



# **GIVING EVERY CHILD A FAIR SHOT**

Ensuring All Students Have Equal Opportunity to Succeed

The Executive Office of the President

July 2015



## **WHITE HOUSE REPORT: Giving Every Child a Fair Shot**

America's educators, students and families have produced historic progress in student outcomes across the nation in recent years, including reaching the highest high school graduation rate and lowest dropout rates in our history, and narrowing achievement and graduation gaps. States and districts that have led the way on school reform – including Tennessee, Kentucky, District of Columbia, and Denver – are seeing meaningful gains in student achievement.

At the same time, some students are still denied an equal opportunity to succeed. Information on the performance of schools in each state is attached. Nationally<sup>1</sup>:

- Only four out of ten students attending the lowest-performing under-resourced high schools graduate on time, compared to an 87% graduation rate at all other high schools.
- Between students in the nation's lowest-performing 5% of elementary and middle schools and their peers in all other schools, there is a 31 percentage point gap in reaching grade-level proficiency in reading, and a 36 percentage point gap in math – in these lowest-performing schools, approximately two-thirds of students do not meet grade level standards.
- Nationwide, black and Hispanic fourth-graders are only half as likely as white students to be on grade level in math.

To accelerate our progress and ensure that it reaches every child, we must replace No Child Left Behind (NCLB) with a strong law that invests in what's working and improves on what's not. A new law should empower state and local decision makers – including school leaders, superintendents, and state officials – to develop their own systems for measuring and improving schools. It should push states to reduce testing without sacrificing clear, comprehensive information for parents and educators. And it should guarantee that steps are taken to help struggling students and schools.

### **Progress in Supporting College and Career-Readiness for All Students**

Across the country, the hard work of America's students and educators is paying off. Our high school graduation rate is the highest ever reported, at 81%. Reading and math scores for fourth- and eighth-graders, across all student subgroups, have also increased, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). More students are earning college degrees than ever before, and college enrollment of black and Hispanic students is up by more than 1 million students since 2008.

We are also seeing remarkable progress in states that have embraced bold action to prepare students for college and careers. For example, Kentucky was among the first states to adopt college- and career-ready standards. It was also among the first to receive flexibility from the onerous, one-size-fits-all approach of NCLB in exchange for state-led reforms that raised expectations for every student and targeted resources to better support locally designed interventions in its lowest-performing schools. Kentucky is seeing results. Its graduation rate has

---

<sup>1</sup> Numbers and percentages are taken from the state-by-state tables attached as appendixes to this document.

increased in recent years to 87.5% – above the national average. And the percentage of high school graduates demonstrating success on the state’s measures for readiness in college and careers has nearly doubled.

By replacing NCLB with a more flexible law, we can continue and spread this kind of progress, while maintaining guardrails and protections for the most vulnerable students and directing federal resources toward what works in helping all children learn. All children should have an equal opportunity, and all schools should have the support, funding, and resources they need to improve student outcomes. Federal policy should also recognize and reward high poverty schools and districts showing improvement based on progress and growth.

### **Much Work Remains to Ensure Equity and Opportunity for All Students**

Despite the advances we’ve made, much work remains to ensure that every child in America has the opportunity that he or she needs and deserves.

While many low-performing schools – including those eligible for federal Title I funds to support students in poverty – are improving, and disadvantaged students in all schools are making progress, achievement data underscore how important it is that we continue to focus attention and resources on further helping these schools and students.

**Crisis in the Lowest-Performing Schools:** Even with the progress we’ve made, comparing the percentage of students nationwide performing at grade level (“proficient”) on state assessments in the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools to all other public schools reveals vast gaps. For example, in our lowest performing 5% of elementary and middle schools, only 36% of students have reached grade level proficiency in reading compared to 67% in all other schools, a gap of 31 percentage points. The average gap in math proficiency is 36 percentage points. In other words, across the bottom 5% of Title I schools, about two-third of students do not meet grade level standards, but in all other schools, the reverse is true: two-thirds of students reach proficiency. In half of the states, the gap in math proficiency between the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools and all other schools is more than 35 percentage points. These low-performing schools, approximately 3,000 elementary and middle schools serving more than a million students across the nation, are in crisis.

