

Rhode Island

Grade 4 and 8 Public Schools State Reading 2015

This report provides selected results for Rhode Island'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 11 assessment years (at grade 4 in 1992 and 1994, and at both grades 4 and 8 in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015), 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 2015 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8.

For more information about the assessment, visit the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/> which contains

- *The Nation's Report Card™, Reading 2015*
- 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 2015

Grade 4:

- In 2015, the average reading score for fourth-grade students in Rhode Island was 225. This was higher than that for the nation's public schools (221).
- The average score for students in Rhode Island in 2015 (225) was higher than that in 1992 (217) and was higher than that in 2013 (223).
- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Proficient* was 40 percent. This was greater than that for the nation's public schools (35 percent).
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 (40 percent) was greater than that in 1992 (28 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2013 (38 percent).
- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Basic* was 72 percent. This was greater than that for the nation's public schools (68 percent).
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Basic* in 2015 (72 percent) was greater than that in 1992 (63 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2013 (70 percent).

Grade 8:

- In 2015, the average reading score for eighth-grade students in Rhode Island was 265. This was not significantly different from that for the nation's public schools (264).
- The average score for students in Rhode Island in 2015 (265) was not significantly different from that in 1998 (264) and was not significantly different from that in 2013 (267).
- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Proficient* was 35 percent. This was not significantly different from that for the nation's public schools (33 percent).
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 (35 percent) was not significantly different from that in 1998 (32 percent) and in 2013 (36 percent).
- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Basic* was 76 percent. This was not significantly different from that for the nation's public schools (75 percent).
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island who performed at or above *Basic* in 2015 (76 percent) was not significantly different from that in 1998 (76 percent) and in 2013 (77 percent).

The U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) have 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/content/nagb/assets/documents/publications/frameworks/reading/2015-reading-framework.pdf>.

The Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress replaced the framework that guided the 1992 reading assessment and subsequent reading assessments through 2007. Based on results from special analysis, it was determined that even with a new framework, the results from the 2009 reading assessment could still be compared to those from previous assessment years. A summary of these analyses is available on the Web at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/trend_study.asp. The 2015 NAEP reading assessment used the same framework used in 2009, 2011, and 2013. Trends are reported from 1992 to 2015.

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 exposition, argumentation/persuasive, and procedural texts. The inclusion of distinct text types is aligned with the framework's definition of reading, which recognizes that interaction with different texts elicit different ways of thinking and responding.

Literary texts (all three types at each grade)

- Fiction
- Literary Nonfiction
- Poetry

Informational texts (varies by grade level – see procedural appendix for more detail)

- Exposition
- 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 underlies 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.

Meaning Vocabulary

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

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 assessment was asked to complete two 25-minute sections, each consisting of a reading passage and associated 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/itmrlsx/>.

Who Was Assessed?

All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity schools (DoDEA) participated in the 2015 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8. In order for assessment results to be reported publicly, 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. A participation rate of at least 85 percent for schools in each subject and grade was required. Participation rates for the 2015 reading assessment are available on the NAEP website at http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/#reading/about#participation.

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 DoDEA or Bureau of Indian Education schools.

How Is Student Reading Performance Reported?

The 2015 state results are compared to results from 10 earlier assessments at grade 4 and from 8 earlier assessments at grade 8.

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. 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, 25th, 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 National Assessment Governing Board has set 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 .

Figure
1-A

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment
Descriptions of fourth-grade achievement levels for 2015 NAEP reading assessment

Basic Level (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 in the shaded boxes indicate the lowest point on the 0-500 scale at which the achievement-level range begins.
SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2014). *Reading Framework for the 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC.

Figure
1-B

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment
Descriptions of eighth-grade achievement levels for 2015 NAEP reading assessment

Basic Level (243) 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 Level (281) Eighth-grade students performing at the *Proficient* level should be able to provide relevant information and summarize main ideas and themes. They should be able to make and support inferences about a text, connect parts of a text, and analyze text features. Students performing at this level should also be able to fully substantiate judgments about content and presentation of 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.

NOTE: The scores in parentheses in the shaded boxes indicate the lowest point on the 0-500 scale at which the achievement-level range begins.

SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2014). *Reading Framework for the 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC.

