

Technical Q&A for Mega-States Report

2nd Draft 02/08/13

Contents

A. Reporting purpose and demographic information

1. Why focus on the Mega-States?
2. What were some of the school and student characteristics for the Mega-States?
3. How did the demographic makeup of the student population shift over time in the Mega-States?
4. What is the distribution of students by Hispanic origin and by English language learners and students from lower-income families?
5. Are the Mega-States educating the preponderance of lower-income or minority students in the nation?

B. Exclusions and accommodations

6. What were the exclusion and accommodation rates for the Mega-States in the NAEP reading, mathematics, and science assessments?
7. What accommodations were offered in the NAEP reading, mathematics, and science assessments?
8. Why is the exclusion rate higher in Texas in grade 4 reading than in the other Mega-States?

C. Reporting and interpreting results

9. What results were included in the Mega-States report? Why weren't writing results included in the report?
10. Can results be compared across subjects and grades?
11. What information is on the website that is not shown in the report card?
12. What were the score changes for the other 45 states in the NAEP reading and mathematics assessments?

A. Reporting purpose and demographic information

1. Why focus on the Mega-States?

The importance of these “Mega-States” goes beyond the sheer size of their population. They now serve more than half of the nation’s English language learners (ELL), as well as some of the largest concentrations of children from lower-income families. As policymakers and educators look at the nation’s changing demographics and explore ways to close achievement gaps, the educational progress of children in these states is of interest far beyond their state borders. That’s why the National Center for Education Statistics and the National Assessment Governing Board focused this special report on educational outcomes in the five largest states.

2. What were some of the school and student characteristics for the Mega-States?

The table below provides an overview of the five Mega-States in several key categories, including the number of students enrolled in operating schools in the nation and the five Mega-States. The expenditures per pupil, student/teacher ratio, percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch, and number of English language learners are also shown.

School and student characteristics for public elementary and secondary schools, by state/jurisdiction: Fiscal year 2009, school year 2009-10, and school year 2010-11

State/jurisdiction	School System Data				Socioeconomic Indicators	Number of English language learners
	Number of operating schools	Number of students	Current expenditures per pupil	Student/teacher ratio	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price school lunch	
United States	98,817	49,484,181	\$10,591	16.0	48.0	5,208,247
California	10,124	6,289,578	9,503	24.1	53.8	1,467,989
Florida	4,131	2,643,347	8,867	15.1	56.0	260,202
Illinois	4,361	2,091,654	11,592	15.7	46.6	176,262
New York	4,757	2,734,955	17,746	12.9	47.8	237,634
Texas	8,732	4,935,715	8,562	14.7	50.0	726,823

NOTE: The results for current expenditures per pupil are based on fiscal year 2009, and the results for the number of English language learners are based on school year 2009-10. The other results shown in the table are based on school year 2010-11.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 2010-11, Version 1a; and "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education," 2010-11, Version 1a; and "National Public Education Financial Survey," FY09 (2008-09); and Consolidated State Performance Reports, 2009-10.

3. How did the demographic makeup of the student population shift over time in the Mega-States?

The table below shows that the demographic makeup of students has changed in the Mega-States and in the nation overall. In looking at eighth-graders who were assessed in NAEP mathematics, the percentage of Hispanic students assessed in 2011 increased nationally and across the Mega-States compared to 1990, while the percentage of White students assessed decreased. In comparison to 2003, the proportion of students eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch increased in the nation and the Mega-States.

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students assessed in NAEP mathematics, by jurisdiction, race/ethnicity, and eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch: 1990, 2003, and 2011

Race/ethnicity	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011
White	73 *	54	49 *	26	64 *	45	70 *	51	61 *	51	50 *	32
Black	16	16	7	7	22	22	19	18	19	19	14	13
Hispanic	7 *	23	30 *	52	12 *	27	8 *	24	13 *	22	33 *	51
Asian/Pacific Islander	2 *	6	12	15	2	3	2 *	5	4 *	8	2	4
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	1	1	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#
Free/reduced-price school lunch	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011
Eligible	36 *	48	41 *	54	43 *	55	37 *	48	44 *	51	45 *	59
Not eligible	58 *	52	46	45	52 *	45	60 *	52	51	49	53 *	41

Rounds to zero.

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2011.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because results are not shown for students whose race/ethnicity was two or more races and for students whose eligibility status for free/reduced-price school lunch was not available.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990, 2003, and 2011 Mathematics Assessments.

4. What is the distribution of students by Hispanic origin and by English language learners and students from lower-income families?

The three charts below show the distribution by Hispanic origin in each state for all public school students at grade 8. In addition, Hispanic origin is cross-tabulated by English language learners (ELL), and by students who are eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). For example, 6 percent of all public school eighth-graders in Florida are Cuban, compared to 0.4 percent in the nation and 0.1 percent in the other Mega-States. Among ELL students in Florida, 18 percent are Mexican, 13 percent are Puerto Rican, 19 percent are Cuban, 23 percents are from some other Hispanic or Latino background, and 1 percent reported two or more of these Hispanic origins.

Grade 8 Math 2011

Jurisdiction	All students						
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic Origin					
		Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other	Two or more	Not specified
National Public	77.5%	13.2%	1.5%	0.4%	4.9%	1.6%	0.9%
California	48.5%	37.1%	0.3%	0.1%	8.3%	3.9%	2.0%
Florida	72.7%	6.2%	4.7%	5.6%	8.6%	1.5%	0.8%
Illinois	76.5%	17.3%	1.6%	0.1%	1.9%	2.0%	0.7%
New York	78.4%	3.0%	5.1%	0.1%	10.9%	1.5%	1.0%
Texas	49.4%	34.8%	0.7%	0.1%	9.7%	4.0%	1.4%
Alabama	95.2%	3.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.1%
Alaska	94.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%
Arizona	59.1%	32.7%	0.5%	0.1%	4.0%	2.7%	1.1%
Arkansas	91.3%	6.1%	0.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.3%	0.3%
Colorado	71.7%	19.3%	0.4%	0.1%	4.9%	1.9%	1.6%
Connecticut	83.4%	2.3%	8.8%	0.2%	3.5%	1.4%	0.4%
Delaware	89.6%	4.3%	2.7%	0.2%	2.2%	0.8%	0.2%
Georgia	90.7%	5.6%	0.7%	0.1%	1.9%	0.6%	0.3%
Hawaii	95.7%	1.9%	1.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%
Idaho	84.5%	11.3%	0.1%	0.1%	1.7%	1.4%	0.9%
Indiana	92.4%	5.0%	0.6%	0.1%	1.2%	0.5%	0.3%
Iowa	92.0%	5.0%	0.3%	0.0%	1.4%	0.5%	0.8%
Kansas	86.1%	9.9%	0.5%	0.0%	2.1%	0.7%	0.6%
Kentucky	97.0%	1.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%
Louisiana	96.2%	1.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%	0.3%	0.1%
Maine	98.8%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%
Maryland	89.4%	1.4%	0.8%	0.1%	7.6%	0.4%	0.4%
Massachusetts	86.7%	0.4%	5.5%	0.1%	5.3%	1.2%	0.8%
Michigan	95.8%	2.9%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
Minnesota	94.0%	3.8%	0.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.4%	0.1%
Mississippi	97.5%	1.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%
Missouri	96.8%	1.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%
Montana	96.6%	2.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%
Nebraska	85.4%	10.5%	0.3%	0.3%	2.4%	0.7%	0.5%
Nevada	61.6%	26.1%	0.7%	0.7%	6.1%	4.0%	0.8%
New Hampshire	96.9%	0.3%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.2%	0.3%
New Jersey	80.2%	2.4%	5.4%	0.5%	7.9%	1.6%	1.9%
New Mexico	39.3%	34.0%	0.6%	0.4%	17.2%	5.0%	3.4%
North Carolina	89.3%	6.3%	0.8%	0.1%	2.5%	0.7%	0.3%
North Dakota	98.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%
Ohio	97.0%	1.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%

