

Appendix

Technical Procedures for the NAEP 2019 Reading Assessment

This appendix provides an overview of some of the technical procedures for the NAEP 2019 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 <https://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 passages and questions should be included, as well as how the questions should be scored. Frameworks incorporate ideas and rely on the expertise of many individuals involved in reading and reading education, including researchers, policymakers, teachers, teacher educators, 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 National Assessment of Educational Progress* and *Assessment and Item Specifications for the NAEP Reading Assessment* are available on the Governing Board's website at <https://www.nagb.gov/naep-frameworks/reading.html>.

The frameworks for the 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* replaced 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 previous assessment years. A summary of these special analyses is available on the Web at https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/trend_study.asp. The 2019 NAEP reading assessment used the same framework used in 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. Trends are reported from 1992 to 2019.

Framework development was guided by scientifically based reading research that defines reading as a dynamic cognitive process that involves:

- Understanding written text
- Developing and interpreting meaning
- Using meaning as appropriate to the type of text, purpose, and situation

The framework prescribes 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 exposition. At grade 8, informational texts include two types: exposition and argumentation/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. The inclusion of distinct text types is aligned with the framework definition of reading, which recognizes that subject with different texts elicits different ways of thinking and responding.

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 of readers' knowledge of specific word meaning as used in the passage.

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 2019 assessment, are presented in tables A-1 and A-2.

Table A-1.

Target and actual percentage distribution of passages in NAEP reading, by grade and text type: 2019

Grade	Types of text	
	Literary text	Informational text
Grade 4		
Target	50	50
Actual	51	49
Grade 8		
Target	45	55
Actual	48	52

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-2.

Target and actual percentage distribution of cognitive targets in NAEP reading, by grade: 2019

Grade	Cognitive targets		
	Locate and recall	Integrate and interpret	Critique and evaluate
Grade 4			
Target	30	50	20
Actual	21	62	17
Grade 8			
Target	20	50	30
Actual	18	61	21

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Content of the 2019 Reading Assessment

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

The number of questions in the 2019 reading assessment 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 literary and informational texts 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 so each student was required to take only a small portion of the entire pool of assessment questions.

The reading passages and questions for each grade were divided up into subsets or "blocks." In 2019, there were a total of 12 cognitive blocks at fourth grade and 15 blocks at eighth grade. Each reading assessment form contained two separately timed 30-minute blocks. Each block typically contained 10 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 <https://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 2013–14 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 2013–14 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 2019 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: 2019**

State/jurisdiction	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Nation	154,000	3,991,000	146,200	3,907,000
Public	148,000	3,689,000	141,200	3,603,000
Private	2,600	293,000	2,600	298,000
Alabama	2,400	58,000	2,200	51,000
Alaska	2,300	9,000	2,100	8,000
Arizona	2,500	86,000	2,300	86,000
Arkansas	2,400	37,000	2,300	35,000
California	6,200	444,000	5,900	442,000
Colorado	3,300	68,000	3,000	64,000
Connecticut	2,400	38,000	2,300	39,000
Delaware	2,300	10,000	2,300	10,000
Florida	5,800	204,000	5,600	205,000
Georgia	3,500	133,000	3,500	125,000
Hawaii	2,200	12,000	2,200	13,000
Idaho	2,400	23,000	2,300	23,000
Illinois	3,600	137,000	3,500	146,000
Indiana	2,400	78,000	2,100	73,000
Iowa	2,300	35,000	2,300	37,000
Kansas	2,300	35,000	2,300	34,000
Kentucky	3,200	49,000	3,100	49,000
Louisiana	2,300	53,000	2,100	47,000
Maine	2,300	13,000	2,300	13,000
Maryland	3,300	70,000	3,100	64,000
Massachusetts	3,500	69,000	3,500	70,000
Michigan	3,400	99,000	3,300	102,000
Minnesota	2,500	63,000	2,400	64,000
Mississippi	2,500	37,000	2,200	34,000
Missouri	2,500	68,000	2,400	68,000
Montana	2,300	12,000	2,300	11,000
Nebraska	2,500	25,000	2,400	24,000
Nevada	2,600	35,000	2,400	35,000
New Hampshire	2,300	13,000	2,100	14,000
New Jersey	2,300	100,000	2,200	98,000
New Mexico	2,700	25,000	2,800	24,000
New York	3,200	192,000	3,000	191,000
North Carolina	4,500	120,000	4,400	113,000
North Dakota	2,400	9,000	2,200	8,000
Ohio	3,700	130,000	3,300	122,000
Oklahoma	2,300	49,000	2,200	46,000
Oregon	2,400	41,000	2,400	42,000
Pennsylvania	3,200	126,000	3,100	127,000
Rhode Island	2,400	10,000	2,300	11,000
South Carolina	2,400	60,000	2,300	54,000
South Dakota	2,300	11,000	2,200	10,000
Tennessee	3,200	72,000	3,100	71,000
Texas	7,400	406,000	7,000	388,000
Utah	2,400	49,000	2,400	50,000
Vermont	2,400	6,000	2,400	6,000
Virginia	2,300	95,000	2,100	90,000
Washington	2,500	83,000	2,300	75,000
West Virginia	2,300	20,000	2,200	18,000
Wisconsin	3,600	61,000	3,200	60,000
Wyoming	2,200	7,000	2,200	7,000
Other jurisdictions				
BIE ¹	900	3,000	800	3,000
District of Columbia	2,600	6,000	1,900	5,000
DoDEA ²	2,500	6,000	1,700	4,000

¹ Bureau of Indian Education.² Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools).

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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 national totals, but not in the public school totals. Data for the District of Columbia public schools are counted, along with the states, in the national public school totals. 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), 2019 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: 2019**

Urban district	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Albuquerque	1,100	7,000	1,100	6,000
Atlanta	1,200	4,000	1,400	3,000
Austin	1,200	6,000	1,100	5,000
Baltimore City	1,100	6,000	1,000	5,000
Boston	1,300	4,000	1,300	3,000
Charlotte	1,000	12,000	1,100	11,000
Chicago	1,800	27,000	1,600	26,000
Clark County (NV)	1,800	24,000	1,600	23,000
Cleveland	1,400	3,000	1,100	3,000
Dallas	1,200	12,000	1,200	10,000
Denver	1,200	7,000	1,000	6,000
Detroit	1,200	4,000	1,300	3,000
District of Columbia (DCPS)	1,600	4,000	1,000	2,000
Duval County (FL)	1,200	10,000	1,100	8,000
Forth Worth	1,200	6,000	1,200	6,000
Fresno	1,200	5,000	1,100	5,000
Guilford County (NC)	1,100	5,000	1,100	5,000
Hillsborough County (FL)	1,100	16,000	1,100	16,000
Houston	1,700	17,000	1,600	12,000
Jefferson County (KY)	1,200	7,000	1,100	7,000
Los Angeles	1,800	35,000	1,700	31,000
Miami-Dade	1,800	25,000	1,700	25,000
Milwaukee	1,200	6,000	1,000	5,000
New York City	1,800	71,000	1,800	69,000
Philadelphia	1,100	11,000	1,000	8,000
San Diego	1,100	8,000	1,100	7,000
Shelby County (TN)	1,100	8,000	1,100	7,000

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools. The sample size is rounded to the nearest hundred. The target population is rounded to the nearest thousand.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 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 2019 reading assessment are presented in table A-5. Student-weighted school participation rates were 96 percent for grade 4 (100 percent for public schools and 53 percent for private schools) and 96 percent for grade 8 (99 percent for public schools and 50 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 2019, 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-7). The 27 urban districts participating at grades 4 and 8 also met the criteria for reporting (table A-8).

Table A-5.

National school and student participation rates in NAEP reading, by grade and type of school: 2019

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	96	97	88	90	8,300	94	150,600
Public	100	100	100	100	7,830	93	144,700
Private	53	63	55	62	290	95	2,600
Grade 8							
Nation	96	96	81	84	6,950	91	143,100
Public	99	99	99	99	6,560	91	138,100
Private	50	62	51	60	270	93	2,600

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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 school 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), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-6.**Public school and student participation rates in NAEP reading at grade 4, by state/jurisdiction: 2019**

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	7,830	93	144,700
Alabama	100	100	120	94	2,400
Alaska	98	92	160	91	2,300
Arizona	100	100	130	94	2,500
Arkansas	100	100	120	95	2,300
California	99	99	300	94	6,000
Colorado	100	100	170	93	3,200
Connecticut	100	100	120	93	2,300
Delaware	100	100	90	93	2,300
Florida	99	99	280	93	5,600
Georgia	100	100	160	95	3,400
Hawaii	100	100	120	93	2,200
Idaho	100	100	130	94	2,400
Illinois	100	100	190	94	3,500
Indiana	100	100	120	94	2,300
Iowa	99	99	120	94	2,200
Kansas	100	100	130	94	2,200
Kentucky	100	100	160	95	3,100
Louisiana	100	100	120	93	2,200
Maine	100	99	140	92	2,200
Maryland	100	100	160	93	3,200
Massachusetts	100	100	180	93	3,300
Michigan	100	100	180	93	3,300
Minnesota	100	100	130	93	2,400
Mississippi	100	100	120	95	2,400
Missouri	100	100	130	94	2,400
Montana	100	98	160	93	2,300
Nebraska	100	100	150	95	2,500
Nevada	100	100	130	93	2,500
New Hampshire	100	100	140	90	2,200
New Jersey	99	99	120	93	2,200
New Mexico	99	99	140	93	2,700
New York	100	100	160	89	3,100
North Carolina	100	100	230	93	4,400
North Dakota	99	99	160	94	2,300
Ohio	100	100	200	93	3,500
Oklahoma	100	100	130	94	2,300
Oregon	100	100	140	91	2,400
Pennsylvania	100	100	160	93	3,100
Rhode Island	100	100	110	94	2,300
South Carolina	100	100	120	94	2,400
South Dakota	100	98	150	92	2,300
Tennessee	100	100	160	94	3,100
Texas	100	100	360	95	7,100
Utah	100	100	130	92	2,400
Vermont	100	100	210	94	2,400
Virginia	100	100	120	93	2,300
Washington	99	99	130	92	2,500
West Virginia	100	100	130	93	2,300
Wisconsin	99	99	190	94	3,500
Wyoming	100	100	130	94	2,200
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	120	93	2,500
DoDEA ¹	97	95	90	94	2,400

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-7.**Public school and student participation rates in NAEP reading at grade 8, by state/jurisdiction: 2019**

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)	99	99	6,560	91	138,100
Alabama	100	100	110	94	2,200
Alaska	98	86	100	89	2,100
Arizona	100	100	120	91	2,300
Arkansas	100	100	110	92	2,200
California	96	93	230	93	5,700
Colorado	100	100	150	91	3,000
Connecticut	100	100	110	92	2,200
Delaware	100	100	60	92	2,300
Florida	99	99	250	92	5,500
Georgia	100	100	130	92	3,400
Hawaii	100	100	60	90	2,200
Idaho	100	100	100	94	2,300
Illinois	100	100	190	91	3,400
Indiana	100	100	110	92	2,100
Iowa	100	100	120	93	2,300
Kansas	100	100	120	94	2,200
Kentucky	100	100	130	92	3,000
Louisiana	100	100	110	92	2,100
Maine	100	100	110	89	2,200
Maryland	100	100	160	90	3,000
Massachusetts	99	99	150	91	3,300
Michigan	100	100	160	93	3,200
Minnesota	100	96	130	89	2,400
Mississippi	100	100	110	92	2,200
Missouri	100	100	130	94	2,400
Montana	100	100	130	93	2,300
Nebraska	97	99	120	93	2,400
Nevada	100	100	90	92	2,300
New Hampshire	100	100	90	85	2,100
New Jersey	100	100	110	91	2,100
New Mexico	100	100	120	92	2,700
New York	99	97	160	84	3,000
North Carolina	100	100	170	91	4,300
North Dakota	99	99	130	92	2,200
Ohio	100	100	190	93	3,200
Oklahoma	100	100	130	92	2,200
Oregon	100	100	130	90	2,400
Pennsylvania	99	100	160	91	3,000
Rhode Island	100	100	60	91	2,200
South Carolina	100	100	120	93	2,300
South Dakota	99	96	120	92	2,200
Tennessee	100	100	150	91	3,100
Texas	100	100	240	92	6,900
Utah	100	100	120	90	2,400
Vermont	100	100	120	94	2,400
Virginia	100	100	110	90	2,100
Washington	99	100	120	90	2,300
West Virginia	100	100	110	93	2,200
Wisconsin	100	100	170	91	3,200
Wyoming	100	100	80	91	2,100
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	70	89	1,800
DoDEA ¹	97	91	50	93	1,700

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-8.**Public school and student participation rates for Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in reading, by grade and urban district: 2019**

Grade and urban district	School participation			Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	School-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Grade 4					
Albuquerque	96	94	50	93	1,100
Atlanta	99	98	50	95	1,200
Austin	100	100	60	92	1,100
Baltimore City	100	100	60	92	1,000
Boston	100	100	70	93	1,200
Charlotte	100	100	60	92	1,000
Chicago	100	100	100	93	1,700
Clark County (NV)	100	100	90	93	1,800
Cleveland	100	100	80	92	1,300
Dallas	100	100	60	95	1,100
Denver	100	100	60	93	1,100
Detroit	100	100	70	93	1,200
District of Columbia (DCPS)	100	100	80	94	1,600
Duval County (FL)	100	100	60	95	1,200
Fort Worth	100	100	60	95	1,100
Fresno	100	100	60	94	1,200
Guilford County (NC)	100	100	50	93	1,100
Hillsborough County (FL)	100	100	60	93	1,100
Houston	100	100	90	96	1,600
Jefferson County (KY)	100	100	60	95	1,100
Los Angeles	100	100	90	96	1,700
Miami-Dade	100	100	90	96	1,700
Milwaukee	100	100	70	92	1,200
New York City	100	100	90	91	1,700
Philadelphia	96	98	60	95	1,100
San Diego	100	100	60	93	1,100
Shelby County (TN)	100	100	60	93	1,100
Grade 8					
Albuquerque	100	100	40	91	1,100
Atlanta	100	100	20	93	1,300
Austin	100	100	20	87	1,000
Baltimore City	100	100	60	89	1,000
Boston	100	100	40	92	1,200
Charlotte	100	100	40	91	1,000
Chicago	100	100	90	92	1,600
Clark County (NV)	100	100	60	92	1,600
Cleveland	100	100	70	92	1,000
Dallas	100	100	40	93	1,100
Denver	96	96	40	91	1,000
Detroit	100	100	50	91	1,200
District of Columbia (DCPS)	100	100	30	90	1,000
Duval County (FL)	100	100	40	91	1,100
Fort Worth	100	100	30	94	1,100
Fresno	100	100	20	88	1,100
Guilford County (NC)	100	100	20	91	1,100
Hillsborough County (FL)	100	100	50	91	1,100
Houston	100	100	50	92	1,500
Jefferson County (KY)	100	100	20	91	1,100
Los Angeles	100	100	80	92	1,700
Miami-Dade	100	100	80	93	1,700
Milwaukee	100	100	50	87	1,000
New York City	99	96	90	93	1,700
Philadelphia	89	97	50	92	1,000
San Diego	100	100	40	91	1,100
Shelby County (TN)	100	100	40	90	1,100

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools. 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.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 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, explored 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. While identification rates of SD and ELL students have leveled off in recent years, NAEP inclusion rates have generally remained steady or increased since 2003. This reflects efforts on the part of states and jurisdictions to include all students who can meaningfully participate in the NAEP assessments. The 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.

