

Appendix A

Technical Procedures for the NAEP 2011 Reading Assessment

This appendix provides an overview of some of the technical procedures for the NAEP 2011 reading assessment. Information is included about the content of the assessment, school and student samples and participation, inclusion of students with disabilities and/or English language learners, analysis procedures, and interpretation of results. Additional technical information about NAEP assessments is available on the Web at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/>.

Development of the Reading Framework

The National Assessment Governing Board oversees the creation of the NAEP frameworks that provide the theoretical basis for the assessment, the direction for what types of items should be included, and how the items should be designed and scored. Frameworks incorporate ideas and rely on the expertise of many individuals involved in reading and reading education, including researchers, policymakers, teachers, parents, and other members of the public. While the frameworks describe the general content and design of NAEP subject area assessments, the specifications provide the detailed information used by test developers for constructing the assessments. Both the *Reading Framework for the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress* and *Assessment and Item Specifications for the NAEP 2011 Reading Assessment* are available on the Governing Board's website at <http://www.nagb.org/publications/frameworks.htm>.

The frameworks for main NAEP assessments are periodically updated or changed to reflect current curricula and standards. Whenever changes are made to a subject framework, every effort is made to try to maintain the trend lines that permit the reporting of changes in student achievement over time. If, however, the nature of the changes made to an assessment are such that the results would not be comparable to earlier assessments, a new trend line is started.

The *Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Education Progress* replaces the framework first used for the 1992 reading assessment and subsequent reading assessments through 2007. Results from special analyses determined that even with a new framework, the 2009 reading assessment results could be compared to those from earlier assessment years. A summary of these special analyses is available on the Web at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/trend_study.asp. The 2011 NAEP reading assessment used the same framework used in 2009 and trends are reported from 1992 to 2011.

Framework development was guided by scientifically based reading research that defines reading as a dynamic cognitive process that allows students to do the following:

- Understand written text
- Develop and interpret meaning
- Use meaning as appropriate to the type of text, purpose, and situation

The framework recommends the use of both literary and informational texts. Literary texts include three types at each grade: fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry. The types of informational texts vary by grade level. At grade 4, all informational texts are expository. At grades 8 and 12, informational texts include two types: expository and argumentative/persuasive. In addition, the reading assessment includes procedural texts and documents such as tables, charts, maps, schedules, and manuals. Procedural text or document elements will be embedded in other texts at grades 4 and 8, but may appear as stand-alone stimuli at grade 12. The inclusion of distinct text types is aligned with the framework definition of reading, which recognizes that students read different texts for different purposes.

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

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

The assessment framework specifies not only the particular dimensions of reading literacy to be measured, but also the percentage of assessment questions that should be devoted to each. The target percentage distribution for types of reading text and reading cognitive targets as specified in the framework, along with the actual percentage distribution in the 2011 assessment, are presented in tables A-1 and A-2.

Table A-1. Target and actual percentage distribution of questions in NAEP reading, by types of text and grade: 2011

Grade	Types of text	
	Reading for literary experience	Reading for information
Grade 4		
Target	50	50
Actual	51	49
Grade 8		
Target	45	55
Actual	46	54

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

Table A-2. Target and actual percentage distribution of student time in NAEP reading, by cognitive targets of reading and grade: 2011

Grade	Cognitive targets of reading		
	Locate/recall	Integrate/interpret	Critique/evaluate
Grade 4			
Target	30	50	20
Actual	19	64	17
Grade 8			
Target	20	50	30
Actual	18	58	23

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

Content of the 2011 Reading Assessment

Each NAEP assessment contains two major components: subject-specific cognitive items that measure the achievement of students in an academic subject; and noncognitive items that collect information from students, teachers, and school administrators about background variables that are related to student achievement. Both the cognitive and noncognitive items are developed through a process that includes reviews by external advisory groups and field testing. Results from the cognitive items provide information about what students know and can do in a subject area. Information from the background items gives context to NAEP results and/or allows researchers to track factors associated with academic achievement.

The 2011 reading assessment was made up of 102 cognitive questions at 4th grade and 130 questions at 8th grade. The number of questions used for reporting results at each grade has remained relatively constant across assessment years. Students spend about one-half of the assessment time responding to multiple-choice questions and one-half responding to two types of constructed-response questions. Short constructed-response questions require students to provide answers in one or two sentences, while extended constructed-response questions require more detailed responses or explanations.

Cognitive Blocks: The assessment design allowed for broad coverage of the two types of text and the three cognitive targets at each grade, while minimizing the time burden for any one student. This was accomplished through the use of matrix sampling of items in which each student was required to take only a small portion of the entire pool of assessment questions.

The reading item pool for each grade was divided up into subsets or "blocks." In 2011, there were a total of 10 cognitive blocks at fourth grade and 13 blocks at eighth grade. Each reading assessment booklet contained two separately timed 25-minute blocks. Each block typically contained 10 questions depending on the balance between multiple-choice and constructed-response questions.

The procedure used for distributing blocks across booklets controlled for position and context effects by balancing the positioning of blocks across booklets and balancing the pairing of blocks within booklets. The procedure also cycled the booklets for administration so that no more than a few students in an assessment section received the same test booklet.

Sample released questions can be viewed at the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/itmrls/>.

NAEP Samples

NAEP assesses representative samples of students rather than the entire population of students. The sample selection process utilizes a probability sample design in which each school and each student has a known probability of being selected (the probabilities are proportionate to the estimated number of students in the grade assessed). Samples are selected according to a multistage design, with students drawn from within sampled public and private schools nationwide.

The 2007–08 Common Core of Data (CCD) file, a comprehensive list of operating public schools in each jurisdiction that is compiled each school year by the National Center for Education Statistics, served as the sampling frame for the selection of public schools in each state/jurisdiction. The sample of students in districts participating in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) represents an augmentation of the sample of students selected as part of the state samples. All students at more local geographic sampling levels also make up part of the broader samples. For example, the TUDA samples are included as part of the corresponding state samples, and the state samples are included as part of the national sample.

The 2007–08 Private School Survey (PSS), a mail survey of all U.S. private schools carried out biennially by the Census Bureau under contract to NCES, served as the sampling frame for private schools. While state and district results are based on samples of public schools only, the national results are based on the combined samples of public and private schools. Although information about the combined public and private school national samples is provided here for context, performance results in the State Report Generator and the District Report Generator are for public school students only.

Table A-3 shows the target populations and sample sizes in 2011 for the nation and participating states and jurisdictions at grades 4 and 8. Table A-4 shows the same information for participating urban districts for grades 4 and 8.

Because each school that participated in the assessment, and each student assessed, represents only a portion of the larger population of interest, the results are weighted to make appropriate inferences between the student samples and the respective populations from which they are drawn. Sampling weights are adjusted for the disproportionate representation of some groups in the selected sample. This includes oversampling of schools with high concentrations of students from certain racial/ethnic groups and the lower sampling rates of students who attend very small schools.

Table A-3. Student sample sizes and target populations in NAEP reading at grades 4 and 8, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Nation	222,200	3,940,000	174,700	3,835,000
Public	211,700	3,614,000	164,100	3,508,000
Private	6,200	317,000	8,100	319,000
Alabama	3,100	54,000	2,700	55,000
Alaska	2,900	9,000	2,500	8,000
Arizona	3,900	80,000	2,700	75,000
Arkansas	3,700	37,000	2,700	35,000
California	9,600	438,000	7,200	462,000
Colorado	3,600	61,000	2,700	55,000
Connecticut	3,200	41,000	2,700	40,000
Delaware	3,700	10,000	2,800	9,000
Florida	7,500	195,000	6,100	191,000
Georgia	5,600	129,000	4,000	112,000
Hawaii	3,500	13,000	2,900	12,000
Idaho	3,800	21,000	2,900	19,000
Illinois	5,300	157,000	4,200	147,000
Indiana	3,600	80,000	2,700	75,000
Iowa	3,500	36,000	2,600	33,000
Kansas	3,300	35,000	2,700	32,000
Kentucky	5,200	51,000	4,000	49,000
Louisiana	3,400	56,000	2,600	46,000
Maine	3,300	14,000	2,700	14,000
Maryland	4,900	60,000	3,700	61,000
Massachusetts	5,400	76,000	3,900	73,000
Michigan	4,300	113,000	4,100	114,000
Minnesota	3,800	62,000	3,000	59,000
Mississippi	3,100	35,000	2,500	35,000
Missouri	3,700	68,000	2,500	60,000
Montana	3,300	11,000	2,600	10,000
Nebraska	3,300	22,000	2,600	20,000
Nevada	4,100	34,000	2,800	32,000
New Hampshire	3,400	14,000	2,700	15,000
New Jersey	3,500	99,000	2,700	95,000
New Mexico	4,400	25,000	3,400	23,000
New York	4,900	197,000	4,100	208,000
North Carolina	5,500	112,000	4,300	103,000
North Dakota	3,200	7,000	2,300	7,000
Ohio	4,500	125,000	3,700	125,000
Oklahoma	3,300	45,000	2,500	41,000
Oregon	3,900	45,000	2,900	42,000
Pennsylvania	4,900	130,000	3,800	138,000
Rhode Island	3,400	11,000	2,700	11,000
South Carolina	3,500	52,000	2,800	51,000
South Dakota	3,400	9,000	3,000	9,000
Tennessee	3,700	75,000	2,800	68,000
Texas	10,400	359,000	7,700	341,000
Utah	4,200	43,000	2,900	38,000
Vermont	2,800	6,000	2,100	6,000
Virginia	3,900	96,000	2,700	86,000
Washington	4,100	77,000	3,100	78,000
West Virginia	3,200	20,000	2,700	19,000
Wisconsin	4,700	62,000	3,600	58,000
Wyoming	3,000	7,000	2,100	6,000
Other jurisdictions				
BIE ¹	1,100	3,000	900	2,000
District of Columbia	2,200	5,000	2,500	4,000
DoDEA ²	3,300	7,000	1,600	5,000

¹ Bureau of Indian Education.

² Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools).

NOTE: The sample size is rounded to the nearest hundred. The target population is rounded to the nearest thousand. Data for BIE and DoDEA schools are counted in the overall nation total, but not in the nation (public) total. Data for the District of Columbia public schools are counted, along with the states, in nation (public). 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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-4. Student sample sizes and target populations for Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in reading at grades 4 and 8, by urban district: 2011

District	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

NOTE: The sample size is rounded to the nearest hundred. The target population is rounded to the nearest thousand. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

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

School and Student Participation

National Participation

To ensure unbiased samples, NAEP requires that participation rates be 70 percent or higher to report national results separately for public and private schools. In instances where participation rates meet the 70 percent criteria but fall below 85 percent, a nonresponse bias analysis is conducted; however, results may still be reported.

National school and student participation rates for the 2011 reading assessment are presented in table A-5. Student-weighted school participation rates were 97 percent for grade 4 (100 percent for public schools and 74 percent for private schools) and 98 percent for grade 8 (100 percent for public schools and 74 percent for private schools).

State and District Participation

Standards established by the Governing Board require that school participation rates for the original state and district samples need to be at least 85 percent for results to be reported. In 2011, all 52 states and jurisdictions participating in the reading assessment at grades 4 and 8 met this participation rate requirement (tables A-6 through A-8). The 21 urban districts participating at grades 4 and 8 also met the criteria for reporting (table A-9).

Table A-5. National school and student participation rates in NAEP reading, by grade and type of school: 2011

Grade and type of school	School participation				Number of schools participating after substitution	Student participation	
	Student-weighted		School-weighted			Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
	Percent before substitution	Percent after substitution	Percent before substitution	Percent after substitution			
Grade 4							
Nation	97	98	92	95	8,500	95	213,100
Public	100	100	100	100	7,720	95	202,900
Private	74	84	68	80	560	95	6,100
Grade 8							
Nation	98	98	88	92	7,590	93	168,200
Public	100	100	100	100	6,750	93	157,800
Private	74	85	70	80	690	95	8,000

NOTE: The national totals for schools include Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools) and Bureau of Indian Education schools, which are not included in either the public or private totals. The national totals for students include students in these schools. Columns of percentages have different denominators. The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students 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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-6. Public school and student participation rates in NAEP reading at grade 4, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	School participation			Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	School-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Nation (public)	100	100	7,720	95	202,900
Alabama	99	100	110	95	3,000
Alaska	100	100	170	93	2,800
Arizona	99	99	120	94	3,800
Arkansas	100	100	120	95	3,600
California	100	100	280	95	9,300
Colorado	100	100	120	93	3,600
Connecticut	100	100	110	94	3,200
Delaware	100	100	100	95	3,400
Florida	100	100	220	95	7,300
Georgia	100	100	170	94	5,300
Hawaii	100	100	120	93	3,500
Idaho	100	100	130	95	3,700
Illinois	100	100	190	94	5,200
Indiana	100	100	110	95	3,600
Iowa	100	100	140	96	3,500
Kansas	99	99	140	95	3,200
Kentucky	100	100	150	94	4,700
Louisiana	100	100	120	94	3,400
Maine	100	100	160	94	3,300
Maryland	100	100	170	94	4,300
Massachusetts	100	100	180	94	5,000
Michigan	100	100	150	94	4,100
Minnesota	100	100	140	94	3,700
Mississippi	100	100	110	94	3,000
Missouri	100	100	130	95	3,600
Montana	100	100	190	94	3,200
Nebraska	100	100	160	95	3,100
Nevada	100	100	120	96	4,000
New Hampshire	100	100	130	94	3,300
New Jersey	99	99	110	95	3,100
New Mexico	100	100	150	93	4,100
New York	100	100	160	94	4,800
North Carolina	100	100	170	94	5,400
North Dakota	100	100	250	96	3,000
Ohio	100	100	180	94	4,200
Oklahoma	100	100	140	95	3,100
Oregon	99	99	140	95	3,700
Pennsylvania	100	100	160	94	4,700
Rhode Island	100	100	110	95	3,300
South Carolina	100	100	110	94	3,400
South Dakota	100	100	190	96	3,300
Tennessee	100	100	120	95	3,400
Texas	99	99	300	95	8,900
Utah	100	100	120	94	4,000
Vermont	100	100	220	94	2,700
Virginia	100	100	110	95	3,800
Washington	100	100	130	95	4,000
West Virginia	100	100	150	95	3,100
Wisconsin	100	100	180	95	4,600
Wyoming	100	100	180	95	3,000
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	120	95	2,200
DoDEA ¹	99	97	110	94	3,100

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

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. Columns of percentages have different denominators. 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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-7. Public school and student participation rates in NAEP reading at grade 8, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	School participation			Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	School-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Nation (public)	100	100	6,750	93	157,800
Alabama	100	100	110	94	2,600
Alaska	100	98	120	91	2,400
Arizona	99	99	120	94	2,700
Arkansas	100	100	120	94	2,700
California	100	100	230	93	7,100
Colorado	100	97	120	92	2,600
Connecticut	100	100	110	92	2,600
Delaware	100	100	50	93	2,600
Florida	100	100	210	92	5,900
Georgia	100	100	120	94	3,900
Hawaii	100	100	80	92	2,800
Idaho	100	100	110	94	2,800
Illinois	100	100	210	94	4,100
Indiana	100	100	110	93	2,600
Iowa	100	100	130	93	2,600
Kansas	100	100	140	93	2,700
Kentucky	100	100	140	94	3,700
Louisiana	100	100	120	93	2,500
Maine	100	100	130	92	2,700
Maryland	99	99	150	92	3,300
Massachusetts	99	98	140	92	3,600
Michigan	100	100	160	93	3,800
Minnesota	100	100	140	93	2,900
Mississippi	100	100	110	92	2,500
Missouri	100	100	120	94	2,500
Montana	100	98	190	92	2,500
Nebraska	100	100	140	94	2,500
Nevada	100	97	90	93	2,700
New Hampshire	100	100	90	92	2,600
New Jersey	100	100	110	92	2,500
New Mexico	99	99	130	91	3,200
New York	99	100	170	91	4,000
North Carolina	100	100	150	92	4,200
North Dakota	100	99	190	93	2,100
Ohio	100	100	170	93	3,400
Oklahoma	100	100	150	93	2,400
Oregon	99	99	140	92	2,800
Pennsylvania	100	100	160	92	3,700
Rhode Island	100	100	50	93	2,600
South Carolina	100	100	110	94	2,600
South Dakota	100	100	230	95	2,900
Tennessee	100	100	120	92	2,600
Texas	99	100	210	94	7,200
Utah	100	100	120	92	2,800
Vermont	100	100	120	93	2,000
Virginia	100	100	110	94	2,600
Washington	100	100	140	92	3,000
West Virginia	100	100	110	92	2,700
Wisconsin	100	100	160	94	3,500
Wyoming	100	100	90	93	2,000
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	80	90	2,400
DoDEA ¹	99	95	60	92	1,600

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

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. Columns of percentages have different denominators. 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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-8. Public school and student participation rates for Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in reading, by grade and urban district: 2011

Grade and district	School participation		Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Grade 4				
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Grade 8				
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. The percentages for school-weighted and student-weighted school participation were both at 100 percent for the participating districts in 2011. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

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

Table A-9. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) assessed in NAEP reading with accommodations, by SD/ELL category and type of accommodation: 2011

Type of accommodation	Grade 4			Grade 8		
	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL
Braille version of the text	#	#	#	#	#	#
Breaks	2.6	2.1	0.7	1.4	1.3	0.2
Cue to stay on task	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.3	#
Directions read aloud in English	3.5	2.8	1.2	2.6	2.4	0.4
Directions read aloud in Spanish	0.1	#	0.1	#	#	#
Extended time	8.4	6.1	3.0	7.5	6.4	1.5
Large-print booklet	#	#	#	#	#	#
Magnification device	#	#	#	#	#	#
One-on-one	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.2	#
Other	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	#
School staff administers	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.2	#
Scribe	0.4	0.3	#	0.2	0.2	#
Sign language	#	#	#	#	#	#
Small group	7.7	6.1	2.3	6.4	5.8	1.0
Special equipment	0.3	0.3	#	0.3	0.3	#

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.

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

Inclusion of Students With Disabilities and/or English Language Learners

It is important for NAEP to assess as many students selected to participate as possible. Assessing representative samples of students, including students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), helps to ensure that NAEP results accurately reflect the educational performance of all students in the target population and can continue to serve as a meaningful measure of U.S. students' academic achievement over time.

The National Assessment Governing Board, which sets policy for NAEP, has been exploring ways to ensure that NAEP continues to appropriately include as many students as possible and to do so in a consistent manner for all jurisdictions assessed and reported. In March 2010, the Governing Board adopted a new policy, NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. This policy was the culmination of work with experts in testing and curriculum, and those who work with exceptional children and students learning to speak English. The policy aims to

- maximize participation of sampled students in NAEP,
- reduce variation in exclusion rates for SD and ELL students across states and districts,
- develop uniform national rules for including students in NAEP, and
- ensure that NAEP is fully representative of SD and ELL students.