Oklahoma	88.9%	7.7%	0.4%	0.1%	1.5%	0.8%	0.6%
Oregon	80.1%	14.6%	0.3%	0.1%	2.6%	1.7%	0.8%
Pennsylvania	93.4%	1.1%	3.4%	0.1%	1.5%	0.3%	0.2%
Rhode Island	81.1%	0.9%	5.3%	0.1%	10.7%	1.3%	0.7%
South Carolina	94.5%	2.7%	0.8%	0.0%	1.3%	0.5%	0.3%
South Dakota	97.0%	1.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%
Tennessee	94.7%	3.5%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Utah	85.2%	10.3%	0.1%	0.0%	2.9%	0.9%	0.6%
Vermont	98.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%	0.1%
Virginia	89.0%	2.0%	1.3%	0.2%	6.6%	0.4%	0.5%
Washington	82.8%	12.5%	0.5%	0.0%	2.0%	1.2%	0.9%
West Virginia	98.9%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%
Wisconsin	92.3%	5.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%
Wyoming	88.2%	8.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.8%	1.0%	0.7%
Dist of Columbia	89.5%	0.9%	0.3%	0.1%	8.4%	0.3%	0.7%
DoDEA	83.3%	4.9%	5.3%	0.4%	4.0%	1.0%	1.0%

Jurisdiction	NSLP Eligible students						
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic Origin					
		Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other	Two or more	Not specified
National Public	64.6%	21.6%	2.2%	0.5%	7.5%	2.5%	1.1%
California	31.0%	50.0%	0.1%	0.1%	11.4%	4.9%	2.6%
Florida	63.4%	10.1%	5.8%	7.0%	11.0%	1.7%	1.0%
Illinois	61.4%	29.2%	2.2%	0.1%	3.2%	3.1%	0.9%
New York	64.5%	5.3%	8.2%	0.2%	18.1%	2.5%	1.3%
Texas	32.8%	47.8%	0.6%	0.0%	12.3%	5.1%	1.4%
Alabama	92.7%	5.1%	0.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.5%	0.1%
Alaska	93.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Arizona	40.2%	49.1%	0.6%	0.1%	5.4%	3.2%	1.5%
Arkansas	86.9%	9.3%	0.2%	0.1%	2.6%	0.6%	0.4%
Colorado	46.4%	40.5%	0.4%	0.2%	7.6%	3.3%	1.7%
Connecticut	62.0%	5.3%	21.6%	0.1%	7.4%	3.0%	0.7%
Delaware	82.1%	8.1%	3.9%	0.1%	4.0%	1.5%	0.3%
Georgia	86.6%	9.1%	0.7%	0.1%	2.3%	1.0%	0.3%
Hawaii	95.4%	1.9%	1.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
Idaho	73.2%	20.4%	0.0%	0.1%	2.7%	2.5%	1.2%
Indiana	87.4%	8.8%	0.6%	0.1%	1.8%	0.9%	0.4%
Iowa	83.7%	10.7%	0.7%	0.0%	2.5%	1.2%	1.3%
Kansas	75.6%	18.6%	0.7%	0.1%	3.2%	1.2%	0.6%

Jurisdiction	ELL students						
	Not Hispanic	Hispanic Origin					
		Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other	Two or more	Not specified
National Public	20.5%	51.9%	2.7%	1.0%	17.3%	3.8%	3.0%
California	14.5%	62.9%	0.0%	0.0%	14.0%	4.1%	4.5%
Florida	25.5%	17.6%	12.7%	18.5%	23.2%	1.3%	1.2%
Illinois	15.3%	60.1%	2.9%	0.0%	10.4%	7.7%	3.6%
New York	24.6%	12.3%	4.5%	0.0%	53.3%	3.4%	2.1%
Texas	4.1%	73.9%	1.0%	0.0%	13.2%	5.0%	2.7%
Alabama	8.0%	59.8%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	5.0%	0.0%
Alaska	88.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.5%
Arizona	18.4%	63.4%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	1.7%	6.2%
Arkansas	15.4%	63.6%	0.5%	0.0%	18.0%	0.9%	1.6%
Colorado	11.4%	77.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	2.9%	0.0%
Connecticut	20.1%	17.3%	39.9%	0.0%	19.4%	3.4%	0.0%
Delaware	46.6%	32.7%	8.0%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%	1.9%
Georgia	28.5%	49.2%	1.7%	0.0%	16.5%	2.1%	2.0%
Hawaii	95.7%	2.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Idaho	19.9%	65.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	5.0%	1.7%
Indiana	16.3%	60.6%	1.3%	0.9%	14.3%	3.8%	2.8%
Iowa	33.4%	50.9%	1.2%	0.0%	8.0%	5.2%	1.4%
Kansas	22.2%	63.0%	0.0%	0.7%	10.8%	2.2%	1.1%
Kentucky	44.0%	35.1%	5.8%	5.3%	5.7%	4.1%	0.0%
Louisiana	27.0%	39.1%	3.2%	3.4%	24.5%	0.0%	2.9%
Maine	94.9%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Maryland	41.7%	7.2%	0.3%	0.0%	47.6%	0.0%	3.2%
Massachusetts	43.9%	2.0%	16.7%	2.1%	32.9%	0.4%	2.1%
Michigan	59.7%	31.5%	2.3%	1.5%	3.8%	1.0%	0.2%
Minnesota	63.2%	28.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	0.2%	0.8%
Mississippi	6.5%	68.7%	5.5%	0.0%	7.2%	12.2%	0.0%
Missouri	62.2%	18.6%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Montana	96.8%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Nebraska	24.3%	51.7%	0.0%	4.3%	17.0%	1.8%	1.0%
Nevada	13.3%	61.6%	0.6%	2.2%	13.4%	8.2%	0.6%
New Hampshire	65.8%	1.9%	10.2%	0.0%	15.8%	3.3%	3.0%
New Jersey	29.9%	8.2%	1.3%	1.6%	44.0%	1.3%	13.7%
New Mexico	18.2%	59.1%	0.6%	0.5%	12.5%	5.0%	4.1%
North Carolina	21.1%	53.1%	1.9%	0.0%	16.4%	6.7%	0.8%
North Dakota	83.3%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.1%	0.0%
Ohio	52.6%	33.2%	9.9%	0.0%	4.2%	0.2%	0.0%

