\frac{Exit_i}{1 - Exit_i}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Asian_i + \beta_2 Latinx_i + \beta_3 White_i + \beta_4 Other_i \\ + \beta_5 Female_i + \beta_6 EconDis_i + \beta_7 ELL_i + \beta_8 SPED_i \\ + \beta_9 SchConcDetroit_i + \beta_{10} SchConcMetro_i \\ + \beta_{11} UpperEl_i + \beta_{12} JuniorHS_i + \beta_{13} HS_i + \epsilon_i \quad (1).$$

As shown, the odds of exit are modeled as a function of student race (Black is the excluded category for reference), gender, economic disadvantage status, English language learner status, special education status, concentration of schools near a student's residence both within and outside of the city, and level of schooling (lower elementary is the excluded category for reference). Therefore, the base outcome is a Black male student in a lower elementary grade (Grades K-3) who was not economically disadvantaged, was not an English Language Learner, and did not qualify for special education services. Student demographic data was gathered from the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS), and school concentration was calculated by the number of schools within a specific radius of a student's home residence (2.5 mile radius for elementary students (K-8), and 3.5 mile radius for high school students). The odds-ratios on all of these variables can be interpreted as being relative to that base outcome (e.g.,  $\beta_1=7.86$  indicates that an Asian student is 7.86 times more likely to exit Detroit than a Black student).

In a second model, we also controlled for the percent of vacant homes and



number of crimes near a student’s residence (tract level). Finally, in a third model, we excluded those residential variables but included a measure of making a residential move between spring 2017 and fall 2017, and whether or not a student had exited the city the previous year.

## STUDENT MOBILITY: MULTI-LEVEL LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS

We ran a series of multilevel logistic regressions to explore the associations between inter-year mobility and student- and school-level characteristics. The outcome variable indicates whether a student changed schools between the end of 2016-17 and the start of 2017-18 during a non-transition year (0 = did not move; 1 = moved). Students who were in a transition year at their school were coded as missing. Our outcome variable notation—*Mob<sub>ij</sub>*—refers to the interyear mobility status of student *i* in school *j*, with school-level variables measured at t-1 (2016-17 school year). We confined our analytic sample to students who lived in Detroit in both end-of-year 2016-17 and fall of 2017-18, as well as excluded students who attended either a juvenile detention facility or virtual school.

Our base model, which incorporates random intercepts (but not random slopes), is specified as:

### Level One Equation:

$$\ln\left(\frac{Mob_{ij}}{1 - Mob_{ij}}\right) = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}Asian_{ij} + \beta_{2j}Latinx_{ij} + \beta_{3j}White_{ij} + \beta_{4j}Other_{ij} \\ + \beta_{5j}Female_{ij} + \beta_{6j}EconDis_{ij} + \beta_{7j}ELL_{ij} + \beta_{8j}SPED_{ij} \\ + \beta_{9j}Commuter_{ij} + \beta_{10j}InterYearResMover_{ij} \\ + \beta_{11j}SchConcMetro_{ij} \\ + \beta_{12j}UpperEl_{ij} + \beta_{13j}JuniorHS_{ij} + \beta_{14j}HS_{ij} + u_j + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (4).$$

## Level Two Equations:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}Charter_j + \gamma_{02}PctEconDis_j + \gamma_{03}PctCommuter_j \\ + \gamma_{04}PctChronicAbsent_j + \gamma_{05}SchInDetroit_j$$

$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10}$$

⋮

$$\beta_{15j} = \gamma_{150}$$

(5).

In this model, the base outcome is a Black male student who is not economically disadvantaged, an ELL, or qualify for special education services who also is not a commuter or an interyear residential mover and enrolled in K-3. We created school-level aggregates based on the MSDS data for percent economically disadvantaged and percent commuter, as well as percent chronically absent. The odds ratios can be interpreted the same as previous output (e.g.,  $\hat{\gamma}_{80}=0.9321$  indicates that a special education student is 7.3% less likely to change schools than a non-special education student [ $1/0.9321=1.0728$ ]).

## CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM AND ATTENDANCE: MULTI-LEVEL LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS

As with exit and mobility, chronic absenteeism was modeled as a binary outcome (0 = not chronically absent; 1 = chronically absent). To account for the hierarchical nature of the data (i.e., students nested within schools), we used multilevel logistic regression to identify the association between chronic absenteeism and student- and school-level factors. Our analytic sample was confined to all students who attended a school within Detroit in 2017-18. We excluded students who attended either a juvenile detention facility or virtual school.

Our base model, which incorporates random intercepts (but not random slopes), is specified as:



### Level One Equation:


$$\ln\left(\frac{CA_{ij}}{1 - CA_{ij}}\right) = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}Asian_{ij} + \beta_{2j}Latinx_{ij} + \beta_{3j}White_{ij} + \beta_{4j}Other_{ij} \\ + \beta_{5j}Female_{ij} + \beta_{6j}EconDis_{ij} + \beta_{7j}ELL_{ij} + \beta_{8j}SPED_{ij} \\ + \beta_{9j}Commuter_{ij} + \beta_{10j}ResVacancy_{ij} + \beta_{11j}ResCrimes_{ij} \\ + \beta_{12j}IntrayearMover_{ij} + \beta_{13j}Asthma_{ij} \\ + \beta_{14j}UpperEl_{ij} + \beta_{14j}JuniorHS_{ij} + \beta_{15j}HS_{ij} + u_j + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (2).$$