The policy defines specific inclusion goals for NAEP samples. At the national, state, and district levels, the goal is to include 95 percent of all students selected for the NAEP samples, and 85 percent of those in the NAEP sample who are identified as SD or ELL.

Students are selected to participate in NAEP based on a sampling procedure designed to yield a sample of students that is representative of students in all schools nationwide and in public schools within each state. First, schools are selected, and then students are sampled from within those schools without regard to disability or English language proficiency. Once students are selected, those previously identified as SD or ELL may be offered accommodations or excluded.

States and jurisdictions vary in their proportions of special-needs students and in their policies on inclusion and the use of accommodations. Despite the increasing identification of SD and ELL students in some states, in particular of ELL students at grade 4, NAEP inclusion rates have generally remained steady or increased since 2003. Only a small number of states included a smaller percentage of students in the 2011 NAEP reading assessments than in 2009. At grade 4, inclusion rates increased by more than 1 percentage point for 28 of 52 jurisdictions and decreased by more than 1 percentage point for only 2 states. At grade 8, the inclusion rates increased by more than 1 percentage point for 19 jurisdictions, and no jurisdictions saw a decline of more than 1 percentage point. This reflects efforts on the part of states and jurisdictions to include all students who can meaningfully participate in the NAEP assessments. The new NAEP inclusion policy is an effort to ensure that this trend continues.

Determining whether each jurisdiction has met the NAEP inclusion goals involves looking at three different inclusion rates—an overall inclusion rate, an inclusion rate for SD students, and an inclusion rate for ELL students. Each inclusion rate is calculated as the percentage of sampled students who were included in the assessment (i.e., were not excluded).

Inclusion rate percentages are estimates because they are based on representative samples of students rather than on the entire population of students. As such, the inclusion rates are associated with a margin of error. The margin of error for each jurisdiction's inclusion rate was taken into account when comparing it to the corresponding inclusion goal. For example, if the point estimate of a state's overall inclusion rate was 93 percent and had a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points, the state was considered to have met the 95 percent inclusion goal because the 95 percent goal falls within the margin of error, which ranges from 90 percent to 96 percent. Refer to the Technical Notes for more details about how the margin of error was used in these calculations.

Variations in inclusion rates across jurisdictions or from year to year may affect the comparability of results. Because SD and ELL students tend to score lower than average, it might be expected that excluding more of these students would tend to raise scores and that including more would tend to lower scores. However, across states, correlations between inclusion rates and average 2011 reading scores at grade 4 (-.34) and grade 8 (-.28) showed only a weak association. With regard to state trends, changes in the percentages of students included and changes in average reading scores from 2009 to 2011 showed a weak negative correlation (-.23) at grade 8, but a more moderate correlation (-.45) at grade 4. Therefore, there was a moderate tendency at grade 4 for states with score gains to also have excluded a larger percentage of students in 2011 compared to 2009.

Confidence intervals for state inclusion rates

NAEP endeavors to include as many sampled students as possible in the assessment, including students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), and has established specific inclusion goals: 95 percent of all sampled students and 85 percent of sampled students identified as SD or ELL. Inclusion rates were computed for each state/jurisdiction participating in the 2011 assessment and compared to NAEP inclusion goals. Three inclusion percentages were computed for each state/jurisdiction. An overall inclusion percentage represents included students as a percentage of all students sampled within the state/jurisdiction. In addition, separate percentages were computed to report included students as a percentage of the state/jurisdiction sample that was identified as SD or ELL.

Inclusion percentages are estimates based on a sample, and each estimate has a measure of uncertainty or margin of error. Confidence intervals quantify this uncertainty due to sampling, resulting in interval estimates of the inclusion percentages. Therefore, confidence intervals for inclusion percentages were used to determine upper and lower confidence bounds around the inclusion point estimates.

When determining whether each state/jurisdiction met the NAEP inclusion goals, the confidence intervals were used, rather than just the point estimates. This means that if the inclusion goal of either 95 percent or 85 percent fell within the corresponding confidence interval, the state/jurisdiction was considered as having met the goal. States/jurisdictions for which the upper bound of the confidence interval was less than 95 percent (or 85 percent) did not meet the inclusion goal.

See the National Assessment Governing Board's policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners at http://www.nagb.org/policies/PoliciesPDFs/Reporting%20and%20Dissemination/naep_testandreport_studentswithdisabilities.pdf.

Forty-two of the states/jurisdictions participating in the 2011 reading assessment met the 95 percent inclusion goal at both grades 4 and 8. See appendix table A-10 for the inclusion rates as a percentage of all students in each state/jurisdiction, and table A-X11 for the rates as a percentage of the SD or ELL students.

Twenty-one of the districts participating in the 2011 reading assessment met the 95 percent inclusion goal at both grades 4 and 8. See appendix table A-12 for the inclusion rates as a percentage of all students in each state/jurisdiction, and table A-13 for the rates as a percentage of the SD or ELL students.

Table A-10. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public school students included in NAEP reading, as a percentage of all students, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	Grade 4			Grade 8		
	Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval		Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval	
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper
Nation (public)	96 ¹	95.9	96.3	97 ¹	96.4	96.7
Alabama	98 ¹	97.0	98.3	98 ¹	97.1	98.5
Alaska	98 ¹	97.4	98.4	98 ¹	97.6	98.6
Arizona	99 ¹	97.9	99.0	99 ¹	98.3	99.2
Arkansas	99 ¹	98.3	99.1	99 ¹	98.0	98.9
California	98 ¹	96.8	98.5	98 ¹	97.1	98.4
Colorado	99 ¹	98.1	99.0	98 ¹	97.8	98.9
Connecticut	98 ¹	96.7	98.5	98 ¹	96.8	98.4
Delaware	93	92.1	93.8	95 ¹	94.0	95.4
Florida	98 ¹	97.2	98.3	98 ¹	97.0	98.2
Georgia	94	92.4	94.8	96 ¹	94.7	96.4
Hawaii	98 ¹	97.1	98.2	98 ¹	97.2	98.3
Idaho	98 ¹	97.5	98.7	98 ¹	97.7	98.7
Illinois	98 ¹	97.6	98.9	98 ¹	97.8	98.8
Indiana	99 ¹	98.3	99.1	98 ¹	97.0	98.5
Iowa	99 ¹	98.4	99.4	99 ¹	98.8	99.5
Kansas	98 ¹	97.2	98.3	98 ¹	97.4	98.6
Kentucky	91	90.2	92.2	93	92.1	93.4
Louisiana	99 ¹	98.1	99.1	99 ¹	98.5	99.3
Maine	98 ¹	98.0	98.8	98 ¹	97.6	98.8
Maryland	90	88.6	90.6	92	90.5	92.5
Massachusetts	94 ¹	93.3	95.2	94	92.5	94.7
Michigan	96 ¹	95.5	97.2	95 ¹	94.2	96.0
Minnesota	98 ¹	97.8	98.9	97 ¹	96.3	97.8
Mississippi	99 ¹	98.4	99.3	99 ¹	98.6	99.3
Missouri	98 ¹	97.8	98.8	99 ¹	98.0	99.0
Montana	96 ¹	94.9	96.5	96 ¹	95.2	96.6
Nebraska	96 ¹	94.4	96.7	95 ¹	94.6	95.9
Nevada	99 ¹	98.4	99.2	98 ¹	97.3	98.6
New Hampshire	97 ¹	96.3	97.9	96 ¹	94.9	96.6
New Jersey	91	89.2	92.4	93	91.2	94.3
New Mexico	94 ¹	92.9	95.4	94	93.6	94.9
New York	97 ¹	96.2	98.3	97 ¹	96.0	97.6
North Carolina	98 ¹	97.2	98.3	98 ¹	97.2	98.5
North Dakota	94	92.6	94.3	92	91.2	92.9
Ohio	94 ¹	92.5	95.6	94 ¹	93.1	95.2
Oklahoma	95 ¹	93.9	96.0	96 ¹	94.7	96.5
Oregon	97 ¹	96.7	97.9	98 ¹	97.2	98.3
Pennsylvania	97 ¹	96.2	97.8	97 ¹	95.8	97.7
Rhode Island	98 ¹	97.3	98.4	99 ¹	98.4	99.1
South Carolina	97 ¹	96.2	98.0	95 ¹	93.6	95.6
South Dakota	97 ¹	96.1	97.4	97 ¹	96.2	97.3
Tennessee	93	91.7	94.0	94	92.6	94.6
Texas	90	88.4	91.5	94	92.7	95.0
Utah	96 ¹	94.7	96.8	96 ¹	95.4	97.0
Vermont	98 ¹	96.9	98.2	97 ¹	96.7	97.7
Virginia	97 ¹	96.3	97.9	96 ¹	95.4	97.2
Washington	97 ¹	96.4	97.8	98 ¹	97.3	98.3
West Virginia	98 ¹	97.7	98.7	99 ¹	98.0	98.9
Wisconsin	98 ¹	97.6	98.6	98 ¹	97.2	98.3
Wyoming	98 ¹	97.5	98.5	98 ¹	97.4	98.5
Other jurisdictions						
District of Columbia	97 ¹	95.9	97.4	97 ¹	96.4	97.7
DoDEA ²	93	92.4	94.0	97 ¹	95.9	97.4

¹ The state/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board goal of 95 percent.

² Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools).

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

Table A-11. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL) included in NAEP reading, as a percentage of identified SD or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	Percentage of identified SD or ELL students			
	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	SD	ELL	SD	ELL
Nation (public)	77 (0.5)	89 ¹ (0.7)	76 (0.5)	86 ¹ (0.8)
Alabama	77 (3.5)	95 ¹ (3.4)	82 ¹ (2.9)	‡ (†)
Alaska	92 ¹ (1.4)	92 ¹ (1.5)	88 ¹ (1.7)	96 ¹ (1.1)
Arizona	88 ¹ (2.2)	99 ¹ (0.6)	89 ¹ (2.2)	‡ (†)
Arkansas	89 ¹ (1.5)	98 ¹ (0.9)	87 ¹ (2.1)	97 ¹ (1.6)
California	80 ¹ (3.3)	96 ¹ (0.8)	78 (3.3)	95 ¹ (1.1)
Colorado	89 ¹ (1.8)	98 ¹ (0.7)	87 ¹ (2.1)	92 ¹ (2.2)
Connecticut	88 ¹ (2.0)	84 ¹ (4.8)	87 ¹ (2.4)	77 ¹ (5.9)
Delaware	60 (2.6)	63 (4.4)	67 (2.2)	‡ (†)
Florida	89 ¹ (1.5)	92 ¹ (1.5)	87 ¹ (1.9)	83 ¹ (2.8)
Georgia	54 (3.4)	69 (7.3)	62 (3.1)	60 (8.9)
Hawaii	87 ¹ (2.1)	89 ¹ (2.4)	93 ¹ (1.6)	84 ¹ (1.9)
Idaho	84 ¹ (2.5)	94 ¹ (2.4)	82 ¹ (3.0)	87 ¹ (2.7)
Illinois	91 ¹ (1.6)	92 ¹ (2.3)	90 ¹ (1.6)	91 ¹ (2.7)
Indiana	93 ¹ (1.2)	98 ¹ (0.8)	86 ¹ (2.2)	90 ¹ (3.7)
Iowa	93 ¹ (1.6)	98 ¹ (1.1)	95 ¹ (1.1)	99 ¹ (0.9)
Kansas	87 ¹ (1.5)	94 ¹ (1.6)	84 ¹ (2.6)	98 ¹ (1.4)
Kentucky	45 (2.3)	37 (5.2)	39 (2.6)	59 (6.7)
Louisiana	89 ¹ (1.9)	100 ¹ (0.0)	92 ¹ (1.9)	‡ (†)
Maine	91 ¹ (1.2)	98 ¹ (1.6)	90 ¹ (1.5)	‡ (†)
Maryland	31 (2.2)	52 (4.3)	30 (3.3)	45 (6.6)
Massachusetts	71 (2.6)	82 ¹ (3.2)	69 (2.9)	70 (4.8)
Michigan	75 (3.1)	93 ¹ (2.4)	63 (3.3)	79 ¹ (4.5)
Minnesota	90 ¹ (1.8)	98 ¹ (0.8)	78 (2.7)	94 ¹ (2.3)
Mississippi	90 ¹ (2.2)	‡ (†)	88 ¹ (2.2)	‡ (†)
Missouri	88 ¹ (1.7)	97 ¹ (1.7)	90 ¹ (1.7)	‡ (†)
Montana	64 (3.5)	87 ¹ (4.0)	68 (2.8)	‡ (†)
Nebraska	80 (2.0)	84 ¹ (5.0)	70 (2.2)	‡ (†)
Nevada	90 ¹ (1.8)	99 ¹ (0.3)	83 ¹ (2.4)	94 ¹ (1.8)
New Hampshire	83 ¹ (2.1)	90 ¹ (3.3)	77 (2.2)	‡ (†)
New Jersey	50 (3.9)	55 (8.8)	64 (3.7)	‡ (†)
New Mexico	72 (2.9)	82 ¹ (2.4)	66 (2.4)	80 (1.8)
New York	90 ¹ (2.4)	86 ¹ (2.6)	85 ¹ (2.1)	79 ¹ (4.1)
North Carolina	84 ¹ (2.0)	96 ¹ (1.1)	85 ¹ (2.2)	91 ¹ (2.7)
North Dakota	58 (2.4)	64 (4.7)	48 (2.8)	40 (5.4)
Ohio	59 (3.9)	83 ¹ (5.7)	62 (3.4)	73 (6.6)
Oklahoma	74 (2.9)	80 ¹ (5.3)	75 (2.7)	76 ¹ (6.5)
Oregon	84 ¹ (1.8)	95 ¹ (1.2)	85 ¹ (1.9)	94 ¹ (2.0)
Pennsylvania	85 ¹ (1.9)	74 (4.9)	84 ¹ (2.5)	66 (10.1)
Rhode Island	88 ¹ (1.6)	91 ¹ (2.6)	95 ¹ (0.8)	88 ¹ (3.3)
South Carolina	82 ¹ (3.0)	91 ¹ (2.4)	57 (3.8)	80 ¹ (5.6)
South Dakota	82 (1.6)	87 ¹ (3.1)	74 (2.5)	71 (5.1)
Tennessee	50 (4.1)	82 ¹ (3.5)	47 (4.3)	‡ (†)
Texas	48 (3.8)	75 (2.7)	53 (3.6)	80 ¹ (3.7)
Utah	72 (3.5)	85 ¹ (3.0)	70 (3.0)	75 (4.7)
Vermont	86 ¹ (1.9)	92 ¹ (3.3)	85 ¹ (1.8)	‡ (†)
Virginia	81 ¹ (2.5)	92 ¹ (1.9)	77 (3.0)	78 (3.9)
Washington	82 ¹ (2.3)	94 ¹ (1.1)	86 ¹ (1.7)	88 ¹ (2.9)
West Virginia	90 ¹ (1.4)	‡ (†)	89 ¹ (1.8)	‡ (†)
Wisconsin	88 ¹ (1.4)	95 ¹ (1.7)	86 ¹ (1.8)	92 ¹ (2.5)
Wyoming	89 ¹ (1.4)	91 ¹ (2.4)	88 ¹ (1.9)	‡ (†)
Other jurisdictions				
District of Columbia	83 ¹ (2.2)	88 ¹ (2.2)	87 ¹ (1.6)	83 ¹ (2.9)
DoDEA ²	55 (2.3)	69 (3.4)	72 (3.8)	75 (4.8)

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

(†) Not applicable. Standard error estimate cannot be accurately determined.

¹ The state/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board goal of 85 percent.

² Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools).

NOTE: Standard errors of the estimates appear in parentheses.

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

Table A-12. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public school students included in NAEP reading, as a percentage of all students, by jurisdiction: 2011

Jurisdiction	Grade 4			Grade 8		
	Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval		Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval	
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper
Nation	96 ²	95.9	96.3	97 ²	96.4	96.7
Large city¹	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA

¹ Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

² The district/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board's goal of 95 percent.

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

Table A-13. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL) included in NAEP reading, as a percentage of identified SD or ELL students, by jurisdiction: 2011

Jurisdiction	Percentage of identified SD or ELL students							
	Grade 4				Grade 8			
	SD		ELL		SD		ELL	
Nation	77	(0.5)	89 ²	(0.7)	76	(0.5)	86 ²	(0.8)
Large city¹	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

† Not applicable. Standard error estimate cannot be accurately determined.

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

¹ Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

² The district/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board's goal of 85 percent.

NOTE: Standard errors of the estimates appear in parentheses.

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

Accommodations

Prior to 1998, no testing accommodations were provided to students taking the NAEP reading assessment, resulting in the exclusion of students who could not be assessed without them. As the number of identified students with disabilities and English language learners increased over the years, the exclusion of those needing accommodations to participate in NAEP threatened the stability of trend lines (excluding more students in one assessment year than in another might lead to apparent rather than real differences), and threatened to compromise NAEP samples as optimally representative of target populations. Therefore, administration procedures allowing for many of the same testing accommodations provided on state and district assessments (e.g., extra testing time or individual rather than group administration) were introduced in 1998 for national and state NAEP reading assessments.

The percentages of SD/ELL students assessed with the available accommodations in 2011 are presented in table A-15. Students assessed with accommodations typically received some combination of accommodations. In contrast to assessment years prior to 2009 in which students were only counted once in the category reflecting the primary accommodation provided, students are counted in the categories for each accommodation they received in 2011. For example, students assessed in small groups (as compared with standard NAEP sessions of about 30 students) were also usually given extended time and are included in counts for both groups in table A-15.

Since providing accommodations represented a change in testing conditions that could potentially affect the measurement of changes over time, split samples of students were assessed nationally and at the state level in 1998—one sample permitted accommodations, and the other did not. Although the results for both samples are presented in the tables, the comparisons to 1998 in the text are based on just the accommodated samples.

Table A-14. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted: 1992, 1994, and 1998

Grade and SD/ELL category	1992	1994	1998
Grade 4			
SD and/or ELL			
Identified	10	13	16
Excluded	6	5	9
Assessed	4	8	7
SD			
Identified	7	10	11
Excluded	4	4	6
Assessed	3	6	5
ELL			
Identified	3	4	6
Excluded	2	1	3
Assessed	1	2	2
Grade 8			
SD and/or ELL			
Identified	10	13	12
Excluded	7	7	6
Assessed	4	6	7
SD			
Identified	8	11	10
Excluded	5	6	5
Assessed	3	5	5
ELL			
Identified	3	3	3
Excluded	2	1	1
Assessed	1	1	2

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

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, and 1998 Reading Assessments.

Exclusion Rates

Even with the availability of accommodations, some students are excluded from the NAEP assessments by their schools. The decision to exclude any student is made by school staff, who using NAEP guidelines and each student's Individualized Education Program (IEP), decide whether the student can meaningfully be assessed.

