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## Mega-State Report: Comparing Florida's 2015 NAEP Scores with California, Texas, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the Nation

In 2010, more than one-third of the Nation's public school students attended school in California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. These states now serve more than half of the Nation's English language learners (ELLs), as well as some of the largest concentrations of children from lower-income families.

Because of their large student populations, California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas are referred to as the Mega-States. Pennsylvania and Ohio place sixth and seventh in population, respectively, and are therefore important to compare as well. Policymakers and educators look at the educational progress of these states' children as they explore ways to close achievement gaps across the Nation's changing demographics.

The following document compares Florida's NAEP 2015 scores and achievement levels to the other Mega-States, Pennsylvania, Ohio and the Nation, with special focus on Race/Ethnicity, Students with Disabilities (SD), English Language Learners (ELL), and students eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP).
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## Overview

Overall, Florida has made some of the greatest learning gains in both mathematics and reading since the 1990s, especially when compared to the other four Mega-States (CA, TX, NY, and IL), Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation. Each section of this document separates Florida's scores by grade level and subject area, but a few performance highlights follow. All NAEP data is compiled from the NAEP Data Explorer (NDE) accessible online via the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) website. ${ }^{1}$

Grade 4 Reading Compared to the other six states and the Nation, Florida's public school students improved the most on the Grade 4 NAEP Reading assessment, gaining 19 average scale score points between 1992 and 2015. Florida's significant gain moved the state from scoring well below the national average in 1992 to above it in 2015. Additionally,

- In 2015, Florida's Grade 4 average scale score ranked $10^{\text {th }}$ against the other 49 states.
- Florida's White Grade 4 public school students placed $8^{\text {th }}$, Hispanic students placed $1^{\text {st }}$, and Black students placed $8^{\text {th }}$ nationwide for their 2015 NAEP Reading average scale scores.
- Florida's NSLP eligible Grade 4 public school placed $1^{\text {st }}$, students with disabilities placed $2^{\text {nd }}$, and ELLs placed $8^{\text {th }}$ nationwide for their 2015 NAEP Reading average scale score.

Grade 8 Reading Florida's average scale score increased 10 points on Grade 8 NAEP Reading between 1998 and 2015; the Nation gained 3 points. Florida's gain moved the state from scoring below the national average in 1998 to being on par with the national average in 2015.

Grade 4 Mathematics Florida's average scale score increased by 29 points on Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics between 1992 and 2015, significantly greater than the Nation's 21-point gain. Florida's improvement moved the state from scoring below the national average in 1992 to above the national average in 2015. Additionally,

- Florida's Hispanic Grade 4 public school students placed $2^{\text {nd }}$ and Black students placed $9^{\text {th }}$ nationwide for their 2015 NAEP Mathematics average scale scores.
- Florida's NSLP eligible Grade 4 public school students placed $5^{\text {th }}$ and students with disabilities placed $2^{\text {nd }}$ nationwide for their 2015 NAEP Mathematics average scale scores.


## Florida Demographics

Florida is fourth ( 2.6 million) in size of public school enrollment, behind California ( 6.3 million), Texas ( 5 million), and New York ( 2.7 million), but ahead of Illinois ( 2.1 million), Pennsylvania ( 1.8 million), and Ohio (1.7 million).

Florida has the third-greatest number of English language learners in the nation, behind California and Texas.

Florida's student/teacher ratio of 15.2 students to 1 teacher was lower than those of California, Texas, Illinois, Ohio, and the Nation. ${ }^{2}$

[^0]Florida had the second highest percentage of students (57.5\%) eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) out of the seven states. California had the highest (60\%). The NSLP is used as an indicator of socio-economic standing.

## Participation in State-Level NAEP

The chart below shows when the seven states started participating in state-level NAEP. Florida chose not to participate in state-level NAEP in 2000, the same year that FCAT began in grades 3 through 8. Beginning in 2003, the NCLB Act of 2001 required all states to participate in state-level NAEP.