Oklahoma	10.3%	68.2%	2.7%	0.0%	10.5%	8.3%	0.0%
Oregon	23.8%	58.5%	0.5%	0.8%	9.8%	5.0%	1.7%
Pennsylvania	34.1%	5.3%	41.9%	0.0%	18.2%	0.6%	0.0%
Rhode Island	43.4%	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%	37.4%	1.0%	2.2%
South Carolina	25.5%	47.2%	2.1%	0.0%	17.7%	6.6%	1.0%
South Dakota	70.8%	17.4%	3.7%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Tennessee	36.9%	38.3%	3.9%	0.0%	19.9%	1.1%	0.0%
Utah	21.0%	66.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	2.4%	0.9%
Vermont	90.7%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Virginia	36.3%	11.0%	2.9%	0.9%	45.7%	1.7%	1.5%
Washington	30.7%	58.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	3.0%	0.0%
West Virginia	19.0%	24.2%	22.9%	0.0%	24.5%	9.4%	0.0%
Wisconsin	45.1%	41.4%	4.2%	0.0%	4.3%	4.5%	0.6%
Wyoming	24.8%	56.7%	3.1%	0.0%	9.2%	3.1%	3.1%
Dist of Columbia	25.2%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	65.6%	0.8%	3.1%
DoDEA	68.9%	5.0%	17.9%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	1.8%

5. Are the Mega-States educating the preponderance of lower-income or minority students in the nation?

Based on the 2011 NAEP grade 8 mathematics assessment, Mega-States served nearly 40 percent public school students in the nation. Among those students who are eligible for the NSLP in the nation, 44 percent are in the Mega-States. Mega-States are also educating 33 percent of Black students and 69 percent of Hispanic students in the nation. The chart below shows that California and Texas are the two front contributors for these percentages.

Grade 8 Math 2011

Jurisdiction	Total		Eligible		Black		Hispanic		Black+Hispanic	
	WtN	Pct	WtN	Pct	WtN	Pct	WtN	Pct	WtN	Pct
National Public	3,507,908		1,688,236		555,175		790,389		1,345,564	
California	462,215	13%	252,277	15%	31,750	6%	238,808	30%	270,558	20%
Florida	191,088	5%	105,118	6%	42,043	8%	52,334	7%	94,377	7%
Illinois	146,728	4%	70,868	4%	26,609	5%	34,488	4%	61,097	5%
New York	207,743	6%	105,449	6%	39,277	7%	44,500	6%	83,777	6%
Texas	340,795	10%	202,957	12%	45,282	8%	172,335	22%	217,617	16%
Mega-States	38%		44%		33%		69%		54%	
Alabama	54,901	2%	29,172	2%	18,133	3%	2,605	0%	20,738	2%
Alaska	8,472	0%	3,527	0%	352	0%	511	0%	863	0%
Arizona	74,761	2%	38,274	2%	4,353	1%	30,667	4%	35,020	3%
Arkansas	35,428	1%	20,138	1%	7,594	1%	3,138	0%	10,732	1%
Colorado	55,095	2%	20,643	1%	2,881	1%	15,690	2%	18,571	1%

Connecticut	39,663	1%	13,087	1%	4,971	1%	6,691	1%	11,662	1%
Delaware	9,101	0%	3,995	0%	3,021	1%	946	0%	3,967	0%
Georgia	111,742	3%	62,507	4%	43,695	8%	10,386	1%	54,081	4%
Hawaii	12,487	0%	5,794	0%	317	0%	543	0%	860	0%
Idaho	19,378	1%	8,930	1%	243	0%	3,019	0%	3,262	0%
Indiana	74,662	2%	33,090	2%	10,433	2%	5,800	1%	16,233	1%
Iowa	33,205	1%	12,540	1%	1,617	0%	2,682	0%	4,299	0%
Kansas	31,888	1%	14,118	1%	2,404	0%	4,428	1%	6,832	1%
Kentucky	49,336	1%	26,075	2%	5,200	1%	1,547	0%	6,747	1%
Louisiana	46,445	1%	28,661	2%	18,394	3%	1,769	0%	20,163	1%
Maine	14,045	0%	5,823	0%	412	0%	166	0%	578	0%
Maryland	60,935	2%	20,901	1%	21,251	4%	6,729	1%	27,980	2%
Massachusetts	72,825	2%	24,672	1%	5,615	1%	10,136	1%	15,751	1%
Michigan	113,665	3%	48,642	3%	18,770	3%	4,737	1%	23,507	2%
Minnesota	59,498	2%	19,039	1%	4,893	1%	3,599	0%	8,492	1%
Mississippi	34,558	1%	23,357	1%	16,956	3%	858	0%	17,814	1%
Missouri	60,155	2%	25,992	2%	9,317	2%	1,911	0%	11,228	1%
Montana	10,378	0%	3,973	0%	93	0%	354	0%	447	0%
Nebraska	19,866	1%	7,877	0%	1,167	0%	2,893	0%	4,060	0%
Nevada	31,545	1%	14,793	1%	2,930	1%	12,151	2%	15,081	1%
New Hampshire	14,500	0%	3,391	0%	317	0%	459	0%	776	0%
New Jersey	95,447	3%	28,938	2%	15,383	3%	18,622	2%	34,005	3%
New Mexico	23,448	1%	15,028	1%	432	0%	14,248	2%	14,680	1%
North Carolina	103,317	3%	52,149	3%	26,830	5%	11,174	1%	38,004	3%
North Dakota	7,156	0%	2,303	0%	195	0%	146	0%	341	0%
Ohio	125,254	4%	54,588	3%	22,068	4%	3,664	0%	25,732	2%
Oklahoma	40,957	1%	22,168	1%	4,275	1%	4,456	1%	8,731	1%
Oregon	41,991	1%	21,198	1%	1,179	0%	8,362	1%	9,541	1%
Pennsylvania	137,550	4%	55,332	3%	26,527	5%	9,120	1%	35,647	3%
Rhode Island	10,672	0%	4,432	0%	772	0%	2,041	0%	2,813	0%
South Carolina	50,735	1%	26,526	2%	18,097	3%	2,799	0%	20,896	2%
South Dakota	9,224	0%	3,289	0%	223	0%	275	0%	498	0%
Tennessee	68,146	2%	36,549	2%	15,041	3%	3,509	0%	18,550	1%
Utah	38,138	1%	13,660	1%	515	0%	5,763	1%	6,278	0%
Vermont	6,438	0%	2,197	0%	112	0%	113	0%	225	0%
Virginia	85,623	2%	28,064	2%	18,822	3%	9,758	1%	28,580	2%
Washington	78,300	2%	31,564	2%	4,087	1%	13,574	2%	17,661	1%
West Virginia	19,454	1%	9,057	1%	1,101	0%	215	0%	1,316	0%
Wisconsin	58,227	2%	20,228	1%	5,661	1%	4,452	1%	10,113	1%
Wyoming	6,481	0%	2,242	0%	70	0%	761	0%	831	0%
Dist of Columbia	4,246	0%	3,042	0%	3,495	1%	454	0%	3,949	0%

