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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the 2017-18 academic year evaluation for the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship (FTC) Program, as required by the 2017 Florida Statutes, s. 1002.395(9)(j). The twelfth in a series of reports, this evaluation is the fifth 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, 201718 test score results of program participants, gain scores from 2016-17 to 2017-18 of program participants, school-level average gain scores for schools with at least 30 participating students, attributes of new program participants in 2017-18, and the performance of program participants who return to Florida public schools.

Similar to the several most recent 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, such a comparison may not be valid.

Pursuant to the 2017 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 2017-18 academic year. The main findings include:

## Participating private school compliance with protocol:

- Compliance with program testing requirements was high in 2017-18. Participating private schools reported test scores for 94.0 percent of program participants in grades 3-10. This was slightly lower than the last year's score reporting ( 95.8 percent). 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 somewhat higher in 2017-18 at 4.0 percent. This rate was 1.5 percent last year. The percentage of missing/unusable tests was 0.8 percent; the rate of unreported scores due to school closures or suspension from the program was 0.3 percent, the rate of sick or absent students was 0.7 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 2017-18 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 lower 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 a 45.3 normal curve equivalent score in reading and a 44.1 normal curve equivalent score in math, while FTC students who remained in the program scored at the $47.7^{\text {th }}$ normal curve equivalent in reading and the $46.0^{\text {th }}$ normal curve equivalent 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 $38.2^{\text {nd }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and the $36.0^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in math, while other subsidized meal-eligible public school students who never participated in the FTC Program performed at the $43.8^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and the $44.1^{\text {st }}$ Florida percentile in math.


## Test scores of program participants, 2017-18:

- FTC students scored at the $47.4^{\text {th }}$ normal curve equivalent in reading and the $45.2^{\text {nd }}$ normal curve equivalent in math.
- In terms of gains in math and reading from 2016-17 to 2017-18, 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 2017-18 academic year evaluation results of the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program, as required by the 2017 Florida Statutes, s. $1002.395(9)(\mathrm{j})$. The twelfth in a series of reports, this evaluation is the fifth of those conducted by the Florida State University Learning Systems Institute. This report provides a summary of key findings, details about test score collection, 2017-18 test score results of program participants, gain scores from 2016-17 to 2017-18, test score gains of individual schools with at least 30 or more students, attributes of new program participants in 2017-18, and the performance of program participants who return to Florida public schools. Similar to the five 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, such a comparison may not be valid. 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 (LSI), holds that it is not valid to make these comparisons.

Pursuant to the 2017 Florida Statutes, s. 1002.395(9)(j), the Learning Systems Institute 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 2017-18 academic year evaluation of the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program.

## 2. TEST SCORE COLLECTION IN 2017-18

## Data collection protocol

As mandated by the 2017 Florida Statutes, s. 1002.395(8)(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 (Math Enterprise, Reading Enterprise), 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 2017-18, in which private schools sent students' test scores to the Learning Systems Institute. The 1,546 private schools that had participating students in grades 3 through 10 during the 2017-18 school year were contacted by the Learning Systems Institute in spring 2018 and again throughout spring and summer 2018 to encourage compliance with score reporting. Schools were provided a roster of participating FTC students, which was obtained in early spring 2018 from the Scholarship Funding Organizations. ${ }^{1}$ From the 1,546

[^0]private schools with participating FTC students, 62,492 students were enrolled in grades 3 to 10, the grades mandated for testing per the 2017 Florida Statutes, 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 2017-18
A large majority of schools were in compliance with test score reporting for the academic year 2017-18. 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 hand-scored, schools were instructed to send detailed test administration and scoring procedures. Throughout the spring and summer of 2017 the Learning Systems Institute followed up with schools that had sent invalid test score results, including missing or incomplete test scores.

Test score sheets were sent to 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 are shredded one year after this double-entry 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 FLDOE 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 1,546 FTC participating schools with students in the relevant grades in 2017-18. The vast majority of the FTC participating schools provided evidence of test administration consistent with the specifications of the program. Ten participating schools, serving 182 testing-eligible students, closed or did not participate in the program following the 2017-18 school year and hence did not provide test scores. Ten schools, serving 165 students, did not administer tests to or report scores for any participating students. ${ }^{2}$ There were 62,492 students in relevant grades participating in the FTC Program in 2017-18. Valid, legible test scores were received for 58,716 FTC students, which represents 94.0 percent of all expected test scores received.