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) and/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 and/or ELL students. In 1998, NAEP was administered using a split sample of schools—one sample in which accommodations were permitted for SD and/or ELL 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. Please note that bullet statements only reference the results from the 1998 assessment where accommodations were permitted. 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, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015).

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/or 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 2015 NAEP reading assessment are available on the NAEP website at http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2015/#reading/about#inclusion.

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 percentages are discussed in this report only when they are significant from a statistical perspective. Significant differences between 2015 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.

Score or percentage differences or gaps cited in this report are calculated based on differences between unrounded numbers. Therefore, the reader may find that the score or percentage difference cited in the text or tables may not be identical to the difference obtained from subtracting the rounded values shown in the accompanying tables or figures.

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 2015 Reading Overall Average Score and Achievement-Level Results for Public School Students

Overall reading results for public school students from Rhode Island are reported in this section, as well as regional and national results. The regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/hsts/tabulations/regions.asp>). Trend data by region are not provided for assessment years prior to 2003.

Prior to 1998, testing accommodations were not provided for SD and/or ELL students 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.

[Table xx shows] the overall performance results of grades 4 and 8 public school students in Rhode Island, the nation, and the region. Prior to 2003, the list of states that comprise a given region for NAEP 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, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015. The first column of results presents the average score on the NAEP reading scale. The remaining columns show the scores at selected percentiles. Percentiles indicate the percentages of students whose scores fell at or below a particular score. For example, the 25th percentile defines the cut point for the lowest 25 percent of students within the distribution of scale scores.

Grade 4 Scale Score Results

- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island was 225. This was higher than that for students across the nation (221).
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score for students in 2015 was higher than that in 2013 (223). However, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2015 was not significantly different from that in 2013 (221).
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score for students in 2015 was higher than the scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results

- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island was 265. This was not significantly different from that for students across the nation (264).
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score for students in 2015 was not significantly different from that in 2013 (267). However, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2015 was lower than that in 2013 (266).
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score for students in 2015 was higher than the scores in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009. However, it was not significantly different from the scores in 1998, 2011, and 2013.

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.

[Table xx shows] 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 2015, the percentage of Rhode Island's students who performed at or above *Proficient* was 40 percent. This was greater than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Proficient* (35 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the percentages in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011, but was not significantly different from the percentage in 2013.
- In 2015, the percentage of Rhode Island's students who performed at or above *Basic* was 72 percent. This was greater than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Basic* (68 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Basic* in 2015 was greater than the percentages in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but was not significantly different from the percentages in 2009, 2011, and 2013.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2015, the percentage of Rhode Island's students who performed at or above *Proficient* was 35 percent. This was not significantly different from the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Proficient* (33 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the percentages in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but was not significantly different from the percentages in 1998, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the percentage of Rhode Island's students who performed at or above *Basic* was 76 percent. This was not significantly different from the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Basic* (75 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Basic* in 2015 was greater than the percentages in 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but was not significantly different from the percentages in 1998, 2002, 2011, and 2013.

Comparisons Between Rhode Island, the Nation, and Participating States and Jurisdictions

All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Department of Defense Education Activity schools (DoDEA) participated in the 2015 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8. References to "jurisdictions" in the results statements may include states, the District of Columbia, and DoDEA schools.

Comparisons by Scale Scores

Figures 2-A and 2-B compare Rhode Island's 2015 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 Rhode Island in the NAEP 2015 reading assessment.

Grade 4 Scale Score Comparison Results

- The average score for students in Rhode Island was higher than 23 jurisdictions, not significantly different from 21 jurisdictions, and lower than 7 jurisdictions.

Grade 8 Scale Score Comparison Results

- The average score for students in Rhode Island was higher than 15 jurisdictions, not significantly different from 17 jurisdictions, and lower than 19 jurisdictions.

Figure
2-A

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Rhode Island's average scale score in NAEP reading for fourth-grade public school students compared with scores for the nation and other participating jurisdictions: 2015

Figure
2-B

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Rhode Island's average scale score in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students compared with scores for the nation and other participating jurisdictions: 2015

Comparisons by Achievement Levels

Figures 3-A and 3-B permit comparisons of all jurisdictions (and the nation) participating in the NAEP 2015 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 that reflect 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 Rhode Island.