Table 1: Initial year of participation in state-level NAEP ${ }^{3}$

|  | Grade 4 Math | Grade 8 Math | Grade 4 Reading | Grade 8 Reading |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Florida | 1992** | 1990** | 1992** | 1998 |
| California | 1992 | 1990 | 1992** | 1998 |
| Texas | 1992 | 1990 | 1992** | 1998 |
| New York | 1992 | 1990 | 1992** | 1998 |
| Illinois | 2000 | 1990^ | 2003 | 2003 |
| Pennsylvania | 1992** | 1990** | 1992+ | 2002 |
| Ohio | 1992* | 1990* | 1992~ | 2002 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}* \text { Did not participate in 1996 } & \text { ** Did not participate in } 2000 \\ \sim\end{array}$ <br> ^ Did not participate in 1992 or 1996 |  | ** Did not participate in 2000+ Did not participate in 1998 or 2000 |  |  |

## Student Enrollment, Student/Teacher Ratio, and Per-Pupil Expenditures

Based on 2011-2012 School Year Common Core of Data, California has the largest student population and New York has the lowest student/teacher ratio and the highest per-pupil expenditure.

Table 2: Student Enrollment, Student/Teacher Ratio, and Perpupil Expenditure ${ }^{3}$

|  | Student <br> Enrollment | Student/Teacher <br> Ratio | Per pupil <br> Expenditure |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Florida | $2,668,156$ | 15.2 | $\$ 9,060$ |
| California | $6,287,834$ | 23.4 | $\$ 9,184$ |
| Texas | $5,000,470$ | 15.4 | $\$ 8,837$ |
| New York | $2,704,718$ | 12.9 | $\$ 18,621$ |
| Illinois | $2,083,097$ | 15.8 | $\$ 11,671$ |
| Pennsylvania | $1,771,395$ | 14.2 | $\$ 13,149$ |
| Ohio | $1,740,030$ | 16.1 | $\$ 11,329$ |

[^1]Eligibility for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), by English Language Learners, and by Race/Ethnicity of Florida, the Six Other Most Populated States, and the Nation California has the highest percentage of students eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and students eligible to participate in the English Language Learners program. Ohio has the largest percentage of White students, Florida has the highest percentage of Black students, and California has the highest percentage of Hispanic and Asian students.

Table 3: Percentages of students eligible for the NSLP and ELL programs, as well as percentages of White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian students.

|  |  | Proficie |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eligible for NSLP | Program | White | Black | Hispanic | Asian |
| Florida | 57.5\% | 8.7\% | 42.4\% | 22.9\% | 28.5\% | 2.5\% |
| California | 61.0\% | 23.0\% | 26.0\% | 6.5\% | 52.1\% | 11.1\% |
| Texas | 51.0\% | 14.9\% | 30.5\% | 12.8\% | 50.8\% | 3.5\% |
| New York | 49.3\% | 7.6\% | 48.2\% | 18.4\% | 23.3\% | 8.3\% |
| Illinois | 48.9\% | 8.1\% | 50.8\% | 18.0\% | 23.7\% | 4.2\% |
| Pennsylvania | 39.8\% | 2.6\% | 70.6\% | 15.3\% | 8.6\% | 3.2\% |
| Ohio | 43.6\% | 2.2\% | 73.7\% | 16.2\% | 3.8\% | 1.7\% |

Charter Schools
Since 1996, Florida charter schools have played a key role in increasing parental options in public education and providing innovative learning opportunities for students. Charter schools are tuition-free public schools created through an agreement, or "charter," typically between the school and the local district school board, giving the charter school expanded freedom relative to traditional public schools in return for a commitment to higher accountability standards. Many charter schools in Florida have innovative missions, often providing themed learning approaches focusing on areas such as arts, sciences, and technologies. Others provide services to special populations, such as students at risk of academic failure or students with disabilities.

