

Student Achievement in Schools Managed by Mosaica Education, Inc



A Union of Professionals



A Union of Professionals

Student Achievement in Schools Managed by Mosaica Education, Inc.

F. Howard Nelson
Nancy Van Meter

American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
555 New Jersey Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20001-2079

Sandra Feldman, PRESIDENT
Edward J. McElroy, SECRETARY-TREASURER
Nat LaCour, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

AFT Research & Information Services Department **AFT Center on Privatization**

F. Howard Nelson, Ph.D.
hnelson@aft.org
202/879-4428

Nancy Van Meter
nvanmete@aft.org
202/879-4551

Copy editing by Donna Fowler
Manuscript prepared by Pat Cochran, Research & Information Services Department

Copyright © AFT 2003

Permission is hereby granted to reproduce and distribute copies of this work for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost, and that the author, source and copyright notice are included on each copy.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Background.....	4
Methodology and Data.....	5
Student Achievement in Mosaica Schools Compared to Similar Public Schools	6
Student Achievement in Mosaica Schools Compared to Host School Districts	11
Colorado.....	11
Delaware	13
Michigan	14
New Jersey.....	22
Pennsylvania.....	22
Conclusion.....	26
Appendix.....	27
References.....	28

Executive Summary

This report by the American Federation of Teachers is the first comprehensive effort to assess student achievement in public schools managed by Mosaica Education, Inc., one of the leading private management companies in education, marketing itself to charter boards and school districts since 1997.

All schools examined in the report had been managed by Mosaica for at least two years, some for three or more years, which allows an analysis of trends. Mosaica currently manages 21 charter schools in six states and the District of Columbia.

The first part of our evaluation compares student achievement the 11 charter schools managed by Mosaica during 2000-01, to other schools in the state with the same grade levels and a comparable percentage of low-income students (i.e. eligible for free or reduced-price lunch).¹ The AFT study ranks each Mosaica school among the comparison schools (usually 40 schools including Mosaica), based on the 2000-01 average math and reading score of every grade tested by the state. The rank is then converted into a decile scale ranging from “1” (lowest possible) to “10” (highest possible). By definition, the average rank of other public schools in the comparison is always a “5.5.” Tests other than math and reading (e.g., science or writing) are not included, but the analysis includes every grade tested by a state (most states tested a very limited number of grades in 2000-01).

Findings for the 11 schools include:

- In grade 5 (the only grade tested), the Denver Arts & Technology Academy ranked in the lowest decile in both math and reading.
- The Marion T. Academy in Delaware ranked in the lowest decile in math and reading in both third and fifth grades (the only grades tested).
- Three of five schools in Michigan ranked in the lowest, second-lowest or third-lowest deciles in math and reading: Capital Area Academy, Grand Blanc Academy and George Washington Carver Academy. While grade 7 reading at Center Academy in Flint ranked a high “8,” the fourth grade ranked “2” in both math and reading. In Saginaw, Mosaica’s longest-operating charter school in the nation consistently ranked higher than its other charter schools in Michigan, but still ranked slightly below average among other comparable public schools.
- Liberty Academy in Jersey City, N.J., ranked in the lowest decile in fourth -grade math and reading (the only grades tested).
- In Pennsylvania, Leadership Learning Partners and Ronald H. Brown Academy, the two newest Mosaica schools in the state, ranked in the lowest or second-lowest deciles. Mosaica Academy

¹ None of the Mosaica charter schools were pre-existing, low-performing public schools converted to charter school status. As start-up charter schools, no legacy of poor performance existed, and the Mosaica schools accepted only those students who wanted to attend.

ranked slightly higher than the newer Mosaica schools, but still below average when compared to similar schools.

The second section of this study incorporates 2001-02 testing results, as well as assessment data for all previous years. In addition to math and reading, the analysis uses assessment data for other subjects (e.g., science and writing). While 2001-02 assessment data are not yet available to construct multischool comparison groups, the analysis compares the Mosaica schools to trends in state averages and the school district in which the charter school is geographically located (referred to as the “host” school district).

When compared to host school districts with the same or very similar rates of poverty, Mosaica’s charter schools ranked *below average* on 2001-02 student achievement in nine out of the 11 sites they operated. Those ranking below average included the Mosaica schools in Colorado, Delaware, New Jersey, two out of the three in Pennsylvania and four out of the five schools in Michigan. Only George Washington Carver Academy in Michigan clearly performed better than its host school district.

All schools had been managed by Mosaica for at least two years, some for three or more years, which allows an analysis of trends. Performance improved in about half of the subject/grade comparisons and declined in the other half, indicating no progress overall.

Student Achievement in Schools Managed by Mosaica Education, Inc.

Background

The AFT has been monitoring the academic performance of students in schools managed by private companies since the early 1990s, including Educational Alternatives Inc. (EAI) and Edison Schools Inc.² A lesser-known private management company, Mosaica Education, Inc. opened its first school in 1997 in Michigan and experienced modest growth over the next three years. The company acquired Advantage Schools, Inc. in 2001, taking over contracts to operate seven Advantage schools, and the company now manages a total of 21 charter schools in six states and the District of Columbia. To date, Mosaica schools enroll students only through the eighth grade. Although considerably smaller in size than some of its competitors, Mosaica is now one of the industry leaders.

The Mosaica design uses familiar off-the-shelf curricula such as “Science Anytime,” “Everyday Mathematics,” the Junior Great Books series, and “WiggleWorks,” a Scholastic Literacy curriculum. Mosaica also developed a proprietary curriculum, the Paragon curriculum, which is based on the seven intelligences defined by psychologist Howard Gardner—linguistic, logical/mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily kinesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal. Mosaica offers a 200-day school year and classes that run 7.5 hours a day. The company claims that if students attend Mosaica schools from kindergarten through high school, they will receive an extra four years of instruction. Mosaica also offers after-school tutorials to aid failing students. With private investment capital from venture capital firms, Mosaica is able to renovate or build charter school facilities. The company also promises new technology, including one computer for every three students.

In addition to contracts for managing charter schools, Mosaica has sought to take over low-performing district schools under contract with local school districts or state agencies. However, since no independent study of student achievement in schools managed by Mosaica has been undertaken, school districts or state agencies have no information on which to judge the company’s claims of raising student achievement.