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 conducted 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 Rhode Island was greater than the percentage in 23 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 24 jurisdictions, and smaller than those in 4 jurisdictions.
- The percentage of students performing at or above the *Basic* level in Rhode Island was greater than the percentage in 23 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 24 jurisdictions, and smaller than those in 4 jurisdictions (data not shown).

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Comparison Results

- The percentage of students performing at or above the *Proficient* level in Rhode Island was greater than the percentage in 15 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 29 jurisdictions, and smaller than those in 7 jurisdictions.
- The percentage of students performing at or above the *Basic* level in Rhode Island was greater than the percentage in 13 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 20 jurisdictions, and smaller than those in 18 jurisdictions (data not shown).

Figure
3-A

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Average scale scores in NAEP reading for fourth-grade public school students, percentage within each achievement level, and Rhode Island's percentage at or above *Proficient* compared with the nation and other participating jurisdictions: 2015

Figure
3-B

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Average scale scores in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students, percentage within each achievement level, and Rhode Island's percentage at or above *Proficient* compared with the nation and other participating jurisdictions: 2015

Reading Performance of Selected Student Groups

This section of the report presents trend results for public school students in Rhode Island 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, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015)
- 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.

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 2015 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 2015 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/naepdata/>.

Race/Ethnicity

Prior to 2011, student race/ethnicity was obtained from school records and reported for the six mutually exclusive categories shown below:

- White
- Black
- Hispanic
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Unclassified (not shown in tables)

Students who identified with more than one of the other five categories were classified as "Other" and were included as part of the "Unclassified" category along with students who had a background other than the ones listed or whose race/ethnicity could not be determined.

In compliance with new standards from the U.S. Office of Management and Budget for collecting and reporting data on race/ethnicity, additional information was collected in 2011 so that results could be reported separately for Asian students, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander students, and students identifying with two or more races. Beginning in 2011, all of the students participating in NAEP were identified as one of the seven racial/ethnic categories listed below:

- White
- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- Asian
- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Two or more races

As in earlier years, students identified as Hispanic were classified as Hispanic in 2011, 2013, and 2015 even if they were also identified with another racial/ethnic group. Students who identified with two or more of the other racial/ethnic groups (e.g., White and Black) would have been classified as "Other" and reported as part of the "Unclassified" category prior to 2011, and were classified as "Two or more races" in 2011, 2013, and 2015.

When comparing the results for racial/ethnic groups prior to 2011, data for Asian and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander students are combined into a single Asian/Pacific Islander category.

[Table xx shows] average scale scores and percentage of students by achievement-level for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in Rhode Island and the nation, by race/ethnicity.

Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2015, White students in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scores of Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- In 2015, the average scale score of White students in Rhode Island was higher than their respective scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2011, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 2009 and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale scores of Black and Hispanic students in Rhode Island were higher than their respective scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score of Asian/Pacific Islander students in Rhode Island was higher than their respective scores in 1992, 1994, 1998, and 2002, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, Black students in Rhode Island had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 20 points. This performance gap was narrower than that of 1992 (31 points).
- In 2015, Hispanic students in Rhode Island had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 27 points. In 1992, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 40 points.

Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2015 in Rhode Island, the percentage of White students performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the corresponding percentages of Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- In 2015, the percentage of White students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2011, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 2009 and 2013.
- In 2015, the percentages of Black and Hispanic students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* were greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 1992, 1994, and 2002, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1998, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2015, White students in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scores of Black and Hispanic students, but not significantly different from the average score of Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- In 2015, the average scale score of White students in Rhode Island was higher than their respective scores in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 2011 and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score of Black students in Rhode Island was higher than their respective score in 2007, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score of Hispanic students in Rhode Island was higher than their respective scores in 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 1998, 2002, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score of Asian/Pacific Islander students in Rhode Island was higher than their respective scores in 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from their respective scores in 1998, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, Black students in Rhode Island had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 27 points. In 1998, the average score for Black students was lower than that of White students by 22 points.
- In 2015, Hispanic students in Rhode Island had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 30 points. In 1998, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 29 points.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2015 in Rhode Island, the percentage of White students performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the corresponding percentages of Black and Hispanic students, but not significantly different from the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- In 2015, the percentage of White students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 2011 and 2013.
- In 2015, the percentage of Black students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* was not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the percentage of Hispanic students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1998, 2002, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander students in Rhode Island performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentages of their respective peers in 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 1998, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

[Table xx shows] average scale scores and percentage of students by achievement-level data for the seven racial/ethnic categories used in 2011, 2013, and 2015: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Two or more races at grades 4 and 8 in Rhode Island and the nation.