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 2017 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/content/nagb/assets/documents/policies/naep_testandreport_studentswithdisabilities.pdf.

All 52 of the states/jurisdictions participating in the 2019 reading assessment met the 95 percent inclusion goal at 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-11 for the rates as a percentage of the SD or ELL students.

All of the districts participating in the 2019 reading assessment met the 95 percent inclusion goal at grade 4 and 8. See appendix table A-12 for the inclusion rates as a percentage of all students in each urban district/jurisdiction, and table A-13 for the rates as a percentage of the SD or ELL students.

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: 2019

Type of accommodation	Grade 4			Grade 8		
	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL
Braille	#	#	#	#	#	#
Breaks during test	4.4	3.9	1.0	2.7	2.6	0.3
Cueing to stay on task	2.6	2.4	0.5	1.3	1.2	0.1
Directions only presented in Sign Language	#	#	#	#	#	#
Directions translated into Spanish	0.6	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.4
Extended time	11.4	8.3	4.3	10.3	8.7	2.4
Hearing impaired version of test	0.1	0.1	#	0.1	0.1	#
High contrast for visually impaired	#	#	#	0.1	0.1	#
Low mobility version of test	#	#	#	#	#	#
Magnification equipment	0.1	0.1	#	0.1	0.1	#
Must be tested in separate session	5.7	5.2	1.2	4.2	4.0	0.5
Other	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	#
Preferential seating	2.9	2.7	0.6	2.4	2.3	0.3
Responds orally to scribe	0.3	0.3	#	0.1	0.1	#
Response in Sign Language	#	#	#	#	#	#
School staff administers/Aide present	1.4	1.2	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.1
Special equipment	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	#
Template	0.2	0.2	#	0.2	0.1	#

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-10.

Inclusion rate and confidence interval in NAEP reading for fourth- and eighth-grade public school students, as a percentage of all students, by state/jurisdiction: 2019

State/jurisdiction	Grade 4				Grade 8			
	Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval		Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval			
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper		
Nation (public)	98 ¹	97.5	97.9	98 ¹	97.9	98.2		
Alabama	99 ¹	98.1	99.2	98 ¹	97.7	98.9		
Alaska	99 ¹	98.4	99.2	99 ¹	98.7	99.4		
Arizona	99 ¹	98.0	99.1	98 ¹	97.0	98.5		
Arkansas	98 ¹	97.7	98.8	98 ¹	97.3	98.6		
California	97 ¹	96.4	97.9	98 ¹	97.6	98.8		
Colorado	98 ¹	97.4	98.5	99 ¹	98.1	99.1		
Connecticut	98 ¹	97.3	98.7	98 ¹	97.1	98.6		
Delaware	98 ¹	97.9	98.9	98 ¹	97.4	98.6		
Florida	98 ¹	96.9	98.1	97 ¹	96.7	98.0		
Georgia	98 ¹	96.9	98.6	97 ¹	96.2	97.7		
Hawaii	98 ¹	97.3	98.3	99 ¹	98.0	99.0		
Idaho	99 ¹	98.1	99.0	99 ¹	98.3	99.3		
Illinois	99 ¹	97.9	99.1	99 ¹	98.5	99.4		
Indiana	98 ¹	97.6	98.7	98 ¹	97.6	99.0		
Iowa	98 ¹	97.8	98.9	99 ¹	98.3	99.2		
Kansas	98 ¹	97.3	98.6	98 ¹	97.6	98.7		
Kentucky	97 ¹	96.3	98.0	98 ¹	97.0	98.3		
Louisiana	98 ¹	97.2	98.6	97 ¹	95.4	97.6		
Maine	98 ¹	97.7	98.9	98 ¹	97.8	98.8		
Maryland	97 ¹	96.1	97.8	97 ¹	96.3	97.7		
Massachusetts	97 ¹	95.8	98.1	97 ¹	96.0	98.1		
Michigan	98 ¹	97.3	98.7	97 ¹	96.5	98.2		
Minnesota	99 ¹	97.9	99.0	98 ¹	97.6	98.8		
Mississippi	99 ¹	98.8	99.5	99 ¹	98.6	99.4		
Missouri	99 ¹	98.0	99.2	99 ¹	98.3	99.3		
Montana	98 ¹	97.8	98.8	99 ¹	98.3	99.2		
Nebraska	98 ¹	97.8	99.0	99 ¹	98.1	99.2		
Nevada	98 ¹	97.5	98.7	99 ¹	98.3	99.2		
New Hampshire	99 ¹	98.0	99.1	99 ¹	98.5	99.3		
New Jersey	98 ¹	97.2	98.7	98 ¹	95.8	98.8		
New Mexico	99 ¹	98.0	98.9	97 ¹	96.8	98.0		
New York	97 ¹	94.0	98.5	98 ¹	97.1	98.5		
North Carolina	98 ¹	97.6	98.6	99 ¹	98.1	99.0		
North Dakota	98 ¹	97.9	98.8	99 ¹	98.1	99.1		
Ohio	98 ¹	97.0	98.3	98 ¹	97.3	98.3		
Oklahoma	98 ¹	96.8	98.6	98 ¹	97.3	98.5		
Oregon	99 ¹	98.5	99.3	99 ¹	98.2	99.1		
Pennsylvania	97 ¹	96.6	97.8	98 ¹	97.2	98.4		
Rhode Island	97 ¹	96.6	98.2	98 ¹	97.2	98.4		
South Carolina	99 ¹	98.3	99.3	99 ¹	97.9	99.0		
South Dakota	98 ¹	97.9	98.8	98 ¹	97.8	98.9		
Tennessee	98 ¹	97.2	98.2	98 ¹	96.6	98.2		
Texas	96 ¹	95.2	97.2	98 ¹	96.9	98.2		
Utah	99 ¹	98.4	99.3	99 ¹	98.2	99.3		
Vermont	99 ¹	98.0	98.9	99 ¹	98.0	99.0		
Virginia	99 ¹	97.9	98.9	98 ¹	97.3	98.6		
Washington	98 ¹	96.8	98.3	98 ¹	97.3	98.5		
West Virginia	99 ¹	98.0	99.2	99 ¹	97.8	99.0		
Wisconsin	98 ¹	97.7	98.9	98 ¹	97.9	98.9		
Wyoming	99 ¹	98.1	99.0	98 ¹	97.6	98.5		
Other jurisdictions								
District of Columbia	98 ¹	97.0	98.0	98 ¹	97.6	98.6		
DoDEA ²	98 ¹	97.6	98.6	99 ¹	98.2	99.2		

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).

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-11.

Inclusion rate and standard error (SE) in NAEP reading for fourth- and eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), as a percentage of identified SD or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2019

State/jurisdiction	Percentage of identified SD or ELL students															
	Grade 4					Grade 8										
	SD		ELL			SD		ELL								
Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE							
Nation (public)	88	1	0.5		94	1	0.4		89	1	0.4		92	1	0.4	
Alabama	94	1	1.2		91	1	2.7		87	1	2.2		‡		†	
Alaska	94	1	1.2		99	1	0.6		97	1	0.9		96	1	1.0	
Arizona	91	1	1.8		95	1	1.4		87	1	1.9		90	1	3.6	
Arkansas	89	1	1.6		97	1	1.2		86	1	2.5		95	1	1.9	
California	82	1	2.4		96	1	0.7		90	1	2.1		95	1	1.2	
Colorado	89	1	1.9		94	1	1.1		90	1	2.3		93	1	1.5	
Connecticut	91	1	2.2		93	1	1.4		93	1	1.4		79	1	5.1	
Delaware	93	1	1.3		96	1	1.0		89	1	1.9		94	1	2.3	
Florida	91	1	1.3		91	1	1.7		88	1	1.7		85	1	3.3	
Georgia	87	1	2.9		96	1	1.4		81	1	2.6		83	1	4.5	
Hawaii	89	1	2.0		92	1	1.2		90	1	1.9		92	1	2.0	
Idaho	89	1	1.9		98	1	0.9		90	1	2.1		98	1	1.4	
Illinois	91	1	2.1		96	1	1.0		95	1	1.4		94	1	1.6	
Indiana	90	1	1.6		97	1	1.2		91	1	1.7		94	1	2.6	
Iowa	92	1	1.6		90	1	2.8		93	1	1.4		95	1	1.7	
Kansas	90	1	1.8		95	1	1.5		90	1	2.0		94	1	2.0	
Kentucky	85	1	2.6		88	1	2.0		83	1	2.7		87	1	3.9	
Louisiana	86	1	2.5		91	1	3.3		77		3.5		87	1	4.6	
Maine	94	1	1.4		90	1	2.3		92	1	1.3		91	1	3.4	
Maryland	84	1	2.7		91	1	1.5		81	1	3.1		84	1	3.0	
Massachusetts	88	1	2.4		92	1	1.4		90	1	2.0		80	1	4.5	
Michigan	85	1	2.6		98	1	1.0		83	1	2.4		91	1	4.0	
Minnesota	91	1	1.8		98	1	0.8		90	1	1.6		89	1	3.3	
Mississippi	95	1	1.2		98	1	1.8		92	1	1.8		‡		†	
Missouri	94	1	1.7		93	1	2.2		93	1	1.8		‡		†	
Montana	90	1	1.7		97	1	1.9		91	1	1.7		‡		†	
Nebraska	94	1	1.4		93	1	1.5		94	1	1.5		89	1	3.5	
Nevada	88	1	1.7		96	1	0.9		92	1	1.6		96	1	1.2	
New Hampshire	93	1	1.5		95	1	2.2		95	1	1.2		‡		†	
New Jersey	93	1	1.9		89	1	2.9		93	1	1.6		75		5.4	
New Mexico	94	1	1.2		97	1	0.6		87	1	1.6		92	1	1.5	
New York	86	1	4.6		89	1	2.7		92	1	1.7		88	1	2.4	
North Carolina	88	1	2.0		95	1	1.0		92	1	1.6		90	1	2.3	
North Dakota	90	1	1.6		95	1	2.0		91	1	1.8		‡		†	
Ohio	86	1	1.8		91	1	4.9		86	1	1.6		95	1	2.9	
Oklahoma	89	1	2.1		95	1	1.6		88	1	1.9		96	1	1.8	
Oregon	94	1	1.2		97	1	0.9		93	1	1.2		94	1	2.2	
Pennsylvania	89	1	1.6		83	1	3.0		91	1	1.3		82	1	4.2	
Rhode Island	88	1	2.0		92	1	2.0		90	1	1.8		90	1	2.2	
South Carolina	94	1	1.4		95	1	2.0		92	1	1.4		93	1	2.5	
South Dakota	92	1	1.5		98	1	1.4		91	1	1.7		82	1	4.5	
Tennessee	89	1	1.6		91	1	1.8		82	1	2.7		84	1	4.2	
Texas	77		2.8		94	1	1.7		83	1	2.3		96	1	0.9	
Utah	94	1	1.5		97	1	1.2		92	1	1.9		96	1	1.9	
Vermont	92	1	1.2		99	1	1.2		93	1	1.2		‡		†	
Virginia	93	1	1.3		94	1	1.4		88	1	2.0		90	1	3.4	
Washington	88	1	2.0		93	1	1.6		90	1	2.2		89	1	2.5	
West Virginia	94	1	1.3		‡		†		91	1	1.8		‡		†	
Wisconsin	91	1	1.5		93	1	1.9		90	1	1.8		93	1	2.2	
Wyoming	93	1	1.4		92	1	2.7		87	1	1.5		‡		†	
Other jurisdictions																
District of Columbia	89	1	1.4		93	1	1.2		92	1	1.3		90	1	1.9	
DoDEA ²	91	1	1.5		93	1	1.5		90	1	2.2		95	1	2.1	

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

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

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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. SD includes students identified as having an Individualized Education Program but excludes other students protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-12.