### Level Two Equations:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}Charter_j + \gamma_{02}PctEconDis_j + \gamma_{03}PctCommuter_j \\ + \gamma_{04}StabilityRate_j \\ \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{15j} = \gamma_{150} \quad (3).$$

Therefore, we modeled chronic absence of student  $i$  in school  $j$  as a function of both student- and school-level characteristics. In this specification, the base outcome represents a student with the following characteristics: a) Black, b) male, c) not economically disadvantaged, d) not a recipient of special education services, e) not a commuter, f) not an intra-year school mover, and g) was in early elementary (grades K-3). In a second model, we also controlled for student level math achievement z-score as well as school average math achievement z-score.

With respect to student-level data, the student demographic data come directly from the MSDS. We define commuter as a student who attends a school outside a geographic radius of their home (2.5 miles for K-8 students and 3.5 miles for HS students). Resident vacancy rate comes from the American Community Survey, while crime data comes from the city of Detroit and adult asthma rates come from the US Centers for Disease Control. With respect to school-level data, the charter indicator variable comes from the MSDS. We created school-level aggregates based on the MSDS data for percent economically disadvantaged and percent commuter. Finally,



we constructed the school-level stability rate by finding the percentage of students not in a transition year who remained at the school from end-of-year 2017 to fall of 2017.

As with the single-level logit, the binary indicators (e.g., race, gender, etc.) provide odds-ratios that can be interpreted relative to a base outcome. The odds-ratio from a multilevel logistic regression can be interpreted the same as one from a single-level logistic (e.g.,  $\hat{\gamma}_{6,0}=1.7221$  indicates that an economically disadvantaged student is 72% more likely to be chronically absent than a student who is not economically disadvantaged).






**Table 1: T-Tests Comparing Those Who Exited Detroit for School and Those Who Stayed**

Variable	Leaver	Stayer	Statistically Significant Difference
<b>STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
Black	0.80	0.83	***
Latinx	0.04	0.13	***
White	0.11	0.03	***
Asian	0.04	0.004	***
Other Race	0.02	0.007	***
Female	0.50	0.49	
Economically Disadvantaged	0.90	0.90	
ELL	0.11	0.12	***
Special Education	0.10	0.14	***
ELA MEAP/M-STEP Score	-0.63	-0.68	***
Math MEAP/M-STEP Score	-0.67	-0.77	***
Distance traveled to school (miles)	4.19	2.42	***
Concentration of Detroit schools	5.43	7.06	***
Concentration of non-Detroit schools	4.04	2.52	***
Students in Same Neighborhood who Exit Detroit (%)	0.35	0.21	***
Neighborhood crimes	337.74	312.12	***
Neighborhood vacancies	0.14	0.25	***
Residential Mover	0.17	0.18	***
Prior Year Exiter	0.12	0.95	***
<b>SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
Black (%)	0.72	0.82	***
Latinx (%)	0.04	0.13	***
White (%)	0.17	0.03	***
Asian (%)	0.05	0.01	***
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	0.86	0.90	***
ELL (%)	0.12	0.12	
Special Education (%)	0.11	0.14	***
ELA MEAP/M-STEP School Average	-0.67	-0.74	***
Math MEAP/M-STEP School Average	-0.68	-0.81	***

\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

**Figure 2:** Average Number of Suburban Schools in Student Residential Radius by Neighborhood



**Table 2:** Estimated Odds Ratios for Attending a School Outside Detroit

Variable	(1) Student Characteristics and School concentration	(2) Student, Concentration, and Neighborhood Characteristics	(3) Student, Concentration, and Prior Year Characteristics
Asian	7.8629***	8.8083***	1.7048***
Latinx	0.5252***	0.5558***	0.6677***
White	3.0435***	3.2007***	1.9586***
Other Race	2.7784***	2.8486***	2.3902***
Female	0.9860	0.9863	0.9637
Econ Disadvantaged	1.0289	1.0220	1.1757***
ELL	0.7057***	0.7123***	0.8309*
Special Education	0.6535***	0.6523***	0.7558***
School Concentration in Detroit	0.9173***	0.9176***	0.9254***
School Concentration outside Detroit	1.1404***	1.1305***	1.0741***
Grades 3-5	1.3510***	1.3534***	1.1011*
Grades 6-8	1.6101***	1.6044***	1.1745***
Grades 9-12	1.3356***	1.3505***	1.0009
Residential Percent Vacant Homes		0.5122***	
Residential Number of Crimes		1.0044***	
Previous Residential Mover			0.3648***
Previous Detroit Exiter			134.8354***
N	95,847	95,832	84,581
Intercept	0.2814***	0.2294***	0.0531***
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.0938	0.0994	0.6044

\*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05

**Table 3: T-Tests Comparing Movers and Non-Movers**

Variable	Non-School Mover	School Mover	Statistically Significant Difference
Female	0.50	0.50	
Economically Disadvantaged	0.90	0.92	***
ELL	0.14	0.26	***
Special Education	0.14	0.14	
Commuter#	0.34	0.34	
Residential Mover	0.11	0.44	***
School Concentration Metro	9.54	9.34	***
Math Z-Score	-0.70	-0.91	***
Charter#	0.47	0.39	***
School in Detroit	0.76	0.80	***
Pct School Economic Disadvantage#	0.86	0.87	***
Pct School Chronic Absent#	0.39	0.47	***
Pct School Commuter#	0.36	0.29	***
School Avg Math Z-Score#	-0.76	-0.88	***