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.

[Table xx shows] average scale scores and percentage of students by achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in Rhode Island and the nation, by gender.

Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Gender

- In 2015, male students in Rhode Island had an average score in reading (223) that was lower than that of female students (228). In 1992, male students in Rhode Island had an average score in reading (215) that was not significantly different from that of female students (218).
- In 2015, male students in Rhode Island had an average scale score in reading (223) that was higher than that of male students in public schools across the nation (218). Similarly, female students in Rhode Island had an average scale score (228) that was higher than that of female students across the nation (225).
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score of male students in 2015 was higher than the scores of male students in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score of female students in 2015 was higher than the scores of female students in 1992, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from the scores of female students in 1994, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Gender

- In the 2015 assessment, 38 percent of male students and 42 percent of female students performed at or above *Proficient* in Rhode Island. The difference between these percentages was not statistically significant.
- The percentage of male students in Rhode Island's public schools who were at or above *Proficient* in 2015 (38 percent) was greater than that of male students in the nation (32 percent).
- The percentage of female students in Rhode Island's public schools who were at or above *Proficient* in 2015 (42 percent) was greater than that of female students in the nation (38 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of male students performing at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the corresponding percentages of students in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of female students performing at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the corresponding percentages of students in 1992, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007, but not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1994, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Gender

- In 2015, male students in Rhode Island had an average score in reading (260) that was lower than that of female students (270). In 1998, male students in Rhode Island had an average score in reading (259) that was lower than that of female students (269).
- In 2015, male students in Rhode Island had an average scale score in reading (260) that was not significantly different from that of male students in public schools across the nation (259). Similarly, female students in Rhode Island had an average scale score (270) that was not significantly different from that of female students across the nation (269).
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score of male students in 2015 was higher than the scores of male students in 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the scores of male students in 1998, 2002, 2011, and 2013.
- In Rhode Island, the average scale score of female students in 2015 was higher than the scores of female students in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the scores of female students in 1998, 2011, and 2013.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Gender

- In the 2015 assessment, 30 percent of male students and 40 percent of female students performed at or above *Proficient* in Rhode Island. The difference between these percentages was statistically significant.
- The percentage of male students in Rhode Island's public schools who were at or above *Proficient* in 2015 (30 percent) was not significantly different from that of male students in the nation (28 percent).
- The percentage of female students in Rhode Island's public schools who were at or above *Proficient* in 2015 (40 percent) was not significantly different from that of female students in the nation (38 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of male students performing at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the corresponding percentages of students in 2002, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1998, 2003, 2011, and 2013.
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of female students performing at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the corresponding percentages of students in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1998, 2011, and 2013.

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.

[Table xx shows] average scale scores and percentage of students by achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in Rhode Island and the nation, by student eligibility for the NSLP.

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

- In 2015, students in Rhode Island eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 211. This was lower than that of students in Rhode Island not eligible for this program (238).
- In 2015, students in Rhode Island who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible by 27 points. This performance gap was narrower than that of 1998 (35 points).
- Students in Rhode Island eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (211) in 2015 that was not significantly different from that of students in the nation who were eligible (209).
- In Rhode Island, students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score in 2015 that was higher than that of eligible students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

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

- In Rhode Island, 24 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 54 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015. These percentages were significantly different from one another.
- For students in Rhode Island in 2015 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above *Proficient* (24 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation (21 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the corresponding percentages in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

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

- In 2015, students in Rhode Island eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 250. This was lower than that of students in Rhode Island not eligible for this program (277).
- In 2015, students in Rhode Island who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible by 27 points. In 1998, the average score for students in Rhode Island who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch was lower than the score of those not eligible by 26 points.
- Students in Rhode Island eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (250) in 2015 that was lower than that of students in the nation who were eligible (253).
- In Rhode Island, students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score in 2015 that was higher than that of eligible students in 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from that of eligible students in 1998, 2002, 2011, and 2013.