Inclusion rate and confidence interval in NAEP reading for fourth- and eighth-grade public school students, as a percentage of all students, by urban district/jurisdiction: 2019

Urban district/jurisdiction	Grade 4				Grade 8			
	Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval		Inclusion rate	95% confidence interval			
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper		
Nation (public)	98 ²	97.5	97.9	98 ²	97.9	98.2		
Large city ¹ (public)	97 ²	95.9	97.4	98 ²	97.5	98.0		
Albuquerque	98 ²	97.2	99.1	98 ²	97.5	98.9		
Atlanta	98 ²	97.7	99.0	97 ²	96.4	97.9		
Austin	96 ²	94.4	96.9	97 ²	96.5	98.2		
Baltimore City	97 ²	95.7	98.1	96 ²	93.9	96.9		
Boston	95 ²	93.8	96.4	94 ²	93.2	95.2		
Charlotte	97 ²	95.9	98.5	97 ²	96.3	98.1		
Chicago	98 ²	97.1	98.9	99 ²	97.9	99.6		
Clark County (NV)	98 ²	97.3	98.6	99 ²	98.1	99.3		
Cleveland	97 ²	95.3	97.4	95 ²	93.6	95.9		
Dallas	95 ²	92.7	96.9	96 ²	94.7	97.2		
Denver	94 ²	90.8	96.1	98 ²	97.6	99.0		
Detroit	96 ²	94.6	96.7	94 ²	92.7	95.3		
District of Columbia (DCPS)	97 ²	95.8	97.5	97 ²	96.5	98.2		
Duval County (FL)	98 ²	95.9	98.6	98 ²	96.7	98.4		
Fort Worth	97 ²	95.8	97.9	99 ²	98.0	99.3		
Fresno	98 ²	96.8	98.8	98 ²	97.2	98.6		
Guilford County (NC)	99 ²	98.2	99.5	99 ²	98.2	99.5		
Hillsborough County (FL)	97 ²	95.7	98.3	98 ²	96.7	98.8		
Houston	98 ²	96.9	98.5	98 ²	97.3	98.6		
Jefferson County (KY)	95 ²	93.7	96.5	98 ²	96.9	98.6		
Los Angeles	97 ²	95.9	97.9	97 ²	96.5	98.1		
Miami-Dade	96 ²	95.1	97.3	97 ²	96.0	97.8		
Milwaukee	97 ²	96.0	97.9	97 ²	95.2	97.5		
New York City	95 ²	85.7	98.5	98 ²	97.3	98.7		
Philadelphia	93	91.3	94.9	94 ²	91.4	96.1		
San Diego	98 ²	96.3	98.5	96 ²	94.8	97.0		
Shelby County (TN)	98 ²	96.6	98.8	98 ²	96.8	98.8		

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

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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), 2019 Reading Assessment.

Table A-13.

Inclusion rate and standard error (SE) in NAEP reading for fourth- and eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), as a percentage of identified SD and ELL students, by urban district/jurisdiction: 2019

Urban district/jurisdiction	Percentage of identified SD or ELL students									
	Grade 4					Grade 8				
	SD		ELL			SD		ELL		
	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE
Nation (public)	88 ²	0.5	94 ²	0.4	89 ²	0.4	92 ²	0.4		
Large city ¹ (public)	84 ²	1.8	93 ²	1.0	90 ²	0.7	93 ²	0.6		
Albuquerque	94 ²	1.8	99 ²	0.7	93 ²	1.5	97 ²	0.9		
Atlanta	90 ²	2.4	97 ²	1.9	82 ²	2.7	‡	†		
Austin	79	3.4	95 ²	1.1	87 ²	2.6	93 ²	1.6		
Baltimore City	87 ²	3.3	86 ²	3.1	84 ²	3.0	73	6.7		
Boston	86 ²	2.2	92 ²	1.4	84 ²	1.8	86 ²	2.0		
Charlotte	82 ²	5.1	92 ²	2.0	92 ²	3.1	81 ²	3.8		
Chicago	91 ²	2.7	95 ²	1.2	96 ²	2.0	96 ²	1.3		
Clark County (NV)	87 ²	2.3	96 ²	1.0	93 ²	2.1	96 ²	1.4		
Cleveland	85 ²	2.2	95 ²	1.6	80	2.4	91 ²	1.3		
Dallas	77	3.8	94 ²	1.6	67	5.2	96 ²	1.0		
Denver	79 ²	4.3	86 ²	2.9	92 ²	2.7	97 ²	0.9		
Detroit	71	3.8	98 ²	1.1	70	2.9	97 ²	1.1		
District of Columbia (DCPS)	87 ²	2.2	91 ²	1.5	89 ²	2.3	87 ²	2.6		
Duval County (FL)	90 ²	2.8	90 ²	4.2	89 ²	2.6	‡	†		
Fort Worth	83 ²	3.9	97 ²	0.7	89 ²	2.8	99 ²	0.5		
Fresno	84 ²	3.9	97 ²	0.9	87 ²	2.7	92 ²	1.7		
Guilford County (NC)	94 ²	2.1	100 ²	†	93 ²	2.2	‡	†		
Hillsborough County (FL)	91 ²	2.4	89 ²	2.8	90 ²	2.1	95 ²	2.5		
Houston	80 ²	4.2	98 ²	0.7	86 ²	2.7	96 ²	1.0		
Jefferson County (KY)	81 ²	3.9	80 ²	3.4	83 ²	3.8	88 ²	3.2		
Los Angeles	84 ²	2.8	92 ²	1.5	88 ²	2.3	88 ²	2.1		
Miami-Dade	85 ²	2.9	91 ²	1.6	89 ²	2.5	87 ²	2.4		
Milwaukee	88 ²	2.0	96 ²	1.7	86 ²	2.3	93 ²	2.4		
New York City	84 ²	8.5	87 ²	4.2	96 ²	1.1	89 ²	2.4		
Philadelphia	73	3.9	84 ²	3.5	75	5.2	85 ²	3.7		
San Diego	89 ²	2.7	96 ²	1.2	79	3.2	82 ²	3.2		
Shelby County (TN)	82 ²	5.0	96 ²	1.9	84 ²	3.4	‡	†		

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools. SD includes students identified as having an Individualized Education Program but excludes other students protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2019 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 2019 are presented in table A-14. 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 2019. 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-14.

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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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.

In 2013, the method used by school staff to determine whether or not a student should be excluded from the NAEP assessment was revised. Previously, a student who required an accommodation specified in their IEP that was not allowed by NAEP was excluded. Beginning in 2013, SD students could be excluded only if they took an alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards, and ELL students could be excluded only if they had been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than one year. All other students were encouraged to take the assessment, even if their accommodation was not allowed by NAEP. Schools, students, or parents could, however, refuse to allow such a student to be assessed. For weighting and reporting purposes, these refusals were counted as exclusions.

Jurisdictions vary in their proportions of SD and/or ELL students. These variations, as well as differences in policies and practices regarding the identification and inclusion of SD and/or ELL 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): The percentage 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. (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).

State Exclusion Rates (public school students only): The states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1992, 1994, and 1998 reading assessments at grade 4 when accommodations were not permitted are provided in table A-17. The states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, and 2019 reading assessments at grade 4 when accommodations were permitted are provided in table A-18.

The states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1992, 1994, and 1998 reading assessments at grade 8 when accommodations were not permitted are provided in table A-19. The states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, and 2019 reading assessments at grade 8 when accommodations were permitted are provided in table A-20.

Rates by state are reported separately for SD and ELL students at each grade in tables A-21 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.

District Exclusion Rates (public school students only): District-level results in reading are only available based on administrations in which accommodations were permitted. Among the 27 urban districts that participated in the 2019 reading assessment, the percentage of fourth-graders identified as SD and/or ELL are provided in table A-31. The percentage of eighth-graders identified as SD and/or ELL are provided in table A-32.

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, 1998–2019

Grade and SD/ELL category	1998	2000	2002	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Grade 4												
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	16	18	19	20	21	22	21	22	22	23	24	25
Excluded	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	3	2	2	2
Assessed	10	12	13	14	15	16	16	18	19	21	22	23
Without accommodations	7	10	9	9	9	9	8	9	7	8	10	9
With accommodations	3	2	4	5	6	7	8	10	12	13	12	14
SD												
Identified	10	11	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	14	14	15
Excluded	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	3	2	2	1	2
Assessed	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10	11	12	12	13
Without accommodations	3	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3
With accommodations	3	2	3	4	5	5	6	7	9	10	9	10
ELL												
Identified	6	8	8	10	10	10	10	11	10	11	12	12
Excluded	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Assessed	4	5	6	7	8	8	8	10	9	10	11	12
Without accommodations	3	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	7
With accommodations	1	#	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	5
Grade 8												
SD and/or ELL												
Identified	12	—	17	17	17	18	17	17	16	18	19	20
Excluded	4	—	5	5	5	5	4	3	2	2	2	2
Assessed	9	—	11	12	13	13	13	13	14	16	17	18
Without accommodations	6	—	8	7	7	6	5	5	4	5	6	6
With accommodations	2	—	4	5	6	6	8	9	11	11	11	12
SD												
Identified	10	—	12	13	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	14
Excluded	3	—	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	1	1	1
Assessed	7	—	8	9	8	8	9	9	11	11	12	13
Without accommodations	5	—	5	4	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	2
With accommodations	2	—	3	5	5	6	7	7	9	10	9	10
ELL												
Identified	3	—	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	7	7
Excluded	1	—	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Assessed	2	—	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	7
Without accommodations	2	—	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	4
With accommodations	#	—	#	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	3

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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, 1998–2019 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: 2019

Assessment mode, 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	8	92	37	55
SD	11	89	21	68
ELL	6	94	54	40
Grade 8				
SD and/or ELL	9	91	30	60
SD	10	90	17	73
ELL	8	92	55	37

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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), 2019 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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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, 1998–2019

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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	23	4	19	9	10	23	3	20	7	13
Alabama	12	2	10	6	4	12	1	11	6	5
Alaska	27	2	25	6	20	27	1	26	5	21
Arizona	22	1	20	7	13	17	1	15	2	13
Arkansas	20	1	18	5	13	21	1	20	5	15
California	38	2	35	29	6	32	3	30	22	8
Colorado	25	1	23	10	13	23	2	21	8	13
Connecticut	19	2	17	2	15	19	2	17	2	15
Delaware	19	7	12	4	8	18	5	13	3	10
Florida	23	2	21	3	18	25	3	22	3	19
Georgia	16	6	10	4	6	16	5	11	3	8
Hawaii	20	2	18	6	11	17	2	15	5	10
Idaho	15	2	13	5	7	15	1	13	4	9
Illinois	21	2	19	6	13	20	1	19	4	15
Indiana	22	1	21	7	14	22	2	19	3	16
Iowa	19	1	18	3	15	18	1	17	2	14
Kansas	24	2	22	10	12	26	2	24	11	13
Kentucky	16	9	8	4	4	15	3	12	3	10
Louisiana	22	1	21	4	17	22	1	21	2	19
Maine	20	2	19	4	15	22	2	20	2	18
Maryland	19	10	9	2	7	21	13	8	2	6
Massachusetts	25	6	19	7	12	27	3	25	9	16
Michigan	16	4	13	6	7	20	4	16	7	10
Minnesota	23	2	22	11	10	22	3	19	9	10
Mississippi	11	1	10	5	6	12	1	11	4	7
Missouri	16	2	15	5	9	16	1	15	3	11
Montana	14	4	9	4	5	15	3	12	5	7
Nebraska	23	4	19	8	11	22	4	19	5	14
Nevada	35	1	34	16	18	31	2	30	7	23
New Hampshire	19	3	16	3	14	18	3	15	2	13
New Jersey	20	9	10	2	9	19	2	17	2	15
New Mexico	27	6	21	11	10	28	1	27	12	15
New York	23	3	20	1	19	22	1	21	1	20
North Carolina	21	2	19	7	12	20	2	18	5	13
North Dakota	17	6	10	4	6	16	4	12	3	9
Ohio	17	6	11	2	9	17	3	15	2	13
Oklahoma	21	5	16	6	9	22	2	20	6	14
Oregon	28	3	25	12	13	27	2	24	12	12
Pennsylvania	18	3	15	4	11	18	2	16	3	13
Rhode Island	19	2	17	5	12	19	1	18	3	14
South Carolina	18	3	16	8	7	20	2	18	9	10
South Dakota	19	3	16	9	8	19	2	17	7	9
Tennessee	17	7	10	3	7	18	3	14	2	12
Texas	30	10	20	17	3	33	5	28	13	14
Utah	19	4	14	7	8	18	3	15	4	10
Vermont	19	2	17	3	14	19	1	18	2	16
Virginia	19	3	16	7	10	19	2	18	6	12
Washington	22	3	20	8	12	22	3	19	7	12
West Virginia	18	2	16	8	8	19	2	17	8	9
Wisconsin	21	2	19	3	16	21	2	20	3	17
Wyoming	19	2	17	4	12	18	1	16	3	13
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	21	3	18	2	16	20	2	19	1	17
DoDEA ¹	19	7	12	5	7	19	6	13	5	7

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2015					2017				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	24	2	22	9	14	25	2	23	10	13
Alabama	14	1	13	7	5	15	2	13	8	6
Alaska	27	1	26	8	17	27	1	25	12	13
Arizona	21	2	19	6	14	21	1	19	6	13
Arkansas	21	2	20	5	15	24	2	23	6	17
California	35	2	33	25	8	34	2	32	25	7
Colorado	24	2	22	12	10	24	2	23	13	9
Connecticut	19	2	17	3	14	22	2	20	6	14
Delaware	20	2	18	4	14	26	2	24	9	15
Florida	26	2	24	3	21	25	4	21	2	19
Georgia	20	4	16	4	11	18	2	16	5	11
Hawaii	16	2	14	5	10	15	2	13	7	6
Idaho	15	2	14	4	9	16	2	15	6	9
Illinois	22	1	21	6	15	24	1	23	8	15
Indiana	23	1	22	5	17	22	1	21	5	15
Iowa	20	1	19	3	16	20	1	19	3	15
Kansas	28	2	26	12	14	26	2	24	16	8
Kentucky	19	5	15	5	9	19	3	15	5	10
Louisiana	24	3	20	3	18	23	3	20	3	17
Maine	22	1	21	4	17	23	2	21	7	15
Maryland	21	4	17	3	14	22	3	19	5	15
Massachusetts	27	3	24	8	16	28	3	25	10	15
Michigan	19	3	16	7	9	20	3	17	11	6
Minnesota	23	2	21	12	9	22	2	20	14	5
Mississippi	14	1	13	5	8	16	1	15	6	9
Missouri	16	1	15	5	11	18	1	17	7	10
Montana	14	2	12	5	8	16	1	15	6	9
Nebraska	23	2	21	5	16	24	2	22	8	15
Nevada	33	2	31	15	16	27	2	25	19	7
New Hampshire	21	1	19	3	16	21	1	19	5	14
New Jersey	21	3	19	2	17	21	2	19	3	16
New Mexico	29	2	26	11	15	29	2	27	11	16
New York	25	2	23	1	22	24	2	22	3	18
North Carolina	19	2	18	6	11	20	2	18	7	11
North Dakota	15	2	13	4	10	15	2	14	6	7
Ohio	19	2	17	3	15	19	2	17	4	14
Oklahoma	24	3	21	8	13	25	2	23	9	14
Oregon	25	2	23	12	11	28	1	26	17	9
Pennsylvania	21	2	20	5	15	20	3	18	6	12
Rhode Island	20	2	18	4	14	21	2	19	4	14
South Carolina	21	1	20	9	11	22	1	21	14	7
South Dakota	19	3	16	7	10	18	2	16	10	6
Tennessee	20	3	17	4	13	18	2	16	5	11
Texas	34	4	30	13	18	37	4	33	14	19
Utah	16	1	15	6	8	21	2	19	12	8
Vermont	20	2	19	4	14	20	2	18	5	13
Virginia	18	2	17	6	11	21	2	18	8	11
Washington	24	2	23	11	12	25	2	23	14	9
West Virginia	21	2	19	8	11	22	1	21	12	8
Wisconsin	19	2	17	4	13	21	1	20	8	12
Wyoming	18	1	17	5	12	17	1	16	4	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	19	2	17	2	15	22	3	19	4	15
DoDEA ¹	22	2	20	8	12	21	2	19	8	12