In 1997-98 for one school and 1998-99 for two schools, Mosaica issued one-page press releases claiming that student achievement had progressed rapidly from fall to spring. The fall-to-spring measurement technique used by Mosaica has been widely discredited because it results in overly optimistic gains.³ Student achievement gains should be measured and reported from spring to spring or from fall to fall. Furthermore, the internal testing reports were not released to the public. In a study of

² Education Alternatives, Inc. ran one school in Miami-Dade County in Florida and nine schools in Baltimore (AFT 1994, 1995 and 1996). In three comprehensive reports released in 1998, 2000, and 2003, the AFT also has evaluated student achievement in schools operated by the largest private management company, Edison Schools Inc.

³ According to test expert Robert Linn of the University of Colorado at Boulder, fall-to-spring testing has been so widely discredited by testing experts that public school districts have abandoned it. “The practice of looking at gains in terms of changes from fall to spring in percentile ranks, though once a widely used approach to evaluating Title I programs, [federally funded education programs serving low-income students], was rejected as appropriate practice for that purpose more than a decade ago because the fall-to-spring comparisons gave a biased [overly optimistic] picture of actual program effects.” Linn reported, for example, that in the case of Title I students nationally, fall-to-spring testing used to produce gains of about 10 percentile points,

companies managing charter schools in the District of Columbia, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO, 2002) dismissed company reports on student achievement for similar reasons. The GAO concluded that Mosaica does not present data for comparable students who are not in their programs, a necessary component of determining a program's effectiveness.

Methodology and Data

This report uses publicly available data to study the 11 schools operated by Mosaica Education, Inc. in 2000-01 (five in Michigan, three in Pennsylvania, and one each in Colorado, Delaware and New Jersey). Together, the schools served approximately 5,000 students.⁴ The Bensalem, Pa., charter school board cancelled its contract with Mosaica in 2001-02, but the school remains in our analysis for the years in which the company managed it. Our study excludes several Mosaica schools acquired from Advantage Schools, Inc. because Mosaica did not manage them in 2000-01.⁵

The criteria for evaluating student achievement in Mosaica schools should be no different from the standards applied to any other public school. State student achievement test data are used, so that performance in Mosaica schools can be gauged with the same measures used to evaluate student achievement in other public schools. The report includes data on achievement levels attained, as well as gains in student performance over time. It compares test results for schools managed by Mosaica to a large number of comparable public schools and the host school district.

The state student assessment systems in the states where Mosaica operates schools provide for several methods of evaluation.⁶ The first part of our evaluation compares student achievement in Mosaica schools to other schools in the state with the same grade levels and a comparable percentage of low-income students (i.e., those eligible for free or reduced-price lunch). The 2000-01 state assessments are the most recent data available for this type of comprehensive multischool analysis.

In the second part of our study, math and reading achievement at Mosaica schools is compared to the host school district record after taking into account differences between the school and district in percentages of low-income students. The analysis incorporates 2001-02 achievement data when available, and in addition to math and reading, presents information on other tested subjects, such as science and writing. All schools had been managed by Mosaica for at least two years and some for three or more years, which allows an analysis of trends.

The following analyses are obviously the most robust for the Mosaica schools that have been operating for the longest period of time. In some instances, however, good student testing data and a

but when Title I switched to yearly testing (spring-to-spring), the 10-point gain became only a 1 or 2-point gain. (See <http://www.cse.ucla.edu/CRESSST/Files/PolicyPaper.pdf>)

⁴ Other Mosaica schools not open or without data in 2000-01 include M.O.T. Academy in Middletown, Del.; Bay County Public School Academy and Pontiac Public School Academy in Michigan; One World Neighborhood Charter School in New York City; and Graystone Academy and Fall Township Charter School in Pennsylvania.

⁵ Greenberger, Scott, "Advantage Schools Taken Over," The Boston Globe, July 3, 2001. Advantage Schools acquired by Mosaica include Phoenix Advantage Charter School in Arizona; Kalamazoo Advantage Academy, Benton Harbor Charter School and Detroit Advantage Academy in Michigan; Renaissance Advantage in Philadelphia; and Arts and Technology Academy and Howard Road Academy in the District of Columbia.

⁶ State assessment systems used in our study include the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP), the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP), the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP), New Jersey's Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA), and the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA).

solid evaluation design can result in insightful early impressions gleaned from one or two years of school operations. It would be premature, however, to draw firm conclusions about student achievement in schools that have been operating for only a short period of time.

Student Achievement in Mosaica Schools Compared to Similar Public Schools

To fairly evaluate each Mosaica school, our study uses data available on The Education Trust Web site for the 2000-01 school year (the most recent data available on this Web site).⁷ (See Table 1.) The Education Trust data include state assessment results for nearly every school in the United States, as well as information on the ethnic composition of each school and the percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch. The performance of each Mosaica school on state assessments is compared to similar schools in the state—those schools with the same grade levels and similar proportions of low-income students. The average math and reading score of each Mosaica school is ranked among the comparison schools (usually 40 schools including Mosaica). Tests other than math and reading (e.g., science or writing) are not included, but the analysis includes every grade tested by a state (most states tested a very limited number of grades in 2000-01). The rank of the Mosaica school is then converted into a decile scale ranging from “1” (lowest possible) to “10” (highest possible), as follows:

Rank	Decile
1 to 4 (highest achieving)	10
5 to 8	9
9-12	8
13-16	7
17-20	6
21-24	5
25-28	4
29-32	3
33-36	2
37-40 (lowest achieving)	1

The Education Trust, an independent nonprofit agency, promotes high academic achievement for all students.⁸ The data obtained through The Education Trust came from a U.S. Department of Education database created by the American Institutes for Research (AIR). According to The Education Trust, it is the largest database on student achievement in U.S. public schools, as well as the first to integrate demographic information and assessment scores at the school level for almost all of the nation’s schools. States must organize and process student achievement data, and that can then take six months after the close of the school year to make the data public. Several states, like New Jersey, take even longer. AIR also needs time to collect data from individual states, ensure its accuracy and build a

⁷ <<http://64.224.125.0/dtm/>>.

⁸ The American Association for Higher Education established The Education Trust in 1990 as a special project to encourage colleges and universities to support K-12 reform efforts. Since then, the Trust has become an independent nonprofit organization whose mission is to make schools and colleges work for all of the young people they serve.

uniform set of data. Consequently, The Education Trust's 2000-01 data were just posted on its Web site in fall 2002. Data for the 2001-02 school year will not be posted until fall 2003.