Students who attend low performing high schools– Title I-eligible schools that are among the lowest-performing 5% of high schools or have graduation rates of less than 60% – graduate on time at an unacceptably low rate: 40%. Students in all other high schools graduate on time at a rate of 87%, an average rate nearly 50 percentage points higher than what we see in our lowest performing schools. And in over a dozen states, the graduation rate gap is even larger between the most challenged schools and all other high schools.

**Disadvantaged Students in Other Schools:** While the crisis in low-performing schools contributes to significant achievement gaps in all states, we also know that disadvantaged students often fall behind in higher-performing schools. This includes low-income, black, and Hispanic students as well as students with disabilities or with limited English proficiency. Often disadvantaged students in these schools are denied access to rigorous coursework, or are not held

to the same high standards as other students. While 37% of high school students are black or Hispanic, they represent only 27% of students enrolled in at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course, and a mere 18% of students receiving a qualifying score of 3 or above on an AP exam. That is why it is critical that we identify schools that are failing any group of students and expect tailored actions in those schools to improve student outcomes.

The most recent results of the NAEP show extremely large gaps in student achievement across categories of race, income, disability status, and English learner status in every state. For instance, the percentage of fourth grade students scoring at or above proficient in math is well over 50% for white students. But for black students and Hispanic students, it is 18% and 26%, respectively. Some states have achievement gaps that exceed 40 percentage points. Federal policy must ensure that we provide support to narrow these gaps and improve low subgroup performance wherever it exists, even in our highest-performing schools.

### **Leading States and Districts Show the Potential for Progress**

While we have much work to do, we know it is possible for even the most challenged schools to change course and dramatically improve student achievement. Educators, local and state leaders, and other stakeholders are joining together to achieve success with results-driven, commonsense reforms to help ensure that every child in this country has the opportunity for a high-quality education. Through these efforts, states and local communities are:

- Raising standards for teaching and learning to align with real expectations for success in college and careers;
- Providing resources to adapt curriculum and instruction and to support great teaching;
- Focusing on improving student outcomes, especially for those students who are furthest behind, by rejecting labels of failure based on a single snapshot and instead identifying schools that are showing improvement and closing achievement gaps, recognizing progress and growth over time, and responding accordingly;
- Supporting dramatic change to accelerate student achievement, close gaps, and turnaround persistently low-performing schools that aren't providing students with the education they need to succeed in college and a career.
- Creating comprehensive systems to support great teaching and school leadership that integrate pre-service preparation, recruitment, induction, multi-measure evaluation systems, personalized development and feedback, and career advancement for all educators; and
- Identifying innovative approaches to teaching and learning, based on evidence of what works and what can work better for their schools.

In states and school districts across the country, we are seeing remarkable progress. For example:

- **Closing Achievement Gaps in New Mexico:** New Mexico has used flexibility from NCLB mandates to move from a pass/fail accountability system to a letter grade system that provides educators and parents with clear information about their schools' performance, identifies students that are struggling, and targets greater supports toward those students. These reforms continue to emphasize accountability for student performance, including an

enhanced focus on subgroup performance, while also encouraging schools to promote student success on indicators of college and career readiness. Last year the state saw an 8% increase in the number of AP exams taken, and a 5% increase in students scoring a 3 or better. Additionally, between 2009 and 2013, the achievement gaps between white and Hispanic students on the NAEP math assessment decreased by 4%.

