APPENDIX A VOUCHER STUDIES

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study	Key Findings	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Rep			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
M1	Witte, J.F. (1998). The Milwaukee voucher experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* , *20* (4), 229-251.	Student level data for more than 1,300 students (slightly different in math and reading); Iowa Test of Basic Skills scores in reading and mathematics collected for 1990-1994; because of problems with lottery losers as unreliable comparison group, Witte compares choice participants and MPS low-income students *Limitations:* Limited generalizability, because of matched design, controls used may not control for differences adequately	Mixed: No substantial difference over the life of the program between choice and MPS families, especially MPS low-income students	8	4	5	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**29**	**0**
M2	Greene, J.P., Peterson, P.E., & Du, J. (1999). Effectiveness of school choice: The Milwaukee experiment. *Education and Urban Society, 31,* 190-213.	Individual level scores on math and reading Iowa Test of Basic Skills, lottery winners compared with lottery losers in a randomized design *Limitations:* Questions raised about legitimacy of comparison group; did not report findings based on low-income MPS students; nonrandomness of attrition.	Strongly positive: Statistically significant changes for winners in their third and fourth year in the program when demographic controls are used	10	4	4	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	**27**	**2**
M3	Rouse, C. (1998). Private school vouchers and student achievement: An evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 113* (2), 553-602.	This analysis sample consists of African-American and Hispanic students who applied to the choice program between 1990 and 1993 for grades K–8; compares the test scores of students selected to attend a participating private school with those of unsuccessful applicants and other students from the Milwaukee Public Schools *Limitations:* Questions about the nonrandomness of attrition	Slightly positive: Students selected for the choice program scored approximately 1.5 to 2.3 percentile points higher per year in math compared with unsuccessful applicants and the sample MPS students. Math learning gains are higher for choice students and statistically significant; however, reading	10	4	6	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	**30**	**1**
C1	Metcalf, K.K., Legan, N.A., Paul, K.M., & Boone, W.J. (2004, October). *Evaluation of the Cleveland scholarship and tutoring program: Technical report 1998-2003.* Bloomington: Indiana University, School of Education.	The study followed 780 first-grade scholarship students attending private schools, 541 first-grade public school applicant nonrecipients, and 1,233 first-grade nonapplicants; achievement data collected from same cohort each spring; reports findings from autumn, 1998 (early first grade) through spring 2003 (late fifth grade). *Limitations:* Questions about the nonrandomness of attrition	Mixed: Program does not show any substantial gains for voucher users relative to other comparison groups. The CSTP is not differentially effective for African-American students.	10	4	4	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	**28**	**0**
C2	Greene, J.P., Howell, W.G., & Peterson, P.E. (1999). *An evaluation of the Cleveland voucher program after two years.* Harvard University, Program on Education Policy and Governance.	California Achievement Test in fall 1996 and spring 1997 and spring 1998 scores for two academies were collected and group learning gains determined; 2 academies used were created in response to the Cleveland Scholarship Program; average student gains from these schools compared with national average *Limitations:* Only 2 academies from the program used; school level data; compared with national averages, not a specific comparison group with	Mixed: During first year, NPRs in both math and reading rose significantly but did not continue to rise during the second year; some actually declined, one score significantly declined. However, authors recommend that program is continued	4	3	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	**14**	**0**
C3	Plucker, J., Muller, P., Hansen, J., Ravert, R., & Makel, M. (2006). *Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program: Technical report 1998-2004.* Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.	Student level data used in mixed model, longitudinal approach on Terra Nova standardized test scores; controls for prior achievement, student mobility, and poverty status included. Compares lottery winners and nonwinners over time. *Limitations: M* issing data for some students had to be mathematically estimated; controls are	Positive: In first and second grades, CSTP outperformed public school students; but with more exposure, differences disappeared (except for language arts, in which CSTP maintained higher scores)	10	4	4	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**29**	**1**
NY1	Mayer, D.P., Peterson, P.E., Myers, D.E., Tuttle, C.C., & Howell, W.G. (2002). *School choice in New York City after three years: An evaluation of the school choice scholarships program (No. 8404-045*). Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research	Compares Iowa Test of Basic Skills scores of lottery winners and nonwinners for baseline and for several subsequent years; uses several demographic controls *Limitations:* Response bias, attrition	Slightly positive: After 3 years, no significant difference; some positive results for African Americans	10	4	5	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	**29**	**1**

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study	Key Findings	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Rep			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
NY2	Krueger, A.B., & Zhu, P. (2004). Another look at the New York City voucher experiment. *American Behavioral Scientist, 47* (5), 658-698.	Data were collected from low income students in grades k-4 and their parents at baseline and in the spring of each of the next 3 years. Base weights constructed so sample was representative of the pool of eligible applicants. Students were given the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) at baseline and in the spring of each of the 3 follow-up years. Study compares gains over time for lottery winners and losers. *Limitations:* Lack of generalizability to other grades and voucher programs	Mixed: When students with missing baseline scores are taken into account, results are insignificant	10	4	4	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	**28**	**0**
DC1	Wolf, P.J., Howell, W.G., & Peterson, P.E. (2000). *School choice in Washington, DC: An evaluation after one year*. Cambridge, MA: Program on Education Policy and Governance, Harvard University.	Involved 1,584 students in grade 2-8 who applied to scholarship and had not previously attended a private school; students tested at baseline and follow up sessions, scholarship winners and nonwinners were compared in terms of Iowa Test of Basic Skills gains in math and reading *Limitations:* Did not look at high school effects; legitimacy of comparison group questioned; attrition patterns may be threat to internal validity; no significance for any racial group except African Americans but conclusions reported as extremely positive	Slightly positive: African-Americans switching to private schools in grades 2 through 5 outperformed public school students by 3 percent in reading (not statistically significant), 7 percent in math (statistically significant); African American students attending private schools in grades six through eight scored 2 national percentile points higher in math (not statistically significant) but trailed their public school peers in reading by 8 points (statistically significant).	10	1	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	0	**23**	**1**