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

- In Rhode Island, 19 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 48 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015. These percentages were significantly different from one another.
- For students in Rhode Island in 2015 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above *Proficient* (19 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation (20 percent).
- In Rhode Island, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than the corresponding percentages in 1998, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the corresponding percentages in 2002, 2003, 2011, and 2013.

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 results for 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015 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.

[Table xx shows] average scale scores and percentage of students by achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in Rhode Island and the nation, by type of location (for 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015 only).

Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Type of Location

- In 2015, the average scale score of students in Rhode Island attending public schools in city locations was lower than the scores of students in suburban and rural schools.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in city and suburban locations in Rhode Island had average scale scores that were not significantly different from the average scale scores of students in city and suburban locations in the nation.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in rural locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scale score of students in rural locations in the nation.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in city and rural locations in Rhode Island had average scale scores that were not significantly different from the average scale scores of students in city and rural locations in 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013 in Rhode Island.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in suburban locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scale score of students in suburban locations in 2007 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from the average scale score of students in suburban locations in 2009, 2011, and 2013 in Rhode Island.

Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Type of Location

- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in city locations who performed at or above *Proficient* was smaller than the corresponding percentages of students in suburban and rural schools.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in city locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was not significantly different from those of students in city locations in the nation.
- The percentages of students in Rhode Island's public schools in suburban and rural locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 were greater than those of students in suburban and rural locations in the nation.
- The percentages of students in Rhode Island's public schools in city and rural locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 were not significantly different from those of students in city and rural locations in 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013 in Rhode Island.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in suburban locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than that of students in suburban locations in 2007 and 2011 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from that of students in suburban locations in 2009 and 2013 in Rhode Island.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Type of Location

- In 2015, the average scale score of students in Rhode Island attending public schools in city locations was lower than the scores of students in suburban and rural schools.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in city locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was lower than the average scale score of students in city locations in the nation.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in suburban locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was not significantly different from the average scale score of students in suburban locations in the nation.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in rural locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scale score of students in rural locations in the nation.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in city locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was lower than the average scale score of students in city locations in 2011 and 2013 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from the average scale score of students in city locations in 2007 and 2009 in Rhode Island.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in suburban locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scale score of students in suburban locations in 2007 and 2009 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from the average scale score of students in suburban locations in 2011 and 2013 in Rhode Island.
- In 2015, students attending public schools in rural locations in Rhode Island had an average scale score that was higher than the average scale score of students in rural locations in 2007, 2009, and 2011 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from the average scale score of students in rural locations in 2013 in Rhode Island.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Type of Location

- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in city locations who performed at or above *Proficient* was smaller than the corresponding percentages of students in suburban and rural schools.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in city locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was smaller than those of students in city locations in the nation.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in suburban locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was not significantly different from those of students in suburban locations in the nation.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in rural locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than those of students in rural locations in the nation.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in city locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was smaller than that of students in city locations in 2013 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from that of students in city locations in 2007, 2009, and 2011 in Rhode Island.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in suburban locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than that of students in suburban locations in 2007 and 2009 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from that of students in suburban locations in 2011 and 2013 in Rhode Island.
- The percentage of students in Rhode Island's public schools in rural locations who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2015 was greater than that of students in rural locations in 2007, 2009, and 2011 in Rhode Island, but not significantly different from that of students in rural locations in 2013 in Rhode Island.

Parents' Highest Level of Education

Eighth- and twelfth-grade students who participated in the NAEP 2015 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 xx shows] .

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

- In 2015, students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had graduated from college had an average scale score that was higher than the average scores of students with a parent in any of the following education categories: some education after high school, graduated from high school, and did not finish high school.
- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had graduated from college was higher than the score of students in the nation.
- In 2015, the average scale scores for students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had some education after high school, had graduated from high school, or had not finished high school were not significantly different from the corresponding scores of students in the nation.
- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had graduated from college was higher than the score of students in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but not significantly different from the score of students in 1998, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had some education after high school was higher than the score of students in 2007 and 2009, but not significantly different from the score of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had graduated from high school was not significantly different from the score of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015, the average scale score for students in Rhode Island who reported that a parent had not finished high school was higher than the score of students in 2007, but not significantly different from the score of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