Jurisdictions vary in their proportions of special-needs students. These variations, as well as differences in policies and practices regarding the identification and inclusion of special-needs students, lead to differences in exclusion and accommodation rates. These differences should be considered when comparing student performance over time and across jurisdictions. While the effect of exclusion is not precisely known, the validity of comparisons of performance results could be affected if exclusion rates are comparatively high or vary widely over time.

National Exclusion Rates (public and nonpublic school students): In the 1992 national sample, when accommodations were not permitted, about 10 percent of students at grades 4 and 8 were identified as SD and/or ELL, 6 percent were excluded at grade 4 and 7 percent were excluded at grade 8 (table A-14). In 2011, 22 percent at grade 4 and 17 percent at grade 8 were identified as SD and/or ELL, with 4 percent excluded at grade 4 and 3 percent excluded at grade 8 (table A-15). The percentage of SD and/or ELL students assessed with accommodations in 2011 was 10 percent at grade 4 and 9 percent at grade 8. (Note that the denominator for these percentages includes assessed students plus excluded students; it does not include sampled students who were absent or refused to participate. The proportions of SD and/or ELL students excluded and assessed with and without accommodations as a percentage of students identified are provided in table A-16.)

State Exclusion Rates (public school students only): Across the states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1992 reading assessment at grade 4, the percentage of students identified as SD and/or ELL ranged from 7 to 28 percent, and the percentage excluded ranged from 2 to 14 percent (table A-17). In 2011, the state percentages of fourth-graders identified as SD and/or ELL ranged from 11 to 38 percent, and exclusion rates ranged from 1 to 10 percent (table A-18).

Across the states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1998 reading assessment at grade 8, the percentage of students identified as SD and/or ELL ranged from 9 to 23 percent, and the percentage excluded ranged from 2 to 10 percent (table A-19). In 2011, the state percentages of eighth-graders identified as SD and/or ELL ranged from 8 to 23 percent, and exclusion rates ranged from 1 to 8 percent (table A-20).

Rates by state are reported separately for SD and ELL students at each grade in tables A-20 through A-28. Rates are also reported as the percentage of SD and/or ELL students identified in each state in tables A-29 through A-30.

Table A-15. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted: Various years, 1998–2011

Grade and SD/ELL category	1998	2000	2002	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011
Grade 4								
SD and/or ELL								
Identified	16	18	19	20	21	22	21	22
Excluded	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	4
Assessed	10	12	13	14	15	16	16	18
Without accommodations	7	10	9	9	9	9	8	9
With accommodations	3	2	4	5	6	7	8	10
SD								
Identified	10	11	12	13	13	13	13	13
Excluded	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	3
Assessed	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10
Without accommodations	3	5	4	4	3	3	3	3
With accommodations	3	2	3	4	5	5	6	7
ELL								
Identified	6	8	8	10	10	10	10	11
Excluded	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1
Assessed	4	5	6	7	8	8	8	10
Without accommodations	3	5	6	6	6	6	6	6
With accommodations	1	#	1	1	2	2	2	3
Grade 8								
SD and/or ELL								
Identified	12	—	17	17	17	18	17	17
Excluded	4	—	5	5	5	5	4	3
Assessed	9	—	11	12	13	13	13	13
Without accommodations	6	—	8	7	7	6	5	5
With accommodations	2	—	4	5	6	6	8	9
SD								
Identified	10	—	12	13	12	12	12	12
Excluded	3	—	4	4	4	4	3	3
Assessed	7	—	8	9	8	8	9	9
Without accommodations	5	—	5	4	3	2	2	2
With accommodations	2	—	3	5	5	6	7	7
ELL								
Identified	3	—	6	6	6	6	6	6
Excluded	1	—	2	1	1	1	1	1
Assessed	2	—	4	4	5	5	5	5
Without accommodations	2	—	4	4	4	4	3	3
With accommodations	#	—	#	1	1	1	1	2

— Not available.

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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-16. Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP reading, as a percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students, by grade and SD/ELL category: 2011

Grade and SD/ELL category	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students			
	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Grade 4				
SD and/or ELL	17	83	40	44
SD	22	78	21	57
ELL	11	89	58	31
Grade 8				
SD and/or ELL	19	81	29	52
SD	23	77	15	62
ELL	14	86	56	31

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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-17. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1992, 1994, and 1998

State/jurisdiction	1992			1994			1998		
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	11	6	4	14	6	8	17	10	7
Alabama	10	6	4	11	5	5	13	8	5
Arizona	16	7	9	21	7	14	22	10	12
Arkansas	11	5	6	12	6	6	11	5	6
California	28	14	13	31	12	18	31	15	15
Colorado	11	6	4	15	7	8	15	7	8
Connecticut	15	7	8	17	8	8	18	13	6
Delaware	12	6	6	15	6	9	16	7	9
Florida	17	9	8	22	10	11	18	9	9
Georgia	9	5	4	11	5	5	11	7	4
Hawaii	13	6	8	12	5	7	15	5	10
Idaho	9	4	5	12	5	7	—	—	—
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	10	5
Indiana	8	4	3	11	5	6	—	—	—
Iowa	9	4	6	11	5	6	15	8	7
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	6	7
Kentucky	8	4	4	8	4	4	13	9	4
Louisiana	8	4	4	11	6	5	15	12	3
Maine	12	5	6	17	10	7	15	8	7
Maryland	14	7	7	15	7	8	13	10	3
Massachusetts	17	7	10	18	8	10	19	8	11
Michigan	7	5	2	10	6	4	10	7	3
Minnesota	10	4	6	12	4	8	15	4	11
Mississippi	7	5	2	9	6	4	7	4	3
Missouri	11	5	6	12	5	7	14	7	7
Montana	—	—	—	11	4	8	10	4	6
Nebraska	13	4	9	16	4	12	—	—	—
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	12	7
New Hampshire	12	4	7	15	6	9	14	5	9
New Jersey	10	6	5	12	6	6	—	—	—
New Mexico	13	8	6	18	8	10	28	11	16
New York	13	6	7	15	8	7	14	9	5
North Carolina	12	4	7	14	5	9	15	10	5
North Dakota	10	2	8	10	2	8	—	—	—
Ohio	10	6	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oklahoma	13	8	4	—	—	—	15	9	6
Oregon	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	7	12
Pennsylvania	9	4	5	11	6	5	—	—	—
Rhode Island	16	7	9	15	5	10	20	7	12
South Carolina	11	6	5	13	7	6	16	11	5
Tennessee	11	5	7	13	6	6	13	4	9
Texas	17	8	9	24	11	13	26	14	13
Utah	10	4	6	12	5	7	14	5	9
Virginia	12	6	6	13	7	6	15	8	7
Washington	—	—	—	15	5	9	15	5	10
West Virginia	8	5	3	12	7	5	12	9	3
Wisconsin	11	7	4	13	7	6	16	10	6
Wyoming	11	4	7	11	4	7	14	4	9
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	12	10	3	12	9	3	16	11	6
DoDEA ¹	—	—	—	9	5	—	8	4	3

— Not available.

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

NOTE: Alaska, South Dakota, and Vermont did not participate in NAEP reading assessments from 1992 to 1998. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, and 1998 Reading Assessments.

Table A-18. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	18	7	11	7	3	21	7	14	10	4
Alabama	13	8	4	3	1	14	3	12	9	2
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	22	10	12	10	1	28	8	21	18	3
Arkansas	11	5	6	4	2	14	5	10	8	2
California	31	14	16	15	1	34	5	29	28	1
Colorado	15	6	9	6	3	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	18	10	8	5	3	16	5	11	5	6
Delaware	16	1	15	11	4	17	8	9	4	5
Florida	18	6	12	8	5	25	7	18	10	8
Georgia	11	5	6	3	3	13	4	9	6	3
Hawaii	15	5	10	9	1	18	6	12	7	5
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	17	4	13	11	2
Illinois	14	6	8	6	2	20	7	14	8	6
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	13	5	9	7	2
Iowa	15	5	10	7	3	16	8	8	3	5
Kansas	12	4	8	5	4	19	5	14	7	7
Kentucky	13	7	5	3	2	12	8	4	3	1
Louisiana	15	7	8	3	5	19	10	9	3	6
Maine	15	7	7	4	3	17	6	11	5	6
Maryland	13	6	8	4	4	14	7	7	5	2
Massachusetts	19	5	14	9	5	19	6	13	4	9
Michigan	10	6	4	3	1	14	7	6	5	1
Minnesota	15	3	12	9	3	19	5	13	10	4
Mississippi	7	4	3	2	#	7	4	3	2	1
Missouri	14	6	8	3	4	16	9	8	4	3
Montana	10	2	7	5	2	15	6	8	4	4
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	21	5	15	9	6
Nevada	20	11	9	8	1	27	10	17	14	3
New Hampshire	14	3	11	6	5	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	28	9	18	16	2	37	10	27	23	4
New York	14	7	7	2	4	18	8	9	3	6
North Carolina	15	7	9	3	6	19	12	7	3	4
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	18	5	13	9	3
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	14	8	5	4	2
Oklahoma	15	9	6	5	1	21	5	15	10	5
Oregon	20	6	14	10	4	25	8	17	13	4
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	14	5	10	4	5
Rhode Island	20	7	13	9	4	25	6	19	8	11
South Carolina	16	8	9	6	3	16	5	12	9	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	13	4	9	8	2	14	3	10	9	1
Texas	26	13	14	11	3	27	11	16	14	2
Utah	14	6	8	6	2	19	6	13	9	4
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	15	5	10	4	6
Virginia	15	6	9	4	5	18	10	8	5	3
Washington	15	5	10	7	3	15	5	11	7	4
West Virginia	12	8	4	2	1	16	10	5	3	2
Wisconsin	16	8	8	5	3	19	8	10	5	5
Wyoming	14	3	10	6	4	17	3	15	7	7
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	16	9	8	5	3	19	8	11	5	5
DoDEA ¹	8	3	4	3	1	16	3	12	8	4

See notes at end of table.

Table A-18. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	22	6	16	10	5	23	7	16	10	7
Alabama	12	2	10	7	3	13	2	11	8	3
Alaska	29	3	27	20	7	32	3	28	17	12
Arizona	28	7	21	18	2	29	6	23	16	7
Arkansas	16	6	10	7	3	17	8	9	5	3
California	38	5	32	30	2	39	5	34	31	3
Colorado	18	3	15	7	8	22	4	18	5	13
Connecticut	15	5	10	4	6	17	3	13	4	9
Delaware	18	11	7	4	3	20	13	7	4	3
Florida	25	5	20	9	11	25	6	18	5	14
Georgia	16	4	12	6	5	15	6	10	6	4
Hawaii	17	4	13	6	7	18	3	15	7	8
Idaho	18	4	14	12	3	17	3	14	11	3
Illinois	22	8	14	7	7	22	7	14	8	6
Indiana	15	4	11	6	5	19	5	14	6	8
Iowa	17	7	11	4	6	19	6	13	4	9
Kansas	15	3	12	4	9	19	4	15	6	8
Kentucky	15	9	6	5	1	15	9	7	3	3
Louisiana	21	6	15	3	12	24	14	10	3	7
Maine	19	7	12	5	7	18	6	12	5	7
Maryland	16	7	9	6	3	15	6	9	4	5
Massachusetts	22	4	17	4	13	25	8	17	6	11
Michigan	15	7	8	5	3	16	7	9	5	5
Minnesota	19	3	16	10	6	20	3	17	9	8
Mississippi	10	6	4	3	1	13	4	9	7	2
Missouri	18	8	10	5	5	17	8	10	5	5
Montana	16	5	12	6	6	16	5	11	4	6
Nebraska	20	5	15	9	6	23	5	17	9	8
Nevada	26	8	17	13	5	25	7	18	13	5
New Hampshire	19	4	15	5	10	21	4	17	5	12
New Jersey	17	5	12	2	10	18	5	12	3	9
New Mexico	41	8	33	23	10	34	10	24	16	8
New York	19	8	11	3	8	20	6	14	2	13
North Carolina	20	7	13	5	8	22	4	18	5	13
North Dakota	17	4	13	9	4	16	5	10	6	4
Ohio	13	6	7	2	5	14	8	6	2	4
Oklahoma	22	6	16	11	5	22	6	16	7	9
Oregon	26	9	17	12	5	28	7	21	15	7
Pennsylvania	15	4	12	3	9	17	5	13	5	8
Rhode Island	26	5	21	8	13	25	4	22	9	13
South Carolina	18	8	10	8	2	17	7	11	8	3
South Dakota	18	4	14	8	5	18	5	13	8	5
Tennessee	15	4	11	8	2	13	7	6	3	2
Texas	26	11	15	14	1	26	11	16	13	3
Utah	22	5	17	11	6	21	4	17	11	6
Vermont	18	6	12	4	7	16	5	11	5	7
Virginia	19	10	9	5	4	23	12	11	7	4
Washington	20	5	15	10	5	20	4	16	8	8
West Virginia	15	9	6	4	2	18	5	12	9	4
Wisconsin	19	6	13	4	9	20	6	14	5	9
Wyoming	18	2	16	7	10	20	2	18	7	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	18	6	12	3	9	20	7	12	3	9
DoDEA ¹	15	3	12	7	6	16	4	12	7	6

See notes at end of table.

Table A-18. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	23	6	17	10	7	23	5	18	9	9
Alabama	14	3	11	8	3	12	2	10	7	3
Alaska	28	4	23	12	11	25	3	22	6	16
Arizona	25	6	19	13	6	26	4	22	13	8
Arkansas	20	7	12	5	7	17	1	16	4	12
California	40	4	36	32	4	36	3	33	28	5
Colorado	24	4	20	10	11	21	3	18	6	12
Connecticut	18	4	15	4	11	18	4	14	2	12
Delaware	22	12	11	4	7	18	8	11	3	8
Florida	22	7	16	2	14	23	5	19	4	15
Georgia	15	8	7	4	3	14	5	9	4	5
Hawaii	19	4	15	7	8	20	2	18	5	13
Idaho	18	3	15	9	6	15	3	12	6	6
Illinois	23	7	16	9	8	22	4	18	5	13
Indiana	20	5	15	7	8	19	5	15	6	9
Iowa	17	5	12	4	8	18	5	14	3	10
Kansas	19	6	14	8	6	22	6	16	8	9
Kentucky	17	8	9	6	3	17	8	9	5	4
Louisiana	19	4	15	4	12	22	2	20	4	16
Maine	20	6	14	5	9	20	4	15	3	12
Maryland	17	9	9	4	5	19	11	8	2	6
Massachusetts	23	6	16	6	10	24	5	19	7	12
Michigan	16	5	11	5	6	17	4	12	6	7
Minnesota	21	4	17	9	8	21	3	19	9	9
Mississippi	12	2	9	6	4	10	1	9	4	5
Missouri	17	4	14	5	8	16	4	12	4	8
Montana	16	4	12	5	7	14	4	11	4	6
Nebraska	22	5	17	9	8	24	5	19	10	9
Nevada	32	8	24	16	8	30	4	26	13	13
New Hampshire	21	4	17	4	13	21	3	17	3	14
New Jersey	17	7	10	1	9	19	9	10	2	8
New Mexico	33	12	21	15	6	26	7	19	10	9
New York	23	6	16	2	15	22	5	18	1	16
North Carolina	22	3	19	6	13	19	3	17	5	12
North Dakota	17	9	8	5	3	17	8	10	5	5
Ohio	17	8	9	3	6	16	6	9	2	8
Oklahoma	20	7	12	7	6	19	7	11	5	7
Oregon	28	5	22	13	9	26	4	22	10	12
Pennsylvania	18	5	13	5	8	18	3	15	4	11
Rhode Island	25	5	21	7	13	22	4	19	5	13
South Carolina	18	4	14	8	6	19	5	14	8	5
South Dakota	18	6	13	9	4	16	6	10	7	3
Tennessee	17	11	7	5	2	16	9	7	3	4
Texas	26	10	16	12	4	29	9	20	16	3
Utah	22	6	16	10	6	19	6	13	7	7
Vermont	21	7	14	6	9	21	4	17	4	13
Virginia	21	8	13	7	6	20	4	15	6	9
Washington	21	5	16	10	6	21	4	17	10	7
West Virginia	18	2	16	10	7	17	2	15	9	7
Wisconsin	20	5	14	6	8	20	4	16	4	12
Wyoming	19	4	15	7	8	18	2	16	5	12
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	22	14	8	2	7	20	11	10	2	7
DoDEA ¹	16	5	11	6	5	18	6	12	6	6

See notes at end of table.