- **Tennessee Achievement Rising for Students:** Tennessee's "First to the Top" legislation created conditions for significant improvement in the state's public schools, setting clear educational priorities that helped it become the fastest improving state in the nation on the NAEP in 2013. These reforms were incentivized and supported by Tennessee's \$500 million Race to the Top grant, awarded in 2010. With the opportunity to invest in meaningful changes for kids, Tennessee raised expectations with higher standards and assessments, enhanced data systems to improve instruction, supported teachers and leaders with strategies to increase teacher effectiveness, and created a leading-edge local turnaround effort in the Achievement School District. For example, Tennessee fourth graders scored seven points higher in both subjects between the 2011 and 2013 NAEP, propelling the state from below average scores to a level of performance on par with national results. Results from the 2013 NAEP also showed progress among nearly all student demographic groups compared to 2009 data.
- **Higher Performance in Washington, DC:** Bolstered by \$75 million in Race to the Top funds, DC Public Schools, the Office of the State Superintendent for Education for the District, and 29 public charter organizations came together to support the implementation of college- and career-ready standards, build a stronger pipeline for effective teachers and leaders, and create conditions to support and attract those educators to DC's persistently low-achieving schools. Results from the 2013 NAEP for DC Public Schools showed significant progress since 2011 in reading and math in both 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades – the most significant of all 21 districts that participated in the urban district NAEP. When viewed over a longer period of time, DC's progress is even more pronounced. Since 2003, fourth grade scores have increased by 24 points on the NAEP math assessment, and eighth grade performance has increased by 17 points.
- **Ten Years of Growth in Denver:** Over the last decade, Denver Public Schools has increased its on-time graduation rate for black and Hispanic students by 60%, increased college enrollment by 25%, and transformed from the district with the lowest rate of academic growth among major districts in Colorado to the highest for three years running. Denver accomplished these feats by raising expectations for students, overhauling its system for supporting educators, creating robust public school choice options for all families through a portfolio of traditional, charter, and innovation schools, introducing a student-based budget that leveled the funding playing field between schools, adopting a multi-measure school performance system, and investing in extensive community engagement and school climate initiatives.

## President Obama's Vision to Strengthen Our Schools

The President stands ready to work with Congress to advance a strong, bipartisan reauthorization of NCLB that helps to prepare all students for a globally competitive economy by:

- **Holding all students to high expectations** that set them on a path to graduate from high school ready for success in college and a career.
- **Helping states ensure that all students succeed** by targeting additional supports to schools that are not preparing groups of students for success and ensuring that they take action to improve, with the boldest action expected in the lowest-performing 5% of schools.
- **Working with states to reduce unnecessary testing** to make sure teachers and students have maximum time for learning and to place sensible limits on testing, following the lead of states like New York, which limits the amount of time spent on state-mandated testing to no greater than 2% of total classroom time. This also means helping states and localities rigorously review their tests and eliminate those which are outdated, repetitive, low-quality, or unnecessary.
- **Encouraging states to allow for greater creativity** in the classroom and more time for a balanced curriculum that includes arts, history, foreign languages, financial literacy, music, physical education and after school enrichment.
- **Investing in the expansion of high-quality preschool** so that all children arrive in kindergarten ready to learn.
- **Making sure that all students have an equitable opportunity** to succeed, including access to excellent teachers and principals, rigorous coursework, and a continuum of community services and supports to meet the needs of the whole child.
- **Supporting teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals** with better information, preparation, development, support and recognition, including additional resources, and opportunities to advance in their roles. We should also ensure that the best teachers are serving the students who need them most.
- **Providing significant incentives and support for states**, school districts and nonprofit organizations to innovate with new ideas and then identify and expand what's working.

## Conclusion

Our nation's elementary and secondary schools are improving, with students learning more and with more students graduating. But, there is still much more that must be done to ensure that every child receives a quality education. That's why the President wants to replace NCLB with a new law that addresses the overuse of standardized tests, raises expectations for all students and schools, and gives every kid a fair shot at success. Federal resources must be directed toward what works and toward those communities and students that need them most. We cannot afford to ignore our lowest-performing 5% of schools, our schools where subgroups of students are not making progress year after year, and our high schools where far too many students do not earn a diploma.

