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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the 2015-16 academic year evaluation for the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship (FTC) program, as required by the Florida Statutes, s. 1002.395(9)(j). The tenth in a series of reports, this evaluation is the third of those conducted by the Florida State University Learning Systems Institute (LSI). This report provides a summary of key findings, details about test score collection, 2015-16 test score results of program participants, gain scores from 2014-15 to 2015-16 of program participants, school-level average gain scores for schools with at least 30 participating students, attributes of new program participants in 2015-16, and the performance of program participants who return to Florida public schools.

Similar to the several most recent reports, this report does not attempt to make direct comparisons between the performance of FTC students and public school students due to the difference in the tests that each group takes.

Pursuant to the Florida Statutes, s. 1002.395(9)(j), LSI was designated as the independent research organization and was directed to conduct annual evaluations of the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship program beginning in the year 2014. This report presents data collected by LSI for students participating in the 2015-16 academic year. The main findings include:

## Participating private school compliance with protocol:

- Compliance with program testing requirements was high in 2015-16. Participating private schools reported test scores for 95.6 percent of program participants in grades 3-10. This was comparable to the last year's score reporting ( 95.9 percent), which was the second-highest level of score reporting in program history. Compared to the last year, the percentage of students not enrolled during testing, because they either left before testing or arrived after testing at the school, was higher in 2015-16 at 2.2 percent. This rate was 0.4 percent last year. The percentage of missing/unusable tests was lower at 1.1 percent in 2015-16 compared to the last year's rate of 2.5 percent. The other categories of score reporting remained at levels comparable to those observed in recent years. The rate of unreported scores due to school closures or suspension from the program was 0.1 percent, the rate of sick or absent students was 0.6 percent, and the rate of students ineligible for testing was 0.3 percent.

Differential program participation rates for different groups of students and families:

- Newly participating FTC students in 2015-16 were more likely to be black, and less likely to be Hispanic or white than non-participant eligible students. Also, they were less likely to be English-language learners than were non-participants.

The share of new FTC students who were free-lunch eligible was somewhat higher than the share of free-lunch eligible, non-participant students. Lastly, compared to eligible non-participant students, new FTC students had poorer test performance both in English Language Arts (ELA) and math before entering the FTC program and they tended to come from lower-performing public schools.

- Former FTC students who returned to the public schools had poorer test performance in both reading and math during their last year in the FTC program, compared to FTC students who remained in the FTC program. Specifically, FTC students who returned to the public schools had scores at the $44.0^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and $41.8^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math, while FTC students who remained in the program scored at the $47.7^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the $46.3^{\text {rd }}$ national percentile in math.
- Former FTC students who returned to the public schools also had lower performance in both ELA and math during their first year back in the public schools, compared to low-income public school students who never participated in the FTC program. Former FTC students who returned to the public schools performed at the $41.2^{\text {nd }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and 39.0 th Florida percentile in math, while other subsidized-meal eligible public school students who never participated in the FTC program performed at the $46.4^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and $46.9^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in math.


## Test scores of program participants, 2015-16:

- FTC students scored at the $48^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the $46^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math. These scores are similar to previous years' scores.
- In terms of gains in national percentile ranking from 2014-15 to 2015-16, the typical FTC student tended to maintain his or her relative position in comparison with all students nationally both in math and reading. It is important to note that the FTC students are being compared to all students nationally, and not just students from low-income families.


## 1. BACKGROUND

This report details the 2015-16 academic year evaluation results of the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program, as required by the Florida Statutes, s. $1002.395(9)(j)$. The tenth in a series of reports, this evaluation is the third of those conducted by the Florida State University Learning Systems Institute. This report provides a summary of key findings, details about test score collection, 2015-16 test score results of program participants, gain scores from 2014-15 to 2015-16, test scores gains of individual schools with at least 30 or more students, attributes of new program participants in 2015-16, and the performance of program participants who return to Florida public schools. Similar to the four previous reports, this report also does not compare the performance of FTC students to public school students due to the difference in the tests that each group takes. While FTC students take a nationally norm-referenced test, public school students take the Florida Standards Assessments (FSA) Test. Because there is no correspondence between the FSA and the nationally norm-referenced tests that FTC students take, the independent research organization tasked with this evaluation, the Learning Systems Institute, holds that it is not valid to make these comparisons.

Pursuant to the Florida Statutes, s. 1002.395(9)(j), the Learning Systems Institute (LSI) has been directed to conduct annual evaluations of the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship program beginning in the year 2014. This report provides the results of the 2015-16 academic year evaluation of the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program.

## 2. TEST SCORE COLLECTION IN 2015-16

## Data collection protocol

As mandated by s. $1002.395(8)(\mathrm{c})(2)$, participating private schools administered a nationally norm-referenced test approved by the Florida Department of Education. The state designates an approved list of tests from which to choose: the ACT Aspire, Basic Achievement Skills Inventory, Comprehensive Testing Program, Curriculum Associates i-Ready Assessments, Educational Development Series, Iowa Assessments, Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Iowa Tests of Educational Development, Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, NWEA Measures of Academic Progress, Pivot INSPECT Summative Assessment, PSAT/NMSQT, Scantron Performance Series, Stanford Achievement Test, STAR, TerraNova, or Wide Range Achievement Test. Alternatively, participating students may be administered the FSA in accordance with 1002.395(7)(e).

Data collection took place during the year 2015-16, in which private schools sent students' test scores to the Learning Systems Institute. The 1,330 private schools that had participating students in grades 3 through 10 during the 2015-16 school year were contacted by the Learning Systems Institute in spring 2016 and again throughout spring and summer 2016 to encourage compliance with score reporting. Schools were provided a roster of participating FTC students, which was obtained in early spring 2016 from the Scholarship Funding Organizations. ${ }^{1}$ From the 1,330 private schools with participating FTC students, 43,270 students were enrolled in

[^0]grades 3 to 10, the grades mandated for testing per s. 1002.395(8)(c)(2). If schools had any missing or invalid student scores, they were instructed to provide an explanation backed by evidence, most commonly in the form of a notarized letter, for each missing or invalid student score.

## Participating private school compliance with protocol

## Score reporting in 2015-16

A large majority of schools were in compliance with test score reporting for the academic year 2015-16. Regarding test score submission, most schools sent photocopied test score sheets that had been scored by the testing company. In a small number of cases where tests had been scored by the schools or hand-scored, schools were instructed to send detailed test administration and scoring procedures. Throughout the spring and summer of 2016 the Learning Systems Institute followed up with schools who had sent invalid test score results, including missing or incomplete test scores.

Test score sheets were sent to the LSI where they were stored in a locked room. As test score data was received, two data entry staff members recorded students' test scores and test information on a spreadsheet saved to a secure password-protected server. The scores were then reconciled with the hard copy scores to ensure the highest accuracy. Score sheets were shredded after this doubleentry and reconciliation procedure as mandated by s. 1002.22(2)(d) of the Florida Statutes.

To obtain information about prior public schooling records, the electronic database of students' test scores, including information from student scholarship applications provided by the Scholarship Funding Organizations, was sent to the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) using its secured file share system. FTC student records were matched to FLDOE records in order to include information about students' FSA scores, public schooling history, free/reduced lunch status, limited English proficiency, and disability status. A unique FLDOE identification number replaced students' identifying information. The LDOE then returned via secure file share the matched and comparison data that were de-identified and stripped of any personal information. These de-identified data were then used for analysis.

There were 1,330 FTC participating schools with students in the relevant grades in 2015-16. The vast majority of the FTC participating schools provided evidence of test administration consistent with the specifications of the program. Three participating schools, serving 23 testing-eligible students, closed or did not participate in the program following the 2015-16 school year and hence did not provide test scores. Two schools, serving 24 students, did not administer tests to or report scores for any participating students ${ }^{2}$. There were 43,270 students in relevant grades participating in the FTC program in 2015-16. Valid, legible test scores were received for 41,372 FTC students, which represents 95.6 percent of all expected test scores received.

[^1]Table 1: Distribution of score reporting percentages: 2015-16 and prior years

|  | Academic year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 06-07 | 07-08 | 08-09 | 09-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 |
| Legible, valid scores received | 72.7 | 92.7 | 89.8 | 91.3 | 93.5 | 96.4 | 92.3 | 90.0 | 95.9 | 95.6 |
| Not enrolled at time of testing | 19.5 | 2.7 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 2.2 |
| Ineligible for testing | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| School closed/suspended | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Student sick/absent | 3.4 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Missing/unusable test | 2.5 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 7.9 | 2.5 | 1.1 |

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

The rate of legible, valid scores received was high in 2015-16. As seen in Table 1, private schools reported test scores for 95.6 percent of program participants in grades 3-10. This is comparable to the last year's score reporting ( 95.9 percent), which was the second-highest level of score reporting in program history. Compared to the last year, the percentage of students not enrolled during testing, because they either left before testing or arrived after testing at the school, was higher in 2015-16 at 2.2 percent. This rate was 0.4 percent last year. Compared with last year, the percentage of missing/unusable tests was lower at 1.1 percent in 2015-16 compared to the last year's rate which was 2.5 percent.

The other categories of score reporting remained at levels comparable to those observed in recent years. The rate of sick/absent students was 0.6 percent; the
share of students who were at schools that were closed or suspended from program participation was 0.1 percent. Lastly, 0.3 percent of students on the official roster were either deemed ineligible for test score reporting pursuant to $s$. $1002.395(8)(c)(2)$ or were not enrolled in the school identified on the official rosters.