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2019				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	27	2	24	10	15
Alabama	19	1	18	8	10
Alaska	30	1	28	12	17
Arizona	20	1	19	7	11
Arkansas	24	2	23	5	18
California	34	3	31	23	8
Colorado	25	2	23	13	10
Connecticut	24	2	22	7	15
Delaware	31	2	30	12	18
Florida	30	2	27	3	25
Georgia	24	2	22	7	15
Hawaii	24	2	21	14	7
Idaho	20	1	18	8	10
Illinois	28	1	27	11	15
Indiana	27	2	25	5	21
Iowa	20	2	18	3	15
Kansas	25	2	23	12	11
Kentucky	22	3	19	5	14
Louisiana	22	2	20	3	18
Maine	25	2	23	5	19
Maryland	27	3	24	6	18
Massachusetts	31	3	29	10	19
Michigan	22	2	20	10	10
Minnesota	25	1	24	14	10
Mississippi	17	1	16	6	11
Missouri	21	1	19	8	12
Montana	19	2	17	8	9
Nebraska	23	2	22	8	14
Nevada	30	2	28	20	8
New Hampshire	22	1	21	6	15
New Jersey	25	2	23	3	20
New Mexico	34	1	32	14	18
New York	25	3	22	4	19
North Carolina	23	2	22	9	12
North Dakota	18	2	17	6	11
Ohio	20	2	17	2	15
Oklahoma	28	2	26	11	15
Oregon	24	1	23	12	11
Pennsylvania	23	3	20	6	14
Rhode Island	27	3	24	5	19
South Carolina	20	1	19	9	10
South Dakota	22	2	20	12	9
Tennessee	22	2	20	5	15
Texas	35	4	31	12	19
Utah	23	1	22	14	8
Vermont	23	1	21	5	16
Virginia	25	1	23	9	14
Washington	26	2	24	13	11
West Virginia	22	1	21	10	11
Wisconsin	21	2	19	8	12
Wyoming	20	1	19	4	14
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	28	2	26	3	23
DoDEA ¹	24	2	22	7	14

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), various years, 1998–2019 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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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-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, 1998–2019

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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	18	3	14	5	9	17	2	15	4	11
Alabama	12	2	10	6	4	11	1	10	5	5
Alaska	21	2	20	4	16	23	1	22	3	18
Arizona	12	1	11	2	8	13	1	12	2	10
Arkansas	16	1	14	3	11	19	2	17	3	13
California	23	2	21	15	6	19	3	17	10	7
Colorado	16	2	14	4	10	18	1	16	6	11
Connecticut	16	2	14	2	12	18	2	16	2	14
Delaware	16	5	11	2	9	17	3	14	1	12
Florida	19	2	16	1	15	18	2	16	1	15
Georgia	12	4	8	1	6	13	4	10	1	8
Hawaii	20	2	18	8	10	21	2	19	7	12
Idaho	12	2	10	4	6	12	2	10	2	8
Illinois	17	2	15	3	12	17	1	15	2	13
Indiana	17	2	15	2	13	18	2	16	2	14
Iowa	17	1	16	3	14	15	1	14	2	12
Kansas	18	2	16	7	8	19	2	18	6	12
Kentucky	13	7	6	1	4	13	3	10	1	8
Louisiana	15	1	14	1	13	16	1	15	1	14
Maine	20	2	18	4	14	20	2	18	3	15
Maryland	14	8	5	1	4	16	9	6	1	5
Massachusetts	22	6	16	3	12	22	2	20	5	15
Michigan	14	5	10	3	7	16	4	12	3	10
Minnesota	17	3	14	7	7	18	2	16	7	8
Mississippi	8	1	7	2	6	9	1	9	2	7
Missouri	14	1	12	2	11	13	1	12	2	11
Montana	13	4	9	3	6	13	2	11	3	8
Nebraska	16	5	12	4	7	16	3	13	3	10
Nevada	18	2	16	7	9	16	1	15	4	11
New Hampshire	20	4	16	4	12	20	3	17	3	14
New Jersey	19	7	12	1	11	18	3	16	1	15
New Mexico	22	6	16	10	6	24	2	22	12	10
New York	20	3	17	#	17	22	1	21	1	20
North Carolina	18	2	16	4	12	18	2	16	4	12
North Dakota	16	8	8	2	6	16	4	11	2	10
Ohio	16	6	10	2	9	16	2	14	1	13
Oklahoma	18	4	14	4	9	19	1	17	5	12
Oregon	18	2	15	7	9	16	1	15	4	11
Pennsylvania	17	3	14	2	13	19	2	17	2	15
Rhode Island	19	1	18	4	14	19	1	18	3	15
South Carolina	15	5	10	6	4	15	2	13	6	7
South Dakota	13	3	9	4	6	13	3	10	4	6
Tennessee	13	6	7	2	5	12	3	9	1	8
Texas	18	6	12	9	3	18	4	14	4	10
Utah	14	4	10	4	6	14	3	11	3	8
Vermont	20	3	17	4	13	18	1	17	2	15
Virginia	18	4	14	6	8	17	1	15	5	11
Washington	16	2	14	5	9	16	2	14	4	10
West Virginia	14	1	13	5	7	13	2	11	4	8
Wisconsin	18	2	16	2	14	18	2	17	2	14
Wyoming	14	2	12	2	11	16	1	14	2	12
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	21	3	19	2	16	23	2	21	1	20
DoDEA ¹	14	3	11	3	8	14	4	10	3	7

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2015					2017				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	19	2	17	5	12	20	2	17	6	11
Alabama	11	1	10	5	5	13	2	11	7	4
Alaska	23	2	22	5	17	23	1	22	8	14
Arizona	14	2	13	3	10	14	1	13	4	9
Arkansas	19	2	17	4	13	21	2	19	7	12
California	22	2	20	12	8	23	2	20	14	6
Colorado	21	2	19	7	12	20	2	18	9	9
Connecticut	19	2	17	3	13	20	2	17	5	12
Delaware	19	2	17	3	14	19	2	18	4	13
Florida	20	3	16	1	16	21	2	19	2	17
Georgia	15	3	11	1	10	15	3	12	2	10
Hawaii	17	2	15	6	10	16	2	14	8	6
Idaho	13	2	11	3	9	13	2	11	4	7
Illinois	17	1	16	3	12	18	2	16	3	13
Indiana	19	1	18	3	14	19	2	17	4	14
Iowa	16	1	15	2	13	16	1	15	2	13
Kansas	22	1	21	11	10	23	2	21	14	7
Kentucky	14	3	11	1	10	15	2	12	2	11
Louisiana	19	2	17	1	16	21	3	18	2	16
Maine	21	2	19	3	15	21	2	19	5	14
Maryland	18	5	13	1	12	17	3	15	2	13
Massachusetts	24	2	22	5	16	24	2	22	7	15
Michigan	16	2	14	4	10	19	2	16	7	9
Minnesota	19	2	17	8	9	19	2	17	11	6
Mississippi	11	1	10	2	8	12	1	11	3	8
Missouri	15	1	13	2	11	15	2	14	5	8
Montana	13	2	12	4	8	15	1	13	6	7
Nebraska	17	2	14	3	11	18	3	16	4	11
Nevada	23	2	21	12	9	22	1	21	16	5
New Hampshire	19	1	18	3	15	19	1	18	6	11
New Jersey	20	2	18	1	18	20	2	18	2	16
New Mexico	24	2	22	11	11	24	2	22	10	12
New York	22	2	20	1	19	23	2	21	2	19
North Carolina	18	2	17	4	13	17	2	15	5	10
North Dakota	16	3	14	2	12	16	2	15	6	8
Ohio	19	2	17	1	15	18	2	16	1	15
Oklahoma	20	2	19	6	13	20	2	19	8	11
Oregon	17	2	15	4	11	18	2	16	8	8
Pennsylvania	19	2	17	3	14	19	2	17	4	13
Rhode Island	20	2	18	3	15	21	2	19	4	15
South Carolina	17	2	15	6	9	20	2	18	12	6
South Dakota	14	2	12	5	8	15	3	13	8	5
Tennessee	16	3	13	1	12	17	3	14	4	10
Texas	21	2	19	7	12	23	3	21	9	12
Utah	13	1	12	3	9	15	1	13	4	9
Vermont	20	1	19	3	16	21	2	20	6	14
Virginia	18	2	16	5	11	17	2	15	7	8
Washington	18	2	16	5	11	18	2	16	7	9
West Virginia	15	2	13	3	10	16	2	14	6	8
Wisconsin	17	2	15	2	13	17	1	16	5	11
Wyoming	16	1	15	2	13	15	1	14	3	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	25	3	21	2	20	24	3	21	3	18
DoDEA ¹	15	1	14	4	10	15	1	14	4	10

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2019				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	21	2	19	6	13
Alabama	13	2	11	6	6
Alaska	24	1	23	8	15
Arizona	19	2	17	6	11
Arkansas	21	2	19	3	16
California	24	2	22	14	8
Colorado	18	1	17	7	10
Connecticut	21	2	19	6	13
Delaware	21	2	19	5	14
Florida	24	3	21	2	19
Georgia	17	3	14	2	12
Hawaii	16	1	15	10	5
Idaho	15	1	14	5	9
Illinois	19	1	18	4	15
Indiana	21	2	19	3	16
Iowa	18	1	17	3	15
Kansas	21	2	19	10	9
Kentucky	16	2	14	2	12
Louisiana	20	3	17	2	15
Maine	22	2	20	5	16
Maryland	19	3	16	1	14
Massachusetts	24	3	21	6	15
Michigan	19	3	16	6	11
Minnesota	20	2	18	9	9
Mississippi	13	1	12	3	10
Missouri	15	1	14	4	10
Montana	16	1	15	5	9
Nebraska	18	1	17	4	13
Nevada	22	1	21	15	6
New Hampshire	21	1	20	7	14
New Jersey	21	2	19	2	17
New Mexico	25	3	23	9	14
New York	24	2	22	2	20
North Carolina	17	1	16	4	11
North Dakota	15	1	14	4	10
Ohio	19	2	17	2	15
Oklahoma	20	2	18	6	12
Oregon	20	1	18	8	10
Pennsylvania	22	2	19	5	15
Rhode Island	22	2	20	5	15
South Carolina	20	1	18	10	9
South Dakota	15	2	14	8	6
Tennessee	15	2	13	3	10
Texas	27	2	25	12	13
Utah	18	1	17	5	11
Vermont	21	1	19	4	15
Virginia	19	2	17	6	11
Washington	20	2	18	9	10
West Virginia	17	1	15	7	9
Wisconsin	17	2	15	4	11
Wyoming	16	2	14	3	12
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	25	2	23	1	22
DoDEA ¹	17	1	15	4	11

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), various years, 1998–2019 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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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, 1998–2019

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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	3	10	3	7	14	2	12	2	9
Alabama	10	2	8	5	3	10	1	9	4	5
Alaska	16	1	15	3	12	16	1	14	3	12
Arizona	12	1	10	3	8	10	1	10	2	8
Arkansas	13	1	11	2	9	14	1	13	2	11
California	10	2	8	3	5	10	2	7	2	6
Colorado	11	1	10	2	8	10	1	9	1	8
Connecticut	14	1	12	1	11	14	1	13	1	12
Delaware	16	6	10	3	7	16	4	12	2	10
Florida	16	2	14	3	11	16	2	14	2	11
Georgia	12	5	7	3	4	12	4	8	2	6
Hawaii	10	1	8	1	7	10	1	9	1	7
Idaho	11	2	9	3	6	11	1	10	2	8
Illinois	14	1	13	4	9	14	1	13	3	10
Indiana	16	1	15	5	10	17	2	15	2	12
Iowa	15	1	14	2	12	13	1	12	1	11
Kansas	14	2	12	4	8	15	2	14	3	10
Kentucky	15	8	7	4	3	13	3	11	2	8
Louisiana	20	1	19	3	16	20	1	19	2	17
Maine	17	2	16	2	14	20	2	18	2	17
Maryland	14	8	6	1	4	14	9	5	1	4
Massachusetts	18	5	13	1	12	19	2	17	2	15
Michigan	13	3	10	3	7	13	3	10	2	8
Minnesota	15	1	13	5	8	14	2	12	5	7
Mississippi	9	1	9	4	5	10	1	10	4	6
Missouri	13	2	12	4	8	14	1	13	3	9
Montana	12	4	8	3	5	12	3	9	3	7
Nebraska	17	3	13	5	8	17	3	13	3	10
Nevada	11	1	10	3	7	13	1	11	2	9
New Hampshire	17	3	14	2	13	16	2	14	1	12
New Jersey	17	8	9	1	7	16	1	15	2	13
New Mexico	13	4	10	3	7	14	1	13	3	10
New York	16	2	14	1	13	17	1	16	1	15
North Carolina	15	2	13	3	10	15	2	14	3	11
North Dakota	15	6	9	3	6	14	4	10	2	8
Ohio	14	5	9	2	7	15	2	12	2	11
Oklahoma	15	4	11	4	8	17	2	16	4	12
Oregon	15	2	13	5	8	16	2	13	4	9
Pennsylvania	15	2	13	3	10	16	2	14	3	11
Rhode Island	14	2	12	1	11	14	1	13	1	12
South Carolina	14	2	11	5	7	14	2	13	4	9
South Dakota	16	3	13	7	6	16	2	14	6	8
Tennessee	14	7	7	3	4	14	3	12	2	10
Texas	10	6	5	2	3	12	3	8	2	6
Utah	13	4	10	4	6	13	3	10	3	7
Vermont	17	2	15	2	13	17	1	16	2	14
Virginia	13	2	11	3	7	14	1	13	3	10
Washington	14	2	11	4	7	14	2	12	3	8
West Virginia	17	2	16	8	8	18	2	17	8	9
Wisconsin	14	2	13	2	11	15	1	13	2	11
Wyoming	16	2	14	3	11	15	1	14	3	12
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	15	3	13	1	12	15	1	14	#	14
DoDEA ¹	13	5	7	2	5	14	5	9	3	6