Table 1

Description of Data	
Mosaica Schools	11
Comparison Schools	429
Data Source	The Education Trust
Year	2000-01
Measure of Comparability	Free and Reduced-price Lunch
Tests	Math and Reading
Ranking System	Deciles—Scale of "1" (lowest) to "10" (highest)

Mosaica schools ranked well below average in all schools and grade levels in both math and reading with one exception. Grade 7 reading at Center Academy in Flint, Mich., ranked an "8." The remainder of this section briefly describes specific findings in each school. (See Table 2.)

Colorado. Mosaica began operating the Denver Arts & Technology Academy in fall 2000. In grade 4 reading, the school ranked in the second lowest decile. In grade 5, the school ranked in the lowest decile in both math and reading.

Delaware. In 2000-01, Mosaica managed one school in Delaware, the Marion T. Academy. Among similar schools in the state, it ranked in the lowest possible decile in math and reading, in both third and fifth grades.

Michigan. Mosaica operated five charter schools in Michigan during 2000-01, including the company's first charter school in Saginaw, which opened in 1997-98. The other four opened in 1999-2000. Three schools ranked in the lowest, second-lowest or third-lowest deciles in math and reading: Capital Area Academy in Lansing, Grand Blanc Academy in Grand Blanc and George Washington Carver Academy in Highland Park, a suburb of Detroit. While grade 7 reading at Center Academy in Flint ranked a high "8" on the 1-to-10-scale, the fourth grade ranked a "2" in both math and reading. Mosaica's charter school in Saginaw consistently ranked higher than the company's other charter schools in Michigan, but the rank of "4" in both fourth-grade math and reading, and "5" in seventh-grade reading, still placed it slightly below average among other comparable public schools.

Table 2

Comparison of 2000-01 Student Achievement on State Assessment in Mosaica Schools to Similar Public Schools

		Low-Income Students						
		Math		Reading/Language		Mosaica	Comparison Schools	
		Grade	Decile	Grade	Decile		Lowest	Highest
Colorado	Denver Arts & Technology	Grade 4	NA	Grade 4	2	51%	49.0%	54.4%
	Denver Arts & Technology	Grade 5	1	Grade 5	1	51%	48.4%	54.4%
Delaware	Marion T. Academy	Grade 3	1	Grade 3	1	35%	23.1%	45.4%
	Marion T. Academy	Grade 5	1	Grade 5	1	35%	14.7%	39.3%
Michigan	Capital Area Academy	Grade 4	1	Grade 4	2	47%	45.4%	47.6%
	Capital Area Academy	Grade 7	NA	Grade 7	2	47%	44.2%	50.8%
	Center Academy	Grade 4	2	Grade 4	2	73%	71.1%	74.9%
	Center Academy	Grade 7	NA	Grade 7	8	73%	68.3%	76.9%
	George Washington Carver	Grade 4	3	Grade 4	2	76%	74.3%	76.9%
	Grand Blanc Academy	Grade 4	1	Grade 4	3	20%	19.4%	20.9%
	Grand Blanc Academy	Grade 7	NA	Grade 7	1	20%	18.4%	21.1%
	Mosaica Academy of Saginaw	Grade 4	4	Grade 4	4	77%	75.8%	78.1%
	Mosaica Academy of Saginaw	Grade 7	NA	Grade 7	5	73%	73.2%	82.2%
New Jersey	Liberty Academy	Grade 4	1	Grade 4	1	86%	84.6%	88.9%
Pennsylvania	Ronald H. Brown Academy	Grade 5	1	Grade 5	2	85%	81.9%	86.6%
	Leadership Learning Partners	Grade 5	1	Grade 5	2	73%	70.0%	77.1%
	Mosaica Academy	Grade 5	2	Grade 5	4	13%	12.3%	13.7%
	Mosaica Academy	Grade 8	4	Grade 8	3	13%	11.8%	14.5%

1=lowest scoring decile, 5.5=average, 10=highest scoring decile.

NA indicates data not available on The Education Trust Web site.

New Jersey. In its second year of operation, Liberty Academy in Jersey City still ranked in the lowest possible decile in grade 4 math and reading. In 2002-03, Mosaica no longer managed this school.

Pennsylvania. Opened in fall 1998, Mosaica Academy in Bensalem, a suburban area outside Philadelphia, became the second school in the nation managed by the company. The charter school board cancelled the management contract for fall 2001-02. Two other Mosaica schools opened in fall 2000: Leadership Learning Partners in Philadelphia and Ronald H. Brown Charter School in Harrisburg. While still ranking below average among its peers, Mosaica Academy ranked higher than the two new schools, which ranked in either the lowest or second-lowest decile for both math and reading in each grade.

Pennsylvania's official evaluation of its charter schools (Miron, Nelson and Risley, 2002) provides longitudinal data for schools in 2001-02 and prior years on the Pennsylvania State Student Assessment (PSSA). The state evaluation corroborates our finding that Mosaica charters performed poorly in comparison to similar schools. (See Table 3.) The Pennsylvania evaluation uses a methodology that predicts charter school student achievement (measured by scale scores) based on the performance of other public schools with similar characteristics (percentage of students qualifying for free lunch, race, school size and urban/suburban/rural location). Results are presented for the fourth and eighth grades because these were the only grades tested in Pennsylvania during those years. When the actual score of a charter school exceeds its predicted score, its students are achieving at higher levels than other comparable public schools. Schools with actual scores below predicted levels are performing below other comparable public schools.

Table 3

Actual and Predicted Pennsylvania State Assessment (PSSA) Scale Scores by School, Year and Grade

		Math			Reading		
		Actual	Predicted ¹	Gap	Actual	Predicted ¹	Gap
Grade 5							
Mosaica Academy	1998-99	1240	1277.2	-37.2	1220	1263.1	-43.1
	1999-00	1350	1394.7	-44.7	1350	1385.2	-35.2
	2000-01	1310	1358.9	-48.9	1320	1351.6	-31.6
	2001-02 ³	1290	1367.6	-77.6	1290	1362.3	-72.3
Leadership Learning Partners							
Partners	2000-01	1050	1099.0	-49.0	1096	1090.0	6.0
	2001-02	1030	1109.9	-79.9	1070	1110.2	-40.2
Renaissance Advantage²							
Advantage²	2000-01	1040	1121.8	-81.8	1080	1126.3	-46.3
	2001-02	1030	1136.3	-106.3	1100	1146.4	-46.4
Ronald H. Brown							
Ronald H. Brown	2001-02	1090	1158.0	-68.0	1110	1153.0	-43.0
Grade 8							
Mosaica Academy	2000-01	1320	1381.0	-61.0	1320	1375.8	-55.8
	2001-02 ³	1330	1379.4	-49.4	1360	1380.3	-20.3

Note: Scale scores range from 1000 to 1600 with a state average of around 1300.