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

- In 2015, the percentage of students performing at or above *Proficient* in Rhode Island 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: some education after high school, graduated from high school, and did not finish high school.
- In 2015, the percentage of students in Rhode Island reporting that a parent had graduated from college and who performed at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentage of students in the nation.
- In 2015, the percentages of students in Rhode Island reporting that a parent had some education after high school, had graduated from high school, or had not finished high school and who performed at or above *Proficient* were not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in the nation.
- In 2015 in Rhode Island, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had graduated from college and who performed at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentage of students in 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009, but was not significantly different from the percentage of students in 1998, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015 in Rhode Island, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had some education after high school and who performed at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentage of students in 2009, but was not significantly different from the percentage of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2011, and 2013.
- In 2015 in Rhode Island, the respective percentages of students reporting that a parent had graduated from high school or had not finished high school and who performed at or above *Proficient* were not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013.

A More Inclusive NAEP: Students With Disabilities and/or 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 SD and/or ELL students 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 9-A and 9-B display data for grades 4 and 8 grade students in Rhode Island 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 grades 4 and 8 students in the state.

[Table xx shows] the percentages of students assessed in Rhode Island by disability status and their performance on the NAEP assessment in terms of average scores and percentages performing below *Basic*, at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at *Advanced* for grades 4 and 8.

[Table xx shows] the percentages of students assessed in Rhode Island by ELL status, their average scores, and their performance in terms of the percentages below *Basic*, at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at *Advanced* for grades 4 and 8.

Tables 12-A and 12-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.

**Table
9-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP reading as a percentage of all students, by assessment year and testing status: Various years, 1992–2015

Year and testing status		SD and/or ELL		SD		ELL	
		Rhode Island	Nation (public)	Rhode Island	Nation (public)	Rhode Island	Nation (public)
1992 ¹	Identified	16	11	10	8	6	3
	Excluded	7	6	4	5	4	2
	Assessed without accommodations	9	4	6	3	3	1
1994 ¹	Identified	15	14	12	11	3	4
	Excluded	5	6	4	5	1	2
	Assessed without accommodations	10	8	8	6	2	2
1998	Identified	20	18	14	11	6	7
	Excluded	7	7	5	5	3	3
	Assessed without accommodations	9	7	6	4	3	4
	Assessed with accommodations	4	3	3	3	1	1
2002	Identified	25	21	19	13	9	9
	Excluded	6	7	3	5	3	2
	Assessed without accommodations	8	10	6	4	4	6
	Assessed with accommodations	11	4	10	4	2	1
2003	Identified	26	22	19	14	9	10
	Excluded	5	6	3	5	2	2
	Assessed without accommodations	8	10	5	4	4	7
	Assessed with accommodations	13	5	11	5	3	1
2005	Identified	25	23	20	14	7	11
	Excluded	4	7	2	5	1	2
	Assessed without accommodations	9	10	6	4	3	7
	Assessed with accommodations	13	7	11	5	3	2
2007	Identified	25	23	19	14	8	11
	Excluded	5	6	3	5	2	2
	Assessed without accommodations	7	10	5	3	3	7
	Assessed with accommodations	13	7	11	6	3	2
2009	Identified	22	23	17	13	6	11
	Excluded	4	5	3	4	1	2
	Assessed without accommodations	5	9	3	3	3	6
	Assessed with accommodations	13	9	12	7	2	3
2011	Identified	19	23	14	13	6	11
	Excluded	2	4	2	3	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	5	9	1	3	4	7
	Assessed with accommodations	12	10	11	7	2	4
2013	Identified	19	23	14	14	6	11
	Excluded	1	3	1	2	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	3	7	1	2	3	5
	Assessed with accommodations	14	13	12	9	3	5
2015	Identified	20	24	14	14	8	12
	Excluded	2	2	1	2	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	4	9	1	3	4	6
	Assessed with accommodations	14	14	12	10	3	5

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.

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, 1992–2015 Reading Assessments.