Based on the 2010 Census data, eight of the ten most populated cities are in Mega-States. Seven of these top ten cities also participated in the NAEP Trial Urban District Assessments. The chart below shows what percentages of lower-income or minority students in the nation or in their home state are from these 7 districts.

Jurisdiction	Total			Eligible			Black			Hispanic		
	WtN	Pct of NP	Pct of state	WtN	Pct of NP	Pct of state	WtN	Pct of NP	Pct of state	WtN	Pct of NP	Pct of state
National Public	3,507,908			1,688,236			555,175			790,389		
Nat Pub Large City	562,050	16%		392,084	23%		150,105	27%		242,650	31%	
Fresno	5,050	0.1%	1.1%	4,434	0.3%	1.8%	553	0.1%	1.7%	3,098	0.4%	1.3%
Los Angeles	41,301	1.2%	8.9%	33,827	2.0%	13.4%	3,756	0.7%	11.8%	30,445	3.9%	12.7%
San Diego	7,533	0.2%	1.6%	4,553	0.3%	1.8%	857	0.2%	2.7%	3,200	0.4%	1.3%
Hillsborough County	14,063	0.4%	7.4%	7,600	0.5%	7.2%	2,705	0.5%	6.4%	4,411	0.6%	8.4%
Miami-Dade	25,437	0.7%	13.3%	18,423	1.1%	17.5%	5,666	1.0%	13.5%	17,090	2.2%	32.7%
Chicago	27,266	0.8%	18.6%	22,996	1.4%	32.4%	11,839	2.1%	44.5%	11,113	1.4%	32.2%
New York City	73,567	2.1%	35.4%	63,837	3.8%	60.5%	22,145	4.0%	56.4%	29,693	3.8%	66.7%
Austin	5,176	0.1%	1.5%	3,134	0.2%	1.5%	491	0.1%	1.1%	3,061	0.4%	1.8%
Dallas	9,687	0.3%	2.8%	8,285	0.5%	4.1%	2,495	0.4%	5.5%	6,536	0.8%	3.8%
Houston	11,653	0.3%	3.4%	8,917	0.5%	4.4%	3,136	0.6%	6.9%	7,200	0.9%	4.2%
Albuquerque	6,379	0.2%	27.2%	3,898	0.2%	25.9%	90	0.0%	20.8%	4,198	0.5%	29.5%
Atlanta	3,086	0.1%	2.8%	2,530	0.1%	4.0%	2,640	0.5%	6.0%	147	0.0%	1.4%
Baltimore	4,187	0.1%	6.9%	3,600	0.2%	17.2%	3,515	0.6%	16.5%	135	0.0%	2.0%
Boston	3,628	0.1%	5.0%	2,767	0.2%	11.2%	1,369	0.2%	24.4%	1,302	0.2%	12.8%
Charlotte	9,144	0.3%	8.9%	4,729	0.3%	9.1%	3,980	0.7%	14.8%	1,371	0.2%	12.3%
Cleveland	2,899	0.1%	2.3%	2,899	0.2%	5.3%	1,886	0.3%	8.5%	412	0.1%	11.2%
Detroit	3,721	0.1%	3.3%	2,966	0.2%	6.1%	3,255	0.6%	17.3%	357	0.0%	7.5%
Dist of Columbia	2,386	0.1%	56.2%	1,682	0.1%	55.3%	1,857	0.3%	53.1%	295	0.0%	65.0%
Jefferson County	6,675	0.2%	13.5%	4,032	0.2%	15.5%	2,478	0.4%	47.7%	364	0.0%	23.5%
Milwaukee	4,730	0.1%	8.1%	3,799	0.2%	18.8%	2,694	0.5%	47.6%	1,079	0.1%	24.2%
Philadelphia	10,415	0.3%	7.6%	9,172	0.5%	16.6%	5,833	1.1%	22.0%	2,221	0.3%	24.4%

B. Exclusions and accommodations

6. What were the exclusion and accommodation rates for the Mega-States in the NAEP reading, mathematics, and science assessments?

The exclusion and accommodation rates for the Mega-States in the NAEP reading, mathematics, and science assessments are presented in **Appendix A** in this document. In

general, the percentages of students identified as SD and/or ELL have increased over time in the nation and in the Mega-States, and the percentages of SD and/or ELL students being assessed have also increased.

7. What accommodations were offered in the NAEP reading, mathematics, and science assessments?

The accommodations offered in the NAEP reading, mathematics, and science assessments are shown below:

- Bilingual booklet (mathematics and science)
- Bilingual dictionary (mathematics and science)
- Read-aloud in regular session (mathematics and science)
- Large-print booklet
- Extended time in regular session
- Small-group session
- One-on-one session
- Scribe or use of computer
- Breaks during testing
- Magnification device
- School staff administers
- Directions read aloud in Spanish
- Directions read aloud in English
- Braille version of the text
- Sign language (reading and science)
- Cue to stay on the task
- Special equipment (reading and science)

Most other accommodations that schools usually offer, with the exception of testing over more than one day and permitting use of calculators in non-calculator blocks in the mathematics assessment. Allowing extra time and giving the assessment in a small-group format were the two most commonly used accommodations.

8. Why is the exclusion rate higher in Texas in grade 4 reading than in the other Mega-States?

The Texas exclusion rate of 5% is due to a state level policy where 4th grade students are allowed to use a Spanish version bilingual booklet on their state assessment. Because this accommodation is not allowed on the NAEP Reading assessment there were more students excluded.

C. Reporting and interpreting results

9. What results were included in the Mega-States report? Why weren't writing results included in the report?

The Mega-States report presents previously released NAEP results for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in reading, mathematics, and science for the nation, California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas. Specifically, it includes the following:

- Student performance results in these subjects over time and in the most recent assessments,
- Comparisons to the nation and among the Mega-States,
- Highlights of score gains for student groups that performed higher than their peers in the nation, and
- Student performance at or above the *Proficient* level on NAEP.

