

This report provides selected results for District of Columbia's public school students at grades 4 and 8 from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assessment in reading. Results are reported by average scale scores and by achievement levels (Basic, Proficient, and Advanced).

State-level results in reading are available for eight assessment years (at grade 4 in 1992 and 1994, and at both grades 4 and 8 in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009), although not all states may have participated or met the criteria for reporting in every year. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity schools (DoDEA) participated in the 2009 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8. For the first time in 2009, grade 12 reading results are also available at the state level. Eleven states volunteered for the assessment and all 11 met the reporting criteria. Grade 12 results are released a few months following the grade 4 and 8 results.

For more information about the assessment, see the NAEP website
http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/ which contains

- The Nation's Report Card, Reading 2009
- The full set of national and state results in an interactive database
- Released test questions, scoring guides, and question-level performance data

NAEP is a project of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), reporting on the academic achievement of elementary and secondary students in the United States.

KEY FINDINGS FOR 2009

## Grade 4:

- In 2009, the average reading score for fourth-grade students in District of Columbia was 202. This was lower than that of the nation's public schools (220).
- The average score for students in District of Columbia in 2009 (202) was higher than that in 1992 (188) and in 2007 (197).
- In 2009, the percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Proficient was 17 percent. This was smaller than that for the nation's public schools ( 32 percent).
- The percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 (17 percent) was greater than that in 1992 (10 percent) and in 2007 (14 percent).
- In 2009, the percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Basic was 44 percent. This was smaller than that for the nation's public schools (66 percent).
- The percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Basic in 2009 (44 percent) was greater than that in 1992 (30 percent) and in 2007 (39 percent).


## Grade 8:

- In 2009, the average reading score for eighth-grade students in District of Columbia was 242. This was lower than that of the nation's public schools (262).
- The average score for students in District of Columbia in 2009 (242) was higher than that in 1998 (236) and was not significantly different from that in 2007 (241).
- In 2009, the percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Proficient was 14 percent. This was smaller than that for the nation's public schools ( 30 percent).
- The percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 (14 percent) was not significantly different from that in 1998 (11 percent) and in 2007 (12 percent).
- In 2009, the percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Basic was 51 percent. This was smaller than that for the nation's public schools ( 74 percent).
- The percentage of students in District of Columbia who performed at or above Basic in 2009 (51 percent) was greater than that in 1998 (44 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2007 (48 percent).

The U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has provided software that generated user-selectable data, statistical significance test result statements, and technical descriptions of the NAEP assessments for this report. Content may be added or edited by states or other jurisdictions. This document, therefore, is not an official publication of the National Center for Education Statistics.

## Introduction

## What Was Assessed?

The content for each NAEP assessment is determined by the National Assessment Governing Board. The framework for each assessment documents the content and process areas to be measured and sets guidelines for the types of questions to be used. The development process for the reading framework required the active participation of teachers, curriculum specialists, subject-matter specialists, local school administrators, parents, and other members of the general public. The current framework is available at the Governing Board's website http://www.nagb.org/publications/frameworks/reading09.pdf.

The current NAEP reading framework approved by the Governing Board replaces the framework that guided the 1992 reading assessment and subsequent reading assessments through 2007. Based on results from special analyses, it was determined that even with a new framework, the results from the 2009 reading assessment could still be compared to those from earlier assessment years. A summary of these analyses is available on the Web at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/trend study.asp.

## Types of Text

The framework calls for the use of both literary and informational texts in the reading assessment. Literary texts include three types at each grade: fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry. Informational texts include expositional, argumentative/persuasive, and procedural texts. The inclusion of distinct text types is aligned with the framework definition of reading, which recognizes that students read different texts for different purposes.

Literary texts (all three types at each grade)

- Fiction
- Literary nonfiction
- Poetry


## Informational text

- Expositional
- Argumentation and Persuasive Text
- Procedural Texts and Documents


## Cognitive Targets

All reading questions are aligned to cognitive reading behaviors applicable to both literary and informational text. The framework specifies three reading behaviors, or cognitive targets: locate/recall, integrate/interpret, and critique/evaluate. The term cognitive target refers to the mental processes or kinds of thinking that underlie reading comprehension.

- Locate and Recall: When locating or recalling information from what they have read, students may identify explicitly stated main ideas or may focus on specific elements of a story.
- Integrate and Interpret: When integrating and interpreting what they have read, students may make comparisons, explain character motivation, or examine relations of ideas across the text.
- Critique and Evaluate: When critiquing or evaluating what they have read, students view the text critically by examining it from numerous perspectives or may evaluate overall text quality or the effectiveness of particular aspects of the text.

In addition, the framework calls for a systematic assessment of meaning vocabulary. Meaning vocabulary items function as both a measure of passage comprehension and a test of readers' knowledge of specific word meaning as used in the passage by the author.

## Assessment Design

The assessment contains reading materials that were drawn from sources commonly available to students both in and out of the school environment. These authentic materials were considered to be representative of students' typical reading experiences. Each student in the state assessment was asked to complete two 25 -minute sections, each consisting of a reading passage and associated comprehension questions. A combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions was used to assess students' understanding of the passages. Released NAEP reading passages and questions, along with student performance data by state, are available on the NAEP website at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/itmrls/.

## Who Was Assessed?

All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Schools participated in the 2009 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8 . For the first time in 2009, grade 12 reading results are also available at the state level. Eleven states volunteered for the assessment and all 11 met the reporting criteria: Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

The overall participation rates for schools and students must meet guidelines established by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the National Assessment Governing Board for assessment results to be reported publicly. A participation rate of at least 85 percent for schools in each subject and grade was required. Participation rates for the 2009 reading assessment are available on the NAEP website http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading 2009/participation.asp.

The schools and students participating in NAEP assessments are selected to be representative both nationally and for public schools at the state level. The comparisons between national and state results in this report present the performance of public school students only. In NAEP reports, the category "nation (public)" does not include Department of Defense or Bureau of Indian Education schools.

## How Is Student Reading Performance Reported?

The 2009 state results are compared to results from seven earlier assessments at grade 4 and from five earlier assessments at grade 8. At grade 12, state results are available for 2009 only.

Scale Scores: Student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500 for grades 4 and 8 , and from 0 to 500 for grade 12. Because NAEP scales are developed independently for each subject and for each content area within a subject, the scores cannot be compared across subjects or across content areas within the same subject. Results are also reported at five percentiles (10th, 25 th, 50th, 75th, and 90th) to show trends in performance for lower-, middle-, and higher-performing students.

Achievement Levels: Based on recommendations from policymakers, educators, and members of the general public, the Governing Board sets specific achievement levels for each subject area and grade. Achievement levels are performance standards indicating what students should know and be able to do. They provide another perspective with which to interpret student performance. NAEP results are reported in terms of three achievement levels-Basic, Proficient, and Advanced-and are expressed in terms of the percentage of students who attained each level. The three achievement levels are defined as follows:

- Basic denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.
- Proficient represents solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and appropriate analytical skills.
- Advanced represents superior performance.

The achievement levels are cumulative; therefore, students performing at the Proficient level also display the competencies associated with the Basic level, and students at the Advanced level also demonstrate the competencies associated with both the Basic and the Proficient levels.

As provided by law, NCES, upon review of congressionally mandated evaluations of NAEP, has determined that achievement levels are to be used on a trial basis and should be interpreted with caution. The NAEP achievement levels have been widely used by national and state officials. The reading achievement-level descriptions are summarized in figures 1-A and 1-B.

| Basic <br> Level <br> $(208)$ |
| :---: |

Fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to locate relevant information, make simple inferences, and use their understanding of the text to identify details that support a given interpretation or conclusion. Students should be able to interpret the meaning of a word as it is used in the text.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to make simple inferences about characters, events, plot, and setting. They should be able to identify a problem in a story and relevant information that supports an interpretation of a text.
When reading informational texts such as articles and excerpts from books, fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to identify the main purpose and an explicitly stated main idea, as well as gather information from various parts of a text to provide supporting information.

## Proficient

Level
(238)

Fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to integrate and interpret texts and apply their understanding of the text to draw conclusions and make evaluations.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to identify implicit main ideas and recognize relevant information that supports them. Students should be able to judge elements of an author's craft and provide some support for their judgment. They should be able to analyze character roles, actions, feelings, and motivations.
When reading informational texts such as articles and excerpts from books, fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to locate relevant information, integrate information across texts, and evaluate the way an author presents information. Student performance at this level should demonstrate an understanding of the purpose for text features and an ability to integrate information from headings, text boxes, and graphics and their captions. They should be able to explain a simple cause-and-effect relationship and draw conclusions.
Advanced
Level
$(268)$

Fourth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to make complex inferences and construct and support their inferential understanding of the text. Students should be able to apply their understanding of a text to make and support a judgment.
When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, fourth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to identify the theme in stories and poems and make complex inferences about characters' traits, feelings, motivations, and actions. They should be able to recognize characters' perspectives and evaluate characters' motivations. Students should be able to interpret characteristics of poems and evaluate aspects of text organization.
When reading informational texts such as articles and excerpts from books, fourth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to make complex inferences about main ideas and supporting ideas. They should be able to express a judgment about the text and about text features and support the judgments with evidence. They should be able to identify the most likely cause given an effect, explain an author's point of view, and compare ideas across two texts.

NOTE: The scores in parentheses indicate the lowest point on the scale at which the achievement-level range begins.
SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2006). Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress. Washington, DC: Author.

Eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to locate information; identify statements of main idea, theme, or author's purpose; and make simple inferences from texts. They should be able to interpret the meaning of a word as it is used in the text. Students performing at this level should also be able to state judgments and give some support about content and presentation of content.
When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should recognize major themes and be able to identify, describe, and make simple inferences about setting and about character motivations, traits, and experiences. They should be able to state and provide some support for judgments about the way an author presents content and about character motivation. When reading informational texts such as exposition and argumentation, eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to recognize inferences based on main ideas and supporting details. They should be able to locate and provide relevant facts to construct general statements about information from the text. Students should be able to provide some support for judgments about the way information is presented.

| Proficient <br> Level <br> $(281)$ | Eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to provide relevant <br> information and summarize main ideas and themes. They should be able to make and support <br> inferences about a text, connect parts of a text, and analyze text features. Students performing at <br> this level should also be able to fully substantiate judgments about content and presentation of <br> content. |
| :---: | :--- |

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to make and support a connection between characters from two parts of a text. They should be able to recognize character actions and infer and support character feelings. Students performing at this level should be able to provide and support judgments about characters' motivations across texts. They should be able to identify how figurative language is used.
When reading informational texts such as exposition and argumentation, eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to locate and provide facts and relevant information that support a main idea or purpose, interpret causal relations, provide and support a judgment about the author's argument or stance, and recognize rhetorical devices.

| Advanced |
| :---: | :--- |
| Level |
| (323) | | Eighth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to make connections |
| :--- |
| within and across texts and to explain causal relations. They should be able to evaluate and |
| justify the strength of supporting evidence and the quality of an author's presentation. Students |
| performing at the Advanced level also should be able to manage the processing demands of |
| analysis and evaluation by stating, explaining, and justifying. |

When reading literary texts such as fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry, eighth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to explain the effects of narrative events. Within or across texts, they should be able to make thematic connections and make inferences about characters' feelings, motivations, and experiences.
When reading informational texts such as exposition and argumentation, eighth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to infer and explain a variety of connections that are intratextual (such as the relation between specific information and the main idea) or intertextual (such as the relation of ideas across expository and argument texts). Within and across texts, students should be able to state and justify judgments about text features, choice of content, and the author's use of evidence and rhetorical devices.

## NAEP 2009 Reading Report for District of Columbia

## Assessing Students With Disabilities and/or English Language Learners

Testing accommodations, such as extra testing time or individual (rather than group) administration, are provided for students with disabilities (SD) or English language learners (ELL) who could not fairly and accurately demonstrate their abilities without modified test administration procedures. In 1996, administration procedures were introduced at the national level allowing certain accommodations for students requiring such accommodations to participate.

In state NAEP reading assessments prior to 1998, no testing accommodations or adaptations were permitted for SD or ELL students. In 1998, NAEP was administered using a split sample of schools-one sample in which accommodations were permitted for special-needs students who normally received them and another sample in which accommodations were not permitted. Therefore, there were two different sets of results available for 1998, and both are shown in the tables in this report. Results for the assessment years where accommodations were not permitted in state NAEP reading assessments (1992 and 1994) are reported in the same tables as the results where accommodations were permitted (1998, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, and 2009).

Even with the availability of accommodations, however, some students may still be excluded from the NAEP assessment. Due to differences in policies and practices regarding the identification and inclusion of SD and ELL students, variations in exclusion and accommodation rates should be considered when comparing students' performance over time and across states. The types of accommodations used in the 2009 NAEP reading assessment are available on the NAEP website at http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading 2009/type accomm.asp

## Interpreting Results

The scores and percentages in this report are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. In addition, the collection of questions used at each grade level is only a sample of the many questions that could have been asked to assess the skills and abilities described in the NAEP framework. Comparisons over time or between groups are based on statistical tests that consider both the size of the differences and the standard errors of the two statistics being compared. Standard errors are margins of error, and estimates based on smaller groups are likely to have larger margins of error. The size of the standard errors may also be influenced by other factors such as how representative the assessed students are of the entire population. Statistical tests that factor in these standard errors are used to determine whether the differences between average scores or percentages are significant. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers.

NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller standard errors. As a consequence, smaller differences are detected as statistically significant than were detected in previous assessments. In addition, estimates based on smaller groups are likely to have relatively large standard errors. Thus, some seemingly large differences may not be statistically significant. That is, it cannot be determined whether these differences are due to sampling error, or to true differences in the population of interest.

Differences between scores or between percentages are discussed in this report only when they are significant from a statistical perspective. Significant differences between 2009 and prior assessments are marked with a notation (*) in the tables. Any differences in scores within a year or across years that are mentioned in the text as "higher," "lower," "greater," or "smaller" are statistically significant.

The reader is cautioned against making simple causal inferences between student performance and the other variables (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, and type of school location) discussed in this report. A statistically significant relationship between a variable and measures of student performance does not imply that the variable causes differences in how well students perform. The relationship may be influenced by a number of other variables not accounted for in this report, such as family income, parental involvement, or student attitudes.

## NAEP 2009 Reading Overall Scale Score and Achievement-Level Results for Public School Students

Overall reading results are reported in this section for public school students from District of Columbia along with regional and national results.

Prior to 1998, testing accommodations were not provided for students with special needs in NAEP state reading assessments. For 1998, results are displayed for both the sample in which accommodations were permitted and the sample in which they were not permitted. Subsequent assessment results were based on the more inclusive samples. In the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

## Overall Scale Score Results

Student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500 for grades 4 and 8, and from 0 to 500 for grade 12.

Tables 1-A and 1-B show the overall performance results of grades 4 and 8 public school students in District of Columbia, the nation (public), and the region. The list of states making up a given region for NAEP prior to 2003 differed from the list used by the U.S. Census Bureau, which has been used in NAEP from 2003 onward. Therefore, the data for the state's region are given only for 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009. The first column of results presents the average score on the NAEP reading scale. The remaining columns show the scores at selected percentiles. A percentile indicates the percentages of students whose scores fell at or below a particular score. For example, the 25th percentile demarks the cut point for the lowest 25 percent of students within the distribution of scale scores.

## Grade 4 Scale Score Results

- In 2009, the average scale score for students in District of Columbia was 202. This was lower than that of students across the nation (220).
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score for students in 2009 was higher than that in 2007 (197). However, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2009 was not significantly different from that in 2007 (220).
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score for students in 2009 was higher than the scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.


## Grade 8 Scale Score Results

- In 2009, the average scale score for students in District of Columbia was 242 . This was lower than that of students across the nation (262).
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score for students in 2009 was not significantly different from that in 2007 (241). However, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2009 was higher than that in 2007 (261).
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score for students in 2009 was higher than the scores in 1998, 2002, 2003, and 2005. However, it was not significantly different from the score in 2007.

|  | The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 1-A | Average scale scores and selected percentile scores in NAEP reading for fourth-grade public school students, by year and jurisdiction: Various years, 1992-2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year and jurisdiction |  | Average scale score | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \text { th } \\ \text { percentile } \end{array}$ | 25 2th percentile | 50th percentile | 75 th percentile | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \text { th } \\ \text { percentile } \end{array}$ |
| 1992 ${ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 215* | 168* | 192* | 217* | 240* | 259 |
|  | District of Columbia | 188* | 139* | 162* | 188* | 214* | 237* |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 212* | 156* | 187* | 217* | 241* | 261 |
|  | District of Columbia | 179* | 124* | 150* | 179* | 207* | 233* |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 215* | 165* | 192* | 218* | 242 | 261 |
|  | District of Columbia | 182* | 125* | 153* | 182* | 212* | 238* |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 213* | 161* | 189* | 215* | 241* | 260* |
|  | District of Columbia | 179* | 119* | 149* | 180* | 211* | 239* |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 217* | 169* | 194* | 219* | 242* | 261* |
|  | District of Columbia | 191* | 144* | 167* | 191* | 215* | 237* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 216* | 167* | 193* | 219* | 243* | 262 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 215* | 167* | 192* | 217* | 241* | 261 |
|  | District of Columbia | 188* | 136* | 162* | 189* | 214* | 239* |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 217* | 169* | 194* | 220* | 243* | 262 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 217* | 171* | 194* | 219* | 241* | 260 |
|  | District of Columbia | 191* | 141* | 165* | 191* | 217* | 241* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 220 | 173 | 198 | 222 | 244 | 263 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 219 | 175 | 198 | 221 | 242 | 261 |
|  | District of Columbia | 197* | 148* | 171* | 197* | 222* | 246 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 220 | 173 | 198 | 222 | 244 | 263 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 220 | 176 | 198 | 221 | 243 | 261 |
|  | District of Columbia | 202 | 153 | 177 | 202 | 227 | 251 |

[^0]| Table$1-B$ | The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average scale scores and selected percentile scores in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students, by year and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year and jurisdiction |  | Average scale score | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 10th } \\ \text { percentile } \end{array}$ | 25 th percentile | 50 th percentile | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 75th } \\ \text { percentile } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 90th } \\ \text { percentile } \end{array}$ |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 261 | 215 | 240 | 264 | 286 | 304 |
|  | District of Columbia | 236* | 187* | 212* | 237* | 263 | 285 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 261 | 214 | 238* | 264 | 285 | 303 |
|  | District of Columbia | 236* | 186 | 211 | 237* | 262 | 284 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 263 | 219 | 242 | 265 | 286 | 303 |
|  | District of Columbia | 240* | 197 | 219 | 241 | 262 | 281* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 261* | 215* | 240* | 264* | 286 | 304 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 259* | 214* | 238* | 261* | 283 | 301 |
| 2005 | District of Columbia | 239* | 193 | 216 | 241 | 262 | 282* |
|  | Nation (public) | 260* | 214* | 238* | 263* | 285* | 303 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 258* | 212* | 236* | 260* | 282* | 301 |
| 2007 | District of Columbia | 238* | 191 | 215* | 239* | 262* | 284 |
|  | Nation (public) | 261* | 216* | 240* | 264* | 285* | 303* |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 260* | 216 | 239* | 262* | 283 | 301 |
| 2009 | District of Columbia | 241 | 196 | 218 | 241 | 264 | 285 |
|  | Nation (public) | 262 | 218 | 242 | 265 | 286 | 304 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 261 | 217 | 240 | 263 | 284 | 302 |
|  | District of Columbia | 242 | 196 | 219 | 244 | 267 | 288 |

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2009.