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2015					2017				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	2	13	3	10	15	2	13	4	9
Alabama	12	1	11	6	5	12	2	11	6	5
Alaska	15	1	14	3	11	15	1	14	5	9
Arizona	13	1	12	2	9	11	1	10	3	7
Arkansas	14	2	13	2	10	16	2	14	3	11
California	10	1	9	2	6	11	1	10	5	5
Colorado	11	1	10	2	8	12	1	11	3	7
Connecticut	13	1	12	2	10	15	1	14	3	10
Delaware	17	2	15	3	12	18	1	17	4	12
Florida	17	1	16	2	14	17	2	15	2	13
Georgia	14	4	11	3	8	14	2	12	3	9
Hawaii	10	1	8	1	7	10	2	8	3	5
Idaho	11	1	10	2	8	11	1	10	3	7
Illinois	13	1	13	3	10	15	1	14	3	10
Indiana	17	1	16	4	12	17	1	16	3	12
Iowa	13	1	13	2	11	15	1	14	2	12
Kansas	15	2	13	3	11	15	2	13	5	7
Kentucky	16	3	12	4	8	16	3	13	5	8
Louisiana	21	3	18	2	16	18	2	16	2	14
Maine	19	1	18	2	16	20	1	18	4	14
Maryland	13	2	11	2	9	13	2	11	2	9
Massachusetts	20	2	17	1	16	20	2	18	3	14
Michigan	14	2	12	4	8	12	2	10	5	5
Minnesota	14	2	13	6	7	14	2	12	8	4
Mississippi	12	1	12	4	7	14	1	13	5	8
Missouri	14	1	13	3	10	15	1	15	6	9
Montana	12	2	10	3	7	13	1	12	4	8
Nebraska	17	1	16	4	12	17	2	15	5	10
Nevada	12	2	10	3	7	12	1	11	7	4
New Hampshire	18	1	17	2	15	18	1	17	4	13
New Jersey	18	2	16	1	15	17	1	16	2	14
New Mexico	15	1	14	4	10	16	1	14	4	10
New York	18	1	17	#	17	17	1	15	2	13
North Carolina	13	1	12	3	10	15	1	14	5	9
North Dakota	13	1	12	3	9	14	1	12	5	7
Ohio	16	2	14	2	13	16	2	14	2	12
Oklahoma	18	2	16	5	12	18	2	16	5	11
Oregon	14	2	12	4	8	14	1	13	6	7
Pennsylvania	19	1	17	4	13	17	2	15	5	10
Rhode Island	14	1	13	1	12	14	1	13	1	12
South Carolina	14	1	13	4	9	15	1	14	8	6
South Dakota	16	2	14	6	8	17	2	15	9	5
Tennessee	15	2	13	3	10	13	2	11	4	8
Texas	14	3	11	2	9	15	2	12	3	10
Utah	12	1	11	4	7	14	1	13	6	7
Vermont	18	2	16	2	14	18	1	16	4	12
Virginia	13	1	12	3	9	13	1	12	3	9
Washington	13	1	12	4	8	13	1	12	4	8
West Virginia	20	2	18	7	11	21	1	20	12	8
Wisconsin	13	1	11	3	9	15	1	14	4	9
Wyoming	15	1	14	3	12	15	1	14	3	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	14	1	13	#	12	16	2	14	2	12
DoDEA ¹	14	2	13	3	9	13	1	12	3	9

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, 1998–2019—Continued**

State/jurisdiction	2019				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	16	2	14	3	11
Alabama	15	1	14	5	9
Alaska	16	1	15	4	12
Arizona	13	1	12	4	9
Arkansas	18	2	16	3	13
California	13	2	11	5	6
Colorado	13	1	12	3	9
Connecticut	15	1	14	3	11
Delaware	18	1	17	2	14
Florida	21	2	19	2	17
Georgia	15	2	13	2	11
Hawaii	11	1	10	5	5
Idaho	12	1	11	2	8
Illinois	15	1	13	3	11
Indiana	18	2	16	3	13
Iowa	14	1	13	2	11
Kansas	15	1	13	4	10
Kentucky	17	2	15	4	11
Louisiana	19	2	17	2	15
Maine	21	1	20	2	18
Maryland	14	2	12	2	11
Massachusetts	21	2	19	2	17
Michigan	13	2	11	4	7
Minnesota	15	1	13	6	8
Mississippi	14	1	14	4	9
Missouri	15	1	14	4	10
Montana	15	2	14	5	9
Nebraska	17	1	16	6	11
Nevada	12	1	11	6	5
New Hampshire	19	1	18	3	14
New Jersey	17	1	16	2	14
New Mexico	17	1	16	4	12
New York	18	2	16	2	14
North Carolina	14	1	12	3	10
North Dakota	15	1	13	3	10
Ohio	18	2	16	2	14
Oklahoma	19	2	17	6	11
Oregon	16	1	15	6	9
Pennsylvania	19	2	17	4	13
Rhode Island	16	2	14	1	14
South Carolina	15	1	14	6	9
South Dakota	17	1	16	9	7
Tennessee	15	2	13	4	9
Texas	15	3	13	2	11
Utah	14	1	13	6	7
Vermont	20	1	19	4	15
Virginia	15	1	14	3	11
Washington	14	2	13	5	8
West Virginia	22	1	20	9	11
Wisconsin	14	1	13	3	9
Wyoming	17	1	15	3	13
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	17	2	16	1	15
DoDEA ¹	14	1	13	3	10

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), various years, 1998–2019 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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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, 1998–2019

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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	3	10	2	8	13	2	11	2	9
Alabama	10	2	9	5	4	10	1	9	4	4
Alaska	13	1	11	1	11	14	1	13	1	12
Arizona	11	1	9	2	8	12	1	11	2	9
Arkansas	11	1	10	1	9	13	2	11	1	10
California	10	2	8	2	5	10	2	8	2	6
Colorado	10	1	9	1	8	11	1	10	2	8
Connecticut	12	1	11	1	10	15	2	13	1	12
Delaware	14	5	10	1	9	15	3	13	1	12
Florida	14	2	13	1	12	13	1	12	1	11
Georgia	10	4	6	1	5	12	4	8	1	7
Hawaii	11	1	10	3	8	12	1	11	2	9
Idaho	8	1	7	2	5	9	1	8	1	6
Illinois	14	1	13	2	11	13	1	12	1	11
Indiana	14	2	12	1	11	15	2	13	1	12
Iowa	15	1	14	1	12	13	1	12	1	11
Kansas	12	2	10	2	8	13	2	11	1	10
Kentucky	12	7	5	1	4	11	3	8	1	8
Louisiana	14	1	13	1	13	15	1	14	1	13
Maine	18	2	17	3	13	18	1	17	3	14
Maryland	11	7	4	1	3	13	8	5	1	4
Massachusetts	19	5	13	1	12	17	1	16	1	15
Michigan	12	4	8	2	6	13	3	10	2	8
Minnesota	13	3	10	3	7	13	2	11	4	7
Mississippi	7	1	6	1	5	8	1	8	1	6
Missouri	13	1	12	2	10	12	1	11	1	10
Montana	12	4	8	2	6	12	2	9	2	7
Nebraska	14	4	10	3	7	14	3	11	2	9
Nevada	10	2	8	2	6	11	1	10	2	8
New Hampshire	18	4	14	3	11	18	3	16	2	13
New Jersey	17	6	11	1	10	17	2	14	1	14
New Mexico	12	4	8	3	5	13	1	12	5	8
New York	16	2	14	#	13	17	#	16	#	16
North Carolina	14	2	12	2	10	14	1	13	2	11
North Dakota	14	7	7	2	5	14	4	10	1	9
Ohio	15	5	9	1	8	15	2	13	#	12
Oklahoma	16	4	12	3	9	16	1	15	3	11
Oregon	13	2	11	3	8	14	1	13	3	10
Pennsylvania	16	2	13	1	12	16	1	15	2	13
Rhode Island	16	1	15	3	12	15	1	14	2	12
South Carolina	11	5	6	3	4	12	2	10	3	7
South Dakota	11	3	8	3	5	11	2	9	3	6
Tennessee	12	6	6	2	4	11	3	8	1	7
Texas	11	5	6	3	3	11	3	8	2	7
Utah	10	3	7	2	5	11	3	9	1	7
Vermont	18	2	16	3	13	17	1	16	2	15
Virginia	13	3	10	3	7	13	1	12	3	9
Washington	12	2	10	2	8	12	2	10	2	8
West Virginia	14	1	12	5	7	13	2	11	4	8
Wisconsin	14	2	12	1	11	14	1	13	1	11
Wyoming	13	2	12	1	11	14	1	13	1	12
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	17	2	15	1	14	18	1	17	#	16
DoDEA ¹	10	3	8	1	7	11	3	7	1	6

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2015					2017				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	2	12	2	10	14	2	12	3	9
Alabama	10	1	9	4	5	11	1	10	6	4
Alaska	14	1	13	1	12	14	1	13	3	10
Arizona	11	1	10	1	9	10	1	10	3	7
Arkansas	12	1	11	1	10	14	1	12	2	10
California	11	1	9	3	7	12	1	10	5	5
Colorado	11	1	10	1	9	12	1	10	3	8
Connecticut	16	2	14	2	12	16	1	14	4	10
Delaware	17	2	15	2	13	17	1	16	3	12
Florida	14	2	12	1	12	15	1	13	1	12
Georgia	12	3	9	#	9	13	2	11	2	9
Hawaii	11	2	10	2	8	11	2	9	5	4
Idaho	11	2	9	2	8	10	2	9	2	6
Illinois	13	1	12	2	10	14	1	13	2	11
Indiana	14	1	13	1	12	15	2	13	1	12
Iowa	13	1	12	1	11	13	1	12	1	11
Kansas	12	1	11	3	9	13	1	11	5	6
Kentucky	13	3	9	1	9	13	2	11	1	10
Louisiana	18	1	16	1	15	19	2	16	2	14
Maine	18	2	17	2	15	19	2	18	4	14
Maryland	15	4	11	1	10	13	2	11	1	11
Massachusetts	19	2	18	1	16	19	2	18	3	14
Michigan	13	2	11	2	9	13	2	11	3	8
Minnesota	13	1	12	3	9	13	2	12	6	6
Mississippi	10	#	9	1	8	10	1	10	2	7
Missouri	13	1	12	2	10	14	2	12	4	8
Montana	12	2	10	3	8	13	1	12	5	7
Nebraska	14	2	13	2	10	15	2	14	3	10
Nevada	10	1	9	2	7	11	1	10	6	4
New Hampshire	17	1	16	2	14	17	1	16	5	10
New Jersey	18	1	17	1	16	17	1	16	2	15
New Mexico	14	2	12	3	9	15	2	14	5	9
New York	17	1	16	1	16	17	1	16	1	15
North Carolina	15	1	14	2	12	14	1	13	4	9
North Dakota	14	2	12	2	11	14	1	13	5	8
Ohio	16	2	14	1	13	16	2	14	1	13
Oklahoma	16	1	15	3	12	17	2	15	6	10
Oregon	15	2	13	3	10	14	2	13	6	7
Pennsylvania	17	2	15	2	13	17	2	15	3	12
Rhode Island	16	1	14	2	13	16	1	15	3	13
South Carolina	12	2	11	3	8	13	2	12	6	6
South Dakota	12	1	10	4	7	13	2	11	6	5
Tennessee	14	3	12	1	10	14	3	12	3	9
Texas	12	2	10	1	9	14	2	11	2	9
Utah	11	1	10	1	8	11	1	10	3	8
Vermont	19	1	18	2	16	20	2	18	5	13
Virginia	14	1	13	3	10	13	1	12	5	6
Washington	12	1	11	1	10	14	2	12	4	8
West Virginia	14	2	12	2	10	15	2	13	6	8
Wisconsin	14	2	12	1	11	13	1	12	3	9
Wyoming	14	1	13	1	12	14	1	13	2	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	19	1	18	1	17	18	2	17	2	15
DoDEA ¹	10	1	10	1	8	12	1	11	2	9

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2019				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	15	1	13	2	11
Alabama	12	2	11	5	6
Alaska	14	#	14	3	11
Arizona	13	2	11	3	9
Arkansas	15	2	14	1	12
California	12	1	11	4	7
Colorado	12	1	11	3	8
Connecticut	18	1	17	5	12
Delaware	17	2	16	3	13
Florida	17	2	15	1	14
Georgia	15	2	12	1	11
Hawaii	11	1	10	6	4
Idaho	12	1	11	3	8
Illinois	14	1	14	1	12
Indiana	16	1	15	1	14
Iowa	14	1	13	1	12
Kansas	13	1	12	3	9
Kentucky	14	2	12	1	10
Louisiana	17	3	14	1	14
Maine	19	1	18	3	15
Maryland	14	2	11	1	11
Massachusetts	19	2	17	2	15
Michigan	13	2	11	2	9
Minnesota	15	1	14	6	8
Mississippi	12	1	11	1	9
Missouri	13	1	12	3	10
Montana	14	1	13	4	9
Nebraska	15	1	14	3	11
Nevada	12	1	11	6	4
New Hampshire	19	1	18	5	12
New Jersey	16	1	15	1	14
New Mexico	17	2	15	4	11
New York	19	1	17	1	16
North Carolina	14	1	13	3	10
North Dakota	13	1	12	3	9
Ohio	17	2	15	1	14
Oklahoma	15	2	13	3	10
Oregon	15	1	14	5	9
Pennsylvania	19	2	17	3	14
Rhode Island	15	1	14	2	12
South Carolina	14	1	13	5	8
South Dakota	13	1	12	6	6
Tennessee	12	2	10	2	8
Texas	14	2	12	2	10
Utah	14	1	13	3	10
Vermont	20	1	19	4	15
Virginia	15	2	13	3	10
Washington	13	1	12	4	8
West Virginia	16	1	15	6	9
Wisconsin	12	1	11	2	9
Wyoming	15	2	13	1	12
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	20	1	19	1	18
DoDEA ¹	12	1	11	1	10