Source: Miron, G., Nelson, C., Riskey, J. 2002. Strengthening Pennsylvania's Charter School Reform: Findings from the Statewide Evaluation and Discussion of Relevant Policy Issues. The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University. <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/charter/pa_5year/>.

¹ Predicted value based on percentage of students qualifying for free lunch, race, location and school size.

² Managed by Advantage Schools, Inc. in 2000-01 and by Mosaica Education, Inc. in 2001-02.

³ No longer managed by Mosaica and renamed School Lane Charter School.

The Mosaica schools performed below predicted levels 21 out of 22 times in every year on both math and reading in every school by at least 20 scale score points. The only exception was fifth grade reading at Leadership Learning Partners during its first year of operation. Over a two-year period, the difference between predicted and actual achievement scores widened at Leadership Learning Partners. At Mosaica Academy in Bensalem, the difference between predicted and actual scores stayed about the same in fifth grade over the three-year period Mosaica managed the school. After the management contract was terminated and the former Mosaica Academy was reborn in 2000-01 as School Lane Charter School, the achievement difference widened in reading and math in grade 5 and decreased in grade 8. In a reverse situation, where Mosaica took over the existing Renaissance Advantage charter school in Philadelphia in 2001-02, the difference between predicted and actual achievement scores increased in math and stayed about the same in reading. At least in its first year under Mosaica management, the former Advantage Schools, Inc. charter school failed to improve.

Student Achievement in Mosaica Schools Compared to Host School Districts

This section of our study incorporates 2001-02 testing as well as assessment data for all previous years each school had been managed by Mosaica. While 2001-02 assessment data are not yet available to construct multischool comparison groups, the analysis compares the Mosaica schools to trends in state averages and the host school districts. In addition to math and reading data, other subject-matter test results (e.g., science or writing) are examined. The analysis includes every grade that a state tested.

Colorado

Mosaica began operating the Denver Arts & Technology Academy in fall 2000. Approximately half of its students qualified for free or reduced-price lunch, compared to more than 60 percent for all Denver schools. The Mosaica school performed below the Denver average in 2000-01 in all grade and subject matter comparisons, except fourth-grade writing (performance was about the same). Results for third-grade reading in 2001-02 indicate a decline in the Mosaica school's performance. While grade 4 writing proficiency noticeably improved in the Denver public schools, it fell modestly at the Mosaica school, as did grade 4 reading. In the fifth and sixth grades in 2001-02, the Mosaica students achieved higher proficiency ratings than Denver public school students in reading but lower ratings in math. (See Table 4.)

Table 4

**State Assessments (CSAP) for Denver Arts & Technology Academy
2001-02 (Opened in fall 2000)**

	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch		
Colorado Average	20.9%	NA
Denver Public Schools	64.3%	NA
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	51.5%	NA
Grade 3 Reading—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	72.0%	72.0%
Denver Public Schools	50.0%	50.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	48.0%	37.0%
Grade 3 Writing—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	NA	51.0%
Denver Public Schools	NA	29.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	NA	31.0%
Grade 4 Reading—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	63.0%	61.0%
Denver Public Schools	37.0%	35.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	31.0%	28.0%
Grade 4 Writing—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	38.0%	50.0%
Denver Public Schools	17.0%	28.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	19.0%	16.0%

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.

Source: Colorado Department of Education School Accountability Reports:

<http://reportcard.cde.state.co.us/reportcard/CommandHandler.jsp> and Colorado State Summaries:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/as_latestCSAP.htm.

Table 4 Continued

**State Assessments (CSAP) for Denver Arts & Technology Academy
2001-02 (Opened in fall 2000)**

	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch		
Colorado Average	20.9%	NA
Denver Public Schools	64.3%	NA
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	51.5%	NA
Grade 5 Math—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	51.0%	55.0%
Denver Public Schools	27.0%	30.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	11.0%	26.0%
Grade 5 Reading—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	64.0%	63.0%
Denver Public Schools	38.0%	38.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	22.0%	43.0%
Grade 6 Math—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	NA	51.0%
Denver Public Schools	NA	25.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	NA	0.0%
Grade 6 Reading—Percent Proficient and Above		
Colorado Average	NA	65.0%
Denver Public Schools	NA	37.0%
Mosaica (Denver Arts & Technology Academy)	NA	46.0%

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.

Source: Colorado Department of Education School Accountability Reports:

<http://reportcard.cde.state.co.us/reportcard/CommandHandler.jsp> and Colorado State Summaries:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/as_latestCSAP.htm.

Delaware

Mosaica managed one charter school in Delaware during the 2000-01 and 2001-02 school years, located in the 20,000-student Christina school district. In its first year of operation, Marion T. Academy served a population of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch comparable to the other public schools in the host district, but in 2001-02, the school's low-income student population increased. Despite this change, the percentage of Mosaica students meeting state standards increased in every test at every grade level. Even with these gains, however, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards generally fell far below both the state average and the Christina school district average. (See Table 5.)

Table 5
**State Assessments (DSTP) for Marion T. Academy in Christina
 2001-02 (Opened in fall 2000)**

	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch		
Delaware	34.0%	34.0%
Christina School District	32.5%	35.3%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	37.1%	48.8%
Grade 3 Reading—Meets or Exceeds Standards		
Delaware	75.1%	79.3%
Christina School District	78.1%	79.4%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	32.3%	38.6%
Grade 3 Math—Meets or Exceeds Standards		
Delaware	73.4%	72.0%
Christina School District	74.7%	72.9%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	27.5%	30.3%
Grade 3 Writing—Meets or Exceeds Standards		
Delaware	32.8%	45.6%
Christina School District	40.6%	52.0%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	5.9%	10.1%
Grade 5 Reading—Meets or Exceeds Standards		
Delaware	66.7%	78.0%
Christina School District	62.8%	73.4%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	29.2%	60.6%
Grade 5 Math—Meets or Exceeds Standards		
Delaware	65.0%	67.1%
Christina School District	59.9%	62.5%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	20.8%	42.3%
Grade 5 Writing—Meets or Exceeds Standards		
Delaware	50.7%	49.3%
Christina School District	48.4%	47.4%
Mosaica (Marion T. Academy)	8.0%	20.4%

Source: Delaware State Testing Program
 <<http://dstp.doe.state.de.us/DSTPMart/default.asp#ByDist>>.