Table 2: Distribution of percent and number of students with legible, valid scores: 2015-16 and prior years.

|  | Academic year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ \hline 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ \hline \hline 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2009- \\ 10 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ \hline 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2011- \\ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012- \\ 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2013- \\ 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2015- \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2015- \\ 16 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of students | 9,721 | 10,734 | 11,508 | 15,151 | 17,724 | 19,284 | 26,595 | 30,036 | 36,106 | 43,270 |
| Number of students with legible, valid scores | 7,067 | 9,949 | 10,333 | 13,829 | 16,575 | 18,583 | 24,534 | 27,020 | 34, 469 | 41,372 |
| Percent of students with legible, valid scores | 72.7 | 92.7 | 89.8 | 91.3 | 93.5 | 96.4 | 92.3 | 90.0 | 95.9 | 95.3 |

In 2015-16 the number of students in relevant grades participating in the program was the highest compared to previous years. As can be seen in Table 2, the number of enrolled students in relevant grades increased over the years and reached 43,270 in 2015-16. ${ }^{3}$

[^2]Comparison of students with legible, valid test scores to scholarship population

Although the rate of successful score reporting was high in 2015-16 at 95.6 percent, there were about 4 percent of students whose expected scores were not received. Thus, it was still important to examine whether the students whose test scores were successfully reported are comparable to the population enrolled in 201516.

For this analysis, we used data from the families' scholarship applications. We found differences between students whose test scores were successfully reported and those whose scores were not successfully reported in terms of their family incomes, their parents' marital status, their gender and race. This finding was consistent with previous years' findings. As in previous years, students whose scores were successfully reported come from families with higher incomes (averaging $\$ 28,207$ versus $\$ 24,358$ ) and with parents more likely to be married (46.2 percent versus 34.4 percent). Moreover, students whose scores were successfully reported were more likely to be white (55.2 percent) and female (51.6 percent), compared to students with no test scores (44.3 percent white and 47.9 percent female). We cannot make any claims about whether students with missing test scores would have had higher or lower gain scores than those with test scores available.

## 3. TEST SCORES OF FTC STUDENTS IN 2015-16

We reported test scores in the form of national percentile rankings as in previous years' reports. There was variation in the test administered by schools and the time of the year it is administered as reported in the previous section. Reporting test scores as national percentile rankings is common practice to ensure reasonable comparability across schools and program participants. There is no inherent bias associated with comparing the national percentile rankings of students taking different tests since the national percentile rankings indicates a student's performance compared to a nationally-representative group of students. Thus, reporting test scores in the form of national percentile rankings provides a common metric across different tests taken by students. Another advantage of using national percentile ranking is the ability to compare this year's test scores of program participants to the test scores of FTC students in previous years.

Figure 1 presents the basic distribution of national percentile rankings of FTC students participating in the program in 2015-16. Most of the students were in the middle of the test score distributions. The average national percentile ranking for FTC students was $48^{\text {th }}$ percentile in reading and $46^{\text {th }}$ percentile in math in 2015-16. In other words, the typical student in the FTC program scored at the $48^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the $46^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math.


Average national percentile rankings in 2015-16 were very similar to national percentile rankings observed in prior years for both reading and math. In fact, since 2006-07, the average national percentile rankings varied by about one percentile point in reading and less than one percentile point in math over the years including 2015-16.

## Average test scores in 2015-16 by attributes of program participants

We provided a breakdown of test scores of 2015-16 program participants by race/ethnicity, sex, and family income. Family income is expressed in terms of likely eligibility for federal free or reduced lunch program based upon self-reported income
collected from the Scholarship Funding Organizations (SFOs) ${ }^{4}$. Students from families who have incomes below 130 percent of the federal poverty line are eligible for free school meals, while those from families with incomes between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty line are eligible for reduced-price meals.

As seen in Figure 2, white participants had higher mean national percentile rankings than black and Hispanic participants. While mean national percentile rankings of males and females were not different in math, females tended to perform better than males did in reading. Lastly, relatively higher-income families tended to score better than relatively lower-income families. These figures were similar to the figures reported in previous years.


[^3]
## 4. GAIN SCORES FROM 2014-15 TO 2015-16

## Test score gains for FTC students

Test score gains for FTC students are calculated as required by $s$. 1002.395(9)(j). Gain scores can be interpreted as changes in national percentile rankings for program participants from 2014-15 to 2015-16 since test scores in both years are measured in terms of national percentile rankings. We should note that this analysis is vulnerable to ceiling effects (where students whose percentile rankings were high in 2014-15 cannot gain much more) and floor effects (where students whose percentile rankings were low in 2014-15 cannot lose much more ground). Ceiling and floor effects were of less concern for students whose initial national percentile ranking falls in the middle portions of the initial test score distributions, which was the case for the majority of students participating in the FTC Scholarship Program.

Gain scores were calculated for 25,107 FTC students with legible reading scores and 25,064 FTC students with legible math scores in both 2014-15 and 201516. The mean gain score for FTC students was 0.5 national percentile ranking points in reading and -0.8 national percentile ranking points in math. This means that the typical FTC student tended to maintain his or her relative position in comparison with others nationwide. It is important to note that these national comparisons pertain to all students nationally, and not just students from low-income families. However, we cannot make any claims about whether gain scores of FTC students would have been
higher or lower if they were compared against only students from low-income families nationally.


Gain scores for 2015-16 were similar to previous years' gain scores which ranged from -1.2 to 0.0 for reading and from -2.4 to 0.0 for math between 2008-09 to 2014-15. Moreover, as was the case in previous years, considerable variation in individual student gain scores was observed in 2015-16 as well (see Figure 3). Between 2014-15 and 2015-16, 11.3 percent of program participants in reading and 10.4 percent of participants in math gained more than 20 percentile points relative to the nation and 11.1 percent of participants lost 20 or more percentile points in reading and 13.3 percent in math. This suggests that, while some FTC students gained
considerable ground relative to peers nationally, other FTC students lost considerable ground relative to national peers.

## School-level differences in average gain scores, 2014-15 to 2015-16

We calculated average gain scores from 2014-15 to 2015-16 at the school level as well. As mentioned in the preceding section, there was considerable variation in gain scores of individual students. Both individual level differences and school level differences contributed to this variation. By using gain scores aggregated to the school level, we examined the variation in gain scores across schools. It is important to note that observed between-school variation doesn't reflect "true" school-level differences since noise in individual test scores is still manifested as part of the school-level average gain scores. That said, examining school-level variation still provides further insights about the distribution of school gain scores.


At the school level, the distribution of average gain scores was concentrated in the middle of the distribution (see Figure 4). The percent of schools with observed average gains of -20 percentile points or below was 2.6 percent for reading and 3.7 percent for math. These figures were 11.1 percent and 13.3 percent, respectively, at the individual-level. Similarly, 2.7 percent of schools had observed average gains of 20 percentile points or above in reading, and 2.9 percent of schools have observed average gains of 20 percentile points or above in math. This contrasted with 11.3 percent and 10.4 percent, respectively, of individual-level gains. As expected, much of the observed variability in gain scores was at the individual level.


The degree to which school-average gains reflect "true" school effects rather than noise increases as the number of students in the school increases. Hence, we looked at the same distribution this time only including schools with more than ten students. As can be seen in Figure 5, school-average gain scores became more compressed. The percent of schools with observed average gains of -20 percentile points or below was only 0.7 percent in reading and 0.8 percent in math. At the top of the average score distribution, the percent of schools with observed average gains of 20 percentile points or above was only 0.3 percent in reading and 0.2 percent in math.

Although the distribution of average gain scores for schools that had more than 10 students were more compressed, there still existed considerable betweenschool variation. The percent of schools with observed average gains of -10 percentile points or lower was 4.3 percent in reading and 7.2 percent in math. At the top of the average score distribution, 4.0 percent of these schools had average reading gain scores higher than 10 percentile points. This figure was 3.7 percent for math. These findings suggest that there was a non-trivial between-school variability in the average gain scores, although it was not "true" school-level differences as a result of noise due to small sample sizes at the school level.

## Individual school average gain scores, 2014-15 to 2015-16

We calculated average gain scores for schools with 30 or more participating students as required by the relevant Florida statutes. It is important to note that average gain scores are not a definitive measure of a school's performance. They only serve as one among many other indicators of a school's performance.

The average gain score for a school in a single year is typically a less precise measure of a school's contribution to student test scores. This measure is less reliable for schools where a small number of students contribute to the average school gain score. As the number of students gets smaller in a given school, the likelihood increases that the average gain score will be less precise. Examining average gain scores only for schools with 30 or more participating students increased the likelihood of getting a more precise measure of average gain scores of individual schools.

In addition to the average gain scores for 2014-2015, we also calculated average gain scores over three years from 2013-14 through 2015-16. This added extra observations for schools and hence provided more accurate average gain scores for individual schools. Moreover, school gain scores calculated by a three-year moving average of gain scores is less likely driven by "regression to the mean" compared to one-year average gain scores. Regression to the mean is the phenomenon that if a variable, such as a test score, is extreme on its first measurement, it will tend to be closer to the average on its second measurement and, if it is extreme on its second measurement, it will tend to have been closer to the average on its first. In this context, if a school had particularly high average scores in 2014-15, it is likely to observe a negative average gain score for that school in 201516. On the other hand, if a school had particularly low average scores in 2014-15, it is likely to observe a positive average gain score in 2015-16 for that school. Using average gain scores across the last three years balance out particularly positive and particularly negative scores over time, and thus helps to lessen the likelihood of making faulty inferences driven by regression to the mean. The risk of having faulty observed results due to regression to the mean is another reason to treat one-year average gain scores for individual schools extremely cautiously.

