

Evaluating Milwaukee Parental Choice Program with regard to Implementing School Choice Program in Seoul

박대권(朴大權)*

논문 요약

본 연구의 목적은 미국 밀워키 지역의 학교선택 프로그램 (MPCP)이 어떤 과정을 통해서 현지에 이르렀는지를 알아보고, 그 효과성에 대해서 밝히고자 한다. 아울러, 현재 서울에서 시행되고 있는 고등학교 학교선택제에 어떤 시사점을 줄 수 있는지를 알아보려고 한다.

밀워키학교선택프로그램은 1990년에 시행되기 시작한 미국 최초로 공적 예산이 집행된 바우처 프로그램이다. 밀워키 지역에 거주하는 저소득층 학생이 바우처를 통하여 사립학교에 진학하는 것이 가능하도록 돕는 제도이다. 많은 사립학교들이 천주교 계통의 종교학교들이어서 '국가와 종교의 분리' 라는 미국연방헌법 위배에 대한 논란이 계속되었지만, 2002년 미국 연방 대법원의 합헌 선언으로 그 논란은 종식되었다.

밀워키학교선택프로그램에 대한 종합적인 평가를 위하여 레빈이 개발한 4개 기준을 적용하였다. 선택의 자유, 효율성, 형평성, 사회적 통합이라는 기준을 통하여 프로그램을 평가하고, 현재 서울특별시교육청이 시행하고 있는 고등학교 학교 선택제에 대한 시사점을 제시하였다.

주요어 : 학교선택(School Choice), 밀워키학교선택프로그램(Milwaukee Parental Choice Program), 선택의 자유(Freedom of Choice), 효율성(Efficiency), 형평성(Equity), 사회적 통합(Social Cohesion)

I. Introduction

Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) was launched in 1990. The outcomes has been controversial because MPCP was the first experiment of public funding for private schools in the U.S.

The voucher system, itself, was originally proposed in the 1960s by Milton Friedman, Nobel Prize Laureate of Economics, and was the basis for the MPCP. Again, this was the first program to use taxpayers' funds to provide parents and students with the opportunity to choose between public schools and private schools in the United States. The original program was a progressive and controversial decision because the program was limited to non-religious private schools and only one percent of total enrollment in Milwaukee Public Schools. It became more controversial when the program expanded to include religious schools and increased the number of the eligible students. But in 1998, the Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the expanded program. Furthermore, voucher program itself is free from legal controversy because the U.S. Supreme Court upheld its constituency last June. On June 27, 2002, the Supreme Court ruled that the Cleveland voucher program is parental choice for schools rather than an inappropriate relationship between state and church. Under these patronizing moods, some states initiated new voucher program like Colorado.

This paper tried to evaluate the MPCP based on empirical evidences of resulting effects. In order to analyze MPCP, three policy instruments of 'finance', 'regulation' and 'support services' were used (Levin, 1991). These rationales enabled to get to how the effects of MPCP could be brought. Then 4 criteria, those are 'freedom of choice', 'efficiency', 'equity', and 'social cohesion' were adopted for evaluation (Levin, 2002). Each criterion would have its own benchmarks for scrutinizing each category. Also, this paper would like to figure out the target population of MPCP, who are the economically challenged minority group.

Discussing for implementing similar voucher programs in educational policy arena in Korea, overhauling the environment and the beneficiaries are the 'must checkup list' before making real action. Balancing four criteria is significant for recommending policy implementation in Korea for its polarizing issues: Targeting freedom on choice, efficiency, equity, social cohesion together would be necessary consideration for initiating school choice policy in Korea.

II. Background

1. Demographic information

Milwaukee is the largest city, having more than one million population, in the state of Wisconsin. Historically, this city was primarily Anglo oriented because large amount of population originated from European Continent; among them, the largest population group was German. Poles, Norwegians, and Italians were main bodies of Milwaukee. The residence of each ethnic group was distinct; southern part of city was Polish dominated and northern region was concentrated with German. The city was originally blue-collar, middle-class oriented with large numbers of skilled and unionized craft-men in machine tool, heavy industries and brewing sectors (Witte, 2000, p.36).