In 2012-2013, Florida had the highest percentage of charter schools and tied with California for the highest percentage of student enrollment in charter schools when compared to the other Mega States, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

Table 4: Charter school data for the 2012-2013 school year. ${ }^{4}$

| State | Number of Charter Schools | Charter School Enrollment | Percentage of Charter Schools (out of total public schools) | Percentage of Public School Students Enrolled in Charter Schools | State Percentage of Overall National Charter Schools |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 6,079 | 2,267,814 | 6.2\% | 4.6\% | N/A |
| California | 1,085 | 470,880 | 10.5\% | 7.6\% | 17.8\% |
| Florida | 581 | 204,132 | 13.6\% | 7.6\% | 9.6\% |
| Illinois | 58 | 53,829 | 1.4\% | 2.6\% | 1.0\% |
| New York | 211 | 78,139 | 4.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.5\% |
| Ohio | 368 | 114,459 | 10.0\% | 6.6\% | 6.1\% |
| Pennsylvania | 175 | 118,430 | 5.6\% | 6.8\% | 2.9\% |
| Texas | 628 | 215,082 | 7.2\% | 4.2\% | 10.3\% |

[^2]
## Grade 4 Reading

In 2015, Florida's Reading average scale score for all Grade 4 public school students was significantly higher than the other Mega-States and the Nation. However, Ohio and Pennsylvania had average scale scores that were not significantly different from Florida's.

Between 1992 and 2015, Florida's average scale score improved by 19 points, a significantly greater increase in average scale scores than California, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and the Nation. Illinois did not participate in Grade 4 reading until 2003. Florida's Grade 4 NAEP reading average scale score improved from placing below the national average in 1992 to above the national average in 2015.

## Grade 4 Reading

Average Scale Score Changes Between 1992 and 2015 for All Public School Students

Table 5: Florida's change in its Grade 4 NAEP Reading average scale scores between 1992 and 2015 compared to that of 5 of the other large states and the Nation.

| State | Scale Score Change |
| :--- | :---: |
| Florida | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |
| California | $10<$ |
| New York | $8<$ |
| Ohio | $8<$ |
| National Public | $7<$ |
| Pennsylvania | $6<$ |
| Texas | $5<$ |
| FL had a greater average scale score change |  |

## Grade 4 Reading <br> Percentages Performing at or above Proficient, 2015

Table 6: Percentages of students performing at or above Proficient in key demographic groups

|  | All | White | Hispanic | Black | Asian | NSLP | No NSLP | SD | ELL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | 35* | 46 | 21* | 18 | 53 | 21* | 52 | 12 | 8 |
| California | 28* | 46 | 16* | 14 | 50 | 16* | 48 | 8 | 6 |
| Florida | 39 | 49 | 34 | 20 | 63 | 29 | 55 | 16 | 9 |
| Illinois | 35 | 46 | 23* | 15 | 65 | 20* | 55 | 15 | 4 |
| New York | 36 | 49 | 19* | 18 | 50 | 21* | 53 | 8 | 5 |
| Ohio | 38 | 43 | 23 | 16 | 58 | 23 | 52 | 9 | 12 |
| Pennsylvania | 41 | 49 | 18* | 17 | 51 | 24 | 55 | 16 | 3 |
| Texas | 31* | 50 | 22* | 17 | 66 | 20* | 49 | 11 | 12 |

* Florida scored significantly higher than
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards were not met or appropriate standard errors could not be calculated for one or more estimates in the test

Students performing at or above Proficient have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter. In 2015, Florida's overall percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient was significantly higher than in California, Texas, and the Nation.

Additionally in 2015, Florida's percentage of Hispanic public school students performing at or above Proficient was higher than the other Mega-States, Pennsylvania, and the Nation. Only Ohio had a percentage that was not significantly different from Florida's.

Florida students eligible for NSLP had a percentage scoring at or above Proficient that was significantly higher than California, Illinois, New York, Texas and the Nation in 2015. Ohio and Pennsylvania had scores not significantly different from Florida's.