Michigan

Mosaica launched its very first charter school in Saginaw in 1997 and opened four others in 1999-2000. Four of the five Mosaica schools enrolled a slightly higher percentage of low-income students than the host school districts in 2001-02, so small differences in student performance favoring school districts should not be considered significant. The fifth school, Capital Area Academy in Lansing, enrolled a lower percentage of low-income students than the host district.

Michigan has not had a consistent source of accurate data on charter school students eligible for free and reduced-priced lunch. In Tables 6-10, data for 1999-2000 and earlier years came primarily from Standard & Poor's School Evaluation Services Michigan Web site.⁹ Data from The Education Trust Web site was used for 2000-01 (See Table 2), which corresponds closely to information on Standard & Poor's Web site. Neither The Education Trust nor Standard & Poor's has yet posted low-income student data for 2001-02. The low-income student data for 2001-02 in the following tables are estimated by dividing the count of free-lunch applicants by enrollment.¹⁰

Capital Area Academy. Over the three years reviewed in this report, Mosaica's school enrolled a much smaller percentage of low-income students than Lansing public schools. Even so, student achievement lagged behind the school district in every subject and grade level comparison for each year, except for seventh-grade reading in 2001-02 (where the difference was small). Over time, the charter school's performance tended to stay about the same or decline relative to school district performance. (See Table 6.)

Grand Blanc Academy. Located in a school district of 8,000 students outside Flint with few low-income students (about 12 percent), Grand Blanc Academy serves a student population slightly more disadvantaged (about 20 percent applied for free or reduced-price lunch in 2001-02) than the school district. Student proficiency rates at the Mosaica school ranged from 10 to 35 percentage points below the host school district's levels for all grade and subject comparisons for each year, except for grade 5 science in 2000-01. District students significantly outscored the charter school students even after taking into account the slightly higher percentage of low-income students in the Mosaica school. Over time, both the school district and the charter school demonstrated moderate improvement in passing rates in reading and science, but not in writing. Over three years, grade 4 math scores declined at the Mosaica school. Grade 5 writing declined across all three years. (See Table 7.)

George Washington Carver Academy. This Mosaica charter school enrolled a slightly more disadvantaged population than the other public schools in Highland Park, a suburban school district outside Detroit. In Carver's first year of operation, passing rates fell well below school district averages in most grades and subjects. By 2001-02, however, George Washington Carver exceeded school district proficiency ratings in all grades and subjects. Over three years, only grade 5 writing failed to improve. In 2000-01, its second year, Carver did not rank highly in its peer group of 40 similar public schools in the state (a "3" in math and a "2" in reading on the 1 to 10 decile ranking system), but much of the school's improvement occurred during its third year, 2001-02. (See Table 8.)

Center Academy. Mosaica manages the Center Academy charter school in the city of Flint. During its first two years of operation, the percentage of low-income students at the school increased from 58 percent to 73 percent, while the low-income student population in the Flint school district held steady at about 65 percent. The percentage of Center Academy students scoring satisfactory on the state

⁹ During summer 2002, all data on this Web site regarding students receiving or eligible for free and reduced price lunch were replaced by students "applying" for free or reduced-price lunch: <<http://www.ses.standardandpoors.com/Homepage.html>>.

¹⁰ October 2001 Counts of Membership Pupils Eligible for Free Lunch: <http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6525_6530_6559-18603--,00.html>. Enrollment based on the number of students funded by the state, obtained at <<http://www.state.mi.us/mde/cfdata/statusreports.cfm>>. Michigan uses free-lunch application data to determine final estimated at-risk (Section 31a) funding allocations for school districts and charter schools. Because the proportion of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch is not available for many charter schools, free-lunch application data are used to indicate the number of economically disadvantaged students served by a charter school.

assessment (MEAP), however, lagged 10 to 25 percentage points behind the school district average across all four subject/grade comparisons (except seventh -grade reading) in both years. In 2001-02, the percentage of low-income students jumped to an estimated 80 percent, and the gap in performance compared to the school district further widened. While performance improved modestly during the school's second year of operation, test data for 2001-02, the school's third year, indicates a reversal. (See Table 9.)

Mosaica Academy of Saginaw. Student achievement at the longest-operating Mosaica school has been inconsistent over the school's five-year history, with no clear evidence of improvement. The school has attracted a more disadvantaged student body (about 80 percent low-income students) than the Saginaw school district (about 65 percent low-income students). Given the somewhat higher percentage of low-income students at the charter school, the higher passing rate of school district students is not surprising. However, the gaps topped 30 or 40 percentage points in several comparisons. Across the 25 possible grade/subject comparisons during the five years, Mosaica students only once surpassed (grade 8 science in 2001-02) the school district's average passing rate. (See Table 10.)

Table 6

**State Assessments (MEAP) for Capital Area Academy in Lansing
1999-2000 to 2001-02 (Opened in 1999)**

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch			
Michigan Average	28.9%	30.7%	32.1%
City of Lansing	51.7%	54.8%	57.1%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	32.8%	46.6%	38.1%
Grade 4 Math—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	74.8%	72.3%	64.5%
City of Lansing	62.9%	66.9%	50.5%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	NA	30.8%	33.3%
Grade 4 Reading—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	58.2%	60.4%	56.8%
City of Lansing	47.0%	54.6%	42.4%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	NA	50.0%	33.3%
Grade 5 Science—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	43.6%	41.6%	73.2%
City of Lansing	28.8%	27.2%	62.6%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	16.7%	5.6%	31.0%
Grade 5 Writing—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	67.8%	61.1%	55.7%
City of Lansing	69.0%	63.4%	49.1%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	50.0%	42.1%	17.2%
Grade 7 Reading—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	48.4%	57.9%	50.9%
City of Lansing	39.6%	43.3%	32.5%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	NA	41.7%	38.9%
Grade 8 Math—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	NA	NA	53.8%
City of Lansing	NA	NA	30.4%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	NA	NA	29.4%
Grade 8 Science—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	NA	NA	66.6%
City of Lansing	NA	NA	48.2%
Mosaica (Capital Area Academy)	NA	NA	35.3%

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.
Source: Michigan Department of Education,
<<http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/results/data/index.htm>>.

