

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assesses reading on a 0-500 point scale. In 2005, City of Chicago School District 299 was one of ten urban districts that voluntarily participated in the NAEP reading assessment on a trial basis.

Overall Reading Results for Chicago	Student Percentages at NAEP Achievement Levels																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2005, the average scale score for fourth-grade students in Chicago was 198. This was not significantly different from their average score in 2003 (198), and was not significantly different from their average score in 2002 (193).¹ Chicago's average score (198) in 2005 was lower than that of public schools in large central cities² (206). The percentage of students in Chicago who performed at or above the NAEP <i>Proficient</i> level was 14 percent in 2005. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2003 (14 percent), and was not significantly different from that in 2002 (11 percent). The percentage of students in Chicago who performed at or above the NAEP <i>Basic</i> level was 40 percent in 2005. This percentage was not significantly different from that in 2003 (40 percent), and was not significantly different from that in 2002 (34 percent). 	<p>Chicago (public)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>66</td> <td>23</td> <td>9</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>60</td> <td>26</td> <td>11</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>60</td> <td>27</td> <td>12</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table> <p>Large central city (public)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>56</td> <td>27</td> <td>14</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table> <p>Nation (public)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>38</td> <td>33</td> <td>23</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table> <p>Percent below Basic Percent at Basic, Proficient, and Advanced</p> <p>■ Below Basic □ Basic ■ Proficient ■ Advanced</p> <p>NOTE: The NAEP grade 4 reading achievement levels correspond to the following scale points: Below Basic, 207 or lower; Basic, 208–237; Proficient, 238–267; Advanced, 268 or above.</p>	2002	66	23	9	2	2003	60	26	11	3	2005	60	27	12	2	2005	56	27	14	3	2005	38	33	23	7
2002	66	23	9	2																						
2003	60	26	11	3																						
2005	60	27	12	2																						
2005	56	27	14	3																						
2005	38	33	23	7																						

Performance of NAEP Reporting Groups in Chicago: 2005						
Reporting groups	Percent of students ³	Average score	Percent below Basic	Percent of students at or above Basic	Percent Proficient	Percent Advanced
Male	52	195	62	38	13	2
Female	48	202	57	43	14	3
White	9	225	30	70	39	11
Black	48	190	69	31	7	1
Hispanic	41	201	57	43	15	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
American Indian/Alaska Native	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch	84	194	65	35	9	1
Not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch	16 †	222	32	68	35	9

Average Score Gaps Between Selected Groups	Reading Scale Scores at Selected Percentiles																
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2005, male students in Chicago had an average score that was lower than that of female students by 7 points. In 2002, the average score for male students was lower than that of female students by 9 points. In 2005, Black students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 35 points. In 2002, the average score for Black students was lower than that of White students by 35 points. In 2005, Hispanic students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 25 points. In 2002, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 28 points. In 2005, students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch, an indicator of poverty, had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 28 points. In 2002, the average score for students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch was lower than the score of those not eligible by 32 points. In 2005, the score gap between students at the 75th percentile and students at the 25th percentile was 48 points. In 2002, the score gap between students at the 75th percentile and students at the 25th percentile was 48 points. 	<p>Reading Scale Scores at Selected Percentiles</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>75th Percentile</th> <th>50th Percentile</th> <th>25th Percentile</th> </tr> <tr> <td>'02</td> <td>217</td> <td>194</td> <td>170</td> </tr> <tr> <td>'03</td> <td>223</td> <td>199</td> <td>174</td> </tr> <tr> <td>'05</td> <td>223</td> <td>199</td> <td>175</td> </tr> </table> <p>Scores at selected percentiles on the NAEP reading scale indicate how well students at lower, middle, and higher levels performed.</p>	Year	75th Percentile	50th Percentile	25th Percentile	'02	217	194	170	'03	223	199	174	'05	223	199	175
Year	75th Percentile	50th Percentile	25th Percentile														
'02	217	194	170														
'03	223	199	174														
'05	223	199	175														

The estimate rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

* Significantly different from 2005.

† Significantly higher than 2003. ‡ Significantly lower than 2003.

¹ Comparisons (higher/lower/not different) are based on statistical tests. The .05 level was used for testing statistical significance. Comparisons across jurisdictions and comparisons with the nation or within a jurisdiction across years may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL). The exclusion rates for SD and ELL in Chicago were 5 percent and 4 percent in 2005, respectively. Statistical comparisons are calculated on the basis of unrounded scale scores or percentages.

² "Large central city" includes public schools located in large central cities (population 250,000 or more) within metropolitan statistical areas as defined by the federal Office of Management and Budget. It is not synonymous with "inner city."

³ For comparison, non-White students comprised 78 percent of students in large central city public schools and 41 percent in public schools nationally. Also, students eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch comprised 71 percent of students in large central city public schools and 45 percent in public schools nationally.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding and because the "Information not available" category for free/reduced-price school lunch and the "Unclassified" category for race/ethnicity are not displayed. Visit <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/tuda.asp> for additional results and detailed information.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2002, 2003, and 2005 Trial Urban District Reading Assessments.