



Technical Assistance Review:
Education Management Organizations,
Charter Management Organizations, and Charter Schools

December 2010

The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center
at The George Washington University
Center for Equity and Excellence in Education
1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 515
Arlington, VA 22209
Tel: 703.528.3588
Fax: 703.528.5973

**The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center
at The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (GW-CEEE)**

The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center (MACC) at GW-CEEE's mission is to build the capacity of state education agencies (SEAs) to develop a statewide system of differentiated technical assistance for districts and schools in need of improvement. MACC's goals support this mission by helping SEAs to

- foster relationships, share resources, and plan comprehensively across divisions to build their facility to meet the technical assistance needs of schools and districts identified for improvement;
- use data to identify and differentiate the needs of schools and districts identified for improvement so that appropriate assistance can be delivered by the SEA to address these needs; and
- support ongoing, job-embedded professional development that helps district instructional leaders build effective practice in schools identified for improvement.

GW-CEEE

The mission of The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (GW-CEEE) is to advance education reform so all students achieve to high standards. GW-CEEE conducts policy and applied research, designs and implements program evaluations, and provides professional development and technical assistance. GW-CEEE's clients include state education agencies, school districts, schools, foundations, and federal agencies.

This report was supported by funds from the U.S. Department of Education. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred. The contents are the sole responsibility of the authors.

1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 515 Arlington, VA 22209
www.ceee.gwu.edu

Executive Summary

The Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) and the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) requested information on the academic effectiveness of education management organizations (EMOs), charter management organizations (CMOs), and charter schools. This review by the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center (MACC) draws together a wide array of research on the effectiveness of charter schools run by EMOs and CMOs generally, and a select number of specific charter schools to assess whether, on average, there is a clear confirmation that charter schools outperform traditional public schools (TPSs) in raising student achievement levels. The purpose of this review is to describe the research and identify themes and patterns in these studies' findings, if any. It is beyond the scope of this review to thoroughly investigate and evaluate the quality of the methodology of each study, the analysis of the data, or the validity or reliability of the research.

In the United States, 77.8% of charter schools are freestanding, while nearly all others (21.6%) are run by EMOs and CMOs. The distinction among these organizations has been blurred in recent years since 97% of schools managed by non-profit organizations are also charter schools. A more productive distinction among these organizations would be those that are for-profit versus non-profit. Therefore, for the purposes of this review, no distinction will be made between EMOs/CMOs. Any determination about whether they are for-profit or non-profit will be the responsibility of the DDOE and OSSE.

Few studies of EMOs/CMOs were found that met MACC's criteria for inclusion in this review. Because studies that, instead, analyze aggregated data of charter schools were numerous, they form the basis of this review. The following criteria were used to guide the selection of research for this review:

- Publication after 2004
- Research reports include a description of methodology
- Studies span multiple states and match students and schools to similar students and schools
- When possible, studies include charter schools that use lottery systems for accepting applicants.
- Studies are listed in The U.S. Department of Education What Works Clearinghouse (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/search/?output=xml_no_dtd&client=wwc&site=wwc&q=Charter+Schools).

Following a careful analysis of the findings from the studies selected for this review, MACC researchers draw the following conclusions about the research on charter schools' effectiveness:

- Taken in its totality, the research on charter schools' effectiveness in raising student achievement in comparison to TPSs is inconclusive with respect to the following categories:
 - the overall effectiveness of charter schools compared to the overall effectiveness of traditional public schools in raising student achievement;
 - the ability of charter schools to raise student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics;

- the ability of charter schools to raise student achievement at different levels of schooling (i.e. elementary, middle, and high school); and
- the effect of the number of years in attendance at a charter school on student achievement.
- The single conclusive finding was that the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) correlated with positive academic achievement at the middle school level in four of the studies surveyed in MACC's analysis. No other EMO/CMO demonstrated similar positive results across several studies.

MACC recommends that the DDOE and OSSE engage in a careful analysis of these and other studies according to the specific recommendations in the conclusion section of this review.

Table of Contents

Section A: Introduction.....	1
Section B: Research on Specific EMOs, CMOs, and Charter Schools	5
Section C: General Research.....	10
Section D: Conclusions.....	18
References.....	22
Resources	26
Appendix A: Information About Non-Profit and For-Profit EMOs.....	A-1
Appendix B: Articles, Reviews, Summaries, Etc.	B-1

Section A: Introduction

As of 2009, 41 states and the District of Columbia have passed charter school laws. According to the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools Web site, there are currently 4,936 charter schools (5.1% of all schools) in the United States. These schools serve 1,665,779 students, which is 3.4% of the total school population.

Zimmer et al. (2009) define charter schools as “... publicly funded schools that operate outside the direct control of local school districts, under a publicly issued charter that gives them greater autonomy than other public schools have over curriculum, instruction, and operations. (p. xi).

The U.S. Department of Education defines charter schools as ‘public schools that operate with freedom from many of the local and state regulations that apply to traditional public schools’ (n.d.a). In practice, each state’s charter school law outlines the state’s approach to charter schools. Charter schools operate under a contract between the school’s founders and a sponsor—usually a university, local school board, district, or state. The charter outlines the school’s mission, educational program, and methods for evaluating the school’s performance. To maintain accountability, the charter’s sponsor monitors a school’s adherence to the charter and holds the school accountable for students’ academic achievements and the school’s financial stability. (Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center, 2006, p. 2)

According to the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools Web site, the majority (77.8%) of charter schools in the United States in 2009-2010 are freestanding, having been started by educators, parents, activists, and others. Freestanding charters have the full responsibility of running a school, including the administration, finances, curricula, instruction, teacher hiring, evaluation, reporting, etc. This myriad of tasks can be challenging for a freestanding school without the benefit of a larger organization behind it. As a result, EMOs and CMOs have sprung up since charters began appearing in 1991. These organizations serve the basic purpose of providing centralized support to a group of schools. They provide the administrative support to hire, evaluate, and provide professional development for the teaching staff, while fulfilling reporting and financial oversight responsibilities. In addition, some program requirements required by EMOs and CMOs are highly prescriptive (e.g., Open Court, Success for All, Woodcock Reading) and must be followed (Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center, 2006).

The definitions of EMOs and CMOs have been blurred in recent years. Miron and Urschel (2009) state,

We define an education management organization, or EMO, as an organization or firm that manages schools that receive public funds, including district and charter public schools. A contract details the terms under which executive authority to run one or more schools is given to an EMO, usually in return for a commitment to produce measurable outcomes within a given time frame. (p. 3)

They go on to report that non-profit EMOs are sometimes referred to as charter management organizations. In fact, more than 97% of schools managed by non-profit EMOs are charter schools (Miron and Urschel, 2009). Therefore, for purposes of this review, no distinction will be made between EMOs and CMOs. Appendix B of this review provides a sampling of for-profit

and non-profit EMOs serving the mid-Atlantic region. The following two reports, updated annually, provide additional information on for-profit and non-profit EMOs:

Molnar, A., Miron, G., & Urschel, J. (2009). *Profiles of for-profit educational management organizations: Eleventh annual report*. Boulder, CO: Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/08-09%20profiles%20report.pdf>

Miron, G., & Urschel, J. L. (2009). *Profiles on non-profit education management organizations: 2008-2009*. Boulder, CO: Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/NP%2008-09.pdf>

The following criteria were used in the selection of research for this review, although few studies met all criteria:

- Publication after 2004
 - With the exception of two studies (Raymond, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 2004), all research was published after 2004. This cutoff date reflects the fact that states and the federal government responded to the requirements of NCLB and more recently generated increasingly high-quality data. (Hill, 2005)
- Research reports include a description of methodology
- Studies span multiple states and match students and schools to similar students and schools.
- When possible, studies include charter schools that use lottery systems for accepting applicants.
 - These schools often had more applicants than could be selected. The premise is that there is no difference between students who were accepted and those who are not accepted because of the random nature of a lottery. This situation creates a comparable control group. In fact, these studies also claim students are matched based on a variety of criteria. Hoxby (2009) claims that, in addition to all the other factors that are matched they are also identical on dimensions that we cannot readily observe, like motivation and their family's interest in education. The lotteried-in and lotteried-out students who participated in the same lottery are identical on these subtle dimensions because they all applied to the charter school. They are separated only by a random number (p. vii).

This assumption should be weighed carefully because the attitudes of both parents and students who were selected may have a significant impact on academic achievement when compared to those who were not selected.

- Studies are listed in The U.S. Department of Education What Works Clearinghouse (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/search/?output=xml_no_dtd&client=wwc&site=wwc&q=Charter+Schools).
- The Clearinghouse reviewed few of the studies used in this review. Those that had been reviewed there were chosen for inclusion in this review when they met the minimum criteria of “meets standards with reservations.”