Table 7

**State Assessments (MEAP) for Grand Blanc Academy in Grand Blanc
1999-2000 to 2001-02 (Opened in 1999)**

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch			
Michigan Average	28.9%	30.7%	32.1%
Grand Blanc	9.6%	11.8%	12.2%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	9.4%	19.2%	19.9%
Grade 4 Math—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	74.8%	72.3%	64.5%
Grand Blanc	84.8%	90.0%	86.4%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	65.8%	68.2%	51.6%
Grade 4 Reading—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	58.2%	60.4%	56.8%
Grand Blanc	66.4%	74.8%	77.5%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	47.4%	65.1%	51.5%
Grade 5 Science—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	43.6%	41.6%	73.2%
Grand Blanc	52.4%	57.5%	90.2%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	36.4%	51.7%	61.9%
Grade 5 Writing—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	67.8%	61.1%	55.7%
Grand Blanc	79.1%	78.9%	67.5%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	59.4%	48.3%	42.9%
Grade 7 Reading—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	NA	57.9%	50.9%
Grand Blanc	NA	78.9%	78.6%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	NA	50.0%	47.1%
Grade 8 Math—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	NA	NA	53.8%
Grand Blanc	NA	NA	74.5%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	NA	NA	43.6%
Grade 8 Science—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	NA	NA	66.6%
Grand Blanc	NA	NA	80.9%
Mosaica (Grand Blanc Academy)	NA	NA	56.5%

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.
Source: Michigan Department of Education,
<<http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/results/data/index.htm>>.

Table 8
**State Assessments (MEAP) for George Washington Carver Academy
 In Highland Park, 1999-2000 to 2001-02 (Opened in 1999)**

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch			
Michigan Average	28.9%	30.7%	32.1%
Highland Park	66.7%	63.3%	66.9%
Mosaica (G.W. Carver Academy)	54.4%	76.8%	72.1%
Grade 4 Math—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	74.8%	72.3%	64.5%
Highland Park	35.6%	21.0%	14.0%
Mosaica (G.W. Carver Academy)	10.6%	33.3%	58.8%
Grade 4 Reading—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	58.2%	60.4%	56.8%
Highland Park	26.8%	23.1%	13.0%
Mosaica (G.W. Carver Academy)	8.5%	20.0%	41.5%
Grade 5 Science—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	43.6%	41.6%	73.2%
Highland Park	11.0%	5.3%	24.0%
Mosaica (G.W. Carver Academy)	16.7%	2.7%	33.8%
Grade 5 Writing—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	67.8%	61.1%	55.7%
Highland Park	53.7%	31.2%	28.6%
Mosaica (G.W. Carver Academy)	50.0%	24.7%	30.6%

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.
 Source: Michigan Department of Education,
<http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/results/data/index.htm>.

Table 9
**State Assessments (MEAP) for Center Academy in Flint
 1999-2000 to 2001-02 (Opened in 1999)**

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch			
Michigan Average	30.7%	30.7%	32.1%
City of Flint	64.2%	65.7%	66.4%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	58.2%	73.2%	80.3%
Grade 4 Math—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	74.8%	72.3%	64.5%
City of Flint	52.7%	57.8%	44.0%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	24.4%	30.0%	14.3%
Grade 4 Reading—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	58.2%	60.5%	56.8%
City of Flint	34.7%	44.7%	29.4%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	17.5%	20.0%	14.3%
Grade 5 Science—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	43.6%	41.6%	73.2%
City of Flint	21.5%	21.6%	42.7%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	0.0%	12.9%	23.7%
Grade 5 Writing—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	67.8%	61.1%	55.7%
City of Flint	56.3%	42.4%	39.2%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	24.4%	35.7%	13.5%
Grade 7 Reading—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	NA	57.9%	50.9%
City of Flint	NA	32.5%	31.0%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	NA	44.4%	36.8%
Grade 8 Math—Percent Proficient			
Michigan Average	NA	NA	53.8%
City of Flint	NA	NA	18.2%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	NA	NA	0.0%
Grade 8 Science—Percent Satisfactory			
Michigan Average	NA	NA	66.6%
City of Flint	NA	NA	27.6%
Mosaica (Center Academy)	NA	NA	21.1%

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.
 Source: Michigan Department of Education,
<http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/results/data/index.htm>.

Table 10

**State Assessments (MEAP) for Mosaica Academy of Saginaw in Saginaw
1997-98 to 2001-02 (Opened in 1997)**

	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Free Lunch					
Michigan Average	32.0%	31.0%	30.7%	30.7%	32.1%
City of Saginaw	62.5%	63.3%	63.3%	70.9%	65.4%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	80.7%	77.8%	80.7%	76.9%	88.5%
Grade 4 Math—Percent Satisfactory					
Michigan Average	74.1%	71.7%	74.8%	72.3%	64.5%
City of Saginaw	70.8%	61.8%	65.7%	66.7%	40.6%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	16.7%	23.3%	11.1%	43.2%	20.7%
Grade 4 Reading—Percent Satisfactory					
Michigan Average	58.6%	59.4%	58.2%	60.4%	56.8%
City of Saginaw	46.9%	39.6%	41.1%	46.8%	37.5%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	10.0%	11.6%	2.8%	35.1%	19.3%
Grade 5 Science—Percent Proficient					
Michigan Average	40.4%	37.5%	43.6%	41.6%	73.2%
City of Saginaw	20.4%	20.6%	21.6%	20.5%	54.9%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	0.0%	2.6%	5.1%	2.9%	31.7%
Grade 5 Writing—Percent Proficient					
Michigan Average	64.3%	54.8%	67.8%	61.1%	55.7%
City of Saginaw	57.0%	34.2%	52.8%	58.9%	52.2%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	30.0%	21.1%	13.5%	17.1%	28.2%
Grade 7 Reading—Percent Satisfactory					
Michigan Average	48.8%	53.0%	48.4%	57.9%	50.9%
City of Saginaw	28.4%	35.5%	28.6%	43.2%	30.9%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	NA	NA	7.1%	23.8%	16.7%
Grade 8 Science—Percent Proficient					
Michigan Average	NA	NA	NA	NA	53.8%
City of Saginaw	NA	NA	NA	NA	37.7%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	NA	NA	NA	NA	58.8%
Grade 8 Math—Percent Proficient					
Michigan Average	NA	NA	NA	NA	66.6%
City of Saginaw	NA	NA	NA	NA	26.7%
Mosaica (Academy of Saginaw)	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.6%

Note: NA indicates data not available , grade not tested or grade not offered by school.