After World War II, the racial and socio-economic conditions of the city began to change. Between 1940 and 1990, Anglos in the city decreased from 98.4 percent to 63.4 percent, while Afro-American increased form 1.5 percent to 30.5 percent (Witte, 2000, p.36). According to Levine et al. (1993), the change of population was more extreme in inner city. Between 1950 and 1985, Anglos in the inner city drastically declined from 91.7 percent to 6.2 percent, whereas Afro-Americans increased form 8.1 percent to 86.9 percent. Subsequently, this cataclysmic racial transition brought deterioration of the economic condition of the city. During 1970 to 1990, the percentage of Milwaukee house holds with incomes below the poverty line increased from 11.4 percent to 22.2 percent (Witte, 2000, p.37).

2. Brief history of public education

The history of public education in Milwaukee has experienced even more drastic changes than the city. These transformations are tightly linked to the demographic and economic shifts. Racial composition of the Milwaukee Public School (MPS) changed dramatically during 1950 through 1985 as shown in table 1. The percentage of racial minority students in the MPS increased from 29.7 percent in 1970 to 64.3 percent in 1985. Along with the number of racial minority increased, the number of economically challenged students increased. The number of students available for free or reduced-free lunch rose from 15 percent in 1970 to 68.8 percent in 1997. This demographic change resulted in an NAACP lawsuit filed in 1967

regarding segregation issues in individual schools in the MPS. Finally it led to a desegregation order in 1976. This historical decline of the MPS is a prior assumption of those of both voucher proponents and opponents (Witte, 2000, pp. 40-41).

<Table 1> Percentage distribution of the changing racial composition in the city of Milwaukee by population and the MPS enrollments

	1950		1960		1970		1980		1985	
	City	MPS	City	MPS	City	MPS	City	MPS	City	MPS
Anglo	96.3	-	90.2	-	82.2	70.3	71.1	44.3	67.3	35.7
Afro-Am	3.4	-	8.4	-	14.6	26	23.1	46.9	25.3	52.6
Others	0.3	-	1.4	-	3.2	3.7	5.6	8.8	7.4	11.7

Source: Levine et al., 1993, p.55.

3. Issue of voucher

The first voucher bill in Milwaukee had been introduced in 1988 and enacted in 1990 by Wisconsin Legislature. The program was originally planned to operate for five years until 1994-95 but was mended to be permanent. The original draft contained few restrictions that would be included in later version. That is to say that most regulations were added during revision of the legislature (Witte, 2000, p.43).

The enactment of MPCP was urged by State Representative, Polly Williams and Governor, Tommy Thompson and the program was increased to cover more eligible children and add sectarian schools in 1995. Following a legal challenge, the Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld the expanded program in 1998 (Marquette University, 2000, p.1)

III. Policy Instrument

Different voucher plans vary with respect to different policy instruments to achieve their own specific goals. These policy details are crucial for understanding vouchers because differences in the specifics of voucher programs can result in profound differences in empirical outcomes (Gill et al., 2001). To analyze the MPCP, three policy instruments,

suggested by Levin (1991, 2001), of 'finance', 'regulation', and 'support services' were applied.

1. Finance

Finance refers to the overall value of the voucher, how it is allocated, and whether families have to add to it. The finance component comprises the size of the educational voucher, what it can be used for, whether a school can charge more than the voucher amount, whether costs of transportation are covered, and basic sources of funding. Equity can be effected by how the amount covers the real costs for participants in voucher schools as well as whether it includes the costs for disabled or disadvantaged students.

2. Regulation

Regulation indicates the requirements for schools and families participation in the voucher program. This component includes curriculum contents, personnel, and admission standards. Especially, how to establish admission criteria of voucher schools is closely related to equity issue.

3. Support Services

Support services comprise of certain kinds of publicly provided services to increase the effectiveness of the market. Information and transformation services are crucial components. The former means information about quality of school teachers, ideology, academic program, and average class size (Doolittle et al., 2001). The latter is the matter of who will be responsible for the costs of transportation.