Given these criteria, numerous studies (particularly studies in which data from many charter schools were aggregated) were acceptable and form the basis of this review. However, it is

beyond the scope of this review to thoroughly investigate and evaluate the quality of the methodology of each study, the analysis of the data, or the validity or reliability of the research. Through an analysis of these selected studies, the purpose of this review is to describe the research and identify themes and patterns in these studies' findings, if any. The challenge in reporting these studies is that the same data can be used by different organizations to support their own political, education, or social agendas. Additionally, research can be misunderstood or misused in ways not intended by the authors. Finally, there can be legitimate differences of opinion about the results based on what data were collected and how they were analyzed. Therefore, the DDOE and OSSE can weigh the findings based on their knowledge of the organizations producing the research and a more complete analysis of the studies.

An example of this issue is appropriate here. The following two quotes demonstrate the difficulty in evaluating the research on charters, EMOs and CMOs. The first quote is taken from the abstract of the National Charter School Research Project (Betts & Tang, 2008). The second quote is taken from a report from the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2009).

We assess the literature that uses either experimental (lottery) methods or student-level growth-based methods to infer the causal impact of attending a charter school on student performance. We focus on the evidence on math and reading scores. We test that none of the effects is positive and, conversely, that none of the effects is negative. We find compelling evidence that charter schools underperform traditional public schools in some locations, grades, and subjects, and outperform them in other locations, grades, and subjects. We examine the distribution of effect sizes suggested by the existing work, using various methods to weight one study relative to another. We find a fairly wide range of estimated effects. Two cases in which charter schools appear quite frequently to outperform traditional public schools are elementary school reading and middle school math, although the effect sizes are small in the latter case. Conversely, charter schools often significantly underperform in high school reading and math. The lack of rigorous studies in many parts of the nation limits the ability to extrapolate. (p. 1)

Now read the following excerpt from the National Charter School Research Project abstract, which refers to the previous quote:

Additionally, the National Charter School Research Project recently released a meta-analysis of charter school studies. This report is the most solid review to date of the empirical research on how public charter schools perform compared to traditional public schools. *Studies that use the best data and the most sophisticated research techniques show charters outperforming comparable traditional public schools.* The findings indicate that public charter schools have the strongest positive effects in elementary school reading and middle school math. *Moreover, the magnitude of the positive charter school effect sizes is relatively large when compared with other school reform efforts, such as reducing class size [emphasis added].* (p.1)

The conclusions in the abstract of the Betts and Tang (2008) study differ markedly from the

interpretation presented in the report from the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2009). Readers of research on charter schools and organizations are cautioned to carefully check claims made by advocacy groups on both sides of this highly politicized issue. As Betts and Tang (2008) state at the end of their literature review:

Finally, even though we have learned a great deal about charter schools and achievement over the last decade, we need to exercise some caution in reading this literature. Researchers have conducted rigorous value-added or lottery-based studies of charter schools in only a very few states and major cities to date, and even here, the quality of the data and hence the quality of the analyses vary. In many cases, a few new soundly designed studies in a given grade span and subject area could lead to meaningful revisions to our understanding. (p. 27)

Teh, McCullough, and Gill (2010) add that “The existing empirical literature on the academic impacts of CMOs is virtually nonexistent, largely because most CMOs are very new.” They go on to state, “The literature on the achievement effects of charter schools in general, is now extensive, but it has not offered any definitive conclusions” (p. 1).

The following sections will present research about specific EMOs/CMOs (Section B) and general research (Section C) that aggregates student data nationally or within geographic areas. When not directly quoted, statements represent highlights of the research studies.

Section B: Research on Specific EMOs, CMOs, and Charter Schools (Organizations are listed alphabetically)

This section provides a summary of research on specific charter schools with respect to their effectiveness in raising student achievement. The schools and organizations included in this section were chosen because they were targeted for independent research, as opposed to research undertaken by the organizations themselves. Secondly, they were known to the MACC researcher and appeared in ASCD SmartBriefs and Edweek articles, two sources that were consulted during the preparation of this review. For each school or organization, the citation is provided with a summary of the research findings.

Edison Learning is an EMO with nearly 20 years of experience partnering with school districts and boards to operate schools. Edison Learning offers a wide range of services including assistance with curriculum, professional development, and staff recruitment, among others.

Rand Corporation. (October 11, 2005). *Rand says most public schools managed by Edison Schools match or exceed gains of comparable public schools in 4 to 5 years* (News Release). Retrieved from <http://www.rand.org/news/press/2005/10/11.html>¹

- The RAND study concluded that it is unclear whether Edison's average long-term results exceed or merely match those of comparable public schools. This is because Edison's startup schools, by definition, lack pre-Edison baseline test results, making it impossible to examine the full period of Edison management using schoolwide scores. RAND examined two alternatives: an analysis of all Edison schools, beginning with scores at the end of the first year of Edison operation, and an analysis of Edison conversion schools, beginning from pre-Edison baselines.
- When Edison schools (both converted and start-up) were examined beginning in the spring of the first year of Edison management, gains of Edison schools and matched comparison schools were similar in Years 2 and 3. But by their fourth year of operation, Edison schools' cumulative test-score gains from the first year were larger than those of comparison schools in both reading and mathematics, and Edison schools generally maintained this relative advantage in later years.
- Converted Edison schools experienced small average declines in achievement during their first year under the Edison system. Achievement in these schools continued to lag behind comparison schools during the first three years under Edison management. However, results improved as converted schools gained experience implementing the Edison design. By Year 5, the cumulative test-score gains (starting from the year before Edison took over) were similar for Edison schools and comparison schools.
- Variation among the results attained by individual Edison schools is extensive, with some

¹ For the complete study see: Gill, B. P., et al. (2005). *Inspiration, perspiration, and time: Operations and achievement in Edison schools*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG351.pdf

See <http://www.edisonlearning.com/> for more information about Edison Learning.

schools showing gains that far outpaced those of comparison schools, and others falling behind.

- Edison schools that offered the strongest instructional leaders and the fullest implementation of Edison's curriculum – providing strong offerings in subjects such as science and music, along with core instruction in math and reading – showed the largest gains in student proficiency.
- Edison Schools has an unusually comprehensive set of strategies for promoting school performance. These include an ambitious curriculum, a professional environment that emphasizes teamwork and professional development, and a proprietary online assessment system known as the Edison Benchmarks. This system is used to assess student learning every month and provide immediate feedback to teachers, principals, and Edison central office staff.
- A large proportion of Edison schools have remained with the company for at least four years, but Edison's contracts have been more stable in charter schools than in district public schools.
- Edison schools that face fewer constraints on their ability to implement the Edison design seem to demonstrate greater achievement gains than other Edison schools.
- Edison schools showed gains in both reading and math between 2002 and 2004, confirming results previously reported in Edison's annual reports on student achievement.

Harlem Success Academy is a free public charter elementary school in New York City. Students are enrolled through a random lottery for grades K to 5.

Supovitz, J. & Rikoon, S. (2010). *Early achievement impacts of the Harlem Success Academy Charter School in New York City*. Retrieved from <http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/fac/SupovitzHSA.pdf>

The following passage is taken from the executive summary by Supovitz and Rikoon:

Researchers at the University of Pennsylvania conducted two external analyses of the performance of Harlem Success Academy Charter School (HSA) 2008-2009 3rd graders on the New York State Test in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. The first analysis was based on a comparison of the performance of 2006-2007 first graders (who became the 2008-2009 3rd graders) who were chosen through a random selection lottery process to attend HSA, and remained in HSA through the 3rd grade, relative to those who were not admitted by lottery to attend HSA and remained in New York City public schools. The second analysis compared the same HSA 3rd graders to 3rd graders in geographically proximate and demographically comparable New York City public schools. Student results were compared separately for ELA and mathematics using ordinary least squares regression and controlling for student gender, age, and special education status. The results indicated that HSA 3rd graders performed statistically significantly better than did either the randomized comparison group or the students in the demographically similar schools. More specifically, attendance at HSA was associated with 34-59 additional scale score points (depending on test subject) for non-special education students, after adjusting for differences in student demographic characteristics. Described another way, these results represent between 13-19 percent higher test performance associated with attending Harlem Success Academy. (p. 1)

See <http://www.successcharters.org/> for more information about the Success Charter Network.

The Knowledge is Power program is a national network of public charter schools with a focus on college preparedness. KIPP serves over 27,000 students in 20 states and the District of Columbia.