## Achievement Gaps in Our Lowest Performing Schools

State Name	Average Math Proficiency (%)			Average Reading and Language Arts Proficiency (%)			Average Graduation Rates (%)		
	Low Performing	All Other Schools	Gap	Low Performing	All Other Schools	Gap	Low Performing	All Other Schools	Gap
<b>NATION</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>47</b>
ALABAMA	47	83	36	65	88	23	52	83	31
ALASKA	51	77	27	53	83	30	37	83	46
ARIZONA	28	64	37	49	79	29	30	85	54
ARKANSAS	45	78	33	52	81	29	—	87	—
CALIFORNIA	26	62	36	26	58	32	44	89	45
COLORADO	27	67	39	35	72	38	30	86	56
CONNECTICUT	41	85	44	38	82	43	53	89	36
DELAWARE	28	72	44	39	75	36	45	83	38
D.C.	18	56	38	17	52	35	46	82	35
FLORIDA	24	59	34	26	60	34	19	83	64
GEORGIA	56	86	30	79	95	16	47	79	32
HAWAII	38	64	26	49	75	26	—	83	—
IDAHO	61	83	22	71	90	18	—	—	—
ILLINOIS	23	61	38	25	61	35	47	85	39
INDIANA	52	84	32	51	81	30	45	89	44
IOWA	50	78	28	44	73	29	45	92	46
KANSAS	41	81	40	49	87	38	37	89	52
KENTUCKY	17	44	27	22	51	29	75	91	16
LOUISIANA	36	72	36	41	73	32	52	80	28
MAINE	36	63	28	44	72	28	70	87	16
MARYLAND	40	81	41	55	86	31	45	87	42
MASSACHUSETTS	19	60	42	22	67	46	38	89	51
MICHIGAN	8	44	36	29	69	40	35	89	54
MINNESOTA	17	64	47	16	59	43	29	90	61
MISSISSIPPI	35	68	33	31	60	29	54	78	23
MISSOURI	15	56	41	17	54	37	45	90	45
MONTANA	18	69	51	41	86	45	54	85	31
NEBRASKA	28	73	45	43	80	37	73	90	18
NEVADA	26	62	35	35	64	29	59	79	20
NEW HAMPSHIRE	46	73	28	52	80	27	—	88	—
NEW JERSEY	34	77	44	24	69	45	46	89	43
NEW MEXICO	15	45	30	22	52	30	40	75	35
NEW YORK	3	34	30	5	34	28	44	85	42
NORTH CAROLINA	13	44	31	15	45	30	50	86	35
NORTH DAKOTA	37	80	43	31	76	45	56	91	35

State Name	Average Math Proficiency (%)			Average Reading and Language Arts Proficiency (%)			Average Graduation Rates (%)		
	Low Performing	All Other Schools	Gap	Low Performing	All Other Schools	Gap	Low Performing	All Other Schools	Gap
OHIO	26	78	52	42	85	42	31	91	59
OKLAHOMA	32	71	39	34	70	36	37	87	50
OREGON	32	64	32	43	72	28	34	78	44
PENNSYLVANIA	31	77	46	28	71	44	46	89	44
RHODE ISLAND	26	65	38	37	75	38	48	83	35
SOUTH CAROLINA	40	74	34	49	78	29	32	80	48
SOUTH DAKOTA	18	76	58	29	76	47	37	89	52
TENNESSEE	16	53	37	14	52	38	49	88	40
TEXAS	44	77	32	54	80	26	39	91	52
UTAH	50	80	30	56	83	27	31	87	56
VERMONT	39	67	27	47	74	26	64	87	24
VIRGINIA	38	72	34	42	74	32	51	85	35
WASHINGTON	30	63	33	41	72	31	23	84	62
WEST VIRGINIA	26	47	21	26	49	23	26	49	23
WISCONSIN	12	51	40	6	37	31	6	37	31
WYOMING	48	80	32	48	76	28	48	76	28

**Math and Reading/Language Arts Proficiency Data**

**Methodology:** This analysis was conducted by (1) identifying the 5 percent of schools with the lowest school-wide math proficiency rates among all elementary/middle schools in the state, (2) identifying the Title I participating (Title I eligible for New York) schools with at least 30 valid scores among the bottom 5% of schools, (3) calculating the average proficiency rate among those schools, and (4) comparing that rate to the average rate among the schools with at least 30 valid scores not in the bottom 5%. The gap is defined as the average proficiency rate for the all students group among the other 95% of elementary/middle schools in the state minus the average proficiency rate for the all students group among Title I schools that are in the bottom 5% of all elementary/middle schools in the state. Gap calculations are based on unrounded numbers. **Source:** 2012–13 Common Core of Data (Title I status, student membership) and 2012–13 EDFacts State Assessment Data

**Graduation Rate Data**

**Notes:** — Calculation not possible. The following states had no schools with ACGR data in the bottom 5%, or with graduation rates below 60% that were eligible for Title I and had at least 30 students in the cohort: Arkansas and West Virginia. Idaho is not included because the state did not report ACGR data in 2012–13. Data for Hawaii and New Hampshire are suppressed to protect privacy.

