



## National Alliance for Public Charter Schools

### Studying Achievement in Charter Schools: What Do We Know?

Prepared by Bryan C. Hassel  
Public Impact  
for the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools  
January 31, 2005

#### Summary

Accountability is a cornerstone of the charter school idea. As a result, more and more data have become available over time about how well individual charter schools are doing. This report summarizes and provides commentary on 38 comparative analyses of charter and district performance, including a study-by-study look at central findings and methodological strengths and weaknesses. All of the studies are recent (2000 or later), compare charter vs. district performance, use serious (though often flawed) analytical methods, and examine some significant segment of the charter sector.

**Study quality.** Study quality varies widely. The stronger studies offer information about how much value charter schools are contributing to their students; study an adequate number of students and schools to be meaningful; use sound comparisons when assessing relative performance of district vs. charter schools; and “disaggregate” analysis to show how well different kinds of students and schools are doing. Many of the studies reviewed fall short on one or more of these criteria.

**Snapshots: mixed.** Of the 38 studies, 17 look only at a snapshot of performance at one or more points in time, and these return a mix of results. Nine show charter schools generally underperforming district schools. The other eight show comparable, mixed or generally positive results for charter schools. These studies, however, fail to examine how much progress students and schools are making over time, and they are thus of limited use in drawing conclusions about the effectiveness of charter schools.

**Change over time: encouraging.** The other 21 studies make some attempt to look at change over time in student or school performance. Nine actually follow individual students over time, the ideal way to examine change. The others use other methods, such as looking at changes in school-wide or grade-wide performance. Of these 21 studies:

- Nine find that overall gains in charter schools were larger;
- Three find charter schools’ gains higher in certain significant categories of schools, such as elementary schools, high schools, or schools serving at risk students;

- Five find comparable gains in charter and district schools; and,
- Three find that charter schools' overall gains lagged behind.

Seven studies examine whether individual charter schools improve their performance with age (e.g. after overcoming start-up challenges). Of these, five find that as charter schools mature, they improve. The other two find no significant differences between older and younger charter schools.

**Recommendations.** A number of recommendations emerge from this review:

1. We need better research about how well students in charter schools are performing.
2. We need more and better research about why some charter schools perform so much better than other charter and non-charter schools.
3. We need much more attention on evaluating chartering as a policy. Knowing how well charter school students on average are performing does not answer the most important questions policymakers have about where to proceed with their charter policies.
4. Charter schooling represents an experiment worth continuing – and refining to improve quality further over time.

## Studying Achievement in Charter Schools: What Do We Know?

Prepared by Bryan C. Hassel  
Public Impact  
for the Charter School Leadership Council  
January 31, 2005

Accountability is a cornerstone of the charter school idea. In return for autonomy over key aspects of school operations, charter schools agree to be held accountable for results – to have their performance measured and to face the consequences if they fail to live up to expectations. As public schools, all charter schools participate in state assessment programs. They administer tests to all of their students, report the results, receive labels, and become subject to whatever sanctions arise from inadequate performance. The No Child Left Behind Act makes clear that charter schools, like all public schools, must make “Adequate Yearly Progress,” or else.

As a result, more and more data have become available over time about how well individual charter schools are doing when it comes to student achievement on standardized assessments.<sup>i</sup> Along with more data has come a raft of academic studies, state evaluations, and other efforts to answer the question “How well are charter schools doing?” The charter sector has been subject to an unprecedented level of scrutiny and transparency related to school performance. Just as individual schools are to be held accountable for results, the very idea of charter schools is being asked to prove itself, as well it should.

Reviewing all of these emerging studies of achievement in charter schools, however, is enough to make one’s head spin. As studies accumulate, each with its own unique methodological take on the basic question, contradictory findings proliferate. In fall 2004, for example, we were treated to two nationwide analyses of charter school achievement, one purporting to show that charter schools outperformed district schools, and one purporting to show the reverse. And these two were just the latest in an increasingly rapid volley of studies that show charter schools to be working well, or not.

At some level, mixed results are inevitable. The charter sector is host to a vast diversity of schools, utilizing all manner of educational and organizational approaches. The charter is but a shell, into which the operators place an instructional and management program. Asking about the quality of “charter schools” as a group is a bit like asking about the quality of “new restaurants” or “American cars” – any overall generalization will mask the great diversity within.

In short, there is really no simple answer to the question “how are charter schools doing?” At any point in time, some will be doing well, and some poorly. What we really want to know is how well *chartering*, as a policy, is working for a state. Is it producing new and better schools? How are the schools being chartered different from district schools? Are good charter schools expanding and being copied, while poor schools close or stagnate? Is the quality of chartering getting better over time? Is the presence of chartering inducing non-charter public schools to improve?<sup>ii</sup>

In light of that set of questions, comparing the test scores of charter vs. district public schools cannot provide all of the answers. But it can shed some light on important issues of performance and progress by the students enrolled in this new form of public school. This report aims to help those interested in charter schools make sense of the dizzying array of studies about charter achievement in two ways:

- **Setting out some criteria** that observers can use to judge how sound a particular study's comparison of charter vs. district schools is; and
- **Summarizing and providing commentary** on many of the most recent comparative analyses of charter and district achievement. This summary includes an overview of some trends and patterns that appear across studies, as well as a study-by-study look at central findings and methodological strengths and weaknesses.

### **What Makes a “Good” Study of Achievement in Charter Schools?**

Research methodology is a highly complex field, and this report does not endeavor to touch on all the intricacies of method that might arise in a study of charter achievement. Instead, it outlines a set of high-level, essential criteria that ought to be applied to any study that seeks to compare charter and district achievement. When analyzing any particular study, it will be important to go beyond these basic criteria to look at specific methodological issues related to the particular study's approach.

- **Value-added Analysis.** For a given charter school, what we really want to know is whether students are better off for having attended it. The best way to find out is to examine the learning of individual students over time, seeking to determine how much “value” schools are “adding” to student learning. It is quite common in educational studies to compare two groups of schools or students based on a snapshot of their performance at a point in time. For example, many studies compare the percentage of charter school vs. district school students “making grade level.” Such comparisons can be very misleading because they fail to take into account changes in student performance over time. Consider two middle schools, both with 70% of their children at grade level at the end of an academic year. Suppose, though, that in one of the schools, only 15% of the children entered the school at grade level. In the second school, 80% did. These schools appear identical on the simple snapshot measure, but in fact their performance is dramatically different. Researchers can mitigate these challenges by comparing schools and students that are as similar as possible, but doing so is challenging (see bullet point about “sound comparisons,” below).

