

APPENDIX A: REFINING AND DEFINING MEASURES

(1) General note on counting schools: Edison operated 136 schools during the 2001–2002 (133 excluding the Granville schools). These 136 schools are comprised of 112 sites (Edison’s K–8 schools are organized into two schools—elementary schools and junior academies; although for assessment purposes most K-8 grades are measured by the same CRT/NRT exams, producing one set of scores, and counted as one site, respectively). Therefore, those 112 sites are the basis of this report’s analyses.

(2) All of the gain scores cited throughout this report, unless otherwise stated, are annualized rates of gain. The “score” that represents an individual school in the subsequent analyses is a summative average across all subjects and tested grade levels. The scores are not weighted either by subject importance, grade levels tested, or number of students tested. The “score” for any individual school is calculated by averaging each individual long-term gain shown in the school profile pages, and then dividing by the number of intervals between testing periods.

For example, the annualized gain rate of Edison-Bethune Charter Academy (page 34) can be calculated by averaging the column labeled “Succ 00-02” (the successive cohort gain from the first year, 2000, to the last year, 2002) across all four displayed subject areas (Reading, Mathematics, Language, and Spelling) and across all grades (in this example, grades 2–6). The average gain is 5.9 national percentiles. Since it has been open 3 years—a period of two gain intervals—we divide 5.9 by 2 to get an annualized gain rate of 2.9 national percentiles.

As this report states, Edison focuses on the school as the smallest unit of analysis. As detailed in subsequent Appendices, when calculating system averages, because we use schools as the smallest unit, we do not take into account school enrollment, length of time under Edison management, or grade span configuration when averaging scores into systemwide summative figures.

(3) The school performance data displayed on the individual school profile pages represent the publicly available achievement data at all grades and in all subject areas on the school’s primary means of accountability as of December 15, 2002 (data released or revised after this date will not be included). “Primary means of accountability” as defined by this report will in most cases be the state-mandated assessment(s), and not district-mandated assessments, with the exception of our schools in Wichita, Kansas, where the district assessment is Edison’s primary measure of accountability. In some cases, a school will have two primary means of accountability—in this report, only our school in Chicago, Illinois, and our three schools in Baltimore, Maryland—as determined by their individual contracts and accountability plans. Chicago Public Schools mandate that all schools administer the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and focuses on the ITBS in their citywide accountability plan. The state, however, mandates the Illinois Standards Achievement Test. Both figures are reported and included in relevant analyses. Similarly, in Baltimore, our schools are held accountable to both the CTBS and the MSPAP.

Most of the publicly available data can be accessed via the websites of individual state departments of education and accountability. The websites from which the scores in this report were verified by RAND have been included on the individual school pages.

(4) Where accountability data was not publicly available, Edison provided RAND with the official score sheets released by the state or district to the school for their score verification process.

Examples of this occurred in all of our schools in Washington, D.C., the Chicago International Charter School—Longwood Campus, and the Thomas Edison Charter School in Wilmington, Delaware. At the time of the creation of this report, the District of Columbia did not publicly report the assessment scores for our schools. Official test publisher reports were provided instead. Secondly, the Chicago International Charter School Foundation manages several campuses and the state website posts only a consolidated score for the CICS Foundation. All relevant analyses were computed using figures for Longwood separated from the consolidated CICS figures. As for Thomas A. Edison Charter School, the state of Delaware allows multiple assessment sessions for their state-mandated reading assessments, including a summer session. The state officially posts only results from the initial testing session, and not subsequent testing sessions for reading. Score reports adjusted for summer testing have been included instead.

(5) Scores for our first-year elective norm-referenced assessments with fall-to-spring gains are not publicly available. However, official summary reports from the test publishers were provided for score verification to RAND. The schools with first-year elective assessments reported in this analysis are as follows: Charter School for Applied Technologies, Chester High School, Columbus Elementary School, Harriet Tubman Charter School, Main Street Edison Academy, Milwaukee Urban League Academy of Business and Economics, Pulaski Middle School, Showalter Middle School, Smedley Middle School, Stepping Stone Academy Charter School, Stetser Elementary School, The Riverhead Charter School, Wetherill Elementary School, and William Penn Elementary School.