## Grade 4 Reading

Gain in Percent Scoring at or above Proficient, 2003-2015
Table 7: Overall gains and gains by subgroup between 2003 and 2015

|  | All | White | Black | Hispanic | Asian | NSLP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | +5 | +6 | +6 | +6 | +16 | +6 |
| California | +7 | +10 | 3 | +7 | +14 | +7 |
| Florida | +7 | +7 | +7 | +10 | 19 | +10 |
| Illinois | +5 | 5 | +5 | +8 | +19 | +7 |
| New York | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1* | 8 | 3* |
| Ohio | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | $\ddagger$ | 5 |
| Pennsylvania | +8 | +9 | +8 | 7 | $\ddagger$ | +10 |
| Texas | 4 | +10 | 1 | +5 | +28 | +4* |

* Florida's gain significantly greater than
+/- Changes between 2003 and 2015 were significant
$\ddagger$ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met or appropriate standard errors could not be calculated for one or more estimates in the test

All of Florida's groups, except for students identifying themselves as Asian, had significant gains in the percent scoring at or above Proficient between 2003 and 2015.

While the percentage of Florida's Hispanic students scoring at or above Proficient significantly increased by 10 points between 2003 and 2015, the change was not significantly different from that of the Nation, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the other Mega-States excluding New York. The change in Ohio's Hispanic students scoring at or above Proficient rounded to zero.

## Race and Ethnicity

Florida's 2015 NAEP results by Race/Ethnicity compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient on NAEP Reading:

- 49\% of Florida's Grade 4 White students scored at or above Proficient-similar to the four other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 34\% of Florida's Grade 4 Hispanic students scored at or above Proficient-the highest among the Mega-States and significantly higher than Pennsylvania and the Nation. Ohio's Hispanic students scored not significantly different from Florida's.
- 20\% of Florida's Grade 4 Black students scored at or above Proficient-similar to that of the four other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 63\% of Florida's Grade 4 Asian students scored at or above Proficient-similar to that of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.

Figure 1: Comparison of percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient by Race/Ethnicity

## Grade 4 Reading-White, Hispanic, Black and Asian Students

Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015


Eligibility for National School Lunch Program (NSLP), Students with Disabilities (SD), and English Language Learners (ELLs)
Florida's 2015 NAEP results by eligibility for the National School Lunch Program (NALP) and by exceptionality (SD and ELL) compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient on NAEP Reading:

- 29\% of Florida's Grade 4 students who were eligible for NSLP scored at or above Proficientsignificantly higher than New York, Illinois, Texas, California, and the Nation but not significantly different from Pennsylvania and Ohio.
- $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ of Florida's Grade 4 students who were not eligible for NSLP scored at or above Profi-cient-not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the Nation
- $16 \%$ of Florida's Grade 4 students who were classified as SDs scored at or above Proficientnot significantly different from the other Mega-States, Pennsylvania, Ohio and the Nation.
- 9\% of Florida's Grade 4 students who were classified as ELLs scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, and the Nation. Pennsylvania could not be included in the significance test.

Figure 2: Comparison of percentages of students scoring at or above Proficient by NSLP Eligibility and by exceptionality (SD or ELL)

Grade 4 Reading—NSLP Eligible, NSLP Not Eligible, SD, and ELL Public School Students Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015


## Grade 8 Reading

Florida's Reading Grade 8 public school students' average scale score improved from being significantly lower than the national average in 1998 to being not significantly different from the national average in 2015.

Between 1998 and 2015, Florida's and California's gains were not significantly different. The gains of the Nation, New York, and Texas were significantly smaller than Florida's. Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois did not participate in NAEP in 1998.

Between 2002 and 2015, California had an average scale score gain significantly greater than Florida's and 4 of the other large states and the Nation.