Ideally, then, a study would follow students over time in charter and district schools – ideally randomly assigned to attend them – and determine how much growth or gain students were experiencing. Such longitudinal analyses have their own methodological challenges, but if done well they shed more light on the central questions: how much are students learning in their schools. The longer the study can follow a given student, the better.

Many studies of school performance look at change over time, but are not able to follow individual students. For example, a study might examine the change in the percentage of a school's students meeting grade level standards from one year to the next. These approaches are inferior to following individual students; change from one year to the next in a school's overall performance reflects, in part, changes in composition of the student body – not just growth by individual students. While these studies are not true measures of “value added,” they provide more insight than simple snapshots.

- **Adequate Sample.** Does the study include a sufficient sample of charter schools/students to allow for generalization? Studies that are restricted to a small number of schools, a subset of grade levels, or a subset of the student population are less valuable than studies that seek to look at all charter school students in the relevant jurisdiction. Often, sampling is necessary due to lack of data or the immensity of data-gathering that would be required to look at all students and schools. In such cases, the question becomes whether the approach to sampling introduces bias into the results.
- **Sound Comparison.** Does the study compare charter school schools'/students' performance to that of a relevant group of district schools/students? Does it use appropriate controls or other methods to make the comparison valid? The “gold standard” in this regard is random experimental design, in which students are randomly assigned to a “treatment” group (admitted to the charter school) or a “control” group (not admitted). Such a design minimizes the chance that charter school attenders are somehow different from non-attenders in ways that influence achievement, such as their motivation, the level of challenge they bring to the school, or the engagement of their families.

There are several limits on the use of randomized studies in this area. First, such studies are expensive to run relative to approaches that rely on statistical analysis of publicly available data. Second, not all states require their charter schools to run lotteries. Third, even in states that require lotteries, only oversubscribed schools run them. Leaving undersubscribed schools out of an analysis because they do not have lotteries undermines the study's generalizability. Finally, students who are unsuccessful in a lottery may attend a district school, a private school, or another charter school. To the extent that the aim of the study is to compare charter and district performance, decisions by students to attend private and other charter schools muddy the waters considerably.

More commonly, researchers will use large databases of information about test scores, student demographics, and school characteristics to carry out comparisons. They will seek to compare charter school students' performance to that of students who are similar demographically and/or who are attending schools that charter school students would likely have attended in the absence of charter schools.

As the University of Washington's Paul Hill has noted, such comparisons are fraught with peril, and no study can provide the perfect comparison.<sup>iii</sup> However, some will be better than others, working harder to compare charter school and students to the most relevant counterparts possible, in light of the available data. Sound comparative methods

are especially important for studies that provide just a snapshot of performance at a point in time.

- **Appropriate Disaggregation.** A related question is whether the study adequately differentiates between the performance of different kinds of schools and students. The charter sector is likely to be diverse and serve multiple student populations. Schools are chartered by different kinds of entities; have different levels of funding; take different approaches in their learning programs and organizational arrangements. Student populations differ by race, income, special needs, degree of initial academic challenge, and other factors. Since different kinds of schools and students may experience different success rates, it is vital for a study to analyze different groups separately where possible in addition to whatever kind of aggregate analysis is conducted.

One particularly important kind of disaggregation in research about charter schools is examining the performance of schools at different points in their life-cycles. Early-stage charter schools may have a different performance pattern than more mature charter schools, and studies should endeavor to sort out these differences.

### **The Studies: Emerging Patterns & Questions**

Dozens of studies looking at charter schools have been issued since the first charter school opened in 1992. This review examines 38 analyses that meet several criteria.<sup>iv</sup> All of the included studies:

- **Are recent.** They were all released in or after the year 2001. The charter sector has grown and changed enormously since then, making earlier studies less relevant to today's charter school policy debates.
- **Include comparisons** of charter school students' achievement on standardized tests with that of students in district schools. As argued above, other kinds of studies are critical to understanding how well chartering is working. But the focus here is on test-based measures of charter school student achievement.
- **Use serious methods.** While the methodological quality of the studies varies greatly, all the research reviewed here represent reasonable attempts to analyze data about student achievement in charter and district schools. This is admittedly not a very high bar. While more higher quality research, such as the planned federally funded study that will use random assignment to gauge charter school value-added, are needed, this report gleans what it can from the research that exists, however imperfect. In addition, reviewing flawed studies helps highlight strengths and weaknesses in today's research and point the way to better evaluations in the future.
- **Examine a significant segment of the charter sector.** All but two of the studies included examined national data, multi-state data, or statewide data. One study (Metis Associates) was included because it examines all charter schools in Kansas City, MO, a city with one of the largest charter school "market shares" of any city. Another (Hoxby & Rockoff) looks at Chicago charter schools operated by a single management organization.

It was included because it is the only study to date that uses randomized experimental design to attribute value-added to charter schools.

Many other analyses were reviewed but ultimately excluded. Notably, the report does not include studies that provide only simple comparisons of a state's charter school and district test scores, without conducting statistical analysis to create a reasonable comparison. For example, the analysis does not include the January 2005 *Boston Globe* story showing that the percentage of students passing the state tests in urban charter schools higher than in district schools.<sup>v</sup>

The included studies differ from one another in many ways, but probably the most important is what kind of outcome they examine. It is possible to divide the studies into three groups as shown in Table 1:

- **Panel studies.** Nine of the studies follow individual students over time to see how their test scores change from year to year (left column of Table 1). These student “panel” studies are the most likely to identify the schools’ “value-added.”
- **Snapshot studies.** A second group of 17 studies (right column of Table 1), by contrast, only look at a snapshot of one or more points in time. While some of these studies attempt to control for student background characteristics, most are not as powerful as the panel studies in gauging how much value the schools are adding. Snapshots may reveal more about the starting levels of students entering the schools than they do about how much learning the schools are producing. The better the controls, the more likely snapshots are to shed light on value-added. For example, Hoxby & Rockoff’s experimental design makes it more meaningful because the two groups compared in the snapshot randomly assigned by lottery.
- **Other change studies.** Finally, 12 studies (middle column) look at change over time, but through some method other than following individual students over time (for example, looking at changes in average school-wide scores from year to year). While these studies contain more information about the effects of the schools than do most of the snapshots, they are not as powerful as the panel studies. Change over time in school-level averages could well be due to changes in what students attend schools rather than how much learning the schools produce.<sup>vi</sup>

A more complete description of each study and its methods is in Table 2. The Appendix contains the full references, including web links where available.