Henig, J. R. (2008). *What do we know about the outcomes of KIPP schools?* Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/outcomes-of-kipp-schools>

This brief reviewed seven studies that attempted to answer the question of whether KIPP schools raise student achievement. The following were the brief's conclusions:

- The weight of the evidence suggests that students who enter and stay in KIPP tend to perform better than similar students in more traditional public schools.
- This does not appear to be attributable to a selective admissions process. KIPP serves minority and high-need students, many of whom performed poorly before they entered the schools. Some unobservable biases may be present in student motivation and support, but, except for a tendency to attract more girls than boys, there is as yet no strong observable evidence of a systematic selection bias.
- Where it has been monitored, student attrition is high and seemingly selective. Those who leave KIPP tend to have been performing less well than those who stay, and at least one study suggests that those who leave were lower performing when they entered. Such attrition, if it were taken into consideration, would reduce the size of gains in reports that simply compare KIPP eighth graders with those in their host districts. However, the evidence does not go so far as to suggest that attrition fully accounts for the observed KIPP advantage.
- Most of the studies are limited to early KIPP schools and students in their first or second year. Studies that follow cohorts over time seem to show that gains persist, but there is no evidence that early gains grow into progressively higher gains in later years.
- Few studies look deeply inside the KIPP process; those that do show that teacher enthusiasm is high, but that demands on teachers and leaders are great, resulting in high turnover and an unrelieved pressure to find and train new people. The implications for the expansion and sustainability of the KIPP model are still not clear (pp. 1-2).

McDonald, A. J., Ross, S. M., Abney, J., & Zoblotsky, T. (2008). *Urban school reform: Year 4 outcomes for the Knowledge is Power Program in an urban middle school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

The following is taken from the abstract of the paper by McDonald, Ross and Zoblotsky:
The present longitudinal study examined the fourth year effects of the Knowledge is Power Program, which is specifically designed to raise academic achievement of at-risk urban middle school students via interventions such as extended learning time, rigorous curriculum, after-school access to teachers, and extensive family-school connection. This study individually matched 165 KIPP students with control students of the same ethnicity, SES, gender, and ability who attended demographically similar schools. While the majority

of the comparisons directionally favored KIPP students this year, only the 5th grade mathematics comparison was significant. The loss of the school principal and increased student behavior issues are interpreted as likely contributing factors. (p. 2)

Tuttle, C. C., Teh, B., Nichols-Barrer, I., Gill, B. P., & Gleason, P. (2010). *Student characteristics and achievement in 22 KIPP middle schools*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved on from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/KIPP_fnl rpt.pdf

The following passage is taken from the executive summary of the report by Tuttle, Nichols-Barrer, Gill, and Gleason:

This report presents preliminary findings from a matched, longitudinal analysis designed to estimate KIPP's effect on student achievement. Our preliminary work estimates effects in 22 KIPP middle schools- making this the first report that applies a rigorous (nonexperimental) methodological approach to collect longitudinal, student-level data, and that were established by the 2005-06 school year or earlier to ensure that a minimum of two entering cohorts of students per school would be observed for multiple years.

We find that students entering these 22 KIPP schools typically had prior achievement rates lower than the average achievement rates in their local school districts. For the vast majority of KIPP schools studied, impacts on students' state assessment scores in mathematics and reading are positive, statistically significant, and educationally substantial. Estimated impacts are frequently large enough to substantially reduce race- and income-based achievement gaps within three years of entering KIPP.

Woodworth, K. R., David, J. L., Guha, R., Wang, H., & Lopez-Torkos, A. (2008). *San Francisco Bay Area KIPP schools: A study of early implementation and achievement*. Final report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved from http://policyweb.sri.com/cep/publications/SRI_ReportBayAreaKIPPSchools_Final.pdf

The following are direct quotes from the executive summary of the study by Woodworth, et al.:

- “Consistent with the KIPP mission, the Bay Area KIPP schools serve predominantly poor and minority students” (p. viii).
- “In most grades and cohorts, Bay Area KIPP students make above-average progress compared with national norms, and they outperform their host districts” (p. viii).
- “Bay Area KIPP schools have large and statistically significant effects on the academic achievement of fifth-grade students and new sixth-grade students” (p.vii).
- “Bay Area KIPP schools do not appear to attract higher scoring students” (p. ix).
- “Student attrition rates are high, and those who leave Bay Area KIPP schools start out lower performing and benefit less from their time at the schools than those who stay” (p. ix).

See <http://www.kipp.org/about-kipp> for more information about the KIPP Foundation.

Achievement First (AF) is a non-profit CMO that operates a network of college-preparatory K to 12 public charter schools in Connecticut and New York. It includes 19 academies under 10 charters in four cities.

Uncommon Schools is a non-profit organization that starts and manages urban charter public schools to prepare students to graduate from college. Uncommon manages 24 schools in New York City; upstate New York; Newark, New Jersey; and Boston, Massachusetts.

Teh, B., McCullough, M. M., & Gill, B. P. (2010). *Student achievement in New York City middle schools affiliated with Achievement First and Uncommon Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/student_achieve_ny.pdf

The study by Teh, McCullough, and Gill compared three AF and two Uncommon middle schools.

- First and second year reading achievement was not statistically different, but third year gains are positive and significant. Math shows positive and significant improvement after two and three years.
- “In sum, the evidence suggests that, for the small number of New York's AF and Uncommon middle schools that can yet be included in analysis, achievement impacts are positive, significant, and substantial” (p. 10).

Section C: General Research

(Works are listed alphabetically by author's last name or by first word of entry.)

This section provides summaries of research that examined aggregated data on charter schools' effectiveness in raising student achievement. As in Section B, a citation of the article featuring the study is provided, along with a summary of the research findings.

- Berends, M., Goldring, E., Stein, M., & Cravens, X. (2010). Instructional conditions in charter schools and students' mathematics achievement gains: Research brief. Nashville, TE: National Center on School Choice. Retrieved from http://www.vanderbilt.edu/schoolchoice/documents/brief_conditions_achievementgains.pdf
- The study included 1,727 students from a matched sample of 44 charter and traditional public schools in Northwest Evaluation Association-tested schools in Idaho, Indiana, and Minnesota.
 - "Mathematics achievement gains were similar for students who attend charter schools and students who attend traditional public schools" (p. 1).
 - "Greater instructional innovation did not result in greater achievement gains" (p. 1).

- Braun, H., Jenkins, F., & Grigg, W. (2006). *A Closer Look at Charter Schools Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling (NCES 2006-460)*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/2006460.pdf>

Results were based on the 2003 NAEP study and compared 150 charter schools to 6,764 public non-charter schools. The study also compared charters affiliated with public school districts with unaffiliated charters. This was not a randomized study; there was no control group.

- "After adjusting for student characteristics, charter school mean scores in reading and mathematics were lower, on average, than those for public non-charter schools" (p. vi). Both differences were statistically significant.
- "Charter schools not affiliated with a public school district scored significantly lower on average than public noncharter schools" (p. vi).

- Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2009). *Multiple choice: Charter school performance in 16 states*. Stanford, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/MULTIPLE_CHOICE_EXECUTIVE%20SUMMARY.pdf

The U.S. Department of Education What Works Clearinghouse rated this as consistent with evidence standards with reservations. The study compared 70% of charter school students with matched students in 2,403 charter schools from 15 states and the District of Columbia.

- Charter school students' reading and math test score growth was slightly lower than that of students attending traditional public schools
- "And yet, this study reveals in unmistakable terms that, in the aggregate, charter students are not faring as well as their TPS counterparts" (p. 6).
- Seventeen percent of charter schools provided superior educational opportunities, 37%

had significantly worse learning results, with the remaining 46% being no different from local public school.

- There was wide variation with almost equal numbers of states doing better than, worse than, or about the same as matched TPSs in their states.
- States that empower authorizers realize significantly lower growth in academic learning.
- In states that have appeals processes, students realize small but significant gains.
- States that have limits on the number of charter schools have significantly lower gains.
- Students in elementary and middle school grades have significantly higher rates of learning than peers in TPSs.
- Students in high schools and multilevel schools have significantly worse results.
- Blacks and Hispanics fare worse in charter schools.
- Students in poverty have better academic growth in charter schools.
- English language learners do significantly better in charter schools.
- Special education students have about the same outcomes in both types of school.
- Students do better in charters over time. First-year students in charters show a decline. Second- and third-year students show a reversal and positive gains.

Crane E., & Edwards, B. (2007). *California's charter schools: Measuring their performance*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource. Retrieved from http://www.edsource.org/pub_CharterPerf6-07_report.html

- “Charters serve greater proportions of African American and White students and smaller proportions of Asians, Latinos, and English learners” (p. 3).
- “Charters have higher percentages of teachers who are not fully credentialed and have two years or less of experience” (p. 3).
- “After controlling for differences in enrollment and student characteristics, charter elementary schools scored lower than non-charter elementary schools on the API (Academic Performance Index)” (p.9). Note: The API included results from various tests and subjects.
- “Both with and without controlling for differences in enrollment and student characteristics, California's middle school charters scored higher than noncharters on the API. The results are consistent over time and across multiple measures” (p. 11).
- “After controlling for differences in enrollment and student characteristics, the study found that charter high schools scored higher than noncharters on the API, but the results were not stable over time. However, noncharter high schools outperformed charters in math” (p. 13).
- “After controlling for differences in enrollment and student characteristics, charters run by management organizations scored significantly higher than other charter schools” (p. 15).
- “With the exception of elementary math performance, start-up charter schools did not score significantly differently than conversion charters, after controlling for differences in enrollment and student characteristics” (p. 17).
- “Among charter elementary schools, nonclassroom-based charters scored lower than classroom-based charters on the 2006 API, after adjusting for differences in enrollment and student characteristics” (p. 19). Note: Non-classroom-based instruction can include home schooling, distance learning, community-based learning, field trips, etc.