(6) As stated, we do not routinely include scores from prior to Edison management unless we are contractually bound to compare to prior year scores, and where enrollment change can be documented as minimal. Schools with pre-Edison scores included are as follows: Edison-Hernandez Academy, Edison-Blair Academy, Edison-Henderson Academy, Edison-Maple Lawn Academy, Edison-Medrano Academy, Edison-Runyon Academy, Edison-Titche Academy, Furman-Templeton, Gilmore Elementary, and Montebello Elementary.

(7) Several schools under management during the 2001–2002 school year experienced dramatic enrollment changes due to expansion (Detroit Academy of Arts & Sciences) or notification of contraction of the Edison partnership (Edison-PPL in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Swift Creek-Edison in Whitakers, North Carolina). All schools whose enrollment changes were over 15 percent from one year to the next due to expansion or contraction (and not via normal student mobility) were excluded from summary-level analysis, although their school profile pages indicate their performance.

(8) Several schools have no data to report. Meek-Milton Elementary is a K–2 school in Inkster, Michigan. Edison does not routinely administer norm-referenced assessments to primary schools, thus Meek-Milton has no data to report. LearnNow schools that were under Edison management after the Edison Schools-LearnNow merger have yet to be fully converted to the Edison School Design and were excluded from all summary-level analyses, with the exception of Harriet Tubman Charter School in Bronx, New York, which was converted to the Edison design last year and was the only LearnNow school that posted fall-to-spring baseline scores. The LearnNow schools excluded from all analyses were: Community Academy Public Charter School, Hope Community Academy Charter School, Mariana Bracetti Academy Charter School, Minnesota Institute of Technology, and Southeast Academy of Scholastic Excellence Public Charter School.

All three of Edison's schools in Trenton, New Jersey, do not have any scores reported. First, as of December 15, 2002, the state of New Jersey had not yet publicly released data for the 2001–2002 year. Second, Granville's contract with Edison ended early during the 2001–2002 school year, and Edison ceased to provide support for these schools. Their scores have been excluded from all relevant analyses. Similarly, both Edison schools in Mount Clemens, Michigan (Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mt. Clemens Junior/Senior Academy), have been excluded from all relevant analyses (although they are included in the count of schools considered positive/negative since opening) due to the effective end of their contract midway through the 2001–2002 school year.

Subsequent Appendices detail which schools were included in their particular analyses, along with any reasons for exclusions.

APPENDIX B: CONSISTENT GAINS

(1) All schools with measurable gains are included in this long-term gain analysis. Of the 112 sites listed in this report, only 18 were excluded from the summary analysis due to a lack of assessment scores for the 2001–2002 year. The sites excluded from analysis were as follows (with their reason for their exclusion in parentheses):

Ann Lynch Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Cahlan Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Charles I. West Middle School (baseline scores only)
Community Academy Public Charter School (baseline scores only)
Crestwood Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences (Medbury campus) (baseline scores only)
Granville Charter High School (no data posted as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Granville Charter Middle School (no data posted as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Granville Charter School (no data posted as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Hope Community Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)
John S. Park Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Lincoln Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Mariana Bracetti Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)
Meek-Milton Primary Academy (no primary means of accountability)
Minnesota Institute of Technology (baseline scores only)
Rolling Acres Edison (baseline scores only)
Ronnow Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Southeast Academy of Scholastic Excellence Public Charter School (baseline scores only)

(2) The positive or negative rating included for every school listed in this analysis was an average of total gains from baseline score to most recent score across all grades and subject areas. Successive cohorts were used for every calculation. For our schools in Baltimore and Chicago that had two primary means of accountability, we defaulted to the schools' performance on the state assessment to calculate their positive rating (although all four schools would have received positive ratings had we used the district assessment as well).

(3) There were seven schools that were no longer under Edison management as of the 2001–2002 school year, and as the text states, each of these had an average total gain that was positive as of the ending of the Edison partnership. (The scores for non-renewed contracts are available in previous annual reports.) The schools are listed below with the years in which they were under management in parentheses.

Carver Heights Elementary (1998–2001): positive
Dillard Junior Academy (2000–2001): Baseline Data Only
Dillingham Intermediate (1996–2000): positive
McNair Junior Academy (1999–2001): positive
Mid-Michigan Public School Academy (1996–2001): positive
Scobee Junior Academy (1999–2001): positive
Timberview Junior Academy (1999–2001): positive
Washington Elementary School (1995–2000): positive

Three of the schools listed above (McNair Junior Academy, Scobee Junior Academy, and Timberview Junior Academy) were schools-within-schools whose scores were disaggregated from the larger school population. Their scores were provided to us by the schools themselves but could not be independently verified by RAND.