**Table 1. Different Approaches to Comparing Charter and District Achievement**

Panel studies (following individual students over time)	Other change studies (e.g., looking at changes in school average results over time)	Snapshot studies (looking at results in one or more points in time)
Bifulco & Ladd (NC) Booker et al. (TX) Florida Department of Education (FL) Gronberg & Jansen (TX) Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin (TX) Noblit & Dickson (NC) Sass (FL) Solmon & Goldschmidt (AZ) Zimmer et al. (CA)	Bettinger (MI) Greene, Forster, & Winters (multi) Loveless (multi) Metis Associates (KC, MO) Miron & Horn (CT) Miron & Nelson (MI) Miron, Nelson & Risley (PA) NY Board of Regents (NY) Raymond (CA) Rogosa (CA) Slovacek et al. (CA) Zimmer et al. (CA)	Bifulco & Ladd (NC) Colorado Department of Education (CO) Eberts & Hollenbeck (MI) Finnigan et al. (multi) Florida Department of Education (FL) Gronberg and Jansen (TX) Hoxby (national) Hoxby & Rockoff (Chicago) Legis. Office of Ed. Oversight (OH) Loveless (multi) Nelson, Rosenberg, & Van Meter (national) Nelson & Miron (IL) Noblit & Dickson (NC) Raymond (CA) U.S. Department of Ed. (national) Witte et al. (WI) Zimmer et al. (CA)

Looking at all of these studies as a group, here are some observations that emerge about student performance in charter schools:

**Diversity of outcomes.** Like their instructional and organizational designs, schools’ results vary widely from one to the next. Some charter schools score at or near the top of the heap in their cities and states; it is these schools that show the great promise of chartering as a mechanism for creating new, excellent schools. Others lie at the bottom of the heap; the existence of these schools suggests the need for stronger up-front chartering and ongoing accountability, but it is also just a natural phenomenon in any open system. Other charter schools fall within the “normal” range of performance for schools in their states. In this context, any attempt to discuss “the average charter school” is destined to mask this wide diversity. More illuminating would be an analysis of what proportion of charter schools fall in the top quintile of schools, the second quintile, and so on, and what happens to schools over time in these categories. Do the best schools expand and replicate? Do the worst get better or close?

**Evidence of added value.** Of the 38 studies reviewed, 17 look only at a snapshot at one or more points in time, and these return a mix of results. Nine show charter students generally underperforming district schools (Bifulco & Ladd; Eberts & Hollenbeck; Finnigan et al.; Gronberg & Jansen; Legislative Office of Education Oversight in Ohio; Loveless; Nelson et al.;



Noblit & Dickson; and U.S. Department of Education). However, most of these studies tell us little about whether charter schools are “adding value.”

Twenty-one made some attempt to look at change over time in student or school performance. Nine actually followed students over time. Another 12 examined growth by looking at changes in school-wide or grade-wide scores. What do these studies tell us about the gains students are making in charter schools?

- Nine studies find that *overall gains in charter schools were larger* (Booker et al.; Florida Dept. of Ed.; Greene et al.; Loveless; Metis; Miron & Horn; Miron, Nelson & Risley; NY Board of Regents; and Slovacek et al.).
- Three studies find charter schools’ gains higher than in district schools for *certain categories* of charter schools: at-risk schools in Texas (Gronberg & Jansen); elementary schools in Arizona (Solmon & Goldschmidt) and high schools in California (Raymond).
- Five studies find *comparable gains* (both Zimmer et al change analyses and Rogosa, all in CA; Hanushek et al. and Sass, once they account for the age of the charter school).
- Three find that charter schools’ gains *lagged behind* those in districts generally – the two NC studies (Bifulco & Ladd and Noblit & Corbett) and Miron and Nelson (Michigan).

So while the change-over-time picture is somewhat mixed, in general it is very encouraging about the gains students are making in charter schools. Only in North Carolina and Michigan do these analyses show that district students are out-gaining charter students overall. Most of the other studies show charter students or schools out-gaining their district peers, at least in some significant categories of schools.

**Schools gaining ground over time?** Some of the studies (Bifulco & Ladd; Miron & Horn; Miron et al.; Booker et al.; Hanushek et al.; Sass; Gronberg & Jansen) explicitly examine a more specific question: do charter schools get better as they age?<sup>vii</sup> Do schools improve as they overcome initial start-up issues? Bifulco & Ladd finds that they do not: gains experienced by charter school students in NC are still lower even in more mature schools. Miron et al. finds only small differences based on first year of operation. The other five, though, find that as charter schools mature, they do better. Booker, Hanushek et al., Sass, and Gronberg & Jansen specifically find that rates of individual student growth in charter schools rise as schools get older.

## Recommendations

A number of recommendations emerge from this review. First, we need **better research on how well students in charter schools are performing**. Specifically, we need many more studies that track individual students over time, ideally in a randomized experimental setting, but at the very least using sophisticated methods to attribute value-added. These studies will provide the best information about how well individual schools are working for children.

We would also benefit from research that looks at other outcomes, such as dropout / completion rates in high schools, post-graduation outcomes like college persistence, attendance rates,

satisfaction levels, performance in subjects other than reading and math, and how well charter schools perform on aspects of their accountability plans other than standardized test scores. Also important is the question of “productivity.” Charter schools typically receive lower funding than districts do – what does this mean for the level of outcomes produced for each dollar provided to charter vs. district schools? These other measures are especially important if standardized test comparisons suggest that charter and district performance is similar, as they do in many of the examined studies.

Second, we need more and better research on **why some charter schools perform so much better** than other charter schools and non-charter schools. Moving beyond average performance, we see a significant number of charter schools that appear to perform far better than other schools. In all likelihood, many of the same factors that research has shown differentiate schools generally are at work in the charter sector. But there may be unique characteristics of leadership, organization, or program that are particularly valuable in the charter sector. Authorizers, policymakers, educators, and parents would benefit from understanding these.

Third, we need much **more research attention on evaluating chartering as a policy**. Knowing whether how well the average charter school student is performing does not answer most of the key questions that confront policymakers, like whether and how to expand the number of charter schools; how to change the way authorizing works; how to change charter schools’ funding and regulatory regimes; and how to stimulate the supply of more high-quality charter schools. Evaluating these dimensions is time-consuming and costly, but necessary if research is going to provide policymakers with useful, actionable information about how to make chartering work better as a strategy for improving public education.