Garcia, D. R., Barber, R. & Molnar, A. (2009). *Profiting from public education: Education management organizations and student achievement*. New York, NY: Teachers College Record. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED EJ842200).

This study analyzed achievement over three years of both basic skills and complex thinking in EMOs in Arizona.

- "... EMO-managed charter schools may be associated with higher levels of academic achievement in basic skills at the expense of complex thinking skills, at least in reading. In all, the results are modest, ..." (p. 1).

Gill, B., Zimmer, R., Christman, J., & Blanc, S. (2006). *State takeover, school restructuring, private management, and student achievement in Philadelphia*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG351.pdf

Philadelphia schools were taken over by the state in 2002, and outside providers were hired to run persistently low-achieving schools. There was no parental choice and district involvement limited provider autonomy.

- "In sum, with four years of experience, we find no evidence of differential academic benefits that would support the additional expenditures on private managers" (p. xiv).
- "In sum, Philadelphia has seen substantial districtwide gains in the proportion of students achieving proficiency since the 2002 state takeover. But after four years, the gains of its low-achieving schools (constituting most of the schools in the district) have generally not exceeded the gains of low-achieving schools elsewhere in Pennsylvania" (p. xii-xiii).
- "In short, after four years of intervention, achievement gains in privately operated schools and sweet 16 schools, on average, are no different from SDP districtwide gains. Meanwhile, restructured schools outgained the rest of the district in math in all three years of restructuring, with evidence that the gain persisted a year after the conclusion of restructuring. These positive effects for restructured schools in math (ranging from 0.16 to 0.22 standard deviations) are moderate to large in size, when compared with effects seen in educational interventions generally" (p. xiii).
- "In short, after four years of intervention, achievement gains in privately operated schools and sweet 16 schools, on average, are no different from SDP districtwide gains. Meanwhile, restructured schools outgained the rest of the district in math in all three years of restructuring, with evidence that the gain persisted a year after the conclusion of restructuring. These positive effects for restructured schools in math (ranging from 0.16 to 0.22 standard deviations) are moderate to large in size, when compared with effects seen in educational interventions generally" (p. xiii).
- "We find no clear indications of any notable differences in effects on particular at-risk subgroups of students, such as special education students or those with limited English skills" (p. xiii).

Gleason, P., Clark, M., Tuttle, C., & Dwoyer, E. (2010). *The evaluation of charter school impacts: Final report* (NCEE Publication No. 2010-4029). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S.

Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104029/pdf/20104029.pdf>

- The U.S. Department of Education What Works Clearinghouse rated this study as “meets WWC evidence standards.”
- “The evaluation, which we conducted in 36 charter middle schools across 15 states, compares outcomes of students who applied and were admitted to these schools through randomized admissions lotteries (lottery winners) with the outcomes of students who also applied to these schools and participated in the lotteries but were not admitted (lottery losers). This analytic approach produces the most reliable impact estimates. But because the study could only include charter middle schools that held lotteries, the results do not necessarily apply to the full set of charter middle schools in the U.S.
- On average, charter middle schools that hold lotteries are neither more nor less successful than traditional public schools in improving student achievement, behavior, and school progress. Participating schools had no significant impacts on math or reading test scores either a year or two years after students applied, other measures of academic progress (such as attendance or grade promotion), or student conduct within or outside of school. Being admitted to a study charter school did significantly and consistently improve both students’ and parents’ satisfaction with school.
- The impact of charter middle schools on student achievement varies significantly across schools. Across 28 sites (covering 32 schools), the effects on reading scores after two years were estimated to be greater than zero in 11 sites and less than zero in 17 sites (with magnitudes ranging from -0.43 to +0.33 standard deviation units), with 4 of the individual site estimates statistically significant. The estimated effects on math scores were greater than zero in 10 sites and less than zero in 18 of the 28 sites (-0.78 to +0.65 standard deviation units), with 10 of the site estimates statistically significant.
- In our exploratory analysis, for example, we found that study charter schools serving more low income or low-achieving students had statistically significant positive effects on math test scores, while charter schools serving more advantaged students—those with higher income and prior achievement—had significant negative effects on math test scores. Charter middle schools in large urban areas also had significant positive impacts on math achievement compared to negative impacts in other locales, although urbanicity was no longer an influential factor once such characteristics as students’ demographics and income levels were controlled for. There were also differential effects on reading achievement, with negative and significant impacts for study charter schools serving more advantaged students and no impacts for study charter schools serving fewer advantaged students.
- Some operational features of charter middle schools are associated with more positive (or less negative) impacts on achievement. These features include smaller enrollments and the use of ability grouping in math or English classes. Although impacts differed for study charter schools with longer versus shorter hours of operations or higher versus lower revenue per student, these features were no longer significant once other school and student characteristics were controlled for. We found no statistically significant relationships between achievement impacts and the charter schools’ policy environment, including the extent of its decision-making autonomy, the type of authorizer and how the authorizer held the school accountable, and whether it was operated by a private organization” (p. xvii).

Hill, P. T. (2005). Assessing achievement in charter schools. In Lake, R. J. & Hill, P. T. (Eds.), *Hopes, fears, and reality: A balanced look at American charter schools in 2005* (pp. 21-32). Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved from

http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/HopesandFears2005_report.pdf

- “It seems that, regardless of the methods used, the results are variable. There are some positive and some negative results, whatever the methods employed” (p. 24).
- “The performance of new charter schools improves steadily over their first five years of operation” (p. 31).

Howe, K. & Foser, S. (2005). *An assessment of Colorado’s charter schools: Implications for policy*. Boulder, CO: Education and the Public Interest Center. Retrieved from

<http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/HoweFoster.pdf>

- “Colorado’s charter schools fare well on only 1 of 5 central evaluation criteria considered here: parental satisfaction and participation. They have come up short on each of the others: improving achievement and closing the achievement gap; serving at least as high a proportion of racial/ethnic minority, low-income, and special education students as other public schools; having a positive impact or no impact on other public schools; and introducing more innovative educational programs into the public school system.” (p. 8)

Hoxby, C. M., Murarka, S., & Kang, J. (2009). *How New York City’s charter schools affect achievement*. Cambridge, MA: New York City Charter Schools Evaluation Project. Retrieved from

http://www.nber.org/~schools/charterschoolseval/how_NYC_charter_schools_affect_achievement_sept2009.pdf

- “A student who attends a charter high school is about 7 percent more likely to earn a Regents diploma by age 20 for each year he spends in that school. For instance, a student who spent grades ten through twelve in charter high school would have about a 21 percent higher probability of getting a Regents diploma.” (p. viii).

Note: This study has been criticized because it is based on extrapolated data as opposed to actual student achievement data (Guilfoyle, 2010).

Lake, R., Dusseault, B., Demeritt, A., & Hill, P. (2010). *The national study of Charter Management Organization (CMO) effectiveness: Report on interim findings*. Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved from

http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/pub_ncsrp_cmo_jun10.pdf

Forty-three CMOs overseeing 314 schools were included in this interim study to be completed in 2011. Highlights include:

- Eighty-four percent of CMOs are moderately to highly prescriptive on curriculum, instruction, teacher evaluation and compensation, student behavior, and support programs for struggling students. Sixteen percent adapt to talents and preferences of local teachers and administrators. Larger CMOs are more highly prescriptive. They are least prescriptive around professional development and teacher hiring.

- CMOs are likely to report using compensation to reward performance.
- "Creating a calm, orderly, focused school environment is central to these CMO's theory of action for improving student achievement" (p. 5).
- CMO schools tend to offer longer school days than do traditional public schools" (p. 5). (7.4 hrs vs. 6.2 hours=30 additional days per year)

Miron, G., Coryn, C., & Mackety, D. M. (2007). *Evaluating the impact of charter schools on student achievement: A longitudinal look at the Great Lakes states*. Boulder, CO: Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://epsl.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPSSL-0706-236-EPRU.pdf>

- "Charter schools in the Great Lakes states are not currently outperforming demographically similar, traditional public schools.
- Trends indicate that generally, charter schools are making notable gains in achievement over time, with newest initiatives showing some of the greatest rates of improvement.
- All states in the region do have some successful charter schools" (p. 2).

Raymond, M. E., (2003). *The performance of California charter schools*. Stanford University, CA: Center for Research on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved from http://credo.stanford.edu/downloads/ca_chart_sch.pdf

The U.S. Department of Education What Works Clearinghouse rated this study as "not consistent with WWC evidence standards." Three hundred sixteen elementary, middle, and high school charters were compared to other, similar California public schools.