The National Assessment Governing Board oversees the creation of the NAEP frameworks that describe the specific knowledge and skills that should be assessed in each subject. The frameworks also provide the theoretical basis for the assessments, direction for what types of items should be included, and instructions for how the items should be designed and scored. The frameworks for all main NAEP assessments are periodically updated or changed to reflect current curricula and standards. Whenever changes are made to a subject framework, every effort is made to maintain the trend lines that permit the reporting of changes in student achievement over time. If, however, the changes made to an assessment are such that the results are not comparable to earlier assessments, a new trend line is started. This was the case for the science assessment in 2009 and the writing assessment in 2011, so the science results in the report are only shown for 2009 at grade 4 and for 2009 and 2011 at grade 8. The writing results were not included in the report because the 2011 writing framework begins a new trend line, and the new computer-based writing assessment in 2011 was not administered at the state level. Previous writing assessment results can be found in the 2002 and 2007 NAEP writing report cards and the NAEP Data Explorer at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>.

The state assessment component of NAEP began in 1990 with grade 8 mathematics. In 1992, grade 4 mathematics and reading were added, with grade 8 reading following in 1998. As explained above, a new science trend line began in 2009 for both grades 4 and 8. All of the five largest states have data available from these earliest assessments, with the exception of Illinois (as shown in the table below). In Illinois, the first grade 4 data were available for mathematics in 2000 and for reading in 2003. The first grade 8 data were available for reading in 2003.

Summary of the earliest NAEP assessment years for which selected state data are available, by grade and subject

Subject	Grade 4	Grade 8
Reading	1992 - California, Florida, New York, and Texas 2003 - Illinois	1998 - California, Florida, New York, and Texas 2003 - Illinois
Mathematics	1992 - California, Florida, New York, and Texas 2000 - Illinois	1990 – California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas
Science	2009 - California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas	2009 - California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas

10. Can results be compared across subjects and grades?

Because NAEP scales are developed independently for each subject, scores cannot be compared across subjects. Reading and mathematics scores are reported on a 0-500 scale, while science scores are reported on a 0-300 scale. For science, a separate 0-300 scale was developed at each grade level, so scores cannot be compared across grades. For mathematics and reading, results for all grades assessed were analyzed together to create a 0-500 cross-grade scale in the base year of the trend line. In subsequent years, the data from each grade level were analyzed separately and then linked to the original cross-grade scale established in the base year. Comparisons of overall national performance across grade levels on a cross-grade scale are acceptable; however, other comparisons of scores across grades are not as strongly supported by the data, so they are therefore discouraged.

11. What information is on the website that is not shown in the report card?

In addition to the results presented in the print report, the Web version of the Mega-States report also included the following:

- Demographic information and performance results for various student groups (i.e., race/ethnicity, eligibility status for free/reduced-price school lunch, school location, students with disabilities, and English language learners),
- White-Black/White-Hispanic score gaps,
- Contextual variable results (e.g., teachers' educational background and classroom instructions), and
- The percentage of students identified as SD and/or ELL excluded and accommodated as a percentage of all students or as a percentage of identified SD/ELL students over time.

The summary of student performance at or above the *Basic* level on NAEP is presented in **Appendix B** in this document. More Mega-States data are available on the NAEP Data Explorer at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>.

12. What were the score changes for the other 45 states in the NAEP reading and mathematics assessments?

The charts below show the score changes for each state and show their changes compared to the nation.

Reading grade 4					
Order	State	Score change compared to the nation (public)	1992	2011	Score change 2011-1992
1	Maryland	>	211	231	20
2	Florida	>	208	225	16
3	Alabama	>	207	220	13
4	Kentucky	>	213	225	13
5	District of Columbia	>	188	201	12
6	Delaware	>	213	225	12
7	Massachusetts	>	226	237	11
8	Hawaii	>	203	214	10
9	Mississippi	>	199	209	10
10	North Carolina	>	212	221	10
11	California	=	202	211	9
12	Georgia	=	212	221	8
13	New Jersey	=	223	231	8
14	New York	=	215	222	8
15	Colorado	=	217	223	7
16	Louisiana	=	204	210	7
17	Pennsylvania	=	221	227	7
18	Ohio	=	217	224	6
19	Rhode Island	=	217	222	6
20	Texas	=	213	218	6
21	Connecticut	=	222	227	6
22	Virginia	=	221	226	6
23	Arkansas	=	211	217	6
	National public		215	220	5
24	South Carolina	=	210	215	5
25	Arizona	=	209	212	3
26	Michigan	=	216	219	3
27	New Hampshire	=	228	230	3
28	Tennessee	=	212	215	3
29	Nebraska	=	221	223	2

30	Idaho	<	219	221	2
31	Minnesota	=	221	222	1
32	Wyoming	<	223	224	1
33	Missouri	<	220	220	0
34	North Dakota	<	226	226	0
35	Utah	<	220	220	0
36	Indiana	<	221	221	0
37	West Virginia	<	216	214	-1
38	Wisconsin	<	224	221	-2
39	New Mexico	<	211	208	-3
40	Maine	<	227	222	-5
41	Iowa	<	225	221	-5
42	Oklahoma	<	220	215	-5
N/A	DoDEA		—	229	—
N/A	Washington		—	221	—
N/A	Vermont		—	227	—
N/A	South Dakota		—	220	—
N/A	Oregon		—	216	—
N/A	Nevada		—	213	—
N/A	Montana		—	225	—
N/A	Kansas		—	224	—
N/A	Illinois		—	219	—
N/A	Alaska		—	208	—

Reading grade 8

Order	State	Score change compared to the nation (public)	1998	2011	Score change 2011-1998
1	Delaware	>	254	266	12
2	Maryland	>	261	271	10
3	Hawaii	>	249	257	8
4	Florida	>	255	262	8
5	Colorado	>	264	271	7
6	Massachusetts	=	269	275	7
7	Kentucky	=	262	269	7
8	Wyoming	=	263	270	6
9	District of Columbia	=	236	242	6
10	South Carolina	=	255	260	6
11	Georgia	=	257	262	5

12	Minnesota	=	265	270	5
13	Missouri	=	262	267	4
14	Connecticut	=	270	275	4
15	Washington	=	264	268	4
16	Utah	=	263	267	4
17	DoDEA	=	269	272	4
18	Alabama	=	255	258	3
19	Louisiana	=	252	255	3
20	Arkansas	=	256	259	3
	National public		261	264	3
21	California	=	252	255	3
22	Mississippi	=	251	254	2
23	Montana	=	271	273	2
24	Wisconsin	=	265	267	2
25	Tennessee	=	258	259	1
26	New York	=	265	266	1
27	Virginia	=	266	267	1
28	Rhode Island	=	264	265	1
29	North Carolina	=	262	263	1
30	Nevada	=	258	258	0
31	Texas	=	261	261	0
32	Arizona	=	260	260	0
33	Kansas	=	268	267	0
34	Maine	<	271	270	-2
35	Oregon	<	266	264	-2
36	New Mexico	<	258	256	-2
37	Oklahoma	<	265	260	-5
38	West Virginia	<	262	256	-6
N/A	Vermont		—	274	—
N/A	South Dakota		—	269	—
N/A	Pennsylvania		—	268	—
N/A	Ohio		—	268	—
N/A	North Dakota		—	269	—
N/A	New Jersey		—	275	—
N/A	New Hampshire		—	272	—
N/A	Nebraska		—	268	—
N/A	Michigan		—	265	—
N/A	Iowa		—	265	—
N/A	Indiana		—	265	—
N/A	Illinois		‡	266	‡
N/A	Idaho		—	268	—
N/A	Alaska		—	261	—