1 Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
${ }^{2}$ Region in which jurisdiction is located. Regional data are not provided for years prior to 2003 to be consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau defined regions.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 .
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

## Overall Achievement-Level Results

Student results are reported as the percentages of students performing relative to performance standards set by the National Assessment Governing Board. These performance standards for what students should know and be able to do were based on the recommendations of broadly representative panels of educators and members of the public.

Tables 2-A and 2-B show the percentage of students at grades 4 and 8 who performed below Basic, at or above Basic, at or above Proficient, and at Advanced. Because the percentages are cumulative from Basic to Proficient to Advanced, they may sum to more than 100 percent. Only the percentage of students performing at or above Basic (which includes the students at Proficient and Advanced) plus the students below Basic will sum to 100 percent.

## Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2009, the percentage of District of Columbia's students who performed at or above Proficient was 17 percent. This was smaller than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above Proficient (32 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of students who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 was greater than the percentages in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009, the percentage of District of Columbia's students who performed at or above Basic was 44 percent. This was smaller than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above Basic (66 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of students who performed at or above Basic in 2009 was greater than the percentages in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2009, the percentage of District of Columbia's students who performed at or above Proficient was 14 percent. This was smaller than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above Proficient (30 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of students who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 was greater than the percentages in 2002 and 2003, but was not significantly different from the percentages in 1998, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009, the percentage of District of Columbia's students who performed at or above Basic was 51 percent. This was smaller than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above Basic (74 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of students who performed at or above Basic in 2009 was greater than the percentages in 1998, 2003, and 2005, but was not significantly different from the percentages in 2002 and 2007.

| Year and jurisdiction |  | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 40* | 60* | 27* | 6 * |
|  | District of Columbia | 70* | 30* | 10* | 2* |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 41* | 59* | 28* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 76* | 24* | 8* | 2* |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 39* | 61* | 29* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 72* | 28* | 10* | 3* |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 42* | 58* | 28* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 73* | 27* | 10* | 3* |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 38* | 62* | 30* | 6* |
|  | District of Columbia | 69* | 31* | 10* | 2* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 38* | 62* | 30* | 7 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 40* | 60* | 28* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 69* | 31* | 10* | 3* |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 38* | 62* | 30* | 7 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 38* | 62* | 28* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 67* | 33* | 11* | 2* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 34 | 66 | 32 | 7 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 35 | 65 | 30 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 61* | 39* | 14* | 4 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 34 | 66 | 32 | 7 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 34 | 66 | 30 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 56 | 44 | 17 | 5 |

[^1]The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students at or above NAEP reading achievement levels, by year and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| Year and jurisdiction |  | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{At} \\ \text { Advanced } \\ \hline 2 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 28 | 72 | 31 |  |
| 1998 | District of Columbia | 56* | 44* | 12 | 1 |
|  | Nation (public) | 29* | 71* | 30 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 56* | 44* | 11 | 1 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 26 | 74 | 31 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 52 | 48 | 10* | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 28* | 72* | 30 | 3 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 30* | 70* | 27 | 2 |
| 2005 | District of Columbia | 53* | 47* | 10* | 1 |
|  | Nation (public) | 29* | 71* | 29* | 3 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 31* | 69* | 26* | 2 |
| 2007 | District of Columbia | 55* | 45* | 12 | 1 |
|  | Nation (public) | 27* | 73* | 29* | 2 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 29 | 71 | 27 | 2 |
| 2009 | District of Columbia | 52 | 48 | 12 | 1 |
|  | Nation (public) | 26 | 74 | 30 | 2 |
|  | South ${ }^{2}$ | 28 | 72 | 28 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 49 | 51 | 14 | 1 |

\# Rounds to zero.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2009.

1 Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
${ }^{2}$ Region in which jurisdiction is located. Regional data are not provided for years prior to 2003 to be consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau defined regions.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

## Comparisons Between District of Columbia, the Nation, and Participating States and Jurisdictions

All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Schools participated in the 2009 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8 . For the first time in 2009, grade 12 reading results are also available for 11 states that met the reporting criteria. References to "jurisdictions" in the results statements may include states, the District of Columbia, and/or Department of Defense Schools.

## Comparisons by Average Scale Scores

Figures 2-A and 2-B compare District of Columbia's 2009 overall reading scale scores at grades 4 and 8 with those of public schools in the nation and all other participating states and jurisdictions. The different shadings indicate whether the average score of the nation (public), a state, or a jurisdiction was found to be higher than, lower than, or not significantly different from that of District of Columbia in the NAEP 2009 reading assessment.

## Grade 4 Scale Score Comparison Results

- Students' average score in District of Columbia was lower than the scores in 51 jurisdictions.


## Grade 8 Scale Score Comparison Results

- Students' average score in District of Columbia was lower than the scores in 51 jurisdictions.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment


Focal state/jurisdiction (District of Columbia)
Higher average scale score than District of Columbia (nation and 51 jurisdictions)
Not significantly different from District of Columbia (0 jurisdiction)
Lower average scale score than District of Columbia (0 jurisdiction)
${ }^{1}$ Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
NOTE: Significance tests used a multiple-comparison procedure based on all jurisdictions that participated. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment compared with scores for the nation and other participating jurisdictions: 2009


Focal state/jurisdiction (District of Columbia)
Higher average scale score than District of Columbia (nation and 51 jurisdictions)
Not significantly different from District of Columbia (0 jurisdiction)
Lower average scale score than District of Columbia (0 jurisdiction)
${ }^{1}$ Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
NOTE: Significance tests used a multiple-comparison procedure based on all jurisdictions that participated. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

## Comparisons by Achievement Levels

Figures 3-A and 3-B permit comparisons of all jurisdictions (and the nation) participating in the NAEP 2009 reading assessment in terms of percentages of grades 4 and 8 students performing at or above Proficient. The participating states and jurisdictions are grouped into categories reflecting whether the percentage of their students performing at or above Proficient (including Advanced) was found to be higher than, not significantly different from, or lower than the percentage in District of Columbia.

Note that the selected state is listed first in its category, and the other states and jurisdictions within each category are listed alphabetically; statistical comparisons among jurisdictions in each of the three categories are not included in this report. However, statistical comparisons among states by achievement level can be calculated online by using the NAEP Data Explorer at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/.

## Grade 4 Achievement-Level Comparison Results

- The percentage of students performing at or above the Proficient level in District of Columbia was not significantly different from the score in 2 jurisdictions, and lower than those in 49 jurisdictions.
- The percentage of students performing at or above the Basic level in District of Columbia was lower than the score in 51 jurisdictions (data not shown).


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Comparison Results

- The percentage of students performing at or above the Proficient level in District of Columbia was lower than the score in 51 jurisdictions.
- The percentage of students performing at or above the Basic level in District of Columbia was lower than the score in 51 jurisdictions (data not shown).

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Average scale scores in NAEP reading for fourth-grade public school students, percentage within each achievement level, and District of Columbia's percentage at or above Proficient compared with the nation and other participating states/jurisdictions: 2009


1 Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
NOTE: The bars above contain percentages of students in each NAEP reading achievement level. Achievement levels corresponding to each population of students are aligned at the point where the Proficient category begins, so that they may be compared at Proficient and above. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The shaded bars are graphed using unrounded numbers. Significance tests used a multiple-comparison procedure based on all jurisdictions that participated.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.


The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Average scale scores in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students, percentage within each achievement level, and District of Columbia's percentage at or above Proficient compared with the nation and other participating states/jurisdictions: 2009


1 Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
NOTE: The bars above contain percentages of students in each NAEP reading achievement level. Achievement levels corresponding to each population of students are aligned at the point where the Proficient category begins, so that they may be compared at Proficient and above. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The shaded bars are graphed using unrounded numbers. Significance tests used a multiple-comparison procedure based on all jurisdictions that participated.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

## Reading Performance of Selected Student Groups

This section of the report presents trend results for public school students in District of Columbia and the nation by demographic characteristics. Student performance data are reported for

- race/ethnicity
- gender
- student eligibility for the National School Lunch Program
- type of school location (for 2007 and 2009 only)
- parents' highest level of education

Results for each of the variables are reported in tables that include the percentage of students in each group in the first column, and the average scale score in the second column. The columns to the right show the percentage of students below Basic and at or above each achievement level.

Two sets of results from the 1998 reading assessment are included in the tables for grades 4 and 8: one obtained from student samples for which accommodations were permitted and one for which accommodations were not permitted. Comparisons to the 1998 results made in the summary statements, however, are based solely on the sample for which accommodations were permitted.

Results by students' race/ethnicity and gender include statements about score point differences between student groups (e.g., between White and Black or White and Hispanic students, or between male and female students) in 2009 and in the first assessment year. Because these differences are calculated using unrounded values, they may differ slightly from what would be obtained by subtracting the rounded values that appear in the tables. Statements indicating a narrowing or widening of the gap in students' scores are only made if the change in the gap from the first assessment year to 2009 was found to be statistically significant.

The reader is cautioned against making simple causal inferences about group differences, as a complex mix of educational and socioeconomic factors may affect student performance. NAEP collects information on many additional variables, including school and home factors related to achievement. This information is in an interactive database available on the NAEP website http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdatal.

## Race/Ethnicity

Schools reported the race/ethnicity that best described each student. The six mutually exclusive categories are White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Unclassified. Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Tables 3-A and 3-B show average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in District of Columbia and the nation, by race/ethnicity.

## Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2009, White students in District of Columbia had an average scale score that was higher than the scores of Black and Hispanic students.
- In 2009, the average scale score of Hispanic students in District of Columbia was higher than their respective scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, and 2005, but not significantly different from their respective score in 2007.
- In 2009, the average scale score of White students in District of Columbia was higher than their respective scores in 1992 and 1998, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 1994, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009, the average scale score of Black students in District of Columbia was higher than their respective scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009, Black students in District of Columbia had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 60 points. In 1992, the average score for Black students was lower than that of White students by 62 points.
- In 2009, Hispanic students in District of Columbia had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 49 points. In 1992, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 57 points.


## Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In District of Columbia in 2009, the percentage of White students performing at or above Proficient was greater than the corresponding percentages of Black and Hispanic students.
- In 2009, the percentage of White students in District of Columbia performing at or above Proficient was greater than the percentage in 1998, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1992, 1994, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009, the percentage of Black students in District of Columbia performing at or above Proficient was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, and 2003, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 2005 and 2007.
- In 2009, the percentage of Hispanic students in District of Columbia performing at or above Proficient was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 2002 and 2003, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2005, and 2007.


## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 19922009

| Racelethnicity, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 72* | 223* | 31* | 69* | 33* | 8* |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 246* | 10 | 90 | 61 | 23 |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 71* | 222* | 31* | 69* | 35* | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 248 | 15* | 85* | 63 | 34 |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 69* | 224* | 30* | 70* | 36* | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 248 | 12 | 88 | 64 | 28 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 64* | 223* | 31* | 69* | 36* | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 6* | 247* | 11 | 89 | 62* | 27 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 60* | 227* | 26* | 74* | 39* | 9* |
|  | District of Columbia | 3* | 248 | 9 | 91 | 66 | 28 |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 59* | 227* | 26* | 74* | 39* | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 254 | 10 | 90 | 70 | 37 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 57* | 228* | 25* | 75* | 39* | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 4* | 252 | 8 | 92 | 70 | 29 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 56* | 230 | 23 | 77 | 42 | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 6 | 258 | 4 | 96 | 74 | 38 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 54 | 229 | 23 | 77 | 41 | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 256 | 6 | 94 | 75 | 36 |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 18* | 191* | 69* | 31* | 8* | 1* |
|  | District of Columbia | 91* | 185* | 73* | 27* | 7* | 1 |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 18 | 184* | 72* | 28* | 8* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 90* | 174* | 80* | 20* | 5* | 1 |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 17 | 192* | 66* | 34* | 9* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 84* | 177* | 77* | 23* | 6* | 1 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 16 | 192* | 66* | 34* | 10* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 84* | 174* | 78* | 22* | 6* | 1 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 18* | 198* | 61* | 39* | 12* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 88* | 188* | 72* | 28* | 7* | 1 |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 17* | 197* | 61* | 39* | 12* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 85* | 184* | 73* | 27* | 7* | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 17 | 199* | 59* | 41* | 12* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 85* | 187* | 71* | 29* | 8 | 1 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 17 | 203 | 54 | 46 | 14 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 85* | 192* | 67* | 33* | 9 | 1 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 16 | 204 | 53 | 47 | 15 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 80 | 196 | 63 | 37 | 11 | 2 |

See notes at end of table.

## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1992-2009-Continued

| Race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 7* | 194* | 63* | 37* | 10* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3* | 189* | 73* | 27* | 10 | 2 |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 7* | 186* | 68* | 32* | 11 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 4* | 183* | 68* | 32* | 14 | 2 |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 10* | 194* | 62* | 38* | 12* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 8* | 180* | 71* | 29* | 10 | 2 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 14* | 192* | 64* | 36* | 12* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 8* | 173* | 73* | 27* | 10 | 3 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 17* | 199* | 57* | 43* | 14* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 7* | 193* | 66* | 34* | 8* | 1 |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 18* | 199* | 57* | 43* | 14* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 9* | 187* | 71* | 29* | 8* | 2 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 19* | 201* | 56* | 44* | 15 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 9* | 193* | 63* | 37* | 12 | 3 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 20* | 204 | 51 | 49 | 17 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 7* | 206 | 45 | 55 | 15 | 2 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 21 | 204 | 52 | 48 | 16 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 11 | 207 | 49 | 51 | 17 | 4 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 2* | 215* | 41* | 59* | 23* | 4* |
|  | District of Columbia | 1* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 3* | 217* | 36* | 64* | 34* | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 2* | 218* | 39* | 61* | 31* | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 4 | 211* | 45* | 55* | 27* | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 4* | 223* | 31* | 69* | 36* | 9* |
|  | District of Columbia | 1* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 4* | 225* | 31* | 69* | 37* | 11* |
|  | District of Columbia | 1* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 4* | 227* | 28* | 72* | 40* | 12* |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 5 | 231 | 24 | 76 | 45 | 14 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 5 | 234 | 21 | 79 | 48 | 17 |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |

See notes at end of table.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1992-2009-Continued

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different $(p<.05)$ from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.
${ }^{1}$ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
$\mathbf{2}$ The unclassified category includes students whose school-reported race/ethnicity was "other" or unavailable, or was missing, and whose race/ethnicity category could not be determined from self-reported information.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. 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), various years, 1992-2009 Reading Assessments.


## Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2009, Black students in District of Columbia had an average scale score that was lower than the score of Hispanic students.
- In 2009, the average scale score of Black students in District of Columbia was higher than their respective scores in 1998, 2003, and 2005, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 2002 and 2007.
- In 2009, the average scale score of Hispanic students in District of Columbia was higher than their respective score in 2003, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 1998, 2002, 2005, and 2007.
- Data are not reported for White students in 2009, because reporting standards were not met.
- Data are not reported for White students in 2009, because reporting standards were not met.


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In District of Columbia in 2009, the percentage of Black students performing at or above Proficient was smaller than the percentage of Hispanic students.
- In 2009, the percentages of Black and Hispanic students in District of Columbia performing at or above Proficient were greater than the percentage in 2002, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1998, 2003, 2005, and 2007.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 19982009

| Racelethnicity, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or <br> above <br> Proficient | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { At } \\ \text { Advanced } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 68* | 269* | 20* | 80* | 38 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 68* | 268* | 21* | 79* | 37 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 64* | 271 | 17 | 83 | 39 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 61* | 270* | 18* | 82* | 39 | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 60* | 269* | 19* | 81* | 37* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | 301 | 6 | 94 | 74 | 24 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 58* | 270* | 17 | 83 | 38 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 57 | 271 | 17 | 83 | 39 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 15 | 241* | 51* | 49* | 11 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 87 | 234* | 58 | 42 | 9 | 1 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 16 | 242* | 50* | 50* | 11 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 90* | 233* | 59* | 41* | 9 | \# |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 15 | 244 | 46 | 54 | 13 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 88 | 238 | 54 | 46 | 8* | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 17* | 244* | 47* | 53* | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 88 | 236* | 55 | 45 | 8 | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 17* | 242* | 49* | 51* | 11* | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 89* | 235* | 58* | 42* | 9 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 17* | 244* | 46 | 54 | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 88 | 238 | 55 | 45 | 9 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 16 | 245 | 44 | 56 | 13 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 87 | 239 | 52 | 48 | 10 | \# |

See notes at end of table.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009-Continued

| Race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or <br> above <br> Proficient | Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 12* | 243 | 47 | 53 | 14 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 8 | 243 | 45 | 55 | 15 | 1 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 12* | 241* | 48* | 52* | 13* | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 6* | 246 | 41 | 59 | 22 | 3 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 15* | 245 | 44 | 56 | 14 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 240 | 47 | 53 | 11* | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 15* | 244* | 46* | 54* | 14 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 8 | 240* | 49 | 51 | 11 | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 17* | 245* | 45* | 55* | 14* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 6* | 247 | 41 | 59 | 18 | 1 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 18* | 246* | 43 | 57 | 14 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 8 | 249 | 44 | 56 | 19 | 1 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 20 | 248 | 41 | 59 | 16 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 9 | 249 | 40 | 60 | 21 | 1 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 3* | 265 | 25 | 75 | 32 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 4 | 261 | 27 | 73 | 30 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 4* | 265* | 25* | 75* | 34* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 4* | 268* | 22* | 78* | 38 | 5 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 4* | 270* | 21* | 79* | 39 | 5 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 5 | 269* | 21 | 79 | 40 | 5 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 5 | 273 | 18 | 82 | 44 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |

See notes at end of table

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009-Continued

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different $(p<.05)$ from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

1 Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
2 The unclassified category includes students whose school-reported race/ethnicity was "other" or unavailable, or was missing, and whose race/ethnicity category could not be determined from self-reported information.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

## Gender

Information on student gender is reported by the student's school when rosters of the students eligible to be assessed are submitted to NAEP.

Tables 4-A and 4-B show average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in District of Columbia and the nation, by gender.

## Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Gender

- In 2009, male students in District of Columbia had an average score in reading (198) that was lower than that of female students (206). In 1992, male students in District of Columbia had an average score in reading (185) that was lower than that of female students (191).
- In 2009, male students in District of Columbia had an average scale score in reading (198) that was lower than that of male students in public schools across the nation (216). Similarly, female students in District of Columbia had an average scale score (206) that was lower than that of female students across the nation (223).
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score of male students in 2009 was higher than the scores of male students in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, and 2005, but not significantly different from the score of male students in 2007.
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score of female students in 2009 was higher than the scores of female students in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.


## Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Gender

- In the 2009 assessment, 16 percent of male students and 18 percent of female students performed at or above Proficient in District of Columbia. The difference between these percentages was not statistically significant.
- The percentage of male students in District of Columbia's public schools who were at or above Proficient in 2009 (16 percent) was smaller than that of male students in the nation ( 28 percent).
- The percentage of female students in District of Columbia's public schools who were at or above Proficient in 2009 (18 percent) was smaller than that of female students in the nation (35 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of male students performing at or above Proficient in 2009 was greater than the corresponding percentages of students in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of female students performing at or above Proficient in 2009 was greater than the corresponding percentages of students in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, and 2005, but not significantly different from the percentage of students in 2007.

| Table$4-A$ | The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by gender, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1992-2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 51 | 211* | 44* | 56* | 24* | 5 |
|  | District of Columbia | 50 | 185* | 71* | 29* | 9* | 2* |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 51 | 207* | 47* | 53* | 24* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 50 | 174* | 79* | 21* | 7* | 2* |
| 19981 | Nation (public) | 50 | 212* | 43* | 57* | 27 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 48 | 177* | 76* | 24* | 8* | 2* |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 50 | 210* | 45* | 55* | 25* | 5 |
|  | District of Columbia | 48 | 175* | 76* | 24* | 8* | 2* |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 51 | 214* | 41* | 59* | 26* | 5* |
|  | District of Columbia | 49 | 185* | 74* | 26* | 8* | 1* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 51 | 213* | 42* | 58* | 26* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 49 | 182* | 74* | 26* | 8* | 2* |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 50* | 214* | 41* | 59* | 27* | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 46* | 186* | 72* | 28* | 9* | 2* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 50 | 216 | 38 | 62 | 29 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 48 | 194 | 64 | 36 | 12* | 3 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 51 | 216 | 38 | 62 | 28 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 49 | 198 | 60 | 40 | 16 | 4 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1992{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 49 | 219* | 35* | 65* | 30* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 50 | 191* | 68* | 32* | 10* | 2* |
| 19941 | Nation (public) | 49 | 218* | 36* | 64* | 32 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 50 | 183* | 73* | 27* | 9* | 3* |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 50 | 218* | 36* | 64* | 31* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 52 | 186* | 69* | 31* | 12* | 3 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 50 | 215* | 40* | 60* | 30* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 52 | 183* | 71* | 29* | 12* | 3 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 49 | 220* | 35* | 65* | 33* | 8* |
|  | District of Columbia | 51 | 196* | 64* | 36* | 11* | 2* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 49 | 220* | 35* | 65* | 33* | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 51 | 195* | 64* | 36* | 13* | 4 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 50* | 220* | 34* | 66* | 33* | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 54* | 195* | 63* | 37* | 13* | 3* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 50 | 223 | 31 | 69 | 35 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 52 | 200* | 59* | 41* | 16 | 4 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 49 | 223 | 31 | 69 | 35 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 51 | 206 | 52 | 48 | 18 | 5 |

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

1 Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1992-2009 Reading Assessments.

## Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Gender

- In 2009, male students in District of Columbia had an average score in reading (236) that was lower than that of female students (248). In 1998, male students in District of Columbia had an average score in reading (229) that was lower than that of female students (241).
- In 2009, male students in District of Columbia had an average scale score in reading (236) that was lower than that of male students in public schools across the nation (258). Similarly, female students in District of Columbia had an average scale score (248) that was lower than that of female students across the nation (267).
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score of male students in 2009 was higher than the scores of male students in 2003 and 2005, but not significantly different from the scores of male students in 1998, 2002, and 2007.
- In District of Columbia, the average scale score of female students in 2009 was higher than the score of female students in 1998, but not significantly different from the scores of female students in 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Gender

- In the 2009 assessment, 11 percent of male students and 16 percent of female students performed at or above Proficient in District of Columbia. The difference between these percentages was statistically significant.
- The percentage of male students in District of Columbia's public schools who were at or above Proficient in 2009 (11 percent) was smaller than that of male students in the nation ( 26 percent).
- The percentage of female students in District of Columbia's public schools who were at or above Proficient in 2009 (16 percent) was smaller than that of female students in the nation ( 35 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of male students performing at or above Proficient in 2009 was not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of female students performing at or above Proficient in 2009 was greater than the percentage of students in 2002, but not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1998, 2003, 2005, and 2007.

| The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 4-B | Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by gender, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 51 | 255* | 35* | 65* | 24 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 48 | 230 | 61 | 39 | 10 | 1 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 51 | 253* | 36* | 64* | 23 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 47 | 229 | 63 | 37 | 9 | 1 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 50 | 258 | 30 | 70 | 26 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 47 | 235 | 58 | 42 | 9 | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 50 | 256* | 33* | 67* | 25 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 48 | 231* | 62* | 38* | 8 | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 50 | 255* | 34* | 66* | 24* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 47 | 230* | 64* | 36* | 7 | 1 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 50 | 256* | 32* | 68* | 24* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 44 | 235 | 59 | 41 | 9 | 1 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 50 | 258 | 30 | 70 | 26 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 47 | 236 | 56 | 44 | 11 | 1 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19981 | Nation (public) | 49 | 268 | 21 | 79 | 37 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 52 | 242* | 50 | 50 | 14 | 2 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 49 | 268 | 21 | 79 | 37 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 53 | 241* | 51* | 49* | 13 | 1 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 50 | 267 | 21 | 79 | 36 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 53 | 245 | 46 | 54 | 11* | 1 |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 50 | 267 | 23 | 77 | 35 | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 52 | 245 | 45 | 55 | 13 | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 50 | 266* | 24* | 76* | 34* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 53 | 245 | 47 | 53 | 15 | 2 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 50 | 266* | 23 | 77 | 34* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 56 | 245 | 47 | 53 | 15 | 1 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 50 | 267 | 22 | 78 | 35 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 53 | 248 | 43 | 57 | 16 | 1 |

\# Rounds to zero.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.
${ }^{1}$ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.


## Student Eligibility for the National School Lunch Program

NAEP collects data on eligibility for the federal program providing free or reduced-price school lunches. The free/reduced-price lunch component of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) offered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is designed to ensure that children near or below the poverty line receive nourishing meals. Eligibility is determined through the USDA's Income Eligibility Guidelines, and results for this category of students are included as an indicator of low family income. NAEP first collected information on participation in this program in 1996; therefore, cross-year comparisons to assessments prior to 1996 cannot be made.

Tables 5-A and 5-B show average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in District of Columbia and the nation, by student eligibility for the NSLP.

## Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch Eligibility

- In 2009, students in District of Columbia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 193. This was lower than that of students in District of Columbia not eligible for this program (226).
- In 2009, students in District of Columbia who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 33 points. This performance gap was narrower than that of 1998 (42 points).
- Students in District of Columbia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (193) in 2009 that was lower than that of students in the nation who were eligible (206).
- In District of Columbia, students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score in 2009 that was higher than that of eligible students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.


## Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch Eligibility

- In District of Columbia, 9 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 39 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above Proficient in 2009. These percentages were significantly different from one another.
- For students in District of Columbia in 2009 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above Proficient (9 percent) was smaller than the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation ( 17 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above Proficient for 2009 was greater than the corresponding percentages for 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.


## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by eligibility for National School Lunch Program, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| Eligibility status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eligible |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 38* | 198* | 58* | 42* | 13* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 79* | 174* | 79* | 21* | 5* | 1 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 41* | 195* | 61* | 39* | 12* | 1* |
|  | District of Columbia | 78* | 172* | 80* | 20* | 5* | 1 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 43* | 202* | 54* | 46* | 16 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 78* | 185* | 75* | 25* | 5* | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 44* | 201* | 56* | 44* | 15* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 70* | 182* | 75* | 25* | 6* | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 45* | 203* | 54* | 46* | 15* | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 76* | 183* | 75* | 25* | 6* | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 45* | 205 | 50 | 50 | 17 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 66* | 188* | 71* | 29* | 6* | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 47 | 206 | 49 | 51 | 17 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 73 | 193 | 65 | 35 | 9 | 1 |
| Not eligible |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 54 | 226* | 28* | 72* | 39* | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 12* | 216* | 40 | 60 | 33 | 12 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 51 | 226* | 28* | 72* | 39* | 10* |
|  | District of Columbia | 13* | 215* | 41* | 59* | 35 | 12 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 50* | 229* | 24* | 76* | 41* | 10* |
|  | District of Columbia | 21* | 210* | 48* | 52* | 23* | 7* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 52 | 229* | 25* | 75* | 41* | 11 |
|  | District of Columbia | 25 | 206* | 52* | 48* | 24* | 9* |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 53* | 230* | 23* | 77* | 42* | 11* |
|  | District of Columbia | 23* | 215* | 41* | 59* | 29* | 8* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 54* | 232 | 21 | 79 | 44 | 12 |
|  | District of Columbia | 34* | 216* | 42* | 58* | 29* | 10 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 52 | 232 | 21 | 79 | 45 | 12 |
|  | District of Columbia | 26 | 226 | 31 | 69 | 39 | 14 |

See notes at end of table.

## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by eligibility for National School Lunch Program, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009-Continued

| Eligibility status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Information not available |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 7* | 225 | 30 | 70 | 38 | 10 |
|  | District of Columbia | 9* | 200 | 56 | 44 | 22 | 8 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 7* | 219 | 35 | 65 | 33 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 9* | 188 | 63 | 37 | 17 | 6 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 7* | 217 | 38 | 62 | 30 | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 4* | 219 | 35 | 65 | 33 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 183 | 71 | 29 | 8 | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 2* | 218 | 38 | 62 | 32 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 2 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 1 | 220 | 34 | 66 | 33 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 1 | 219 | 38 | 62 | 31 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |

\# Rounds to zero
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different $(p<.05)$ from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.
${ }^{1}$ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.


## Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch Eligibility

- In 2009, students in District of Columbia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 237. This was lower than that of students in District of Columbia not eligible for this program (256).
- In 2009, students in District of Columbia who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 19 points. In 1998, the average score for students in District of Columbia who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch was lower than the score of those not eligible by 25 points.
- Students in District of Columbia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (237) in 2009 that was lower than that of students in the nation who were eligible (249).
- In District of Columbia, students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score in 2009 that was higher than that of eligible students in 1998, 2003, and 2005, but not significantly different from that of eligible students in 2002 and 2007.


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch Eligibility

- In District of Columbia, 9 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 26 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above Proficient in 2009. These percentages were significantly different from one another.
- For students in District of Columbia in 2009 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above Proficient (9 percent) was smaller than the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation ( 16 percent).
- In District of Columbia, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above Proficient for 2009 was greater than the corresponding percentages for 2002 and 2003, but not significantly different from the corresponding percentages for 1998, 2005, and 2007.


## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by eligibility for National School Lunch Program, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| Eligibility status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eligible |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 30* | 246 | 44* | 56* | 15 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 53* | 228* | 64* | 36* | 6 | \# |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 30* | 245* | 45* | 55* | 14 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 53* | 229* | 64* | 36* | 6 | \# |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 34* | 249 | 40 | 60 | 17 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 68* | 235 | 57 | 43 | 6* | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 36* | 246* | 44* | 56* | 15* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 57* | 232* | 61* | 39* | 6* | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 39* | 247* | 43* | 57* | 15 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 70 | 234* | 59* | 41* | 8 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 40* | 247* | 42* | 58* | 15* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 65* | 234 | 59 | 41 | 7 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 43 | 249 | 40 | 60 | 16 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 72 | 237 | 55 | 45 | 9 | \# |
| Not eligible |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 58 | 269* | 20* | 80* | 38 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 24* | 257 | 35 | 65 | 25 | 5 |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 58 | 268* | 21* | 79* | 37* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 23* | 253 | 38 | 62 | 26 | 4 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 57 | 271 | 17 | 83 | 40 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 31* | 251 | 39 | 61 | 18* | 1 |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 58* | 271* | 18* | 82* | 39* | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 30* | 248* | 44* | 56* | 17* | 3 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 59* | 270* | 19* | 81* | 38* | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 27 | 249* | 44* | 56* | 20 | 3 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 58* | 271* | 18* | 82* | 39* | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 35* | 253 | 40 | 60 | 22 | 3 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 56 | 273 | 16 | 84 | 41 | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 27 | 256 | 35 | 65 | 26 | 4 |

See notes at end of table.

## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by eligibility for National School Lunch Program, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009-Continued

| Eligibility status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Information not available |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 12* | 265 | 25 | 75 | 35 | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 23* | 234 | 57 | 43 | 10 | \# |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 11* | 264 | 27 | 73 | 34 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 24* | 234 | 57 | 43 | 9 | \# |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 10* | 264 | 25 | 75 | 32 | 4 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 6* | 262 | 28 | 72 | 31 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 12* | 249 | 38 | 62 | 15 | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 3* | 258 | 31 | 69 | 28 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 3* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 1 | 255 | 34 | 66 | 27 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | \#* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 1 | 259 | 31 | 69 | 29 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 1 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |

\# Rounds to zero
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different $(p<.05)$ from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.
${ }^{1}$ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.


## Type of Location

Schools that participated in the assessment were classified as being located in four mutually exclusive types of communities: city, suburb, town, and rural. These categories indicate the geographic locations of schools. "City" is a geographical term meaning the principal city of a U.S. Census Bureau-defined Core-Based Statistical Area and is not synonymous with "inner city." The criteria for classifying schools with respect to type of location changed for 2007; therefore, only comparisons between 2007 and 2009 are available. More detail on the changes for the classification of type of location is available at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/Rural Locales.asp.

Tables 6-A and 6-B show average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in District of Columbia and the nation, by type of location (for 2007 and 2009 only).

## Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Type of Location

- In 2009, students attending public schools in city locations in District of Columbia had average scale score that was lower than the average scale score of students in city locations in the nation.
- In 2009, students attending public schools in city locations in District of Columbia had average scale score that was higher than the average scale score of students in city locations in 2007 in District of Columbia.


## Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Type of Location

- The percentage of students in District of Columbia's public schools in city locations who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 was smaller than those of students in city locations in the nation.
- The percentage of students in District of Columbia's public schools in city locations who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 was greater than those of students in city locations in 2007 in District of Columbia.


## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by type of location, year, and jurisdiction: 2007 and 2009

| Type of location, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 29 | 213 | 43 | 57 | 25 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 100 | 197* | 61* | 39* | 14* | 4 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 30 | 214 | 42 | 58 | 26 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | 100 | 202 | 56 | 44 | 17 | 5 |
| Suburb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 37 | 224 | 29 | 71 | 37 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 36 | 224 | 30 | 70 | 36 | 9 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| Town |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 12 | 218 | 35 | 65 | 29 | 6 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 12 | 217 | 36 | 64 | 28 | 5 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 22 | 222 | 31 | 69 | 33 | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 22 | 222 | 31 | 69 | 33 | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009

NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), 2007 and 2009 Reading Assessments.

## Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Type of Location

- In 2009, students attending public schools in city locations in District of Columbia had average scale score that was lower than the average scale score of students in city locations in the nation.
- In 2009, students attending public schools in city locations in District of Columbia had average scale score that was not significantly different from the average scale score of students in city locations in 2007 in District of Columbia.


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Type of Location

- The percentage of students in District of Columbia's public schools in city locations who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 was smaller than those of students in city locations in the nation.
- The percentage of students in District of Columbia's public schools in city locations who performed at or above Proficient in 2009 was not significantly different from those of students in city locations in 2007 in District of Columbia.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by type of location, year, and jurisdiction: 2007 and 2009

| Type of location, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 28 | 254* | 36 | 64 | 23 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 100 | 241 | 52 | 48 | 12 | 1 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 27 | 256 | 34 | 66 | 24 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 100 | 242 | 49 | 51 | 14 | 1 |
| Suburb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 36 | 265 | 24 | 76 | 34 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 36 | 266 | 23 | 77 | 35 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| Town |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 13 | 261 | 27 | 73 | 28 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 14 | 261 | 27 | 73 | 28 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 22 | 264 | 24 | 76 | 31 | 2 |
| 2009 | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
|  | Nation (public) | 23 | 264 | 23 | 77 | 31 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | \# | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), 2007 and 2009 Reading Assessments.

## Parents' Highest Level of Education

Eighth- and twelfth-grade students who participated in the NAEP 2009 assessment were asked to indicate the highest level of education they thought their father and their mother had completed. Five response options-did not finish high school, graduated from high school, some education after high school, graduated from college, and "I don't know"-were offered. The highest level of education reported for either parent was used in the analysis. Fourth-graders were not asked about their parents' education level because their responses in previous NAEP assessments were not reliable, and a large percentage of them chose the "I don't know" option.

The results by highest level of parental education are shown in table 7.

## Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Parents' Highest Level of Education

- In 2009, students in District of Columbia who reported that a parent had graduated from college had an average scale score that was higher than the average score of students with a parent in any of the following education categories: graduated from high school, but was not significantly different from the average scores of students with a parent in any of the following education categories: some education after high school and did not finish high school.
- In 2009, the average scale scores for students in District of Columbia who reported that a parent had graduated from college, had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school were lower than the corresponding scores of students in the nation.
- In 2009, the average scale score for students in District of Columbia who reported that a parent had not finished high school was not significantly different from the score of students in the nation.
- In 2009, the average scale scores for students in District of Columbia who reported that a parent had graduated from college, had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school were not significantly different from the corresponding scores of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009, the average scale score for students in District of Columbia who reported that a parent had not finished high school was higher than the score of students in 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from the score of students in 1998 and 2002.


## Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Parents' Highest Level of Education

- In 2009, the percentage of students performing at or above Proficient in District of Columbia who reported that a parent had graduated from college was greater than the percentage for students whose parents' highest level of education was in any of the following education categories: graduated from high school, but was not significantly different from the percentage for students whose parents' highest level of education was in any of the following education categories: some education after high school and did not finish high school.
- In 2009 in District of Columbia, the percentages of students reporting that a parent had graduated from college, had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school who performed at or above Proficient were smaller than the corresponding percentages of students in the nation.
- In 2009 in District of Columbia, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had not finished high school who performed at or above Proficient was not significantly different from the percentage of students in the nation.
- In 2009 in District of Columbia, the respective percentages of students reporting that a parent had graduated from college, had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school who performed at or above Proficient were not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In 2009 in District of Columbia, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had not finished high school who performed at or above Proficient was greater than the percentage of students in 2003 and 2007, but was not significantly different from the percentage of students in 1998, 2002, and 2005.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by parental education level, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| Parental education level, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or <br> above <br> Proficient | At Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Did not finish high school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 8 | 242* | 49* | 51* | 11 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 10* | 235 | 57 | 43 | 8 | \# |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 8 | 242* | 49* | 51* | 11 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 10* | 232 | 59 | 41 | 8 | \# |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 7* | 247 | 42 | 58 | 14 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 240 | 46 | 54 | 6 | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 7* | 245* | 45* | 55* | 13 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 233* | 61* | 39* | 5* | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 8 | 244* | 47* | 53* | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 233* | 61* | 39* | 6 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 8 | 245* | 44* | 56* | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 237* | 58 | 42 | 6* | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 8 | 247 | 41 | 59 | 14 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 249 | 43 | 57 | 15 | \# |
| Graduated from high school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 23* | 253 | 36 | 64 | 21 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 30* | 227 | 67 | 33 | 5 | \# |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 23* | 253 | 36 | 64 | 20 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 31* | 226 | 69 | 31 | 4 | \# |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 18* | 256* | 31* | 69* | 21* | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 21 | 235 | 57 | 43 | 5 | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 18* | 253 | 35 | 65 | 19 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 23 | 233 | 62 | 38 | 4 | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 18* | 252* | 37* | 63* | 18 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 26* | 232 | 63 | 37 | 6 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 17 | 252 | 36 | 64 | 18 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 22 | 235 | 57 | 43 | 6 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 17 | 253 | 34 | 66 | 18 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 21 | 234 | 60 | 40 | 7 | \# |