- "After controlling for other possible influences, the analysis reveals a significant association between smaller schools and higher achievement across all grade levels" (p. 2).
- "... once the attributes and talents of students was controlled for, fully credentialed teachers did not factor significantly as expected in changes in a school's API scores over time" (p. 2).
- "The analyses show that against similar populations, charters and traditional schools perform about the same in elementary and middle schools, but outperform their peers in high schools" (p. 2).

Teh, B., McCullough, M. M., & Gill, B. P. (2010). *Student achievement in New York City middle schools affiliated with Achievement First and Uncommon Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/student_achieve_ny.pdf

This study reports only on the achievement of students in these schools. Achievement trajectories for a matched sample were used for comparison purposes. Nearly the entire (98%) student population is Black or Hispanic.

- The first- and second-year reading scores are not statistically different from comparison students, but third-year scores are positive and significant.
- Math shows positive and significant improvement after two and three years.
- "In sum, the evidence suggests that, for the small number of New York's AF and Uncommon middle schools that can yet be included in analysis, achievement impacts are

positive, significant, and substantial” (p. 10).

- AF/Uncommon students had similar levels of achievement on the baseline reading and math tests as the comparison group.

Therriault, S. B., Ghandi, A. G., Casasanto, J., & Carney, S. (2010). *Out of the debate and into the schools: Comparing practices and strategies in traditional, pilot, and charter schools in the city of Boston*. Boston, MA: Boston Foundation Project Coordination. Retrieved from http://www.tbf.org/uploadedFiles/tbforg/Utility_Navigation/Multimedia_Library/Reports/OutofDebate_Evidence.pdf

This study was based on a matched sample with charter, traditional, and pilot school students. English/language arts and mathematics scores were compared.

- “On balance, our lottery-based findings provide strong evidence that the charter model has generated substantial test score gains in high-demand Charter Schools with complete records” (p. 39).

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, The National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *America’s charter schools: Results from the NAEP 2003 pilot study* (NCES Publication No. 2004-456). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/student_achieve_ny.pdf

This is a pilot study with 150 charter schools using the 2003 NAEP 4th grade reading and math assessments. Aggregated and sub-group results from charter schools were compared to aggregated and sub-group results from all non-charter schools.

- In mathematics, fourth grade charter school students did not do as well as their public school counterparts. However, White, Black, and Hispanic fourth-graders in charters were not measurably different than similar racial/ethnic counterparts in other public schools. This was also true in reading - no measurable difference.
- Fourth-graders in charter schools, eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, did not score as high in reading or mathematics, on average, as fourth-graders in other public schools.
- In comparison to results from all other public schools, charters have higher percentages of Black students and are in central cities.

Zimmer, R., Gill, B., Booker, K., Lavertu, S., Sass, T. R., & Witte, J. (2009). *Charter schools in eight states: Effects on achievement, attainment, integration, and competition*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG869.pdf

- “For charter schools with entry grades at the middle- and high-school levels (plus a handful of schools that begin in grades 3 and 4), for which we have baseline scores, we have greater confidence in the impact estimates. In five out of seven locales, these nonprimary charter schools are producing achievement gains that are, on average, neither substantially better nor substantially worse than those of local traditional public schools (TPSS)” (p xiii).
- “In most locations, charter schools have difficulty raising student achievement in their first year of operation, typically producing achievement results that fall short of those of

local TPSs” (p. xiv).

- “In terms of prior achievement, in most sites, the transferring students did not differ substantially from other students in the TPS they left” (p. xii).
- “In most sites, the racial composition of the charter schools entered by transferring students was similar to that of the TPS from which the students came” (p. xiii).
- There is a general pattern of improved performance as schools age.
- The probability of graduating from high school and of entering college increases statistically significantly.
- There was no effect from charters on achievement of students in nearby TPSs.

Section D: Conclusions

As Teh, McCullough, and Gill (2010) state, “The existing empirical literature on the academic impacts of CMOs is virtually nonexistent, largely because most CMOs are very new.” They continue, “The literature on the achievement effects of charter schools in general, is now extensive, but it has not offered any definitive conclusions” (p. 1). The conclusions of this review are in complete agreement with these statements. The available research that met the criteria for inclusion in this review on CMOs/EMOs is limited. However, many studies were located that aggregate data from large numbers of charter schools. The conclusions presented in this section include both types of reports – EMO/CMO and studies that aggregate the data from many charter schools. The conclusions are based on the impact on student achievement. Most of the conclusions from these studies clustered in four areas, which has formed the basis of this review. These areas are:

- Overall impact in comparison to traditional public schools (Table 1)
- Impact on reading/language arts and mathematics (Table 2)
- Impact in different levels of schooling (elementary, middle, and high school) (Table 3)
- The effect of number of years in attendance at a charter school on student achievement

In addition, a number of other areas received limited attention in these reports. These areas include, but are not limited to, student demographics, charter affiliation with districts, classroom versus non-classroom, school size, mobility, and teacher credentials. These will be addressed in this review as well.

The following tables organize reports according to three categories:

1. Those that found charter schools to do *better* than TPSs
2. Those that found *no difference* between charter schools and TPSs
3. Those that found charter schools to perform *worse* than TPSs

Table 1
Overall Impact of Charter School on Student Achievement Compared to Traditional Public Schools

Better	Woodworth et al. (2008) Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (2009) Henig (2008)
No Difference	Miron et al. (2007) Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (2009) Gill et al. (2006)
Worse	Howe & Foster (2005) Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (2009)

Table I illustrates the dissimilarity of findings that is found when surveying several studies that compare the academic gains made by charter schools with the gains made by TPSs. Of the three reports indicating that charter schools do better than TPSs, two of the reports are about KIPP schools and the third report from the Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (2009)

reports that only 17% of the schools across 15 states and the District of Columbia outperformed their TPS counterparts. This report goes on to state that in 37% of the schools there was no difference in academic gains between charter schools and TPSs, and 46% of the charter schools did worse than their TPS counterparts.

Table 2

Impact of Charter Schools on Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Achievement

	<i>Reading/Language Arts</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>
Better	Supovitz & Rikoon (2010) Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center (2006)	Suppovitz & Rikoon (2010) McDonald et al. (2008) Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center (2006) Gleason et al. (2010)
No Difference	Gleason et al. (2010) U.S. Department of Education (2004) Gill et al. (2005)	Berends et al. (2010) Gill et al. (2005) Gleason et al. (2010)
Worse	Gleason et al. (2010) Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (2009) Braun et al. (2006)	Braun et al. (2006) Crane & Edwards (2007) Center for Research on Educational Outcomes (2009) U.S. Department of Education (2004)

Note: Gleason et al. (2010) appears in four cells of this table because achievement differed based on the demographic group. See Section C for results of this study.

As shown in Table 2, the results of studies comparing reading/language arts and mathematics achievement support the conclusion that research is not definitive. There are almost equal numbers of studies finding better, worse, or no differences between charter schools and TPSs.

Table 3

Impact of Charter Elementary, Middle, and High Schools on Academic Achievement

	Elementary schools	Middle schools	High schools
Better	Dobbie & Fryer (2009)	Dobbie & Fryer (2009) Crane & Edwards (2007) Tuttle et al. (2010) McDonald et al. (2008) Henig (2008) Woodworth et al. (2008)	Crane & Edwards (2007)
No Difference		Gleason et al. (2010) Zimmer et al. (2009)	Zimmer et al. (2009)
Worse	Crane & Edwards (2007)		

Table 3 presents a different picture from the previous two tables. There are more studies supporting successful middle school charters. It is worth noting that four of the studies reach the same positive conclusions about KIPP middle schools. The McDonald et al. (2008) study of KIPP middle schools concludes, “While the majority of the comparisons directionally favored KIPP students this year, only the 5th grade mathematics comparison was significant” (p.2). In addition, the Woodworth et al. (2008) study of KIPP middle schools concluded that “Bay Area

KIPP schools have large and statistically significant effects on the academic achievement of fifth-grade students and new sixth-grade students” (p.vii). Henig (2008) states, “The weight of the evidence suggests that students who enter and stay in KIPP schools tend to perform better than similar students in more traditional public schools” (p. 1). These reports suggest that KIPP middle schools are successful at raising achievement in comparison to TPSs, although the results may be somewhat limited to a specific content area (mathematics) and specific grade levels (5th and 6th).

The Effect of Number of Years in Attendance at a Charter School on Student Achievement

A number of studies reported results of student achievement over time. A common finding was that achievement dropped in the first year of attendance in a charter school (Zimmer et al., 2009; Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, 2009; Gill et al., 2005). Even more frequent was the finding that achievement increased in subsequent years (Hill, 2005; Zimmer et al., 2009; Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, 2009; Hoxby et al., 2009; Miron et al., 2007; Teh et al., 2010). Gill et al. (2005) found achievement declined in the first year and then increased during the fourth and fifth years but questioned if this increase could compensate for the first year loss. This concern suggests that subsequent gains must be considered in comparison to potential first-year declines.

Additional Results

The following statements reflect additional results reported in most cases in only one study. The reader is cautioned to weigh carefully how much credence to place in these results until further studies can be located to address the same issues.