Table A-18. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	23	4	19	9	10
Alabama	12	2	10	6	4
Alaska	27	2	25	6	20
Arizona	22	1	20	7	13
Arkansas	20	1	18	5	13
California	38	2	35	29	6
Colorado	25	1	23	10	13
Connecticut	19	2	17	2	15
Delaware	19	7	12	4	8
Florida	23	2	21	3	18
Georgia	16	6	10	4	6
Hawaii	20	2	18	6	11
Idaho	15	2	13	5	7
Illinois	21	2	19	6	13
Indiana	22	1	21	7	14
Iowa	19	1	18	3	15
Kansas	24	2	22	10	12
Kentucky	16	9	8	4	4
Louisiana	22	1	21	4	17
Maine	20	2	19	4	15
Maryland	19	10	9	2	7
Massachusetts	25	6	19	7	12
Michigan	16	4	13	6	7
Minnesota	23	2	22	11	10
Mississippi	11	1	10	5	6
Missouri	16	2	15	5	9
Montana	14	4	9	4	5
Nebraska	23	4	19	8	11
Nevada	35	1	34	16	18
New Hampshire	19	3	16	3	14
New Jersey	20	9	10	2	9
New Mexico	27	6	21	11	10
New York	23	3	20	1	19
North Carolina	21	2	19	7	12
North Dakota	17	6	10	4	6
Ohio	17	6	11	2	9
Oklahoma	21	5	16	6	9
Oregon	28	3	25	12	13
Pennsylvania	18	3	15	4	11
Rhode Island	19	2	17	5	12
South Carolina	18	3	16	8	7
South Dakota	19	3	16	9	8
Tennessee	17	7	10	3	7
Texas	30	10	20	17	3
Utah	19	4	14	7	8
Vermont	19	2	17	3	14
Virginia	19	3	16	7	10
Washington	22	3	20	8	12
West Virginia	18	2	16	8	8
Wisconsin	21	2	19	3	16
Wyoming	19	2	17	4	12
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	21	3	18	2	16
DoDEA ¹	19	7	12	5	7

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: 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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-19. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1998

State/jurisdiction	1998		
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	14	6	7
Alabama	12	6	6
Arizona	17	7	11
Arkansas	12	7	5
California	23	8	15
Colorado	14	5	9
Connecticut	15	8	7
Delaware	14	6	8
Florida	17	5	12
Georgia	12	5	7
Hawaii	15	6	9
Illinois	12	6	6
Kansas	12	5	7
Kentucky	10	5	5
Louisiana	14	10	4
Maine	14	7	7
Maryland	12	7	5
Massachusetts	17	7	10
Minnesota	13	4	9
Mississippi	11	7	3
Missouri	13	6	6
Montana	11	3	8
Nevada	15	8	8
New Mexico	22	7	15
New York	16	10	6
North Carolina	14	9	5
Oklahoma	13	9	5
Oregon	14	4	11
Rhode Island	16	5	12
South Carolina	12	6	5
Tennessee	14	4	9
Texas	19	7	12
Utah	11	5	7
Virginia	13	7	6
Washington	13	4	8
West Virginia	14	8	6
Wisconsin	14	8	6
Wyoming	10	2	8
Other jurisdictions			
District of Columbia	14	9	5
DoDEA ¹	9	4	4

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

NOTE: Alaska, South Dakota, and Vermont did not participate in the 1998 NAEP reading assessment. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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

Table A-20. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	4	10	7	3	18	6	12	8	4
Alabama	12	6	6	5	#	14	2	12	11	1
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	17	5	12	10	1	21	5	16	14	2
Arkansas	12	5	6	5	1	15	5	10	9	2
California	23	4	19	17	2	26	4	23	21	2
Colorado	14	4	10	7	3	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	15	6	9	7	3	17	4	12	6	6
Delaware	14	2	13	10	2	15	6	9	2	6
Florida	17	5	12	9	3	21	6	15	8	8
Georgia	12	4	8	5	3	13	4	8	5	3
Hawaii	15	5	10	7	3	20	5	15	10	5
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	10	8	2
Illinois	12	4	8	6	3	16	4	13	7	6
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	11	7	3
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	12	4	8	6	2	16	5	11	6	5
Kentucky	10	3	6	4	3	12	7	5	4	1
Louisiana	14	5	9	4	5	16	10	6	3	3
Maine	14	5	9	6	3	17	4	13	8	6
Maryland	12	3	9	3	5	15	4	10	8	2
Massachusetts	17	4	12	8	5	20	6	14	6	8
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	13	7	6	4	2
Minnesota	13	1	12	9	3	15	3	12	9	3
Mississippi	11	6	5	4	1	10	5	5	3	1
Missouri	13	4	9	6	3	15	8	8	4	4
Montana	11	4	8	6	1	13	4	9	7	2
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	17	7	10	7	2
Nevada	15	6	9	8	2	20	6	14	12	2
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	22	8	14	10	4	31	8	23	17	5
New York	16	8	8	3	5	20	9	11	4	7
North Carolina	14	6	8	3	5	18	9	9	3	6
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	15	4	11	8	2
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	12	7	5	4	1
Oklahoma	13	9	4	4	1	17	4	13	10	4
Oregon	14	4	10	6	4	18	5	13	10	3
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	15	3	12	4	8
Rhode Island	16	6	10	9	1	20	5	15	8	7
South Carolina	12	5	7	5	1	14	5	9	6	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	14	6	8	7	1	13	3	9	9	1
Texas	19	5	13	11	3	20	8	12	11	1
Utah	11	4	7	6	2	15	4	11	9	2
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	18	5	13	8	6
Virginia	13	5	8	4	3	17	8	9	5	4
Washington	13	4	9	6	3	14	4	10	6	5
West Virginia	14	7	7	4	2	16	10	7	4	2
Wisconsin	14	5	9	5	4	16	7	9	4	5
Wyoming	10	2	8	7	1	14	3	11	6	6
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	14	5	9	6	3	21	7	13	5	8
DoDEA ¹	9	1	7	5	2	11	2	9	6	3

See notes at end of table.

Table A-20. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	19	5	13	8	5	19	5	13	7	6
Alabama	14	3	11	9	2	14	2	12	10	2
Alaska	25	2	23	15	7	25	2	23	14	9
Arizona	25	6	19	15	3	23	4	18	11	8
Arkansas	16	5	11	7	4	15	6	9	5	4
California	29	4	25	22	3	28	3	25	21	4
Colorado	15	3	11	6	6	15	4	12	4	8
Connecticut	16	4	12	5	7	17	3	13	4	9
Delaware	17	9	8	3	5	17	11	6	4	2
Florida	23	6	17	6	12	20	5	15	3	12
Georgia	12	3	9	5	5	14	5	9	4	5
Hawaii	21	5	16	9	7	19	4	15	7	8
Idaho	17	4	13	12	1	15	3	12	9	4
Illinois	17	5	11	5	7	17	5	12	4	8
Indiana	16	4	12	7	5	16	4	12	4	8
Iowa	17	5	12	5	7	17	4	13	6	7
Kansas	16	4	12	3	9	15	4	11	4	7
Kentucky	14	7	7	5	1	13	7	6	3	3
Louisiana	15	6	9	3	6	16	8	8	2	7
Maine	17	5	12	6	6	20	7	13	5	8
Maryland	15	3	12	7	5	13	4	8	4	5
Massachusetts	18	4	14	5	9	20	7	13	3	10
Michigan	13	6	7	4	3	15	6	9	5	4
Minnesota	17	3	14	8	5	17	3	14	8	7
Mississippi	9	5	4	3	1	10	4	6	3	2
Missouri	17	8	8	3	5	16	8	8	3	5
Montana	16	5	11	6	5	17	5	12	5	7
Nebraska	18	5	13	8	4	16	4	13	5	7
Nevada	18	4	14	9	5	22	4	18	12	6
New Hampshire	19	3	16	6	9	20	2	17	7	10
New Jersey	18	3	15	3	12	18	5	13	3	10
New Mexico	31	8	23	14	9	27	8	20	13	7
New York	19	7	12	3	9	17	6	11	2	9
North Carolina	18	7	11	3	8	18	4	14	3	11
North Dakota	16	4	11	8	4	17	7	10	5	5
Ohio	13	6	7	3	4	14	7	7	2	5
Oklahoma	18	4	14	9	5	19	5	14	7	7
Oregon	20	6	14	11	4	19	4	14	8	6
Pennsylvania	16	2	14	4	10	16	3	13	3	10
Rhode Island	24	4	19	8	12	23	4	19	8	11
South Carolina	15	8	7	4	3	14	7	7	4	3
South Dakota	13	3	9	6	4	13	3	9	5	4
Tennessee	15	3	12	11	1	13	7	6	4	2
Texas	20	8	12	11	1	20	7	13	10	3
Utah	16	3	12	8	4	17	5	13	7	6
Vermont	18	4	13	7	6	20	4	15	7	9
Virginia	17	9	8	4	4	17	7	10	5	4
Washington	16	4	13	9	4	17	4	12	6	6
West Virginia	18	9	9	4	4	18	6	11	7	5
Wisconsin	16	5	11	3	8	17	6	11	3	8
Wyoming	16	2	13	6	8	17	3	14	6	8
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	20	8	12	4	8	19	8	11	3	9
DoDEA ¹	11	2	10	3	6	11	3	9	4	5

See notes at end of table.

Table A-20. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	19	5	13	7	7	18	4	14	6	8
Alabama	14	4	10	8	2	11	2	10	7	3
Alaska	26	2	24	12	12	21	2	19	5	14
Arizona	19	5	14	9	4	16	3	13	5	8
Arkansas	16	6	10	5	5	16	2	14	3	11
California	29	3	26	22	4	25	2	23	18	6
Colorado	16	3	12	4	8	17	3	13	5	9
Connecticut	17	3	14	4	10	16	3	13	3	9
Delaware	18	7	11	4	7	17	5	12	1	11
Florida	19	5	14	2	12	19	4	15	1	13
Georgia	13	7	6	3	3	13	4	9	3	6
Hawaii	20	3	17	7	10	18	2	16	6	10
Idaho	16	3	12	8	5	12	2	10	4	6
Illinois	17	5	12	3	9	16	4	13	3	10
Indiana	17	5	12	3	9	16	5	11	3	8
Iowa	18	5	13	3	10	16	4	12	3	9
Kansas	16	5	11	5	6	17	5	12	5	7
Kentucky	14	8	6	2	4	13	7	6	2	4
Louisiana	14	3	12	2	10	16	2	14	2	12
Maine	18	6	12	3	8	19	4	15	4	11
Maryland	14	8	6	1	5	14	9	6	1	4
Massachusetts	21	7	14	4	10	21	5	16	4	12
Michigan	17	6	11	3	8	15	4	11	3	8
Minnesota	17	4	13	6	7	17	3	14	6	8
Mississippi	9	3	6	2	5	10	2	8	2	6
Missouri	15	3	11	4	8	14	3	10	3	8
Montana	16	4	12	4	7	14	4	10	4	7
Nebraska	15	4	11	5	6	17	6	11	4	7
Nevada	19	6	14	9	4	17	3	14	5	9
New Hampshire	19	4	15	5	10	21	4	18	5	12
New Jersey	18	7	11	2	9	18	7	11	1	10
New Mexico	29	9	20	15	5	21	6	16	9	7
New York	18	6	11	1	10	20	7	13	1	12
North Carolina	18	4	15	3	12	17	2	15	3	12
North Dakota	15	9	6	3	3	16	8	8	4	4
Ohio	18	9	9	2	7	15	7	9	2	7
Oklahoma	18	7	11	6	6	18	5	13	5	8
Oregon	18	3	15	9	6	18	3	15	8	7
Pennsylvania	19	5	13	4	10	19	3	16	3	12
Rhode Island	21	4	18	6	12	21	3	18	5	13
South Carolina	16	7	9	4	4	16	6	10	5	5
South Dakota	12	6	6	3	4	12	4	7	4	4
Tennessee	14	8	6	4	2	12	7	5	2	3
Texas	19	7	12	8	4	17	5	12	8	4
Utah	17	5	13	8	5	14	5	9	5	5
Vermont	21	5	16	6	10	21	3	18	6	11
Virginia	18	8	10	4	5	17	4	13	4	8
Washington	16	5	11	5	6	14	3	11	4	7
West Virginia	16	2	14	8	6	15	2	13	6	7
Wisconsin	18	7	11	3	9	18	5	13	3	10
Wyoming	16	4	13	5	8	15	3	12	3	9
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	21	13	8	3	5	20	12	8	2	6
DoDEA ¹	11	3	7	2	5	13	4	9	3	6

See notes at end of table.

Table A-20. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	18	3	14	5	9
Alabama	12	2	10	6	4
Alaska	21	2	20	4	16
Arizona	12	1	11	2	8
Arkansas	16	1	14	3	11
California	23	2	21	15	6
Colorado	16	2	14	4	10
Connecticut	16	2	14	2	12
Delaware	16	5	11	2	9
Florida	19	2	16	1	15
Georgia	12	4	8	1	6
Hawaii	20	2	18	8	10
Idaho	12	2	10	4	6
Illinois	17	2	15	3	12
Indiana	17	2	15	2	13
Iowa	17	1	16	3	14
Kansas	18	2	16	7	8
Kentucky	13	7	6	1	4
Louisiana	15	1	14	1	13
Maine	20	2	18	4	14
Maryland	14	8	5	1	4
Massachusetts	22	6	16	3	12
Michigan	14	5	10	3	7
Minnesota	17	3	14	7	7
Mississippi	8	1	7	2	6
Missouri	14	1	12	2	11
Montana	13	4	9	3	6
Nebraska	16	5	12	4	7
Nevada	18	2	16	7	9
New Hampshire	20	4	16	4	12
New Jersey	19	7	12	1	11
New Mexico	22	6	16	10	6
New York	20	3	17	#	17
North Carolina	18	2	16	4	12
North Dakota	16	8	8	2	6
Ohio	16	6	10	2	9
Oklahoma	18	4	14	4	9
Oregon	18	2	15	7	9
Pennsylvania	17	3	14	2	13
Rhode Island	19	1	18	4	14
South Carolina	15	5	10	6	4
South Dakota	13	3	9	4	6
Tennessee	13	6	7	2	5
Texas	18	6	12	9	3
Utah	14	4	10	4	6
Vermont	20	3	17	4	13
Virginia	18	4	14	6	8
Washington	16	2	14	5	9
West Virginia	14	1	13	5	7
Wisconsin	18	2	16	2	14
Wyoming	14	2	12	2	11
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	21	3	19	2	16
DoDEA ¹	14	3	11	3	8

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: 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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-21. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1992, 1994, and 1998

State/jurisdiction	1992			1994			1998		
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	8	5	3	11	5	6	12	7	5
Alabama	10	5	4	11	5	5	12	7	5
Arizona	8	5	3	10	4	6	10	5	5
Arkansas	11	5	5	12	6	6	10	4	6
California	8	4	4	9	4	4	6	3	3
Colorado	8	5	3	11	6	5	10	5	5
Connecticut	11	4	7	13	6	8	14	10	4
Delaware	11	5	6	14	6	9	14	7	8
Florida	13	7	6	17	9	9	14	8	6
Georgia	8	5	3	9	5	5	10	6	3
Hawaii	9	4	5	8	4	4	10	4	6
Idaho	8	3	4	10	4	6	—	—	—
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	7	3
Indiana	7	4	3	11	5	6	—	—	—
Iowa	9	4	5	10	4	6	14	8	7
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	5	6
Kentucky	7	4	4	8	4	4	13	9	4
Louisiana	7	4	3	11	6	5	15	12	3
Maine	11	5	6	16	10	6	13	8	6
Maryland	12	6	6	14	7	7	12	9	2
Massachusetts	14	6	8	14	5	9	16	7	9
Michigan	6	4	2	9	6	3	9	6	2
Minnesota	8	4	4	10	4	7	12	3	9
Mississippi	7	5	2	9	6	3	7	4	3
Missouri	11	4	6	12	5	7	14	7	6
Montana	—	—	—	10	3	7	9	4	5
Nebraska	13	4	9	15	4	11	—	—	—
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	6	4
New Hampshire	11	4	7	15	6	9	14	5	9
New Jersey	7	3	3	9	4	5	—	—	—
New Mexico	10	6	4	14	6	8	14	9	5
New York	8	4	4	10	6	4	9	7	3
North Carolina	11	4	7	13	5	9	13	9	4
North Dakota	10	2	8	9	2	7	—	—	—
Ohio	9	6	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oklahoma	11	8	3	—	—	—	12	9	4
Oregon	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	6	8
Pennsylvania	7	3	4	10	5	4	—	—	—
Rhode Island	10	4	6	12	4	8	14	6	9
South Carolina	11	6	5	13	6	6	16	11	5
Tennessee	11	5	7	12	6	6	12	4	8
Texas	9	5	4	13	7	6	14	7	7
Utah	9	4	5	11	5	6	10	3	6
Virginia	11	6	5	12	6	6	12	7	5
Washington	—	—	—	11	4	7	11	4	7
West Virginia	8	5	3	12	7	5	12	9	3
Wisconsin	9	6	4	11	7	4	13	9	5
Wyoming	10	4	6	11	4	7	13	4	9
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	9	7	2	7	5	1	10	9	1
DoDEA ¹	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	4	3

— Not available.

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

NOTE: Alaska, South Dakota, and Vermont did not participate in NAEP reading assessments from 1992 to 1998. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, and 1998 Reading Assessments.

Table A-22. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	5	7	4	3	13	5	8	4	4
Alabama	13	8	4	3	1	13	2	11	8	2
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	10	5	5	4	1	11	5	7	5	2
Arkansas	10	4	6	4	2	12	4	7	5	2
California	6	3	2	2	1	7	3	4	3	1
Colorado	10	3	8	4	3	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	14	7	7	4	3	13	4	9	4	6
Delaware	14	1	12	9	4	15	7	8	3	5
Florida	14	5	9	5	4	17	5	13	6	7
Georgia	9	4	6	3	3	10	3	7	4	3
Hawaii	10	4	7	5	1	12	4	8	3	4
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	13	4	9	7	2
Illinois	10	3	6	4	2	13	4	9	4	5
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	12	4	8	6	2
Iowa	14	5	9	6	3	15	7	8	3	5
Kansas	9	3	6	3	3	14	4	10	4	5
Kentucky	12	7	5	3	2	11	8	4	2	1
Louisiana	14	7	7	2	5	19	10	8	3	5
Maine	15	7	7	4	3	16	6	10	5	6
Maryland	11	5	6	2	4	12	6	6	4	2
Massachusetts	16	4	12	7	5	16	4	12	3	9
Michigan	9	5	3	2	1	11	7	4	3	1
Minnesota	12	3	9	6	3	13	4	10	6	3
Mississippi	7	4	3	2	#	7	4	3	2	1
Missouri	14	6	7	3	4	15	8	7	4	3
Montana	10	2	7	5	2	13	5	8	4	4
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	18	4	13	7	6
Nevada	10	6	4	4	1	12	5	7	5	2
New Hampshire	13	3	10	5	5	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	14	7	7	5	2	15	7	9	6	3
New York	9	4	5	1	4	14	6	8	2	5
North Carolina	14	6	8	2	6	17	10	6	3	4
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	16	5	11	8	3
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	13	8	5	3	2
Oklahoma	13	9	5	3	1	17	5	13	8	5
Oregon	14	4	10	6	4	16	5	10	7	3
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	13	4	9	4	5
Rhode Island	14	5	10	6	3	19	3	15	6	10
South Carolina	15	7	8	5	3	16	4	11	8	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	12	3	9	7	2	11	3	8	6	1
Texas	14	7	8	5	2	14	8	6	5	2
Utah	10	4	6	4	1	12	4	7	5	3
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	13	5	9	3	6
Virginia	14	6	8	4	4	14	8	6	3	3
Washington	11	4	8	5	3	13	4	9	6	4
West Virginia	12	8	4	2	1	15	10	5	3	2
Wisconsin	13	7	6	4	2	13	6	8	3	4
Wyoming	13	3	10	6	4	14	2	12	5	7
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	10	6	4	2	2	14	7	7	3	4
DoDEA ¹	6	3	4	2	1	10	3	7	4	4

See notes at end of table.