# Measure taken from 2016-17 school  
 \*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05

**Table 4: Estimated Odds Ratios for Between-Year Mobility**

Variable	(1)	(2)
Asian	0.463***	0.379***
Latinx	0.477***	0.496***
White	0.679***	0.703**
Other Race	0.960	0.955
Female	0.995	1.051
Economically Disadvantaged	1.082	1.105
ELL	1.226**	1.192
Special Education	0.945	0.833***
Commuter#	1.019	1.028
Residential Move	6.029***	6.401***
School Concentration Metro	0.994	0.992
Math Z-Score		0.833***
Charter#	1.047	1.349***
School in Detroit#	1.009	0.892**
School % Economically Disadvantaged#	0.138***	0.065***
School % Chronically Absent#	2.047***	3.090***
School % Commuter#	0.832***	0.824***
School Avg Math Z-Score#	0.650	0.577***
Grades 3-5	1.107	
Grades 6-8	0.908**	
Grades 9-12	0.834***	
N	64,772	37,073
AIC Intercepts Only	54,123.189	29,713.721
AIC w/Covariates	47,600.623	25,698.0.94
Pseudo R2	0.0964	0.1036
Fixed Effects	N	N

+ Grand-mean centered  
 # Measure taken from 2016-17 school  
 \*\*\*p < 0.001; \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05

**Table 5: T-Tests Comparing Chronically Absent and Not Chronically Absent Students**

Variable	Not Chronically Absent Students	Chronically Absent Students	Statistically Significant Difference
<b>STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
Attendance Rate (%)	0.95	0.76	***
Black	0.77	0.87	***
Latinx	0.17	0.09	***
White	0.04	0.02	***
Asian	0.01	0.01	
Other Race	0.009	0.006	***
Female	0.51	0.48	***
Economically Disadvantaged	0.87	0.92	***
ELL	0.17	0.08	***
Special Education	0.11	0.17	***
ELA MEAP/M-STEP Score	-0.47	-0.89	***
Math MEAP/M-STEP Score	-0.54	-0.99	***
Commuter	0.35	0.28	***
Vacant Homes (%) of Residential Census Block Group	0.25	0.28	***
Adult Asthma Rate (per 100) in Census Tract	12.8	13.1	***
Number of Crimes Yearly in Residential Census Tract	295.63	316.40	***
Chronic Absenteeism in Previous Year	0.15	0.65	***
Attendance Rate in Previous Year (%)	0.94	0.83	***
Within-Year Mobility	0.03	0.11	***
Between-Year Mobility	0.16	0.24	***
<b>SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
Chronic Absenteeism (%)	0.41	0.66	***
Attendance Rate (%)	0.87	0.81	***
Economically Disadvantaged (%)	0.89	0.90	***
ELA MEAP/M-STEP School Average	-0.58	-0.84	***
Math MEAP/M-STEP School Average	-0.66	-0.91	***
Charter	0.59	0.29	***
School Stability Rate of Peers (%)	0.84	0.81	***

\*p&lt;0.05, \*\*p&lt;0.01, \*\*\*p&lt;0.001

**Table 6: Estimated Odds Ratios for Chronic Absence**

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)
<b>STUDENT LEVEL</b>			
Asian	0.8104	0.8226	0.8173
Latinx	0.7012***	0.7416***	0.7368***
White	1.0389	0.9780	0.9827
Other Race	0.9061	0.8567	0.8675
Female	0.9863	0.9962	0.9932
Economically Disadvantaged	1.7221***	1.5007***	1.5019***
ELL	0.6301***	0.7130***	0.7105***
Special Education	1.1687***	1.0403	1.0420
Commuter	1.0670**	1.0500	1.0484
Residential Pct Vacancy	1.1311	1.1286	1.1163
Residential Number of Crimes	1.0001	1.0000	1.0001
Within-year School Mover	3.6166***	3.3332***	3.3432***
Residential Adult Asthma Rate	1.0567***	1.0343*	1.0355*
Upper Elementary	0.8205***	1.0340	
Junior High	0.7006***	1.0622	1.0572
High School	1.2319*	1.8802***	1.8532***
Previously Chronically Absent		9.5843***	9.4765***
Between-year Mover		1.0754*	1.0783**
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>			
Pct Economically Disadvantaged	202.4338***	26.1016***	6.6295
Charter	0.1688***	0.2275***	0.3025***
Stability Rate	0.1701***	0.2280**	0.5833
Pct Commuter	1.1502	1.0313	1.0465
Avg Math Z-Score			0.4126***
N	73,619	58,948	58,213
Number of Schools	185	184	173
Intraclass Correlation Coefficient	0.1839	0.1744	0.1652
School Stability Rate of Peers (%)	0.84	0.81	***