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), various years, 1998–2019 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	#	#	#	#	#	#	—	—	—
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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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, 1998–2019

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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—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	17	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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	1	10	7	4	11	1	10	5	5
Alabama	2	#	2	2	1	2	#	2	2	#
Alaska	14	1	13	3	10	14	#	14	2	11
Arizona	12	#	12	5	6	7	#	7	1	6
Arkansas	8	#	7	3	5	8	#	8	2	5
California	32	1	30	27	3	26	1	25	21	4
Colorado	16	#	15	9	7	14	#	14	7	6
Connecticut	6	1	5	1	5	6	1	5	#	5
Delaware	4	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Florida	9	1	8	#	8	10	1	9	#	9
Georgia	5	2	4	2	2	4	1	3	1	2
Hawaii	11	1	10	5	5	8	1	7	3	4
Idaho	5	#	4	2	2	5	#	4	2	3
Illinois	8	1	7	2	6	8	#	8	2	6
Indiana	7	#	7	2	5	6	1	5	1	5
Iowa	6	#	5	1	4	5	#	5	1	4
Kansas	11	1	11	7	4	13	#	13	8	5
Kentucky	2	1	1	#	1	3	1	2	#	2
Louisiana	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	#	2
Maine	3	#	3	2	2	2	#	2	1	2
Maryland	6	3	3	#	3	8	5	3	1	2
Massachusetts	8	1	7	5	1	11	1	10	8	2
Michigan	3	#	3	2	1	8	1	7	5	3
Minnesota	10	#	9	7	3	8	1	8	5	3
Mississippi	2	#	2	1	1	1	#	1	1	1
Missouri	3	#	3	2	2	2	#	2	#	2
Montana	2	#	2	2	#	4	#	3	2	1
Nebraska	8	1	7	3	3	7	#	7	1	5
Nevada	27	#	27	14	13	23	#	22	5	17
New Hampshire	3	#	2	1	2	2	#	2	1	2
New Jersey	3	1	2	#	2	3	#	3	#	3
New Mexico	17	3	14	9	5	18	#	18	10	8
New York	9	1	8	#	8	8	1	7	#	7
North Carolina	7	#	7	4	3	7	#	6	3	3
North Dakota	3	1	2	2	#	2	#	1	#	1
Ohio	3	1	3	#	3	3	#	3	#	2
Oklahoma	6	1	5	3	2	7	#	6	2	4
Oregon	14	1	14	8	5	14	1	13	8	5
Pennsylvania	3	1	2	#	2	2	#	2	#	2
Rhode Island	6	1	6	4	2	6	1	6	3	3
South Carolina	5	#	5	4	1	6	#	6	5	1
South Dakota	4	1	4	2	2	4	#	3	1	2
Tennessee	3	1	3	#	3	4	1	3	#	3
Texas	22	5	16	15	1	23	2	21	12	9
Utah	7	1	6	3	2	6	1	5	1	4
Vermont	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	2
Virginia	7	1	7	3	3	7	1	7	3	4
Washington	11	1	10	4	6	9	1	9	3	5
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	8	#	8	1	6	8	#	8	1	7
Wyoming	4	#	3	2	2	3	#	3	1	2
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	1	7	1	5	7	1	6	1	5
DoDEA ¹	7	2	5	3	2	6	1	5	2	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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2015					2017				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	12	1	11	6	5	12	1	11	7	5
Alabama	2	#	2	2	#	3	1	3	2	1
Alaska	15	1	14	6	9	14	#	14	8	6
Arizona	10	1	10	3	6	11	1	10	3	7
Arkansas	8	#	8	2	5	10	#	10	3	7
California	28	1	27	23	4	27	1	25	22	4
Colorado	14	1	14	10	3	15	1	14	10	3
Connecticut	7	1	6	1	5	9	1	7	3	5
Delaware	5	1	4	2	3	10	1	9	6	4
Florida	10	1	9	#	9	10	2	8	1	7
Georgia	5	1	4	1	3	5	#	4	2	3
Hawaii	8	1	7	3	3	7	1	6	4	2
Idaho	5	#	4	2	2	6	#	6	3	2
Illinois	10	#	10	3	7	11	#	11	5	6
Indiana	8	#	7	2	6	6	#	6	2	3
Iowa	8	#	7	1	6	6	#	6	1	4
Kansas	14	#	13	9	4	13	1	12	11	2
Kentucky	4	1	2	1	2	3	1	3	1	2
Louisiana	3	#	2	1	2	5	1	4	1	3
Maine	3	#	3	2	1	4	#	4	3	1
Maryland	9	1	7	2	5	11	1	10	3	6
Massachusetts	10	1	9	7	2	10	1	9	8	1
Michigan	5	1	4	3	1	9	1	8	6	2
Minnesota	10	#	9	7	3	9	1	9	7	1
Mississippi	2	#	2	1	1	3	#	3	1	1
Missouri	3	#	3	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Montana	3	#	3	2	1	3	#	3	2	1
Nebraska	7	1	6	1	5	9	1	8	3	5
Nevada	25	1	24	12	12	18	1	17	13	4
New Hampshire	3	#	3	2	1	4	#	3	2	2
New Jersey	3	1	3	#	2	4	1	3	1	2
New Mexico	17	2	15	8	8	17	1	17	8	9
New York	8	1	7	#	7	10	1	8	2	7
North Carolina	7	1	6	3	3	5	#	5	2	3
North Dakota	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	4	#	4	1	3	4	#	4	1	2
Oklahoma	7	1	6	4	2	9	#	8	4	4
Oregon	13	1	13	8	4	16	1	16	12	4
Pennsylvania	4	#	3	1	2	4	1	4	2	2
Rhode Island	8	1	7	4	3	9	1	7	3	4
South Carolina	8	#	8	5	3	9	#	8	7	1
South Dakota	3	1	3	1	2	2	#	2	1	1
Tennessee	5	1	4	1	3	6	1	5	2	4
Texas	23	2	21	11	10	25	2	24	12	12
Utah	4	#	4	3	1	9	1	8	6	2
Vermont	3	#	3	2	1	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	7	1	6	3	3	10	1	8	5	4
Washington	13	1	13	7	5	14	1	13	10	3
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	7	#	7	2	5	8	#	7	4	4
Wyoming	3	#	3	2	1	3	#	3	1	2
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	1	5	1	4	9	1	7	2	5
DoDEA ¹	9	1	8	4	4	10	1	9	5	4

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, 1998–2019—Continued**

State/jurisdiction	2019				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	13	1	12	7	5
Alabama	5	#	5	4	1
Alaska	15	#	15	8	7
Arizona	8	#	8	4	4
Arkansas	8	#	8	2	6
California	25	1	24	19	5
Colorado	15	1	14	10	4
Connecticut	11	1	10	4	6
Delaware	16	1	15	10	5
Florida	11	1	10	#	10
Georgia	11	#	11	5	6
Hawaii	14	1	13	10	3
Idaho	9	#	8	6	2
Illinois	16	1	16	9	7
Indiana	10	#	10	2	8
Iowa	7	1	7	2	5
Kansas	12	1	11	9	2
Kentucky	5	1	5	1	4
Louisiana	4	#	4	1	3
Maine	4	#	4	2	2
Maryland	14	1	13	4	9
Massachusetts	14	1	13	8	4
Michigan	11	#	10	7	4
Minnesota	13	#	12	9	3
Mississippi	3	#	3	1	2
Missouri	6	#	6	4	2
Montana	4	#	4	4	#
Nebraska	7	#	7	3	4
Nevada	20	1	19	15	4
New Hampshire	5	#	4	3	1
New Jersey	8	1	7	1	6
New Mexico	21	1	21	11	10
New York	10	1	8	2	6
North Carolina	11	1	10	7	4
North Dakota	4	#	4	2	2
Ohio	2	#	2	1	2
Oklahoma	11	1	11	6	5
Oregon	11	#	11	7	4
Pennsylvania	5	1	4	2	2
Rhode Island	13	1	12	5	8
South Carolina	6	#	5	4	2
South Dakota	6	#	6	4	2
Tennessee	8	1	8	1	7
Texas	23	1	21	11	10
Utah	11	#	11	8	2
Vermont	3	#	3	2	1
Virginia	12	1	11	7	5
Washington	14	1	14	9	5
West Virginia	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	8	1	7	4	3
Wyoming	4	#	4	2	2
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	13	1	12	2	11
DoDEA ¹	11	1	10	5	5

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), various years, 1998–2019 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: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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, 1998–2019

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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	6	1	5	3	2	5	1	5	2	3
Alabama	2	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	11	#	10	3	7	11	#	10	2	9
Arizona	2	#	2	#	1	2	#	1	#	1
Arkansas	5	#	5	2	3	6	#	6	2	3
California	17	1	16	13	3	13	1	11	9	2
Colorado	7	1	7	4	3	8	#	8	4	4
Connecticut	4	1	3	1	3	4	1	3	#	3
Delaware	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Florida	5	1	4	#	4	5	1	4	#	4
Georgia	2	1	1	#	1	2	#	2	#	1
Hawaii	9	1	8	5	3	10	1	10	5	5
Idaho	4	#	3	2	1	3	#	3	1	2
Illinois	4	#	3	2	2	5	#	4	1	3
Indiana	3	#	3	1	2	3	#	3	1	2
Iowa	3	#	3	1	2	3	#	2	1	2
Kansas	6	#	6	5	1	8	#	7	5	3
Kentucky	1	1	1	#	#	2	#	1	#	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1
Maine	2	#	2	2	1	2	#	2	#	1
Maryland	3	2	1	#	1	3	2	1	#	1
Massachusetts	4	1	3	2	1	6	1	5	4	1
Michigan	2	#	2	1	1	4	1	3	1	2
Minnesota	5	#	5	3	1	6	#	5	3	2
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Missouri	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1
Montana	2	#	1	1	1	2	#	2	1	#
Nebraska	3	1	2	1	1	3	#	2	1	1
Nevada	10	1	10	5	4	7	#	7	2	5
New Hampshire	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	#	1
New Jersey	2	1	1	#	1	2	#	1	#	1
New Mexico	12	2	10	7	2	14	1	13	8	5
New York	6	1	5	#	4	7	1	6	#	6
North Carolina	5	#	4	2	2	4	#	4	2	2
North Dakota	2	1	1	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	1	#	1
Oklahoma	3	1	2	1	1	4	#	4	2	2
Oregon	6	#	6	4	2	4	#	3	1	2
Pennsylvania	2	1	2	#	1	3	#	2	#	2
Rhode Island	3	#	3	1	2	5	1	4	1	3
South Carolina	5	1	4	3	1	4	#	3	3	#
South Dakota	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	2	#
Tennessee	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1
Texas	9	2	7	7	1	8	1	7	3	4
Utah	5	1	4	2	1	4	1	3	1	2
Vermont	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	#	1
Virginia	6	1	5	3	1	5	#	5	2	3
Washington	5	1	5	3	2	5	1	5	2	3
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	5	#	5	1	3	5	#	5	1	4
Wyoming	2	1	1	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	6	1	5	1	4	6	1	5	1	4
DoDEA ¹	5	1	3	2	1	4	1	3	1	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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2015					2017				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	7	1	6	3	3	7	1	6	4	3
Alabama	2	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	#
Alaska	12	1	11	4	7	12	1	11	6	5
Arizona	4	1	3	1	2	4	#	4	2	2
Arkansas	7	#	7	3	4	9	1	8	5	3
California	15	1	14	10	3	15	1	13	10	3
Colorado	12	1	11	6	5	10	1	9	7	3
Connecticut	4	#	3	1	2	5	1	4	2	3
Delaware	2	#	2	1	1	4	1	3	1	2
Florida	6	2	5	#	4	8	1	7	1	5
Georgia	3	#	3	1	2	3	1	3	#	2
Hawaii	7	1	6	4	3	6	1	5	3	2
Idaho	3	#	2	1	1	4	#	3	2	2
Illinois	5	#	5	2	3	5	1	5	2	3
Indiana	5	#	5	2	3	5	#	5	2	2
Iowa	4	#	4	1	3	4	#	4	1	3
Kansas	11	#	10	9	2	11	#	11	10	1
Kentucky	2	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	#	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Maine	3	#	3	2	1	2	#	2	1	1
Maryland	4	1	2	1	2	5	1	4	1	3
Massachusetts	6	1	5	4	1	7	1	6	4	2
Michigan	4	1	3	2	1	6	1	6	5	1
Minnesota	7	#	6	5	1	7	1	6	5	1
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	1
Missouri	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Montana	2	#	2	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Nebraska	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Nevada	15	#	15	10	4	14	#	14	12	2
New Hampshire	2	#	1	1	1	3	#	2	1	1
New Jersey	2	1	2	#	2	3	1	2	#	2
New Mexico	14	1	13	8	5	12	1	11	5	6
New York	6	1	5	#	5	7	1	6	1	5
North Carolina	5	1	4	2	3	4	1	3	2	1
North Dakota	2	#	2	#	1	3	#	2	1	1
Ohio	3	#	3	1	2	3	1	2	#	2
Oklahoma	5	#	5	3	2	5	#	4	3	2
Oregon	4	1	3	1	2	5	#	5	3	2
Pennsylvania	3	#	2	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Rhode Island	5	1	5	2	3	6	1	5	1	4
South Carolina	5	#	4	3	1	7	#	7	6	1
South Dakota	3	#	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Tennessee	3	#	2	#	2	3	#	3	1	2
Texas	11	1	10	6	5	12	1	11	7	4
Utah	4	1	3	1	2	5	#	5	2	3
Vermont	2	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	5	1	5	3	2	6	1	5	3	2
Washington	7	1	6	4	2	6	1	5	3	2
West Virginia	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	4	#	4	1	3	5	#	4	2	3
Wyoming	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	2	5	1	4	8	2	6	1	4
DoDEA ¹	5	1	5	3	2	5	1	4	2	2

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, 1998–2019—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2019				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	8	1	7	4	3
Alabama	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	12	#	12	5	6
Arizona	6	1	6	3	3
Arkansas	6	#	6	2	4
California	15	1	14	11	3
Colorado	8	1	8	5	3
Connecticut	5	1	4	2	2
Delaware	4	#	4	2	2
Florida	7	1	6	1	5
Georgia	4	1	3	1	3
Hawaii	7	1	6	5	1
Idaho	4	#	4	2	2
Illinois	7	#	6	2	4
Indiana	5	#	4	2	2
Iowa	5	#	5	2	3
Kansas	9	1	9	7	2
Kentucky	3	#	2	1	2
Louisiana	3	#	3	1	2
Maine	3	#	3	2	1
Maryland	6	1	5	1	4
Massachusetts	7	1	5	4	1
Michigan	6	1	6	3	2
Minnesota	6	1	5	4	1
Mississippi	2	#	2	1	1
Missouri	2	#	2	1	1
Montana	2	#	2	1	1
Nebraska	4	#	3	1	2
Nevada	14	1	13	10	3
New Hampshire	3	#	3	1	1
New Jersey	5	1	4	#	3
New Mexico	12	1	11	6	6
New York	7	1	6	1	5
North Carolina	4	#	4	2	2
North Dakota	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	2	#	2	1	1
Oklahoma	6	#	6	3	3
Oregon	7	#	6	4	2
Pennsylvania	4	1	3	1	2
Rhode Island	8	1	7	3	4
South Carolina	7	#	6	6	1
South Dakota	3	1	3	2	1
Tennessee	3	1	3	1	2
Texas	15	1	15	11	4
Utah	6	#	6	3	2
Vermont	1	#	1	#	1
Virginia	5	1	5	3	2
Washington	9	1	8	5	3
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	5	#	5	2	3
Wyoming	2	#	2	1	1
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	7	1	6	#	6
DoDEA ¹	6	#	5	3	3

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based 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), various years, 1998–2019 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: 2019

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

‡ Reporting standards not met.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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), 2019 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: 2019

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

‡ Reporting standards not met.