Table A-22. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	5	9	4	5	14	5	9	4	5
Alabama	12	2	10	7	3	12	2	10	7	3
Alaska	16	2	14	7	7	15	3	12	5	8
Arizona	11	5	6	4	2	12	4	8	3	4
Arkansas	13	5	8	5	3	13	6	7	4	3
California	10	3	8	6	2	9	3	7	4	2
Colorado	11	2	9	3	6	12	3	9	2	7
Connecticut	12	4	9	3	6	12	3	9	2	7
Delaware	17	10	6	3	3	17	12	5	2	2
Florida	16	3	13	4	9	19	5	14	4	10
Georgia	13	3	10	5	5	13	5	8	5	3
Hawaii	11	3	9	3	5	10	2	8	2	6
Idaho	12	3	10	7	3	10	3	7	5	2
Illinois	16	5	10	4	7	13	5	8	3	5
Indiana	13	4	10	5	4	16	4	12	5	7
Iowa	15	7	8	2	5	15	5	10	2	8
Kansas	13	2	11	3	8	13	3	10	3	6
Kentucky	14	8	6	4	1	14	8	6	3	3
Louisiana	20	6	14	3	12	23	14	9	2	7
Maine	18	7	11	4	7	18	6	11	5	7
Maryland	13	6	7	4	3	13	5	8	3	4
Massachusetts	17	3	15	2	12	20	7	13	3	10
Michigan	11	6	5	2	3	14	7	7	3	4
Minnesota	13	3	11	6	5	14	3	11	5	6
Mississippi	10	6	4	3	1	12	4	8	6	2
Missouri	16	7	9	4	5	15	7	8	4	4
Montana	14	5	9	4	5	13	5	8	2	6
Nebraska	17	4	13	7	6	17	5	12	6	7
Nevada	13	5	8	5	4	12	5	6	3	3
New Hampshire	17	3	14	4	10	19	3	15	4	11
New Jersey	13	3	10	1	8	15	4	11	2	8
New Mexico	18	4	14	7	7	14	6	8	4	5
New York	14	5	9	1	7	15	4	10	1	10
North Carolina	17	6	10	3	7	17	3	13	3	10
North Dakota	15	4	11	7	4	15	5	9	5	4
Ohio	12	6	7	2	5	13	8	5	1	4
Oklahoma	17	5	11	7	5	18	5	12	5	7
Oregon	17	7	10	6	4	15	5	11	6	4
Pennsylvania	14	3	11	2	8	15	4	11	4	7
Rhode Island	19	3	16	5	11	20	2	17	6	11
South Carolina	16	7	9	7	2	15	6	9	7	3
South Dakota	14	4	10	6	4	15	4	10	6	4
Tennessee	14	4	10	8	2	11	7	4	2	2
Texas	14	7	7	6	1	14	7	7	5	2
Utah	13	3	10	5	5	13	4	9	4	5
Vermont	17	6	11	3	7	15	5	10	4	6
Virginia	14	8	6	3	3	15	10	6	3	2
Washington	14	4	9	5	4	13	3	10	4	6
West Virginia	15	9	6	3	2	17	5	12	8	4
Wisconsin	14	4	9	2	7	14	4	9	2	7
Wyoming	15	2	13	4	10	16	2	14	4	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	13	5	8	2	6	15	7	9	2	7
DoDEA ¹	9	2	7	3	5	11	3	7	3	4

See notes at end of table.

Table A-22. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	5	9	3	6	13	4	10	3	7
Alabama	12	3	9	6	3	10	1	9	6	3
Alaska	15	3	12	4	8	17	3	14	3	11
Arizona	11	4	8	3	4	13	3	10	5	5
Arkansas	13	6	7	3	4	12	1	11	3	8
California	10	3	8	5	3	10	3	7	3	4
Colorado	11	3	8	2	7	11	3	9	2	7
Connecticut	14	2	11	3	9	13	3	10	1	9
Delaware	18	10	8	3	5	15	7	8	2	6
Florida	16	4	12	1	11	17	3	14	4	10
Georgia	13	8	5	3	2	10	4	7	3	4
Hawaii	10	2	8	2	6	10	1	9	1	8
Idaho	11	3	8	4	5	10	3	8	3	4
Illinois	15	5	10	4	6	15	3	12	3	9
Indiana	16	4	12	6	7	16	4	11	5	6
Iowa	13	4	9	2	7	14	4	10	2	8
Kansas	12	5	7	3	4	14	5	9	3	7
Kentucky	15	7	8	5	3	15	7	8	4	3
Louisiana	19	4	15	4	11	20	2	18	3	14
Maine	19	6	13	4	9	18	4	14	3	11
Maryland	13	7	6	3	4	14	9	5	2	4
Massachusetts	18	5	13	3	10	19	5	14	3	11
Michigan	14	4	9	4	5	14	4	10	3	7
Minnesota	14	3	10	5	6	14	2	12	5	7
Mississippi	11	2	8	4	4	10	1	8	4	5
Missouri	16	3	12	5	8	14	3	11	4	7
Montana	12	4	8	2	6	12	4	8	3	6
Nebraska	16	5	11	5	7	18	4	14	6	7
Nevada	13	5	8	4	4	12	3	9	3	5
New Hampshire	18	4	14	3	12	18	3	15	2	13
New Jersey	14	5	8	1	7	16	7	8	2	7
New Mexico	14	7	7	3	4	13	4	8	3	5
New York	15	4	11	1	10	16	4	12	1	11
North Carolina	15	2	13	3	10	15	2	13	3	9
North Dakota	15	8	7	4	3	16	7	9	5	5
Ohio	15	7	7	2	6	14	6	8	2	6
Oklahoma	15	7	9	4	5	15	7	8	3	5
Oregon	15	4	11	5	6	16	3	12	5	8
Pennsylvania	16	5	11	4	8	15	3	13	3	9
Rhode Island	19	3	16	5	11	17	3	14	3	12
South Carolina	14	4	11	5	5	14	4	10	5	5
South Dakota	15	6	10	6	4	15	6	9	6	3
Tennessee	16	10	6	4	2	14	8	5	3	2
Texas	13	7	6	3	3	10	5	5	2	3
Utah	12	5	7	3	4	12	5	7	4	3
Vermont	18	6	12	4	8	19	3	15	3	12
Virginia	15	7	8	3	4	14	4	10	4	7
Washington	15	4	11	6	5	12	3	9	4	5
West Virginia	17	2	15	9	7	17	2	15	8	7
Wisconsin	14	4	9	3	6	15	4	11	3	9
Wyoming	16	4	12	4	8	16	2	14	4	10
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	15	11	4	1	3	14	9	4	1	3
DoDEA ¹	10	3	7	3	4	12	4	8	3	5

See notes at end of table.

Table A-22. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	3	10	3	7
Alabama	10	2	8	5	3
Alaska	16	1	15	3	12
Arizona	12	1	10	3	8
Arkansas	13	1	11	2	9
California	10	2	8	3	5
Colorado	11	1	10	2	8
Connecticut	14	1	12	1	11
Delaware	16	6	10	3	7
Florida	16	2	14	3	11
Georgia	12	5	7	3	4
Hawaii	10	1	8	1	7
Idaho	11	2	9	3	6
Illinois	14	1	13	4	9
Indiana	16	1	15	5	10
Iowa	15	1	14	2	12
Kansas	14	2	12	4	8
Kentucky	15	8	7	4	3
Louisiana	20	1	19	3	16
Maine	17	2	16	2	14
Maryland	14	8	6	1	4
Massachusetts	18	5	13	1	12
Michigan	13	3	10	3	7
Minnesota	15	1	13	5	8
Mississippi	9	1	9	4	5
Missouri	13	2	12	4	8
Montana	12	4	8	3	5
Nebraska	17	3	13	5	8
Nevada	11	1	10	3	7
New Hampshire	17	3	14	2	13
New Jersey	17	8	9	1	7
New Mexico	13	4	10	3	7
New York	16	2	14	1	13
North Carolina	15	2	13	3	10
North Dakota	15	6	9	3	6
Ohio	14	5	9	2	7
Oklahoma	15	4	11	4	8
Oregon	15	2	13	5	8
Pennsylvania	15	2	13	3	10
Rhode Island	14	2	12	1	11
South Carolina	14	2	11	5	7
South Dakota	16	3	13	7	6
Tennessee	14	7	7	3	4
Texas	10	6	5	2	3
Utah	13	4	10	4	6
Vermont	17	2	15	2	13
Virginia	13	2	11	3	7
Washington	14	2	11	4	7
West Virginia	17	2	16	8	8
Wisconsin	14	2	13	2	11
Wyoming	16	2	14	3	11
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	15	3	13	1	12
DoDEA ¹	13	5	7	2	5

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: 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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-23. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1998

State/jurisdiction	1998		
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	11	6	5
Alabama	12	6	6
Arizona	9	5	4
Arkansas	10	6	5
California	8	4	4
Colorado	10	3	6
Connecticut	14	7	7
Delaware	13	6	7
Florida	13	4	9
Georgia	11	5	6
Hawaii	11	5	6
Illinois	9	5	5
Kansas	11	5	6
Kentucky	9	5	5
Louisiana	13	9	4
Maine	13	7	7
Maryland	11	6	5
Massachusetts	15	5	10
Minnesota	10	3	7
Mississippi	11	7	3
Missouri	11	5	6
Montana	11	3	8
Nevada	10	5	5
New Mexico	15	7	9
New York	10	7	4
North Carolina	12	8	5
Oklahoma	12	8	3
Oregon	12	3	8
Rhode Island	13	3	10
South Carolina	12	6	5
Tennessee	13	4	9
Texas	13	5	8
Utah	9	4	5
Virginia	12	6	5
Washington	10	3	7
West Virginia	14	8	6
Wisconsin	13	7	6
Wyoming	10	2	8
Other jurisdictions			
District of Columbia	9	6	2
DoDEA ¹	7	4	4

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

NOTE: Alaska, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Vermont did not participate in the 1998 NAEP reading assessment. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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

Table A-24. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	3	7	5	2	13	5	8	5	4
Alabama	12	6	6	5	#	14	2	12	11	1
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	9	3	6	4	1	11	4	7	6	2
Arkansas	10	4	6	5	1	13	4	9	7	2
California	8	2	6	5	1	10	2	7	6	2
Colorado	10	3	7	5	2	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	13	5	9	6	3	15	3	11	5	6
Delaware	14	2	12	10	2	14	6	8	2	6
Florida	13	4	9	6	2	16	4	12	6	6
Georgia	10	4	6	4	2	10	3	7	4	3
Hawaii	11	4	7	6	2	15	4	12	7	5
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	11	3	8	6	2
Illinois	9	3	7	4	3	12	3	10	4	6
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	10	7	3
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	9	3	7	5	2	13	4	9	5	4
Kentucky	9	3	6	4	3	12	6	5	4	1
Louisiana	13	5	9	4	5	16	10	6	3	3
Maine	13	5	8	6	3	16	4	12	7	6
Maryland	10	3	8	3	5	13	4	9	7	2
Massachusetts	15	3	11	7	5	17	4	13	5	8
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	11	6	5	3	2
Minnesota	10	1	9	7	2	11	2	9	7	3
Mississippi	10	5	5	4	1	10	5	5	3	1
Missouri	12	3	9	6	3	15	7	7	3	4
Montana	11	4	7	6	1	11	4	8	6	2
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	14	5	9	7	2
Nevada	10	4	6	5	1	13	4	9	7	2
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	15	5	10	6	3	18	7	12	7	5
New York	10	4	6	2	5	15	8	8	2	6
North Carolina	13	5	8	3	5	16	8	8	2	6
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	10	7	2
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	12	7	5	4	1
Oklahoma	11	8	3	2	1	15	4	11	8	4
Oregon	12	3	9	5	4	13	4	9	7	2
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	14	2	11	4	8
Rhode Island	13	5	9	7	1	16	4	12	5	7
South Carolina	11	5	6	5	1	14	5	9	6	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	13	5	8	7	1	12	3	9	8	1
Texas	13	4	9	6	2	14	6	8	7	1
Utah	10	3	6	5	1	10	3	7	5	2
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	17	4	13	7	6
Virginia	12	5	7	4	3	14	7	7	4	4
Washington	10	3	7	4	3	11	3	8	4	4
West Virginia	14	7	6	4	2	16	10	7	4	2
Wisconsin	13	5	9	4	4	14	5	8	3	5
Wyoming	10	2	8	7	1	13	3	10	4	6
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	13	4	8	6	3	16	6	11	4	7
DoDEA ¹	7	1	6	4	2	7	1	6	3	3

See notes at end of table.

Table A-24. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	4	10	5	5	13	4	9	3	6
Alabama	13	2	10	8	2	12	1	11	9	2
Alaska	15	2	13	6	7	12	1	10	3	8
Arizona	12	5	8	5	3	11	3	8	3	5
Arkansas	14	4	10	6	4	14	5	8	5	4
California	11	3	9	7	2	9	2	7	4	3
Colorado	10	2	8	3	5	9	2	7	2	5
Connecticut	14	3	11	5	6	14	2	12	4	8
Delaware	16	8	8	3	5	14	10	5	2	2
Florida	17	4	13	3	10	15	3	12	3	9
Georgia	10	2	8	4	4	12	5	7	3	5
Hawaii	16	3	12	6	6	14	3	11	4	6
Idaho	12	3	9	8	1	11	2	8	5	3
Illinois	14	4	10	4	7	15	4	11	3	8
Indiana	14	3	11	5	5	15	4	11	3	8
Iowa	15	4	11	4	6	15	4	12	5	7
Kansas	13	3	11	3	8	13	4	9	2	7
Kentucky	13	7	6	5	1	12	7	5	2	3
Louisiana	14	5	9	2	6	16	8	8	1	6
Maine	16	5	12	5	6	19	7	13	5	8
Maryland	13	3	11	6	4	12	4	8	3	5
Massachusetts	16	3	13	4	9	18	6	12	2	10
Michigan	12	6	6	3	3	13	6	7	3	4
Minnesota	13	3	10	6	4	12	2	10	4	6
Mississippi	8	5	3	2	1	9	4	5	3	2
Missouri	16	8	8	3	5	16	8	8	3	5
Montana	15	5	10	5	5	13	5	9	3	6
Nebraska	16	4	12	7	4	14	3	11	4	7
Nevada	12	2	10	5	5	12	3	9	4	5
New Hampshire	18	3	15	6	9	19	2	16	7	10
New Jersey	15	2	13	2	11	16	4	13	3	10
New Mexico	19	5	15	7	8	16	5	10	5	5
New York	15	5	10	2	8	14	5	9	1	8
North Carolina	16	6	10	2	7	15	3	12	2	10
North Dakota	15	4	10	7	4	15	7	9	4	5
Ohio	12	5	7	3	4	13	7	7	2	5
Oklahoma	15	4	11	7	4	15	4	11	5	6
Oregon	14	4	10	7	3	11	3	8	4	4
Pennsylvania	15	2	13	3	10	15	3	12	2	10
Rhode Island	19	3	16	5	11	20	3	17	7	10
South Carolina	15	8	7	4	3	13	7	7	4	3
South Dakota	11	3	7	4	3	11	3	8	4	4
Tennessee	13	2	11	10	1	12	7	5	3	2
Texas	15	7	8	8	1	14	5	8	6	2
Utah	11	2	8	5	4	11	3	7	3	4
Vermont	17	4	13	7	6	19	4	15	6	9
Virginia	14	8	7	3	3	14	6	7	4	4
Washington	13	3	10	7	3	12	3	8	3	5
West Virginia	18	9	9	4	4	17	6	11	6	5
Wisconsin	14	5	10	2	8	14	4	9	2	7
Wyoming	14	2	12	4	8	14	3	11	3	8
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	16	6	10	3	7	16	6	10	2	8
DoDEA ¹	8	1	7	1	6	8	2	6	2	5

See notes at end of table.

Table A-24. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	5	9	3	6	13	4	9	2	7
Alabama	13	3	9	7	2	10	1	9	6	2
Alaska	12	2	10	2	8	13	2	11	1	10
Arizona	11	4	7	3	4	12	3	9	2	7
Arkansas	13	5	8	3	4	12	2	11	2	9
California	9	2	7	4	3	9	2	7	3	4
Colorado	10	3	7	1	6	11	2	8	2	7
Connecticut	13	2	11	3	9	13	2	11	2	9
Delaware	16	6	10	3	7	15	4	11	1	10
Florida	14	3	11	2	10	15	3	12	1	11
Georgia	11	7	5	2	3	11	4	8	2	6
Hawaii	15	2	12	5	8	12	2	11	3	8
Idaho	11	3	8	3	4	9	2	7	2	5
Illinois	14	4	10	2	8	14	3	11	2	9
Indiana	15	5	11	2	8	14	5	9	2	7
Iowa	16	5	11	2	10	14	4	10	2	9
Kansas	13	4	8	2	6	12	4	7	2	6
Kentucky	13	7	5	2	3	12	7	5	2	4
Louisiana	14	3	11	1	10	15	2	13	2	11
Maine	17	6	11	3	8	17	3	14	3	11
Maryland	12	6	5	1	4	12	7	5	1	4
Massachusetts	18	6	12	2	10	19	4	14	3	12
Michigan	15	6	10	2	8	13	4	9	2	7
Minnesota	12	3	9	3	6	12	3	10	2	8
Mississippi	9	3	6	1	4	10	2	8	2	6
Missouri	13	3	10	2	7	13	3	10	3	7
Montana	13	4	9	2	7	12	4	8	2	6
Nebraska	13	3	9	3	6	14	5	9	2	6
Nevada	11	4	7	3	4	11	2	9	2	6
New Hampshire	18	3	14	4	10	21	3	17	5	12
New Jersey	15	5	10	1	8	16	5	11	1	9
New Mexico	15	6	8	4	4	13	5	8	3	5
New York	14	5	9	1	9	16	5	10	1	10
North Carolina	15	3	12	2	10	12	2	11	1	10
North Dakota	14	9	5	2	3	15	8	7	3	4
Ohio	17	9	8	1	7	15	7	8	1	7
Oklahoma	16	6	9	4	5	15	5	11	3	8
Oregon	11	3	9	4	4	13	2	10	4	6
Pennsylvania	18	5	12	3	9	17	3	14	3	12
Rhode Island	18	3	15	4	11	18	2	16	4	12
South Carolina	14	6	8	4	4	14	6	8	4	4
South Dakota	11	6	6	2	4	10	4	6	2	4
Tennessee	12	7	5	3	2	11	7	5	2	3
Texas	13	6	6	4	3	12	5	7	3	4
Utah	10	4	6	2	4	10	4	6	2	4
Vermont	20	5	14	5	9	20	3	17	6	11
Virginia	14	6	8	2	5	14	3	10	3	7
Washington	11	4	7	2	5	11	2	8	2	6
West Virginia	15	2	13	7	6	15	2	13	6	7
Wisconsin	14	6	9	2	7	14	4	10	2	8
Wyoming	14	3	10	3	7	14	3	11	2	9
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	18	12	6	2	4	17	11	5	1	4
DoDEA ¹	7	2	5	1	5	9	2	6	1	5

See notes at end of table.