Math grade 4

Order	State	Score change compared to the nation (public)	1992	2011	Score change 2011-1992
1	North Carolina	>	213	245	32
2	Maryland	>	217	247	30
3	District of Columbia	>	193	222	29
4	Mississippi	>	202	230	28
5	Arkansas	>	210	238	28
6	Massachusetts	>	227	253	27
7	Louisiana	>	204	231	27
8	Rhode Island	>	215	242	26
9	Florida	>	214	240	26
10	Kentucky	>	215	241	26
11	California	=	208	234	26
12	Ohio	>	219	244	25
13	South Carolina	=	212	237	25
14	Hawaii	=	214	239	25
15	Virginia	=	221	245	25
16	Colorado	=	221	244	23
17	Texas	=	218	241	23
18	Alabama	=	208	231	23
19	Indiana	=	221	244	23
20	Georgia	=	216	238	23
21	Delaware	=	218	240	22
22	New Hampshire	=	230	252	22
23	Tennessee	=	211	233	22
	National public		219	240	22
24	Pennsylvania	=	224	246	21
25	New Jersey	=	227	248	21
26	Minnesota	=	228	249	21
27	Arizona	=	215	235	20
28	New Mexico	=	213	233	20
29	West Virginia	=	215	235	19
30	New York	=	218	238	19
31	Idaho	=	222	240	19
32	Wyoming	<	225	244	18
33	Utah	<	224	243	18
34	Missouri	=	222	240	18
35	Oklahoma	<	220	237	17

36	Michigan	<	220	236	17
37	North Dakota	<	229	245	16
38	Wisconsin	<	229	245	16
39	Connecticut	<	227	242	16
40	Nebraska	<	225	240	14
41	Iowa	<	230	243	13
42	Maine	<	232	244	13
N/A	DoDEA		—	241	—
N/A	Washington		—	243	—
N/A	Vermont		—	247	—
N/A	South Dakota		—	241	—
N/A	Oregon		—	237	—
N/A	Nevada		—	237	—
N/A	Montana		—	244	—
N/A	Kansas		—	246	—
N/A	Illinois		—	239	—
N/A	Alaska		—	236	—

Math grade 8

Order	State	Score change compared to the nation (public)	1990	2011	Score change 2011-1990
1	North Carolina	>	250	286	36
2	Texas	>	258	290	32
3	District of Columbia	>	231	260	29
4	Maryland	>	261	288	27
5	Hawaii	>	251	278	27
6	Louisiana	>	246	273	26
7	Virginia	=	264	289	25
8	Ohio	=	264	289	25
9	Kentucky	=	257	282	25
10	New Jersey	=	270	294	24
11	Colorado	=	267	292	24
12	Arkansas	=	256	279	23
13	Rhode Island	=	260	283	23
14	Illinois	=	261	283	23
15	Florida	=	255	278	23
16	Delaware	=	261	283	22
	National public		262	283	21
17	Pennsylvania	=	266	286	20

18	New York	=	261	280	20
19	Georgia	=	259	278	20
20	Minnesota	=	275	295	20
21	Arizona	=	260	279	19
22	New Hampshire	=	273	292	19
23	New Mexico	=	256	274	18
24	Indiana	=	267	285	18
25	West Virginia	<	256	273	17
26	Connecticut	=	270	287	17
27	California	<	256	273	16
28	Alabama	<	253	269	16
29	Oklahoma	<	263	279	16
30	Michigan	<	264	280	16
31	Wyoming	<	272	288	16
32	Idaho	<	271	287	15
33	Wisconsin	<	274	289	14
34	Montana	<	280	293	12
35	Oregon	<	271	283	11
36	North Dakota	<	281	292	11
37	Nebraska	<	276	283	8
38	Iowa	<	278	285	7
N/A	DoDEA		—	288	—
N/A	Washington		—	288	—
N/A	Vermont		—	294	—
N/A	Utah		—	283	—
N/A	Tennessee		—	274	—
N/A	South Dakota		—	291	—
N/A	South Carolina		—	281	—
N/A	Nevada		—	278	—
N/A	Missouri		—	282	—
N/A	Mississippi		—	269	—
N/A	Massachusetts		—	299	—
N/A	Maine		—	289	—
N/A	Kansas		—	290	—
N/A	Alaska		—	283	—

Appendix A: Summary of Exclusion and Accommodation Rate

Table A-1. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) identified, excluded, and assessed in NAEP reading, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction and SD/ELL category: 1992, 2003, and 2011

SD/ELL category	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1992	2011	1992	2011	1992	2011	2003 ¹	2011	1992	2011	1992	2011
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	11	23	28	38	17	23	22	21	13	23	17	30
Excluded	6	4	14	2	9	2	8	2	6	3	8	10
Assessed	4	19	13	35	8	21	14	19	7	20	9	20
Without accommodations	4	9	13	29	8	3	7	6	7	1	9	17
With accommodations	†	10	†	6	†	18	7	13	†	19	†	3
SD												
Identified	8	13	8	10	13	16	16	14	8	16	9	10
Excluded	5	3	4	2	7	2	5	1	4	2	5	6
Assessed	3	10	4	8	6	14	10	13	4	14	4	5
Without accommodations	3	3	4	3	6	3	4	4	4	1	4	2
With accommodations	†	7	†	5	†	11	7	9	†	13	†	3
ELL												
Identified	3	11	21	32	4	9	9	8	5	9	9	22
Excluded	2	1	11	1	2	1	4	1	2	1	3	5
Assessed	1	10	10	30	2	8	5	7	3	8	5	16
Without accommodations	1	7	10	27	2	#	4	2	3	#	5	15
With accommodations	†	4	†	3	†	8	1	6	†	8	†	1

† Not applicable.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Illinois did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting prior to 2003.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 2003, and 2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-2. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) identified, excluded, and assessed in NAEP reading, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction and SD/ELL category: 1998, 2003, and 2011

SD/ELL category	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1998	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011	2003 ¹	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	14	18	23	23	17	19	17	17	16	20	19	18
Excluded	4	3	4	2	5	2	5	2	8	3	5	6
Assessed	10	14	19	21	12	16	11	15	8	17	13	12
Without accommodations	7	5	17	15	9	1	5	3	3	#	11	9
With accommodations	3	9	2	6	3	15	7	12	5	17	3	3
SD												
Identified	11	13	8	10	13	14	14	14	10	16	13	11
Excluded	3	3	2	2	4	2	4	1	4	2	4	5
Assessed	7	10	6	8	9	13	10	13	6	14	9	6
Without accommodations	5	2	5	2	6	1	4	2	2	#	6	3
With accommodations	2	8	1	5	2	12	7	11	5	13	2	3
ELL												
Identified	3	6	18	17	4	5	4	4	6	6	7	9
Excluded	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	#	4	1	2	2
Assessed	2	5	14	16	3	4	2	3	2	5	5	7
Without accommodations	2	3	14	13	3	#	1	2	1	#	5	7
With accommodations	#	2	1	3	#	4	1	2	#	4	#	1

Rounds to zero.