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

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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), 2017 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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2002					2003				
	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)	21	7	14	10	4	22	6	16	10	5
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	18	12	6	2	3
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	19	8	11	5	5	18	6	12	3	9
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	13	5	8	4	4	14	5	9	4	5
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	15	11	4	2	3
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	14	7	7	3	4	13	5	8	2	6
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	9	2	7	6	1	10	2	8	7	1
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	2	1	1
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	7	3	4	3	2	7	1	6	2	4
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	35	4	31	29	2
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	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)	23	7	16	10	7	23	6	17	10	7
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	19	12	7	3	4	23	17	6	1	5
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	20	7	12	3	9	22	14	8	2	7
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	14	5	9	4	5	14	5	9	3	6
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	16	12	4	1	3	18	15	3	#	3
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	15	7	9	2	7	15	11	4	1	3
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	11	2	8	7	2	11	2	9	7	2
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	5	2	3	2	1	7	3	3	1	2
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	6	1	4	2	3	9	4	5	1	4
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	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 city ¹ (public)	31	7	24	14	10	32	5	28	15	13
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	30	5	24	12	13
Atlanta	12	3	10	3	6	11	4	7	1	6
Austin	44	19	25	21	5	45	16	28	24	4
Baltimore City	19	14	6	2	4	21	17	4	1	3
Boston	35	9	26	14	13	51	8	42	28	14
Charlotte	19	3	16	5	11	20	2	18	8	10
Chicago	24	5	19	7	12	29	2	27	8	19
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	25	17	8	2	6	28	5	22	2	21
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	56	18	37	34	3
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	20	5	15	8	7	26	7	19	13	5
District of Columbia (DCPS)	21	12	9	2	7	23	4	19	1	18
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	38	5	33	30	3	36	2	34	28	6
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	30	3	27	3	24
Houston	43	18	25	22	3	44	14	30	26	4
Jefferson County (KY)	19	7	11	6	5	19	10	10	5	5
Los Angeles	46	2	43	38	6	39	2	37	28	9
Miami-Dade	21	7	14	2	12	27	4	23	1	22
Milwaukee	30	9	21	5	17	33	3	31	2	29
New York City	31	6	25	2	24	30	2	28	1	26
Philadelphia	22	6	16	3	13	22	3	18	2	16
San Diego	43	4	39	32	7	43	4	40	32	7
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	10	3	7	13	3	10	3	7
Large city ¹ (public)	13	4	9	2	7	13	3	10	2	8
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	15	4	11	3	8
Atlanta	10	2	8	3	6	9	3	6	1	5
Austin	16	9	7	3	4	15	9	6	2	4
Baltimore City	18	13	5	1	3	19	15	3	1	3
Boston	22	7	15	3	12	21	6	16	2	14
Charlotte	12	2	11	3	8	11	1	9	2	7
Chicago	14	3	11	3	8	15	1	13	4	10
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	20	14	5	#	5	22	5	17	1	16
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	8	5	4	1	3
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	15	5	10	4	6	15	7	8	3	5
District of Columbia (DCPS)	15	11	4	1	3	16	3	13	#	13
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	11	4	6	3	3	10	2	7	1	6
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	17	2	15	3	12
Houston	7	4	3	1	2	8	4	5	2	3
Jefferson County (KY)	15	5	10	5	5	15	6	8	4	4
Los Angeles	10	2	9	3	5	12	2	10	1	9
Miami-Dade	13	2	10	2	9	12	2	10	1	9
Milwaukee	19	7	12	2	10	20	2	18	1	17
New York City	19	4	15	1	14	17	1	16	1	15
Philadelphia	15	5	10	2	9	16	3	13	1	12
San Diego	13	4	10	4	6	11	3	8	1	7
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	11	2	9	6	3	11	1	10	7	4
Large city ¹ (public)	21	4	17	12	5	22	3	20	13	7
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	18	2	16	10	6
Atlanta	2	1	1	#	1	2	1	1	#	1
Austin	32	13	19	19	1	33	10	23	22	1
Baltimore City	1	#	1	1	#	3	2	1	#	1
Boston	18	3	14	11	3	36	4	32	27	5
Charlotte	8	1	7	2	4	11	1	10	6	4
Chicago	12	2	9	4	5	18	1	16	5	11
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	7	4	3	1	2	7	1	6	1	5
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	50	15	34	34	1
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	7	#	6	5	2	12	1	11	11	#
District of Columbia (DCPS)	8	2	6	1	5	8	1	7	#	7
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	30	2	28	27	1	30	1	29	27	2
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	17	1	16	#	16
Houston	38	16	22	21	1	38	12	26	25	1
Jefferson County (KY)	4	3	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	1
Los Angeles	41	1	40	36	3	34	1	33	27	6
Miami-Dade	10	5	5	1	4	17	2	15	#	14
Milwaukee	12	3	10	3	7	15	#	14	1	13
New York City	16	3	13	1	12	17	2	15	1	15
Philadelphia	8	2	6	1	5	8	#	7	1	6
San Diego	35	2	33	30	4	36	1	35	32	3
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2013					2015				
	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)	23	3	20	7	13	24	2	22	9	14
Large city ¹ (public)	30	3	27	11	16	31	3	28	12	16
Albuquerque	31	1	30	13	18	33	3	30	13	18
Atlanta	12	1	11	2	9	14	3	11	2	9
Austin	45	4	41	14	27	50	4	45	16	29
Baltimore City	21	16	6	1	4	22	8	14	2	12
Boston	50	4	45	28	18	49	6	43	26	17
Charlotte	18	1	17	5	12	19	3	17	6	10
Chicago	24	1	22	4	19	25	2	23	7	16
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	28	5	23	1	22	29	5	24	2	22
Dallas	57	17	40	16	24	56	6	50	26	24
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	30	5	25	12	13	28	5	23	15	7
District of Columbia (DCPS)	21	2	19	1	17	20	3	17	2	15
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	21	3	18	3	14
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	34	2	31	25	6	34	2	32	25	7
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	26	1	25	2	23	28	2	27	2	24
Houston	46	6	39	15	24	48	5	43	16	27
Jefferson County (KY)	18	5	12	5	8	20	5	16	7	9
Los Angeles	33	2	31	20	11	37	3	34	24	10
Miami-Dade	32	5	27	1	26	29	6	23	1	23
Milwaukee	32	4	28	2	26	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	30	2	28	1	27	32	3	30	1	29
Philadelphia	22	4	18	2	15	24	5	18	4	14
San Diego	40	2	37	27	10	46	4	42	33	8
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	14	2	12	2	9	14	2	13	3	10
Large city ¹ (public)	13	2	11	2	9	14	2	12	2	10
Albuquerque	16	1	15	3	12	17	1	15	5	10
Atlanta	10	1	9	2	7	10	2	8	1	7
Austin	15	3	12	1	11	17	3	14	2	12
Baltimore City	18	14	4	1	3	17	7	10	1	9
Boston	21	3	18	1	17	22	4	18	1	16
Charlotte	11	1	11	2	8	10	1	9	2	7
Chicago	13	1	12	2	10	14	1	13	1	12
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	22	4	18	#	17	21	4	18	1	17
Dallas	10	3	6	1	5	8	4	5	1	4
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	15	5	10	3	8	15	5	10	3	7
District of Columbia (DCPS)	15	2	13	1	12	13	1	12	#	12
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	17	3	15	3	12
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	9	2	7	1	6	10	1	8	2	6
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	19	1	18	2	16	20	1	18	2	16
Houston	8	3	6	1	5	10	2	8	1	7
Jefferson County (KY)	13	4	10	4	5	13	3	10	4	6
Los Angeles	9	2	8	#	7	13	2	10	2	8
Miami-Dade	11	2	9	1	8	10	2	8	#	8
Milwaukee	20	4	17	2	15	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	18	1	17	1	16	22	1	21	#	21
Philadelphia	16	3	13	1	11	16	4	12	1	10
San Diego	11	2	9	1	7	12	2	10	3	8
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	11	1	10	5	5	12	1	11	6	5
Large city ¹ (public)	20	2	18	9	9	20	2	18	10	8
Albuquerque	20	#	20	10	9	21	2	19	9	11
Atlanta	3	#	3	#	3	3	#	3	#	3
Austin	34	2	32	13	20	38	2	35	15	21
Baltimore City	4	2	2	#	1	5	1	4	1	3
Boston	36	2	34	27	8	33	2	30	25	5
Charlotte	8	#	7	3	4	11	2	9	5	4
Chicago	15	1	14	2	11	15	1	14	6	8
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	8	1	7	#	6	9	2	7	1	6
Dallas	52	15	36	15	21	51	4	47	26	21
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	17	1	16	9	7	15	1	14	13	1
District of Columbia (DCPS)	8	1	7	1	7	7	1	6	1	4
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	3	#	3
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	27	1	26	24	2	27	1	27	24	3
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	10	#	9	#	9	12	1	12	#	11
Houston	40	5	36	15	21	41	4	37	16	22
Jefferson County (KY)	5	2	3	1	2	9	2	6	3	3
Los Angeles	28	1	27	20	7	31	2	29	24	6
Miami-Dade	25	3	21	#	21	22	4	18	#	18
Milwaukee	13	1	13	1	12	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	16	1	15	#	15	14	2	12	#	12
Philadelphia	7	1	6	1	5	9	1	8	3	5
San Diego	33	1	32	26	6	39	3	36	32	4
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

See notes at end of table.