[^1]Table 1: Distribution of score reporting percentages: 2017-18 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 | 16-17 | 17-18 |
| Legible, valid scores received | 72.7 | 92.7 | 89.8 | 91.3 | 93.5 | 96.4 | 92.3 | 90.0 | 95.9 | 95.6 | 95.8 | 94.0 |
| 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 | 1.5 | 4.0 |
| Ineligible for testing | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 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 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Student sick/absent | 3.4 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Missing/unusable test | 2.5 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 7.9 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 |

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

The rate of legible, valid scores received was high in 2017-18. As seen in Table 1, private schools reported test scores for 94.0 percent of program participants in grades 3-10. This is slightly lower than the last year's score reporting ( 95.8 percent). 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 somewhat higher in 2017-18 at 4.0 percent. This rate was 1.5 percent last year.

The other categories of score reporting remained at levels comparable to those observed in recent years. The percentage of missing/unusable tests was 0.8 percent; the rate of sick/absent students was 0.7 percent; the share of students who were at schools that were closed or suspended from program participation was 0.3
percent. Lastly, 0.3 percent of students on the official roster were either deemed ineligible for test score reporting pursuant to the 2017 Florida Statutes, 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: 2017-18 and prior years.

| Academic <br> Year | Number of <br> students | Number of students with <br> legible, valid scores | Percent of students with <br> legible, valid scores |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-2007$ | 9,721 | 7,067 | 72.7 |
| $2007-2008$ | 10,734 | 9,949 | 92.7 |
| $2008-2009$ | 11,508 | 10,333 | 89.8 |
| $2009-2010$ | 15,151 | 13,829 | 91.3 |
| $2010-2011$ | 17,724 | 16,575 | 93.5 |
| $2011-2012$ | 19,284 | 18,583 | 96.4 |
| $2012-2013$ | 26,595 | 24,534 | 92.3 |
| $2013-2014$ | 30,036 | 27,020 | 90.0 |
| $2014-2015$ | 36,106 | 34,469 | 95.9 |
| $2015-2016$ | 43,270 | 41,372 | 95.3 |
| $2016-2017$ | 55,148 | 52,580 | 95.8 |
| $2017-2018$ | 62,429 | 58,716 | 94.0 |

In 2017-18 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 62,429 in 2017-18. ${ }^{3}$

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

Although the rate of successful score reporting was high in 2017-18 at 94.0 percent, there were 6 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 2017-18.

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. Students whose scores were successfully reported come from families with higher incomes (averaging \$29,177 versus $\$ 24,211$ ) and with parents more likely to be married (48.3 percent versus 40.7 percent). Moreover, students whose scores were successfully reported were more likely to be white ( 28.3 percent) and female ( 51.7 percent), compared to students with no test scores (25.4 percent white and 47.6 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 2017-18

We report test scores in the form of the normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores. The NCE is a normalized standard score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.06. The scale corresponds to national percentile ranks (NPR) at 1,50, and 99.

As reported in the previous section, schools administered different nationally normreferenced tests approved by the Florida Department of Education. Reporting test scores as normal curve equivalent scores ensures reasonable comparability across schools and program participants. Moreover, normal curve equivalent scores convey information about students' rankings compared with normal standards.

Figure 1 presents the basic distribution of reading and math scores of FTC students participating in the program in 2017-18. Most of the students were in the middle of the test score distributions. The average normal curve equivalent score for FTC students was $47.4^{\text {th }}$ in reading and $45.2^{\text {nd }}$ in math in 2017-18. In terms of corresponding national percentile rankings, the typical student in the FTC Program scored at the $44^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the $40^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in math.

Figure 1: Distribution of normal curve equivalent scores of FTC students, 2017-18


|  | $1-9$ | $10-19$ | $20-29$ | $30-39$ | $40-49$ | $50-59$ | $60-69$ | $70-79$ | $80-89$ | $90-99$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | 2.8 | 5.8 | 9.3 | 15.8 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 13.9 | 7.0 | 3.8 | 1.8 |
| Math | 3.3 | 7.0 | 11.4 | 17.2 | 19.4 | 18.3 | 12.4 | 6.1 | 3.2 | 1.8 |

## Average test scores in 2017-18 by attributes of program participants

We provided a breakdown of test scores of 2017-18 program participants by race/ethnicity, gender, and family income. Family income is expressed in terms of likely eligibility for the federal free or reduced lunch program based upon selfreported 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.