**Note.** All school-level variables except for “charter” are grand-mean centered.



**Table 7: Detroit Neighborhoods by Student Population, Characteristics, and Schools Concentration**

Neighborhood Name	Number of City Resident Students	Percent of City Resident Students	n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)	% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)	n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)	% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)	Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)	Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students
Warrendale	3577	3.73%	1,632	45.63%	1,468	41.04%	5.88	4.36
Warren Ave Community	1897	1.98%	716	37.76%	1,050	55.35%	5.33	6.05
Buffalo	1205	1.26%	386	32.06%	963	79.92%	3.36	5.02
Regent Park	1804	1.88%	1,026	56.89%	671	37.20%	5.28	4.36
Campau/Banglatown	718	0.75%	288	40.11%	544	75.77%	2.98	6.59
Cornerstone Village	1110	1.16%	634	57.13%	498	44.86%	3.99	5.84
Franklin Park	1699	1.77%	929	54.71%	465	27.37%	6.87	2.80
Bagley	1830	1.91%	900	49.18%	462	25.25%	6.33	2.42
North Campau	678	0.71%	379	55.92%	443	65.34%	1.41	9.03
Farwell	1063	1.11%	555	52.21%	432	40.64%	2.76	6.03
Boynton	827	0.86%	381	46.07%	431	52.12%	1.33	6.27
Greenfield	1370	1.43%	737	53.80%	413	30.15%	6.20	4.99
Moross-Morang	1161	1.21%	669	57.59%	402	34.63%	5.25	4.77
Evergreen Lahser 7/8	1151	1.20%	521	45.29%	363	31.54%	3.30	3.47
Barton-McFarland	1447	1.51%	870	60.13%	360	24.88%	4.48	4.32
Pembroke	1133	1.18%	592	52.22%	349	30.80%	5.38	4.36
Hubbell-Lyndon	2009	2.09%	1,216	60.51%	342	17.02%	8.24	0.24
Airport Sub	1067	1.11%	440	41.22%	341	31.96%	5.07	3.25
Claytown	4376	4.56%	1,463	33.44%	339	7.75%	7.83	3.71
Crary/St Marys	1250	1.30%	677	54.14%	320	25.60%	9.27	0.53
Morningside	1984	2.07%	1,154	58.15%	313	15.78%	6.47	3.26
Brightmoor	1463	1.52%	795	54.31%	309	21.12%	5.39	1.00
Schulze	1186	1.24%	594	50.08%	291	24.54%	7.84	2.85
O'Hair Park	864	0.90%	450	52.03%	291	33.68%	4.64	3.55
College Park	984	1.03%	519	52.77%	252	25.61%	7.43	3.26
Evergreen-Outer Drive	1024	1.07%	514	50.20%	251	24.51%	5.95	1.93

Table 7 continued



Neighborhood Name	Number of City Resident Students	Percent of City Resident Students	n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)	% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)	n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)	% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)	Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)	Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students
Outer Drive-Hayes	1329	1.38%	860	64.71%	243	18.28%	7.50	1.78
Conner Creek	656	0.68%	401	61.16%	242	36.89%	5.23	3.97
Far West Detroit	373	0.39%	154	41.24%	240	64.34%	3.43	8.19
Fitzgerald	1313	1.37%	838	63.79%	234	17.82%	8.97	1.05
Mapleridge	931	0.97%	587	63.04%	232	24.92%	7.04	3.09
Five Points	405	0.42%	174	42.96%	223	55.06%	1.84	5.08
Schaefer 7/8 Lodge	598	0.62%	291	48.74%	221	36.96%	6.82	5.16
Winship	822	0.86%	382	46.45%	220	26.76%	8.20	3.51
The Eye	371	0.39%	157	42.28%	215	57.95%	1.86	4.64
Mohican Regent	513	0.53%	272	52.93%	213	41.52%	5.76	4.17
Schoolcraft-196	920	0.96%	525	57.02%	196	21.30%	8.63	0.27
Pulaski	763	0.80%	527	69.01%	193	25.29%	5.80	3.41
Von Steuben	811	0.85%	525	64.77%	193	23.80%	6.47	2.09
Aviation Sub	468	0.49%	199	42.52%	188	40.17%	3.46	5.61
Northeast Central District	574	0.60%	211	36.76%	179	31.18%	7.84	0.90
Pershing	378	0.39%	191	50.53%	177	46.83%	1.85	7.40
Plymouth-Hubbell	641	0.67%	380	59.31%	170	26.52%	7.48	3.39
Butler	313	0.33%	149	47.60%	164	52.40%	1.49	8.23
Harmony Village	900	0.94%	523	58.13%	161	17.89%	8.35	1.01
Springwells	2933	3.06%	1,156	39.42%	154	5.25%	7.79	1.81
NW Goldberg	497	0.52%	294	59.15%	154	30.99%	5.13	3.04
Midwest	1339	1.40%	792	59.12%	154	11.50%	9.66	1.56
Castle Rouge	333	0.35%	133	40.00%	150	45.05%	2.41	4.42
Krainz Woods	613	0.64%	308	50.24%	149	24.31%	3.15	5.99
East English Village	740	0.77%	402	54.32%	149	20.14%	4.84	4.79
Northwest Community	290	0.30%	143	49.48%	145	50.00%	1.86	9.18
Dexter-Linwood	1059	1.10%	653	61.67%	145	13.69%	7.90	2.31
Bentler-Pickford	780	0.81%	423	54.24%	145	18.59%	4.81	1.92