## Grade 8 Reading

Average Scale Score Changes Between 2002 and 2015 for All Public School Students

Table 8: Comparison of Florida's Average Scale Score Changes Between 2002 and 2015 with 5 of the other large states and the Nation

| State | Scale Score Change |
| :--- | :---: |
| California | $9>$ |
| Pennsylvania | 3 |
| Florida | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| National Public | 1 |
| New York | -1 |
| Texas | -1 |
| Ohio | -2 |

> FL had a significantly smaller average scale score change
Grade 8 Reading
Percentage Scoring at or above Proficient, 2015
Table 9: Percentages of students performing at or above Proficient in key demographic groups

|  | All | White | Hispanic | Black | Asian | NSLP | No NSLP | SD |  | ELL |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | 33 | 42 | $20^{*}$ | 15 | 50 | 20 | 47 | 8 | 3 |  |
| California | 28 | 44 | $18^{*}$ | 16 | 49 | 18 | 43 | 5 | 2 |  |
| Florida | 30 | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | 15 | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |  |
| Illinois | $35^{* *}$ | 45 | 22 | 13 | 65 | 22 | 49 | 11 | 3 |  |
| New York | 33 | 43 | 22 | 17 | 42 | 22 | 46 | 8 | 3 |  |
| Ohio | $36^{* *}$ | 41 | 26 | 14 | 49 | 20 | 50 | 8 | 7 |  |
| Pennsylvania | $39^{* *}$ | 47 | 18 | 13 | 64 | 20 | $55^{* *}$ | 10 | 6 |  |
| Texas | 28 | 43 | $19^{*}$ | 19 | 55 | 18 | 40 | 5 | 2 |  |

* Florida scored significantly higher than
** Florida scored significantly lower than

Students performing at or above Proficient have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter. In 2015, Florida's overall percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient was not significantly different from New York, California, Texas, and the Nation. Florida's percentage was significantly lower than in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois.

Additionally in 2015, Florida's percentage of Hispanic public school students performing at or above Proficient was higher than the Nation, California, and Texas. Ohio, New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania had percentages that were not significantly different from Florida's.

Grade 8 Reading
Gain in Percent Scoring at or above Proficient, 2003-2015
Table 10: Overall gains and gains by subgroup between 2003 and 2015

|  | All |  |  |  |  |  |  | White | Black | Hispanic |  | Asian | NSLP |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | +3 | +4 | +3 | +6 | +12 | +5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | +6 | +10 | 4 | +7 | 12 | +6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\ddagger$ | +6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | +7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York | $-2^{*}$ | -5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 2 | 2 | 1 | -11 | $\ddagger$ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | +7 | +11 | 2 | -6 | $\ddagger$ | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | +18 | +6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Florida's gain significantly greater than
+/- Changes between 2003 and 2015 were significant
$\ddagger$ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met or appropriate standard errors could not be calculated for one or more estimates in the test

Between 2003 and 2015, Florida's percentage of NSLP eligible students performing at or above Proficient significantly increased by 6 points. Otherwise, Florida's percentages of overall, White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian public students performing at or above Proficient did not significantly increase between 2003 and 2015.

The Nation's percentages of overall, NSLP eligible, White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian students performing at or above Proficient had significant gains between 2003 and 2015.

## Race and Ethnicity

Florida's 2015 NAEP results by Race/Ethnicity compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient on NAEP Reading.

- 40\% of Florida's Grade 8 White students scored at or above Proficient-not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 26\% of Florida's Grade 8 Hispanic students scored at or above Proficient-significantly higher than California, Texas, and the Nation but not significantly different from Ohio, New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.
- 15\% of Florida's Grade 8 Black students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 55\% of Florida's Grade 8 Asian students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.

Figure 3: Comparison of percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient by Race/Ethnicity

Grade 8 Reading-White, Hispanic, Black and Asian Students
Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015


Eligibility for National School Lunch Program (NSLP), Students with Disabilities (SD), and English Language Learners (ELLs)
Florida's 2015 NAEP Reading results by eligibility for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and students with exceptionalities (SD and ELL) compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient.

- 22\% of Florida's Grade 8 students who were eligible for NSLP scored at or above Proficientnot significantly different from the other Mega-States, Pennsylvania, Ohio and the Nation.
- 45\% of Florida's Grade 8 students who were not eligible for NSLP scored at or above Profi-cient-significantly lower than Pennsylvania but not significantly different from the other MegaStates, Ohio, and the Nation.
- 8\% of Florida's Grade $\mathbf{8}$ students classified as SDs scored at or above Proficient-not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 2\% of Florida's Grade 8 students classified as ELLs scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from Pennsylvania, New York, Texas, California, and the Nation. Ohio and Illinois did not have enough ELL students scoring at or above Proficient to calculate a significant difference.