DC2	Wolf, P., Gutmann, B., Puma, M., Rizzo, L., & Eissa, N. (2007). *Evaluation of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program: Impacts After One Year.* Washington: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.	Randomized controlled trial used to assess the first-year impacts of the Program on those who applied for and were given the option. OSP impact sample group includes the randomly assigned members of the treatment and control groups and comprises 57 percent of all eligible applicants in the first 2 years of Program operation *Limitations:* only one year of data, not generalizable to other programs	Mixed: No statistically significant impacts, positive or negative, on student reading or math achievement for the entire impact sample in year 1, or on subgroups	10	1	3	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	**23**	**0**
D1	West, M.R., Peterson, P.E., & Campbell, D.E. (2001, August). *School choice in Dayton, Ohio after two years: An evaluation of the Parents Advancing Choice in Education scholarship program.* Cambridge, MA: Program on Education Policy and Governance, Harvard University	Included 458 of 803 included in Howell, & Peterson (2000). Statistical model estimated to take nonrandomness of the placement of students in public and private schools. Each student's status as a member of the treatment or control group was used as an instrumental variable in a two stage least squares regression in which the dependent variable in the first-stage regression was whether or not the student attended a private school *Limitations:* Positive for one subgroup in some areas, but expressed as positive rather than mixed; attrition may be important	Slightly positive: After two years African American students who attended private schools scored higher in reading and on combined reading and math score. Their score also increased in math, although not statistically significant. Non-African American students did not differ significantly	10	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	**24**	**1**
C4	Belfield, C. (2006). *The evidence on education vouchers: An application to the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program.* Occasional Paper 112. New York: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education.	Compares TerraNova scores for scholarship users, non-users, rejected applicants and a public school comparison group *Limitations:* Lack of generalizability to other programs, only used second and fourth graders	Mixed: No academic advantages for voucher users in second or fourth grade; results do not vary according to: adjustments for prior ability, intention-to-treat versus treatment effects, and dosage differences; not differentially effective for African American students	8	3	4	2	3	0	1	1	1	0	**23**	**0**

APPENDIX B HOMESCHOOL STUDIES

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study	Key Findings	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
A	Boulter, L.T. (1999). *Academic achievement in home school education.* Salisbury, NC: Catawba College.	Compares scores of homeschool students on Woodcock Johnson revised test with national average *Limitations:* Incomplete methods section (lack of information on sampling procedure); sample was all white, middle or upper-middle class, and demographic controls used; sample includes fewer than 50 homeschoolers	Mixed: Homeschoolers were at or above 50th percentile on all subsets of test, but percentile scores for all four clusters were negatively correlated with years in home schooling; significant decline in broad written language and broad knowledge	4	4	1	2	0	2	1	1	1	0	**16**	**0**
B	Collom, E. (2005). The ins and outs of homeschooling: The determinants of parental motivations and student achievement. *Education and Urban Society, 3* (3), 307-335.	Compares scores of 175 homeschooled students on SAT9 to the national average *Limitations:* Limited design in one school, hinged on option to complete parental motivation survey that was merged with test data, school factor clouds results, cross sectional	Slightly positive: Homeschoolers scored in the 54th percentile on reading, language, and math	0	0	4	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	**15**	**1**
C	Galloway, R.A.S. (1995, April). *Home schooled adults: Are they ready for college?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.	Compares homeschooled graduates with both private and public graduates who all attend the same Christian university on ACT scores *Limitations:* Sample was taken from one Christian university, no demographic controls used, cross sectional	Slightly positive: Only significant difference was for English subset ACT scores—significantly higher for home school students over private school graduates ONLY; no other statistically significant differences were found between the groups	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	**7**	**1**
D	Ray, B.D. (2000). Home schooling: The ameliorator of negative influences on learning? *Peabody Journal of Education, 75* (1-2), 71-106.	Compares self-reported homeschoolers' scores on various tests obtained through home education organizations' mailing lists to national averages *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, uses self-report measures, sample obtained through home education organizations' mailing list so representativeness of all homeschoolers is in question, scores on various tests reported	Strongly positive: Homeschoolers scored at 87th percentile in reading, math 82nd, complete battery 87th	0	0	3	2	3	0	1	1	1	1	**12**	**2**
E	Rudner, L.M. (1999). Scholastic achievement and demographic characteristics of home school students in 1998. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 7* (8).	Obtains sample from those homeschoolers using a particular testing center; compares scores of homeschooled children with national averages for "grade level" *Limitations:* Testing site at Bob Jones University so representativeness of all homeschoolers is questionable, cross- sectional, no demographic controls used	Strongly positive: Median scores for homeschoolers at 75th percentile	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**12**	**2**
F	Clemente, D.F. (2006). *Academic achievement and college aptitude in homeschooled high school students compared to their private-schooled and public-schooled counterparts.* (UMI No. 3218862). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach.	Compares SAT scores of college freshmen who previously had been homeschooled with those who graduated from public and private high schools; sample obtained from 7 Christian colleges and universities *Limitations:* Limited generalizability due to sample used, questionable appropriateness of using a directional analysis of variance analysis, cross-sectional	Strongly positive: SAT scores for homeschoolers significantly higher using both data analyses; difference between public and private schooled freshmen's SAT scores not significant	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	**9**	**2**
I	Gray, D.W. (1998). *A study of the academic achievements of home-schooled students who have matriculated into post-secondary institutions.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Sarasota, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59 (021).	Compares SAT scores of random sample of public and private school graduates with population of previously homeschooled college freshmen at three Georgia universities *Limitations:* Homeschooled could not be separated from those with GED, limited generalizability due to sample used	Slightly positive: Slightly higher scores for homeschooled though not statistically significant	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	**8**	**1**