Student Demographics:

- English language learners and students in poverty do better in charter schools than in TPSs (Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, 2009).
- Black and Hispanic students do worse in charter schools than in TPSs. (Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, 2009).
- Poor students do better in charter schools than in TPSs (Dobbie & Fryer, 2009; Gleason et al., 2010).
- High-income students did worse in charter schools than in TPSs (Gleason et al., 2010).
- Mobility was higher/more common in charter schools than in TPSs (Braun et al., 2006).

Other Factors:

- Charter schools run by EMOs/CMOs produce better results than independent charter schools (Crane & Edwards, 2007).
- Charter schools affiliated with school districts do better than unaffiliated charter schools (Braun et al., 2006).
- Conversion charter schools did no better than start-up charter schools (Crane & Edwards, 2007).
- Classroom-based charter schools did better than non classroom-based charter schools (Crane & Edwards, 2007).
- Charter schools in states that authorize multiple authorizing agencies do worse than charter schools in states that authorize fewer authorizing agencies (Center for Research

on Educational Outcomes, 2009).

- Charter schools in states that have appeals processes do better than charter schools in states that do not have appeals processes (Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, 2009).
- Charter schools in states that have limits on the number of charter schools authorized do worse than charter schools in states that do not have limits (Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, 2009).

When reading any of the studies, it must be kept in mind that

- Some studies continued to count students as charter school students when they withdrew from the charter school while others did not. Attention needs to be paid to how the authors of specific studies classified students, as this could have a significant impact on the results.
- Not all studies clarified whether charter school students were compared to national or district averages, to demographically similar schools, or to neighborhood schools from which they drew their students.
- Not all studies matched charter school students to control students. If they were matched, the study should have revealed on what basis they were matched.
- Studies should reveal whether or not results are statistically significant.

General Comments

- Many studies found great variation across schools, including within EMOs, leading to the conclusion that, as with public schools, there are some very good schools and there are some that are not effective.
- Of all the research, the most positive results were found in charter middle schools, with the KIPP program having the most positive results.
- Studies suggested that attention should be paid to the initial year implementation to offset the common finding of achievement loss during startup. This may be an area for further research to help determine which factors may contribute to improved initial-year achievement.
- Engage state education agency and local education agency staff in a thorough analysis of a representative sample of the studies included in this review to become familiar with the issues and results to better inform their decision-making.
- Studies that use school, district, state, or national data that are based on lottery systems may be the most compelling. Lotteries may provide the best opportunity for the establishment of a control group.

References

- Berends, M., Goldring, E., Stein, M., & Cravens, X. (2010). *Instructional conditions in charter schools and students' mathematics achievement gains: Research brief*. Nashville, TE: National Center on School Choice. Retrieved from http://www.vanderbilt.edu/schoolchoice/documents/brief_conditions_achievementgains.pdf
- Betts, J. R. & Tang, Y. E. (2008). *Value added and experimental studies of the effect of charter schools on student achievement*. Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/pub_ncsrp_bettstang_dec08.pdf
- Braun, H., Jenkins, F., & Grigg, W. (2006). *A Closer Look at Charter Schools Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling* (NCES 2006-460). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/2006460.pdf>
- Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2009). *Multiple choice: Charter school performance in 16 states*. Stanford, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/MULTIPLE_CHOICE_EXECUTIVE%20SUMMARY.pdf
- The Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center. (2006). *CSRQ center report on education service providers*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.csrq.org/documents/ESPCSRQReport-Full042806.pdf>
- Crane E., & Edwards, B. (2007). *California's charter schools: Measuring their performance*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource. Retrieved from http://www.edsource.org/pub_CharterPerf6-07_report.html
- Dobbie, W. & Fryer, R. G. (2009). *Are high-quality schools enough to close the achievement gap? Evidence from a bold social experiment in Harlem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. Retrieved from <http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/fryer/files/hcz%204.15.2009.pdf>
- Garcia, D. R., Barber, R. & Molnar, A. (2009). *Profiting from public education: Education management organizations and student achievement*. New York, NY: Teachers College Record. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED EJ842200).
- Gill, B., Zimmer, R., Christman, J., & Blanc, S. (2006). *State takeover, school restructuring, private management, and student achievement in Philadelphia*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG351.pdf
- Gill, B. P., Hamilton, L. S., Lockwood, J. R., Marsh, J. A., Zimmer, R. W., Hill, D., & Pribesh, S. (2005). *Inspiration, perspiration, and time: Operations and achievement in Edison*

schools. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG351.pdf

Gleason, P., Clark, M., Tuttle, C., & Dwoyer, E. (2010). *The evaluation of charter school impacts: Final report (NCEE Publication No. 2010-4029)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104029/pdf/20104029.pdf>

Guilfoyle, C. (2010). *Examining charter schools: Info Brief*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/infobrief/vol16/issue1/full/Examining-Charter-Schools.aspx>

Henig, J. R. (2008). *What do we know about the outcomes of KIPP schools?* Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/outcomes-of-kipp-schools>

Hill, P. T. (2005). Assessing achievement in charter schools. In Lake, R. J. & Hill, P. T. (Eds.), *Hopes, fears, and reality: A balanced look at American charter schools in 2005* (pp. 21-32). Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/HopesandFears2005_report.pdf

Howe, K. & Foser, S. (2005). *An assessment of Colorado's charter schools: Implications for policy*. Boulder, CO: Education and the Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/HoweFoster.pdf>

Hoxby, C. M., Murarka, S., & Kang, J. (2009). *How New York City's charter schools affect achievement*. Cambridge, MA: New York City Charter Schools Evaluation Project. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/~schools/charterschoolseval/how_NYC_charter_schools_affect_achievement_sept2009.pdf

Lake, R. E. (Ed.) (2010) *Hopes, fears, and realities: A balanced look at American charter schools in 2009*. Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/pub_ncsrp_hfr09_jan10.pdf

Lake, R., Dusseault, B., Demeritt, A., & Hill, P. (2010). *The national study of Charter Management Organization (CMO) effectiveness: Report on interim findings*. Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/pub_ncsrp_cmo_jun10.pdf

- McDonald, A. J., Ross, S. M., Abney, J., & Zoblotsky, T. (2008). *Urban school reform: Year 4 outcomes for the Knowledge is Power Program in an urban middle school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Miron, G., Urschel, J. L., Mathis, W. J., & Tornquist, E. (2010). *Schools without diversity: Education management organizations, charter schools, and the demographic stratification of the American school system*. Boulder, CO: Education and the Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/EMO-Seg.pdf>
- Miron, G., & Urschel, J. L. (2009). *Profiles on non-profit education management organizations: 2008-2009*. Boulder, CO: Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/NP%2008-09.pdf>
- Miron, G., Coryn, C., & Mackety, D. M. (2007). *Evaluating the impact of charter schools on student achievement: A longitudinal look at the Great Lakes states*. Boulder, CO: Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://epsu.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPSL-0706-236-EPRU.pdf>
- Molnar, A., Miron, G., & Urschel, J. (2009). *Profiles of for-profit educational management organizations: Eleventh annual report*. Boulder, CO: Education Public Interest Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/08-09%20profiles%20report.pdf>
- Rand Corporation. (October 11, 2005). *Rand says most public schools managed by Edison Schools match or exceed gains of comparable public schools in 4 to 5 years* (News Release). Retrieved from <http://www.rand.org/news/press/2005/10/11.html>
- Raymond, M. E., (2003). *The performance of California charter schools*. Stanford University, CA: Center for Research on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved from http://credo.stanford.edu/downloads/ca_chart_sch.pdf
- Supovitz, J. & Rikoon, S. (2010). *Early achievement impacts of the Harlem Success Academy Charter School in New York City*. Retrieved from <http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/fac/SupovitzHSA.pdf>
- Teh, B., McCullough, M. M., & Gill, B. P. (2010). *Student achievement in New York City middle schools affiliated with Achievement First and Uncommon Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/student_achieve_ny.pdf
- Therriault, S. B., Ghandi, A. G., Casasanto, J., & Carney, S. (2010). *Out of the debate and into the schools: Comparing practices and strategies in traditional, pilot, and charter schools in the city of Boston*. Boston, MA: Boston Foundation Project Coordination. Retrieved from http://www.tbf.org/uploadedFiles/tbforg/Utility_Navigation/Multimedia_Library/Reports/OutofDebate_Evidence.pdf

Tuttle, C. C., Teh, B., Nichols-Barrer, I., Gill, B. P., & Gleason, P. (2010). *Student characteristics and achievement in 22 KIPP middle schools*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/KIPP_fnlrpt.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, The National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *America's charter schools: Results from the NAEP 2003 pilot study* (NCES Publication No. 2004-456). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/education/student_achieve_ny.pdf

Woodworth, K. R., David, J. L., Guha, R., Wang, H., & Lopez-Torkos, A. (2008). *San Francisco Bay Area KIPP schools: A study of early implementation and achievement*. Final report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved from http://policyweb.sri.com/cep/publications/SRI_ReportBayAreaKIPPSchools_Final.pdf