Figure 4: Comparison of percentages of students scoring at or above Proficient by NSLP Eligibility and by exceptionality (SD or ELL)

Grade 8 Reading—NSLP Eligible, NSLP Not Eligible, SD, and ELL Public School Students
Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015 Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015


## Grade 4 Mathematics

The mathematics average scale scores for fourthgraders in Florida increased from placing below the national average in 1992 to significantly above the national average in 2015.

Florida's 29-point gain between 1992 and 2015 was significantly greater than the 23 -point gain for California's public school students, the 21-point gain for public school students nationally, the 19-point gain for Pennsylvania's public school students, and the 18-point gain for New York's public school students. Texas and Ohio had changes that were not significantly different from Florida's.

## Grade 4 Mathematics

Average Scale Score Changes Between 1992 and 2015 for All Public School Students

Table 11: Florida's change in its Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics average scale score between 1992 and 2015 compared to that of 5 of the other large states and the Nation.

| State | Scale Score Change |
| :--- | :---: |
| Florida | $\mathbf{2 9}$ |
| Texas | 26 |
| Ohio | 25 |
| California | $23<$ |
| National Public | $21<$ |
| Pennsylvania | $19<$ |
| New York | $18<$ |

$>$ FL had a significantly smaller average scale score change

## Grade 4 Mathematics

Percent Scoring at or above Proficient, 2015
Table 12: Percentages of students performing at or above Proficient by key demographic groups

|  | All | White | Hispanic | Black | Asian | NSLP | No NSLP | SD | ELL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | 39 | 51 | $26^{*}$ | 19 | 61 | $24^{*}$ | 58 | 16 | 15 |
| California | $29^{*}$ | 48 | $17^{*}$ | 18 | 54 | $16^{*}$ | 51 | $10^{*}$ | 8 |
| Florida | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| Illinois | $37^{*}$ | 49 | $24^{*}$ | $12^{*}$ | 69 | $21^{*}$ | 56 | $13^{*}$ | 8 |
| New York | $35^{*}$ | 47 | $21^{*}$ | 14 | 57 | $23^{*}$ | $51^{*}$ | $12^{*}$ | 9 |
| Ohio | 45 | 52 | 33 | 12 | $\ddagger$ | $24^{*}$ | 64 | $12^{*}$ | 17 |
| Pennsylvania | 45 | 53 | $21^{*}$ | 15 | 65 | 24 | 67 | 20 | 16 |
| Texas | 44 | 60 | 37 | 29 | 82 | 30 | $68^{* *}$ | 18 | $28^{* *}$ |

* Florida scored significantly higher than
** Florida scored significantly lower than
$\ddagger$ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met or appropriate standard errors could not be calculated for one or more estimates in the test

Students performing at or above Proficient have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter. In 2015, Florida's percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above Proficient was higher than those of New York, California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and the Nation. Texas's and Ohio's Hispanic students' scores were not significantly different from Florida's.

Florida's 2015 percentage of students eligible for the NSLP performing at or above Proficient was significantly higher than those of California, New York, Illinois, Ohio, and the Nation. Texas's and Pennsylvania's NSLP percentages were not significantly different from Florida's.

## Grade 4 Mathematics

Gain in Percent Scoring at or above Proficient, 2003-2015
Table 13: Overall gains and gains by subgroups between 2003 and 2015

|  | All | White | Black | Hispanic | Asian | NSLP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | +8 | +9 | +9 | +11 | +13 | +9* |
| California | 4 | 5 | 9 | +6 | 5 | +4* |
| Florida | +11 | +11 | +13 | +11 | 12 | +14 |
| Illinois | +5 | 5 | 5* | +11 | 12 | +10 |
| New York | 2 | 2* | 3* | 7 | 6 | +5 |
| Ohio | +9 | +9 | 3* | +18 | $\ddagger$ | 7* |
| Pennsylvania | +9 | +9 | +7 | +9 | $\ddagger$ | +9 |
| Texas | +11 | +11 | +13 | +15 | +19 | +10 |

* Florida's gain significantly greater than
+/- Changes between 2003 and 2015 were significant
$\ddagger$ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met or appropriate standard errors could not be calculated for one or more estimates in the test

All of Florida's groups, except for students identifying themselves as Asian, had significant gains in their percentages scoring at or above Proficient between 2003 and 2015.