The results to date **suggest important areas for action** by policymakers and practitioners. The existence of high quality charter schools and high growth rates for charter schools, at least in many states and studies, suggests that chartering holds promise as an approach to getting better schools. What we have is an experiment worth continuing – and refining. The existence of poor quality charter schools makes clear that we have more to learn about how to generate success with this policy. Together, these findings suggest a challenging agenda for policymakers and practitioners: to tap the full promise of chartering by continuing to expand the number of charter schools, while getting smarter about authorizing, accountability, and supply-creation. If we can do that, we can hope that a greater preponderance of tomorrow’s charter schools will match the outstanding quality of today’s best.

**Table 2. Summary of Charter Achievement Studies, 2000 to present**

<b>Panel Studies</b> (following individual students over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
NC	Bifulco & Ladd (Duke University)	2004	Compares average individual test score gains of charter students with those of district students and with the same students' gains in district schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students in CS make considerably smaller achievement gains</li> <li>▪ Even more mature CS showed smaller gains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows five cohorts of students for multiple years</li> <li>▪ Uses sophisticated statistical model to attribute value-added to CS</li> <li>▪ Compares student gains in charter schools to their own gains in district schools</li> <li>▪ Analyzes whether results vary by age of school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Though overall sample is very large, CS effect identified based on ~6,000 kids who attended both charter and district schools long enough to calculate gains</li> </ul>
TX	Booker et al. (various institutions)	2004	Compares average individual test score gains in CS and district schools using five cohorts of students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students lose ground initially when moving to CS but gain ground over time</li> <li>▪ School performance improves as CS progress beyond first year of operation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows five cohorts of students for multiple years</li> <li>▪ Uses sophisticated statistical model to attribute value-added to CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Though overall sample is very large, paper does not indicate number of students in different categories of "movers," which is central to analysis</li> </ul>
FL	Florida Dept. of Ed.	2004	Compares gains of CS and district students – overall and within subgroups – between 01-02 and 02-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ On 3 of 4 tests analyzed, CS students out-gained district students (no difference on 4<sup>th</sup> test)</li> <li>▪ CS students started out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Examines individual student gains over time</li> <li>▪ Uses Hierarchical Linear Modeling and controls for numerous student characteristics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No discussion of statistical significance of differences</li> </ul>

<b>Panel Studies</b> (following individual students over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
				<p>behind, but would close gap on those three tests in 4-9 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No CS subgroup had lower gains on any test</li> <li>▪ In 9 of 20 subgroups, CS gains were larger.</li> <li>▪ CS advantage was most pronounced for students with disabilities and gifted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes gains of subgroups of students</li> </ul>	
TX	Gronberg & Jansen (Texas Public Policy Foundation)	2001	Compare changes in an index of test scores in CS and district schools, both at-risk and non-at-risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At-risk CS show a positive effect relative to district schools; non-at-risk schools show opposite effect</li> <li>▪ Students often exhibit one year drop in scores when moving to a CS</li> <li>▪ CS achieve a given level of performance at a lower cost level than comparable districts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows individual students over time</li> <li>▪ Uses sophisticated statistical model to attribute value-added to CS</li> <li>▪ Examines at-risk and non-at-risk CS independently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Authors do not report complete tables, use typical statistical tests or explain variables and findings clearly</li> <li>▪ Only looks at one-year changes despite using 4 yrs. of data</li> <li>▪ Funding comparisons problematic b/c authors use district-level expenses for district schools, ignoring wide intra-district variability</li> </ul>
TX	Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin (Stanford University)	2002	Compares average test score gains of charter students with the same students' gains in district schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS gains are initially lower, but no significant differences after 2 or 3 years of CS's life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows individual students for 4 consecutive years</li> <li>▪ Uses sophisticated statistical model to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not clear how many kids included in the key comparison – kids who attended both charter and district</li> </ul>

<b>Panel Studies</b> (following individual students over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
					attribute value-added to CS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares student gains in charter schools to their own gains when they attended district schools before or after attending charter school</li> </ul>	schools long enough to calculate gains
NC	Noblit & Dickson (NC State Board of Education, UNC-Chapel Hill)	2001	Compares gains over time by individual students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS students lose ground over time, but differences small</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows CS and some CS students for four years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gain analysis sample is small, only 747 students in 23 schools; 60% from 4 schools</li> </ul>
FL	Sass (Florida State University)  (Note: Findings are preliminary and subject to revision.)	2004	Compares growth of individual students in CS and district schools over three years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Average CS achievement is lower in new charter schools but CS gains reach parity in reading in 2 years and math in 4.</li> <li>▪ Schools managed by for-profit entities perform no differently from other CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows individual students over time</li> <li>▪ Uses sophisticated statistical model to attribute value-added to CS</li> <li>▪ Uses data on 15,000 students who switched between CS and district schools to identify effects of CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FL administers two tests, one based on state standards and one based on national norms (variant of SAT-9). This analysis uses only the norm-referenced scores. Author argues this is strength; others say standards-based more meaningful</li> </ul>
AZ	Solmon & Goldschmidt (Goldwater Institute)	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares individual level growth in CS and district schools over three years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall CS students grew 3 percentile points faster annually</li> <li>▪ Results varied by grade level. The</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows individual students over time</li> <li>▪ Uses sophisticated statistical model to attribute value-added</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3-year time frame does not allow comparison of gains individual students made while in district</li> </ul>

<b>Panel Studies</b> (following individual students over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
				charter advantage was at the elementary level; middle school gains were equal; in high schools district students gained more.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to CS</li> <li>▪ Includes the universe of charter school students</li> <li>▪ Disaggregates by grade level</li> </ul>	schools vs. gains the same students made in CS
CA	Zimmer et al. (RAND)	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares individual student progress in CS and six districts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mixed results, but overall differences are small, CS are “keeping pace.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follows individual children over time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Only examines 6 districts, though these have a large number of charter students</li> </ul>