NAEP 2019 Reading Appendix

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools. 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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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, 2002–19 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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2002					2003				
	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	6	12	8	4	19	5	13	8	5
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	24	15	9	2	7
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	21	7	13	5	8	20	8	12	4	8
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	13	5	8	5	4	14	4	10	5	5
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	20	12	8	2	6
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	16	6	11	4	7	16	6	10	3	7
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	6	2	4	4	1	6	2	5	4	1
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	6	5	1	#	1
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	5	2	3	1	2	5	2	3	2	1
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	21	2	19	18	1
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	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)	19	5	13	7	6	19	5	13	7	7
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	21	14	7	3	4	24	16	8	2	6
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	19	8	11	3	9	21	13	8	3	5
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	9	3	6	13	5	9	3	6
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	18	12	6	2	4	20	15	5	1	4
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	16	6	10	2	8	18	12	6	2	4
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	6	1	5	4	1	7	2	5	4	1
Large city ¹ (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
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	4	3	1	1	1	5	2	3	1	2
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
District of Columbia (DCPS)	3	2	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
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
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	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)	18	4	14	6	8	18	3	14	5	9
Large city ¹ (public)	23	5	18	9	9	22	3	19	8	11
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	25	7	18	9	9
Atlanta	12	3	8	2	7	12	4	9	2	6
Austin	29	9	20	16	4	26	9	17	12	5
Baltimore City	19	13	6	1	5	21	17	4	1	3
Boston	30	14	16	4	12	36	10	26	12	14
Charlotte	17	4	13	4	10	17	2	15	5	10
Chicago	21	5	17	4	12	23	2	21	5	16
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	28	16	12	1	10	31	5	26	1	25
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	29	6	23	19	5
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	23	7	16	6	10	26	8	18	10	8
District of Columbia (DCPS)	22	14	8	2	6	25	4	21	2	19
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	29	2	27	21	5	24	2	22	16	6
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	24	2	22	1	21
Houston	22	8	14	9	5	23	6	17	13	4
Jefferson County (KY)	15	8	7	3	4	15	7	8	2	6
Los Angeles	29	3	26	20	6	26	2	24	15	9
Miami-Dade	20	6	13	1	13	20	4	16	1	16
Milwaukee	26	8	18	2	16	33	3	30	2	28
New York City	23	6	17	1	16	26	3	23	1	22
Philadelphia	22	6	16	2	14	26	5	21	1	20
San Diego	25	3	22	16	6	24	1	23	14	9
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	9	2	7	13	3	10	2	8
Large city ¹ (public)	13	4	9	2	7	12	3	10	2	8
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	15	4	11	3	8
Atlanta	11	3	8	2	7	11	3	8	2	6
Austin	17	7	10	6	4	13	7	7	2	4
Baltimore City	19	13	6	1	5	19	16	3	#	3
Boston	22	8	14	2	12	20	5	14	1	14
Charlotte	11	2	9	1	7	11	2	9	2	7
Chicago	16	3	13	2	11	18	2	17	3	13
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	23	14	9	1	8	25	5	20	#	20
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	9	4	4	1	3
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	17	5	12	2	10	18	8	10	2	8
District of Columbia (DCPS)	18	13	5	1	4	20	3	17	1	16
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	11	2	8	3	5	9	2	7	1	6
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	16	1	15	1	14
Houston	12	6	7	2	4	12	5	7	3	3
Jefferson County (KY)	12	6	6	2	4	11	5	6	1	6
Los Angeles	11	2	9	3	6	12	2	10	2	8
Miami-Dade	12	2	10	#	10	11	1	9	#	9
Milwaukee	21	6	15	1	14	21	3	18	#	17
New York City	15	3	12	#	12	17	1	15	#	15
Philadelphia	17	5	11	1	10	17	3	14	1	14
San Diego	12	2	10	4	6	14	1	12	4	8
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	6	1	5	3	1	6	1	5	3	2
Large city ¹ (public)	12	2	10	7	3	12	1	10	7	4
Albuquerque	—	—	—	—	—	13	4	9	6	2
Atlanta	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Austin	16	4	12	10	2	16	4	12	10	2
Baltimore City	#	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	#	#
Boston	10	7	3	3	#	21	6	15	11	3
Charlotte	7	2	5	2	3	7	1	6	4	3
Chicago	7	2	5	2	3	7	1	6	2	4
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	6	4	3	1	2	7	1	7	1	6
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	24	3	21	18	3
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	6	2	4	4	#	9	1	8	8	#
District of Columbia (DCPS)	6	2	4	1	2	7	1	5	1	4
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	22	1	21	19	2	19	1	18	15	3
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	9	1	8	#	8
Houston	12	4	8	7	1	14	2	12	11	1
Jefferson County (KY)	3	2	1	1	#	4	2	2	1	1
Los Angeles	23	2	21	18	3	19	1	18	14	4
Miami-Dade	8	5	3	#	3	10	3	7	#	7
Milwaukee	7	3	4	1	3	14	1	13	1	12
New York City	10	4	7	#	6	12	2	11	#	10
Philadelphia	7	1	6	1	5	10	2	8	1	7
San Diego	16	1	15	13	2	16	#	15	11	4
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2013					2015				
	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)	17	2	15	4	11	19	2	17	5	12
Large city ¹ (public)	22	2	19	5	14	24	2	22	8	14
Albuquerque	27	2	25	13	12	27	2	25	12	13
Atlanta	14	1	12	2	11	14	2	12	1	10
Austin	27	3	23	5	18	29	3	25	10	16
Baltimore City	22	16	6	#	5	26	9	16	1	15
Boston	37	3	34	15	19	38	5	33	16	17
Charlotte	17	2	16	6	10	16	2	14	4	10
Chicago	20	2	18	2	17	21	1	20	4	16
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	32	4	28	#	28	32	5	26	2	24
Dallas	29	4	25	10	15	41	4	36	18	18
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	27	6	22	9	13	32	5	27	14	12
District of Columbia (DCPS)	26	3	23	1	22	28	5	23	1	22
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	16	2	13	1	12
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	21	3	18	12	6	26	2	23	16	8
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	22	2	20	#	20	25	2	23	#	23
Houston	25	4	21	8	12	27	4	22	5	17
Jefferson County (KY)	16	4	12	2	9	17	2	14	2	12
Los Angeles	21	3	19	9	10	22	3	20	8	12
Miami-Dade	22	3	19	#	18	22	5	17	#	17
Milwaukee	31	4	27	2	25	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	28	1	27	1	26	26	2	24	1	24
Philadelphia	26	4	22	1	21	24	5	19	3	17
San Diego	24	3	21	11	11	24	3	21	12	9
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SD										
Nation (public)	13	2	11	2	9	13	2	12	2	10
Large city ¹ (public)	13	2	11	1	10	14	2	12	2	11
Albuquerque	16	1	15	7	8	17	2	15	5	10
Atlanta	12	1	11	1	10	12	2	10	1	9
Austin	15	3	12	1	11	16	2	14	1	12
Baltimore City	21	15	5	#	5	20	7	13	1	13
Boston	20	2	18	#	17	20	3	17	#	16
Charlotte	11	1	10	2	8	9	1	9	1	7
Chicago	15	1	14	1	14	16	1	15	1	14
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	26	3	23	#	23	26	4	21	#	21
Dallas	9	2	7	#	6	10	3	7	#	7
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	17	5	12	1	10	19	5	14	1	12
District of Columbia (DCPS)	20	1	19	#	18	20	1	19	#	18
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	12	1	10	1	9
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	10	3	6	1	6	11	2	9	2	7
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	15	1	14	#	14	17	1	16	#	16
Houston	10	3	7	2	5	11	3	8	#	8
Jefferson County (KY)	12	4	8	1	7	12	2	10	#	10
Los Angeles	12	2	10	1	9	14	2	12	2	11
Miami-Dade	10	1	10	#	9	10	2	8	#	8
Milwaukee	24	4	20	1	19	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	17	1	16	#	16	19	1	18	#	18
Philadelphia	20	3	17	1	16	18	3	15	1	14
San Diego	14	2	12	3	9	12	2	10	3	7
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ELL										
Nation (public)	5	1	5	2	3	7	1	6	3	3
Large city ¹ (public)	11	1	10	4	6	13	1	12	6	5
Albuquerque	14	1	13	7	6	15	1	14	7	6
Atlanta	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	#	1
Austin	15	1	14	4	10	17	1	15	9	7
Baltimore City	1	1	#	#	#	5	2	3	#	3
Boston	23	2	21	14	7	25	3	22	15	7
Charlotte	8	1	7	4	3	8	1	6	3	3
Chicago	7	1	6	1	6	9	1	8	3	5
Clark County (NV)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleveland	8	1	7	#	7	8	2	7	2	5
Dallas	22	2	21	10	11	34	2	31	18	14
Denver	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Detroit	11	#	11	8	3	14	#	14	13	1
District of Columbia (DCPS)	7	2	5	1	5	9	4	5	1	5
Duval County (FL)	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	3	#	3
Fort Worth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fresno	15	1	14	12	2	19	1	18	14	4
Guilford County (NC)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough County (FL)	8	1	7	#	7	9	1	8	#	8
Houston	17	2	15	7	8	18	2	16	5	11
Jefferson County (KY)	4	1	4	1	2	5	#	4	1	3
Los Angeles	15	1	13	8	5	14	2	12	6	6
Miami-Dade	12	2	10	#	10	14	4	10	#	10
Milwaukee	8	1	8	1	7	—	—	—	—	—
New York City	15	1	14	#	13	10	1	8	#	8
Philadelphia	8	1	7	#	6	8	2	6	2	4
San Diego	15	1	14	9	6	17	1	15	11	5
Shelby County (TN)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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/jurisdiction: Various years, 2002–19—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2017					2019				
	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)	20	2	17	6	11	21	2	19	6	13
Large city ¹ (public)	25	3	22	9	13	26	2	24	9	15
Albuquerque	26	2	24	11	13	30	2	29	14	15
Atlanta	15	1	14	2	12	18	3	15	1	14
Austin	33	2	31	8	23	35	3	33	9	24
Baltimore City	22	4	18	2	16	25	4	21	1	20
Boston	39	6	34	17	16	39	6	34	16	18
Charlotte	18	2	15	10	5	17	3	14	7	7
Chicago	21	2	19	4	15	24	1	23	5	18
Clark County (NV)	24	1	23	18	5	23	1	22	16	6
Cleveland	33	6	27	5	22	32	5	27	5	22
Dallas	53	3	50	25	25	54	4	50	34	16
Denver	39	2	36	28	8	33	2	31	20	11
Detroit	35	8	27	17	10	31	6	26	12	14
District of Columbia (DCPS)	26	5	21	4	17	27	3	24	1	23
Duval County (FL)	18	3	15	3	12	21	2	19	2	16
Fort Worth	30	2	27	17	10	34	1	33	25	9
Fresno	21	2	19	13	6	23	2	21	15	6
Guilford County (NC)	20	2	18	8	10	16	1	15	4	11
Hillsborough County (FL)	25	2	23	2	21	27	2	25	2	24
Houston	28	3	25	11	13	30	2	28	18	10
Jefferson County (KY)	14	3	11	2	9	17	2	15	4	11
Los Angeles	22	3	19	12	7	22	3	20	12	8
Miami-Dade	23	5	19	2	17	25	3	22	1	21
Milwaukee	30	4	26	4	22	31	3	28	3	24
New York City	30	2	27	4	24	30	2	28	3	25
Philadelphia	27	5	21	7	14	28	6	22	7	15
San Diego	22	2	20	15	5	22	4	18	12	5
Shelby County (TN)	20	2	18	3	15	17	2	15	3	12
SD										
Nation (public)	14	2	12	3	9	15	1	13	2	11
Large city ¹ (public)	14	2	12	3	9	14	1	13	2	11
Albuquerque	19	1	17	7	10	20	1	19	7	12
Atlanta	13	1	12	1	11	16	2	13	1	13
Austin	17	1	15	1	14	18	2	16	1	15
Baltimore City	19	4	16	1	15	20	3	17	#	17
Boston	20	3	17	2	15	20	3	17	1	16
Charlotte	10	1	9	5	4	9	1	9	3	6
Chicago	15	1	14	1	13	16	1	15	1	14
Clark County (NV)	10	#	10	6	4	11	1	10	6	4
Cleveland	24	5	19	3	16	23	4	18	1	17
Dallas	11	2	9	1	8	11	3	8	2	6
Denver	12	2	10	4	6	11	1	10	2	8
Detroit	18	6	12	2	9	19	6	13	2	11
District of Columbia (DCPS)	18	2	15	2	13	18	2	16	1	16
Duval County (FL)	14	2	11	2	9	16	1	15	1	14
Fort Worth	11	2	8	2	6	11	1	10	5	5
Fresno	10	1	9	3	6	12	1	10	5	5
Guilford County (NC)	16	2	14	6	8	13	1	12	2	10
Hillsborough County (FL)	17	1	16	1	15	19	2	18	1	17
Houston	10	2	8	1	6	10	1	8	1	7
Jefferson County (KY)	10	2	8	1	7	11	2	10	1	9
Los Angeles	13	2	11	5	6	13	2	11	5	7
Miami-Dade	11	2	9	1	9	12	1	11	#	11
Milwaukee	22	4	19	2	17	22	3	19	1	18
New York City	19	1	18	2	16	21	1	20	1	19
Philadelphia	18	4	14	3	11	18	4	13	2	12
San Diego	12	1	11	6	4	14	3	11	7	5
Shelby County (TN)	16	2	14	3	12	12	2	10	1	9
ELL										
Nation (public)	7	1	6	4	3	8	1	7	4	3
Large city ¹ (public)	13	2	12	7	5	14	1	13	8	6
Albuquerque	12	1	11	5	6	14	#	14	8	6
Atlanta	2	#	2	#	1	3	#	2	#	2
Austin	21	1	19	7	12	22	2	20	8	12
Baltimore City	3	1	2	1	1	5	1	4	1	3
Boston	25	3	22	16	6	25	3	21	15	7
Charlotte	8	2	7	5	1	10	2	8	5	3
Chicago	9	1	8	3	5	12	1	11	4	7
Clark County (NV)	17	1	16	13	3	15	1	15	11	3
Cleveland	10	1	9	3	7	12	1	11	4	7
Dallas	46	2	45	25	20	47	2	45	33	11
Denver	32	2	30	26	4	26	1	25	18	6
Detroit	18	2	16	15	1	14	#	14	9	5
District of Columbia (DCPS)	11	4	7	2	6	11	1	9	1	9
Duval County (FL)	5	1	4	1	3	5	1	4	1	3
Fort Worth	23	#	23	16	7	26	#	26	22	5
Fresno	14	1	13	11	3	15	1	14	12	2
Guilford County (NC)	5	#	5	2	2	4	#	4	2	3
Hillsborough County (FL)	10	1	9	1	8	9	#	9	1	8
Houston	20	1	18	10	8	23	1	22	17	5
Jefferson County (KY)	4	1	4	1	2	7	1	6	2	3
Los Angeles	14	3	12	8	4	15	2	13	9	3
Miami-Dade	14	3	11	1	10	14	2	12	1	12
Milwaukee	11	1	10	2	8	12	1	11	3	8
New York City	13	2	11	2	10	12	1	11	2	9
Philadelphia	9	2	8	5	3	11	2	9	5	4
San Diego	14	1	12	10	2	10	2	9	6	2
Shelby County (TN)	5	#	5	1	4	6	#	5	2	3

— 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.

NAEP 2019 Reading Appendix

NOTE: Beginning with the 2017 assessment, NAEP reading results are from a digitally based assessment; prior to 2017, results were from a paper-and-pencil based assessment. 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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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, 2002–19 Reading Assessments.

Data Collection

The NAEP 2019 reading assessment was conducted from January to March 2019 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 of 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 2019 reading assessment, 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. 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 <https://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. For 2019, 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: NAEP first began collecting data in 1996 on student eligibility for NSLP as an indicator of poverty. Based on available school records, students were classified as either currently eligible for the free/reduced-price school lunch or not eligible. Eligibility for free and reduced-price lunches is determined by students' family income in relation to the federally established poverty level. Students from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the poverty level qualify to receive free lunches and those from families with incomes between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty level qualify to receive reduced-price lunch. For the period July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019, for a family of four, 130 percent of the poverty level is \$32,630 and 185 percent is \$46,435.

The classification applies only to the school year when the assessment was administered (i.e., the 2018–19 school year) and is not based on eligibility in previous years. If school records were not available, the student was 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. Because of the improved quality of the data on students' eligibility for NSLP, the percentage of students for whom information was not available has decreased compared to the percentages reported prior to the 2003 assessment.

As a result of the passage of the [Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010](#), schools can use a new universal meal service option, the "Community Eligibility Provision" (CEP). Through CEP, eligible schools can provide meal service to all students at no charge, regardless of economic status and without the need to collect eligibility data through household applications. CEP became available nationwide in the 2014-2015 school year; as a result, the percentage of students in many states categorized as eligible for NSLP may have increased in comparison to 2013. Therefore, readers should interpret NSLP trend results with caution.

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/jurisdiction 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.