J	Holder, M.A. (2001). *Academic achievement and socialization of college students who were homeschooled.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Memphis. (UMI No. 3829894).	Compares ACT scores for random sample of public school graduates and population of homeschooled from one university *Limitations:* Small sample size (N=34), limited generalizability due to sample being taken from one university, cross-sectional, no demographic controls used	Mixed: No statistically significant differences in ACT scores among homeschooled and public schooled students	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	**6**	**0**

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study	Key Findings	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
K	Witt, V.L. (2005). A comparison and descriptive analysis of homeschool reading and vocabulary scores to the national average. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65* (01), 1696. (UMI No. 3174333).	Compares homeschooled students' percentiles on reading and vocabulary subtests of California TerraNova with national averages. Data came from existing database, but participants were selected by parents who returned questionnaire *Limitations:* Small sample size (N=103), cross-sectional, representativeness of all homeschool students questionable	Strongly positive: Homeschooled math scores at 79th percentile, vocabulary at 78.5 percentile	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	1	**9**	**2**
H	Delahooke, M.M. (1986). Home educated children's social/emotional adjustment and academic achievement: A comparative study. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47* (2), 475A. (UMI No. 8608759).	Compares homeschooled students' scores to private school students' scores on parts of Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised *Limitations:* Small sample size (N=60), no random selection, participants chose to participate in study from private and homeschool settings, no demographic controls used, cross-sectional	Mixed: Study found no differences in test results on parts of Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	**9**	**0**
G	Qaqish, B. (2007). An analysis of homeschooled and non-homeschooled students' performance on an ACT mathematics achievement test. *Home School Researcher, 17* (2), 1-12.	Compares homeschoolers' ACT mathematics scores to non-homeschoolers' ACT mathematics scores using matched student design *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, math only	Slightly positive: On average, non-homeschoolers performed better than homeschoolers, by about 2 items out of 60 items, on the ACT mathematics test that was analyzed	8	0	2	2	3	0	0	2	1	0	**18**	**1**
N	Rakestraw, J. (1988, December). Home schooling in Alabama. *Home School Researcher, 4(* 4).	Compares homeschooled students' scores on SAT with "grade level" *Limitations:* limited generalizability because homeschooled participants were solicited through home education organizations/church ministries; small sample size; technical report is unclear about comparison groups, sample and sampling procedures; no limitations discussed and complete findings are not presented; cross-sectional	Slightly positive: The academic achievement of the homeschooled children in Alabama was at grade level or above in almost all subject areas, except mathematics for Grades 1 and 4 and in reading comprehension and vocabulary for Grade 5, in which homeschoolers were below grade level	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	**2**	**1**
L	Richman, H.B., Girten, W., & Snyder, J. (1990). Academic achievement and its relationship to selected variables…*Home School Researcher, 6* (4), 9-16.	Compares homeschoolers' standardized test scores with national averages *Limitations:* nonrandom sampling (parents had to pay to take test), small sample size, cross-sectional	Strongly positive: Math score for homeschoolers corresponded to 73rd national percentile; reading score correlated with 86th national percentile rank for achievement test	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	1	1	**9**	**2**
M	Wartes, J. (1990). Recent results from the Washington homeschool research project. *Home School Researcher, 6* (4), 1-7.	Compares homeschoolers' scores on Stanford Achievement Test to national norms; multiple years of data gathered but no longitudinal analysis *Limitations:* Complete findings are not presented, cross sectional	Slightly positive: Homeschoolers scored comparably to public composite scores for 1986 68th percentile, 1987 65th or 66th, 1988 65th percentile, 1989 65th percentile	0	0	3	2	3	2	1	0	0	1	**12**	**1**
O	Jones, P., & Gloeckner, G. (2004). First year college performance: A study of home school graduates and traditional school graduates. *The Journal of College Admission* , 17-20.	Compares homeschooled and nonhomeschooled college freshmen ACT scores *Limitations:* Small sample size (N=108), insufficient demographics reported on sample, limited generaliability due to sample tested, cross-sectional, no control for demographics used	Slighly positive: Homeschoolers scored higher on ACT but not significantly so. More variance in homeschoolers' scores	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	**5**	**1**
P	Frost, E.A. (1987). A descriptive study of the academic achievement of selected elementary school-aged children educated at home in five Illinois counties. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48* (7), 1589A.	Sample of 74 students from personal contacts with homeschool educators; uses group level characteristics to select comparison groups *Limitations:* Nonrandom sampling, limited generalizability, cross-sectional	Mixed: Homeschoolers were above grade level in reading, but below grade level in math. Findings ultimately presented as composite, masking inferior math test scores by combining them with test data on unusual subject areas like "work study skills"	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	**7**	**0**
Q	Belfield, C.R. (2005). Home-schoolers: How well do they perform on the SAT for college admissions? In B.S. Cooper (Ed.), *Home schooling in full view: A reader.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.	Compares one year of national SAT scores with large national sample of homeschoolers *large sample of reported homeschoolers (N=6033) *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, description of access to population absent	Mixed: Homeschooled students scored high on reading but lower than comparison on math. When demographic controls introduced, there were no noticable differences between groups	0	0	4	2	3	0	2	1	0	0	**12**	**0**

APPENDIX C INTER-, INTRADISTRICT CHOICE AND MAGNET SCHOOL STUDIES

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study	Key Findings	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
A	Beaudin, B. (2003). *Interdistrict magnet schools and magnet programs in Connecticut: An evaluation report.* Bureau of Evaluation and Educator Standards, Division of Evaluation and Research.	Compares cut scores of interdistrict magnet schools with statewide averages over two years of test data *Limitations:* No demographic controls used, no understanding of value addded by reform, school level data	Mixed: Positive results for interdistrict magnet schools on one standardized test, negative results on the other standardized test	0	3	0	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	**10**	**0**