Source: Michigan Department of Education,

<<http://www.meritaward.state.mi.us/mma/results/data/index.htm>>.

New Jersey

Mosaica's Liberty Academy in Jersey City enrolls a higher percentage of low-income students than the host school district, so student achievement might be expected to fall short of the school district average. Over its first two years of operation, Liberty's fourth-grade performance has been abysmal compared to that of Jersey City schools. Math and science proficiency fell during the school's second year. Even in science, the school's *best* subject in 2001-02, the percentage of students achieving proficiency (35.1 percent) lags well behind Jersey City schools (57.6 percent). The 2001-02 state assessment data for New Jersey public schools are not yet available. In 2002-03, Mosaica no longer manages Liberty Academy.

Table 11
**State Assessments (ESPA) for Liberty Academy in Jersey City
 1999-2000 to 2000-01 (Opened in 1999)**

	1999-00	2000-01
Percent Low Income		
New Jersey	34.2%	34.0%
Jersey City	72.5%	72.1%
Mosaica (Liberty Academy)	86.2%	86.6%
Grade 4 Literacy—Percent Proficient		
New Jersey	57.2%	74.7%
Jersey City	34.4%	57.9%
Mosaica (Liberty Academy)	9.3%	19.3%
Grade 4 Math—Percent Proficient		
New Jersey	49.6%	46.7%
Jersey City	45.0%	32.6%
Mosaica (Liberty Academy)	11.6%	6.9%
Grade 4 Science—Percent Proficient		
New Jersey	57.2%	49.4%
Jersey City	68.7%	57.6%
Mosaica (Liberty Academy)	41.9%	35.1%

Source: New Jersey Statewide Assessment Reports

<<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/schools/achievement/index.html>>. Low-income student data at:

<<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/data/>>.

Pennsylvania

Mosaica Academy in Bensalem opened in fall 1998. Three years later, the charter school board cancelled the management contract for fall 2001. Mosaica continues to manage two schools in the state that opened in fall 2000: Ronald H. Brown Charter School in Harrisburg and Leadership Learning Partners Charter School in Philadelphia.

Test results in the following tables are presented as scale scores. Pennsylvania changed its proficiency rating system in 2001-02, making it impossible to compare over time the percent of students scoring at the proficient level.

Ronald H. Brown Charter School. Although Brown Charter School enrolled a slightly higher proportion of low-income students (85 percent) than the Harrisburg school district average (about 77 percent to 80 percent), the average scale score fell well below the school district average in math and reading in both years. In its second year, however, Brown Charter started to close the achievement gap with the school district. (See Table 12.)

Table 12

**State Assessments (PSSA) for Ronald H. Brown Charter School in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
2000-01 to 2001-02 (Opened in 2000)**

	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Low Income		
Pennsylvania	30.5%	30.5%
Harrisburg	79.5%	77.4%
Mosaica (Ronald H. Brown Charter)	85.0%	85.0%
Grade 5 Math—Average Scale Score		
Pennsylvania	1310	1320
Harrisburg	1150	1130
Mosaica (Ronald H. Brown Charter)	1070	1090
Grade 5 Reading—Average Scale Score		
Pennsylvania	1320	1320
Harrisburg	1130	1120
Mosaica (Ronald H. Brown Charter)	1070	1110

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Education, PSSA Results,

<http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/browse.asp?a=3&bc=0&c=27525&a_and_tNav=|633|&a_and_tNav=|>.

Free-lunch data from Pennsylvania Department of Education: <<http://www.paprofiles.org/pa0001/archives.htm>>.

Leadership Learning Partners Charter School. This Mosaica school enrolls virtually the same percentage of students from low-income families as the Philadelphia school district. Like the Brown Charter in Harrisburg, the school's performance lagged well behind the school district during both years. Unlike Brown, this school's average scale score declined in 2001-02 in both reading and math, falling further behind the Philadelphia average. (See Table 13.)

Table 13

**State Assessments (PSSA) for Leadership Learning Partners in Philadelphia
2000-01 to 2001-02 (Opened in 2000)**

	2000-01	2001-02
Percent Low Income		
Pennsylvania	30.8%	30.8%
Philadelphia	72.2%	71.6%
Mosaica (Leadership Learning Partners)	73.2%	73.0%
Grade 5 Math—Average Scale Score		
Pennsylvania	1310	1320
Philadelphia	1150	1150
Mosaica (Leadership Learning Partners)	1050	1030
Grade 5 Reading—Average Scale Score		
Pennsylvania	1320	1320
Philadelphia	1140	1150
Mosaica (Leadership Learning Partners)	1090	1070

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Education, PSSA Results,

<http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/browse.asp?a=3&bc=0&c=27525&a_and_tNav=|633|&a_and_tNav=|>.

Free-lunch data from Pennsylvania Department of Education: <<http://www.paprofiles.org/pa0001/archives.htm>>.

Mosaica Academy Charter School. Mosaica Academy enrolled a lower proportion of low-income students than the Bensalem school district, which would lead one to expect the Mosaica school's test scores to be superior. Managed by Mosaica for three years, this school demonstrated substantial improvement in both grade 5 math and reading in its first two years, surpassing the school district scores in both subjects. In 2000-01, students in the newly opened eighth grade scored higher than their school district counterparts. No longer under Mosaica management in 2001-02 and reborn as the School Lane Charter School, its grade 5 math scores were about the same as the school district scores, grade 5 reading scores declined and eighth -graders increased their advantage over the school district students. (See Table 14.)