The gain in the percentage of Florida's Black students performing at or above Proficient between 2003 and 2015 was significantly higher than that of Illinois, New York, and Ohio but not significantly different from California, Pennsylvania, Texas, and the Nation.

## Race and Ethnicity

Florida's 2015 NAEP results by Race/Ethnicity compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient

- 54\% of Florida's Grade 4 White students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from other Mega States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 38\% of Florida's Grade 4 Hispanic students scored at or above Proficient-not significantly different from Texas and Ohio but significantly higher than the other Mega-States, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 21\% of Florida's Grade 4 Black students scored at or above Proficient-significantly higher than Illinois, but not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- $\mathbf{6 5 \%}$ of Florida's Grade 4 Asian students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega States, Pennsylvania, and the Nation. Ohio did not have enough Asian students in the sample to provide comparable results.

Figure 5: Comparison of percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient by Race/Ethnicity
Grade 4 Mathematics-White, Hispanic, Black and Asian Students
Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015


Eligibility for National School Lunch Program (NSLP), Students with Disabilities (SD), and English Language Learners (ELLs)
Florida's 2015 NAEP results by eligibility for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and students with exceptionalities (SD and ELL) compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient

- 31\% of Florida's Grade 4 students who were eligible for NSLP scored at or above Proficient-significantly higher than New York, Illinois, California, and the Nation but not significantly different than Texas and Pennsylvania.
- 60\% of Florida's Grade 4 students who were NOT eligible for NSLP scored at or above Profi-cient-a significantly higher percentage than New York and a significantly lower percentage than Texas. Florida's percentage was not significantly different from those of California, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- $\mathbf{2 3 \%}$ of Florida's Grade 4 students with disabilities scored at or above Proficient-a significantly higher percentage than California, Illinois, New York, and Ohio and not significantly different from the Texas, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ of Florida's Grade 4 English language learners scored at or above Proficient-a significantly lower percentage than Texas but not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.

Figure 6: Comparison of percentages of students scoring at or above Proficient by NSLP Eligibility and by exceptionality (SD or ELL)


## Grade 8 Mathematics

Florida's grade 8 mathematics average scale score increased by 20 points between 1990 and 2015, a significantly lower increase than Texas, but not significantly different from California, Illinois, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, or the Nation.

## Grade 8 Mathematics

## Average Scale Score Changes Between 1990

 and 2015 for All Public School StudentsTable 14: Comparison of Florida's Average Scale Score Changes Between 1990 and 2015 with 6 of the other large states and the Nation

| State | Scale Score Change |
| :--- | :---: |
| Texas | $26>$ |
| Illinois | 21 |
| Ohio | 21 |
| Florida | $\mathbf{2 0}$ |
| National Public | 20 |
| New York | 19 |
| California | 19 |
| Pennsylvania | 17 |

> FL had a significantly smaller average scale score change

Grade 8 Mathematics
Percentages Performing at or above Proficient, 2015
Table 15: Percentages of students performing at or above Proficient by key demographic groups

|  | All |  | White | Hispanic | Black | Asian | NSLP | No NSLP | SD | ELL |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | $32^{* *}$ | $42^{* *}$ | 19 | 12 | 58 | 18 | 48 | 8 | 5 |  |
| California | 27 | 43 | $13^{*}$ | 14 | 56 | 16 | 45 | 4 | 2 |  |
| Florida | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |
| Illinois | $32^{* *}$ | 40 | 22 | 12 | 59 | 18 | 47 | 7 | 7 |  |
| New York | 31 | 40 | 19 | 15 | 52 | 21 | 44 | 9 | 7 |  |
| Ohio | $35^{* *}$ | 40 | 24 | 11 | 63 | 20 | 49 | 10 | 3 |  |
| Pennsylvania | $36^{* *}$ | $44^{* *}$ | 14 | 8 | 68 | 18 | 52 | 9 | 5 |  |
| Texas | $32^{* *}$ | $48^{* *}$ | 23 | 16 | 67 | 20 | 47 | 8 | 6 |  |