4. MPCP

In terms of finance, the MPCP is financed by Wisconsin general state aid funds based on the number of students participating in the program in the given year (GAO, 2001, p.4) Per pupil payment of tuition and fees for voucher students have increased each year since beginning of program, the year 1990, as shown in table 2. The payments increased from \$2,466

in 1990-91 to \$5,783 in 2002-03. However, there has been a discrepancy between the tuition and fees covered by voucher and charged by voucher schools. For example, in the year 1992-92, State of Wisconsin provided \$2,745 per student, while voucher schools charged from \$680 to \$ 4,000 to the students. On the other hand, the payments helped the participating schools improved the financial status because four of the seven schools in the first year were in serious financial difficulties (Witte, 2000, pp.90-91)

<Table 2> The MPCP Participation and Payment, 1990-91 through 2003-04

School Year	# of Students	# of Schools	Payment per student (\$)
1990-91	300	7	2,446
199-92	512	6	2,643
1992-93	594	11	2,745
1993-94	704	12	2,985
1994-95	771	12	3,209
1995-96	1,288	17	3,667
1996-97	1,616	20	4,373
1997-98	1,497	23	4,696
1998-99	5,761	83	4,894
1999-2000	7,575	90	5,106
2000-01	9,238	100	5,326
2001-02	10,497	102	5,553
2002-03	11,350	103	5,783
2003-04	15,000	120	5,882
2004-05	11,670	108	5,943
2005-06	15,887	125	6,351
2006-07	17,795	121	6,501
2007-08	19,233	122	6,501
2008-09	20,113	127	6,607
2009-10	21,062	111	6,442

Source: MPCP Homepage, various years.

The original program imposed several types of regulations upon both students and schools.

The voucher was eligible only to students whose families lived in the city of Milwaukee, and family income was at or below 175 percent of federal poverty line which was approximately \$20,000 for a family of three in 1990, whereas it is \$26,996 in the year 2003-04 (State superintendent of Wisconsin, 2003). Current private school students were not available to apply to the MPCP. A sibling rule began informally in the first year and was formally approved in the second year. Disabled students were not allowed to apply to the voucher schools (Witte, 2000, pp.44-45)

The program was limited nonsectarian private schools located within the city until 1997. Participating schools were required to provide at least 875 hours of instruction each school year and to have a sequentially progressive curriculum of instruction in subjects such as mathematics and reading. Schools must also meet health and safety standards, and at last one of the state performance standards such as for academic progress or attendance, and comply with federal anti-discrimination laws. The schools are subject to uniform financial accounting standards, and must submit an annual financial audit report to the state (GAO, 2001, pp. 11-12). The maximum number of choice students was limited to 49 percent of the students in the school, increased to 65 percent in 1993 and 100 percent in 1995. The total number of voucher students in any year was originally limited to 1 percent of the MPS, and was expanded to 1.5 percent in 1994. The schools could not set any admission criterion based on race, religion, gender, or prior school records. They should select student randomly among applicants if over-applied. However, each school had discretion in setting the number of voucher students (Witte, 2001, p.46).

The regulations in the initial MPCP were partially changed. The change of rules made it possible for sectarian schools to participate the program and for students already attending private schools to be eligible of the program. It also eliminated all funding for data collection and evaluation and abolished the maximum number of choice students in the voucher schools (Witte et al., 1995, p.13).

In terms of support services, MPCP didn't provide information services for students and parents. In contrast, those students could use transportation services provided by the MPS system if they wanted, although the parents were not directly paid for them (Greene et al., 1997, p.6). Requirements for MPCP schools and students related to policy instruments can be summarized as table 3.

<Table 3> The MPCP Requirements

	1990	1993	1995	2002
<i>Student Eligibility</i>				
Low income	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prior private school students	No	No	Yes, K3	Yes, K3
Disabled students	No	No	No	Yes/ No*
<i>School Eligibility</i>				
Sectarian	No	No	Yes	Yes
Geographic area	City of Milwaukee			
<i>Program Limits</i>				
Choice students per school	49%	65%	100%	100%
Students in the program	Approx 1,000	Approx 1,500	15,000	15,000 15% of MPS
<i>Program Requirements</i>				
Selection of students	Random, siblings in		Random	Random, siblings in
Standards for schools	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Research reports required	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: Witte, 2000. p.45.; collected from WLFB, 2003.

*: Responsibility of MPS

IV. Evaluation

1. Four criteria: Freedom of Choice, Efficiency, Equity, and Social Cohesion (Levin, 1991, 2000)

Levin's four criteria is the first integrated framework to evaluate school choice program in the U.S. This framework has been evolved from following three arguments: 1) families should have the right to choose the type of education 2) families should be able to choose the schools

fitting the specific needs of their child 3) school choice will improve school's efficiency with respect to student achievement (Levin, 1991).