**Table 7 continued**

<b>Neighborhood Name</b>	<b>Number of City Resident Students</b>	<b>Percent of City Resident Students</b>	<b>n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)</b>	<b>% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)</b>	<b>n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)</b>	<b>% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)</b>	<b>Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)</b>	<b>Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students</b>
Yorkshire Woods	628	0.65%	372	59.23%	143	22.77%	6.01	4.12
Oakman Blvd Community	1043	1.09%	564	54.03%	142	13.61%	7.23	1.32
Riverdale	472	0.49%	194	41.06%	138	29.24%	4.50	1.84
Joy Community	745	0.78%	484	64.95%	138	18.52%	7.53	2.70
Southwest Detroit	3026	3.15%	1,380	45.60%	133	4.40%	10.40	0.28
Rosedale Park	499	0.52%	179	35.94%	130	26.05%	8.58	0.11
Seven Mile-Rouge	360	0.38%	157	43.61%	128	35.56%	1.96	4.57
Denby	478	0.50%	272	56.90%	126	26.36%	6.57	3.07
West Outer Drive	220	0.23%	78	35.62%	124	56.36%	3.52	5.41
Fiskhorn	369	0.38%	197	53.26%	123	33.33%	5.86	6.00
Berg-Lahser	513	0.53%	222	43.22%	121	23.59%	2.55	5.07
Greenfield-Grand River	434	0.45%	246	56.58%	119	27.42%	8.74	0.00
Franklin	415	0.43%	278	66.91%	119	28.67%	6.28	3.20
Grixdale Farms	207	0.22%	109	52.43%	115	55.56%	2.49	7.92
Cadillac Heights	230	0.24%	133	57.64%	115	50.00%	2.03	8.81
Davison	184	0.19%	87	47.54%	113	61.41%	3.38	5.77
Blackstone Park	262	0.27%	136	51.91%	107	40.84%	6.63	5.31
Grandmont #1	338	0.35%	145	42.90%	107	31.66%	8.50	0.05
Belmont	375	0.39%	210	55.88%	104	27.73%	7.91	0.18
Hubbell-Puritan	456	0.48%	233	50.99%	102	22.37%	8.52	1.31
Eliza Howell	290	0.30%	141	48.78%	102	35.17%	2.21	3.34
Greenwich	291	0.30%	142	48.79%	101	34.71%	7.26	4.77
Lafayette Park	448	0.47%	279	62.25%	99	22.10%	6.62	0.74
Grant	316	0.33%	172	54.43%	98	31.01%	4.62	3.66
Grandmont	329	0.34%	161	49.09%	96	29.18%	9.84	0.00
Grand River-St Marys	335	0.35%	188	56.12%	94	28.06%	9.36	0.00
Grand River-196	484	0.50%	304	62.79%	92	19.01%	6.30	1.49
Sherwood	274	0.29%	147	53.68%	88	32.12%	4.66	3.11
Eden Gardens	496	0.52%	315	63.51%	88	17.74%	7.74	0.44



Table 7 continued



Neighborhood Name	Number of City Resident Students	Percent of City Resident Students	n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)	% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)	n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)	% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)	Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)	Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students
South of Six	174	0.18%	78	44.77%	85	48.85%	1.89	4.30
Hawthorne Park	147	0.15%	88	59.59%	85	57.82%	1.88	9.27
Penrose	145	0.15%	87	60.00%	85	58.62%	2.23	8.42
Weatherby	273	0.28%	147	53.85%	83	30.40%	6.58	1.34
Gratiot Woods	914	0.95%	516	56.48%	68	7.44%	6.94	0.02
Mount Olivet	291	0.30%	182	62.50%	67	23.02%	5.30	2.10
Wade	457	0.48%	309	67.69%	63	13.79%	7.39	0.00
Pilgrim Village	454	0.47%	273	60.04%	63	13.88%	7.05	2.52
Chadsey Condon	845	0.88%	373	44.19%	62	7.34%	13.23	0.02
Martin Park	388	0.40%	224	57.73%	60	15.46%	6.16	3.47
We Care Community	272	0.28%	163	59.78%	59	21.69%	5.76	5.00
Joy-Schaefer	173	0.18%	96	55.49%	59	34.10%	4.78	5.79
Jefferson Chalmers	773	0.81%	426	55.12%	59	7.63%	4.57	1.47
Gratiot-Findlay	300	0.31%	201	66.89%	57	19.00%	6.33	0.41
Russell Woods	326	0.34%	144	44.17%	57	17.48%	7.87	1.21
Fox Creek	712	0.74%	436	61.24%	56	7.87%	6.87	1.31
Garden View	203	0.21%	112	54.95%	56	27.59%	7.21	5.58
New Center	465	0.48%	287	61.72%	56	12.04%	8.05	0.97
University District	337	0.35%	110	32.74%	54	16.02%	5.42	3.85
Chandler Park	532	0.55%	337	63.35%	53	9.96%	8.50	0.58
North Corktown	86	0.09%	54	62.79%	53	61.63%	2.48	8.06
Green Acres	171	0.18%	67	39.18%	53	30.99%	3.66	5.27
Palmer Park	109	0.11%	80	73.39%	49	44.95%	4.63	5.20
Westwood Park	135	0.14%	71	52.59%	48	35.56%	7.52	0.30
Minock Park	130	0.14%	62	48.06%	48	36.92%	7.34	0.48
Conant Gardens	157	0.16%	82	51.92%	47	29.94%	2.14	7.84
North Rosedale Park	343	0.36%	169	49.26%	45	13.12%	7.91	6.11
Pride Area Community	195	0.20%	102	52.06%	41	21.03%	5.97	3.05
Petoskey-Otsego	356	0.37%	202	56.78%	38	10.67%	10.30	0.98