<b>Other Change Studies</b> (e.g., looking at changes in school average results over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
MI	Bettinger (Case Western Reserve University)	2005	Compares change in 4 <sup>th</sup> grade average performance from year to year in CS and district schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS average scores do not improve any faster than district school average scores, and may decline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex controls for school demographic composition, pre-charter performance, and other factors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis looks at change in average scores, not changes in individual scores</li> <li>Analysis limited to CS that opened 1996-97</li> </ul>
Multi-state	Greene, Forster, & Winters (Manhattan Institute)	2003	Focuses on CS serving a “general population” rather than schools targeting at risk, dropouts, etc. Compare year-to-year gains in average test score between CS and nearby district schools in 5 states	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS slightly outperform district schools across states (2-3 percentile points)</li> <li>CS students in TX and FL outperform district peers by 7-8 percentile points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compares “apples to apples” – CS serving a general population with nearby district schools</li> <li>Multi-state analysis more generalizable than single-state studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results potentially sensitive to definition of “school serving general population”</li> <li>Different tests administered in different states</li> <li>No results reported for 6 of 11 initially included states; reason not explained</li> </ul>
Multi-state	Loveless (Brown Center, Brookings)	2003	Compares changes in average CS and district test scores in 10 states between 2000 and 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS have lower scores than district schools, but larger gains</li> <li>EMO schools had lower scores than non-EMO and district schools but larger gains</li> <li>CA conversion charters had higher scores than start-ups and district schools, but similar gains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-state analysis more generalizable than single-state studies</li> <li>Analyzes changes over time in school average scores</li> <li>Breaks out EMO vs. non-EMO and (in CA) conversion vs. start-up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different tests administered in different states</li> </ul>

<b>Other Change Studies</b> (e.g., looking at changes in school average results over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
MO (KC)	Metis Associates	2004	Compares change in average CS student score to avg district and state score, 2000-2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In all subjects and grades, CS students started out behind</li> <li>▪ CS closed the gap in all subjects and grades with both district and state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes change over time in student scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis looks at change in overall average scores, not changes in individual student scores</li> <li>▪ No controls for student and school characteristics</li> </ul>
CT	Miron & Horn (Connecticut State Department of Education, Eval. Cntr. Western Michigan University)	2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares changes in school-level scores in CS and district schools over 5 years using two kinds of analysis</li> <li>▪ “Trends” analysis compares changes in a single grade level over time (e.g. this year’s 4<sup>th</sup> grade vs. last year’s 4<sup>th</sup> grade)</li> <li>▪ “Cohort” analysis attempts to follow a grade of students over time (e.g. this year’s 6<sup>th</sup> graders with 4<sup>th</sup> graders two years ago)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Charter schools start out behind but make larger gains</li> <li>▪ After two years, CS still lag districts on average</li> <li>▪ After 4-5 years, CS outperform districts on average</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multiple years of data</li> <li>▪ Cohort analysis allows comparison of 6<sup>th</sup> grade scores with 4<sup>th</sup> grade scores two years prior; not all the same students, but mostly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Trends study: comparing this year’s 4<sup>th</sup> grade with last year’s tells us nothing about how much learning took place – different students</li> <li>▪ Cohort study: gains over time are grade level averages, not individual students.</li> </ul>
MI	Miron & Nelson (Chapter of Corwin Press book)	2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares changes in school-level pass rates in CS and host districts</li> <li>▪ Compares relative changes in pass rates in EMO and non-EMO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Host district changes exceed CS changes in all subjects and grades except 4<sup>th</sup> gr. math</li> <li>▪ Non-EMO changes exceed EMO changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multiple years of data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Changes over time are changes in schoolwide pass rates, not gains of individual students</li> </ul>



<b>Other Change Studies</b> (e.g., looking at changes in school average results over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
			CS	in all subjects and grades except 7 <sup>th</sup> gr. math		
PA	Miron, Nelson & Risley (Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Eval. Cntr. Western Michigan University)	2002	Compares CS test scores with those of a set of similar district schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS students score slightly lower than demographically and geographically similar district schools</li> <li>▪ CS gain ground over time vs. similar district schools; would catch up to district schools in 3 years if continued this rate of growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Seeks to compare charter schools to similar district schools, not just all district schools using regression analysis</li> <li>▪ Analyzes how relative CS scores change as they mature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In some years very small number of CS participated in tests</li> </ul>
NY	New York State Board of Regents	2003	Compares change in pass rates on state tests between CS and their host districts, 2002-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS often started out behind but had larger increases</li> <li>▪ Of 39 comparisons, CS had larger increases in % passing than host districts in 34 cases</li> <li>▪ In 14 cases % passing in CS rose by 25 points or more; none of the host districts saw increases that large</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares CS to host districts, not statewide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis compares 2003 4<sup>th</sup> graders with 2002 4<sup>th</sup> graders (for example). Since these are not the same students, analysis is not looking at student growth over time</li> <li>▪ No disaggregation by student or school characteristics</li> </ul>
CA	Raymond (CREDO, Hoover Institution, Stanford)	2003	Compares CS and district test scores and school average gains over time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statewide, average scores in CS lower, but difference generally not statistically significant</li> <li>▪ Compared to schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes changes over time in school average scores</li> <li>▪ Includes controls for many factors likely to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gain analysis does not explain very much of the variance in gains from school to school</li> </ul>

<b>Other Change Studies</b> (e.g., looking at changes in school average results over time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
				in own district, CS elem. and middle schs had similar gains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High schools had signif. larger gains</li> </ul>	affect school scores	
CA	Rogosa (Stanford University)	2003	Compares scores and gains of CS and district schools from 1999-2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS have lower average scores than district</li> <li>CS progress is comparable to district</li> <li>Separate analysis of disadvantaged students overall &amp; within concentrated poverty schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes all CS and district schools with data during the period</li> <li>Analyzes changes over time in school average scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gains over time are averages of all students in certain grade levels, not gains of individual students</li> </ul>
CA	Slovacek, Kunnan, & Kim	2002	Compares change in scores of all CS and district schools and of schools serving high-poverty populations, 1999-2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS scores increased slightly faster than district scores overall</li> <li>In schools with &gt;50% poverty, the CS advantage was larger – a 23% rise vs. 19%</li> <li>In schools with &gt;75%, CS advantage larger still: 28% rise vs. 24%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disaggregates by looking at schools serving different types of student population</li> <li>Analyzes change over time in school average scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gains over time are school averages, not gains of individual students</li> <li>Analysis mis-coded some schools in ways that make a difference for the study's conclusions.</li> </ul>
CA	Zimmer et al. (RAND)	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compares changes in CS and district school test scores over 4 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No statistically significant difference in gains between CS and district schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looks at change over time</li> <li>Large sample</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gains over time are school averages, not gains of individual students</li> </ul>