* Florida scored significantly higher than
** Florida scored significantly lower than
Students performing at or above Proficient have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter. Overall, Florida's percentage of students performing at or above Proficient was not significantly different from California and New York but significantly lower than Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.

In 2015, the percentage of Florida's White students performing at or above Proficient was not significantly different from California, Illinois, New York, and Ohio but significantly lower than Pennsylvania, Texas, and the Nation.

Grade 8 Mathematics
Gain in Percent Scoring at or above Proficient, 2003-2015

Table 16: Overall gains and gains by subgroup between 2003 and 2015

|  | All | White | Black | Hispanic | Asian | NSLP |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation | +5 | +6 | +5 | +8 | +17 | +7 |
| California | +5 | +9 | +9 | +6 | +17 | +7 |
| Florida | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | +5 |
| Illinois | 3 | $\#$ | +6 | $+14^{* *}$ | 1 | +8 |
| New York | $(-) 1$ | $(-) 4$ | 5 | 3 | 11 | +5 |
| Ohio | +5 | 5 | 3 | 6 | $\ddagger$ | +8 |
| Pennsylvania | +6 | +9 | 4 | 8 | $\ddagger$ | +8 |
| Texas | +7 | +10 | +8 | +10 | 9 | +8 |

* Florida scored significantly higher than
** Florida scored significantly lower than
+/- Changes between 2003 and 2015 were significant
(-) Change was negative, but not statistically significant
$\ddagger$ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met or appropriate standard errors could not be calculated for one or more estimates in the test
\# No change between 2003 and 2015

Between 2003 and 2015, only Illinois' Hispanic students had a greater gain than did Florida in the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient. None of the other states had gains that were significantly different from Florida's.

## Race and Ethnicity

Florida's 2015 NAEP results by Race/Ethnicity compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient on NAEP Mathematics.

- $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ of Florida's Grade 8 White students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from California, New York, Ohio, or Illinois but significantly lower than Pennsylvania, Texas, and the Nation.
- 22\% of Florida's Grade 8 Hispanic students scored at or above Proficient-significantly higher California but not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 11\% of Florida's Grade 8 Black students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- $\mathbf{5 1 \%}$ of Florida's Grade 8 Asian students scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.

Figure 7: Comparison of percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient by Race/Ethnicity

## Grade 8 Mathematics-White, Hispanic, Black and Asian Students Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015



Eligibility for National School Lunch Program (NSLP), Students with Disabilities (SD), and English Language Learners (ELLs)
Florida's 2015 NAEP results by eligibility for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and students with exceptionalities (SD and ELL) compared to those of the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation for students scoring at or above Proficient

- 16\% of Florida's Grade 8 students who were eligible for NSLP scored at or above Proficientnot significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 44\% of Florida's Grade 8 students who were not eligible for NSLP scored at or above Profi-cient-not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.
- 6\% of Florida's Grade $\mathbf{8}$ Students with Disabilities scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the nation, the other Mega-States, Ohio, or Pennsylvania.
- 4\% of Florida's Grade 8 English Language Learners scored at or above Proficient—not significantly different from the other Mega-States, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation.

Figure 8: Comparison of percentages of students scoring at or above Proficient by NSLP Eligibility and by exceptionality (SD or ELL)

Grade 8 Mathematics—NSLP Eligible, NSLP Not Eligible, SD, and ELL Public School Students Percentage Performing at or above Proficient, 2015
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