Freedom of choice is about whether a voucher system ensures freedom of choice de facto for parents and students. These measure include the size of voucher schools and available seats, the amount of tuition and fees, types of regulation on curriculum, admission and testing, and support services.

Efficiency refers to the comparative ability of voucher system to maximize educational outcomes for any given set of resources. These outcomes include not only academic achievements, but also other skills such as problem-solving, working in teams, and effective decision-making. These cost and outcomes can be measured in terms of micro-level and macro-level. Micro-level is calculated on the basis of the costs in school level. It needs not only to consider a different service mix between public and private schools but also to reflect actual costs of each school. In contrast, macro-level covers the overall costs of producing similar services for similar populations, which include not only voucher payment, but also the costs for monitoring and administering the system, information and transportation services.

Equity can be measured in term of access to voucher program, access to resources for participation of the program, and comparison of students' performances by demographic characteristics. The level of access to the voucher program can be evaluated by the participants' characteristics such as the distribution of parents' income and education level, race and geographical location. Access to resources includes information, transportation, and free or reduced lunch services. Students' performances can be measured by standardized test scores.

Social cohesion is closely related to common educational experiences as a citizen of a society. This contains civic education and integration. Civic education implies whether voucher schools provide the students with the skills and knowledge necessary for civic and economic participation, and the principles of democracy, which is usually interpreted as essential elements of schooling with regard to curriculum, values, goals, language and political orientation. Integration focuses on whether voucher students can interact with a variety of peers by demographic characteristics, in which racial distribution is a key issue. Based on Levin's four criteria, the evaluation on MPCP has been conducted as follow.

2. Freedom of Choice

Only twenty-three secular private schools participated MPCP before 1995, while there were about 100 sectarian private schools in Milwaukee. Among the secular schools, about half participated MPCP and others didn't for first five years. But, limited supply, limited participating schools, was not a constraining factor because the available seats were quite above the number of applicants (Witte, 2000, pp. 55-56). Table 4 shows the ratio of available seats and number of aid membership and participating schools.

<Table 4> The MPCP Participation, 1990-95

	1990- 91	1991- 92	1992- 93	1993- 94	1994- 95
Maximum number of students allowed	931	946	950	968	1450
Number of nonsectarian schools	22	22	23	23	23
Number of schools participation	7	6	11	12	12
Number of available seats (A)	406	5446	691	811	982
Number of applicants	577	689	998	1049	1046
Number of students participation (B)	300	512	594	704	771
Filled choice capacity (B/A)	0.74	0.94	0.86	0.87	0.79

Source: Witte, 2000. p.56; WLAB, 2000, p17

The rate of filled choice capacity was relatively constant, e.g) 88 percent in 1999-2000, and didn't meet 1.00 (WLAB, 2000, p.18). After sectarian private school's participation of MPCP, the supply has increased drastically. In addition to 23 current participating secular private schools, 63 sectarian schools participated in 1998-99 (WLAB, 2000, p.27). But data was not available to assess the filled choice capacity. So it is hard to tell whether the number of applicants would have been increased if more schools participated and more seats were available.

As tuition and fees charged by the voucher schools varied, it is hard to say whether the payments provided by MPCP were enough for participating families or students (Witte, 2000, p.90). In 1992-93, voucher payment was \$2,745 per students, but tuition and fees of participating schools were ranged from under \$1,000 to over \$3,000. The gap could be filled by family responsibility, fund-raising, or voluntary contributions. But as MPCP was not responsible for free or reduced lunch service, it could affect less participation of children from

economically challenged families.

As mentioned before, MPCP didn't allow regulation of curriculum, testing and admission for participation schools. Sectarian private schools have been available to join this program since 1995. Most families learned about the program and their children's schools through informal sources, such as friends or relatives (WLAB, 2000, p.4). The ration of informal communication increased from 50.9 percent, average 1990 through 1994, to 58.3 percent in 1994 (Witte et al., 1995, p.3).

3. Efficiency

Each researchers showed different results of standardized test scores as the outcomes. Witte compared the test scores in reading and math among choice students, the low-income MPS students, and MPS students during 1991-94. The low-income MPS students would have qualified for the MPCP because both income levels were similar and similar income level enabled the comparison to be an experimental design. He concluded that there was no substantial difference between the MPCP and MPS students, especially the low-income MPS students. In other words, MPCP resulted in no significant gains in the choice students' achievement compared to non-choice students (Witte, 1998, pp.237-38).