¹ Illinois did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting prior to 2003.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1998, 2003, and 2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-3. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) identified, excluded, and assessed in NAEP mathematics, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction and SD/ELL category: 1992, 2000, and 2011

SD/ELL category	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1992	2011	1992	2011	1992	2011	2000 ¹	2011	1992	2011	1992	2011
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	10	23	28	38	17	23	17	21	12	23	17	30
Excluded	7	2	12	2	8	2	3	2	5	1	8	4
Assessed	4	21	16	36	8	22	14	18	6	22	9	26
Without accommodations	4	9	16	29	8	3	5	6	6	1	9	18
With accommodations	†	12	†	7	†	19	9	13	†	21	†	8
SD												
Identified	7	13	7	10	13	16	11	14	7	16	9	10
Excluded	5	2	3	1	7	1	2	2	3	1	5	4
Assessed	3	11	4	8	6	14	9	12	3	15	5	7
Without accommodations	3	3	4	2	6	3	3	4	3	1	5	2
With accommodations	†	9	†	6	†	12	6	8	†	14	†	5
ELL												
Identified	3	11	22	32	4	9	7	8	5	9	9	22
Excluded	2	#	10	1	2	#	2	1	2	1	4	1
Assessed	1	11	12	31	2	9	5	7	3	9	5	21
Without accommodations	1	6	12	27	2	#	2	2	3	#	5	16
With accommodations	†	4	†	4	†	8	3	6	†	8	†	4

† Not applicable.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Illinois did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting prior to 2000.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 2000, and 2011 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-4. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) identified, excluded, and assessed in NAEP mathematics, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction and SD/ELL category: 1990, 1992, and 2011

SD/ELL category	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1992 ¹	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011	1990	2011
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	10	18	15	23	11	19	9	17	12	20	12	18
Excluded	6	3	7	1	6	2	5	2	6	1	6	5
Assessed	4	15	8	22	5	17	4	15	6	19	6	13
Without accommodations	4	5	8	15	5	1	4	3	6	#	6	8
With accommodations	†	10	†	7	†	16	†	12	†	18	†	5
SD												
Identified	8	13	7	10	8	14	8	14	8	16	8	11
Excluded	5	2	3	1	5	2	4	2	4	1	4	5
Assessed	3	10	4	9	4	13	4	12	4	15	3	6
Without accommodations	3	2	4	3	4	1	4	1	4	#	3	2
With accommodations	†	9	†	6	†	12	†	10	†	14	†	4
ELL												
Identified	2	6	8	17	2	5	1	4	4	6	5	9
Excluded	2	#	4	1	2	#	1	#	2	#	2	1
Assessed	1	6	4	17	1	5	#	3	2	5	3	8
Without accommodations	1	3	4	13	1	#	#	2	2	#	3	6
With accommodations	†	2	†	4	†	4	†	2	†	5	†	1

† Not applicable.

Rounds to zero.

¹National results for SD and ELL public school students are not available prior to 1992.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990, 1992, and 2011 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-5. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) identified, excluded, and assessed in NAEP science, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction and SD/ELL category: 2009

SD/ELL category	Nation (public)	California	Florida	Illinois	New York	Texas
SD and/or ELL						
Identified	23	36	23	22	22	29
Excluded	2	2	2	2	1	3
Assessed	20	33	22	19	21	26
Without accommodations	9	27	4	5	1	16
With accommodations	12	6	18	14	20	9
SD						
Identified	13	10	17	15	16	10
Excluded	2	2	1	1	1	2
Assessed	12	7	15	14	15	8
Without accommodations	3	3	3	3	1	2
With accommodations	9	4	12	10	14	5
ELL						
Identified	10	30	8	8	8	21
Excluded	1	1	1	1	1	2
Assessed	10	29	7	7	7	19
Without accommodations	6	25	#	2	#	15
With accommodations	4	3	7	5	7	5

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Science Assessment.

Table A-6. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) identified, excluded, and assessed in NAEP science, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction and SD/ELL category: 2009 and 2011

SD/ELL category	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	18	18	25	23	19	19	16	17	20	20	17	18
Excluded	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	4	2
Assessed	16	16	24	22	17	17	15	16	18	19	14	16
Without accommodations	5	5	18	14	1	1	3	3	1	#	7	8
With accommodations	10	11	6	8	16	16	12	12	17	18	7	8
SD												
Identified	13	13	9	10	15	14	14	14	16	16	12	11
Excluded	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2
Assessed	11	11	8	8	14	13	13	13	15	15	9	9
Without accommodations	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	#	3	2
With accommodations	9	9	5	6	12	12	11	11	14	14	6	7
ELL												
Identified	6	6	20	17	5	5	3	4	5	6	7	9
Excluded	1	#	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	#	1	1
Assessed	5	6	19	16	4	4	3	4	4	5	6	8
Without accommodations	3	3	16	13	#	#	1	2	#	#	4	7
With accommodations	2	2	3	4	4	4	2	2	4	5	1	1

Rounds to zero.

¹National results for SD and ELL public school students are not available prior to 1992.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 and 2011 Science Assessments.

Appendix B: Summary of Students' Performance at or Above *Basic*

Table B-1. Percentage of fourth-grade students at or above *Basic* in NAEP reading, by state/jurisdiction and selected characteristics: Various years, 1992–2011

Characteristics	Percentage of students at or above <i>Basic</i>											
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1992 ¹	2011	1992 ¹	2011	1992 ¹	2011	2003	2011	1992 ¹	2011	1992 ¹	2011
All students	60 *	66	48 *	56	53 *	71	61 *	65	61 *	68	57 *	64
Race/ethnicity												
White	69 *	77	63 *	76	64 *	83	74	78	74 *	79	71 *	81
Black	31 *	49	28 *	53	26 *	54	36	42	41 *	52	39 *	55
Hispanic	37 *	50	23 *	42	45 *	67	42	49	30 *	54	40 *	54
Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch												
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011
Eligible	44 *	52	33 *	42	49 *	62	41 *	48	51	57	48 *	53
Not eligible	75 *	82	68 *	77	77 *	86	78	82	85	82	72 *	82
Students with disabilities												
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1998	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011	2003	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011
SD	24	32	‡	26	24 *	44	31	32	40	32	21	32
Not SD	60 *	70	49 *	59	56 *	76	65 *	70	63 *	74	63	66
English language learners												
ELL	21 *	30	19	27	‡	35	22	23	‡	29	15 *	38
Not ELL	59 *	70	54 *	70	54 *	75	64 *	69	63 *	72	63 *	70

‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2011.