[^3]Figure 2: Average test scores of program participants in 2017-18 by attributes


As seen in Figure 2, white participants had higher mean scores than black and Hispanic participants. While mean scores 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.

## 4. GAIN SCORES FROM 2016-17 TO 2017-18

## Test score gains for FTC students

Test score gains for FTC students are calculated as required by the 2017 Florida Statutes, s. $1002.395(9)(j)$. Gain scores can be interpreted as changes in normal curve equivalent scores for program participants from 2016-17 to 2017-18
since test scores in both years are measured in terms of normal curve equivalent scores. We should note that this analysis is vulnerable to ceiling effects (where students whose scores were high in 2016-17 cannot gain much more) and floor effects (where students whose scores were low in 2016-17 cannot lose much more ground). Ceiling and floor effects were of less concern for students whose initial score 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.

Figure 3: Distribution of test score gains for FTC students, 2016-17 to 2017-18


Gain scores were calculated for 37,565 FTC students with legible reading scores and 37,675 FTC students with legible math scores in both 2016-17and 201718. Figure 3 presents the basic distribution of reading and math gain scores of FTC students participating in the program in 2017-18. While most of the students were in
the middle of the gain score distributions, considerable variation in the individual student gain scores was observed. The mean gain score for FTC students was 0.2 normal curve equivalent in reading and -0.7 normal curve equivalent in math. These scores correspond to similar national percentile ranking points. 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.

## School-level differences in average gain scores, 2016-17 to 2017-18

We calculated average gain scores from 2016-17 to 2017-18 at the school level as well. Individual level variation in the gain scores examined in the preceding section was composed of both individual and school level differences. By using gain scores aggregated to the school level, we examined the variation in gain scores across schools.

Figure 4: Distribution of school average gains for FTC students, 2016-17 to 2017-18


Figure 4 presents the basic distribution of school average reading and math gain scores for FTC students participating in the program in 2017-18. The average gain scores were concentrated in the middle of the distribution. Of the average gain scores, 88.4 percent of the schools had an average gain score in reading between -10 to 10 points. The average gain score in math was 85.2 percent.


It is important to note that observed between-school variation in Figure 4 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. The degree to which school-average gains reflect "true" school effects increases as the number of students in the school increases. For example, when we looked at the same distribution only including schools with more than ten FTC students, the distribution of school-average gains became more compressed. As can be seen in Figure 5, 97.2 percent of school average gains in reading and 93.9 percent school average gains in math were between -10 to 10 points. In Figure 4, these numbers were 88.4 percent and 85.2 percent,
correspondingly. These findings suggest that there was a non-trivial contribution of the noise to the between-school variability observed in Figure 4.

## Individual school average gain scores, 2016-17 to 2017-18

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 can be an extremely noisy measure of a school's contribution to student test scores. As discussed in the previous section, 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 of noise dominating the average gain score increases. 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 2017-18, we also calculated average gain scores over three years from 2015-16 through 2017-18. 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 2016-17, the likelihood of observing a negative average gain score for that school in 2017-18 increases. On the other hand, if a school had particularly low average scores in 2016-17, the likelihood of observing a positive average gain score in 2017-18 for that school increases. Using average gain scores across the last three years balances 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 418 schools that submitted valid test scores for 30 or more students in both 2016-17 and 2017-18 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 2017-18 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, 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 distribution. 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 in the national distribution (with 95\% certainty). If a school has statistically negative average gain, it means that, on average, students in that school worsened their position in the national distribution (with 95\% certainty).

## 5. ATTRIBUTES OF NEW PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS IN 2017-18

Previous reports noted 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 2017-18 in order to see whether they were systematically different from eligible nonparticipant students before participating in the FTC Program in 2017-18 as well.

In order to make plausible comparisons among students who spent the 201617academic year in Florida public schools, we compared students who entered the FTC Scholarship Program in 2017-18 to subsidized school meal eligible students who did not enter the program in that year but stayed free or reduced-price lunch eligible in 2017-18. 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 2016-17. We also restricted analysis to students who would be in grade 10 or below in 2017-18. ${ }^{5}$ With these criteria, we compared 4,069 new students in the FTC Scholarship Program in 2017-18 to 586,621 students who remained in the public schools and continued on subsidized school

[^4]lunches in 2017-18. 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 2017-18 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 2016-17 school year, the share of new FTC students who were free-lunch eligible was somewhat lower 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.