**Table 7 continued**

<b>Neighborhood Name</b>	<b>Number of City Resident Students</b>	<b>Percent of City Resident Students</b>	<b>n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)</b>	<b>% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)</b>	<b>n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)</b>	<b>% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)</b>	<b>Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)</b>	<b>Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students</b>
Miller Grove	171	0.18%	73	42.69%	38	22.22%	5.64	1.28
Elmwood Park	898	0.94%	499	55.58%	36	4.01%	9.00	0.00
Delray	277	0.29%	124	44.77%	36	13.00%	6.22	1.61
Southfield Plymouth	119	0.12%	59	49.58%	35	29.41%	8.57	0.40
Boston Edison	244	0.25%	71	29.10%	33	13.52%	8.56	3.98
Midtown	441	0.46%	191	43.31%	33	7.48%	10.53	0.33
Plymouth-196	142	0.15%	86	60.56%	32	22.54%	8.32	1.51
Old Redford	106	0.11%	38	35.85%	31	29.25%	3.83	3.15
Islandview	460	0.48%	280	60.87%	30	6.52%	7.96	0.00
Oak Grove	64	0.07%	28	43.55%	29	45.31%	3.73	3.42
Littlefield Community	273	0.28%	170	62.27%	29	10.62%	5.82	0.99
Pingree Park	270	0.28%	113	42.01%	29	10.74%	6.83	0.13
Greenfield Park	48	0.05%	23	47.92%	28	58.33%	2.56	7.67
Herman Kiefer	344	0.36%	199	57.77%	26	7.56%	9.14	2.79
Forest Park	455	0.47%	233	51.11%	24	5.27%	10.62	1.41
Paveway	95	0.10%	58	61.05%	24	25.26%	8.13	2.86
Gateway Community	215	0.22%	109	50.70%	24	11.16%	5.66	5.53
Davison- Schoolcraft	274	0.29%	161	58.61%	24	8.76%	8.14	0.23
Gratiot-Grand	268	0.28%	146	54.31%	22	8.21%	7.65	0.33
Cadillac Community	100	0.10%	50	50.00%	22	22.00%	8.15	0.00
LaSalle College Park	179	0.19%	115	64.25%	21	11.73%	11.41	1.88
Nortown	155	0.16%	76	49.35%	20	12.90%	7.13	0.09
Carbon Works	54	0.06%	30	55.56%	20	37.04%	4.04	3.02
Core City	235	0.24%	106	45.11%	19	8.09%	13.72	0.00
Brewster Homes	218	0.23%	150	68.81%	19	8.72%	11.22	0.29
Wildemere Park	159	0.17%	97	60.76%	19	11.95%	13.31	0.99
Tri-Point	61	0.06%	23	37.70%	19	31.15%	7.79	4.13

Table 7 continued



Neighborhood Name	Number of City Resident Students	Percent of City Resident Students	n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)	% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)	n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)	% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)	Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)	Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students
Chandler Park-Chalmers	146	0.15%	81	55.48%	18	12.33%	7.88	1.19
Jamison	168	0.18%	101	60.12%	17	10.12%	9.63	1.22
Henry Ford	141	0.15%	76	53.57%	17	12.06%	9.40	2.95
Wayne State	186	0.19%	88	47.57%	16	8.60%	10.12	0.56
East Village	528	0.55%	282	53.35%	15	2.84%	6.01	0.00
Poletown East	122	0.13%	69	56.56%	15	12.30%	10.03	3.16
Gratiot Town/Kettering	203	0.21%	136	67.16%	15	7.39%	6.72	1.62
Michigan-Martin	351	0.37%	125	35.61%	14	3.99%	10.45	0.67
Nolan	133	0.14%	81	60.90%	13	9.77%	9.11	4.43
Sherwood Forest	102	0.11%	24	23.53%	13	12.75%	4.62	4.02
Elijah McCoy	195	0.20%	89	45.88%	12	6.15%	10.35	1.61
Dexter-Fenkell	102	0.11%	52	50.98%	12	11.76%	7.25	1.27
Piety Hill	157	0.16%	81	51.28%	12	7.64%	7.60	5.94
Hunt	211	0.22%	109	51.67%	12	5.69%	10.10	1.14
Cultural Center	130	0.14%	43	33.08%	11	8.46%	12.08	3.18
Jeffries	185	0.19%	49	26.63%	10	5.41%	11.39	0.23
North End	174	0.18%	84	48.28%	10	5.75%	13.61	0.00
Ravendale	76	0.08%	47	61.84%	10	13.16%	8.87	0.00
Rouge Park	10	0.01%	2	20.00%	9	90.00%	4.20	7.30
Woodbridge	68	0.07%	26	38.24%	8	11.76%	12.15	0.26
Hubbard Farms	105	0.11%	72	68.57%	8	7.62%	11.97	0.00
Palmer Woods	34	0.04%	11	32.35%	8	23.53%	2.68	8.35
Medbury Park	61	0.06%	26	42.62%	8	13.11%	11.44	4.03
Gold Coast	61	0.06%	29	47.54%	8	13.11%	7.39	0.00
Nardin Park	89	0.09%	50	56.18%	8	8.99%	11.45	0.62
LaSalle Gardens	100	0.10%	44	44.00%	7	7.00%	7.82	0.00
Historic Atkinson	75	0.08%	29	38.67%	7	9.33%	9.29	3.36
Arden Park	44	0.05%	15	34.88%	6	13.64%	6.14	6.82
Hubbard Richard	64	0.07%	19	29.69%	5	7.81%	11.23	0.00