B	Ballou, D., Goldring, E., & Liu, K. (2006, March). *Magnet schools and student achievement.* New York: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education, Columbia University.	Compares lottery winners with losers, adding controls for 7 potential confounding variables *Limitations:* One district studied, no data on magnet high schools	Mixed: Positive impact of magnet schools on mathematics scores until prior achievement and student demographics are taken into account, suggesting attrition patterns are causing differences in scores	10	4	4	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**27**	**0**
C	Crain, R.L., Allen, A., Thaler, R., Sullivan, D., Zellman, G., Little, J.W., & Quigley, D.D. (1992). *The effects of academic career magnet education on high schools and their graduates*. Berkeley, CA: NCRVE.	Aggregates student level data to program level and compares randomly accepted students' scores with randomly rejected students' scores *Limitations:* Sample of programs not defined, not generalizable to all magnet programs, cross-sectional	Slightly negative: Students in academic career magnet schools do not have higher or lower reading scores, but do have slightly lower math scores	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	1	0	**17**	**-1**
D	Gamoran, A. (1996). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive, and private city high schools. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18* (1), 1-18.	Using NELS test data, compares gains from eighth to tenth grade for magnet schools, public comprehensive schools, and Catholic schools *Limitations:* Old data, school level data	Slightly positive: Magnet school advantages in reading and social studies	4	3	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**21**	**1**
E	Heebner, A.L. (1995). The impact of career magnet high schools: Experimental and qualitative evidence. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 20* (2), 27-35.	Uses data from five schools in one city to compare lottery winners and nonwinners on pretest and posttest *Limitations:* Incomplete methods sections (years of data obtained are unclear), not generalizable to other programs	Slightly positive: Lottery winners had higher math scores; students with medium reading scores benefited from winning the lottery	10	3	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	**22**	**1**
F	Institute for Assessment and Evaluation. (2006). *Knox County magnet schools evaluation.* Knoxville: Author, University of Tennessee.	Uses county data to track consecutive cohorts over four years; gains compared with national norms *Limitations:* No demographic controls used, no data on high schools, school level data	Strongly negative: Magnet schools perform more poorly than in Knox County and the state mean	1	4	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	**14**	**-2**
G	Christenson, B., Eaton, M., Garet, M.S., Miller, L.C., Hikawa, H., & DuBois, P. (2003). *Evaluation of the magnet schools assistance program, 1998 grantees.* Washington: U. S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary.	Using national school level data, schools are matched based on student demographics and gains compared for matched magnet and traditional public schools *Limitations:* Multiple state tests used, school level data, data limited to elementaries only	Mixed: When controls for the composition of the schools used, gains of MSAP-sponsored schools were not significantly different than others.	1	3	4	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	**17**	**0**
H	Betts, J.R., Rice, L.A., Zau, A.C., Tang, Y.E., & Koedel, C.R. (2006). *Does school choice work? Effects on student integration and achievement.* San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.	Compares three forms of intradistrict choice in San Diego district using natural lottery to compare winners and nonwinners *Limitations:* Incomplete methods section (no sample size), comparison limited to one district	Slightly positive: Magnet enrollees showed higher scores in high school math in the second and third year of school placement	10	3	5	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	**29**	**1**
I	Eagle, N., & Ridenour, G. (1969). Differences in academic performance and report card grades between "open enrollment" and "matched home" elementary school children, after one and two years. *Urban Education, 4*, 115-123.	Focuses on effect of desegreation on academic achievement *Limitations:* Old data, small sample size, few demographic controls utilized, limited generalizability	Slightly positive: magnet enrollees did not show differences after one year of treatment; but as grade level increased, so did a statistically significant achievement level	8	3	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	**19**	**1**

APPENDIX D CHARTER SCHOOL STUDIES

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study (include details about the design, comparison groups, test and outcome measure used, and scope of study)	Key Findings (Include rating and then bulleted summary of key findings)	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
AZ1	Mulholland, L. (1999, March). *Arizona charter school progress evaluation*. Tempe: Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University.	Analysis of consecutive cohorts with comparison group and statistical controls; stratified sample of individual gain scores from 82 out of 137 charter schools open in Arizona at the time *Limitations:* Low matching rate in high schools (32%-66%); rate is higher in charter schools	Mixed: No difference overall	1	3	0	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**16**	**0**
AZ2	Solmon, L.C., & Goldschmidt, P. (2004). *Comparison of traditional public schools and charter schools on retention, school switching and achievement growth.* Policy Report: Goldwater Institute. No. 192.	Three-level hierarchical linear model used to measure achievement growth trajectories; used 158,000 test scores of more than 60,000 Arizona students attending 873 charter and traditional public schools statewide over a three-year period *Limitations:* None addressed, controls included may not address all differences in students	Slightly positive: Achievement growth varies by grade level; elementary charter school students' growth was higher; in middle grades traditional and charter growth comparable; higher grades, traditional public school achievement growth was higher; overall charter school students gained faster	8	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	0	**24**	**1**
AZ3	Garcia, D.R. (2008). *Growing pains: Revisiting academic achievement in the earliest years of the charter school movement.* Manuscript submitted for publication.	Compares the academic achievement of charter and traditional public elementary students while controlling for prior achievement, grade, student demographics, school mobility, and student entrance into a first-year charter school *Limitations:* Differences may not be adequately controlled for	Slightly positive: Charter schools outperform traditional public schools in total scores; advantages largely attributable to greater achievement gains relative to traditional public schools in the basic skills areas of reading vocabulary and mathematics procedures	8	4	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	0	**25**	**1**
CA1	EdSource. (2007). *California's charter schools: Measuring their performance*. Mountainview, CA: Author.	Cross-sectional analysis with statistical controls used to compare charter schools scores with noncharter school scores; 60% of charter schools in operation in 05-06 and 79% of noncharter schools in operation in same year *Limitations*: Doesn't account for motivation or differences in funding; cross-sectional, school level data	Mixed: Negative for elementary charters, positive for middle school charters, positive but inconsistent for charter high schools	0	0	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**16**	**0**