In contrast, Greene and his colleagues conducted research with opposite results. They criticized that Witte's analysis had the possibility that unobserved background characteristics of students could account for his negative findings because he compared choice students from low-income families with public school students from better backgrounds. As an alternative, they compared the choice winner and the choice loser, which was considered as an experimental design by them. They concluded that the choice students made statistically significant gains by the third and fourth years in both math and reading subjects. On math, the estimated effects were slight for the first two years. But, test scores were 5 percentile points higher after three years, and 10.5 percentile points higher after four years. On reading, the scores were 2 through 3 percentile points higher for the first three years and increased to 5.8 percentile points in the fourth year (Greene et al., 1997, p.7).

On the other hand, Rouse criticized the analysis of Greene and his colleagues. She insisted that they might overestimate the effects of the program by excluding some students from choice group, who were admitted but didn't attend or attended just short period. In addition,

the choice loser might not provide an ideal control group because those who remained in the MPS appeared to have been a non-random subset of the entire choice loser. Instead, she used both the choice loser and the random sample of students from the MPS as comparison groups. In other words, she compared the effect of three groups: selected to attend choice school (choice winner), not selected to attend a choice school. (choice loser), and the MPS sample. She concluded that the choice winner had approximately 1.5-2.3 extra percentile points gains per year in math compared with the other groups. The achievement gains of those who actually enrolled in the choice schools were very similar. However, it was unlikely to make effect on reading scores among the three groups (Rouse, 1998, p.558).

Witte (2000) reanalyzed the effects of students' achievement by comparison between choice winner and choice loser as Greene and his colleagues did. He argued that his methodology was different from the Greene and his colleagues' but similar to that of Rouse. The result showed that there were discernible gains for the choice winner of math test scores (Witte, 2000, p.134).

There is also disagreement about the costs of the program. Greene and his colleagues argues that per student costs for the voucher schools appeared to be only 48 percent of that for MPS in 1991-92: \$3,229 versus \$6,656. The cost of \$3,229 is composed of \$2,729 of voucher payment and \$500 of voucher schools' additional funds through fees and fundraising activities (Greene et al., 1997, p.6). Levin argues that MPCP schools received around \$1,000 more per students than the comparable MPS in K-6 level for 1996-97. His calculation was based on site-based expenditures of MPS instead of the estimated budget per students of the MPS because voucher schools didn't cover other costs such as special education, transportation and free and reduced lunch services, which were provided by MPS (Levin, 1998, p.384). Witte also argued private schools could hold costs down for two primary reasons: they paid their staffs lower than public school levels and they could do this because they were not unionized (Witte, 2000, p.106).

4. Equity

In terms of family income, choice applied family income was \$11,630 on average over the first year as shown in table 5. The low-income MPS parents were a slightly higher by the income of \$12,130 in 1991. The average family income of MPS control group was \$22,000. This

indicates that MPCP achieved the goal of targeting the children from low-income family.

<Table 5> Household Income (Percentage)

Income (\$ thousands)	Choice Applied (1990-94)	Choice Enrolled (1990-94)	Choice Non- -select (1990-94)	Low- income MPS (1991)	MPS Control (1991)
0-5	18	16	19	19	13
5-10	37	40	33	34	23
10-20	29	30	29	29	21
20-35	16	15	17	14	24
35-50	577	689	998	1049	1046
50 and over	1	0	1	3	13
Mean Income	11.63	11.34	12.24	12.13	22.00
(N)	(1020)	(627)	(325)	(880)	(1513)

Source: Witte, 2000, p.60.

In terms of parents' educational level, choice parents, despite their economic status, showed higher educational levels than either the low-income or the average MPS parents. 56 percent of mothers of the Choice students reported some college education, whereas 40 percent for the entire MPS sample and 30 percent of the low-income MPS families (Witte, 2000, p.59).

In terms of race, MPCP had the greatest impact on Afro-American students, who were consisted of 75 percent of those applying to the program and 73 percent of those enrolled in the first five years as indicated table 6. Hispanics accounted for 19 percent of choice applicants and 21percent of those enrolled. Compared to the low-income MPS Sample, choice applied Hispanic students were the most overrepresented, while choice applied Asians and Anglo students were the most underrepresented (Witte, 2000, p.59).