Snapshot Studies (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
State	Authors / Publishing Organization	Year	Basic Description of Approach	Key Findings	Strengths	Weaknesses
NC	Bifulco & Ladd	2004	Compares levels of performance by CS and district students, using complex regression model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS students under-perform similar district students by 0.16 standard deviations in reading and 0.25 in math</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes a large sample of CS and district students</li> <li>Controls for important student background characteristics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time*</li> </ul>
CO	Colorado State Dept. of Ed.	2003	Compares percentage of CS and district school students statewide that score proficient. Compares percentage proficient within matched demographic bands (e.g. 80+% free lunch / minority)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall CS students in grades 3-8 performed better than district students; 9-10 graders in CS performed worse.</li> <li>Within matched bands, similar results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes nearly all CS students statewide</li> <li>Disaggregates by race, income</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time</li> </ul>
MI	Eberts & Hollenbeck (Upjohn Institute)	2002	Compares 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> grade test scores of CS and district students over 5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CS students have lower test scores than district students by 3-10%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes five years of data (but not longitudinal analysis)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only analyzes 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade scores</li> <li>Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time</li> <li>Analysis does not explain very much of variance in scores</li> </ul>
Multi-state	Finnigan et al. (SRI)	2004	Compares percentage of CS and district schools meeting school-level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A higher percentage of district schools meet state performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looks at 5 states</li> <li>Controls for background</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzes achievement at a point in time (2001-02) rather than</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.

<b>Snapshot Studies</b> (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
			state performance standards in five states (CO, IL, MA, NC, TX) in 2001-02	standards in these 5 states	characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Uses more than one strategy to analyze data</li> <li>▪ Uses state performance standards</li> </ul>	gains over time
FL	Florida Dept. of Ed.	2004	Compares average state scores and % proficient of CS and district students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Average CS student test scores are generally slightly lower than district averages, but differences typically “negligible” (&lt;1%)</li> <li>▪ Differences in 10<sup>th</sup> grade are larger, with CS students lagging by 3%</li> <li>▪ Differences do not translate into differences in percentage proficient (~50% of charter and district students proficient)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares large numbers of CS and district students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time*</li> <li>▪ No discussion of statistical significance of differences</li> </ul>
TX	Gronberg & Jansen (Texas Public Policy Foundation)	2001	Compares average CS and district student test scores and % proficient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Average student test scores and % proficient lag substantially behind those of district students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Examines four successive years of test score data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at points in time rather than gains over time*</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.

<b>Snapshot Studies</b> (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Nation	Hoxby (Harvard University & National Bureau of Economic Research)	2004	Compares % proficient at CS with that of nearest district school and nearest racially similar district school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS students are 3-5% more likely to be proficient than students in neighboring schools</li> <li>▪ The CS advantage tends to be greater in:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Older CS</li> <li>– CS in areas with high poor or Hispanic populations</li> <li>– In states with charter laws that provide more autonomy and funding</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Includes schools serving 99% of nation's elementary CS students</li> <li>▪ Compares CS to schools that students would be likely to attend in absence of CS</li> <li>▪ Breaks down results by age of school, state, demographic characteristics of student population, and other variables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time</li> <li>▪ Analysis limited to a single elementary grade level in each state</li> </ul>
Chicago	Hoxby & Rockoff (Harvard University & Columbia Business School)	2004	Compares performance of students who are lotteried in and lotteried out of schools run by Chicago Charter School Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS students have higher math and reading scores, but only reading difference is statistically significant.</li> <li>▪ Students who enter CS at early grades (K-3) have greater benefits than those entering later (who have lower achievement in some grades and subjects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Uses randomized experimental design, the “gold standard” of school effects research</li> <li>▪ Uses other sophisticated statistical controls to identify impact of charter schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Examines only three schools operated by one organization, the Chicago Charter School Foundation</li> <li>▪ Thus far only includes limited analysis of change over time in student test scores</li> </ul>
OH	Legis. Office of Education	2003	Compares scores and percent proficient in CS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statewide, district schools generally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Part of analysis matches CS with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at points in time rather</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.

<b>Snapshot Studies</b> (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
	Oversight		vs. district schools in 4 years. Only CS with at least 2 yrs. operation included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outscored CS but differences were slight</li> <li>Differences b/w demographically similar district and CS not generally statistically significant</li> <li>Statistically significant differences between matched schools generally favored district schools</li> </ul>	district schools similar in grade span and demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>than gains over time</li> <li>Several charter schools omitted from study due to poor data</li> <li>Matching criteria not clearly specified</li> </ul>
Multi	Loveless (Brown Center, Brookings)	2003	Compares average test scores in CS and district schools in 10 states in 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>62% of district schools with similar demographics out-score CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzing multiple states makes findings more generalizable than single state studies</li> <li>Controls for some student demographic characteristics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time*</li> <li>Different tests administered in different states</li> </ul>
IL	Nelson & Miron (Illinois State Board of Education, Eval. Cntr. Western Michigan University)	2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compares percent passing states tests in CS and demographically similar schools statewide</li> <li>Compares percent at or above national norms in Chicago CS vs. composite group of district schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In statewide analyses, CS perform at or just below demographically similar schools.</li> <li>In Chicago analysis, CS have higher proportions scoring at or above national norms than comparison composites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chicago analysis compares CS performance to a composite of schools CS students would likely have attended</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than change over time</li> <li>Includes a small number of schools (8-13 in statewide analyses)</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.

<b>Snapshot Studies</b> (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Nation	Nelson, Rosenberg, & Van Meter (American Federation of Teachers)	2004	Compares 2003 NAEP reading and math scores for 4 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> graders in charter vs. district schools (see also U.S. Department of Education, below, which analyzed same data).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS students had significantly lower achievement in 4<sup>th</sup> gr. math and reading and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading</li> <li>▪ Controlling for family income and school location, CS students still score lower.</li> <li>▪ Controlling for race there are no significant differences between CS and district students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National study using highly-regarded NAEP test scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Small sample included only 3% of charter students, and only in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time</li> <li>▪ Unable to control for race, income, &amp; other factors simultaneously due to data limitations</li> </ul>
NC	Noblit & Dickson (NC State Board of Education, UNC-Chapel Hill)	2001	Compare percent proficient in CS vs. district schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS proficiency levels lower than district schools</li> <li>▪ Black-white achievement gap larger in CS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Breaks out analysis by race</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time*</li> </ul>
CA	Raymond (CREDO, Hoover Institution, Stanford)	2003	Compares CS and district test score levels 1999-2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS elementary and middle schools had scores comparable to district schools statewide and in districts with charters.</li> <li>▪ CS high schools had lower scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes elementary, middle, and high schools separately</li> <li>▪ Compares CS both to schools statewide and schools in districts with charters (their “direct competitors”)</li> <li>▪ Uses multiple years of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time*</li> <li>▪ Relative performance changes significantly from year to year, raising questions re: how well comparisons</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.