**Methodology:** This analysis was conducted by (1) identifying the 5% of schools with the lowest school-wide adjusted cohort graduation rates among all schools with graduation rate data in the state or the schools with graduation rates lower than 60%, (2) identifying the Title I schools with at least 30 students in the cohort among those schools, (3) calculating the average graduation rate among those schools, and (4) comparing that rate to the average rate among the schools with at least 30 students in the cohort not in the bottom 5% and with graduation rates above 60%. The gap is defined as the average graduation rate for the all students group among the other high schools in the state minus the average graduation rate for the all students group among Title I high schools that are either in the bottom 5% of all high schools in the state or have graduation rates below 60%. Gap calculations are based on unrounded numbers.

**Source:** 2012–13 Common Core of Data (Title I status, student membership) and 2012–13 EDFacts Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate data



**NAEP – Percentage of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Students At or Above Proficient in Math**

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	English Learners	Students with Disabilities
<b>NATION</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>
ALABAMA	30	40	9	23	7	10
ALASKA	37	52	22	33	8	14
ARIZONA	40	55	24	28	4	14
ARKANSAS	39	47	17	31	27	18
CALIFORNIA	33	53	18	19	8	11
COLORADO	50	62	22	30	14	17
CONNECTICUT	45	58	14	19	7	20
DELAWARE	42	57	21	27	8	17
FLORIDA	41	54	20	36	11	22
GEORGIA	39	53	20	33	11	16
HAWAII	46	60	34	43	8	7
IDAHO	40	44	‡	20	6	15
ILLINOIS	39	51	16	25	7	16
INDIANA	52	58	21	39	30	21
IOWA	48	52	16	30	20	15
KANSAS	48	53	22	31	28	19
KENTUCKY	41	45	19	30	19	17
LOUISIANA	26	40	13	29	14	10
MAINE	47	49	25	‡	13	20
MARYLAND	47	67	22	33	14	19
MASSACHUSETTS	58	68	26	32	19	29
MICHIGAN	37	45	10	22	13	16
MINNESOTA	59	67	32	34	17	31
MISSISSIPPI	26	42	11	27	‡	14
MISSOURI	39	46	13	29	‡	17
MONTANA	45	50	‡	34	8	15
NEBRASKA	45	54	12	20	9	20
NEVADA	34	46	17	24	14	16
NEW HAMPSHIRE	59	60	‡	34	20	26

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	English Learners	Students with Disabilities
NEW JERSEY	49	61	24	30	12	22
NEW MEXICO	31	48	24	26	9	11
NEW YORK	40	50	17	24	10	15
NORTH CAROLINA	45	60	22	35	15	21
NORTH DAKOTA	48	52	35	27	‡	22
OHIO	48	56	16	36	30	22
OKLAHOMA	36	45	14	21	15	15
OREGON	40	46	16	20	10	19
PENNSYLVANIA	44	52	19	24	11	21
RHODE ISLAND	42	53	19	23	7	10
SOUTH CAROLINA	35	49	15	25	27	12
SOUTH DAKOTA	40	48	14	16	10	15
TENNESSEE	40	50	15	22	9	15
TEXAS	41	61	24	30	23	16
UTAH	44	51	‡	16	2	18
VERMONT	52	53	‡	‡	‡	18
VIRGINIA	47	56	22	32	14	23
WASHINGTON	48	56	29	24	9	24
WEST VIRGINIA	35	36	25	‡	‡	18
WISCONSIN	47	57	12	23	19	21
WYOMING	48	52	‡	29	8	22

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

**NOTE:** The national and state/jurisdiction results include public school students only. Data for DoDEA schools are not in the national results. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The results for English language learners and students with disabilities are based on students who were assessed and cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