See notes at end of table.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by parental education level, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009-Continued

| Parental education level, year, and jurisdiction | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Some education after high school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ Nation (public) | 18 | 268 | 20 | 80 | 35 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 17 | 242 | 49 | 51 | 12 | 1 |
| 1998 Nation (public) | 18* | 267 | 22 | 78 | 34 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 17 | 243 | 47 | 53 | 14 | 1 |
| 2002 Nation (public) | 20* | 267 | 19 | 81 | 33 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 18 | 247 | 43 | 57 | 12 | \# |
| 2003 Nation (public) | 18* | 266 | 21 | 79 | 32 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 18 | 248 | 41 | 59 | 14 | 1 |
| 2005 Nation (public) | 18* | 265 | 23* | 77* | 31 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 19 | 247 | 44 | 56 | 16 | 1 |
| 2007 Nation (public) | 17 | 265 | 21 | 79 | 31 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 18 | 252 | 39 | 61 | 15 | 1 |
| 2009 Nation (public) | 17 | 266 | 21 | 79 | 31 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 19 | 250 | 38 | 62 | 16 | 1 |
| Graduated from college |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $19981 \quad$ Nation (public) | 42* | 272 | 18 | 82 | 42 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 32* | 248 | 43 | 57 | 21 | 3 |
| 1998 Nation (public) | 42* | 271 | 19 | 81 | 41 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 31* | 248 | 45 | 55 | 20 | 3 |
| 2002 Nation (public) | 46 | 273 | 17 | 83 | 42 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 40 | 247 | 45 | 55 | 15 | 1 |
| 2003 Nation (public) | 46* | 271* | 19* | 81* | 41 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 38 | 245 | 47 | 53 | 16 | 3 |
| 2005 Nation (public) | 46* | 270* | 20* | 80* | 40* | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 35* | 244 | 50 | 50 | 18 | 3 |
| 2007 Nation (public) | 46 | 271* | 18* | 82* | 40* | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 39 | 246 | 47 | 53 | 19 | 2 |
| 2009 Nation (public) | 47 | 272 | 17 | 83 | 42 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | 41 | 248 | 43 | 57 | 19 | 2 |

See notes at end of table.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

| Parental education level, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1998{ }^{1}$ | Nation (public) | 10* | 241 | 51 | 49 | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 12 | 226 | 66 | 34 | 6 | \# |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 9* | 241 | 49 | 51 | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 11 | 225 | 66 | 34 | 7 | \# |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 9* | 246* | 44 | 56 | 14 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 14 | 231 | 65 | 35 | 5 | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 11 | 242 | 48 | 52 | 13 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 14 | 233 | 58 | 42 | 5 | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 11 | 242 | 49 | 51 | 12 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 13 | 229 | 63 | 37 | 5 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 11 | 243 | 47 | 53 | 12 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 14 | 230 | 67 | 33 | 4 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 11 | 243 | 47 | 53 | 13 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 13 | 226 | 67 | 33 | 5 | \# |

\# Rounds to zero.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

1 Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

## A More Inclusive NAEP: Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners

To ensure that the samples are representative, NAEP has established policies and procedures to maximize the inclusion of all students in the assessment. Every effort is made to ensure that all selected students who are capable of participating meaningfully in the assessment are assessed. While some students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) can be assessed without any special procedures, others require accommodations to participate in NAEP. Still other SD and/or ELL students selected by NAEP may not be able to participate. Local school staff who are familiar with these students are asked a series of questions to help them decide whether each student should participate in the assessment and whether the student needs accommodations.

Within any assessment year, exclusion and accommodation rates may vary across jurisdictions. In addition, exclusion and accommodation rates may increase or decrease between assessment administrations, making it difficult to interpret comparisons over time within jurisdictions. Since SD and/or ELL students tend to score below average on assessments, the exclusion of students from these groups may result in a higher average score than if those students had taken the assessment. On the other hand, providing appropriate testing accommodations (e.g., providing extended time for some SD and/or ELL students to take the assessment) removes barriers that would otherwise prevent them from demonstrating their knowledge and skills.

Prior to 1998, testing accommodations were not provided for students with special needs in NAEP state reading assessments. For 1998, results are displayed for both the sample in which accommodations were permitted and the sample in which they were not permitted. Subsequent assessment results were based on the more inclusive samples.

Tables 8-A and 8-B display data for $4^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in District of Columbia who were identified as SD and/or ELL, by whether they were excluded, assessed with accommodations, or assessed under standard conditions, as a percent of all $4^{\text {th }}$ or $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in the state.

Tables 9-A and 9-B show the percentages of students assessed in District of Columbia by disability status and their performance on the NAEP assessment in terms of average scale scores and percentages performing below Basic, at or above Basic, at or above Proficient, and at Advanced for grades 4 and 8.

Tables 10-A and 10-B present the percentages of students assessed in District of Columbia by ELL status, their average scale scores, and their performance in terms of the percentages below Basic, the percentages at or above Basic, at or above Proficient, and at Advanced for grades 4 and 8.

Tables 11-A and 11-B present the total number of grades 4 and 8 students assessed in each of the participating states and the percentage of students sampled who were excluded.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

| Year and testing status |  | SD and/or ELL |  | SD |  | ELL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | District of Columbia | Nation (public) | District of Columbia | Nation (public) | District of Columbia | Nation (public) |
| 1992¹ | Identified | 12 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 3 |
|  | Excluded | 10 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 19941 | Identified | 12 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 4 |
|  | Excluded | 9 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 3 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 1998 | Identified | 16 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 7 |
|  | Excluded | 9 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 5 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2002 | Identified | 19 | 21 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 9 |
|  | Excluded | 8 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 5 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2003 | Identified | 18 | 22 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 10 |
|  | Excluded | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 3 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 9 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2005 | Identified | 20 | 23 | 15 | 14 | 6 | 11 |
|  | Excluded | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 3 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 9 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 2007 | Identified | 22 | 23 | 15 | 14 | 9 | 11 |
|  | Excluded | 14 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 2 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 7 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 2009 | Identified | 20 | 23 | 14 | 13 | 8 | 11 |
|  | Excluded | 11 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 2 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations |  | 9 |  | 7 | 4 | 3 |

${ }^{1}$ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment year.
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), various years, 1992-2009 Reading Assessments.

## The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

| Year and testing status |  | SD and/or ELL |  | SD |  | ELL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | District of Columbia | Nation (public) | District of Columbia | Nation (public) | District of Columbia | Nation (public) |
| 1998 | Identified | 14 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Excluded | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | \# | 2 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | \# | \# |
| 2002 | Identified | 21 | 18 | 16 | 13 | 5 | 6 |
|  | Excluded | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 5 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 8 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2003 | Identified | 20 | 19 | 16 | 14 | 5 | 6 |
|  | Excluded | 8 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 4 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 8 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2005 | Identified | 19 | 19 | 16 | 13 | 3 | 6 |
|  | Excluded | 8 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 9 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2007 | Identified | 21 | 19 | 18 | 13 | 4 | 7 |
|  | Excluded | 13 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2009 | Identified | 20 | 18 | 17 | 13 | 5 | 6 |
|  | Excluded | 12 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
|  | Assessed without accommodations | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Assessed with accommodations | 6 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 1 |

\# 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by students with disabilities (SD) status, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| SD status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 7* | 176* | 76* | 24* | 8 | 1 |
| 2002 | District of Columbia | 4 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
|  | Nation (public) | 8* | 187* | 71* | 29* | 9* | 1* |
|  | District of Columbia | 7* | 153 | 92 | 8 | 1 | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 10* | 184* | 71* | 29* | 9* | 1* |
|  | District of Columbia | 8* | 148* | 91 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 10* | 190 | 67 | 33 | 11 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 9* | 154 | 88 | 12 | 3 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 10* | 190 | 64 | 36 | 13 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 4 | 162 | 85 | 15 | 5 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 10 | 189 | 66 | 34 | 12 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 5 | 165 | 81 | 19 | 6 | 2 |
| Not SD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 93* | 216* | 40* | 60* | 29* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 96 | 181* | 72* | 28* | 10* | 3* |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 92* | 220* | 35* | 65* | 31* | 7* |
|  | District of Columbia | 93* | 194* | 67* | 33* | 10* | 2* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 90* | 220* | 35* | 65* | 32* | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 92* | 192* | 67* | 33* | 11* | 3* |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 90* | 220* | 34* | 66* | 32* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 91* | 195* | 65* | 35* | 12* | 2* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 90* | 223 | 31 | 69 | 34 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 96 | 199* | 60* | 40* | 14* | 4 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 90 | 223 | 31 | 69 | 34 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 95 | 204 | 55 | 45 | 17 | 5 |

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities in the NAEP samples and by differences in sample sizes. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by students with disabilities (SD) status, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| SD status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 8* | 224 | 69 | 31 | 6 | \# |
| 2002 | District of Columbia | 9 | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
|  | Nation (public) | 9* | 227 | 65 | 35 | 6* | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 11* | 204 | 90 | 10 | 1 | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 10* | 224* | 68* | 32* | 5* | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 10* | 199 | 89 | 11 | 1 | \# |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 9 | 226* | 67* | 33* | 6* | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 11* | 199 | 91 | 9 | 1 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 9* | 226* | 66* | 34* | 7 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 7 | 210 | 81 | 19 | 4 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 10 | 229 | 63 | 37 | 8 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 6 | 205 | 85 | 15 | 2 | \# |
| Not SD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 92* | 264* | 25* | 75* | 32 | 2 |
|  | District of Columbia | 91 | 239* | 54* | 46* | 13 | 1 |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 91* | 266 | 22 | 78 | 33 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 89* | 244 | 47 | 53 | 11* | \# |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 90* | 266 | 23 | 77 | 33 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 90* | 243 | 49 | 51 | 11* | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 91 | 264* | 25* | 75* | 31* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 89* | 243 | 51 | 49 | 13 | 1 |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 91* | 265* | 24* | 76* | 31* | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 93 | 243 | 50 | 50 | 13 | 1 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 90 | 266 | 22 | 78 | 33 | 3 |
|  | District of Columbia | 94 | 245 | 47 | 53 | 14 | 1 |