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

 performance of their schools in 2016-17In Florida, each public 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 2016-17 school year. We observed that students who entered the FTC Program in 2017-18 came from lower-performing schools. On a scale of A-F, with A being the highest performing schools, 17.8 percent of new FTC students were in schools graded "A", before attending a school in the FTC Program, while 21.8 percent of eligible non-participant
students were in schools graded "A" in the 2016-17 school year. At the other end of the spectrum, 11.8 percent of new FTC students were in schools graded "D" or "F", as compared with 7.8 percent of eligible non-participant students who were in schools graded "D" or "F" (see Figure 7).

Figure 7: Comparison of the share of new FTC participants by the performance of their previously attended public school to eligible non-participants


Comparison of new FTC students and non-participant students within their schools in terms of performance in 2016-17

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 (see Figure 8). The percentage of new FTC students in the bottom fifth of their prior public school's ELA FSA test score distribution was higher (22.8 percent) than non-participating students (19.7 percent). At the top fifth of the distribution, as observed in the previous years, the percentage of new FTC students was lower (16.8 percent) compared to nonparticipating students (19.9 percent).


For the math FSA test score distribution, 20.8 percent of new FTC students were in the bottom fifth of their prior public school's math distribution, while 18.5 percent of non-participating eligible students were in the bottom fifth of the distribution. At the top of the math test score distribution, 16.2 percent of new FTC students were in the top fifth of the distribution, as compared with 19.2 percent of eligible non-participating students in the top fifth of the distribution (see Figure 9).


Findings regarding the attributes of new program participants suggest that new FTC students in 2017-18 - compared to free-lunch eligible, non-participant students - were relatively 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.

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

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In this section we compared FTC students who returned to public schools in 2017-18 after participating in the FTC Program to those who remained in the FTC

Program in 2017-18. 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 2016-17 performance of public school returnees and FTC

 stayers in 2017-18We first compared FTC students who returned to the public school system in Florida in 2017-18 to those who remained in private schools under the FTC Program in terms of their national norm-referenced test performance in 2016-17. The typical student who left the program scored at the $45.3^{\text {rd }}$ normal curve equivalent in reading and $44.1^{\text {st }}$ normal curve equivalent in math in 2016-17, while the typical FTC student who remained in the program in 2017-18 scored at the $47.7^{\text {th }}$ normal curve equivalent in reading and the $46.0^{\text {th }}$ normal curve equivalent 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 incomeeligible to participate while some students who left the program may not have met eligibility criteria anymore in 2017-18. 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 2017-18. We found that the average returnee who is free/reduced lunch eligible in 2017-18 scored at the $44.1^{\text {st }}$ normal curve equivalent in reading and scored at the $43.0^{\text {rd }}$ normal curve equivalent in math in 2016-17, which was 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 2017-18 FSA performance of public school returnees and low income public school students

Next, we compared the performance of FTC students who returned to the public schools to 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 2017-18, who performed at the $38.2^{\text {nd }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and $36.0^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in math while public school students who never participated in the FTC Program performed at the $43.8^{\text {th }}$ Florida percentile in ELA and 44.1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Florida percentile in math in 2017-18.

Figure 11: 2017-18 FSA performance of FTC students returning to public


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 2017-18 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 2017-18. Compliance with program testing requirements was high in 2017-18. Private schools reported test scores for 94.0 percent of program participants in grades 3-10.

FTC students scored at the $47.4^{\text {th }}$ normal curve equivalent in reading and the $45.2^{\text {nd }}$ normal curve equivalent in math in 2017-18, which corresponds to the $44^{\text {th }}$ national percentile in reading and the 40 th national percentile in math. In terms of gains in math and reading from 2016-17 to 2017-18, 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 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.

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 2017-18 and three-year moving average of gain scores from 2015-16 to 2017-18 for schools with 30 or more students with gain scores in 2017-18.

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 zero (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 can be an extremely noisy 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 of noise dominating the average gain score increases. For this reason, we also compute the three-year moving average gain score. However, when interpreting gain scores, one should keep in mind that an average gain score of zero means that, on average, students in that school are maintaining their position in the national distribution. It doesn't mean that students in that school are not gaining.