**Table
9-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP reading as a percentage of all students, by assessment year and testing status: Various years, 1998–2015

Year and testing status		SD and/or ELL		SD		ELL	
		Rhode Island	Nation (public)	Rhode Island	Nation (public)	Rhode Island	Nation (public)
1998	Identified	16	14	13	11	4	3
	Excluded	6	4	5	3	2	1
	Assessed without accommodations	9	7	7	5	1	2
	Assessed with accommodations	1	3	1	2	#	#
2002	Identified	20	18	16	13	5	6
	Excluded	5	6	4	5	2	2
	Assessed without accommodations	8	8	5	5	3	4
	Assessed with accommodations	7	4	7	4	1	1
2003	Identified	24	19	19	14	6	6
	Excluded	4	5	3	4	2	2
	Assessed without accommodations	8	8	5	5	2	4
	Assessed with accommodations	12	5	11	5	1	1
2005	Identified	23	19	20	13	4	6
	Excluded	4	5	3	4	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	8	7	7	3	1	4
	Assessed with accommodations	11	6	10	6	2	1
2007	Identified	21	19	18	13	4	7
	Excluded	4	5	3	5	1	2
	Assessed without accommodations	6	7	4	3	2	4
	Assessed with accommodations	12	7	11	6	1	1
2009	Identified	21	18	18	13	3	6
	Excluded	3	4	2	4	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	5	6	4	2	1	3
	Assessed with accommodations	13	8	12	7	2	1
2011	Identified	19	18	16	13	3	6
	Excluded	1	3	1	3	#	1
	Assessed without accommodations	4	5	3	2	1	3
	Assessed with accommodations	14	9	12	8	2	2
2013	Identified	19	17	15	13	5	5
	Excluded	1	2	1	2	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	3	4	2	2	1	2
	Assessed with accommodations	15	11	12	9	3	3
2015	Identified	20	19	16	13	5	7
	Excluded	2	2	1	2	1	1
	Assessed without accommodations	3	5	2	2	2	3
	Assessed with accommodations	15	12	13	10	3	3

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, 1998–2015 Reading Assessments.

**Table
12-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Number of fourth-grade public school students assessed in NAEP reading and weighted percentage excluded, by state/jurisdiction: 2015

State/jurisdiction	Number assessed	Weighted percentage excluded
Nation (public)	134,000	2
Alabama	2,100	1
Alaska	2,000	1
Arizona	2,400	2
Arkansas	2,100	2
California	5,800	2
Colorado	2,200	2
Connecticut	2,300	2
Delaware	2,300	2
Florida	5,500	2
Georgia	3,200	4
Hawaii	2,200	2
Idaho	2,300	2
Illinois	3,500	1
Indiana	2,200	1
Iowa	2,400	1
Kansas	2,200	2
Kentucky	2,900	5
Louisiana	2,200	3
Maine	2,200	1
Maryland	3,000	4
Massachusetts	3,100	3
Michigan	3,000	3
Minnesota	2,500	2
Mississippi	2,300	1
Missouri	2,200	1
Montana	2,400	2
Nebraska	2,400	2
Nevada	2,200	2
New Hampshire	2,200	1
New Jersey	2,000	3
New Mexico	2,700	2
New York	2,900	2
North Carolina	3,300	2
North Dakota	2,500	2
Ohio	2,900	2
Oklahoma	2,300	3
Oregon	2,400	2
Pennsylvania	3,000	2
Rhode Island	2,300	2
South Carolina	2,300	1
South Dakota	2,300	3
Tennessee	2,100	3
Texas	5,600	4
Utah	2,300	1
Vermont	1,900	2
Virginia	2,300	2
Washington	2,500	2
West Virginia	2,200	2
Wisconsin	2,500	2
Wyoming	2,200	1
Other jurisdictions		
District of Columbia	2,200	2
DoDEA ¹	1,800	2

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools).

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), 2015 Reading Assessment.

**Table
12-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2015 State Assessment

Number of eighth-grade public school students assessed in NAEP reading and weighted percentage excluded, by state/jurisdiction: 2015