<Table 6> Race (Percentage)

Race	Choice Applied (1990-94)	Choice Enrolled (1990-94)	Choice Non-select (1990-94)	Low-income MPS (1991)	MPS Control
Afro American	75	73	78	67	55
Asian	0	0	0	5	4
Hispanic	19	21	14	11	10
Native American	0	0	1	1	1
Anglo	5	5	4	15	29
Other	1	0	3	1	1
(N)	(2673)	(1490)	(886)	(3179)	(5365)

Source: Witte, 2000, p.60.

In terms of geographical location, the voucher schools are located throughout the city of Milwaukee rather than concentrated in specific neighborhood. In 1998-99, secular schools served almost half of the students in the center, while sectarian schools served a greater portion of students in the northern and southern part of the city. However, for 66 of 87 schools, the choice student traveled less than three miles to school (WLAB, 2000, pp.27-29). As mentioned before, MPCP didn't provide information and free and reduced lunch services, which might affect negatively to students' participation from low-income families.

5. Social Cohesion

There exist quite few studies concerning social cohesion issues of MPCP. So it is hard to evaluate the program in terms of civic education and integration, or detailed indicators such as racial tolerance, volunteering, a commitment to community, and self-assessment suggested by Greene (1998). But we might assume the possible effect of the program on social cohesion because the program targeted low-income population and most benefactors were Afro-Americans and Hispanics as mentioned before.

V. Conclusion

So far, this paper examined the MPCP in terms of freedom of choice, efficiency, equity, and social cohesion. The results show mixed effects to low-income students who are targeted by the program.

In terms of freedom of choice, the effects are quite mixed. Effects from participating school numbers and type, available seats, tuition & fees, transportation, curriculum and admission show that MPCP brought more freedom of choice than MPS. But limitation on special education, absence of information providing and nonexistence of free or reduced lunch could restrain freedom of choice of MPCP.

In terms of efficiency, it is not easy to make a decision, particularly, based on test scores; the findings of three researches of Witte, Peterson and Rouse were inconsistent. There exists one common finding that the choice students' math score was higher than the choice losers. Regarding costs, it is also difficult to say one is more efficient than the other. If the costs are assessed in terms of school budget, the MPCP is more efficient than the MPS. But, if we calculate including hidden costs of services, the MPS is more efficient than the MPCP.

In terms of equity, there appear some slightly positive effects. The MPCP was applied to the family who had slightly lower income than low-income MPS parents. MPCP schools' racial composition also favors minorities, Afro-Americans and Hispanic. But low-income students needing special education were underrepresented and MPCP lacked information providing and free and reduced lunch services.

According to few studies, there exists not enough evidence to assess social cohesion. But, some positive effects are expected on the based on racial composition.

As most researches were touching early data of MPCP, more analysis would be needed after the expansion of the program with sectarian schools' participation. Lack of accessible data of Department of Public Instruction was another limitation of this research.

MPCP was focusing on the students from low income family for providing private school education which is considered better than current public school education. So MPCP is a policy intending to enable more opportunity for students and parents not to empower schools themselves. So careful watch over the environment of MPCP, the assumption of and the target population of the policy is required before adopting voucher system in Korea.

Regardless of its controversial effectiveness and constitutionality, it is no doubt that MPCP

has encouraged and expanded the school choice option of the disadvantaged students and families in its neighborhood. If MPCP was not implemented, the low SES students would have locked in failing public schools in their neighbor without any other option. This may give policy implication to school choice policy in Korea.

School choice program has been launched by Seoul Metropolitan Education office since 2010. The purpose of this policy was allowing students to choose their preferred high schools despite the location of residence; the policy aimed to offering students in underdeveloped neighborhood to choose schools in the most privileged school districts in Gangnam area (Seoul Metropolitan Education Office, 2009). But in 2011 survey showed that only 3.5% of students chose the school in the other school district (Seoul Metropolitan Education Office, 2012). The choice option was given to every student of this area equally, the students out of low SES families living in disadvantaged area did not have reserved chance to choose the schools on their preference. As the policy was not eloquently designed to focus on the targeted population, the effect of the school choice policy was diluted. Furthermore, Seoul's school choice program just opened the door of the preferred schools but did not mention anything more; the policy did not consider the accessibility of the transportation, psychological aspect of adaptation to unfamiliar schools not located in one's neighborhood, intra school integration issues and so on.