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different $(p<.05)$ from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities in the NAEP samples and by differences in sample sizes. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Percentage of fourth-grade public school students, average scale score, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by English language learner (ELL) status, year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 1998-2009

| ELL status, year, and jurisdiction |  | Percentage of students | Average scale score | Below Basic | At or above Basic | At or above Proficient | At <br> Advanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 5* | 174* | 79* | 21* | 6 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 4* | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\ddagger$ |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 7* | 183 | 76 | 24 | 5 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 183* | 73 | 27 | 6 | 1 |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 8 | 186 | 72 | 28 | 7 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 6 | 174* | 81* | 19* | 3 | 1 |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 9 | 187 | 73 | 27 | 7 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 5* | 177* | 80 | 20 | 4 | \# |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 9 | 188 | 70 | 30 | 7 | 1 |
|  | District of Columbia | 6 | 198 | 58 | 42 | 9 | \# |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 9 | 188 | 71 | 29 | 6 | \# |
|  | District of Columbia | 6 | 194 | 65 | 35 | 6 | 1 |
| Not ELL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Nation (public) | 95* | 215* | 41* | 59* | 29* | 7* |
|  | District of Columbia | 96* | 180* | 72* | 28* | 11* | 3* |
| 2002 | Nation (public) | 93* | 219* | 35* | 65* | 32* | 7* |
|  | District of Columbia | 95* | 191* | 69* | 31* | 10* | 2* |
| 2003 | Nation (public) | 92 | 219* | 35* | 65* | 32* | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 94 | 189* | 68* | 32* | 11* | 3* |
| 2005 | Nation (public) | 91 | 220* | 34* | 66* | 32* | 7 |
|  | District of Columbia | 95* | 191* | 66* | 34* | 12* | 2* |
| 2007 | Nation (public) | 91 | 223 | 31 | 69 | 34 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 94 | 197* | 61* | 39* | 14* | 4 |
| 2009 | Nation (public) | 91 | 223 | 31 | 69 | 34 | 8 |
|  | District of Columbia | 94 | 202 | 56 | 44 | 17 | 5 |

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for English language learners in the NAEP samples and by differences in sample sizes. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment

\# Rounds to zero.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction and student group in 2009.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 . Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243-280; Proficient, 281-322; and Advanced, 323 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for English language learners in the NAEP samples and by differences in sample sizes. 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), various years, 1998-2009 Reading Assessments.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Number of fourth-grade public school students assessed in NAEP reading and weighted percentage excluded, by state/jurisdiction: 2009

| State/jurisdiction | Number assessed | Weighted percentage excluded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation (public) | 172,500 | 5 |
| Alabama | 2,900 | 2 |
| Alaska | 2,800 | 3 |
| Arizona | 3,200 | 4 |
| Arkansas | 3,000 | 1 |
| California | 8,000 | 3 |
| Colorado | 2,900 | 3 |
| Connecticut | 2,900 | 4 |
| Delaware | 2,900 | 8 |
| Florida | 5,000 | 5 |
| Georgia | 4,200 | 5 |
| Hawaii | 3,000 | 2 |
| Idaho | 3,200 | 3 |
| Illinois | 4,400 | 4 |
| Indiana | 3,000 | 5 |
| lowa | 3,000 | 5 |
| Kansas | 3,200 | 6 |
| Kentucky | 3,900 | 8 |
| Louisiana | 3,200 | 2 |
| Maine | 2,900 | 4 |
| Maryland | 3,400 | 11 |
| Massachusetts | 3,900 | 5 |
| Michigan | 3,700 | 4 |
| Minnesota | 3,600 | 3 |
| Mississippi | 3,100 | 1 |
| Missouri | 2,900 | 4 |
| Montana | 2,900 | 4 |
| Nebraska | 3,300 | 5 |
| Nevada | 3,200 | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 2,900 | 3 |
| New Jersey | 2,900 | 9 |
| New Mexico | 2,900 | 7 |
| New York | 4,200 | 5 |
| North Carolina | 4,800 | 3 |
| North Dakota | 2,100 | 8 |
| Ohio | 3,600 | 6 |
| Oklahoma | 3,000 | 7 |
| Oregon | 3,100 | 4 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,900 | 3 |
| Rhode Island | 2,700 | 4 |
| South Carolina | 3,100 | 5 |
| South Dakota | 2,900 | 6 |
| Tennessee | 3,000 | 9 |
| Texas | 6,000 | 9 |
| Utah | 3,500 | 6 |
| Vermont | 2,900 | 4 |
| Virginia | 3,100 | 4 |
| Washington | 3,400 | 4 |
| West Virginia | 3,000 | 2 |
| Wisconsin | 4,100 | 4 |
| Wyoming | 2,200 | 2 |
| Other jurisdictions |  |  |
| District of Columbia | 1,800 | 11 |
| DoDEA1 | 2,200 | 6 |

1 Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
NOTE: The number of students assessed is rounded to the nearest hundred.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

The Nation's Report Card 2009 State Assessment
Number of eighth-grade public school students assessed in NAEP reading and weighted percentage excluded, by state/jurisdiction: 2009

| State/jurisdiction | Number assessed | Weighted percentage excluded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nation (public) | 155,400 | 4 |
| Alabama | 2,700 | 2 |
| Alaska | 2,500 | 2 |
| Arizona | 2,800 | 3 |
| Arkansas | 2,700 | 2 |
| California | 7,200 | 2 |
| Colorado | 2,800 | 3 |
| Connecticut | 2,800 | 3 |
| Delaware | 2,800 | 5 |
| Florida | 4,200 | 4 |
| Georgia | 3,500 | 4 |
| Hawaii | 2,900 | 2 |
| Idaho | 3,000 | 2 |
| Illinois | 4,100 | 4 |
| Indiana | 2,700 | 5 |
| lowa | 2,600 | 4 |
| Kansas | 2,700 | 5 |
| Kentucky | 3,500 | 7 |
| Louisiana | 2,600 | 2 |
| Maine | 2,700 | 4 |
| Maryland | 3,200 | 9 |
| Massachusetts | 3,600 | 5 |
| Michigan | 3,300 | 4 |
| Minnesota | 2,900 | 3 |
| Mississippi | 2,800 | 2 |
| Missouri | 2,700 | 3 |
| Montana | 2,600 | 4 |
| Nebraska | 2,600 | 6 |
| Nevada | 2,900 | 3 |
| New Hampshire | 2,500 | 4 |
| New Jersey | 2,700 | 7 |
| New Mexico | 2,500 | 6 |
| New York | 3,700 | 7 |
| North Carolina | 4,500 | 2 |
| North Dakota | 2,100 | 8 |
| Ohio | 3,400 | 7 |
| Oklahoma | 2,700 | 5 |
| Oregon | 2,900 | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,500 | 3 |
| Rhode Island | 2,700 | 3 |
| South Carolina | 2,700 | 6 |
| South Dakota | 2,800 | 4 |
| Tennessee | 2,800 | 7 |
| Texas | 5,700 | 5 |
| Utah | 2,800 | 5 |
| Vermont | 2,900 | 3 |
| Virginia | 2,800 | 4 |
| Washington | 2,800 | 3 |
| West Virginia | 2,900 | 2 |
| Wisconsin | 3,400 | 5 |
| Wyoming | 1,900 | 3 |
| Other jurisdictions |  |  |
| District of Columbia | 1,600 | 12 |
| DoDEA1 | 1,600 | 4 |

[^2]NOTE: The number of students assessed is rounded to the nearest hundred.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Reading Assessment.

## Where to Find More Information

## The NAEP Reading Assessment

The latest news about the NAEP 2009 reading assessment and the national results can be found on the NAEP website at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results/. The individual snapshot reports for each participating state and other jurisdictions are also available in the state results section of the website at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/.

The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2009 may be ordered or downloaded at the NAEP website.

The Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress, on which this assessment is based, is available at the National Assessment Governing Board website at http://www.nagb.org/publications/frameworks/reading09.pdf

The NAEP Data Explorer (NDE)
The interactive database at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/ includes student, teacher, and school variables for all participating states and other jurisdictions, the nation, and the four regions. Data tables are also available for each jurisdiction, with all background questions cross-tabulated with the major demographic variables. Users can design and create tables and can perform tests of statistical significance at this website.

## Technical Documentation on the Web (TDW)

Technical documentation section of the NAEP website http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/ contains information about the technical procedures and methods of NAEP. The TDW site is organized by topic (from Item Development through Analysis and Scaling) with subtopics, including information specific to a particular assessment. The content is written for researchers and assumes knowledge of educational measurement and testing.

Publications on the inclusion of students with disabilities and English language learners
References for a variety of research publications related to the assessment of students with special needs may be found at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/inclusion.asp\#research.

## To order publications

Recent NAEP publications related to reading are listed on the reading page of the NAEP website and are available electronically. Publications can also be ordered from

Education Publications Center (ED Pubs)
U.S. Department of Education
P.O. Box 22207

Alexandria, VA 22304
Call toll free: 1-877-4ED-Pubs (1-877-433-7827)
TTY/TDD: 1-877-576-7734
FAX: 1-301-470-1244
Order online at: http://www.edpubs.gov.

## What is the Nation's Report Card ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ ?

The Nation's Report Card ${ }^{\text {M }}$ informs the public about the academic achievement of elementary and secondary students in the United States. Report cards communicate the findings of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a continuing and nationally representative measure of achievement in various subjects over time.

Since 1969, NAEP assessments have been conducted periodically in reading, mathematics, science, writing, U.S. history, civics, geography, and other subjects. NAEP collects and reports information on student performance at the national, state, and local levels, making the assessment an integral part of our nation's evaluation of the condition and progress of education. Only academic achievement data and related background information are collected. The privacy of individual students and their families is protected.

NAEP is a congressionally authorized project of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. The Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible for carrying out the NAEP project. The National Assessment Governing Board oversees and sets policy for NAEP.
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[^0]:    * Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2009.
    ${ }^{1}$ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
    ${ }^{2}$ Region in which jurisdiction is located. Regional data are not provided for years prior to 2003 to be consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau defined regions.
    NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500 .
    SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992-2009 Reading Assessments.

[^1]:    * Value is significantly different ( $p<.05$ ) from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2009.

    1 Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.
    2 Region in which jurisdiction is located. Regional data are not provided for years prior to 2003 to be consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau defined regions.
    NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scales: below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. At or above Basic includes Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. At or above Proficient includes Proficient and Advanced. 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), various years, 1992-2009 Reading Assessments.

[^2]:    1 Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
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