**Table 7 continued**

Neighborhood Name	Number of City Resident Students	Percent of City Resident Students	n students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: 51.6, 112.7, 199.7, 436.8)	% of students who are chronically absent (Quintiles: .429, .493, .544, .601)	n students who leave Detroit for school (Quintiles: 13, 39.8, 102, 193.6)	% of students who leave Detroit for school (.084, .159, .254, .352)	Average # of Detroit schools within 2.5/3.5mi of students (4.475, 6.199, 7.599, 9.142)	Average # of schools outside Detroit within 2.5/3.5mi of students
Melvorn Hill	15	0.02%	11	73.33%	5	33.33%	3.73	4.53
Conner Creek Industrial	15	0.02%	6	40.00%	4	26.67%	5.67	0.33
West Side Industrial	17	0.02%	10	58.82%	4	23.53%	10.82	0.00
Oakwood Heights	18	0.02%	10	55.56%	3	16.67%	2.67	4.78
Happy Homes	48	0.05%	34	70.83%	3	6.25%	7.13	0.00
Marina District	60	0.06%	27	44.83%	3	5.00%	6.08	0.03
West Village	58	0.06%	36	62.50%	3	5.17%	7.76	0.00
Mexicantown	68	0.07%	32	47.06%	3	4.41%	11.51	0.00
Medical Center	97	0.10%	45	46.39%	3	3.09%	10.86	1.01
Corktown	81	0.08%	37	45.68%	2	2.47%	10.05	0.00
Detroit Golf	12	0.01%	3	25.00%	2	16.67%	4.00	8.00
West Virginia Park	31	0.03%	10	32.26%	2	6.45%	9.32	2.42
Indian Village	60	0.06%	24	40.00%	2	3.33%	7.17	0.00
Virginia Park	20	0.02%	9	47.37%	1	5.00%	9.35	5.35
Downtown	40	0.04%	21	51.85%	1	2.50%	11.78	0.00
Brush Park	66	0.07%	7	11.11%	1	1.52%	16.18	0.76
Rivertown	51	0.05%	23	45.10%	0	0.00%	8.71	0.00
Tech Town	<10	-	-	-	-	-	15.67	4.33
Eastern Market	<10	-	-	-	-	-	8.00	1.00
Milwaukee Junction	<10	-	-	-	-	-	6.60	2.00
Joseph Berry Sub	<10	-	-	-	-	-	6.44	0.00
Waterworks Park	<10	-	-	-	-	-	6.40	0.00
New Center Commons	<10	-	-	-	-	-	6.00	2.75



- Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Horsey, C. S. (1997). From first grade forward: Early foundations of high school dropout. *Sociology of Education*, 70, 87-107. doi:10.2307/2673158
- Allensworth, E. M., & Easton, J. Q. (2007). *What matters for staying on-track and graduating in Chicago public high schools: A close look at course grades, failures, and attendance in the freshman year*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2013). *Meeting the challenge of combating chronic absenteeism: Impact of the NYC Mayor's Interagency Task Force on chronic absenteeism and school attendance and its implications for other cities*. Baltimore, MD: Everyone Graduates Center, Johns Hopkins University School of Education. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544570>
- Bell, A. J., Rosen, L. A., & Dynlacht, D. (1994). Truancy intervention. *Journal of Research & Development in Education*, 27, 203-211.
- Bimler, D., & Kirkland, J. (2001). School truants and truancy motivation sorted out with multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 16, 75-102. doi:10.1177/0743558401161006
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Catsambis, S., & Beveridge, A. A. (2001). Does neighborhood matter? Family, neighborhood, and school influences on eighth-grade mathematics achievement. *Sociological Focus*, 34, 435-457. doi:10.1080/00380237.2001.10571212
- Community Education Commission. (2019). Community Education Commission Story. Retrieved February 5, 2019, from <https://cecdetroit.org/>
- Condron, D. J., Tope, D., Steidl, C. R., & Freeman, K. J. (2013). Racial segregation and the black/white achievement gap, 1992 to 2009. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 54(1), 130-157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tsq.12010>
- Corville-Smith, J., Ryan, B. A., Adams, G. R., & Dalicandro, T. (1998). Distinguishing absentee students from regular attenders: The combined influence of personal, family, and school factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 27, 629-640. doi:10.1023/A:1022887124634
- Cowen, J. M., & Creed, B. (2017). Public school choice and student achievement: Evidence from Michigan's interdistrict open enrollment system. *AERA Open*, 3(3), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858417731555>
- Cowen, J., Creed, B., & Keesler, V. (2015). *Dynamic participation in inter-district open enrollment: Evidence from Michigan 2005-2013* (No. Working Paper #49). East Lansing, MI: The Education Policy Center, Michigan State University. Retrieved from <http://education.msu.edu/epc/library/papers/WP-49-Dynamic-Participation-in-Open-Enrollment-Cowen.asp>
- Dahl, P. (2016). Factors associated with truancy: Emerging adults' recollections of skipping school. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 31, 119-138. doi:10.1177/0743558415587324
- Engel, N. (2006). Relationship between mobility and student performance and behavior. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3), 167-178.
- Entwistle, N., & Ramsden, P. (2015). *Understanding student learning (Routledge Revivals)*. Abington, UK: Routledge.
- Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 95, 308-318. doi:10.1080/00220670209596604
- Foy, E. J. (2005). *A study of attendance and its effects on academic achievement in Alliance Public Schools*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissertations/AAI3180799/>
- Gershenson, S. (2016). Linking teacher quality, student attendance, and student achievement. *Education Finance and Policy*, 11, 125-149. doi:10.1162/EDFP\_a\_00180
- Gershenson, S., Jacknowitz, A., & Brannegan, A. (2017). Are student absences worth the worry in US primary schools?. *Education Finance and Policy*, 12(2), 137-165.
- Gottfried, M. A. (2014). Chronic absenteeism and its effects on students' academic and socioemotional outcomes. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 19(2), 53-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2014.962696>
- Gottfried, M. A. (2017). Linking getting to school with going to school. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 0162373717699472. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373717699472>