**NAEP – Percentage of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Students At or Above Proficient in Reading**

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	English Learners
<b>NATION</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>
ALABAMA	31	40	15	15	9	‡
ALASKA	27	41	18	26	6	1
ARIZONA	28	42	19	17	7	1
ARKANSAS	32	38	15	24	9	17
CALIFORNIA	27	46	13	16	11	5
COLORADO	41	52	19	23	7	8
CONNECTICUT	43	53	15	20	15	4
DELAWARE	38	49	23	25	13	4
FLORIDA	39	49	20	36	20	10
GEORGIA	34	45	20	24	16	8
HAWAII	30	46	37	26	4	3
IDAHO	33	38	‡	13	7	3
ILLINOIS	34	46	14	18	10	3
INDIANA	38	42	17	24	9	13
IOWA	38	41	15	23	5	11
KANSAS	38	44	17	20	13	17
KENTUCKY	36	39	15	29	11	11
LOUISIANA	23	35	11	20	6	10
MAINE	37	38	11	‡	9	9
MARYLAND	45	60	22	35	28	18
MASSACHUSETTS	47	57	21	20	17	12
MICHIGAN	31	37	12	21	7	9
MINNESOTA	41	47	21	23	16	8
MISSISSIPPI	21	33	11	16	8	‡
MISSOURI	35	41	13	30	12	6
MONTANA	35	39	‡	23	9	2
NEBRASKA	37	43	16	22	10	7
NEVADA	27	39	14	16	6	6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	45	46	27	18	12	10

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	English Learners
NEW JERSEY	42	52	22	21	14	9
NEW MEXICO	21	38	24	17	4	3
NEW YORK	37	47	21	21	9	4
NORTH CAROLINA	35	47	20	23	9	4
NORTH DAKOTA	34	37	23	29	11	‡
OHIO	37	44	11	25	11	19
OKLAHOMA	30	36	14	17	8	6
OREGON	33	38	11	16	9	6
PENNSYLVANIA	40	47	20	19	13	5
RHODE ISLAND	38	48	18	17	5	4
SOUTH CAROLINA	28	39	13	21	7	18
SOUTH DAKOTA	32	38	17	19	11	5
TENNESSEE	34	40	15	21	9	2
TEXAS	28	46	18	17	9	9
UTAH	37	43	‡	14	12	2
VERMONT	42	43	‡	‡	6	‡
VIRGINIA	43	51	23	25	12	5
WASHINGTON	40	46	25	19	11	3
WEST VIRGINIA	27	28	14	‡	9	‡
WISCONSIN	35	41	11	17	9	9
WYOMING	37	41	‡	24	10	9

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

**NOTE:** The national and state/jurisdiction results include public school students only. Data for DoDEA schools are not in the national results. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The results for English language learners and students with disabilities are based on students who were assessed and cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Reading Assessment.

**NAEP – Percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Students At or Above Proficient in Math**

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	English Learners
<b>NATION</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>
ALABAMA	20	28	6	6	3	‡
ALASKA	33	46	20	24	7	2
ARIZONA	31	45	19	19	4	‡
ARKANSAS	28	34	9	20	6	12
CALIFORNIA	28	42	11	15	5	3
COLORADO	42	53	15	23	8	5
CONNECTICUT	37	48	13	12	13	1
DELAWARE	33	45	14	25	9	‡
FLORIDA	31	40	14	24	10	5
GEORGIA	29	42	12	24	6	4
HAWAII	32	41	‡	28	4	7
IDAHO	36	41	‡	15	8	1
ILLINOIS	36	48	12	22	10	3
INDIANA	38	44	15	24	12	‡
IOWA	36	40	10	13	4	5
KANSAS	40	47	18	24	5	11
KENTUCKY	30	33	11	17	7	1
LOUISIANA	21	31	9	25	3	‡
MAINE	40	40	14	‡	11	‡
MARYLAND	37	51	18	30	10	6
MASSACHUSETTS	55	63	28	28	17	8
MICHIGAN	30	36	7	14	6	2
MINNESOTA	47	54	15	20	13	9
MISSISSIPPI	21	33	8	24	4	‡
MISSOURI	33	38	12	23	8	‡
MONTANA	40	44	‡	28	9	‡
NEBRASKA	36	42	8	17	8	5
NEVADA	28	40	12	17	5	2