Zimmer, R., Gill, B., Booker, K., Lavertu, S., Sass, T. R., & Witte, J. (2009). *Charter schools in eight states: Effects on achievement, attainment, integration, and competition*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG869.pdf

Resources

- Bracey, G. W. (2005). Research: Checking up on charters. *Phi Delta Kappan* 86 (7), 554-555.
- Center on Innovation and Improvement. (2010). *Evaluations of performance of education management organizations*. Lincoln, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://www.centerii.org/techassist/solutionfinding/resources/CMO-EMO_Effectiveness.pdf
- Center on Reinventing Public Education. (2010). *Teacher attrition in charter vs. district schools-brief*. Seattle, WA: Gross, B. & DeArmond, M. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/brief_ics_Attrition_Aug10.pdf
- Christiansen, J. & Rainey, L. (2009). *Custom tailored: Trends in charter school educational programs*. Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/brief_ics_progamguide_may09.pdf
- Henig, J. R. (2009). The spectrum of educational research. *Educational Leadership*, 66(4), 6-11.
- Izumi, L. T. (2008). *What works: Inside model charter schools*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved from <http://www.centerii.org/search/Resources/WhatWorksModelCharter.pdf>
- Lazarin, M. & Ortiz-Licon, F. (2010). *Next generation charter schools: Meeting the needs of Latinos and English language learners*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/09/pdf/charter_schools.pdf
- Learning Point Associates. (2010). *Charter and Innovate schools: Emerging trends reflected in the state Phase I Race to the Top Applications*. Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/RttT_Charter_Innovative.pdf
- Learning Point Associates. (2010). *School restructuring: What works when: A guide for education leaders* (3rd ed.). Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/School_Restructuring_Guide.pdf
- Miron, G. & Urschel, J. L. (2010). *Equal or fair? A study of revenues and expenditures in American charter schools*. Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved from <http://epicpolicy.org/publication/charter-school-finance>
- National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2009). *Charter school achievement: What we know* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/files/publications/Summary%20of%20Achievement%20Studies%20Fifth%20Edition%202009_Final.pdf

Rhim, L. M. & Brinson, D. (2008). *Exploring success in the charter sector: Case studies of six charter schools engaged in promising practices for children with disabilities*. Seattle, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education.

Retrieved from

http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/wp_ncsrp11_pubimpact_jul08.pdf

Wong, K. (2005). *What works in choice-based programs and charter schools*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved from

<http://www.centerii.org/search/Resources/WhatWorksChoiceCharter.pdf>

Appendix A
Information About Non-Profit and For-Profit EMOs

The following two tables represent a small sampling of schools included in two reports (Molnar, A., Miron, G. & Urschel, J., 2009 and Miron, G., & Urschel, J. L., 2009). Schools were selected because of their proximity to the District of Columbia (DC) and Delaware. Other schools and/or organizations listed in these reports may be willing and capable of providing services in DC and Delaware.

Table A1
Non-Profit Educational Management Organizations

Company name	Company location	Size	Focus and/or target population	Locations	Internet link
KIPP	San Francisco, CA	Large	Students in underserved communities	DC, MD, NC, NJ, NY, PA,	www.kipp.org
Lighthouse Academies	Framingham, MA	Large	College prep. Arts-infused program	DC, NY	www.lighthouse-academies.org
Uncommon Schools	New York, NY	Medium	Low income students, college prep.	NJ, NY	www.uncommonschools.org
Baltimore Curriculum Project	Baltimore, MD	Medium	High-poverty schools	MD	www.baltimorecp.org
Friendship Public Charter Schools	Washington, DC	Medium	Underserved communities	DC	www.friendshipschools.org
Mastery Charter Schools	Philadelphia, PA	Medium	Turnaround schools	PA	www.masterycharter.org
Beginning With Children Foundation	New York, NY	Small	Low income, underserved children	NY	www.bwcf.org
Cesar Chavez Public Charter School	Washington, DC	Small	No information	DC	www.cesarchavezhs.org
DC Prep	Washington, DC	Small	Low income, underserved children	DC	www.dcprep.org
Harlem Village Academies	New York, NY	Small	Teacher support, empowerment, and accountability	NY	www.harlemvillageacademies.org
Hyde Leadership Schools	Washington, DC	Small	Character development, academic rigor, family renewal	NY	www.hydedc.org
See Forever Foundation	Washington, DC	Small	Lower-income urban areas, students who have not succeeded in traditional schools, middle and high schools	DC	www.seeforever.org
The SEED Foundation	Washington, DC	Small	Urban underserved middle- and high-school students in a boarding-school setting	DC, MD	www.seedfoundation.com

Note: Large=10 or more schools; medium=4-9 schools; small=3 or fewer schools.

Table A2
For-Profit Educational Management Organizations

Company name	Company location	Size	Focus and/or target population	Locations	Internet link
Connections Academy	Baltimore, MD	Large	Virtual education	PA	www.connectionsacademy.com
Edison Learning	New York, NY	Large	Whole school design, curriculum, classroom management, assessments,	MD, NY, PA	www.edisonlearning.com
Imagine Schools	Arlington, VA	Large	Arts and science focus, IB, single-sex, Core Knowledge, Direct Instruction	DC, MD	www.imagineschools.com
K12 Inc.	Herndon, VA	Large	Online, create individualized learning, develop own curriculum	PA	www.k12.com
Mosaica Education, Inc.	New York, NY	Large	Paragon curriculum, longer school day/school year, foreign language, full day kindergarten, technology	DC, PA	www.mosaicaeducation.com
National Heritage Academies	Grand Rapids, MI	Large	Four pillars of academic excellence, moral focus, parental partnership and student responsibility	NC, NY	www.heritageacademies.com
Victory Schools, Inc.	New York, NY	Large	Eight essentials (see Web site for details)	NY, PA	www.victoryschools.com
White Hat Management	Akron, OH	Large	Distance learning, on-site, and alternative	PA	www.whitehatmgmt.com
OmniVest Properties Management, LLC	Newtown, PA	Medium	New school development, school finance and accounting, program management and compliance	PA	www.omninvestllc.com
Academic Leadership Services, L.P.	Pittsburgh, PA	Small	Not available	PA	No Web site 412-682-6559
Charter School Management, Inc.	Gladwyne, PA	Small	Not available	PA	No Web site 610-447-0400
Community Education Partners	Nashville, TN	Small	Grade 6-12 struggling students	VA	www.communityeducationpartners.com
Nobel Learning Communities	West Chester, PA	Small	Preschool through middle school, centralized curriculum support and training	PA	www.nobellearning.com
Three Cord Inc.	York, PA	Small	Not available	PA	No Web site 717-845-4046

Note: Large=10 or more schools; medium=4-9 schools; small=3 or fewer schools.

Appendix B
Articles, Reviews, Summaries, Etc.

The following section contains a listing of resources containing additional information on charter schools. A short description of the resource is presented along with the URL with which the article can be accessed.

The following links represent a sampling from ASCD SmartBriefs:

Audit calls for more oversight of Utah's charters A legislative audit is calling for increased oversight of Utah's charter schools. The number of charters in Utah has grown to 76 from just seven in 2001, while the state education staff handling charter schools has been reduced. The legislative report also calls on the state school board to adopt clear and consistent financial standards, discipline policies and school-closure procedures for charters. [The Salt Lake Tribune \(Utah\)](http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/home/50511054-76/charter-state-board-schools.html.csp) (10/21)
<http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/home/50511054-76/charter-state-board-schools.html.csp>

The traits of top-performing charter schools The top-performing charter schools in Texas vary in mission as well as the type of students they serve, but high demands on teachers, students and parents is a common characteristic. Many top charters feature longer school days, more challenging courses, clear goals and high expectations for students. Some require parents to sign pledges to participate in their children's schooling, and others ask teachers to work longer hours and require them to remain accessible to their students by phone. [The Dallas Morning News](http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/education/stories/091910dnmetcharterrange.2a6c0b4.html) (9/19)
<http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/education/stories/091910dnmetcharterrange.2a6c0b4.html>

Rhode Island considers holding charter schools to tougher standards With a cap on charter schools lifted in the spring, efforts are under way in Rhode Island to implement more rigorous standards for the schools. State officials are considering higher expectations for charters than other public schools and may move to close those that are not boosting student achievement. However, some charter-school officials are concerned that the achievement levels being sought may be too ambitious. [The Providence Journal \(R.I.\)](http://www.projo.com/news/content/charter_school_changes_09-13-10_NEJRVUS_v96.253595f.html) (free registration) (9/13)
http://www.projo.com/news/content/charter_school_changes_09-13-10_NEJRVUS_v96.253595f.html