Table A-24. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	3	10	2	8
Alabama	10	2	9	5	4
Alaska	13	1	11	1	11
Arizona	11	1	9	2	8
Arkansas	11	1	10	1	9
California	10	2	8	2	5
Colorado	10	1	9	1	8
Connecticut	12	1	11	1	10
Delaware	14	5	10	1	9
Florida	14	2	13	1	12
Georgia	10	4	6	1	5
Hawaii	11	1	10	3	8
Idaho	8	1	7	2	5
Illinois	14	1	13	2	11
Indiana	14	2	12	1	11
Iowa	15	1	14	1	12
Kansas	12	2	10	2	8
Kentucky	12	7	5	1	4
Louisiana	14	1	13	1	13
Maine	18	2	17	3	13
Maryland	11	7	4	1	3
Massachusetts	19	5	13	1	12
Michigan	12	4	8	2	6
Minnesota	13	3	10	3	7
Mississippi	7	1	6	1	5
Missouri	13	1	12	2	10
Montana	12	4	8	2	6
Nebraska	14	4	10	3	7
Nevada	10	2	8	2	6
New Hampshire	18	4	14	3	11
New Jersey	17	6	11	1	10
New Mexico	12	4	8	3	5
New York	16	2	14	#	13
North Carolina	14	2	12	2	10
North Dakota	14	7	7	2	5
Ohio	15	5	9	1	8
Oklahoma	16	4	12	3	9
Oregon	13	2	11	3	8
Pennsylvania	16	2	13	1	12
Rhode Island	16	1	15	3	12
South Carolina	11	5	6	3	4
South Dakota	11	3	8	3	5
Tennessee	12	6	6	2	4
Texas	11	5	6	3	3
Utah	10	3	7	2	5
Vermont	18	2	16	3	13
Virginia	13	3	10	3	7
Washington	12	2	10	2	8
West Virginia	14	1	12	5	7
Wisconsin	14	2	12	1	11
Wyoming	13	2	12	1	11
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	17	2	15	1	14
DoDEA ¹	10	3	8	1	7

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: 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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-25. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1992, 1994, and 1998

State/jurisdiction	1992			1994			1998		
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	3	2	1	4	2	2	6	4	2
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#
Arizona	10	3	6	11	3	8	14	6	8
Arkansas	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#
California	21	11	10	24	9	14	26	13	13
Colorado	2	2	1	4	2	2	5	2	3
Connecticut	4	3	1	4	3	1	5	4	1
Delaware	1	#	1	1	1	1	2	#	2
Florida	4	2	2	5	2	3	5	2	3
Georgia	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	1	#
Hawaii	5	2	2	5	1	3	6	1	4
Idaho	2	1	1	3	1	2	—	—	—
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	3	2
Indiana	#	#	#	#	#	#	—	—	—
Iowa	1	#	1	1	#	#	1	#	1
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	#
Kentucky	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Louisiana	1	#	1	1	#	1	1	1	#
Maine	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1
Maryland	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Massachusetts	3	2	1	4	3	1	4	2	2
Michigan	1	1	#	1	#	#	2	1	1
Minnesota	2	1	2	2	1	1	4	2	3
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1
Montana	—	—	—	1	#	1	1	#	1
Nebraska	1	1	#	1	1	1	—	—	—
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	7	4
New Hampshire	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
New Jersey	4	2	1	3	2	1	—	—	—
New Mexico	4	2	2	4	2	2	16	4	12
New York	5	2	3	6	3	3	5	2	3
North Carolina	1	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1
North Dakota	#	#	#	1	#	#	—	—	—
Ohio	1	1	#	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oklahoma	2	1	1	—	—	—	3	1	2
Oregon	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	2	5
Pennsylvania	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	—
Rhode Island	6	4	3	3	1	2	6	2	4
South Carolina	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Tennessee	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Texas	9	3	5	13	5	8	13	7	6
Utah	1	1	#	2	1	1	5	2	3
Virginia	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	1	2
Washington	—	—	—	4	1	2	4	1	3
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	1
Wyoming	1	#	1	1	#	#	1	#	1
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	4	3	1	6	4	2	7	2	4
DoDEA ¹	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Alaska, South Dakota, and Vermont did not participate in NAEP reading assessments from 1992 to 1998. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, and 1998 Reading Assessments.

Table A-26. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	7	3	4	4	1	9	2	7	6	1
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	14	6	7	6	1	21	5	16	15	1
Arkansas	1	1	1	1	#	3	1	3	3	#
California	26	12	14	13	1	29	3	26	26	#
Colorado	5	3	2	2	#	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	5	4	1	1	#	4	2	2	2	#
Delaware	3	#	2	2	#	3	2	1	1	#
Florida	5	1	3	3	#	10	3	7	5	2
Georgia	2	1	#	#	#	4	1	2	2	#
Hawaii	6	2	4	4	#	8	2	6	4	1
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	7	1	6	5	#
Illinois	5	3	2	2	#	9	4	5	4	1
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	#
Iowa	1	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Kansas	3	1	2	2	#	7	2	6	4	2
Kentucky	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Louisiana	1	1	1	1	#	1	1	1	#	#
Maine	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Maryland	2	1	2	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Massachusetts	4	2	2	2	1	4	2	2	1	1
Michigan	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	2	#
Minnesota	4	1	3	3	1	7	2	5	4	1
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	1	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
Montana	#	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	4	2	3	2	#
Nevada	10	6	4	4	#	18	7	11	10	1
New Hampshire	1	#	1	1	#	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	16	4	12	11	1	27	6	21	19	2
New York	5	4	1	1	#	6	3	3	1	1
North Carolina	2	1	1	1	#	5	3	1	1	1
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	2	1	#
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	#
Oklahoma	2	#	1	1	#	5	1	4	3	1
Oregon	7	2	5	4	1	12	4	8	6	2
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	#
Rhode Island	6	3	4	3	1	9	3	5	4	2
South Carolina	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	1	1	#	#	#	3	1	3	3	#
Texas	13	7	6	6	#	16	5	11	10	1
Utah	5	2	3	2	#	9	3	7	5	1
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	2	#	1	1	#
Virginia	2	1	1	1	1	6	3	3	2	1
Washington	4	2	3	2	#	3	1	2	2	#
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	3	1	2	1	#	6	3	3	2	1
Wyoming	1	1	#	#	#	5	1	4	3	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	3	4	2	1	7	3	4	3	2
DoDEA ¹	2	1	1	1	#	7	1	6	5	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-26. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	10	2	8	7	1	11	2	8	7	2
Alabama	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	#
Alaska	17	1	16	15	2	19	1	18	13	5
Arizona	21	4	16	15	1	20	3	17	13	3
Arkansas	4	1	3	3	#	5	2	2	2	#
California	32	4	28	27	1	33	4	30	28	2
Colorado	9	2	7	4	3	11	2	9	3	6
Connecticut	3	1	2	1	1	5	1	4	2	2
Delaware	3	1	2	1	#	4	2	2	2	#
Florida	12	3	9	6	3	8	2	5	1	4
Georgia	4	1	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	1
Hawaii	7	2	5	3	2	9	1	8	5	3
Idaho	7	1	6	5	#	8	1	7	7	1
Illinois	9	4	5	4	1	10	3	7	5	1
Indiana	2	#	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Iowa	4	1	3	2	1	4	1	3	2	1
Kansas	3	1	2	1	1	7	2	5	3	2
Kentucky	1	1	#	#	#	2	1	#	#	#
Louisiana	2	1	1	#	1	1	#	1	1	#
Maine	1	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Maryland	4	2	2	2	#	4	2	2	1	1
Massachusetts	6	2	4	2	1	6	2	4	3	1
Michigan	5	2	3	3	#	3	1	2	2	1
Minnesota	7	1	6	5	1	7	1	6	4	2
Mississippi	1	1	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Missouri	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Montana	4	1	4	2	1	3	#	3	2	1
Nebraska	4	2	3	2	1	7	1	6	4	2
Nevada	16	5	11	9	2	16	3	13	10	3
New Hampshire	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
New Jersey	4	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
New Mexico	30	5	24	19	6	24	7	17	13	5
New York	7	3	3	1	2	7	2	4	1	3
North Carolina	6	2	4	2	2	7	1	6	2	4
North Dakota	4	1	3	3	#	2	#	1	1	#
Ohio	2	1	1	1	#	1	1	1	#	#
Oklahoma	6	1	5	5	#	5	1	4	3	1
Oregon	13	4	9	7	2	14	2	12	9	3
Pennsylvania	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Rhode Island	9	2	7	4	3	7	1	5	3	3
South Carolina	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
South Dakota	5	1	4	2	2	4	1	3	2	1
Tennessee	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	2	1	#
Texas	15	5	10	10	#	16	6	9	9	1
Utah	12	3	9	7	2	10	1	9	7	2
Vermont	2	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	7	3	4	3	1	9	3	5	4	2
Washington	8	2	6	5	1	9	2	7	5	3
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	6	2	4	2	2	7	2	5	3	2
Wyoming	5	#	4	3	1	5	1	4	3	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	1	6	2	4	6	1	4	2	3
DoDEA ¹	7	1	6	4	1	7	1	5	4	2

See notes at end of table.

Table A-26. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	2	9	7	2	11	2	9	6	3
Alabama	3	1	2	2	#	2	#	2	2	#
Alaska	15	2	13	9	5	10	1	9	3	6
Arizona	17	4	13	10	2	15	2	13	9	4
Arkansas	7	2	5	2	3	6	#	6	1	4
California	33	2	31	29	2	30	1	28	26	2
Colorado	15	2	13	8	5	11	1	10	5	5
Connecticut	6	2	4	1	3	6	2	4	1	3
Delaware	5	2	3	1	1	4	1	3	1	2
Florida	9	4	5	1	4	8	2	6	#	5
Georgia	3	1	2	1	1	4	1	3	2	1
Hawaii	10	2	8	6	2	10	1	10	4	6
Idaho	8	1	7	6	2	5	1	4	3	2
Illinois	9	3	7	5	2	8	2	6	2	5
Indiana	4	1	3	2	1	5	1	4	1	3
Iowa	5	1	3	2	1	5	1	4	1	3
Kansas	9	2	7	5	2	9	2	8	5	2
Kentucky	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	#	2	#	2	1	2
Maine	2	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	1
Maryland	5	3	3	1	1	6	3	3	1	2
Massachusetts	6	2	4	3	1	7	1	6	5	1
Michigan	3	#	2	1	1	4	1	3	2	1
Minnesota	8	1	7	4	3	8	1	7	5	3
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	#	#
Missouri	2	#	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1
Montana	5	#	5	3	2	3	#	2	1	1
Nebraska	7	1	6	5	2	7	1	5	3	2
Nevada	23	5	17	11	6	20	2	19	10	9
New Hampshire	3	1	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
New Jersey	4	2	2	1	1	4	3	1	#	1
New Mexico	23	8	16	12	3	16	4	12	7	5
New York	9	2	7	1	6	8	2	6	#	6
North Carolina	8	1	6	3	4	6	1	5	2	3
North Dakota	3	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	#	#
Ohio	2	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	#	2
Oklahoma	5	1	4	3	1	4	1	3	2	1
Oregon	15	2	13	9	4	12	1	11	6	5
Pennsylvania	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	#	2
Rhode Island	8	2	6	3	3	6	1	5	3	2
South Carolina	4	1	3	3	1	5	1	4	3	1
South Dakota	4	1	3	3	#	2	1	1	1	#
Tennessee	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	#	2
Texas	16	5	10	9	2	21	6	15	14	1
Utah	12	2	9	7	2	9	2	6	3	3
Vermont	3	1	2	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	7	2	5	3	2	7	1	6	3	3
Washington	8	1	6	5	1	10	1	9	6	3
West Virginia	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	7	2	5	3	2	6	1	5	1	4
Wyoming	4	1	3	3	#	3	#	2	1	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	9	4	5	1	4	8	2	6	1	4
DoDEA ¹	6	2	4	3	2	7	2	5	3	2

See notes at end of table.

Table A-26. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	1	10	7	4
Alabama	2	#	2	2	1
Alaska	14	1	13	3	10
Arizona	12	#	12	5	6
Arkansas	8	#	7	3	5
California	32	1	30	27	3
Colorado	16	#	15	9	7
Connecticut	6	1	5	1	5
Delaware	4	1	2	1	1
Florida	9	1	8	#	8
Georgia	5	2	4	2	2
Hawaii	11	1	10	5	5
Idaho	5	#	4	2	2
Illinois	8	1	7	2	6
Indiana	7	#	7	2	5
Iowa	6	#	5	1	4
Kansas	11	1	11	7	4
Kentucky	2	1	1	#	1
Louisiana	2	#	2	1	1
Maine	3	#	3	2	2
Maryland	6	3	3	#	3
Massachusetts	8	1	7	5	1
Michigan	3	#	3	2	1
Minnesota	10	#	9	7	3
Mississippi	2	#	2	1	1
Missouri	3	#	3	2	2
Montana	2	#	2	2	#
Nebraska	8	1	7	3	3
Nevada	27	#	27	14	13
New Hampshire	3	#	2	1	2
New Jersey	3	1	2	#	2
New Mexico	17	3	14	9	5
New York	9	1	8	#	8
North Carolina	7	#	7	4	3
North Dakota	3	1	2	2	#
Ohio	3	1	3	#	3
Oklahoma	6	1	5	3	2
Oregon	14	1	14	8	5
Pennsylvania	3	1	2	#	2
Rhode Island	6	1	6	4	2
South Carolina	5	#	5	4	1
South Dakota	4	1	4	2	2
Tennessee	3	1	3	#	3
Texas	22	5	16	15	1
Utah	7	1	6	3	2
Vermont	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	7	1	7	3	3
Washington	11	1	10	4	6
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	8	#	8	1	6
Wyoming	4	#	3	2	2
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	7	1	7	1	5
DoDEA ¹	7	2	5	3	2

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: 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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-27. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1998

State/jurisdiction	1998		
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	3	1	2
Alabama	1	1	#
Arizona	9	2	7
Arkansas	1	1	#
California	18	6	12
Colorado	5	2	3
Connecticut	1	1	#
Delaware	2	1	1
Florida	4	1	3
Georgia	1	1	1
Hawaii	4	2	3
Illinois	3	1	1
Kansas	1	#	#
Kentucky	#	#	#
Louisiana	1	1	#
Maine	#	#	#
Maryland	1	1	#
Massachusetts	2	2	1
Minnesota	3	1	2
Mississippi	#	#	#
Missouri	1	1	#
Montana	#	#	#
Nevada	6	3	3
New Mexico	9	2	7
New York	6	4	2
North Carolina	2	1	1
Oklahoma	2	#	2
Oregon	3	1	2
Rhode Island	4	2	2
South Carolina	#	#	#
Tennessee	1	#	#
Texas	7	2	5
Utah	2	1	1
Virginia	2	1	1
Washington	3	1	2
West Virginia	#	#	#
Wisconsin	1	1	1
Wyoming	1	#	#
Other jurisdictions			
District of Columbia	6	3	3
DoDEA ¹	1	1	1

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Alaska, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Vermont did not participate in the 1998 NAEP reading assessment. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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

Table A-28. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	3	1	2	2	#	6	2	4	4	1
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	9	3	7	6	#	13	3	10	10	#
Arkansas	1	1	1	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
California	18	3	14	14	1	20	2	18	17	1
Colorado	5	1	3	3	1	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	2	1	1	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Delaware	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	#	#
Florida	4	2	3	3	#	7	2	4	2	2
Georgia	2	#	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	#
Hawaii	4	1	3	2	1	7	2	5	4	1
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	3	3	#
Illinois	3	1	2	2	#	5	1	4	3	#
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	1	#	1	1	#
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	2	1	2	1	#	4	2	2	1	1
Kentucky	1	#	#	#	#	1	1	#	#	#
Louisiana	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Maine	1	#	#	#	#	2	#	1	1	#
Maryland	1	#	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	#
Massachusetts	3	2	1	1	#	5	3	2	1	1
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	#
Minnesota	3	#	3	2	1	5	1	3	3	#
Mississippi	1	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	1	1	#
Montana	1	#	#	#	#	3	1	2	2	#
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	1	1	#
Nevada	6	2	4	3	#	9	3	6	6	#
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	9	4	5	4	1	20	5	15	13	2
New York	6	4	2	1	#	6	3	4	2	2
North Carolina	1	1	#	#	#	3	2	1	1	#
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	2	#	2	2	#
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	#	#	#
Oklahoma	3	2	1	1	#	4	1	3	3	#
Oregon	3	1	2	1	1	7	2	5	4	1
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	#
Rhode Island	4	2	1	1	#	5	2	3	3	1
South Carolina	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	1	1	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Texas	7	2	5	5	#	9	3	6	6	#
Utah	2	1	2	1	#	7	2	5	5	1
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	1	1	#	#	#	3	2	2	1	#
Washington	3	1	2	2	#	5	1	3	2	2
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	1	1	#	#	#	3	2	1	1	#
Wyoming	#	#	#	#	#	2	#	2	2	#
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	1	1	1	#	#	5	2	3	1	2
DoDEA ¹	1	1	1	1	#	4	1	3	3	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-28. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	6	2	5	4	1	6	1	5	4	1
Alabama	1	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	13	#	12	11	1	14	1	14	12	2
Arizona	17	4	13	12	1	13	2	11	8	3
Arkansas	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
California	21	2	19	18	1	22	2	20	18	2
Colorado	5	2	3	3	1	7	2	5	2	3
Connecticut	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Delaware	3	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	#
Florida	8	2	5	3	2	6	2	3	1	3
Georgia	3	1	2	1	#	2	1	1	1	1
Hawaii	7	2	5	4	2	7	2	5	3	2
Idaho	6	1	5	4	#	5	1	4	4	#
Illinois	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	#
Indiana	2	1	2	2	#	2	#	1	1	1
Iowa	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	#
Kansas	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Kentucky	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	#	1	1	1	#	#
Maine	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Maryland	3	1	2	2	#	1	1	#	#	#
Massachusetts	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Michigan	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	2	2	#
Minnesota	5	1	4	3	1	6	1	5	4	1
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	#	#	#
Missouri	1	1	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Montana	2	#	2	1	#	4	1	4	3	1
Nebraska	3	2	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Nevada	7	2	5	4	1	11	2	10	8	2
New Hampshire	2	#	1	1	1	1	#	1	1	#
New Jersey	2	1	2	#	1	2	1	1	#	#
New Mexico	19	5	14	10	4	16	4	12	8	3
New York	5	2	3	1	2	5	2	3	1	2
North Carolina	4	2	2	1	1	4	1	3	1	1
North Dakota	2	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	#
Ohio	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Oklahoma	5	1	4	3	1	4	1	3	2	1
Oregon	7	3	5	4	1	8	2	6	5	2
Pennsylvania	2	#	2	1	1	1	#	1	#	1
Rhode Island	6	2	4	2	1	4	1	3	1	2
South Carolina	1	#	#	#	#	1	1	1	#	#
South Dakota	3	#	2	2	1	2	#	2	1	#
Tennessee	2	#	2	2	#	2	1	1	1	#
Texas	8	3	5	5	#	8	2	6	5	1
Utah	7	1	6	4	2	8	2	6	4	1
Vermont	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	3	2	2	1	1	4	1	2	2	#
Washington	5	1	3	3	#	6	1	4	3	1
West Virginia	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	3	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1
Wyoming	3	#	3	2	#	4	#	3	3	#
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	5	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	1	1
DoDEA ¹	4	1	4	2	1	4	1	3	2	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-28. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	7	2	5	4	1	6	1	5	3	1
Alabama	2	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	17	1	16	10	6	11	1	9	4	5
Arizona	11	3	8	7	1	6	1	5	3	3
Arkansas	4	1	3	1	1	4	#	3	1	3
California	22	2	20	19	1	20	1	19	16	3
Colorado	7	1	5	3	2	7	1	6	4	3
Connecticut	4	1	3	1	2	4	2	2	1	1
Delaware	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	#	1
Florida	6	3	3	1	2	5	2	3	#	3
Georgia	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	1
Hawaii	6	1	5	3	2	6	1	5	3	2
Idaho	6	1	5	4	1	4	#	4	2	1
Illinois	4	1	2	2	#	3	1	2	1	2
Indiana	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	1
Iowa	3	1	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Kansas	4	1	3	2	1	6	1	5	4	1
Kentucky	1	#	1	1	#	1	1	#	#	#
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Maine	2	1	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	1
Maryland	2	2	1	#	1	3	2	1	#	#
Massachusetts	4	2	2	2	#	3	2	2	1	#
Michigan	2	#	2	1	#	2	#	2	2	#
Minnesota	6	1	5	4	1	6	1	5	4	1
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Missouri	2	#	2	1	#	1	#	#	#	#
Montana	5	1	4	2	2	2	#	2	2	1
Nebraska	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	1
Nevada	10	3	7	6	1	8	2	6	3	3
New Hampshire	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	#
New Jersey	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	#	#
New Mexico	18	5	13	12	2	11	2	9	6	3
New York	5	2	3	#	2	5	2	3	#	3
North Carolina	4	1	3	1	2	5	1	4	2	3
North Dakota	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Ohio	2	1	1	#	#	1	1	#	#	#
Oklahoma	3	1	2	2	#	3	1	2	2	1
Oregon	8	1	7	5	2	6	1	5	4	2
Pennsylvania	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1
Rhode Island	4	1	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
South Carolina	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	2	1
South Dakota	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Tennessee	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	#	1
Texas	8	3	6	4	1	7	1	6	5	1
Utah	9	1	7	6	1	5	1	4	3	1
Vermont	2	#	2	1	#	2	#	1	1	#
Virginia	4	2	2	2	#	4	1	3	1	1
Washington	6	2	4	3	1	4	1	3	2	1
West Virginia	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	5	2	3	1	2	4	1	3	1	2
Wyoming	3	1	3	2	1	1	#	1	1	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	4	2	2	1	1	5	2	3	1	2
DoDEA ¹	4	2	2	2	#	5	2	3	2	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-28. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1998–2011—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	
Nation (public)	6	1	5	3	2	
Alabama	2	#	1	1	#	
Alaska	11	#	10	3	7	
Arizona	2	#	2	#	1	
Arkansas	5	#	5	2	3	
California	17	1	16	13	3	
Colorado	7	1	7	4	3	
Connecticut	4	1	3	1	3	
Delaware	2	1	1	1	1	
Florida	5	1	4	#	4	
Georgia	2	1	1	#	1	
Hawaii	9	1	8	5	3	
Idaho	4	#	3	2	1	
Illinois	4	#	3	2	2	
Indiana	3	#	3	1	2	
Iowa	3	#	3	1	2	
Kansas	6	#	6	5	1	
Kentucky	1	1	1	#	#	
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	1	
Maine	2	#	2	2	1	
Maryland	3	2	1	#	1	
Massachusetts	4	1	3	2	1	
Michigan	2	#	2	1	1	
Minnesota	5	#	5	3	1	
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#	
Missouri	1	#	1	#	1	
Montana	2	#	1	1	1	
Nebraska	3	1	2	1	1	
Nevada	10	1	10	5	4	
New Hampshire	2	1	1	1	#	
New Jersey	2	1	1	#	1	
New Mexico	12	2	10	7	2	
New York	6	1	5	#	4	
North Carolina	5	#	4	2	2	
North Dakota	2	1	1	#	1	
Ohio	1	#	1	#	1	
Oklahoma	3	1	2	1	1	
Oregon	6	#	6	4	2	
Pennsylvania	2	1	2	#	1	
Rhode Island	3	#	3	1	2	
South Carolina	5	1	4	3	1	
South Dakota	2	1	1	1	#	
Tennessee	1	#	1	#	#	
Texas	9	2	7	7	1	
Utah	5	1	4	2	1	
Vermont	1	#	1	1	#	
Virginia	6	1	5	3	1	
Washington	5	1	5	3	2	
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	
Wisconsin	5	#	5	1	3	
Wyoming	2	1	1	1	1	
Other jurisdictions						
District of Columbia	6	1	5	1	4	
DoDEA ¹	5	1	3	2	1	