Based on MPCP, Seoul Metropolitan Education Office has to focus on students from low SES families and make them exercise school choice option in reality. Confirming the impact and adaptability, the program can reach more students in this area.

References

- Doolittle, F., and Connors, W. (2001). Designing education voucher experiments: recommendations for researchers, funders, and users. In H. M. Levin (Ed.), *Privatizing Education: Can the marketplace deliver choice, efficiency, equity and social cohesion?* Colorado: Westview Press. (pp.318-359).
- Gill, B. P., Timpane, R. M., Ross, K. E., and Brewer, D. J. (2001). *Rhetoric versus Reality: What we know and what we need to know about vouchers and charter schools.* California: Rand Education
- Greene, H. (1998). Civic values in public and private schools. In P.E. Peterson and B. Hassel (Eds.), *Learning from school choice.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute Press. (pp.83-106).
- Greene, J. P., Peterson, P. E., and Du, J. (1997). Effectiveness of school choice: the Milwaukee experiment. *Education and Urban Society*, 190-213.
- Levin, H. M. (2001). Studying privatization in education. . In H. M. Levin (Ed.), *Privatizing Education: Can the marketplace deliver choice, efficiency, equity and social cohesion?* Colorado: Westview Press. (pp.3-19).
- Levin, H. M. (2000). A comprehensive framework for evaluation educational vouchers. National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education, Teacher College, Columbia University Occasional Paper #5. <http://www.nespe.or>
- Levin, H. M. (1991). The Economics of Educational Choice. *The Economics of Education Review*, 10(2), 137-158.
- Levine, M. V., and Zipp, J. F. (1993). A city at risk: the changing social and economic context of public schooling in Milwaukee. In J. L. Rury and F. A. Cassell (Eds.), *Seeds of Crisis: Public Schooling in Milwaukee since 1920.* Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. (pp.442-72)
- Office of Research. (2000). Information on the Milwaukee family with Parental Choice Program. Wisconsin: Marquette University.
- Peterson, P. E., and Noyes, C. (1997). School Choice in Milwaukee. In D. Ravitch and J. P. Viteritti (Eds.), *New School for a New Century.* Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Rouse, E. C. (1998). Private school vouchers and student achievement: an evaluation of the

- Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 553-602.
- Schneider, M. (2001). Information and choice in educational privatization. In H. M. Levin (Ed.), *Privatizing Education: Can the marketplace deliver choice, efficiency, equity and social cohesion?* Colorado: Westview Press. (pp.72-102).
- Seoul Metropolitan Education Office (2008). Introduction and Prospective of School Choice Program.
- _____ (2011). Renewal of Assignment of High School Students in Seoul.
- United States General Accounting Office. (2001). School vouchers: Publicly funded programs in Cleveland and Milwaukee (GAO-01-914).
<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d01914.pdf>
- Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau. (2000). An evaluation: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (00-2). <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/lab/reports/00-2full.pdf>
- Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau. (2003). Milwaukee Parental Choice Program: Informational Paper 29. <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/lfb/Informationalpapers/29.pdf>
- Wisconsin State Superintendent (2003). The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program: Information for parents. <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dfm/sms/pdf/mpcbro03.pdf>
- Witte, J. F. (2000). *The market approach to education: an analysis of America's first voucher program*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Witte, J. F. (1998). The Milwaukee voucher experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20(4), 229-251.
- Witte, J. F., Sterr, T. D., and Thorn, C. A. (1995). Fifth-year report, Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
http://dpls.dacc.wisc.edu/choice/choice_rep95.html
- Witte, J. F., and Thorn, C. A. (1994). Fourth year report, Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
http://dpls.dacc.wisc.edu/choice/choice_report94toc.html

* 논문접수 2012년 11월 7일 / 1차 심사 2012년 12월 13일 / 게재승인 2013년 3월 18일

* 박대권: 연세대학교 교육과학대학 교육학과를 졸업하고 동 대학교 대학원 석사학위를 취득하였으며, 미국 컬럼비아대학교에서 교육정책으로 박사학위를 취득하였다. 현재 서울대학교 인적자원정책센터 선임연구원으로서 재직 중이다.

* E-mail: yankees@snu.ac.kr