APPENDIX C: SUBSTANTIAL GAINS

(1) As explained in Appendix A, the gains reflected in Exhibits 5 and 6 are systemwide summative figures calculated by averaging the average annualized gains across all schools across all grades and subject areas. Regardless of school size or number of years under Edison management, all schools are treated equally as far as weighting is concerned.

(2) All schools are included in the systemwide summaries reflected in Exhibits 5 and 6, except for the ones noted below: (The reasons behind their exclusion are enclosed in parentheses.)

Ann Lynch Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Cahlan Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Charles I. West Middle School (baseline scores only)
Community Academy Public Charter School (baseline scores only)
Crestwood Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences (15%+ enrollment change due to expansion)
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences—Medbury Campus (baseline scores only)
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Academy (early end to Edison partnership)
Edison-Ingalls Partnership School (early end to Edison partnership)
Edison-Isley Partnership School (early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter High School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter Middle School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Hope Community Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)
John S. Park Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Lincoln Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Mariana Bracetti Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)
Meek-Milton Primary Academy (no scores available)
Minnesota Institute of Technology (baseline scores only)
Mount Clemens Junior & Senior Academy (early end to Edison partnership)
Rolling Acres Edison (baseline scores only)
Ronnow Elementary School (baseline scores only)
Southeast Academy of Scholastic Excellence Public Charter School (baseline scores only)
Swift Creek-Edison Elementary School (15%+ enrollment change due to contraction)
The Edison Project-PPL School (15%+ enrollment change due to contraction)

(3) Four schools appear twice in this analysis—once in the CRT averages, and once in the NRT averages due to their dual means of accountability as stated in Appendix A. These schools are Chicago International Charter School—Longwood Campus and Edison’s three Baltimore schools (Gilmor, Templeton, and Montebello).

(4) In order to calculate the state and district averages in Exhibit 6, for every individual Edison school we compared district and state scores in the same timeframe and grade span as the Edison school. Thus, for a K–6 school in California opened from 2000–2002, we would examine the K–6 scores for the state and district from 2000–2002. Summative averages for the states and districts would be an average of their annualized average gains (and calculated in a means similar to how Edison’s individual annualized gain rates are determined). This resulted in states contributing to the summative state averages in direct proportion to the number of Edison schools in that state. We believe this is consistent, however, with

our treatment of the school as the individual unit of analysis. It also creates a more directly comparable average since due to different grade configurations and startup years, no one figure for a state would have accurately compared to our individual schools' performance. Similar to Edison's reported averages, state and district averages are averages of long-term successive cohort gains. Not all Edison schools had a directly comparable district or state average (for instance, Inkster schools where the three Edison schools ARE the entire district have no relevant district comparison).

(5) In the case of Thomas A. Edison Charter School (which is its own district), we used an adjacent district as its comparison (Colonial).

(6) States often report multiple levels of performance ranging from "Below Basic" or "Failing" to "Advanced" or "Exceeding Standards." Where this multiple level of data reporting is available, Edison examined the reduction in the percentage of students in the lowest category (i.e. "Failing," "Below Basic," "Level 4," etc.) from the baseline year to the most recent year. We then divided the total difference by the number of gain intervals (i.e. $n-1$ intervals for every n years of scores), and calculated summative averages by averaging all of these annualized averages per individual school (again with each school weighing the same).

(7) Not all schools with criterion-referenced assessments as their primary means of accountability have state assessments that report the data in a manner that would allow for calculation of the change in percentage of students in the lowest category. Therefore, there are only 42 sites with CRT scores that are included in this analysis.

APPENDIX D: GAINS BY COMPARISON SCHOOLS

(1) To find comparable schools, Edison used data downloaded from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for the 2000–2001 school year, which listed data for the districts (and all of the schools inside that district) where Edison schools are located. We then applied a blind sort that listed all schools within the district that fell within a $\pm 10\%$ band around the Edison school's Free and Reduced-Price Lunch (FRL) percentage AND that fell within a $\pm 10\%$ band around the Edison school's percentage of African-American and Hispanic students for the most recent year of data available from NCES. For example, if Edison school A had an FRL percentage of 60% and an African-American and Hispanic percentage of 70%, we considered a school in District A comparable if their FRL fell between 50–70% AND if their African-American and Hispanic percentage fell between 60–80%. Of the 66 schools included in this analysis, 75% of the 1,102 comparable schools fell within a $\pm 10\%$ bands of BOTH FRL and African-American and Hispanic percentages.