Average gain scores for the 283 schools that submitted valid test scores for 30 or more students in both 2014-15 and 2015-16 are reported in the Appendix. Gain scores are reported for reading, math, and combined reading and math (by averaging schools' average reading and math scores) for 2015-16 as well as for the last three years' average. Since a three-year moving average is a more reliable measure of a
school's average gain scores than one year's gain scores, we based inferences on the three-year average gain scores. We identified schools with average gain scores that are statistically distinguishable from zero (at the 95 percent confidence level in a twotailed test). We highlighted the cells if the three years average gain score-either positively or negatively-was statistically significant from zero.

When interpreting gain scores based on national percentiles, one should keep in mind that an average gain score of zero means that, on average, students in that school are maintaining their position relative to the national average. It doesn't mean that students in that school are not gaining. If a school has statistically positive average gain, it means that, on average, students in that school improved their position relative to the national average (with $95 \%$ certainty). If a school has statistically negative average gain, it means that, on average, students in that school worsened their position relative to the national average (with 95\% certainty).

## 5. ATTRIBUTES OF NEW PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS IN 2015-16

Previous reports revealed that newly participating FTC students tended to be lower achieving and more disadvantaged than students who were eligible for the program but did not participate. We examined attributes of new FTC students in 2015-16 in order to see whether they were systematically different from eligible nonparticipant students before participating in the FTC program in 2015-16 as well.

In order to make plausible comparisons among students who spent the 201415 academic year in Florida public schools, we compared students who entered the FTC Scholarship Program in 2015-16 versus subsidized school meal eligible students
who did not enter the program in that year but stayed free or reduced-price lunch eligible in 2015-16. We excluded students with disabilities who could participate in the McKay Scholarship Program. We limited the analysis to students who had taken either a reading or math test in public school in 2014-15. We also restricted analysis to students who would be in grade 10 or below in 2015-16.5. With these criteria, we compared 3,701 new students in the FTC Scholarship program in 2015-16 versus 744,139 students who remained in the public schools and continued on subsidized school lunches in 2015-16. We used Florida Department of Education records for these comparisons.

## Comparison of characteristics of new FTC students and non-participant

## students

Newly participating FTC students in 2015-16 were more likely to be black, and less likely to be Hispanic or white than students who were eligible but did not participate as seen in Figure 6. Also, they were less likely to be English-language learners than were non-participants. While both new FTC students and nonparticipant students were eligible for subsidized lunch in the 2014-15 school year, the share of new FTC students who were free-lunch eligible was somewhat higher than the share of free-lunch eligible, non-participant students. Lastly, compared to eligible non-participant students, new FTC students had poorer test performance both in ELA and math before entering the FTC program.

[^4]Figure 6: Comparison of prior year characteristics of new FTC students to "income


## Comparison of new FTC students and non-participant students in terms of

 performance of their schools in 2014-15In Florida, each school is assigned a school grade (A-F) based on student performance. We compared new FTC students and eligible non-participant students in terms of the performance of the schools that they attended in the 2014-15 school year. We observed that students who entered the FTC program in 2015-16 came from lower-performing schools. On a scale of A-F, with A being the highest performing schools, 19.4 percent of new FTC students were in schools graded "A", before
attending a school in the FTC program, while 27.1 percent of eligible non-participant students were in schools graded "A" in the 2014-15 school year. At the other end of the spectrum, 25.6 percent of new FTC students were in schools graded "D" or "F", as compared with 16.8 percent of eligible non-participant students who were in schools graded "D" or "F" (see Figure 7).


Comparison of new FTC students and non-participant students within their schools in terms of performance in 2014-15

We also examined new FTC students' performance relative to eligible nonparticipant students in their own schools before entering the FTC program. In the
previous years, FTC students were more likely to be low performing students in their schools before attending the program regardless of the performance of the school that they were in. A similar pattern was observed this year with the exception that a more balanced distribution was observed at the bottom fifth of the score distribution (see Figure 8). The percent of new FTC students and non-participating students in the bottom fifth of their prior public school's ELA FSA test score distribution was comparable at 23.2 percent and 23.7 percent, respectively. At the top fifth of the distribution, as observed in the previous years, the percentage of new FTC students was lower (12.6 percent) compared to non-participating students (15.3 percent).


For the math FSA test score distribution; 22.1 percent of new FTC students were in the bottom fifth of their prior public school's math distribution, while 23.4 percent of non-participating eligible students were in the bottom fifth of the
distribution. At the top of the math test score distribution, 13.8 percent of new FTC students were in the top fifth of the distribution, as compared with 15.9 percent of eligible non-participating students in the top fifth of the distribution (see Figure 9).

Figure 9: Comparison by quintile of new FTC students in 2015-16 to eligible nonparticipant students of school math FSA score distribution


Findings regarding the attributes of new program participants suggest that new FTC students in 2015-16 - compared to free-lunch eligible, non-participant students- were relatively more disadvantaged and lower-performing prior to entering the FTC program. Moreover, they were more likely to come from low performing public schools and less likely to be high performing students in their prior public schools before attending the program. This observation has not changed over time as similar figures were observed in the previous program reports.

## 6. PERFORMANCE OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS WHO RETURN TO FLORIDA

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In this section we compared FTC students who returned to public schools in 2015-16 after participating in the FTC program to those who remained in the FTC program in 2015-16. We also compared program returnees to Florida public school students who never left the public schools. It is important to note that one cannot make any claims about the effects of participation in the FTC program based on these comparisons, as there are likely factors beyond FTC participation that may influence students' performance. These comparisons only provide additional insights about the performance of the students who participate in the FTC program.

## Comparison of 2014-15 performance of public school returnees and FTC

 stayers in 2015-16We first compared FTC students who returned to the public school system in Florida in 2015-16 versus those who remained in private schools under the FTC program in terms of their national norm-referenced test performance in 2014-15. The typical student who left the program scored at the $44.0^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and $41.8^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math in 2014-15 while the typical FTC student who remained in the program in 2015-16 scored at the $47.7^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the $46.3^{\text {rd }}$ national percentile in math (See Figure 10).


This finding can be an understatement of the difference between these two groups, since all students who remained in the FTC program were still income-eligible to participate while some students who left the program may not meet eligibility criteria anymore in 2015-16. In order to have more comparable groups in terms of income range, we limited the public school returnees to those participating in the National School Lunch Program in 2015-16. We found that the average returnee who is free/reduced lunch eligible in 2015-16 scored at the 42.7 th national percentile in reading and scored at $40.5^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math in 2014-15, somewhat lower than the performance of all returnees as expected.

These findings suggest that as lower-performing public school students are more likely to leave public schools to attend a private school under the FTC program, FTC students who struggle in private schools are somewhat more likely to return to the public schools. This is consistent with previous years' observations.

## Comparison of 2015-16 FSA performance of public school returnees and low

 income public school studentsNext, we compared performance of FTC students who returned to the public schools and the performance of subsidized-meal eligible public school students who never participated in the FTC program. As can be seen in Figure 11, FTC program participants who return to the public schools performed worse on the FSA than did other subsidized-meal recipients who never participated in the FTC program. The difference is particularly large for FTC returnees in 2015-16, who performed at the $41.2^{\text {nd }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and 39.0 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in math while public school students who never participated in the FTC program performed at the $46.4^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and 46.9th Florida percentile in math in 2015-16.

Figure 11: 2015-16 FSA performance of FTC students returning to public schools in Florida


As we mentioned before, based on these comparisons one cannot make any claims about the effects of participation in the FTC program since evidence suggests that FTC students who returned to the public schools in 2015-16 and public school students who never participated in the FTC program represent two different populations of students. Findings indicated that poorly performing public school students are more likely to participate in the program in the first place. Moreover, FTC students who return to public schools tend to be those who are performing worse than the average FTC student. Based on these observations, we cannot associate poor performance of FTC returnees with possible negative effects of the FTC program on participating students.

## 7. CONCLUSION

This report shares findings on the compliance and performance of private schools that participated in the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program in 2015-16. Compliance with program testing requirements was high in 2015-16. Private schools reported test scores for 95.6 percent of program participants in grades 3-10.

FTC students scored at the $48^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the $46^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math in 2015-16. These scores were similar to previous years' scores. In terms of gain in national percentile ranking points from 2014-15 to 201516, the typical FTC student tended to maintain his or her relative position in comparison with all students nationally both in math and reading. It is important to note that these national comparisons pertain to all students nationally, and not just students from low-income families. However, we cannot make any claims about whether gain scores of FTC students would have been higher or lower if they were compared against only students from low-income families nationally.

There was considerable variation in individual student gain scores. While some FTC students gained considerable ground relative to peers nationally, other FTC students lost considerable ground relative to national peers. Similarly, in examining average gain scores at the school level, there was considerable variation across the schools participating in the FTC program.

As in prior years, lower-performing public school students eligible for the FTC program were more likely to attend a private school under the FTC program and FTC students who struggle in these schools were more likely to return to the public
schools. FTC students who returned to the public schools in Florida had substantially lower test scores than other subsidized-meal eligible public school students who never participated in the FTC program. However, based on the available evidence, poor performance of FTC returnees cannot be associated with possible negative effects of the FTC program on participating students. Given selection of students into and out of the FTC program, the former FTC students who returned to public schools would have been expected to perform more poorly than the typical low-income public school students.