CA2	Rogosa, D. (2003). *Student progress in California charter schools, 1999-2002.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.	Controls for API and Stanford 9 test scores; all students in 93 charter schools and 6,584 noncharter schools in most complete analysis; uses consecutive cohort and same cohort designs *Limitations:* School level data, controls may not be adequate	Mixed: More comparable gains than in Rogosa (2002)	4	4	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**21**	**0**
CA3	Raymond, M.E. (2003). *The performance of California charter schools.* Palo Alto, CA: CREDO: Hoover Institution, Stanford University.	Multivariate regression models were constructed for each year of API scores from 1999 to 2002, regressing school scores on student body characteristics, family education characteristics and school attributes *Limitations:* Shortcomings of the API, school level data	Slightly positive - Against all other California schools, the changes in charter schools' API scores at the elementary and middle school levels are not statistically different, but slightly lower. Compared with other California high schools, California charter high schools on average have growth in API scores that is positive and statistically significant. Charter elementary and middle schools were found to create equivalent gains for students as their conventional peer schools. Charter high schools produced significantly more positive changes in API scores	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	**17**	**1**
CA4	Zimmer, R., Buddin, R., Chau, D., Gill, B., Guarino, C., Hamilton, L., Krop, C., McCaffrey, D., Sandler, M., & Brewer, D. (2003). *Charter school operation and performance: Evidence from California.* Santa Monica: RAND.	Approach III: Longitudinally links student-level data→ value-added estimate of the contribution of charter schools to student achievement. *Limitations*: Availability of data in only a few districts; no comparison between different types of charter schools possible	Mixed: Slightly negative for math score comparisons on primary and secondary school level; reading–positive for secondary school level in comparison with public schools but neutral for primary school	8	4	3	2	3	1	1	1	0	1	**24**	**0**
CO	Colorado Department of Education. (2006). *The state of charter schools in Colorado in 2004-05: The characteristics, status, and performance record of Colorado charter schools.* Denver: Author.	Comparison of average charter school % meeting standards and noncharter school students meeting standards *Limitations:* No use of gain score or controls; cut score is used	Mixed: Charter schools scored better in lower grades; noncharter school students scored better in high school grades	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	**10**	**0**
CT	Miron, G. (2005). *Evaluating the performance of charter schools in Connecticut.* Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.	Looks at changes in average scaled scores for same and consecutive cohorts *Limitations*: School level data, CAPT had weaker design	Slightly positive: 3 of 4 cohorts in lower grades made much larger gains than comparison groups, but 10th grade results mixed to negative	4	3	0	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	**17**	**1**

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study (include details about the design, comparison groups, test and outcome measure used, and scope of study)	Key Findings (Include rating and then bulleted summary of key findings)	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
DC	Henig, J.R., Holyoke, T.T., Lacireno-Paquet, N., & Moser, M. (2001, February).*Growing pains: An evaluation of charter schools in the District of Columbia; 1999-2000.* Washington, DC: The Center for Washington Area Studies, The George Washington University.	Comparison of poorly performing public and charter schools with similar proportions of needy students; also a comparison of stability of test scores between the two types of school over time *Limitations* : Group level data	Strongly negative: Consecutive cohorts: DCPS schools more likely to have improved, less likely to have declined than charter schools. Cross-sectional analysis: more charter schools scored "below basic" than DCPS schools; differences hold up under statistical elaboration	1	3	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**17**	**-2**
DE	Miron, G., Cullen, A., Applegate, E.B., & Farrell, P. (2007). *Evaluation of the Delaware charter school reform: Final report.* Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.	Students matched on 4 student-level characteristics; 4x4 factorial ANCOVA; for group or school level analysis, residual gains analysis was used *Limitations:* Cannot be generalized to other states' programs controls may not adequately account for differences	Positive: Charter schools at secondary level gaining more as compared with traditional public school students	8	4	5	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	**27**	**1**
FL1	Florida Department of Education. (2006). *Florida's charter schools: A decade of progress.* Tallahassee: Author.	Examines change in FCAT Development Scale Score (DSS) from grade to grade for charter and traditional students from 2001-2002 to 2005-2006 *Limitations:* No demographic controls, no statistical significance tests	Mixed: No consistent pattern	4	4	0	2	3	2	1	1	1	0	**18**	**0**
FL2	Sass, T. R. (2006). *Charter schools and student achievement in Florida*. Gainesville, FL: American Education Finance Association.	Longitudinal data, control for student level fixed effects, uses econometric model of student achievement *Limitations:* Those who leave one form for another may have unobservable characteristics not controlled for	Slightly positive: Achievement initially lower in charters; but by fifth year of operation, achievement is on par and reading achievement scores are higher than traditional school counterparts	8	4	5	2	3	2	1	2	1	0	**28**	**1**
GA	Plucker, J., Eckes, S., Rapp, K., Ravert, R., Hansen, J., & Trotter, A. (2006, April). *Baseline evaluation of Georgia's charter schools program.* Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education.	Cross-sectional series of analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were conducted, reliance on both statistical significance and effect size interpretation, controls for student ethnicity and gender *Limitations:* Incomplete methods section, cross-sectional, no control for SES	Mixed: Charter schools are achieving at similar levels as their peers statewide and in comparison schools, with significant variations by subject area, grade, and length of time attending charter schools; most differences between charter and comparison schools favor charter schools, but not universal	0	0	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	**11**	**0**
ID	Ballou, D., Teasley B., & Zeidner, T. (2006). *Charter schools in Idaho*. Nashville, TN: National Center on School Choice. Prepared for the National Conference on Charter School Research at Vanderbilt University on September 29, 2006.	Student gain scores were calculated for students' math scores in grades 2-10; virtual schools (5) dropped from sample, and those students who switched during year dropped from sample; models created using ordinary least squares and controls for grade level, ethnicity, and special education *Limitations:* Fixed effects model and no fixed effects model produce completely different results, school level data	Mixed: Analysis of switchers favors CS, while simpler gains analysis does not. Elementary students in CS have made greater gains than they would have made had they remained in traditional public schools (though the difference in higher grades is reversed or insignificant). The smallest drop in gain scores occurred among students who moved from the district schools to CS. The largest drop occurred among students who moved in the opposite direction.	4	3	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	**16**	**0**