In order to increase the count and the number of comparison schools in the analysis (if there were no schools that fell within the $\pm 10\%$ of BOTH FRL and African-American and Hispanic percentages), we listed all schools that fell within a $\pm 10\%$ band of FRL only and whose minority percentage had a difference of less than 30% from the Edison school. In the example above, let's assume there were no schools in District A with both an FRL between 50–70% and an African-American and Hispanic percentage between 60–80%, but there was a school whose FRL fell between 50–70% and whose minority percentage was 55% (slightly out of the band)—this school would be included in the analysis.

Finally, if there were no schools that fell within the $\pm 10\%$ of BOTH FRL and African-American and Hispanic percentages, AND there were no schools that fell within a $\pm 10\%$ band of FRL only, then we listed all schools whose minority percentage was within a $\pm 10\%$ band AND whose FRL had a difference of less than 30% from the Edison school. Again, let's assume in the example above there were no schools in District A with an FRL between 50–70% and an African-American and Hispanic percentage between 60–80%, but there was a school whose minority percentage was between 60–80% and whose FRL was 45% (slightly out of the band)—this school would be included in the analysis.

(2) Only one school failed to register a comparable school match based on the above rules—Thomas Edison Charter School. Its comparable match was within the FRL range, but slightly above the 30 percent difference threshold. This comparable was included in the analysis.

(3) Illinois schools did not have FRL numbers listed. Their comparables were chosen primarily based on demographic matches within $\pm 10\%$ bands.

(4) Of the 112 sites listed in this report, only 66 schools were included in the comparable schools analysis. In some cases, the district or state did not provide data for comparable schools (i.e. Wichita schools). In other cases, our schools had only baseline accountability scores or no scores to report (i.e. Chester and Las Vegas schools). The schools excluded from the analysis are listed below with the reason for their exclusion listed in parentheses:

Ann Lynch Elementary School (baseline scores only)

Cahlan Elementary School (baseline scores only)

Charles I. West Middle School (baseline scores only)

Charter School for Applied Technologies (first-year elective scores only)

Chester High School (first-year elective scores only)

Chicago International Charter School (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Columbus Elementary School (first-year elective scores only)
 Community Academy Public Charter School (baseline scores only)
 Crestwood Elementary School (baseline scores only)
 Dayton View Academy (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences (15%+ enrollment change due to expansion)
 Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences (Medbury campus) (baseline scores only)
 Dodge-Edison Elementary School (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Academy (early end to Edison partnership)
 Edison-Friendship Collegiate Academy-Carter G. Woodson Campus (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Edison-Friendship Public Charter School-Blow Pierce Campus (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Edison-Friendship Public Charter School-Chamberlain Campus (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Edison-Friendship Public Charter School-Woodridge Campus (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Edison-Ingalls Partnership School (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Edison-Isley Partnership School (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 Granville Charter High School (no scores available as of Dec 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
 Granville Charter Middle School (no scores available as of Dec 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
 Granville Charter School (no scores available as of Dec 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
 Harriet Tubman Charter School (first-year elective scores only)
 Hope Community Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)
 Jefferson-Edison Elementary School (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 John S. Park Elementary School (baseline scores only)
 Lincoln Elementary School (baseline scores only)
 Main Street Edison Academy (first-year elective scores only)
 Mariana Bracetti Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)
 Meek-Milton Primary Academy (no scores available)
 Milwaukee Urban League Academy of Business and Economics (first-year elective scores only)
 Minnesota Institute of Technology (baseline scores only)
 Mount Clemens Junior & Senior Academy (early end to Edison partnership)
 Pulaski Middle School (first-year elective scores only)
 Rolling Acres Edison (baseline scores only)
 Ronnow Elementary School (baseline scores only)
 Showalter Middle School (first-year elective scores only)
 Smedley Middle School (first-year elective scores only)
 Southeast Academy of Scholastic Excellence Public Charter School (baseline scores only)
 Stepping Stone Academy Charter School (first-year elective scores only)
 Stetser Elementary School (first-year elective scores only)
 Swift Creek-Edison Elementary School (15%+ enrollment change due to contraction)
 The Dayton Academy (Individual district school scores not available as of Dec 15, 2002)
 The Edison Project-PPL School (15%+ enrollment change due to contraction)
 The Riverhead Charter School (first-year elective scores only)
 Wetherill Elementary School (first-year elective scores only)
 William Penn Elementary School (first-year elective scores only)

(5) The reported regression estimate did not control for ethnicity or socioeconomic factors. However, we have run the fixed-effects model controlling for those factors, and both proved to be insignificant, and therefore have not been included in the final reported model. The weighting variable used in the Weighted Least Squares was an inverse of the cluster size.