## APPENDIX

Appendix Table: Average gain scores in 2015-16 and three-year moving average of gain scores from 2013-14 to 2015-16 for schools with 30 or more students with gain scores in 2015-16.

Notes: Cells report average gain scores. We shade cells where the difference between an individual school's three year moving average gain score is statistically significant from the national average (at the 95 percent confidence interval).

These school-level gain scores are not intended to be a comprehensive analysis of school performance.
As noted in the main body of this report, average gain scores are not a definitive measure of a school's performance. They only serve as one among many other indicators of a school's performance. The average gain score for a school in a single year is typically a less precise measure of a school's contribution to student test scores. This measure is less reliable for schools where a small number of students contribute to the average school gain score. As the number of students gets smaller in a given school, the likelihood increases that the average gain score will be less precise. For this reason, we also compute the threeyear moving average gain score. However, when interpreting gain scores based on national percentiles, one should keep in mind that an average gain score of zero means that, on average, students in that school are maintaining their position relative to the national average. It doesn't mean that students in that school are not gaining.

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Abundant Life Christian Academy | Margate | 78 | 206 | 1.12 | 2.76 | -0.53 | 1.85 | 3.69 | 0.01 |
| Academy Prep <br> Center Of St. <br> Petersburg | Saint Petersburg | 58 | 165 | -1.99 | -1.12 | -2.86 | 3.58 | 3.84 | 3.32 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Academy Prep Center Of Tampa Inc. | Tampa | 70 | 207 | 0.71 | 2.03 | -0.60 | 0.77 | 1.28 | 0.25 |
| Adventure Christian Academy | Tavares | 30 | 52 | -9.28 | -9.10 | -9.47 | -6.25 | -5.63 | -6.87 |
| Agape Christian Academy | Orlando | 58 | 150 | 7.56 | -0.91 | 12.93 | 2.10 | -0.67 | 3.49 |
| Alazhar School | Tamarac | 69 | 178 | 0.35 | -3.18 | 4.64 | 0.21 | -1.43 | 2.16 |
| Aletheia Christian Academy | Pensacola | 36 | 65 | 2.11 | 2.50 | 1.81 | -1.22 | -0.24 | -2.25 |
| Altamonte Christian School | Altamonte Springs | 44 | 80 | 0.17 | -1.12 | 1.82 | 1.14 | 1.26 | 1.34 |
| American Christian School Art Center | Hialeah | 52 | 139 | -8.82 | -10.22 | -7.81 | 5.69 | 6.14 | 5.18 |
| American Youth Academy Inc. | Tampa | 136 | 328 | 0.28 | 0.91 | -0.35 | 10.42 | 10.39 | 10.48 |
| Annunciation Catholic School | Middleburg | 37 | 62 | -3.99 | -6.19 | -1.78 | -2.94 | -5.71 | -0.16 |
| Annunciation School | Hollywood | 56 | 132 | -0.91 | 1.41 | -3.23 | -1.66 | -0.79 | -2.53 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BETWEEN } \\ & \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ & \text { 2015-16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Archbishop Curley/Notre Dame High School | Miami | 83 | 224 | 0.20 | 0.94 | -0.70 | -3.91 | -3.39 | -4.52 |
| Archbishop Edward <br> A. Mccarthy High School | Southwest Ranches | 30 | 30 | 2.57 | -0.20 | 5.33 | 2.57 | -0.20 | 5.33 |
| Arlington Country Day School | Jacksonville | 37 | 99 | 3.16 | 2.61 | 3.58 | 2.92 | 3.18 | 2.82 |
| Atlantic Christian Academy Of The Palm Beach | West Palm Beach | 54 | 84 | -0.79 | -0.30 | -1.28 | 0.28 | -0.33 | 0.89 |
| Baptist Temple School | Orlando | 38 | 67 | 2.41 | -0.24 | 4.89 | 4.03 | 1.15 | 6.84 |
| Berean Christian School | West Palm Beach | 63 | 141 | -1.72 | -1.93 | -1.94 | 0.06 | 0.91 | -0.93 |
| Beryl Wisdom Adventist School | Orlando | 34 | 53 | -8.68 | -12.56 | -4.79 | -5.15 | -6.58 | -3.72 |
| Betesda Christian School | Opa-locka | 54 | 149 | 4.83 | 4.20 | 5.46 | 0.71 | -0.21 | 1.64 |
| Beth Jacob High School Inc. | North Miami Beach | 75 | 151 | -5.80 | -3.72 | -7.77 | -4.14 | -3.24 | -4.98 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ \text { 2015-16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Bethany Christian School | West <br> Melbourne | 34 | 60 | 3.10 | 1.18 | 5.03 | 2.26 | 2.62 | 1.90 |
| Bishop John J. <br> Snyder High School | Jacksonville | 32 | 52 | 1.03 | 1.66 | 0.41 | -0.63 | 0.63 | -1.88 |
| Bishop Kenny High School | Jacksonville | 45 | 111 | -2.78 | -0.82 | -4.73 | 0.34 | 1.21 | -0.52 |
| Bishop Moore Catholic High School | Orlando | 40 | 40 | -2.95 | 0.33 | -6.23 | -2.95 | 0.33 | -6.23 |
| Blessed Trinity | Ocala | 88 | 213 | -2.48 | -1.05 | -3.92 | -2.24 | -1.95 | -2.52 |
| Blessed Trinity <br> Catholic | Jacksonville | 33 | 56 | 3.92 | 5.73 | 2.12 | 1.26 | -0.07 | 2.59 |
| Boca Raton Christian School | Boca Raton | 75 | 75 | 0.37 | 1.80 | -1.54 | 0.37 | 1.80 | -1.54 |
| Bradenton Christian School | Bradenton | 63 | 146 | 0.61 | -0.67 | 1.89 | -1.05 | -2.51 | 0.42 |
| Bridge To Independence Inc. | Orlando | 33 | 92 | -10.41 | -9.97 | -11.19 | -6.64 | -4.17 | -8.89 |
| Brito Miami Private School | Miami | 58 | 155 | -0.25 | -0.59 | -0.04 | 1.86 | 0.89 | 2.81 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Broward Junior Academy | Plantation | 76 | 192 | -0.34 | -0.17 | -0.51 | -3.79 | -6.56 | -1.02 |
| Brush Arbor Christian School | Orlando | 61 | 173 | -0.87 | -0.41 | -0.49 | -0.50 | 0.16 | -0.87 |
| Calvary Chapel Academy | West <br> Melbourne | 60 | 136 | -5.39 | -7.48 | -3.00 | -1.93 | -2.06 | -1.59 |
| Calvary Christian Academy | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 102 | 223 | -4.26 | -1.65 | -6.68 | -2.84 | -1.57 | -4.04 |
| Calvary Christian Academy | Fort Walton Beach | 32 | 53 | 0.05 | 3.81 | -3.72 | 0.08 | 2.66 | -2.51 |
| Calvary Christian Academy | Ormond Beach | 47 | 149 | 0.79 | -3.28 | 4.51 | 1.29 | 0.99 | 1.42 |
| Candlelight Christian Academy | Lake Wales | 50 | 132 | 3.50 | 4.34 | 2.66 | 1.03 | 0.39 | 1.66 |
| Cardinal Gibbons High School | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 47 | 70 | 11.53 | 13.02 | 10.60 | 9.34 | 10.40 | 8.59 |
| Cedar Creek Christian School | Jacksonville | 57 | 128 | -0.18 | 2.07 | -2.54 | -1.87 | -1.87 | -1.94 |
| Cedar Hills Baptist Christian School | Jacksonville | 45 | 115 | -1.72 | -1.47 | -1.98 | 1.18 | 1.62 | 0.75 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Central Baptist Christian School | Brandon | 51 | 83 | -0.29 | 2.16 | -2.75 | -2.73 | 0.29 | -5.76 |
| Central Florida Christian Academy | Orlando | 34 | 62 | 1.97 | 5.24 | -1.29 | 2.33 | 6.16 | -1.50 |
| Central Pointe Christian Academy | Kissimmee | 97 | 135 | 1.34 | 3.98 | -1.31 | -0.37 | 1.01 | -1.76 |
| Champagnat Catholic School Of Hialeah | Hialeah | 57 | 163 | -2.83 | -1.63 | -4.36 | 4.54 | 6.33 | 3.08 |
| Children's Rainbow Dayschool Academy | Goulds | 51 | 121 | -2.95 | -0.67 | -5.24 | -0.57 | 1.66 | -2.79 |
| Christ The King Catholic | Jacksonville | 30 | 55 | 2.35 | 0.13 | 4.57 | -2.38 | -6.47 | 1.71 |
| Christ-Mar Private School | Hialeah | 30 | 92 | -18.38 | -17.76 | -18.27 | -2.87 | -3.71 | -1.79 |
| Christian Heritage Academy | Jacksonville | 44 | 69 | -0.80 | 1.48 | -3.07 | -0.12 | 1.33 | -1.58 |
| Christopher Columbus High School | Miami | 34 | 59 | 8.81 | 11.18 | 6.44 | -1.38 | 0.73 | -3.49 |
| Citrus Park Christian School | Tampa | 38 | 62 | -0.51 | -5.32 | 3.37 | 0.70 | -2.49 | 3.37 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> $2013-14$ AND <br> $2015-16 ~$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| City Of Life Christian <br> Academy | Kissimmee | 88 | 253 | -1.45 | 3.45 | -6.36 | -2.54 | -1.01 | -4.05 |
| Classical Christian <br> School For The Arts <br> Inc | Pinellas Park | 46 | 46 | 1.01 | -0.37 | 2.39 | 1.01 | -0.37 | 2.39 |
| Colonial Christian <br> School | Homestead | 65 | 171 | 3.33 | 3.06 | 3.60 | 2.40 | 2.33 | 2.46 |
| Community <br> Christian Academy | Stuart | 30 | 63 | -6.27 | -5.53 | -7.00 | -3.04 | -1.98 | -4.10 |
| Community <br> Christian Learning <br> Center | Apopka | 42 | 132 | 2.37 | 2.67 | -0.74 | 1.56 | 1.46 | 0.90 |
| Community <br> Christian School | Bradenton | 39 | 64 | -4.77 | 2.51 | -12.05 | -3.53 | 1.94 | -9.00 |