IL1	Hoxby, C.M., & Rockoff, J.E. (2004). *The impact of charter schools on student achievement.* Nashville: Working Paper Series, National Center on School Choice.	Compares gains for lottery winners and lottery losers; student level analysis for lottery applicants to 3 CICS schools in 2000, 2001, and 2002 *Limitations* : Not generalizaible to nonapplicants; private school students can't be compared	Strongly positive: After 2 years in a charter school, average of 6 percentile points higher on standardized tests	10	3	5	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**29**	**2**
IL2	Nelson, C., & Miron, G. (2002). *The evaluation of the Illinois charter school reform: Final report.* Report submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education. Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.	Compares percentages passing state tests in charter schools and demographically similar schools statewide *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, small sample of schools	Mixed: Statewide, charter schools perform slightly below demographically similar schools; in Chicago, charter schools have higher proportions scoring at or above national norms than do demographically similar schools	1	3	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	**16**	**0**
IL3	Chicago Public Schools. (2007). *Charter schools: 2005/2006 annual performance report.* Chicago: Author.	Compares percentage of high, middle, and low ratings received by 21 charter schools and district schools on absolute student and operational performance measures; looks at changes from 2002-2006 Limitations: Aimed at charter school supporters, school level data, use of general rating as measurement	Strongly positive: Charter schools had higher percentage of high and middle ratings than did district schools	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	0	**8**	**2**
MA	Massachusetts Department of Education. (2006). *Massachusetts charter school achievement comparison study: An analysis of 2001-2005 MCAS performance.* Boston: Author.	HLM growth models for each charter school and its corresponding comparison sending district *Limitations:* School level data, concerns about MCAS scaled scores and interpreation across 5-year period, length of charter school operation not taken into account	Slightly positive: HLM data show some charter scores as highest of all schools	4	4	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	**22**	**1**

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study (include details about the design, comparison groups, test and outcome measure used, and scope of study)	Key Findings (Include rating and then bulleted summary of key findings)	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
MI1	Eberts, R.W., & Hollenbeck, K.M. (2002). *Impact of charter school attendance on student achievement in Michigan.* Kalamazoo, MI: Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper. No. 02-080.	Pairs charter schools with public school districts, used fixed effects to control for factors in the areas common to both types of schools *Limitations:* No use of gain scores, cross-sectional only, analysis explains only small proportion of variance	Strongly negative: With student, building, and district controls, students attending charters have lower test scores	0	4	2	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	**16**	**-2**
MI2	Michigan Department of Education (December, 2007). *Public school academies: Michigan Department of Education report to the legislature.* East Lansing: Author.	Comparison of proficiency levels for PSAs, host districts, and non-PSAs for MEAP and other measures; broken down by age of PSA, economically disadvantaged students, ethnicity, students with disabilities, and correlation of proficiency level with percentage of free and reduced price lunch students (all controls/subgroups analyzed separately) *Limitations:* None addressed, cross-sectional, cut scores used, emphasis on elementaries and middle schools performing well	Slightly positive: Elementary and charter middle schools consistently have a higher percentage of proficient students on MEAP than do counterparts in geographical districts in which PSAs are located; charter high schools "are struggling"	0	0	3	1	3	2	1	1	1	0	**12**	**1**
MI3	Bettinger, E.P. (2005). The effect of charter schools on charter students and public schools. *Economics of Education Review, 24* (3), 133-147.	Estimates charter scool achievement for charter schools opening in 1996/97; difference in difference estimator for consecutive cohorts; second model controls for ethnicity and free and reduced lunch *Limitations: G*roup-level data, limited to charters opened in 1996-1997 school year	Slightly negative: charter schools' scores "may" decline; results are negative	8	3	2	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	**23**	**-1**
MI4	Miron, G., & Nelson, C. (2002). *What's public about charter schools? Lessons learned about choice and accountability* (pp. 134-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.	Compares changes in school-level passing rates between charter schools and districts *Limitations: S*chool level data, passing rates as measure of performance	Slightly negative: Host districts' passing rate gains exceed charter school rate gains for all subjects and grades except 4th grade math	1	4	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	**16**	**-1**
MO	Metis Associates. (2004). *A study of the Kansas City, Missouri, charter public schools 2000-2003.* New York: Author	Compares change in average charter school score with average change in district and state score *Limitations*: No controls used, group-level data	Slightly positive: Charter school students start out behind but close gap	1	4	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	**15**	**1**
NC1	Noblit, G.W., & Corbett, D. (2001). *North Carolina charter school evaluation report.* Raleigh: North Carolina State Board of Education.	Compares percentage of traditional public school students proficient with % of charter school students proficient *Limitations*: Percentage of students proficient used as measure of performance, cross-sectional	Strongly negative: Charter school students start with higher prior achievement scores, but lose ground to their peers in all grades and subject areas	8	4	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	**23**	**-2**
NC2	Bilfulco, R., & Ladd, H.F. (2006). *School choice, racial segregation and test-score gaps: Evidence from North Carolina's charter school program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Allied Social Science Associations, Boston.	Models include grade/year fixed effects and are estimated using "within" student estimator. Dependent variable is annual gain in end of grade development scale scores transformed into standard scores *Limitations:* not applicable to other states' charter schools; students who switch sectors may have unobservable characteristics that are not adequately controlled for, introducing sampling bias	Strongly negative: Charter schools have produced larger achievement gaps between Caucasian and African-American students	8	4	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**27**	**-2**
NJ	Barr, J. (2007). *Charter school performance in New Jersey*. (Working Paper #2007-006). Newark: Rutgers University.	Regression analyses done on panel data of fourth graders from 1999 to 2006; 35 charter schools in 18 districts included; comparisons made only to those districts that have a charter school; first regression analysis looks at each school's passing rate on 4th grade standardized language arts and mathematics exams *Limitations:* School level data, cut score used as measure of performance	Slightly negative: Charter schools have lower performance than public schools in the same districts on fourth grade standardized tests for language and math, but performance improves with experience. The estimated time to close the gap between charter and traditional schools is about a decade	1	4	3	1	3	0	1	2	1	0	**16**	**-1**