6) We also estimated the effect of Edison using a Two Stage Ordinary Least Squares procedure. In stage one we regressed the annualized gain score for each school (Edison and non-Edison) on a full set of fixed effects dummy variables, one for each comparison cluster. This stage provided coefficients estimating the mean difference of each cluster from the average annual gain of the entire sample, and the standard errors of each cluster's fixed effect. In a second stage, we then regressed on the un-standardized residuals from the first stage a single dummy variable designating schools as Edison or non-Edison. The regression was estimated with WLS weighting each comparison school by the inverse of the number of schools in the cluster. This two stage approach yielded coefficient estimates for the effect of Edison schools that are identical to those obtained using a single WLS model, and reported in the body of this report. The only difference with the Two Stage model is a slight increase in the standard errors of the Edison effects. The two-stage error estimates of the effect of Edison are, for the CRT model, s.e. = .345, $t = 5.839$; and for the NRT model, s.e. = .461, $t = 6.122$. The estimates in each model remain significant at the .000 level. In addition, we ran several models to explore the effects of having repeated comparison schools for different Edison schools within the same district. This occurs to a significant degree in only a handful of districts, but does cause a violation of the basic regression assumption of independent errors. Alternative specifications, for example, allowing for single district-wide effects instead of unique school effects, did not alter the magnitude or significance of the estimated Edison effects.

7) For complete model estimates of the final WLS models included in the report and the Two-Stage estimates discussed above, contact Edison's Vice President of Assessment, Tung Le, at tle@edisonschools.com.

APPENDIX E: THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

(1) The gain rates shown in Exhibit 10 are the average of the average annualized gain rates as detailed in prior appendices. Thus, gains were measured by averaging the long-term successive gain rates across all grades and subjects, with equal weight given to each individual school as the unit of analysis. State and district averages are calculated in a similar manner, and as expressed in prior appendices appear in proportional weight to the number of Edison schools located in that state/district.

(2) The schools included in this analysis are all Edison schools with African-American percentages over 90% as of the 2001–2002 academic year. The schools included in this analysis are listed below:

Baylor Woodson Elementary School
Blanchette Middle School
Charles R. Drew Charter School
Chester High School
Chicago International (ISAT)
Chicago International (ITBS)
Dayton View Academy
Detroit-Edison Public School Academy
Edison-Oakland Public School Academy
Edison-Perdue Academy
Flint Northwestern Community High School JA
Flint Northwestern Community High School SA
Friendship Edison—Carter G. Woodson
Friendship Edison—Blow Pierce
Friendship Edison—Chamberlain Campus
Friendship Edison—Woodridge Campus
Furman Templeton Elementary (CTBS)
Furman Templeton Elementary (MSPAP)
Garfield-Edison Partnership School
Gilmor Elementary (CTBS)
Gilmor Elementary (MSPAP)
Harriet Tubman Charter School—Learn Now
Inkster High School
M.U.L. Academy of Business & Economics
Martin Luther King, Jr.-Edison
Milwaukee Academy of Science
Montebello Elementary (CTBS)
Montebello Elementary (MSPAP)
New Covenant Charter School
Pulaski Middle
Riley-Edison
Schomburg Charter School
Smedley Middle School
Stepping Stone Academy Charter School
Stetser Elementary School
The Dayton Academy
Westport Edison Middle Academy
Westport Edison Senior Academy
Wetherill Elementary
William Penn Elementary
YMCA Service Learning Academy

As indicated, Edison's three Baltimore schools (Gilmor, Montebello, and Templeton) and its Chicago school are listed twice (once for NRT and once for CRT) because of their dual means of accountability as indicated elsewhere in this report.