<b>Snapshot Studies</b> (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
					data	reflect true differences
National	U.S. Department of Education	2004	Compares 2003 NAEP reading and math scores for 4 <sup>th</sup> graders in charter vs. district schools (see also Nelson et al., above, which analyzed same data).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CS students performed worse in math; no statistically significant difference in reading performance.</li> <li>▪ CS and district students within racial/ethnic groups performed comparably in reading and math.</li> <li>▪ CS students eligible for free lunch performed worse than district students in reading and math</li> <li>▪ CS students with less experienced teachers and in CS's that were independent of school districts performed worse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National study using highly-regarded NAEP test scores</li> <li>▪ Analyzes several variables, like teacher characteristics, that may predict student achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Small sample included only 3% of charter students, and only in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time</li> <li>▪ Unable to control for race, income, &amp; other factors simultaneously due to data limitations</li> </ul>
WI	Witte et al. (University of Wisconsin – Madison)	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares probability of meeting state standards in CS and district schools in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in 2000-01 and 2001-02</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Results are mixed, but CS students are generally more likely to meet standards than district students</li> <li>▪ Charter advantage is all in schools older than one year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Controls for race, income and other characteristics</li> <li>▪ Compares “new” and “old” charters separately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Small sample of charter schools (15-27 depending on analysis)</li> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.



<b>Snapshot Studies</b> (looking at results in one or more points in time)						
<b>State</b>	<b>Authors / Publishing Organization</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Basic Description of Approach</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
CA	Zimmer et al. (RAND)	2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compares CS and district student-level scores statewide over 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall CS performance is comparable to district schools</li> <li>▪ Start-up CS using classroom instruction score higher</li> <li>▪ Schools using non-classroom (cyber) score lower</li> <li>▪ Conversion CS using classrooms have mixed results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Controls for range of demographic factors</li> <li>▪ Large sample</li> <li>▪ Disaggregates by conversion vs. start-up and classroom based vs. non-classroom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analyzes achievement at a point in time rather than gains over time*</li> </ul>

\* Note: Though this part of this study does not analyze change over time, another part of the same study does – see Panel and Other Change Sections of the grid for details.

## Studies Included in this Analysis

- Bettinger, Eric P. Forthcoming (2005). "The Effect of Charter Schools on Charter Students and Public Schools." Forthcoming (2005). *Economics of Education Review*, Volume 24, Issue 2, April 2005, Pages 133-147.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com> (requires subscription or payment).
- Bifulco, Robert and Helen F. Ladd. 2004. "The Impacts of Charter Schools on Student Achievement: Evidence from North Carolina." Terry Sanford Institute of Policy: Working Papers Series SAN04-01.  
<http://www.pubpol.duke.edu/people/faculty/ladd/SAN04-01.pdf>
- Booker, Kevin, Scott M. Gilpatric, Timothy Gronberg, and Dennis Jansen. 2004. "Charter School Performance in Texas." May 25. <http://web.utk.edu/~sgilpatr/charterperf.pdf>
- Colorado Department of Education. 2003. *The State of Charter Schools in Colorado: 2001-02: The Characteristics, Status and Performance Record of Colorado Charter Schools*.  
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdechart/charsurv.htm>
- Eberts, Randall W. and Kevin M. Hollenbeck. 2002. "Impact of Charter School Attendance on Student Achievement in Michigan." *Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper*. No. 02-080. <http://www.upjohninst.org/publications/wp/02-80.pdf>
- Finnigan, Karen, et al. 2004. "Evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program: Final Report." Prepared for U.S. Department of Education by SRI International, Washington, D.C.  
<http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/pcsp-final/finalreport.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education. 2004. "Florida Charter Schools: 2002-2003 Annual Accountability Report." [http://www.fldoe.org/meetings/2004\\_08\\_16/Charter\\_Pres.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/meetings/2004_08_16/Charter_Pres.pdf)
- Greene, Jay P., Greg Forster, and Marcus A. Winters. 2003. "Apples to Apples: An Evaluation of Charter Schools Serving General Student Populations." Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute: Education Working Paper No.1. [http://www.manhattan-institute.org/ewp\\_01.pdf](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/ewp_01.pdf)
- Gronberg, Timothy J. and Dennis W. Jansen. 2001. *Navigating Newly Chartered Waters: An Analysis of Texas Charter School Performance*. Texas Public Policy Foundation. <http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2001-05-17-educ-newly.pdf>
- Hanushek, Eric A., John F. Kain, and Steven G. Rivkin. 2002. "The Impact of Charter Schools on Academic Achievement." *Unpublished Manuscript*.  
<http://edpro.stanford.edu/Eah/papers/charters.aea.jan03.PDF>  
(Texas)