| Community <br> Christian School | Port <br> Charlotte | 81 | 182 | -0.31 | -0.50 | -0.22 | -2.45 | 0.12 | -5.05 |
| Coral Springs <br> Christian Academy | Coral Springs | 37 | 95 | -3.00 | -3.32 | -2.68 | -3.86 | -2.69 | -5.06 |
| Cornerstone <br> Christian School | Dunedin | 34 | 62 | 1.69 | 0.38 | 3.00 | 1.52 | 1.98 | 1.06 |
| Covenant Christian <br> School | Palm Bay | 47 | 139 | -1.90 | -0.11 | -3.70 | -3.50 | -1.74 | -5.26 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Cutler Ridge Christian Academy | Miami | 42 | 42 | 1.13 | 0.98 | 1.29 | 1.13 | 0.98 | 1.29 |
| Deltona Christian School | Deltona | 33 | 52 | -13.50 | -11.79 | -15.21 | -7.66 | -5.37 | -9.96 |
| Downey Christian School | Orlando | 57 | 94 | 3.56 | 5.00 | 2.12 | 1.62 | 2.23 | 1.01 |
| Dr. John A. Mckinney Christian Academy | Miami | 40 | 75 | -7.46 | -3.74 | -11.13 | -2.43 | -0.93 | -3.85 |
| Eastland Christian School | Orlando | 88 | 210 | -5.76 | -4.31 | -7.33 | -2.87 | -2.60 | -3.16 |
| Edison Private School | Hialeah | 144 | 322 | 0.79 | -1.96 | 3.54 | 0.66 | -0.56 | 1.87 |
| Elfers Christian School | New Port Richey | 56 | 170 | 1.74 | 2.71 | 0.77 | 3.82 | 2.88 | 4.58 |
| Esprit De Corps Center For Learning | Jacksonville | 36 | 123 | 2.93 | 1.25 | 4.61 | -0.97 | -0.85 | -1.09 |
| Evangelical Christian | Fort Myers | 31 | 56 | 2.13 | 3.06 | 1.19 | 1.99 | 2.95 | 1.04 |
| Faith Christian Academy | Orlando | 117 | 318 | -1.75 | -1.88 | -1.62 | 0.70 | 0.97 | 0.43 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Faith Lutheran School | Hialeah | 31 | 107 | 2.81 | -1.45 | 7.06 | 3.36 | 1.54 | 5.18 |
| Faith Outreach Academy | Tampa | 45 | 137 | 6.29 | 5.87 | 6.71 | 1.37 | 2.25 | 0.49 |
| Family Christian Center School Clermont | Clermont | 39 | 39 | -3.08 | -4.97 | -1.18 | -3.08 | -4.97 | -1.18 |
| Father Lopez High School | Daytona Beach | 47 | 78 | -4.91 | -4.17 | -5.66 | -5.49 | -6.32 | -4.65 |
| First AcademyLeesburg | Leesburg | 48 | 122 | 1.36 | 1.42 | 1.31 | -0.58 | -2.09 | 1.24 |
| First Assembly Christian School Daycare | Ocala | 72 | 154 | 3.24 | 3.91 | 3.30 | 0.77 | 1.92 | -0.08 |
| First Baptist Christian Academy | Bunnell | 40 | 55 | 0.25 | -0.20 | 0.70 | 0.14 | 2.00 | -1.73 |
| First Coast Christian School | Jacksonville | 112 | 294 | -0.01 | 0.38 | -0.41 | -1.41 | 0.02 | -2.84 |
| Forest City S.D.A. | Orlando | 54 | 54 | 4.03 | 4.78 | 3.17 | 4.03 | 4.78 | 3.17 |
| Forest Lake Academy | Apopka | 59 | 101 | -3.82 | -1.88 | -5.76 | -1.80 | 0.81 | -4.41 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Forest Lake <br> Education Center | Longwood | 91 | 238 | -2.52 | -1.96 | -3.08 | -0.21 | -0.26 | -0.30 |
| Foundation Academy | Jacksonville | 44 | 70 | -6.05 | -7.14 | -5.47 | -1.49 | -0.64 | -2.52 |
| Foundation Christian Academy | Valrico | 30 | 55 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 0.80 | -0.26 | 2.60 | -3.13 |
| Garden Of The Sahaba Academy | Boca Raton | 52 | 133 | 2.73 | 5.23 | 0.33 | -0.56 | 1.74 | -2.83 |
| Glendale Christian School | Vero Beach | 30 | 52 | -1.73 | 0.60 | -4.07 | -0.38 | 1.21 | -1.96 |
| Good Shepherd Catholic School | Orlando | 49 | 124 | 1.02 | 2.10 | -0.06 | 0.74 | 1.29 | 0.19 |
| Good Shepherd School | Miami | 49 | 78 | -0.45 | 2.27 | -3.18 | -2.13 | -0.94 | -3.37 |
| Grace Academy International Central | Miami | 30 | 54 | -2.63 | -1.50 | -3.77 | 1.17 | 2.46 | -0.13 |
| Grace Christian Schools Of Pasco | Hudson | 33 | 58 | -1.44 | 1.45 | -4.33 | -0.49 | 0.33 | -1.31 |
| Greater Miami Academy | Miami | 99 | 269 | 3.87 | 6.30 | 1.37 | 2.99 | 4.56 | 1.39 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Hampden DuBose Academy | Zellwood | 41 | 74 | 1.15 | -1.22 | 3.51 | -0.20 | -1.54 | 1.14 |
| Hebrew Academy Community School | Margate | 74 | 153 | 1.56 | -0.86 | 3.79 | 2.24 | 1.04 | 3.33 |
| Heritage Christian School | Kissimmee | 188 | 203 | 1.86 | 2.93 | 0.88 | 1.91 | 2.57 | 1.33 |
| Heritage Preparatory School | Orlando | 74 | 191 | -0.62 | -2.18 | 0.93 | -1.04 | -1.30 | -0.78 |
| Hernando Christian Academy | Brooksville | 45 | 75 | -3.73 | -3.53 | -3.93 | -2.59 | -1.68 | -3.51 |
| Highlands Christian Academy | Pompano Beach | 98 | 206 | 0.87 | 1.88 | -0.14 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.81 |
| Hobe Sound Christian Academy | Hobe Sound | 40 | 71 | 0.76 | 1.08 | 1.48 | 1.89 | 0.58 | 4.03 |
| Hollywood Christian School | Hollywood | 41 | 64 | -7.00 | -7.60 | -6.68 | -7.70 | -7.52 | -8.05 |
| Holy Cross Lutheran School | North Miami | 94 | 96 | 1.07 | 3.30 | -1.16 | 1.21 | 3.26 | -0.83 |
| Holy Family Catholic School | North Miami | 85 | 243 | -1.37 | 0.06 | -2.80 | -1.62 | -0.54 | -2.69 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Holy Family Catholic School | Orlando | 34 | 67 | 6.26 | 1.29 | 11.24 | -2.87 | -6.84 | 1.10 |
| Holy Redeemer Catholic School | Kissimmee | 83 | 198 | 2.33 | 3.17 | 1.22 | -0.33 | -0.27 | -0.49 |
| Holy Rosary Catholic School | Jacksonville | 47 | 150 | 1.68 | 3.70 | -0.34 | -1.34 | -1.63 | -1.04 |
| Hope Academy | Homestead | 102 | 103 | -2.12 | -4.26 | 0.03 | -2.18 | -4.27 | -0.10 |
| Hope Christian Academy | Starke | 34 | 34 | -3.35 | 1.62 | -8.32 | -3.35 | 1.62 | -8.32 |
| Horeb Christian School | Hialeah | 57 | 131 | -1.26 | 1.51 | -4.04 | 3.68 | 4.89 | 2.46 |
| I.E.C. Christian Academy | Orlando | 41 | 122 | 5.33 | 5.76 | 4.90 | 0.83 | 2.88 | -1.22 |
| IBCK Educational Center | Kissimmee | 76 | 98 | -3.72 | -0.59 | -6.84 | -3.19 | -0.15 | -6.23 |
| Ibn Seena Academy | Orlando | 46 | 117 | 2.26 | 3.41 | 1.11 | 1.62 | 1.95 | 1.30 |
| Immaculate Conception Catholic School | Hialeah | 62 | 166 | 6.10 | 3.08 | 9.13 | 2.14 | 0.25 | 4.04 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Incarnation Catholic School | Tampa | 46 | 78 | -0.14 | -0.74 | 0.46 | -0.90 | -1.01 | -0.79 |
| Indian Rocks Christian School | Largo | 76 | 117 | 1.05 | 3.18 | -1.09 | 0.61 | 1.62 | -0.41 |
| Inverness Christian Academy | Inverness | 37 | 107 | -1.16 | -1.16 | -1.16 | 0.27 | -0.15 | 0.68 |
| Iva Christian School | Largo | 59 | 135 | -1.17 | 0.79 | -2.07 | -0.27 | 0.46 | -0.53 |
| Jose Marti School 3Rd Campus | Miami | 56 | 168 | -8.74 | -4.09 | -13.39 | 5.09 | 4.92 | 5.26 |
| Jubilee Christian Academy | Pensacola | 41 | 106 | -2.43 | -1.43 | -2.90 | -1.79 | -0.81 | -2.57 |
| Keswick Christian School | Saint Petersburg | 56 | 66 | -0.66 | 0.66 | -1.98 | -0.64 | 1.23 | -2.50 |
| Kids Learning Center Of South Dade iii | Miami | 42 | 66 | -4.46 | -10.07 | 0.63 | -4.27 | -7.89 | -1.00 |
| Kingsway Christian Academy | Orlando | 126 | 370 | 0.25 | 1.38 | -0.87 | -1.24 | -1.17 | -1.30 |
| Klurman/Lubavitch | Miami | 38 | 50 | -6.11 | -2.13 | -10.08 | -4.74 | -2.86 | -6.62 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2013-14 AND <br> $2015-16 ~$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| La Progresiva <br> Presbyterian School <br> Inc. | Miami | 101 | 281 | 3.11 | 4.87 | 1.38 | 5.20 | 6.89 | 3.60 |
| Lake Worth <br> Christian School <br> Society Inc. | Boynton <br> Beach | 30 | 52 | -1.57 | 2.47 | -5.60 | -2.37 | -1.46 | -3.27 |
| Lakeside Christian <br> School | Clearwater | 73 | 157 | 2.81 | 1.76 | 2.69 | 1.91 | 1.14 | 2.13 |
| Landmark Christian <br> School | Haines City | 34 | 56 | -0.81 | -0.03 | -1.59 | -0.84 | -0.39 | -1.29 |
| Leaders Preparatory <br> School | Orlando | 46 | 118 | 3.17 | 2.67 | 3.67 | 1.38 | 1.32 | 1.44 |
| Liberty Christian <br> Preparatory School | Tavares | 51 | 83 | -2.61 | -0.10 | -5.12 | -0.43 | 0.64 | -1.51 |
| Liberty Christian <br> School | Sanford | 36 | 65 | -2.11 | -1.28 | -2.94 | 0.21 | 0.78 | -0.37 |
| Life Assembly Of <br> God Life Academy | Kissimmee | 72 | 168 | 7.13 | 7.54 | 6.65 | 0.61 | 0.82 | 0.33 |
| Lighthouse Christian <br> Preparatory <br> Academy | Deland | 44 | 44 | -1.97 | 0.42 | -4.34 | -1.97 | 0.42 | -4.34 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ \text { 2015-16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Lighthouse Private Christian Academy | Gulf Breeze | 48 | 70 | 3.28 | 6.90 | -0.33 | -1.19 | 3.04 | -5.41 |
| Lincoln-Marti Community Agency 10 | Miami | 121 | 351 | 3.81 | 1.33 | 6.22 | 1.71 | 1.85 | 1.54 |