NY1	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.	Compares percentage of students passing from 2002-2003 between charter schools and their districts *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, school level data, no use of gain score	Slightly negative: No real aggregate results/conclusions presented, but for some charter schools, greater % classified with serious deficiencies	0	0	4	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	**9**	**-1**
NY2	Hoxby, C.M., & Murarka, S. (2007). *Charter schools in New York City: Who enrolls and how they affect their students' achievement.* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.	Comparison of students who are lotteried-in and lotteried-out of charter schools using instrumental variables regression *Limitations:* Known underreporting of special education status	Strongly positive: For every year in charter schools, students gain 3.8 scale score points in math (12% of performance level), 1.6 scale score points in reading (3.5% performance level)	10	4	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**28**	**2**

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study (include details about the design, comparison groups, test and outcome measure used, and scope of study)	Key Findings (Include rating and then bulleted summary of key findings)	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
OH1	Carr, M., & Staley, S. (2005).*Using the Ohio proficiency test to analyze the academic achievement of charter school students: 2002-2004.* Columbus, OH: The Buckeye Institute.	Compares gains of percentage of students passing Ohio Proficiency Tests made by low-performing charter and district schools, controlling for family income, race, poverty *Limitations:* School level data, not generalizable to all community schools in Ohio, sample restricted to lowest performing districts, cross-sectional study	Strongly positive: In all cases and both analyses, charter schools performed as well as or better than traditional schools	1	3	3	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	**15**	**1**
OH2	Legislative Office of Education Oversight. (2003).*Community schools in Ohio: Final report on student performance, parent satisfaction, and accountability.* Columbus, OH: Author.	Compares scores on Ohio Proficiency Test and the percentage proficient through matching of schools based on grades served and demographics *Limitations:* School level data, cross-sectional, method for matching schools is incomplete	Slightly negative: District schools generally outperformed community schools, but small differences; when there were statistically significant differences, generally favored district schools	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**11**	**-1**
OR	Bates, M., & Guile, D. (2006). *Oregon charter schools 2004-2005 evaluation report*. Salem: Oregon Department of Education.	Examines AYP general ratings for charter and traditional public schools at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels *Limitations: G*eneral rating used as measurement, cross-sectional, no use of demographic controls, complete set of findings not presented	Mixed: Charter schools outperform at elementary benchmark levels; traditional publi schools outperform charters at middle and high school benchmark levels	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	**7**	**0**
PA	Miron, G., Nelson, C., & Risley, J. (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.	Compares charter school scores with similar district schools using regression analysis; determines how charter school scores change in conjunction with length of operation *Limitations:* School level data, cross-sectional study	Slightly positive: Pennsylvania charter schools appear to be attracting students with lower-than-average achievement levels and producing small relative gains (15 points per year, on average) in their achievement level	1	4	4	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**21**	**1**
TX1	Maloney, C., Sheehan, D., Huntsberger, B., Caranikas-Walker F., & Caldera, S. (2007).*Texas open-enrollment charter schools: 2005-06 evaluation*. Austin: Texas Center for Educational Research	Cross-sectional comparisons for each year, each grade, each subject; patterns for different ethnicities also determined *Limitations:* No controls used, cross-sectional study, no use of gains	Strongly negative: Accountability ratings are negative for charter schools at each year; TAKS scores: all subjects, all years, negative for charter schools; differences in magnitude of negative change by ethnicity, but Caucasian and African-American students both have lower scores in charter schools	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	2	1	0	**11**	**-2**
TX2	Gronberg, T., & Jansen, D.W. (2005). *Texas charter schools: An assessment in 2005.* Austin: Texas Public Policy Foundation.	Comparing gains in z scores for 2003 and 2004 for charter school students and predicted gain in z scores if those students had continued to attend TPS; matched student design employed *Limitations:* Concerns over attrition patterns, longitudinal but only 2 years of study	Slightly positive: Gains for students in lower grades who stay in charter schools are higher than matched students in district schools; at-risk charter school students do better than their matches at district schools; students in charter high school score lower than their matches	8	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**26**	**1**
TX3	Hanushek, E.A., Kain, S.G., & Rivkin, S. (2002).*The impact of charter schools on academic achievement*. Unpublished manuscript.	Compares average test score gains of charter students with the same students' gains in district schools *Limitations* : Incomplete methods section (sample size not included); students who switch sectors may have different unobservable characteristics, controls employed may not be adequate	Slightly negative: Charter schools gains are initially lower, but no significant differences after 2 or 3 years of charter school	8	4	4	2		2	1	1	0	0	**22**	**-1**
TX4	Booker, K., Gilpatric, S.M., Gronberg, T., & Jansen, D. (2004). *Charter school performance in Texas*. College Station: Texas A & M University.	Examines student gains for TAAS test in reading and math using student-level data and fixed effect method *Limitations:* Though overall sample is very large, paper does not indicate number of students in different categories of "movers," which is central to analysis; controls may not adequately account for unobserved differences in students	Strongly positive: After controlling for the mobility effect (the initial negative effect that transferring to a charter school causes), charter schools significantly improve the performance of students in both math and reading, with some evidence that school performance may improve as new charter schools progress beyond their first year in operation. African-American students in charter schools perform particularly well	8	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**24**	**0**
UT	Was, C., & Kristjansson, S. (2006). *An analysis of charter vs. traditional public schools in Utah.* Salt Lake City: Utah State Charter School Board.	Cross-sectional, ANOVA used to compare standardized test scores in charter schools and traditional public schools, HLM used as well *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, school level data, no information on scope	Slightly positive: Charter schools outperform traditional public schools in lower grades, traditional public schools outperform high schools in grade 10	0	0	2	2		2	1	1	1	0	**9**	**1**