- Gruman, D. H., Harachi, T. W., Abbott, R. D., Catalano, R. F., & Fleming, C. B. (2008). Longitudinal effects of student mobility on three dimensions of elementary school engagement. *Child development, 79*(6), 1833-1852.
- Hamlin, D. (2017). Are charter schools safer in cities with high rates of crime? Hypotheses in Detroit. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(4), 725–756
- Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. (2004). Disruption versus Tiebout improvement: The costs and benefits of switching schools. *Journal of public Economics, 88*(9-10), 1721-1746.
- Hartman, C. (2002). *High classroom turnover: How children get left behind*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED466506>
- Herbers, J. E., Cutuli, J. J., Supkoff, L. M., Heistad, D., Chan, C. K., Hinz, E., & Masten, A. S. (2012). Early reading skills and academic achievement trajectories of students facing poverty, homelessness, and high residential mobility. *Educational Researcher, 41*(9), 366-374.
- Jacobsen, R., Frankenberg, E., & Lenhoff, S. W. (2012). Diverse schools in a democratic society: New ways of understanding how school demographics affect civic and political learning. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(5), 812–843. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211430352>
- Jeynes, W. H. (2003). A meta-analysis: The effects of parental involvement on minority children's academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society, 35*, 202–218. doi:10.1177/0013124502239392
- Lleras, C., & McKillip, M. (2017). When children move: Behavior and achievement outcomes during elementary school. *The Journal of Educational Research, 110*(2), 177-187.
- London, R. A., Sanchez, M., & Castrechini, S. (2016). The dynamics of chronic absence and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 24*. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2471
- Mehana, M., & Reynolds, A. J. (2004). School mobility and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review, 26*(1), 93-119.
- Mickelson, R. A., Bottia, M. C., & Lambert, R. (2013). Effects of school racial composition on K–12 mathematics outcomes: A metaregression analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(1), 121–158. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312475322>
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2005). *Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality (K-12 Integration and Diversity)*. Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4xr8z4wb>
- Per-pupil foundation allowance ten-year history for schools: FYs 2009-10 through 2018-19 (estimated). (2018). Senate Fiscal Agency. Retrieved from [http://www.senate.michigan.gov/sfa/departments/datacharts/dck12\\_foundationhistory.pdf](http://www.senate.michigan.gov/sfa/departments/datacharts/dck12_foundationhistory.pdf)
- Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In G. J. Duncan & R. J. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 91–116). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Romero, M., & Lee, Y. (2007). *A national portrait of chronic absenteeism in the early grades*. New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University, Mailman School of Public Health. Retrieved from <https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/catalog/ac:126480>
- Rumberger, R. W. (2003). The causes and consequences of student mobility. *Journal of Negro Education, 6*-21.
- Rumberger, R. W., & Larson, K. A. (1998). Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout. *American journal of Education, 107*(1), 1-35.
- Rumberger, R. W., Larson, K. A., Ream, R. K., & Palardy, G. J. (1999). *The educational consequences of mobility for California students and schools*. Berkley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education, Research Series.
- Schlossberg, M., Greene, J., Phillips, P. P., Johnson, B., & Parker, B. (2006). School trips: Effects of urban form and distance on travel mode. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 72*(3), 337–346.
- Sheldon, S. B. (2007). Improving student attendance with school, family, and community partnerships. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*, 267–275. doi:10.3200/JOER.100.5.267-275
- South, S. J., Haynie, D. L., & Bose, S. (2007). Student mobility and school dropout. *Social Science Research, 36*(1), 68-94.
- Tinkelman, D., & Schwartz, A. (2004). School-based asthma disease management. *Journal of Asthma, 41*, 455–462. doi:10.1081/JAS-120033988
- Welsh, R. O. (2017). School hopscotch: A comprehensive review of K–12 student mobility in the United States. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(3), 475–511. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316672068>