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: 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, 1998–2011 Reading Assessments.

Table A-29. 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 identified SD and/or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students											
	SD and/or ELL				SD				ELL			
	Excluded	Assessed modations	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations	Excluded	Assessed modations	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations	Excluded	Assessed modations	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations
Nation (public)	17	83	40	43	23	77	21	56	11	89	58	31
Alabama	19	81	51	30	23	77	46	31	5	95	67	28
Alaska	7	93	21	72	8	92	17	75	8	92	23	69
Arizona	7	93	34	59	12	88	22	66	1	99	43	55
Arkansas	6	94	25	68	9	91	17	73	2	98	37	61
California	6	94	78	16	20	80	30	51	4	96	86	11
Colorado	6	94	40	54	11	89	15	75	2	98	54	44
Connecticut	12	88	9	79	10	90	9	81	16	84	9	75
Delaware	37	63	23	40	38	62	18	44	37	63	40	23
Florida	9	91	13	77	11	89	18	71	8	92	3	89
Georgia	39	61	26	35	44	56	23	33	31	69	33	36
Hawaii	11	89	31	57	13	87	10	77	11	89	47	42
Idaho	12	88	37	51	15	85	28	57	6	94	55	40
Illinois	8	92	28	64	9	91	29	62	8	92	23	69
Indiana	5	95	30	65	7	93	29	64	2	98	29	69
Iowa	5	95	17	78	6	94	15	79	2	98	22	76
Kansas	9	91	43	48	13	87	28	59	6	94	59	35
Kentucky	54	46	23	23	53	47	24	23	63	37	12	25
Louisiana	6	94	16	78	7	93	13	80	#	100	42	58
Maine	8	92	20	73	9	91	13	78	2	98	52	46
Maryland	54	46	10	35	59	41	11	30	48	52	7	44
Massachusetts	23	77	27	50	27	73	8	65	18	82	65	17
Michigan	21	79	35	43	25	75	26	49	7	93	70	23
Minnesota	7	93	48	45	10	90	34	56	2	98	67	31
Mississippi	9	91	41	50	10	90	38	52	‡	‡	‡	‡
Missouri	10	90	33	57	12	88	29	59	3	97	48	49
Montana	31	69	31	38	35	65	23	42	13	87	66	21
Nebraska	19	81	35	47	20	80	30	50	16	84	43	42
Nevada	3	97	46	50	10	90	30	61	1	99	50	49
New Hampshire	15	85	13	72	15	85	10	74	10	90	29	61
New Jersey	46	54	8	45	47	53	9	44	45	55	5	50
New Mexico	21	79	42	37	28	72	22	49	18	82	51	31
New York	11	89	4	85	10	90	5	85	14	86	2	84
North Carolina	10	90	32	57	14	86	20	66	4	96	53	43
North Dakota	38	62	24	37	40	60	18	41	36	64	49	15
Ohio	33	67	12	55	38	62	12	49	17	83	9	75
Oklahoma	24	76	31	45	26	74	25	49	20	80	45	35
Oregon	9	91	45	46	16	84	29	55	5	95	57	39
Pennsylvania	16	84	21	63	15	85	22	63	26	74	13	60
Rhode Island	11	89	24	65	11	89	8	81	9	91	58	33
South Carolina	15	85	46	39	18	82	34	48	9	91	73	18
South Dakota	16	84	44	39	18	82	42	40	13	87	49	38
Tennessee	42	58	17	41	49	51	19	32	18	82	10	72
Texas	33	67	57	10	53	47	20	27	25	75	71	4
Utah	22	78	36	41	28	72	27	45	15	85	51	35
Vermont	12	88	17	71	13	87	14	74	8	92	38	54
Virginia	15	85	35	51	18	82	26	56	8	92	46	46
Washington	13	87	35	52	18	82	29	53	6	94	39	54
West Virginia	9	91	46	44	10	90	46	44	‡	‡	‡	‡
Wisconsin	9	91	15	76	12	88	14	75	5	95	15	80
Wyoming	10	90	23	66	11	89	19	70	9	91	43	48
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	15	85	8	77	17	83	4	80	12	88	16	72
DoDEA ¹	36	64	28	36	42	58	19	39	31	69	43	26

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

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

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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-30. 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 identified SD and/or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2011

State/jurisdiction	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students											
	SD and/or ELL				SD				ELL			
	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations
Nation (public)	20	80	29	51	24	76	15	61	14	86	56	31
Alabama	18	82	50	33	18	82	46	36	‡	‡	‡	‡
Alaska	9	91	18	73	11	89	6	83	4	96	30	66
Arizona	10	90	19	71	11	89	18	72	‡	‡	‡	‡
Arkansas	9	91	18	72	12	88	11	77	3	97	32	64
California	9	91	64	27	21	79	25	53	5	95	77	18
Colorado	10	90	28	62	12	88	10	78	8	92	48	44
Connecticut	14	86	10	76	11	89	8	81	23	77	13	64
Delaware	33	67	12	56	32	68	10	59	‡	‡	‡	‡
Florida	12	88	7	81	11	89	7	81	17	83	4	79
Georgia	37	63	10	53	38	62	10	53	40	60	12	48
Hawaii	11	89	38	51	7	93	24	69	16	84	53	31
Idaho	15	85	32	53	17	83	22	61	13	87	52	36
Illinois	10	90	20	71	10	90	11	79	9	91	48	43
Indiana	12	88	14	74	13	87	9	77	10	90	31	59
Iowa	4	96	15	80	5	95	10	85	1	99	36	63
Kansas	11	89	41	48	16	84	19	65	2	98	78	20
Kentucky	56	44	11	33	58	42	9	33	41	59	25	34
Louisiana	6	94	7	86	7	93	5	89	‡	‡	‡	‡
Maine	9	91	21	71	9	91	18	73	‡	‡	‡	‡
Maryland	61	39	10	29	62	38	9	29	55	45	17	28
Massachusetts	29	71	15	57	29	71	6	64	30	70	48	21
Michigan	33	67	21	45	36	64	16	48	21	79	48	31
Minnesota	17	83	39	44	21	79	27	52	6	94	69	25
Mississippi	12	88	21	68	12	88	16	72	‡	‡	‡	‡
Missouri	10	90	13	77	10	90	12	78	‡	‡	‡	‡
Montana	30	70	21	48	32	68	18	50	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nebraska	29	71	26	45	29	71	21	50	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nevada	11	89	40	49	16	84	21	62	6	94	51	42
New Hampshire	21	79	21	58	20	80	18	62	‡	‡	‡	‡
New Jersey	37	63	8	56	35	65	6	59	‡	‡	‡	‡
New Mexico	26	74	45	29	34	66	22	44	20	80	62	18
New York	15	85	2	82	14	86	2	84	21	79	2	77
North Carolina	12	88	22	66	13	87	13	74	9	91	46	45
North Dakota	50	50	14	36	49	51	13	37	60	40	15	25
Ohio	36	64	10	54	37	63	9	54	27	73	18	55
Oklahoma	24	76	24	52	24	76	20	56	24	76	50	26
Oregon	12	88	37	51	15	85	25	60	6	94	61	33
Pennsylvania	18	82	9	73	16	84	9	75	34	66	9	57
Rhode Island	6	94	23	71	5	95	19	77	12	88	38	50
South Carolina	35	65	38	27	42	58	25	32	20	80	65	14
South Dakota	26	74	29	45	25	75	25	50	29	71	54	17
Tennessee	49	51	16	36	51	49	16	33	‡	‡	‡	‡
Texas	33	67	51	16	48	52	28	25	20	80	73	6
Utah	26	74	31	43	29	71	21	50	25	75	46	28
Vermont	14	86	20	66	13	87	18	69	‡	‡	‡	‡
Virginia	20	80	36	44	22	78	27	52	22	78	55	23
Washington	13	87	28	58	14	86	18	68	12	88	49	38
West Virginia	10	90	38	52	11	89	37	53	‡	‡	‡	‡
Wisconsin	12	88	13	75	14	86	9	77	8	92	25	68
Wyoming	14	86	12	75	12	88	7	81	‡	‡	‡	‡
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	13	87	9	77	12	88	4	83	17	83	23	60
DoDEA ¹	23	77	22	55	25	75	9	66	25	75	48	26

‡ Reporting standards not met.

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

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), 2011 Reading Assessment.

Table A-31. 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, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–11

SD/ELL category and district	2002					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	21	7	14	10	4	22	6	16	10	5
Large city¹ (public)	28	8	20	17	4	31	8	22	17	5
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	8	2	6	5	1	9	2	7	5	3
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	33	9	24	12	11
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	21	5	16	6	11
Chicago	30	9	21	16	5	31	9	22	16	6
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	18	12	6	2	3
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	19	8	11	5	5	18	6	12	3	9
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	43	17	26	25	1	42	24	19	18	1
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	51	8	43	41	2	59	6	53	49	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	22	8	14	6	8	21	6	15	3	12
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	42	5	37	33	4
SD										
Nation (public)	13	5	8	4	4	14	5	9	4	5
Large city¹ (public)	12	5	7	4	3	13	5	8	4	5
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	5	1	4	3	1	8	2	6	4	3
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	19	4	15	5	10
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	16	4	13	4	8
Chicago	16	4	12	8	4	15	6	9	4	5
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	15	11	4	2	3
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	14	7	7	3	4	13	5	8	2	6
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	12	4	8	7	1	18	9	9	8	1
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	11	3	8	5	2	12	3	9	5	4
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	14	5	9	3	6	13	2	11	1	10
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	13	3	10	8	2
ELL										
Nation (public)	9	2	7	6	1	10	2	8	7	1
Large city¹ (public)	19	5	15	13	1	21	5	16	14	2
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	4	1	3	3	#	2	1	2	1	1
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	18	6	12	9	3
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	10	3	7	2	4
Chicago	19	7	12	9	2	21	6	15	13	1
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	2	1	1
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	7	3	4	3	2	7	1	6	2	4
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	36	16	20	20	#	33	20	14	14	#
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	46	6	40	38	1	56	5	50	47	3
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	11	6	6	3	3	11	5	6	2	3
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

See notes at end of table.

Table A-31. 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, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–11—Continued

SD/ELL category and district	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	23	7	16	10	7	23	6	17	10	7
Large city¹ (public)	32	8	24	17	7	32	7	25	17	8
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	11	4	8	3	5	12	7	5	4	1
Austin	37	20	18	14	4	42	20	22	18	4
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	35	10	24	11	13	45	8	36	23	13
Charlotte	21	4	16	6	10	22	4	18	7	11
Chicago	29	9	21	15	6	30	7	23	16	7
Cleveland	19	12	7	3	4	23	17	6	1	5
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	20	7	12	3	9	22	14	8	2	7
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	44	23	21	19	2	45	17	28	25	3
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	59	6	54	49	5	53	3	50	43	7
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	24	6	17	2	16	29	5	24	2	22
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	46	6	40	34	6	49	4	45	38	6
SD										
Nation (public)	14	5	9	4	5	14	5	9	3	6
Large city¹ (public)	13	5	8	3	5	13	5	8	3	5
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	10	3	7	2	5	10	6	5	3	1
Austin	15	9	6	3	3	14	8	6	2	4
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	24	9	15	3	12	21	7	15	3	12
Charlotte	13	3	10	2	7	12	3	10	3	7
Chicago	14	5	9	4	5	12	4	8	4	5
Cleveland	16	12	4	1	3	18	15	3	#	3
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	15	7	9	2	7	15	11	4	1	3
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	12	7	5	3	2	11	6	5	3	2
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	9	2	6	2	4	11	2	8	3	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	14	3	11	1	10	15	3	12	1	11
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	13	3	11	6	5	14	3	11	5	6
ELL										
Nation (public)	11	2	8	7	2	11	2	9	7	2
Large city¹ (public)	22	4	17	14	3	22	4	18	14	4
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	1	1	1	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Austin	27	14	12	12	#	32	14	17	16	1
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	14	4	10	8	2	29	4	24	21	3
Charlotte	9	2	7	4	3	11	2	9	4	5
Chicago	17	4	13	11	1	21	4	16	13	3
Cleveland	5	2	3	2	1	7	3	3	1	2
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	6	1	4	2	3	9	4	5	1	4
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	36	19	17	16	1	37	13	24	23	1
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	56	5	51	48	4	48	2	46	41	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	12	5	8	1	7	18	3	14	1	13
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	36	4	33	30	2	42	3	40	36	3

See notes at end of table.

Table A-31. 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, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–11—Continued

SD/ELL category and district	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	23	5	18	9	9	23	4	19	9	10
Large city¹ (public)	31	7	24	14	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	12	3	10	3	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	44	19	25	21	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	19	14	6	2	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	35	9	26	14	13	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	19	3	16	5	11	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	24	5	19	7	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	25	17	8	2	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	20	5	15	8	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	21	12	9	2	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	38	5	33	30	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	43	18	25	22	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	19	7	11	6	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	46	2	43	38	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	21	7	14	2	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	30	9	21	5	17	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	31	6	25	2	24	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	22	6	16	3	13	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	43	4	39	32	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	10	3	7	13	3	10	3	7
Large city¹ (public)	13	4	9	2	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	10	2	8	3	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	16	9	7	3	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	18	13	5	1	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	22	7	15	3	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	12	2	11	3	8	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	14	3	11	3	8	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	20	14	5	#	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	15	5	10	4	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	15	11	4	1	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	11	4	6	3	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	7	4	3	1	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	15	5	10	5	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	10	2	9	3	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	13	2	10	2	9	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	19	7	12	2	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	19	4	15	1	14	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	15	5	10	2	9	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	13	4	10	4	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	11	2	9	6	3	11	1	10	7	4
Large city¹ (public)	21	4	17	12	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	2	1	1	#	1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	32	13	19	19	1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	1	#	1	1	#	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	18	3	14	11	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	8	1	7	2	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	12	2	9	4	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	7	4	3	1	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	7	#	6	5	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	8	2	6	1	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	30	2	28	27	1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	38	16	22	21	1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	4	3	1	1	1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	41	1	40	36	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	10	5	5	1	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	12	3	10	3	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	16	3	13	1	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	8	2	6	1	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	35	2	33	30	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
-----------	----	---	----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

NOTE: Beginning in 2009, if the results for charter schools are not included in the school district's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report to the U.S. Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, they are excluded from that district's Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) results. 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. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2002–11 Reading Assessments.