State/jurisdiction	Number assessed	Weighted percentage excluded
Nation (public)	131,900	2
Alabama	2,100	1
Alaska	1,900	2
Arizona	2,400	2
Arkansas	2,300	2
California	6,000	2
Colorado	2,100	2
Connecticut	2,300	2
Delaware	2,200	2
Florida	5,300	3
Georgia	3,500	3
Hawaii	2,200	2
Idaho	2,300	2
Illinois	3,300	1
Indiana	2,100	1
Iowa	2,300	1
Kansas	2,300	1
Kentucky	3,000	3
Louisiana	2,200	2
Maine	2,200	2
Maryland	2,800	5
Massachusetts	3,000	2
Michigan	3,200	2
Minnesota	2,500	2
Mississippi	2,300	1
Missouri	2,100	1
Montana	2,300	2
Nebraska	2,200	2
Nevada	2,300	2
New Hampshire	2,300	1
New Jersey	2,000	2
New Mexico	2,600	2
New York	2,800	2
North Carolina	3,300	2
North Dakota	2,300	3
Ohio	3,000	2
Oklahoma	2,100	2
Oregon	2,200	2
Pennsylvania	2,900	2
Rhode Island	2,300	2
South Carolina	2,200	2
South Dakota	2,300	2
Tennessee	2,000	3
Texas	5,700	2
Utah	2,400	1
Vermont	1,800	1
Virginia	2,300	2
Washington	2,500	2
West Virginia	2,100	2
Wisconsin	2,300	2
Wyoming	2,000	1
Other jurisdictions		
District of Columbia	1,700	3
DoDEA ¹	1,300	1

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools).

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), 2015 Reading Assessment.

Where to Find More Information

The NAEP Reading Assessment

The latest news about the NAEP 2015 reading assessment and the results can be found on the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/>. 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 *Reading Framework for the 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress*, on which this assessment is based, is available at the National Assessment Governing Board website at <https://www.nagb.org/content/nagb/assets/documents/publications/frameworks/reading/2015-reading-framework.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 districts, states, and the nation. Data tables are also available for districts, with all contextual 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 Instruments 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/or English language learners

References for a variety of research publications related to the assessment of SD and/or ELL students 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: 1-703-605-6794
Order online at: <http://www.edpubs.gov>.

The NAEP State Report Generator was developed for the NAEP 2015 reports by Phillip Leung, Bobby Rampey, Rick Hasney, and Ming Kuang.

What is the Nation's Report Card™?

The Nation's Report Card™ 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.

U.S. Department of Education

Arne Duncan

Secretary
U.S. Department
of Education

Ruth Neild

Deputy Director for Policy and Research
Delegated Duties of the Director

Peggy Carr

Acting Commissioner
National Center for Education Statistics

The National Assessment Governing Board

Terry Mazany, Chair

President and CEO
The Chicago Community Trust
Chicago, Illinois

Susan Pimentel, Vice Chair

Educational Consultant
Hanover, New Hampshire

Andrés Alonso

Professor of Practice
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Honorable Mitchell D. Chester

Commissioner
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Malden, Massachusetts

Lucille E. Davy

President and CEO
Transformative Education Solutions, LLC
Pennington, New Jersey

Louis M. Fabrizio

Data, Research and Federal Policy Director
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

Frank Fernandez

Principal
Kaimuki Middle School
Honolulu, Hawaii

Honorable Anitere Flores

Senator
Florida State Senate

Miami, Florida

Rebecca Gagnon

School Board Member
Minneapolis Public Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Shannon Garrison

Fourth-Grade Teacher
Solano Avenue Elementary School
Los Angeles, California

Honorable James Geringer

Director of Policy and Public Sector Strategies
Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI)
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Doris R. Hicks

Principal and Chief Executive Officer
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Charter School for Science and Technology
New Orleans, Louisiana

Andrew Dean Ho

Assistant Professor
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Honorable Terry Holliday

Commissioner of Education
Kentucky Department of Education
Lexington, Kentucky

Tonya Matthews

President and CEO
Michigan Science Center
Detroit, Michigan

Tonya Miles

General Public Representative
Mitchellville, Maryland

Honorable Ronnie Musgrove

Founding Member
Musgrove/Smith Law
Jackson, Mississippi

Dale Nowlin

Twelfth-Grade Teacher
Columbus North High School
Columbus, Indiana

Father Joseph M. O'Keefe, S.J.

Professor
Lynch School of Education
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

W. James Popham

Professor Emeritus
University of California, Los Angeles
Wilsonville, Oregon

B. Fielding Rolston

Chairman
Tennessee Board of Education
Kingsport, Tennessee

Cary Sneider

Associate Research Professor
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

Chasidy White

Eighth-Grade Teacher
Brookwood Middle School
Brookwood, Alabama

Sue Betka (Ex officio)

Acting Director
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Cornelia S. Orr
Executive Director
National Assessment Governing Board
Washington, D.C.