| Lincoln-Marti Community Agency 17 | Miami | 69 | 255 | 13.70 | 10.67 | 16.72 | 4.89 | 2.56 | 7.24 |
| Lincoln-Marti Community Agency 23 | Miami | 81 | 197 | 2.90 | 5.99 | -0.26 | -5.01 | -3.53 | -6.76 |
| Lincoln-Marti Community Agency 28 | Miami | 106 | 260 | -0.79 | -1.30 | -0.50 | -3.83 | -4.61 | -3.56 |
| Lincoln-Marti Community Agency 76 | Miami | 48 | 130 | -11.17 | -21.17 | 1.22 | -2.88 | -2.35 | -2.92 |
| Lincoln-Marti Community Agency 90 | Miami | 32 | 58 | 7.44 | 9.63 | 5.25 | 2.06 | 5.02 | -0.90 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Little Flower School | Hollywood | 43 | 78 | 1.84 | 6.70 | -3.02 | -1.15 | -0.86 | -1.45 |
| Lubavitch <br> Educational Center Inc. | Miami | 196 | 198 | -8.39 | -6.81 | -9.79 | -8.33 | -6.65 | -9.84 |
| Manatee Learning Academy | Bradenton | 32 | 51 | 8.02 | 0.22 | 15.81 | 3.51 | -4.67 | 11.69 |
| Masters <br> Preparatory School | Hialeah | 120 | 179 | -8.10 | -5.97 | -10.30 | -3.74 | -2.31 | -5.07 |
| Meadowbrook Academy Inc. | Ocala | 60 | 137 | -4.27 | 0.47 | -8.77 | -1.46 | 0.36 | -3.27 |
| Melbourne Central Catholic High School | Melbourne | 34 | 55 | -15.01 | -11.15 | -18.88 | -9.01 | -7.02 | -11.00 |
| Merritt Island Christian School | Merritt Island | 34 | 60 | -2.57 | -2.12 | -2.29 | -1.98 | -2.97 | -0.58 |
| Miami Christian | Miami | 40 | 42 | 1.24 | 3.83 | -0.85 | 1.11 | 3.88 | -1.20 |
| Miami Union Academy | North Miami | 91 | 260 | -2.04 | -0.38 | -3.70 | -1.39 | -2.24 | -0.55 |
| Monsignor Edward Pace High School | Miami Gardens | 134 | 271 | 3.56 | 3.96 | 3.11 | -3.39 | -2.62 | -4.21 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Morningside Academy | Port Saint Lucie | 59 | 97 | -1.92 | 0.91 | -4.68 | -2.42 | -1.96 | -2.90 |
| Mother Of Christ Catholic School | Miami | 52 | 134 | 0.52 | 0.04 | 1.22 | -0.35 | -0.56 | 0.05 |
| Mount Bethel Christian Academy | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 38 | 38 | 0.49 | -1.21 | 2.18 | 0.49 | -1.21 | 2.18 |
| Mt. Sinai SeventhDay Adventist | Orlando | 39 | 59 | 0.12 | 1.87 | -1.97 | 0.37 | 2.61 | -2.32 |
| Muslim Academy Of Greater Orlando | Orlando | 54 | 158 | 4.53 | 7.56 | 1.50 | 3.67 | 4.39 | 2.96 |
| Nativity Catholic School | Brandon | 35 | 60 | 3.21 | 3.14 | 3.29 | -1.83 | -1.53 | -2.22 |
| Nativity School | Hollywood | 31 | 53 | 2.74 | 3.00 | 2.48 | 1.79 | 0.70 | 2.89 |
| North Florida Christian School | Tallahassee | 54 | 146 | 0.49 | -1.59 | 2.57 | -0.36 | -2.06 | 1.34 |
| North Kissimmee Christian School | Kissimmee | 41 | 132 | 0.04 | 0.88 | -0.80 | -0.39 | 1.10 | -1.87 |
| Northside Christian Academy | Starke | 48 | 124 | -8.03 | -5.73 | -10.33 | -3.27 | -1.20 | -5.42 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> $2013-14$ AND <br> $2015-16 ~$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Northwest Christian <br> Academy | Miami | 69 | 184 | -2.54 | -0.83 | -4.25 | -2.48 | 0.02 | -4.96 |
| Notre Dame <br> Catholic School | Spring Hill | 34 | 62 | 1.15 | 0.88 | 1.41 | -1.27 | -2.23 | -0.32 |
| Nur Ul-Islam <br> Academy | Cooper City | 110 | 323 | 3.15 | 2.49 | 3.81 | 2.28 | 2.60 | 1.95 |
| Oasis Christian <br> Academy | Winter <br> Haven | 54 | 125 | 0.60 | -2.11 | 3.31 | 1.01 | -0.19 | 2.22 |
| Ocala Christian <br> Academy | Ocala | 105 | 111 | 0.46 | -0.95 | 1.87 | 0.07 | -0.96 | 1.10 |
| Okeechobee <br> Christian Academy | Okeechobee | 45 | 78 | 0.64 | 1.25 | -0.02 | -3.45 | -2.75 | -4.23 |
| Old Plank Christian <br> Academy | Jacksonville | 32 | 51 | -14.02 | -13.69 | -14.34 | -5.45 | -6.55 | -4.35 |
| One School Of The <br> Arts | Longwood | 38 | 56 | 2.97 | 5.11 | 0.84 | 2.71 | 5.68 | -0.27 |
| Orlando Christian <br> Prep | Orlando | 61 | 161 | 1.52 | 0.36 | 2.67 | -0.30 | 1.26 | -1.86 |
| Orlando Junior <br> Academy | Orlando | 47 | 136 | 0.02 | -0.85 | 1.04 | -0.40 | -0.65 | -0.03 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Our Lady Of Charity School Inc | Hialeah | 57 | 165 | 0.84 | 1.79 | 0.05 | -0.74 | -0.62 | -0.83 |
| Our Lady Of Lourdes Catholic School | Daytona Beach | 60 | 148 | -0.24 | -0.73 | 0.25 | 1.37 | 0.54 | 2.20 |
| Our Lady Of Lourdes Parish School | Miami | 37 | 59 | 2.20 | 3.22 | 1.19 | -2.67 | -3.34 | -2.00 |
| Our Lady Of The Holy Rosary-St Richard Cath | Miami | 49 | 121 | 0.91 | 0.08 | 1.73 | 0.20 | -2.81 | 3.21 |
| Our Lady Of The Lakes Catholic School | Miami Lakes | 42 | 78 | -0.45 | 1.50 | -2.44 | -0.78 | -1.14 | -0.40 |
| Our Lady Queen Of Martyrs | Fort Lauderdale | 58 | 133 | 0.62 | 1.36 | -0.12 | -2.51 | -2.44 | -2.58 |
| Palm Beach Bilingual School | Riviera Beach | 44 | 121 | 1.38 | 3.20 | -1.42 | -4.32 | -8.51 | -0.47 |
| Park Avenue Christian Academy | Titusville | 60 | 97 | 3.50 | 2.83 | 4.17 | -0.61 | -1.43 | 0.21 |
| Parsons Christian Academy | Jacksonville | 47 | 120 | -1.02 | -2.13 | -0.17 | -1.55 | -1.56 | -1.48 |
| Peniel Baptist <br> Academy | Palatka | 48 | 125 | -2.57 | -2.29 | -2.85 | -2.98 | -2.01 | -3.94 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2015-16 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Pensacola Catholic High School | Pensacola | 38 | 57 | -1.58 | 0.11 | -3.26 | -2.15 | 1.68 | -5.98 |
| Pentab Academy | Miami | 49 | 143 | -2.36 | -0.05 | -3.76 | 2.21 | 1.70 | 3.17 |
| Pha Preparatory School Kissimmee | Kissimmee | 48 | 128 | -1.13 | 6.83 | -9.49 | -0.42 | 1.53 | -2.17 |
| Phyl's Academy | Coral Springs | 40 | 114 | -3.65 | -4.55 | -2.75 | -1.73 | -1.68 | -1.78 |
| Poinciana Christian Preparatory School | Kissimmee | 32 | 42 | -0.06 | 1.69 | -1.81 | -1.24 | 0.57 | -3.05 |
| Potter's House Academy | Orlando | 71 | 146 | 0.32 | 1.24 | -0.61 | -1.46 | 0.20 | -3.21 |
| Rabbi Alexander S. Gross Hebrew Academy | Miami Beach | 44 | 104 | -3.55 | -1.77 | -4.84 | -1.17 | 0.20 | -2.43 |
| Radiant Life Academy | Orlando | 45 | 114 | 2.40 | -1.43 | 5.04 | 1.64 | 0.65 | 2.19 |
| Real Life Christian Academy | Clermont | 51 | 121 | 3.21 | 3.57 | 2.84 | 0.48 | -1.60 | 2.56 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ \text { 2015-16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Redeemer Christian School | Ocala | 30 | 53 | -2.50 | -4.38 | 0.33 | -0.54 | -1.14 | 0.85 |
| Regency Christian Academy | Orlando | 45 | 114 | 0.70 | 2.40 | -1.00 | 1.64 | 3.04 | 0.24 |
| Resurrection Parish School | Jacksonville | 32 | 62 | 0.88 | 1.88 | -0.13 | 0.39 | -2.74 | 3.52 |
| Rhodora J. Donahue Academy | Ave Maria | 37 | 72 | -3.57 | -3.19 | -3.95 | -1.53 | -2.03 | -1.04 |
| Rj Hendley Christian Community School | Riviera Beach | 45 | 145 | -3.40 | -6.29 | -0.58 | -2.76 | -2.71 | -2.80 |
| Rocky Bayou Christian School | Niceville | 34 | 101 | 3.22 | 2.50 | 3.94 | 1.14 | -1.50 | 3.78 |
| S.L. Jones Christian Academy | Pensacola | 36 | 116 | 0.97 | 0.47 | 1.47 | -6.69 | -6.66 | -6.72 |
| Sacred Heart | Jacksonville | 50 | 142 | 2.74 | 2.26 | 3.22 | -0.32 | -1.78 | 1.13 |
| Sacred Heart <br> Catholic School | Pinellas Park | 54 | 88 | -2.12 | -2.09 | -2.15 | -3.52 | -4.23 | -2.82 |
| Sacred Heart School | Lake Worth | 54 | 89 | 0.22 | 2.87 | -2.87 | -2.12 | -1.42 | -3.10 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ \text { 2015-16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Saint Agatha School | Miami | 59 | 97 | -2.80 | -1.56 | -4.02 | -5.30 | -6.91 | -3.67 |
| Saint Anastasia Catholic School | Fort Pierce | 49 | 73 | -2.36 | 0.35 | -5.06 | -1.14 | 0.56 | -2.84 |
| Saint Andrew Catholic School | Coral Springs | 33 | 62 | 4.74 | 2.03 | 7.45 | 0.58 | -2.08 | 3.24 |
| Saint Andrew Catholic School | Orlando | 109 | 235 | 4.78 | 3.28 | 6.28 | 2.25 | 0.13 | 4.37 |
| Saint Barnabas <br> Episcopal School | Deland | 42 | 75 | 0.68 | 1.43 | -0.07 | -1.67 | -2.57 | -0.76 |
| Saint Bartholomew School | Miramar | 47 | 133 | -2.88 | 1.93 | -7.74 | -1.90 | 1.42 | -5.09 |
| Saint Brendan Elementary School | Miami | 56 | 96 | 0.71 | 1.79 | -0.18 | -1.28 | -1.86 | -0.59 |
| Saint Brendan High School | Miami | 40 | 60 | 3.13 | 6.18 | 0.08 | -0.75 | 0.32 | -1.82 |
| Saint Helen Catholic School | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 70 | 169 | 2.76 | 4.34 | 1.17 | -1.15 | -1.25 | -1.05 |