¹ Accommodations not permitted.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table B-2. Percentage of eighth-grade students at or above *Basic* in NAEP reading, by state/jurisdiction and selected characteristics: 1998, 2003, and 2011

Characteristics	Percentage of students at or above <i>Basic</i>											
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1998	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011	2003	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011
All students	71	* 75	63	65	67	* 73	77	77	76	76	74	74
Race/ethnicity												
White	79	* 84	82	79	78	82	87	85	87	86	86	87
Black	50	* 58	47	53	44	* 57	56	62	55	63	57	63
Hispanic	52	* 63	46	* 56	61	71	61	69	56	62	62	68
Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011
Eligible	56	* 63	47	* 55	55	* 65	59	* 66	59	* 66	57	* 66
Not eligible	82	* 85	75	78	78	* 83	87	87	88	87	81	* 87
Students with disabilities	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1998	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011	2003	2011	1998	2011	1998	2011
SD	31	36	22	20	33	42	40	36	26	41	33	35
Not SD	75	* 79	66	69	70	* 78	82	83	80	82	78	77
English language learners												
ELL	23	29	28	26	‡	28	33	32	‡	21	35	27
Not ELL	72	* 77	70	73	68	* 75	78	78	77	79	76	78

‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2011.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1998, 2003, and 2011 Reading Assessments.

Table B-3. Percentage of fourth-grade students at or above *Basic* in NAEP mathematics, by state/jurisdiction and selected characteristics: Various years, 1992–2011

Characteristics	Percentage of students at or above <i>Basic</i>											
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1992 ¹	2011	1992 ¹	2011	1992 ¹	2011	2000	2011	1992 ¹	2011	1992 ¹	2011
All students	57 *	82	46 *	74	52 *	84	63 *	80	57 *	80	56 *	85
Race/ethnicity												
White	68 *	91	60 *	92	65 *	92	80 *	90	71 *	89	72 *	94
Black	22 *	66	20 *	68	20 *	70	31 *	58	28 *	65	29 *	77
Hispanic	32 *	72	25 *	62	40 *	81	47 *	70	29 *	69	41 *	81
Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011
Eligible	62 *	73	54 *	63	63 *	78	52 *	67	66	71	75 *	80
Not eligible	88 *	92	84 *	89	88 *	93	89	92	91	90	91	94
Students with disabilities	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011
SD	29 *	55	‡	35	—	64	50	57	47	51	56	56
Not SD	67 *	85	51 *	77	—	87	64 *	83	68 *	85	78 *	87
English language learners												
ELL	30 *	58	23 *	51	—	58	‡	54	‡	47	44 *	73
Not ELL	66 *	85	59 *	84	—	86	65 *	82	68 *	83	80 *	89

— Not available.

‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2011.

¹ Accommodations not permitted.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2011 Mathematics Assessments.

Table B-4. Percentage of eighth-grade students at or above *Basic* in NAEP mathematics, by state/jurisdiction and selected characteristics: Various years, 1990–2011

Characteristics	Percentage of students at or above <i>Basic</i>											
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	1990 ¹	2011	1990 ¹	2011	1990 ¹	2011	1990 ¹	2011	1990 ¹	2011	1990 ¹	2011
All students	51 *	72	45 *	61	43 *	68	50 *	73	50 *	70	45 *	81
Race/ethnicity												
White	59 *	83	60 *	80	53 *	79	61 *	84	64 *	82	63 *	92
Black	21 *	50	19 *	42	17 *	46	19 *	48	19 *	53	17 *	71
Hispanic	33 *	60	22 *	49	30 *	65	24 *	64	25 *	51	29 *	76
Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011	2003	2011
Eligible	47 *	59	38 *	49	45 *	57	43 *	61	52 *	57	54 *	74
Not eligible	78 *	84	70 *	77	75 *	81	81	84	85	84	81 *	92
Students with disabilities	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas	
	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011	2000	2011
SD	20 *	35	14	22	—	34	23	36	19 *	36	37	46
Not SD	65 *	77	53 *	65	—	73	70 *	78	67 *	76	69 *	84
English language learners												
ELL	20 *	28	19	18	—	33	‡	30	‡	19	22 *	48
Not ELL	63 *	75	56 *	70	—	70	67 *	75	65 *	73	70 *	84

— Not available.

‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2011.

¹ Accommodations not permitted.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1990–2011 Mathematics Assessments.

Table B-5. Percentage of fourth-grade students at or above *Basic* in NAEP science, by state/jurisdiction and selected characteristics: 2009

Characteristics	Percentage of students at or above <i>Basic</i>					
	Nation (public)	California	Florida	Illinois	New York	Texas
All students	71	58	75	69	70	70
Race/ethnicity						
White	86	81	88	87	86	90
Black	46	41	51	37	45	62
Hispanic	52	42	70	51	51	58
Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch						
Eligible	56	43	66	50	56	58
Not eligible	86	76	86	86	86	88
Students with disabilities						
SD	50	28	60	47	48	51
Not SD	74	60	78	73	75	71
English language learners						
ELL	33	26	47	35	27	41
Not ELL	75	71	77	72	74	77

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Science Assessment.

Table B-6. Percentage of eighth-grade students at or above *Basic* in NAEP science, by state/jurisdiction and selected characteristics: 2009 and 2011

Characteristics	Percentage of students at or above <i>Basic</i>													
	Nation (public)		California		Florida		Illinois		New York		Texas			
	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011	2009	2011		
All students	62	*	64	48	53	57	*	62	61	60	61	62	64	67
Race/ethnicity														
White	77	*	79	71	74	72	77	79	78	80	78	83	83	83
Black	32	*	36	31	32	32	34	23	25	30	38	43	49	49
Hispanic	41	*	48	33	39	51	57	40	44	34	39	53	60	60
Eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch														
Eligible	43	*	48	33	37	44	49	35	41	40	44	52	56	56
Not eligible	76	*	80	67	71	70	*	78	78	79	80	77	*	84
Students with disabilities														
SD	33		34	14	21	34	37	32	32	36	28	32	29	29
Not SD	66	*	68	51	55	61	66	65	64	66	67	67	71	71
English language learners														
ELL	14		17	11	11	15	16	12	10	8	9	17	27	27
Not ELL	65	*	67	57	61	59	64	62	62	64	65	67	71	71

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2011.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 and 2011 Science Assessments.