Table A-32. 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, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–11

SD/ELL category and district	2002					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	18	6	12	8	4	19	5	13	8	5
Large city¹ (public)	23	6	17	14	4	24	6	17	12	5
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	6	2	4	3	1	12	4	8	5	4
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	31	9	21	11	11
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	16	4	12	4	7
Chicago	21	6	15	9	7	21	7	13	8	6
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	24	15	9	2	7
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	21	7	13	5	8	20	8	12	4	8
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	27	7	19	19	#	27	10	17	16	#
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	35	5	29	27	2	37	4	33	28	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	24	9	15	7	8	22	5	17	4	12
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	29	3	26	22	3
SD										
Nation (public)	13	5	8	5	4	14	4	10	5	5
Large city¹ (public)	13	4	9	6	3	14	4	10	5	5
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	5	1	4	3	1	11	3	8	4	3
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	20	5	16	6	9
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	13	3	9	3	7
Chicago	15	3	12	6	6	16	5	11	5	6
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	20	12	8	2	6
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	16	6	11	4	7	16	6	10	3	7
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	15	5	10	10	#	18	7	11	11	#
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	12	3	10	7	2	13	3	10	5	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	14	6	8	3	5	14	2	12	2	10
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	11	1	9	7	3
ELL										
Nation (public)	6	2	4	4	1	6	2	5	4	1
Large city¹ (public)	13	3	10	9	1	13	3	10	8	2
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	15	7	8	5	3
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	6	1	5	3	2
Chicago	8	4	4	3	1	7	3	4	3	1
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	6	5	1	#	1
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	5	2	3	1	2	5	2	3	2	1
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	16	4	12	12	#	16	6	10	10	#
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	30	5	25	24	1	33	3	30	26	3
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	13	5	8	4	4	11	4	7	3	4
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

See notes at end of table.

Table A-32. 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, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–11—Continued

SD/ELL category and district	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	19	5	13	7	6	19	5	13	7	7
Large city¹ (public)	23	5	18	12	7	24	6	18	10	8
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	11	4	8	3	5	13	8	5	3	3
Austin	27	12	15	13	2	29	7	22	17	5
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	24	6	18	8	10	28	8	20	7	13
Charlotte	18	3	15	6	9	19	5	14	5	9
Chicago	21	5	16	6	10	23	6	17	4	13
Cleveland	21	14	7	3	4	24	16	8	2	6
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	19	8	11	3	9	21	13	8	3	5
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	24	7	16	13	3	23	9	14	10	4
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	40	5	35	31	4	35	4	32	27	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	18	5	13	2	11	23	4	19	2	17
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	31	7	24	18	6	29	4	25	19	6
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	9	3	6	13	5	9	3	6
Large city¹ (public)	12	4	9	3	5	13	4	9	3	6
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	10	3	7	2	5	12	7	4	2	2
Austin	15	8	7	5	2	17	5	12	7	5
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	17	5	12	3	9	21	6	15	2	12
Charlotte	11	1	9	2	7	11	2	9	2	7
Chicago	16	3	13	4	10	19	4	14	2	12
Cleveland	18	12	6	2	4	20	15	5	1	4
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	16	6	10	2	8	18	12	6	2	4
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	13	5	8	6	2	13	6	7	3	4
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	12	3	9	5	3	11	2	9	4	5
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	10	2	8	1	8	15	1	13	1	12
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	12	4	9	5	4	12	3	8	4	5
ELL										
Nation (public)	6	1	5	4	1	7	2	5	4	1
Large city¹ (public)	13	2	11	9	2	13	3	10	8	2
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlanta	1	#	1	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Austin	16	6	10	9	1	15	3	12	11	1
Baltimore City	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	9	3	6	5	1	11	4	7	5	2
Charlotte	8	1	7	4	2	9	3	6	3	2
Chicago	6	2	3	2	1	7	3	4	2	1
Cleveland	4	3	1	1	1	5	2	3	1	2
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	3	2	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Houston	14	4	10	9	1	13	4	8	7	1
Jefferson County (KY)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Los Angeles	35	3	31	29	2	30	3	27	25	3
Miami-Dade	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Milwaukee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	10	4	6	2	4	10	3	7	1	6
Philadelphia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	24	5	18	15	4	21	2	20	17	3

See notes at end of table.

Table A-32. 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, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–11—Continued

SD/ELL category and district	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom- modations	Assessed with accom- modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	18	4	14	6	8	18	3	14	5	9
Large city¹ (public)	23	5	18	9	9	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	12	3	8	2	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	29	9	20	16	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	19	13	6	1	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	30	14	16	4	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	17	4	13	4	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	21	5	17	4	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	28	16	12	1	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	23	7	16	6	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	22	14	8	2	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	29	2	27	21	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	22	8	14	9	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	15	8	7	3	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	29	3	26	20	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	20	6	13	1	13	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	26	8	18	2	16	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	23	6	17	1	16	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	22	6	16	2	14	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	25	3	22	16	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	9	2	7	13	3	10	2	8
Large city¹ (public)	13	4	9	2	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	11	3	8	2	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	17	7	10	6	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	19	13	6	1	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	22	8	14	2	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	11	2	9	1	7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	16	3	13	2	11	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	23	14	9	1	8	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	17	5	12	2	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	18	13	5	1	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	11	2	8	3	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	12	6	7	2	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	12	6	6	2	4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	11	2	9	3	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	12	2	10	#	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	21	6	15	1	14	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	15	3	12	#	12	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	17	5	11	1	10	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	12	2	10	4	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	6	1	5	3	1	6	1	5	3	2
Large city¹ (public)	12	2	10	7	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	16	4	12	10	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	10	7	3	3	#	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	7	2	5	2	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	7	2	5	2	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	6	4	3	1	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	6	2	4	4	#	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	6	2	4	1	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	22	1	21	19	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	12	4	8	7	1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	3	2	1	1	#	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	23	2	21	18	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	8	5	3	#	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	7	3	4	1	3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	10	4	7	#	6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	7	1	6	1	5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	16	1	15	13	2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
-----------	----	---	----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

— Not available. The district did not participate.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

NOTE: Beginning in 2009, if the results for charter schools are not included in the school district's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report to the U.S. Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, they are excluded from that district's Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) results. 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. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2002–11 Reading Assessments.

Data Collection

The NAEP 2011 reading assessment was conducted from January to March 2011 by contractors to the U.S. Department of Education. Data collection for NAEP involves a collaborative effort among the participating schools, school districts, states, and NAEP staff. To reduce the burden on the participating schools, NAEP field staff perform most of the work associated with the assessment. The cooperation of the schools involves enlisting a school staff member to assist in coordinating selected students and providing space to administer the assessments.

Assessment sessions are scripted so that all students are given the same instructions and opportunity to demonstrate what they know and can do. Assessment administrators conduct the sessions under the supervision of their team's assessment coordinator. Training of assessment administrators focuses on their responsibilities in the classroom and on reading the scripts verbatim to administer the sessions in a uniform manner.

NAEP procedures guarantee the anonymity of participants. The names of students are never removed from the schools. The results of NAEP are reported on the national level and by region of the country, state, and for some urban districts—not by school or individual student.

Scoring

Three types of cognitive items were scored for the NAEP reading assessment. Responses to multiple-choice questions were scored by high-speed scanners during student booklet processing. Short constructed-response questions (those with two or three score level categories) and extended constructed-response questions (those with four or five score level categories) were scored by trained personnel using high-definition images of student responses captured during processing.

Scoring a large number of short and extended constructed-responses with a high level of accuracy and reliability within a limited time frame is essential to the success of NAEP. To ensure reliable, efficient scoring, NAEP

- develops focused, explicit scoring guides for each item that match the criteria delineated in the assessment frameworks,
- pilot tests all items and adjusts the scoring guides (if necessary) to reflect actual student responses,
- recruits qualified and experienced scorers, trains them, and verifies their ability to score cognitive questions for a particular subject through qualifying tests,
- employs an image-processing and scoring system that routes images of student responses directly to the scorers so they can focus on scoring rather than paper routing,
- monitors scorer consistency through a second scoring a percentage of responses,
- assesses the quality of scorer decision-making through constant monitoring by NAEP assessment experts, and
- documents all training, scoring, and quality control procedures in the technical reports.

For the 2011 reading assessment, more than almost three million individual student responses were scored in all three grades (including rescoring to monitor interrater reliability). Most of the reading items were scored with 95 percent or higher exact agreement between raters of the same student responses.

Data Analysis and Scaling

The goal of the analysis of NAEP data is to summarize the performance of groups of students. Initial analysis activities verify the accuracy of the data and data files used in the analysis and provide the first indication of aspects of the data and analysis that require special consideration and attention. The first step is to determine the percentages of students who gave various responses to each cognitive item. Next, the properties of the items are further examined using classical test theory measures of item difficulty and item discrimination. Some of these activities are conducted without student weights or with preliminary student weights, but final student weights are used whenever possible.

After the initial activities are completed, NAEP score scales are created using Item Response Theory (IRT), and scale score distributions are estimated for groups of students. Not all students take the same blocks of items in a NAEP assessment, so results cannot be summarized using the total number of correct item responses. Instead, IRT models are used to describe the relationships between the item responses provided by students and the underlying scale (e.g., reading ability). The primary purpose of IRT scaling is to provide a common scale on which performance can be compared even when students receive different blocks of items. Item parameters that are used in the models are estimated from student response data for each item. Different IRT models with different types of item parameters are used to describe multiple-choice items, constructed-response items that are scored simply right or wrong, and complex constructed-response items that have three or more categories.

Because the NAEP design gives each student a small proportion of the pool of assessment items, the assessment cannot provide reliable information about individual student performance. Traditional test scores for individual students, even those based on IRT, would result in misleading estimates of population characteristics, such as student group means and percentages of students at or above a certain scale-score level. However, it is NAEP's goal to estimate these population characteristics. NAEP's objectives can be achieved with methodologies that produce estimates of the population-level parameters directly, without the intermediary computation of estimates of individuals. This is accomplished using marginal estimation techniques for latent variables. Under the assumptions of the analysis models, these population estimates will be consistent in the sense that the estimates approach the population values as the sample size increases.

IRT and the NAEP marginal estimation methodology are used to estimate score scales for each of the reading text types at each grade (e.g., at grades 4 and 8, score scales are estimated for literary texts and for informational texts). The scales summarize student performance across all three types of questions in the assessment (multiple-choice, short constructed-response, and extended constructed-response). Each scale score distribution is transformed to a NAEP scale that ranges from 0 to 500. A reading composite scale is subsequently created by combining the scales associated with each text type. Summary statistics of the scale scores are estimated, and statistical tests are used to make inferences about the comparisons of results for different groups of students or for different assessment years. Finally, NAEP scale score distributions are described via achievement levels and/or item mapping procedures. For more information about NAEP analysis, IRT, and scaling see <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/analysis/>.

Variance Estimation

The averages and percentages in this report are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. Moreover, 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. Therefore, the results are subject to a measure of uncertainty, reflected in the standard error of the estimates—a range of up to a few points above or below the score or percentage—which takes into account potential score fluctuation due to sampling error and measurement error.

Because NAEP uses complex sampling procedures, conventional formulas for estimating sampling variability that assume simple random sampling are inappropriate. NAEP uses a jackknife replication procedure to estimate standard errors. The jackknife standard error provides a reasonable measure of uncertainty for any student information that can be observed without error. However, because each student typically responds to only a few questions associated with each reading text type, the estimated scale score for any single student would be imprecise. In this case, NAEP's marginal estimation methodology is used to describe the performance of groups of students without requiring precise estimates of individual student performance. The estimate of the variance of the students' scale score distributions (which reflect the imprecision due to lack of measurement accuracy) is computed. This component of variability is then included in the standard errors of NAEP scale scores.

Drawing Inferences from the NAEP Results

Drawing correct inferences from NAEP assessment results depends on the use of appropriate statistical procedures for comparing assessment results for population groups of interest and following guidelines to ensure the validity of the inferences. Comparisons of different groups of students with respect to scores or percentages of a certain attribute are of primary interest to users of NAEP results. The user is cautioned to rely on the results of statistical tests, rather than on the apparent magnitude of the difference between two numbers when determining whether differences are likely to represent actual differences among the groups in the population.

***t* Test Comparison:** By convention, references to differences in NAEP reports indicate that scores or percentages from two groups are different (e.g., one group performed higher or lower than another group) only when the difference in the point estimates for the groups being compared is statistically significant at an approximate level of .05.

Since 1998, *t* tests have been used for most NAEP comparisons. These tests are more appropriate than *z* tests (based on normal distribution approximations) when the statistics that are being compared are from distributions with proportionally larger extremes (i.e., thicker tails) than the normal distribution. One aspect of the use of *t* tests that contributes to the difficulty in their use for large-scale surveys is the determination of the appropriate degrees of freedom for the *t* distribution of interest.

Multiple Comparison Procedures: The *t* test used by NAEP and the certainty ascribed to intervals (e.g., a 95 percent confidence interval) are based on statistical theory that assumes only one confidence interval is being examined or only one test of statistical significance is being performed. However, in some sections of a report, many different groups may be compared (i.e., multiple sets of confidence intervals are being analyzed). In sets of confidence intervals, statistical theory indicates that certainty associated with the entire set of intervals is less than that attributable to each individual comparison from the set. To hold the significance level for the set of comparisons at a particular level (e.g., .05), adjustments—called multiple comparison procedures—must be made to the methods.

To ensure that comparisons made using NAEP data are as accurate as possible, error rates are controlled when multiple comparisons are made. When making a number of comparisons in a single analysis, such as analyzing White student performance versus the performance of Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native students, the probability of finding significant differences by chance, for at least one comparison, increases with the family size or number of comparisons. There are several ways to take into account how many related comparisons are being made. In NAEP, the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) procedure is used to control for this.

Unlike other multiple comparison procedures (e.g., the Bonferroni procedure) that control the familywise error rate (i.e., the probability of making even one false rejection in the set of comparisons), the FDR procedure controls the expected proportion of falsely rejected hypotheses. Familywise procedures are considered conservative for large families of comparisons; therefore the FDR procedure is more suitable for multiple comparisons in NAEP than other procedures. There are two exceptions where the FDR is not applied: when comparing multiple years and when comparing a state's overall results to the nation.

NAEP Reporting Groups

In addition to overall results for each grade assessed, NAEP results are reported for certain student groups provided there are sufficient numbers of students and adequate school representation. Results for some student groups may not be available for certain years, grades, or jurisdictions.

Race/Ethnicity: The school-recorded race/ethnicity variable records the race/ethnicity of each student as reported by the student's school. When the school-recorded information is missing, student-reported data derived from the student background questions are used. For 2011, the mutually exclusive racial/ethnic categories are White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or more races. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin unless specified.

Gender: The gender of the student assessed is taken from school records.

Eligibility for the National School Lunch Program: The school lunch variable is based on available school records. Students are classified as either currently eligible or not currently eligible for the national lunch component of the Department of Agriculture's National School Lunch Program. The classification refers only to the school year when the assessment was administered and is not based on eligibility in previous years. If school records are not available, the student is classified as "Information not available." If the school did not participate in the program, all students in that school were classified as "Information not available." Eligibility for the program is determined by student's family income in relation to the federally established poverty level. Free lunch qualification is set at 130 percent of the poverty level or below, and reduced-price lunch qualification is set at between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty level. (For the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, for a family of four, 130 percent of the poverty level was \$28,665, and 185 percent was \$40,793.) Additional information on eligibility may be found at the U.S. Department of Agriculture website at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/>.

Type of Location: Results for four mutually exclusive categories of school location are also reported: city, suburb, town, and rural. The categories are based on standard definitions established by the Federal Office of Management and Budget using population and geographic information from the U.S. Census Bureau. Schools are assigned to these categories in the NCES Common Core of Data based on their physical address. The classification system was revised for 2007; therefore, trend comparisons to previous years are not available. The new locale codes are based on an address's proximity to an urbanized area (a densely settled core with densely settled surrounding areas). This is a change from the original system based on metropolitan statistical areas. To distinguish the two systems, the new system is referred to as "urban-centric locale codes."

Parental Education: Eighth-graders were asked the following two questions, the responses to which were combined to derive the parental education variable:

How far in school did your mother go?

- She did not finish high school.
- She graduated from high school.
- She had some education after high school.
- She graduated from college.
- I don't know.

How far in school did your father go?

- He did not finish high school.
- He graduated from high school.
- He had some education after high school.
- He graduated from college.
- I don't know.

The information was combined into one parental-education reporting variable in the following way:

- If a student indicated the extent of education for only one parent, that level was included in the data. If a student indicated the extent of education for both parents, the higher of the two levels was included in the data.
- If a student responded "I don't know" for both parents, or responded "I don't know" for one parent and did not respond for the other, the parental education level was classified as "I don't know."
- If the student did not respond for either parent, the student was recorded as having provided no response.

Because fourth-graders' responses to the questions tend to be highly variable, the questions are not presented to students at grade 4.

Region of the Country: Prior to 2003, NAEP results were reported for four NAEP-defined regions of the nation: Northeast, Southeast, Central, and West. To align NAEP with other federal data collections, NAEP analysis and reports have used the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of "region" beginning in 2003. The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West. Therefore, trend data by region are not provided for assessment years prior to 2003.

Figure A-1 shows how states are subdivided into these census regions. All 50 states and the District of Columbia are listed. Other jurisdictions, including the Department of Defense Education Activity schools, are not assigned to any region.

Figure A-1. States within regions of the country defined by the U.S. Census Bureau

Northeast	South	Midwest	West
Connecticut	Alabama	Illinois	Alaska
Maine	Arkansas	Indiana	Arizona
Massachusetts	Delaware	Iowa	California
New Hampshire	District of Columbia	Kansas	Colorado
New Jersey	Florida	Michigan	Hawaii
New York	Georgia	Minnesota	Idaho
Pennsylvania	Kentucky	Missouri	Montana
Rhode Island	Louisiana	Nebraska	Nevada
Vermont	Maryland	North Dakota	New Mexico
	Mississippi	Ohio	Oregon
	North Carolina	South Dakota	Utah
	Oklahoma	Wisconsin	Washington
	South Carolina		Wyoming
	Tennessee		
	Texas		
	Virginia		
	West Virginia		

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.

Caution in Interpretations

As previously stated, the NAEP reading scale makes it possible to examine relationships between students' performance and various background factors that NAEP measures. However, the relationship between achievement and another variable does not reveal its underlying cause, which may be influenced by a number of other variables. Similarly, the assessments do not reflect the influence of unmeasured variables. The results are most useful when considered in combination with other knowledge about the student population and the educational system, such as trends in instruction, changes in the school-age population, and societal demands and expectations.

Caution in interpretation is also warranted for some small population group estimates. At times in this report, smaller population groups show very large increases or decreases across years in average scores; however, it is necessary to interpret such score changes with extreme caution. The effects of exclusion-rate changes for small student groups may be more marked for small groups than they are for the whole population. In addition, standard errors are often quite large around the score estimates for small groups, which in turn means the standard error around the gain is also large.