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & 2017-18 \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ \text { 2017-18 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READING+ } \\ & \text { MATH } \\ & \text { COMBINED } \end{aligned}$ | READING | MATH |
| ABUNDANT LIFE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | MARGATE | 109 | 284 | -0.40 | 0.16 | -0.95 | -2.53 | -0.92 | -4.16 |
| ACADEMY PREP CENTER OF ST. PETERSBURG | ST. <br> PETERSBURG | 62 | 176 | 0.18 | 0.74 | -0.39 | -0.70 | -0.20 | -1.21 |
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| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ \text { 2017-18 } \end{gathered}$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING + MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| CALVARY CHAPEL ACADEMY | WEST <br> MELBOURNE | 79 | 206 | 6.03 | 7.11 | 4.40 | 2.92 | 3.99 | 1.87 |
| CALVARY CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | FORT WALTON BEACH | 41 | 103 | 1.29 | 2.68 | -0.10 | -0.50 | 1.05 | -2.00 |
| CALVARY CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | FT LAUDERDALE | 178 | 414 | -2.27 | -3.41 | -1.14 | -2.80 | -2.74 | -2.93 |
| CALVARY CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | ORMOND <br> BEACH | 91 | 198 | -2.00 | -0.40 | -3.64 | -2.42 | -1.49 | -3.32 |
| CAMBRIDGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | TAMPA | 34 | 44 | -0.25 | 1.09 | -1.59 | -0.55 | 0.30 | -1.39 |
| CANDLELIGHT <br> CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | LAKE WALES | 56 | 161 | -1.04 | 2.25 | -4.29 | -1.56 | 0.21 | -3.33 |
| CARDINAL GIBBONS HIGH SCHOOL | FORT <br> LAUDERDALE | 72 | 172 | -5.06 | -3.31 | -6.81 | -0.04 | 2.07 | -2.13 |
| CEDAR CREEK CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | JACKSONVILLE | 68 | 177 | 0.32 | 0.78 | -0.13 | -0.30 | 0.20 | -0.76 |
| CEDAR HILLS BAPTIST <br> CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | JACKSONVILLE | 55 | 153 | 0.49 | 1.04 | -0.05 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
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| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017-18 } \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BETWEEN } \\ & \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ & \text { 2017-18 } \end{aligned}$ | READING ${ }^{+}$ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| EAGLE'S VIEW ACADEMY | JACKSONVILLE | 62 | 135 | -2.81 | -1.65 | -3.98 | -3.34 | -2.82 | -3.87 |
| EAST HILL CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | PENSACOLA | 34 | 51 | 0.94 | 1.88 | 0.00 | 2.58 | 3.00 | 2.16 |
| EASTLAND CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | ORLANDO | 126 | 317 | -0.22 | 0.98 | -1.46 | -3.29 | -2.34 | -4.22 |
| EDISON PRIVATE SCHOOL | HIALEAH | 240 | 559 | 1.11 | 0.71 | 1.54 | 1.02 | 0.74 | 1.31 |
| ELFERS CHRISTIAN SCHOOL SCHOOL | NEW PORT RICHEY | 64 | 188 | -2.79 | -1.33 | -4.25 | -0.95 | -0.64 | -1.26 |
| EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN | FORT MYERS | 32 | 96 | 0.47 | 0.42 | 0.83 | -1.66 | -1.05 | -2.15 |
| EXCEL CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | LAKELAND | 68 | 119 | -7.07 | -4.63 | -9.51 | -4.50 | -3.37 | -5.63 |
| FAITH CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | ORLANDO | 166 | 416 | 2.12 | 1.58 | 2.65 | -1.56 | -0.77 | -2.35 |
| FAITH LUTHERAN SCHOOL | EUSTIS | 42 | 68 | -1.57 | -3.57 | 0.43 | -0.92 | -2.03 | 0.19 |
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| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2017-18 } \\ & \text { SCHOOL } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ \text { 2017-18 } \end{gathered}$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING ${ }^{+}$ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| LIGHT CHRISTIAN ACADEMY AND CHILDCARE | OCOEE | 42 | 62 | 0.14 | 1.17 | -0.88 | -0.30 | 0.92 | -1.52 |
| LIGHTHOUSE CHRISTIAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY | DELAND | 65 | 168 | -1.35 | -0.58 | -2.24 | -4.10 | -2.98 | -5.24 |
| LIGHTHOUSE PRIVATE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY PREP | PENSACOLA | 57 | 111 | -4.06 | -1.67 | -5.95 | -3.39 | -3.37 | -3.14 |
| LINCOLN-MARTI <br> COMMUNITY AGENCY 04 | MIAMI | 34 | 50 | 1.43 | 4.71 | -1.85 | 0.70 | 4.50 | -3.10 |
| LINCOLN-MARTI <br> COMMUNITY AGENCY 10 | MIAMI | 135 | 373 | 13.29 | 7.96 | 18.62 | 5.82 | 3.85 | 7.90 |
| LINCOLN-MARTI COMMUNITY AGENCY 17 | MIAMI | 98 | 240 | 12.69 | 1.51 | 23.88 | 11.66 | 6.16 | 17.17 |
| LINCOLN-MARTI <br> COMMUNITY AGENCY 23 | MIAMI | 93 | 254 | 4.67 | 6.65 | 2.69 | 9.88 | 10.83 | 8.89 |
| LINCOLN-MARTI <br> COMMUNITY AGENCY 28 | MIAMI | 125 | 324 | 18.19 | 17.84 | 18.54 | 5.84 | 5.45 | 6.26 |
| LINCOLN-MARTI <br> COMMUNITY AGENCY 76 | MIAMI | 30 | 111 | 9.38 | 1.37 | 17.40 | 0.66 | -2.42 | 2.92 |
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| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH

Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ \text { 2017-18 } \end{gathered}$ | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING ${ }^{+}$ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| OUR LADY OF LOURDES | MELBOURNE | 30 | 47 | -1.75 | -3.73 | 0.23 | -1.21 | -1.98 | -0.45 |
| OUR LADY OF LOURDES CATHOLIC SCHOOL | DAYTONA BEACH FL | 77 | 208 | 0.52 | 1.53 | -0.49 | 0.84 | 1.17 | 0.50 |
| OUR LADY OF LOURDES PARISH SCHOOL | MIAMI | 77 | 155 | 0.40 | 1.74 | -0.95 | 0.76 | 1.49 | 0.03 |
| OUR LADY OF THE HOLY ROSARY-ST RICHARD CATHOLIC | MIAMI | 39 | 134 | 1.90 | 2.00 | 1.79 | 0.94 | 1.33 | 0.54 |
| OUR LADY OF THE LAKES CATHOLIC SCHOOL | MIAMI LAKES | 68 | 170 | -0.21 | 0.12 | -0.54 | -0.04 | 0.42 | -0.50 |
| OUR LADY QUEEN OF MARTYRS | FORT <br> LAUDERDALE | 110 | 247 | -0.82 | -0.54 | -1.12 | -0.37 | 0.44 | -1.19 |
| OUR SAVIOR LUTHERAN SCHOOL | SAINT <br> PETERSBURG | 30 | 46 | 1.43 | 4.37 | -1.50 | 2.03 | 4.39 | -0.33 |
| PARK AVENUE <br> CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | TITUSVILLE | 88 | 218 | 5.46 | 4.59 | 6.33 | 3.45 | 3.38 | 3.53 |
| PARSONS CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | JACKSONVILLE | 53 | 94 | 0.33 | 0.30 | 0.36 | -3.79 | -3.37 | -4.20 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BETWEEN } \\ & \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ & \text { 2017-18 } \end{aligned}$ | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| POINT OF GRACE CHRISTIAN | PERRY | 40 | 60 | -3.90 | -0.28 | -7.53 | -3.18 | -0.60 | -5.77 |
| PORT CHARLOTTE ADVENTIST SCHOOL | PORT <br> CHARLOTTE | 31 | 51 | -3.21 | 0.58 | -7.00 | -2.25 | 0.57 | -5.06 |
| POTTER'S HOUSE ACADEMY | ORLANDO | 83 | 232 | -3.91 | -5.93 | -1.89 | -0.57 | 0.57 | -1.72 |
| PRINCETON CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | PRINCETON | 34 | 50 | 2.49 | 2.89 | 2.35 | 1.01 | 1.45 | 0.78 |
| RABBI ALEXANDER S. GROSS HEBREW ACADEMY | MIAMI BEACH | 51 | 138 | 0.51 | 1.92 | -0.90 | -3.11 | -1 | -5.54 |
| RADIANT LIFE ACADEMY | ORLANDO | 60 | 168 | 2.16 | 1.87 | 2.45 | 0.23 | -0.41 | 1.07 |
| REAGAN EDUCATIONAL ACADEMY INC. | HIALEAH | 35 | 47 | 2.13 | 5.09 | -0.83 | 3.94 | 6.43 | 1.45 |
| REAL LIFE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | CLERMONT | 76 | 189 | -5.46 | -5.08 | -5.83 | -2.02 | -1.91 | -2.20 |
| REBORN CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | KISSIMMEE | 83 | 148 | -1.08 | -0.22 | -1.95 | -1.21 | 0.24 | -2.79 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING |
| MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$
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|  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { NUMBER OF GAIN } \\ \text { SCORES OBSERVED }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { AVERAGE GAIN SCORE } \\ \text { FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 }\end{array}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{array}{c}\text { 2017-18 } \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ \text { 2017-18 }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { READING+ } \\ \text { MATH } \\ \text { COMBINED }\end{array}$ | READING | MATH | $\begin{array}{c}\text { READING+ } \\ \text { MATH } \\ \text { COMBINED }\end{array}$ | READING |
| MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$\}$
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| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING |
| MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL NAME | CITY | $\begin{gathered} 2017-18 \\ \text { SCHOOL } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BETWEEN } \\ \text { 2015-16 AND } \\ \text { 2017-18 } \end{gathered}$ | READING ${ }^{+}$ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ MATH COMBINED | READING | MATH |
| ST. JAMES CHRISTIAN ACADEMY | PORT SAINT <br> LUCIE | 190 | 471 | 1.55 | 2.49 | 0.56 | -2.06 | -1.29 | -2.82 |
| ST. MARY MAGDALEN CATHOLIC SCHOOL | ALTAMONTE SPRINGS | 49 | 131 | -0.24 | -2.98 | 2.49 | 0.51 | -0.71 | 1.73 |
| ST. THOMAS AQUINAS SCHOOL | SAINT CLOUD | 72 | 195 | 1.36 | 2.81 | -0.08 | 0.74 | 1.65 | -0.17 |
| STETSON BAPTIST CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | DELAND | 44 | 122 | 2.73 | 5.11 | 0.34 | -1.43 | 1.16 | -4.02 |
| SUNFLOWERS ACADEMY | MIAMI | 176 | 488 | -0.54 | -1.97 | 0.85 | -0.31 | -0.74 | 0.09 |
| TALLAVANA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL | HAVANA | 61 | 166 | 2.98 | -2.21 | 7.73 | 1.32 | -0.02 | 2.22 |
| TAMPA ADVENTIST ACADEMY | TAMPA | 40 | 113 | 2.56 | 5.75 | -0.63 | 0.05 | 1.78 | -1.50 |
| TAMPA BAY CHRISTIAN ACADEMY OF FLORIDA INC | TAMPA | 35 | 103 | -0.24 | -1.63 | 1.14 | -0.84 | -1.09 | -0.60 |
| TAMPA CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL INC. | TAMPA | 54 | 123 | -2.52 | -0.11 | -4.93 | -3.02 | -1.06 | -4.99 |
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|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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Appendix continued

|  |  | NUMBER OF GAIN <br> SCORES OBSERVED |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE IN 2017-18 |  | AVERAGE GAIN SCORE <br> FROM 2015-16 TO 2017-18  <br> SCHOOL NAME  CITY |  | 2017-18 <br> SCHOOL <br> YEAR | BETWEEN <br> 2015-16 AND <br> 2017-18 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZAREPHATH ACADEMY | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH | READING+ <br> MATH <br> COMBINED | READING | MATH |  |  |  |
| ZEPHYRHILLS CHRISTIAN <br> ACADEMY | ZACKSONVILLE | 33 | 48 | 9.11 | 11.65 | 6.65 | 6.16 | 7.28 | 5.22 |


[^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 was observed in 2011-12 (96.4 percent), the number of students with legible, valid scores was 18,583 that year. This is one third of the number of students with legible, valid scores in 2017-18.

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

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Students who were in grade 10 in 2016-17 are excluded since they are not tested in 2017-18.