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	English Learners
NEW HAMPSHIRE	47	48	‡	20	14	‡
NEW JERSEY	49	58	24	34	13	‡
NEW MEXICO	23	40	12	17	4	3
NEW YORK	32	44	12	14	7	4
NORTH CAROLINA	36	48	17	27	7	6
NORTH DAKOTA	41	44	25	‡	8	‡
OHIO	40	45	16	27	10	8
OKLAHOMA	25	29	9	15	5	6
OREGON	34	40	‡	16	10	#
PENNSYLVANIA	42	49	13	16	12	5
RHODE ISLAND	36	45	15	15	6	2
SOUTH CAROLINA	31	43	13	23	5	23
SOUTH DAKOTA	38	45	10	27	5	2
TENNESSEE	28	33	10	21	5	‡
TEXAS	38	53	21	29	10	7
UTAH	36	42	‡	13	6	1
VERMONT	47	48	18	‡	12	‡
VIRGINIA	38	47	15	25	9	7
WASHINGTON	42	48	23	23	10	5
WEST VIRGINIA	24	24	13	‡	2	‡
WISCONSIN	40	47	8	19	9	8
WYOMING	38	40	‡	26	9	‡

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

**NOTE:** The national and state/jurisdiction results include public school students only. Data for DoDEA schools are not in the national results. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The results for English language learners and students with disabilities are based on students who were assessed and cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment

**NAEP – Percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Students At or Above Proficient in Reading**

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	English Learners
<b>NATION</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
ALABAMA	25	34	9	19	2	‡
ALASKA	31	44	16	31	5	1
ARIZONA	28	42	16	17	4	‡
ARKANSAS	30	37	12	21	7	12
CALIFORNIA	29	44	15	18	5	2
COLORADO	40	50	13	23	10	3
CONNECTICUT	45	54	22	24	13	1
DELAWARE	33	42	19	27	12	‡
FLORIDA	33	42	19	27	13	3
GEORGIA	32	42	17	26	6	4
HAWAII	28	45	27	25	3	3
IDAHO	38	42	‡	19	7	2
ILLINOIS	36	47	14	24	7	1
INDIANA	35	39	11	23	9	6
IOWA	37	39	15	21	5	2
KANSAS	36	42	13	20	5	13
KENTUCKY	38	41	15	30	9	5
LOUISIANA	24	35	12	26	5	‡
MAINE	38	39	‡	‡	11	‡
MARYLAND	42	53	25	30	16	‡
MASSACHUSETTS	48	57	24	20	15	4
MICHIGAN	33	37	12	22	7	8
MINNESOTA	41	46	16	20	10	6
MISSISSIPPI	20	31	8	18	6	‡
MISSOURI	36	41	13	32	8	‡
MONTANA	40	45	‡	28	9	‡
NEBRASKA	37	43	16	19	6	‡
NEVADA	30	43	18	19	6	2
NEW HAMPSHIRE	44	45	‡	18	12	‡

	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	English Learners
NEW JERSEY	46	55	26	31	15	‡
NEW MEXICO	22	40	15	17	5	2
NEW YORK	35	46	18	19	8	1
NORTH CAROLINA	33	43	16	23	6	7
NORTH DAKOTA	34	37	23	‡	5	‡
OHIO	39	43	16	34	6	20
OKLAHOMA	29	35	14	18	6	6
OREGON	37	43	‡	18	9	1
PENNSYLVANIA	42	49	17	17	12	3
RHODE ISLAND	36	44	18	18	10	3
SOUTH CAROLINA	29	39	14	24	5	10
SOUTH DAKOTA	36	40	‡	22	5	‡
TENNESSEE	33	38	16	28	8	‡
TEXAS	31	49	17	20	8	2
UTAH	39	44	‡	22	7	3
VERMONT	45	45	25	‡	10	‡
VIRGINIA	36	45	17	26	9	7
WASHINGTON	42	50	22	21	9	3
WEST VIRGINIA	25	25	23	‡	2	‡
WISCONSIN	36	42	9	23	6	9
WYOMING	38	40	‡	25	7	‡

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

**NOTE:** The national and state/jurisdiction results include public school students only. Data for DoDEA schools are not in the national results. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The results for English language learners and students with disabilities are based on students who were assessed and cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Reading Assessment.