| Saint James Catholic School | Miami | 152 | 388 | -0.63 | 0.90 | -2.16 | -0.50 | 0.23 | -1.23 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Saint Jerome Catholic School | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 33 | 55 | 0.70 | 1.61 | -0.21 | -0.91 | -1.04 | -0.78 |
| Saint John The Apostle School | Hialeah | 85 | 255 | 1.15 | -0.47 | 2.78 | 2.75 | 2.91 | 2.59 |
| Saint Johns Episcopal School | Homestead | 50 | 125 | 2.80 | 3.18 | 2.42 | 1.35 | 3.62 | -0.93 |
| Saint Joseph Catholic School | Palm Bay | 31 | 55 | 1.58 | 3.16 | 0.00 | 0.19 | -0.75 | 1.13 |
| Saint Joseph Catholic School | Winter Haven | 62 | 159 | -0.69 | 1.21 | -2.60 | -1.68 | -1.72 | -1.64 |
| Saint Joseph Parish School | Tampa | 47 | 131 | -1.30 | 0.66 | -3.26 | -0.75 | -1.15 | -0.35 |
| Saint Joseph School | Jacksonville | 56 | 92 | 0.38 | -1.80 | 2.55 | -0.48 | -2.74 | 1.77 |
| Saint Joseph's School | Lakeland | 35 | 61 | 0.70 | 1.97 | -0.57 | 2.41 | 1.70 | 3.11 |
| Saint Jude Cathedral School | Saint <br> Petersburg | 31 | 52 | 1.65 | 3.67 | 0.17 | 1.88 | 2.22 | 1.88 |
| Saint Lawrence School | North Miami Beach | 58 | 151 | -0.27 | -0.60 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.43 | 0.22 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BETWEEN } \\ & \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ & \text { 2015-16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Saint Luke Catholic | Palm Springs | 34 | 63 | -4.38 | 0.62 | -9.38 | -4.27 | -2.14 | -6.40 |
| Saint Mary School | Fort Walton Beach | 31 | 59 | -3.11 | -1.42 | -4.81 | -2.81 | -4.54 | -1.08 |
| Saint Marys Cathedral | Miami | 154 | 417 | 2.43 | 3.55 | 1.33 | 0.56 | 1.37 | -0.25 |
| Saint Matthews Catholic School | Jacksonville | 30 | 49 | -3.28 | -4.43 | -2.13 | -1.05 | -3.59 | 1.49 |
| Saint Michael The Archangel | Miami | 92 | 234 | 1.13 | 2.74 | -0.45 | -0.51 | 0.36 | -1.44 |
| Saint Paul Catholic School | Daytona Beach | 63 | 156 | -1.76 | 0.16 | -3.68 | -2.67 | -1.97 | -3.42 |
| Saint Paul's Catholic School | Leesburg | 40 | 60 | -3.33 | -6.60 | -0.05 | -0.94 | -4.85 | 2.97 |
| Saint Peter Claver | Tampa | 46 | 90 | 2.11 | 4.07 | 0.15 | -0.04 | 2.14 | $-2.30$ |
| Saint Peters Catholic School | Deland | 31 | 51 | 1.37 | 4.39 | -1.65 | -1.33 | -1.43 | -1.24 |
| Saint Petersburg Christian School | Saint <br> Petersburg | 38 | 69 | -7.34 | -3.11 | -11.58 | -4.80 | -1.86 | -7.74 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ \text { 2015-16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Saint Pius V Catholic School | Jacksonville | 40 | 122 | 1.34 | 5.45 | -2.78 | -0.80 | -0.39 | -1.20 |
| Saint Thomas <br> Aquinas High School | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 35 | 61 | 3.49 | 7.43 | -0.46 | 0.75 | 3.41 | -1.90 |
| Saints Academy Inc. | Orlando | 66 | 101 | -2.61 | -3.06 | -2.18 | -2.87 | -2.96 | -2.78 |
| Saints Peter Paul School | Miami | 31 | 56 | 2.94 | 4.97 | 0.90 | 7.62 | 7.20 | 8.04 |
| Salah Tawfik <br> Elementary Middle School | Sunrise | 45 | 45 | 9.31 | 10.89 | 7.73 | 9.31 | 10.89 | 7.73 |
| Seffner Christian Academy | Seffner | 44 | 84 | 0.40 | -0.36 | 1.16 | -1.99 | -0.99 | -2.99 |
| Seven Rivers Christian School | Lecanto | 41 | 80 | 0.52 | 2.31 | -1.24 | -3.51 | -4.35 | -2.56 |
| Sheridan Hills Christian School | Hollywood | 37 | 61 | 3.00 | 2.24 | 3.76 | 5.28 | 4.72 | 5.84 |
| Snow White The Seven Dwarfs School | Hialeah | 59 | 131 | 0.58 | -1.51 | 2.66 | 5.69 | 4.09 | 7.28 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Sonshine Christian Academy | Fort Myers | 44 | 115 | 1.74 | 0.35 | 3.05 | -0.43 | -1.26 | 0.35 |
| South Orlando Christian Academy | Orlando | 76 | 216 | 4.90 | 4.15 | 4.68 | 6.43 | 6.00 | 6.69 |
| Southland Christian School | Kissimmee | 105 | 285 | 1.51 | 0.27 | 2.56 | 1.87 | 1.36 | 2.36 |
| Spring Hill Christian Academy | Spring Hill | 51 | 81 | -0.83 | 1.08 | -2.75 | -1.12 | 0.51 | -2.74 |
| St. Bernadette Catholic School | Hollywood | 35 | 61 | 0.27 | 0.65 | 0.44 | -3.75 | -3.57 | -3.75 |
| St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic School | Palm Coast | 45 | 118 | 2.49 | 2.62 | 2.36 | -1.15 | -1.53 | -0.77 |
| St. James Christian Academy | Port Saint <br> Lucie | 123 | 246 | -2.13 | -1.93 | -2.50 | -2.98 | -2.25 | -3.85 |
| St. Mary Magdalen Catholic School | Altamonte Springs | 38 | 66 | 2.72 | 2.32 | 3.13 | -0.16 | -1.56 | 1.24 |
| St. Thomas Aquinas School | Saint Cloud | 58 | 143 | 2.09 | 4.36 | -0.19 | -0.40 | -1.38 | 0.57 |
| Stetson Baptist Christian School | Deland | 39 | 123 | 4.82 | 5.87 | 3.77 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.65 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ \text { 2015-16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| Sunflowers Academy | Miami | 152 | 419 | -0.73 | 2.59 | -4.02 | -2.96 | -3.16 | -2.74 |
| Tallavana Christian School | Havana | 51 | 143 | 3.27 | 4.82 | 2.78 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 1.30 |
| Tampa Adventist Academy | Tampa | 39 | 117 | 0.21 | 3.47 | -2.97 | 2.36 | 3.77 | 1.12 |
| Tampa Bay Christian Academy Of Florida Inc | Tampa | 35 | 48 | -1.20 | -1.83 | -0.57 | -2.30 | 0.46 | -5.06 |
| Tampa Catholic High School Inc. | Tampa | 32 | 57 | -8.88 | -5.06 | -12.69 | -2.66 | 0.98 | -6.30 |
| Temple Christian Academy | Jacksonville | 34 | 101 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 0.82 | 0.65 | 1.78 | -0.48 |
| The Conrad Academy | Orlando | 63 | 148 | -9.37 | -10.81 | -7.92 | -3.48 | -3.16 | -3.80 |
| The Potter's House Christian Academy Elem | Jacksonville | 64 | 179 | -0.13 | -2.31 | 1.70 | -1.81 | -0.31 | -3.34 |
| Thinking Child Christian Academy School | Homestead | 43 | 74 | 1.30 | 2.47 | 0.14 | 3.76 | 4.45 | 3.08 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BETWEEN } \\ & \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ & \text { 2015-16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| Toras Emes Academy Of Miami | North Miami Beach | 74 | 174 | 1.03 | 0.77 | 1.30 | -0.55 | 0.34 | -1.44 |
| Treasure Of Knowledge Christian Academy | Orlando | 34 | 108 | -4.43 | -9.21 | 0.35 | 0.85 | 0.43 | 1.28 |
| Trinity Catholic High School | Ocala | 34 | 65 | 1.46 | 0.85 | 2.06 | -5.54 | -3.42 | -7.66 |
| Trinity Christian Academy | Deltona | 117 | 304 | 0.41 | 1.63 | -0.74 | 0.15 | 1.46 | -1.12 |
| Trinity Christian Academy | Jacksonville | 193 | 436 | -0.75 | -0.11 | -1.40 | -0.82 | -0.26 | -1.38 |
| Trinity Christian Academy | Lake Worth | 64 | 169 | -0.93 | -1.70 | -0.16 | -0.04 | 0.63 | -0.70 |
| Trinity Lutheran School | Kissimmee | 32 | 56 | -11.88 | -13.94 | -9.81 | -7.73 | -7.43 | -8.04 |
| United Brethren In Christ Academy | Holly Hill | 30 | 55 | -0.55 | 0.13 | -1.23 | -3.45 | -3.96 | -2.95 |
| United Cerebral Palsy-Diamond Minds | Miami | 32 | 47 | 6.80 | 14.72 | -2.58 | 1.09 | 4.96 | -3.64 |
| Universal Academy Of Florida | Tampa | 161 | 428 | 1.71 | 0.61 | 2.81 | 1.64 | 1.11 | 2.16 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2015-16 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BETWEEN } \\ & \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ & \text { 2015-16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| University Christian School | Jacksonville | 81 | 174 | 1.59 | 4.16 | -0.98 | -1.59 | 0.36 | -3.53 |
| Venice Christian School | Venice | 37 | 105 | 1.27 | -0.30 | 2.84 | 1.10 | 0.73 | 1.47 |
| Victory Christian Academy | Jacksonville | 40 | 117 | -6.44 | -6.33 | -6.55 | -0.12 | -1.32 | 1.07 |
| Victory Christian Academy | Lakeland | 73 | 183 | -0.76 | -1.85 | 0.92 | 0.67 | 0.50 | 1.10 |
| Victory Christian Academy | Orlando | 68 | 183 | 8.42 | 11.15 | 5.78 | 0.56 | 1.52 | -0.49 |
| Villa Madonna | Tampa | 42 | 66 | 0.17 | 1.62 | -1.29 | -1.35 | -0.79 | -1.91 |
| Villa Preparatory Academy Corp | Miami | 51 | 102 | 0.72 | 0.10 | 1.33 | 0.24 | 0.72 | -0.24 |
| Village View Christian Academy | Summerfield | 33 | 57 | 1.97 | 2.94 | 1.00 | 2.18 | 2.74 | 1.63 |
| Walker Memorial Academy | Avon Park | 35 | 53 | -4.77 | -0.17 | -10.74 | -3.71 | -2.26 | -5.96 |
| Warner Christian Academy | South Daytona Beach | 124 | 329 | -4.12 | -2.83 | -5.44 | -1.49 | -0.30 | -2.66 |

## Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2015-16 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2013-14 TO 2015-16 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2015-16 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2013-14 AND } \\ 2015-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| West Hernando Christian School | Spring Hill | 70 | 153 | 0.40 | 0.16 | -0.04 | -1.24 | -2.44 | -0.37 |
| West Oaks Academy | Orlando | 35 | 58 | -2.26 | -0.66 | -3.86 | -3.31 | -2.17 | -4.45 |
| Westminster Academy | Fort <br> Lauderdale | 30 | 49 | -0.18 | -0.57 | 0.20 | -3.05 | -1.49 | -4.61 |
| Westwood Christian School | Live Oak | 48 | 118 | -4.67 | -3.56 | -5.77 | -5.02 | -4.12 | -5.92 |
| Westwood Christian School | Miami | 48 | 115 | 2.75 | -0.38 | 3.96 | 0.33 | -1.24 | 0.75 |
| William A. Kirlew Jr. Academy | Miami Gardens | 50 | 131 | 2.99 | 4.32 | 1.66 | 1.89 | 1.50 | 2.27 |
| Winter Haven Christian School | Winter Haven | 67 | 145 | 0.50 | 1.20 | -0.09 | 0.13 | -0.16 | 0.76 |
| Worshipers' House Of Prayer Academy | Miami | 44 | 45 | -5.38 | -7.73 | -3.02 | -4.88 | -7.07 | -2.69 |
| Yeshiva Elementary | Miami Beach | 46 | 133 | -0.03 | 0.15 | -0.22 | -3.96 | -3.20 | -4.35 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This roster is based on actual payments made to schools and is thus thought to contain a more precise representation of participating students than rosters from earlier in the school year.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ LSI reported these non-compliant schools to the Florida Department of Education.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Although the highest level of score reporting observed in 2011-12, which was 96.4 percent, the number of students with legible, valid scores was 18,583 that year. This is less than half of the number of students with legible, valid scores in 2015-16.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ LSI used data from the SFOs for these analyses.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Students who were in grade 10 in 2013-14 are excluded since they are not tested in 2015-16.