Table 14

State Assessments (PSSA) for Mosaica Academy Charter School, Bensalem, 1998-99 to 2001-02 (Opened in 1998, contract terminated June 2001)

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 [*]
Percent Low Income				
Pennsylvania	31.7%	30.5%	30.5%	30.5%
Bensalem	22.2%	25.7%	25.0%	23.4%
Mosaica (Academy Charter School)	NA	13.6%	13.0%	NA
Grade 5 Math—Average Scale Score				
Pennsylvania	1300	1310	1310	1320
Bensalem	1340	1330	1310	1290
Mosaica (Academy Charter School)	1240	1350	1310	1290
Grade 5 Reading—Average Scale Score				
Pennsylvania	1310	1320	1320	1320
Bensalem	1330	1320	1300	1300
Mosaica (Academy Charter School)	1220	1350	1320	1290
Grade 8 Math—Average Scale Score				
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	1310	1320
Bensalem	NA	NA	1290	1290
Mosaica (Academy Charter School)	NA	NA	1320	1330
Grade 8 Reading—Average Scale Score				
Pennsylvania	NA	NA	1310	1310
Bensalem	NA	NA	1290	1290
Mosaica (Academy Charter School)	NA	NA	1320	1360

Note: NA indicates data not available, grade not tested or grade not offered by school.

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Education, PSSA Results,

<[http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/browse.asp?a=3&bc=0&c=27525&a_and_tNav=\[633\]&a_and_tNav=|](http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/browse.asp?a=3&bc=0&c=27525&a_and_tNav=[633]&a_and_tNav=|>)>.

Free-lunch data from Pennsylvania Department of Education: <<http://www.paprofiles.org/pa0001/archives.htm>>.

* No longer managed by Mosaica and renamed School Lane Charter School.

Conclusion

Our study compared the performance of Mosaica schools on state assessments to the performance of other public schools with the same grade levels, using the same tests and with a similar percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. The analysis studied all 11 schools Mosaica operated during the 2000-01 school year. The average math and reading score of each Mosaica school was ranked among the comparison schools (usually 40 schools including Mosaica). With rare exceptions, Mosaica schools ranked below average at all schools and grade levels.

Our analysis also compared academic performance on state assessments for schools managed by Mosaica Education, Inc. in 2000-01 to the school districts in which these charter schools are located. The typical school managed by Mosaica performed well below the host school district average, and no clear evidence shows school performance improving over time. Among the 11 schools, only George Washington Carver Academy in Highland Park, Mich., distinguished itself as outperforming the local public school district. The Mosaica Academy in Bensalem, Pa., also performed as well as or better than its host district. However, the charter school board cancelled the management contract with Mosaica due to disagreements on several issues.

No other agency or organization has conducted an independent evaluation of student achievement in schools operated by Mosaica Education, Inc., nor has the company released its own student performance evaluation, so it is impossible to compare our findings to other studies. Some of the data in Pennsylvania's five-year evaluation of the state's charter schools, however, show that students in the four Mosaica schools performed at lower levels than predicted by a statistical model designed to make fair comparisons to similar schools and demonstrated a mixed record of achievement gains. (See Table 3.)

Appendix

State	Year Opened	Enrollment	Grades
Arizona			
Phoenix Advantage Charter School, Phoenix*	1997	1022	K--8
Colorado			
Denver Arts & Technology Academy, Denver	2000	240	K--6
Delaware			
Marion T. Academy, Wilmington	2000	521	K--6
Michigan			
Mosaica Academy of Saginaw	1997	434	preK--8
Kalamazoo Advantage Academy, Kalamazoo*	1998	443	K--8
Grand Blanc Academy, Grand Blanc	1999	499	K--8
Capital Area Academy, Lansing	1999	under 500	1--8
Center Academy, Flint	1999	358	K--8
George Washington Carver Academy, Highland Park*	1999	553	K--6
Benton Harbor Charter School, Benton Harbor*	2000	443	K--12
Detroit Advantage Academy, Detroit*	2000	702	K--6
Bay County Public School Academy, Bay City	2001	211	K--6
Pontiac Public School Academy, Pontiac	2001	350	K--6
New York			
Our World Neighborhood Charter School, Queens	2001	450	K--5
Pennsylvania			
Graystone Academy, Coatesville	1997	450	K--6
Renaissance Advantage Charter School, Philadelphia*	1999	790	K--6
Ronald Brown Charter School, Harrisburg	2000	465	K--7
Leadership Learning Partners Charter School, Philadelphia	2000	525	K--6
Fell Township Charter School, Carbondale	2002	NA	K--6
Washington, DC			
Arts & Technology Academy*	1997	615	K--6
Howard Road Academy*	1999	550	K--6

*Schools were previously operated by Advantage Schools, Inc.

Source: <www.greatschools.net and www.mosaicaeducation.com>.

Terminations and Non Renewals

Mosaica Academy Charter School, Bensalem, PA April, 2001 -- Contract terminated after three years by the charter board. The board claimed the company failed to fulfill its contract. The company sued for back payments from the board.

Liberty Academy/Community Charter School, Jersey City, NJ

Collegium Charter School, West Chester, PA

References

- American Federation of Teachers. 2003. *Update on Student Achievement for Edison Schools Inc.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. <www.aft.org/research/edisonschools/Edison2003.pdf>.
- American Federation of Teachers. 2000. *Trends in Student Achievement for Edison Schools, Inc.: The Emerging Track Record.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. <www.aft.org/research/edisonschools>.
- American Federation of Teachers. 1998. *Student Achievement in Edison Schools: Mixed Results in an Ongoing Enterprise.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. <www.aft.org/research/edisonproject>.
- American Federation of Teachers. 1996. *Setting the Record Straight: EAI's Track Record in Baltimore.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.
- American Federation of Teachers. 1995. *How Private Managers Make Money in Public Schools: Update on the EAI Experience in Baltimore.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.
- American Federation of Teachers. 1995. *The Private Management of Public Schools: An Analysis of the EAI Experience in Baltimore.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.
- Miron, G., Nelson, C., Risley, J. 2002. *Strengthening Pennsylvania's Charter School Reform: Findings from the Statewide Evaluation and Discussion of Relevant Policy Issues.* Kalamazoo, Mich.: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University. <www.wmich.edu/evalctr/charter/pa_5year/>.
- United States General Accounting Office. *Insufficient Research to Determine Effectiveness of Selected Private Education Companies.* October 2002. GAO-03-11.



A Union of Professionals

American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
202/879-4400
www.aft.org