- Hoxby, Caroline M. 2004. "Achievement in Charter Schools and Regular Public Schools in the US: Understanding the Differences."  
[http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/hoxby/papers/hoxbycharter\\_dec.pdf](http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/hoxby/papers/hoxbycharter_dec.pdf)
- Hoxby, Caroline M. and Jonah E. Rockoff. 2004. The Impact of Charter Schools on Student Achievement."  
<http://post.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/hoxby/papers/hoxbyrockoff.pdf>
- Legislative Office of Education Oversight. 2003. "Community Schools in Ohio: Final Report on Student Performance, Parent Satisfaction, and Accountability."  
[http://www.loeo.state.oh.us/reports/PreEleSecPDF/CS\\_Final\\_Web.pdf](http://www.loeo.state.oh.us/reports/PreEleSecPDF/CS_Final_Web.pdf)
- Loveless, Tom. 2003. *The 2003 Brown Center Report on American Education: Charter Schools: Achievement, Accountability, and the Role of Expertise*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution. [http://www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/g/brown/bc\\_report/2003/2003report\\_part3.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/g/brown/bc_report/2003/2003report_part3.pdf)
- Metis Associates. 2004. *A Study of the Kansas City Missouri Charter Schools 2000-2003*. New York: Metis Associates. Note: this study did not compare gains over time in CS and district schools, but it did track individual CS student performance over time.  
[http://metisassoc.com/DOCS/Final\\_KansasCityCharterSchools\\_Report\\_07-20-2004.pdf](http://metisassoc.com/DOCS/Final_KansasCityCharterSchools_Report_07-20-2004.pdf)
- Miron, Gary and Jerry Horn. 2002. *Evaluation of Connecticut Charter Schools and the Charter School Initiative*. Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center Western Michigan University. <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/charter/ctcharter.html>
- Miron, Gary and Christopher Nelson. 2002. *What's Public About Charter Schools? Lessons Learned About Choice and Accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. Chapter 8, pp. 134-147.
- Miron, Gary, Christopher Nelson, and John Risley with Carolyn Sullins. 2002. *Strengthening Pennsylvania's Charter School Reform: Findings from the Statewide Evaluation and Discussion of Relevant Policy Issues*. Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center Western Michigan University.  
[http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/charter/pa\\_5year/5\\_year\\_report\\_pa\\_cs\\_eval.pdf](http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/charter/pa_5year/5_year_report_pa_cs_eval.pdf)
- Nelson, C., & Miron, G. (2002). "The evaluation of the Illinois charter school reform: Final report." Report submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Nelson, Howard F., Bella Rosenberg, and Nancy Van Meter. 2004. "Charter School Achievement on the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress." American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO. <http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/downloads/teachers/NAEPCharterSchoolReport.pdf>

- New York Board of Regents. 2003. *Report to the Governor, the Temporary President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the Assembly on the Educational Effectiveness of the Charter School Approach in New York State*.  
<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/psc/5yearreport/fiveyearreport.htm>
- Noblit, George W. and Corbett Dickson. 2001. *North Carolina Charter School Evaluation Report*. State Board of Education: Evaluation Section Division of Accountability Services Instructional and Accountability Services.  
<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/evaluation/charter/evalreport.pdf>
- Raymond, Margaret E. 2003. "The Performance of California Charter Schools." CREDO: Hoover Institution Stanford University.  
[http://credo.stanford.edu/downloads/ca\\_chart\\_sch.pdf](http://credo.stanford.edu/downloads/ca_chart_sch.pdf)
- Rogosa, David. 2003. "Student Progress in California Charter Schools, 1999-2002." *Unpublished Manuscript*. <http://www-stat.stanford.edu/~rag/api/charter9902.pdf>
- Sass, Tim R. 2004. "Charter Schools and Student Achievement in Florida." Preliminary draft; subject to revision.  
[http://www.aeaweb.org/annual\\_mtg\\_papers/2005/0109\\_0800\\_0301.pdf](http://www.aeaweb.org/annual_mtg_papers/2005/0109_0800_0301.pdf)
- Slovacek, Simeon P., Antony J. Kunnan, and Hae-Jin Kim. 2002. "California Charter Schools Serving Low-SES Students: An Analysis of the Academic Performance Index." Unpublished manuscript, California State University-Los Angeles.  
[http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/c\\_perc/rpt1.pdf](http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/c_perc/rpt1.pdf)
- Solmon, Lewis C. and Pete Goldschmidt. 2004. "Comparison of Traditional Public Schools and Charter Schools on Retention, School Switching, and Achievement Growth." *Policy Report: Goldwater Institute*. No. 192.  
<http://www.goldwaterinstitute.org/article.php/431.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. Institute for Education Sciences. National Center for Education Statistics. *The Nation's Report Card: America's Charter School Report*, NCES 2005-456, by National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: 2004.  
<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/charter/>
- Witte, John F., David L. Weimer, Paul A. Schlomer, Arnold F. Shober. 2004. "The Performance of Charter Schools in Wisconsin." *Wisconsin Charter Schools Study*. <http://www.lafollette.wisc.edu/wcss/docs/per.pdf>
- Zimmer, Ron, Richard Buddin, Derrick Chau, Glenn Daley, Brian Gill, Cassandra Guarino, Laura Hamilton, Cathy Krop, Dan McCaffrey, Melinda Sandler, and Dominic Brewer. 2003. *Charter School Operations and Performance: Evidence from California*. Santa Monica: Rand.  
<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1700/>

*The author would like to thank Peter Enns for providing invaluable research assistance for this paper. Numerous individuals reviewed drafts of all or part of the paper, including staff and board members of the Charter School Leadership Council, several authors of the studies examined in the paper, and outside reviewers unaffiliated with the researchers or CSLC.*

## Endnotes

<sup>i</sup> Of course there are other measures of success besides student achievement on standardized tests that matter, including the satisfaction of parents and students and how well schools are performing on a range of other measures specified in their charters. Still, few doubt the importance for students of attaining the basic skills measured by standardized tests.

<sup>ii</sup> Ted Kolderie, *A Case for Evaluating the Institutional Innovation Separately* (St. Paul, MN: Education/Evolving, 2003), available: <http://www.educationevolving.org/pdf/evaluating.pdf>.

<sup>iii</sup> Paul T. Hill, “Assessing Student Performance in Charter Schools.” *Education Week Online*, posted January 12, 2005. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/01/12/18hill.h24.html>.

<sup>iv</sup> Thirty distinct studies were reviewed. Several studies contained more than one of the three kinds of analyses discussed here (panel, other “change” analyses, and snapshots). In these cases, each distinct analysis is considered one of the “studies” discussed and is listed separately in Tables 1 and 2. For example, Zimmer et al. includes all three kinds of analysis and thus appears in all three columns of Table 1.

<sup>v</sup> Maria Sacchetti, “Charter students score well on tests. But foes cite ESL, special-ed ratios.” *Boston Globe* online, January 9, 2005.

[http://www.boston.com/news/education/k\\_12/mcas/articles/2005/01/09/charter\\_students\\_score\\_well\\_on\\_tests/](http://www.boston.com/news/education/k_12/mcas/articles/2005/01/09/charter_students_score_well_on_tests/)

<sup>vi</sup> Some of the panel and change studies listed snapshot data by way of background but did not seek to analyze them statistically (e.g. Metis Associates), and therefore they are not listed in the snapshot column.

<sup>vii</sup> Some of the snapshot studies also compare older vs. newer charter schools (e.g. U.S. Department of Education, Witte), but they do not track schools over time and thus do not provide direct evidence about whether individual charter schools are getting better with age.