Not all Edison schools had a directly comparable district and/or state average. Schools included in the analysis that did not have a comparable state and district are as follows (with the reasons for the lack of comparison in parentheses below):

Baylor Woodson Elementary School (the Inkster-Edison schools are the district, so there is no district comparison.)
Blanchette Middle School (the Inkster-Edison schools are the district, so there is no district comparison.)
Inkster High School (the Inkster-Edison schools are the district, so there is no district comparison.)
Friendship Edison—Carter G. Woodson Campus (No state or district data available as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Friendship Edison—Blow Pierce Campus (No state or district data available as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Friendship Edison—Chamberlain Campus (No state or district data available as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Friendship Edison—Woodridge Campus (No state or district data available as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Schomburg Charter School (No state or district data available as of Dec. 15, 2002)
Harriet Tubman Charter School (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Stepping Stone Academy (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
M.U.L. Academy of Business & Economics (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Chester High School (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Pulaski Middle School (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Smedley Middle School (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Wetherill Elementary (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Stetser Elementary School (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
William Penn Elementary (A first year school that was held accountable by Edison to an NRT that is not taken by the district or state. CRT results are baseline only.)
Chicago International (ITBS is the test of district accountability, but not the state, so there is no state comparison.)

(3) Schools with African-American percentages above 90% that were excluded from this analysis were excluded for similar reasons according to policy as indicated elsewhere in this report. The excluded schools are listed below with the reason for their exclusion in parentheses:

Edison-Ingalls Partnership School (early end to Edison partnership)
Edison-Isley Partnership School (early end to Edison partnership)
DAAS—Medbury Campus (baseline scores only)
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences (15%+ enrollment change due to expansion)
Meek-Milton Primary Academy (no scores available)
MIT Charter School (baseline scores only)
Granville Charter High School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter Middle School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Cahlan Elementary (baseline scores only)
Lincoln Elementary (baseline scores only)
Mariana Bracetti Academy Charter School (baseline scores only)

APPENDIX F: NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

(1) The schools used in this analysis consist of all Edison schools that were designated by their individual states as being on the “Needs Improvement” list as of the 2001–2002 year. The schools with that designation (controlled by individual states and not chosen by Edison) and included in this analysis are as follows:

Edison McNair Academy
Edison-Bethune Charter Academy
Starr King-Edison Academy
Martin Luther King, Jr.-Edison
Jefferson-Edison Elementary School
Boston Renaissance Charter School
Gilmor Elementary
Furman Templeton Elementary
Montebello Elementary
Williams-Edison Partnership School
Garfield-Edison Partnership School
Washington-Edison Partnership School
Wilson-Edison Partnership School
Southwestern Edison Jr. Academy
Baylor Woodson Elementary School
Blanchette Middle School
Edison-Titche Academy
Edison-Medrano Academy
Edison-Hernandez Academy
Edison-Maple Lawn Academy
Edison-Blair Academy
Edison-Henderson Academy

Not all Edison schools had a directly comparable district and/or state average. Schools included in the analysis that did not have a comparable state and district are as follows (with the reasons for the lack of comparison in parentheses below):

Jefferson-Edison Elementary School (Primary means of accountability not mandated by state, so there is no state comparison.)
Baylor Woodson Elementary School (the Inkster-Edison schools are the district, so there is no district comparison.)
Blanchette Middle School (the Inkster-Edison schools are the district, so there is no district comparison.)

(2) The only schools which were designated “Needs Improvement” by their particular state and that were excluded from this analysis were schools where comparison data to either the state or district was not available. Those schools are listed below, with the reason for their exclusion in parentheses:

Dodge-Edison Elementary School (NCLB’s designation is not the school’s primary means of accountability)
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Academy (early end to Edison partnership)

Mount Clemens JA (early end to Edison partnership)
Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences (15%+ enrollment change due to expansion)
DAAS—Medbury Campus (baseline scores only)
Granville Charter School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter Middle School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Granville Charter High School (no scores available as of Dec. 15,2002/early end to Edison partnership)
Ann Lynch Elementary (baseline scores only)
Ronnow Elementary (baseline scores only)
Columbus Elementary (baseline scores only)
Main Street Elementary/Middle (baseline accountability scores only)
Wetherill Elementary (baseline accountability scores only)
William Penn Elementary (baseline accountability scores only)
Stetser Elementary School (baseline accountability scores only)

(3) The gain rates shown in Exhibit 10 are the average of the average annualized gain rates as detailed in prior appendices. Thus, gains were measured by averaging the long-term successive gain rates across all grades and subjects, with equal weight given to each individual school as the unit of analysis. State and district averages are calculated in a similar manner, and as expressed in prior appendices appear in proportional weight to the number of Edison schools located in that state/district.