WI	Witte, J.F., Weimer, D.L., Schlomer, P.A., & Shober, A.F. (2004). *The performance of charter schools in Wisconsin.* Madison: Wisconsin Charter Schools Study.	Multichotomous logit group analysis, consecutive cohorts used to compare charter schools' and traditional schools' scores on Terra Nova test in grades 4 and 8 *Limitations* : School level data, does not examine charter high schools because 90% are aimed at high risk populations	Positive: For charters in elementary and middle grades across most comparison. High school results not shared due to concern that many of the charter schools at this level serve at-risk students.	1	3	4	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	**16**	**1**

Code Used in the Chart	Title of Study/Evaluation	Description of the Study (include details about the design, comparison groups, test and outcome measure used, and scope of study)	Key Findings (Include rating and then bulleted summary of key findings)	Study Design 0-10	Duration of Study 0-4	Controls Used 0-6	Measure of Performance 0-2	Scope of the Study			Completeness of the Technical Report			Quality Rating 0-32	Impact Rating -2 to +2
								Scope of study 0-3	Grades levels covered 0-2	Subjects covered 0-1	Clear and complete methods section 0-2	Complete set of findings 0-1	Limitations of study included 0-1		
US1	Finnigan, K., et al. (2004). *Evaluation of the public charter schools program: Final report.* Prepared for U.S. Department of Education by SRI International, Washington, DC.	Logistical regression with background characteristics at school level controlled for *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, differences in standards and definitions of background characteristics from state to state	Strongly negative: Charter schools less likely to meet state standards than traditional public schools when background controls are taken into account	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	**13**	**-2**
US2	Hoxby, C.M. (2004). *Achievement in charter schools and regular public schools in the US: Understanding the differences.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University and National Bureau of Economic Research.	Compares percentage proficient at charter school elementaries with those proficient at geographically closest elementary and with similar by race public school *Limitations:* Elementaries only, cross-sectional, various state standards used, single grade (4th) used	Strongly positive: Charter students are 5.2 percent more likely to be proficient in reading and 3.2 percent more likely to be proficient in math on their state's exams; stronger advantage for older charter schools, those with high minority populations, states with strong charter laws	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	1	1	**10**	**2**
US3	U.S. Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *The nation's report card: America's charter school report*, NCES 2005-456. Washington, DC: Author	Compares NAEP national reading and math scores in charte schools and district schools *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, school level data	Slightly negative: Charter school students performed worse in math; free/reduced lunch students in charter schools performed worse; similar performance by ethnic groups	0	0	2	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	**12**	**-1**
US4	Loveless, T. (2003). *The 2003 Brown Center report on American education: Charter schools: Achievement, accountability, and the role of expertise.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.	Compares changes in average charter school and district tes scores in 10 states from 2000 to 2002. Brown Center researchers computed z-scores for charter schools, indexing charter schools' test scores relative to the mean and standar deviation of test scores within each state, and then examining z-scores nationally *Limitations* : School level data, tests vary from state to state, no controls used	Slightly positive: Charter schools have lower scores but larger gains	1	3	0	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	**16**	**1**
US5	Nelson, H.F., Rosenberg, B., & Van Meter, N. (2004). *Charter school achievement on the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress.* Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.	Comparison of NAEP scores for charter and traditional public schools *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, controls in separate analyses	Slightly negative: Charter school students worse in both fourth grade subjects, statistically significant	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2	0	0	**10**	**-1**
US6	Greene, J.P., Forster, G., & Winters, M.A. (2003). *Apples to apples: An evaluation of charter schools serving general student populations.* (Education Working Paper No. 1). New York City: Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute.	Regression analysis on two most recent years with year-to-year change reported *Limitations:* School level data, different tests used for different states, some states excluded from results	Strongly positive: Cross-sectional and longitudinal positive were overall positive for charter schools; TX and FL were most positive for charter schools	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	0	**14**	**2**
US7	Miron, G., Coryn, C., & Mackety, D. (2007). *Evaluating the impact of charter schools on student achievement: A longitudinal look at the Great Lakes states.* East Lansing, MI: Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice.	Linear regression models used to estimate student achievement patterns, producing three estimates: (1) actual scores, based on observed student achievement data provided by each school; (2) predicted scores, based on the performance of demographically similar public schools across the state; and (3) residual scores, based on the difference between predicted and actual charter school student achievement *Limitations* : School-level data, varied quality of achievement tests, missing or incomplete data for some schools	Slightly negative: Not currently outperforming demographically similar traditional public schools; scores lower than demograpically similar traditional public schools with scores on achievement tests lower than TPS, especially for those with the newest charter school initiatives, IN & OH. IL has highest relative results, maybe because of effort to close low-performing charters? All states have some high performing charter schools	1	4	4	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	**20**	**-1**
US8	Braun, H., Jenkins, F., Grigg, W., & Tirre, W. (2006). *A closer look at charter schools using hierarchical linear modeling.* Washington: U.S. Department of Education	Phase 1: Charter schools are compared with all public noncharter schools, using a variety of models that incorporate different combinations of student and school characteristics (HLM); Phase 2: Charters classified into those who affiliated with public school districts and those not affiliated with public school districts; Phase 3: subset of publi schools in urban areas with large minority populations are compared *Limitations:* Cross-sectional, self-selection bias may not be accounted for	Strongly negative: After adjusting for student characteristics, charter school mean scores in reading and mathematics were lower than public noncharters. Differences between publi noncharter schools and charter schools affiliated with a public school district were not statistically significant, while charter schools not affiliated with a public school district scored significantly lower on average than public noncharter schools	4	0	3	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	**18**	**-2**