What does the future hold for Minnesota's charter schools? Some of the 152 charter schools in Minnesota -- which in 1992 became the first state to allow charters -- may close at the end of this year because of a 2009 state law that tightens restrictions on the schools. Under the new law, charter-school authorizers must demonstrate to the state that they have the resources to perform the additional oversight. However, many authorizers say they will not seek the approval, leaving many charter schools wondering whether they will have an authorizing body next summer. [WCCO-TV \(Minneapolis\)/The Associated Press](http://wcco.com/education/charter.schools.Minnesotans.2.1896408.html) (9/4)
<http://wcco.com/education/charter.schools.Minnesotans.2.1896408.html>

Report calls on charter schools to do more for English language learners Two groups are calling on states to alter policies to ensure that English-language learners (ELLs) are better served by the country's charter schools. A report, released by the National Council of La Raza

and the Center for American Progress, recommends amending charter-school laws to provide such schools with equal access to federal and state funding for ELL programs. The report also recommends ensuring that ELL students have equity of access to charter-school enrollment and requiring that charter-school operators have a plan to support ELLs before opening a school. Education Week (premium article access compliments of EdWeek.org) (9/1)

http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/09/01/02charter_ep.h30.html?tkn=MYTCXFooDzSiBYrwG%2BpTA11TjFHSU8Kydex&cmp=clp-sb-ascd

Charter-school network emphasizes personal responsibility A struggling Philadelphia elementary school has reopened as a charter with a model for student learning that includes more arts education, smaller class sizes, and a curriculum focused on students' interpersonal skills and personal responsibility. The school is one of four in the city being taken over this school year by the Mastery Charter Schools group, which has won national recognition for succeeding with its approach to improve low-performing schools. The Philadelphia Inquirer (9/2)

http://www.philly.com/inquirer/education/20100902_Mastery_Charter_Schools_big_test_in_Philadelphia.html

Philadelphia charters establish new coalition An organization has formed to represent and promote the growing number of charter schools in the Philadelphia school district. Officials with the non-profit Philadelphia Charters for Excellence say they will establish high ethical standards for member schools and create a website for tracking how well area charters perform. The move comes as a number of Philadelphia charters are under investigation for alleged corruption. The Philadelphia Inquirer (8/13)

http://www.philly.com/inquirer/local/20100813_Group_forms_to_promote_Philadelphia_charter_schools.html

Many NYC charters outperformed public schools on tests ASCD SMARTBRIEF | AUG 1, 2010 Students in charter schools across New York state performed worse than their public-school counterparts when the state applied tougher proficiency standards to the most recent tests in English and math. In New York City, however, an analysis shows the charters still largely outperformed traditional public schools within their districts - with 81% outscoring public schools in math and 70% doing better in English.

<http://www.SmartBrief.com/news/aaa/storyDetails.jsp?copyid=C8A086EC-09ED-448A-A4DB-6E18E419642C&issueid=09051912-2DAE-42ED-BAFE-7A217812FAAC>

Are charter schools viable in high-performing districts? ASCD SMARTBRIEF | JUL 19, 2010 A number of proposed charter schools in New Jersey are expected to fail over concerns about whether charters are viable in high-performing and affluent school districts. Proponents of the schools say demand for charter programs should be the sole consideration, but critics say charters should be created only in areas where parents need alternatives to failing public schools.

<http://www.SmartBrief.com/news/aaa/storyDetails.jsp?copyid=C8A086EC-09ED-448A-A4DB-6E18E419642C&issueid=09051912-2DAE-42ED-BAFE-7A217812FAAC>

Grant to fund expansion of KIPP schools in D.C. ASCD SMARTBRIEF | AUG 3, 2010 The non-profit Venture Philanthropy Partners has donated \$5.5 million to fund the expansion of Knowledge Is Power Program -- or KIPP -- charter schools in Washington, DC. KIPP plans to

more than double the number of students it serves and increase the number of area charters from seven to 10 in the next five years. "We can do the things we've been talking about doing, and wishing we could do, for years," said KIPP's chief academic officer in DC.

<http://www.SmartBrief.com/news/aaaa/storyDetails.jsp?copyid=C2EDB06F-E4EE-4F05-AB2A-EF9A3E74E013&issueid=BC29759A-6BFC-463C-97AE-8C788FEDB17C>

Gates urges charters to be accountable for student achievement ASCD SMARTBRIEF |

JUL 1, 2010 Microsoft founder Bill Gates promoted charter schools as an important model for improving education, but urged charters to be accountable for the success of their students. "The deal that allowed for the autonomy really has to be a real deal," Gates told attendees of the National Charter Schools Conference. "The freedom to perform in new ways meant that if you don't perform that things are shut down after being given a chance."

<http://www.SmartBrief.com/news/aaaa/storyDetails.jsp?copyid=F1C179AF-152A-4210-838C-882AAC349312&issueid=DC5259E1-5F1E-4219-8487-38FDFA5FABEB>

Research: Charter middle-school students may not have better grades ASCD

SMARTBRIEF | **JUN 30, 2010** Students who won lotteries to enroll in charter middle schools did not outperform their peers who were not chosen for the schools, according to a federal study of middle-school students in 15 states. The study showed that charter-school students did not score higher averages in reading and math than other students and that they had about the same behavior and attendance records. However, a federal official who oversaw the study said, "We found that these charter schools were more effective for more low-income, lower-achieving students and less effective for higher-income, higher-achieving students."

<http://www.SmartBrief.com/news/aaaa/storyDetails.jsp?copyid=3374DDA0-812A-440C-AFB4-AF409B2E1CFD&issueid=F75736BF-FE5C-41E0-869A-EF8D7D91D435>

The following is a listing of related articles from Education Week, some of which refer to research reported elsewhere in this report:

09/01/10 Pa. Virtual Schools Struggle to Meet State Standards

Although enrollment has grown at Pennsylvania's 11 virtual academies, they have mostly failed to reach state testing standards. Education Week

08/11/10 49 Applicants Win i3 Grants

Teach for America, KIPP, and the Success for All Foundation are to get up to \$50 million each in the federal program to spur educational innovation. Education Week

07/14/10 No Clear Edge for Charter Schools Found in 15-State Study

Mathematica compared results for students who won lotteries to attend 36 charter middle schools with those of their peers who lost out in the random-assignment process. Education Week

07/14/10 Who's in Charge at Charter Schools?

Greg Richmond, who heads the national group representing charter authorizers, suggests six criteria for ensuring the quality of governing boards. Education Week

07/14/10 KIPP Middle Schools Boost Learning Gains, Study Says

Across 22 schools studied, researchers found few signs that schools were 'creaming' the best students or pushing out low achievers. Education Week

06/29/10 Study Finds No Clear Edge for Charter Schools

Mathematica compared results for students who won lotteries to attend charter middle schools with those of their peers who lost out in the random admissions process. Education Week

06/18/10 Minn. Law Spurs Charter Sponsors to Think Twice

Though seen as a national model, a law putting new demands on charter sponsors is prompting some to consider leaving authorizing. Education Week

06/09/10 Banking Giant Offers Financing for Charter Schools

JPMorgan Chase & Co. pledges \$325 million so that charter schools can finance expansions and renovations in a tight credit market. Education Week

02/10/10 Charter Schools

Charter schools are more racially isolated than regular public schools in practically every state and large urban area in the United States, says a report. Education Week

12/02/09 Charter Schools

A new policy brief from a civil rights group is calling on the federal government to do more to counter racial segregation in the nation's growing population of charter schools. Education Week

08/06/09 Create Charter Schools That Reduce Segregation

“Government incentives to create charters that enroll students from several racially and economically distinct school districts could result in diverse schools that are better equipped to intervene and counteract the inequalities in the larger society,” write Susan Eaton and Gina Chirichigno. Education Week

01/23/08 Charter Schools

Nearly half of Ohio's charter schools within the state's eight largest school districts exceeded the state's expectations for improved learning from the 2005-06 school year to 2006-07, concludes a study. Education Week

06/20/07 Charter Schools

While student achievement in charter schools continues to lag behind that of traditional public schools, charter schools are making gains in improving performance, a study concludes. Education Week

10/31/06 Study Says Mich. Charter Schools Falling Short on Quality, Performance

Michigan's charter schools have been politically controversial and are delivering mixed academic results, with some not meeting acceptable standards for quality and performance, a study by Education Sector has found. Education Week

10/04/06 Charter Schools

The report said its goal was to showcase charter schools that are improving student learning

using some unconventional approaches. Education Week

08/30/06 Reanalysis of NAEP Scores Finds Charter Schools Lagging

A federal reanalysis of 2003 test-score data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress finds that charter schools trailed regular public schools that year in student achievement in both reading and mathematics. Education Week

10/23/10 A's and F's for Charter Schools

On average, there's no advantage to a charter school education except among the poor, national studies show. But in a few states, charter students are doing well. <http://www.miller-mccune.com/education/a-s-and-f-s-for-charter-schools-24640/>

For further research on charter schools, EMOs and CMOs see:

Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII) <http://www.centerii.org/search/ciisearch.aspx>