What is The Nation’s Report Card™?
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Executive Summary

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is an ongoing, nationally representative sample survey of student achievement in core subject areas. Authorized by Congress and administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education, NAEP regularly reports to the public on the educational progress of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade students.

This report presents results of the NAEP 2003 fourth- and eighth-grade reading assessments for the nation, for regions of the country, for participating states and other jurisdictions, and for participating urban districts. Assessment results are described in terms of students’ average reading score on a 0–500 scale and in terms of the percentage of students attaining each of three achievement levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. National and district-level scores at different percentiles on the scale (indicating the percentage of students whose scores fell below a particular point) are also discussed.

The achievement levels are performance standards adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) as part of its statutory responsibilities. The achievement levels are a collective judgment of what students should know and be able to do for each grade tested. As provided by law, NCES, upon review of a congressionally mandated evaluation of NAEP,
determined that the achievement levels are to be used on a trial basis and should be interpreted with caution. However, both NCES and NAGB believe these performance standards are useful for understanding trends in student achievement. They have been widely used by national and state officials and others as a common yardstick of academic performance.

Approximately 188,000 fourth-graders from 7,500 schools and 155,000 eighth-graders from 6,100 schools were assessed. The national results reflect the performance of students attending both public and nonpublic schools, while the results for participating states and other jurisdictions, and for urban districts, reflect the performance of students attending public schools. In addition to providing average scores and achievement-level percentages in reading for the nation, states and other jurisdictions, and urban districts, this report provides results for subgroups of students defined by various background characteristics.

A summary of major findings from the NAEP 2003 Reading Assessment is presented on the following pages. Comparisons are made to results from previous years in which the assessment was administered. In addition to the 2003 results, national results are reported from the 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000 (fourth grade only), and 2002 assessments. Results for participating states and other jurisdictions are also reported from the 1992, 1994, 1998, and 2002 assessments at grade 4 and from the 1998 and 2002 assessments at grade 8. Results for participating urban districts are reported for 2002 and 2003. The more recent results (those from 1998 or later) are based on administration procedures in which testing accommodations were permitted for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students. Accommodations were not permitted in earlier assessments. Comparisons between results from 2003 and those from assessment years in which both types of administration procedures were used (1998 at both grades and 2000 at grade 4 only) are discussed in this executive summary based on the results when accommodations were permitted. Changes in student performance across years or differences between groups of students in 2003 are discussed only if they have been determined to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

Overall Reading Results for the Nation, Regions of the Country, and States and Other Jurisdictions

Reading Results for the Nation

At grade 4

- No measurable difference was detected between the fourth-grade average score in 2003 and the score in 1992.
- The score at the 75th percentile for fourth-graders was higher in 2003 than in 1992, indicating improvement among higher-performing students.
- The percentage of fourth-graders performing at or above Proficient was higher in 2003 than in 1992.

At grade 8

- The average eighth-grade reading score decreased by one point between 2002 and 2003; however, the score in 2003 was higher than that in 1992.
Scores decreased from 2002 to 2003 among lower-performing eighth-graders at the 10th and 25th percentiles; however, scores at the 10th, 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles were higher in 2003 than in 1992.

The percentage of eighth-graders at or above Proficient was higher in 2003 than in 1992. The percentage of students at or above Basic decreased by one point between 2002 and 2003, but was higher in 2003 than in 1992.

Reading Results for Regions of the Country
Prior to 2003, NAEP results were reported for four NAEP-defined regions of the nation: Northeast, Southeast, Central, and West. As of 2003, to align NAEP with other federal data collections, NAEP analysis and reports have used the U.S. Census Bureau’s definition of “region.” The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

At grade 4
- The average fourth-grade reading score in 2003 was higher for students in the Northeast than in the Midwest, South, and West. In the Midwest, the average score was higher than in the South and West, and the average score was higher for students in the South than for students in the West.
- The percentages of fourth-graders performing at or above the Basic and Proficient levels in 2003 were higher in the Northeast than in the Midwest, South, and West. Higher percentages of students performed at or above the Basic and Proficient levels in the Midwest than in the South and the West, and higher percentages of students performed at or above the Basic and Proficient levels in the South than in the West.

At grade 8
- In 2003, the average eighth-grade reading scores were higher in the Northeast and Midwest than in the South and West, and the average score was higher in the South than in the West.
- Higher percentages of eighth-graders performed at or above the Basic and Proficient levels in 2003 in the Northeast and Midwest than in the South and West. In the South, a higher percentage of students performed at or above the Basic level than in the West.

Reading Results for the States and Other Jurisdictions
Results from the 2003 assessment are reported for fourth- and eighth-grade students attending public schools in 50 states and 3 other jurisdictions that participated in the assessment. (Throughout this summary, the term “jurisdiction” is used to refer to the states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense schools that participated in the NAEP reading assessments.)

At grade 4
- Of the 42 jurisdictions that participated in both the 1992 and 2003 fourth-grade assessments, 13 showed increases and 5 showed declines in average scores.
- The percentage of fourth-graders at or above Proficient increased in 17 of the 42 jurisdictions that participated in both the 1992 and 2003 assessments.
- Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Vermont were among the jurisdictions with the highest average reading scores at grade 4.
**At grade 8**

- Of the 39 jurisdictions that participated in the eighth-grade assessment in 1998 (when accommodations were permitted) and 2003, 8 showed increases and 7 showed declines in average scores.

- Between 1998 (when accommodations were permitted) and 2003, the percentage of eighth-graders performing at or above Proficient increased in 5 of the 39 jurisdictions that participated in both years, and declined in one.

- Department of Defense overseas schools, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont were among the jurisdictions with the highest average reading scores at grade 8.

**Reading Results for Student Subgroups in the Nation and in the States and Other Jurisdictions**

In addition to reporting overall results, NAEP reports on the performance of various subgroups of students. In interpreting these data, readers are reminded that the relationship between contextual variables and student performance is not necessarily causal. There are many other educational, cultural, and social factors that play a role in student achievement in a particular subject area.

**National Results**

**Gender**

- At grade 4, there was no measurable difference detected in the average reading scores for male or female students from 1992 to 2003. At grade 8, the average score for male students in 2003 was higher than in 1992, and lower than in 2002.

- In 2003, female students outperformed male students by 7 points on average at grade 4 and by 11 points on average at grade 8. The fourth- and eighth-grade reading score gaps between male and female students showed no measurable change from 1992 to 2003.

- The percentages of male and female fourth-graders performing at or above Proficient showed no measurable change from 1992 to 2003. The percentage of male eighth-graders at or above Proficient was higher in 2003 than in 1992.
**Race/Ethnicity**

- At grade 4, White students and Asian/Pacific Islander students scored higher on average in 2003 than Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native students. White students also scored higher on average than Asian/Pacific Islander students, and Hispanic students scored higher on average than Black students. At grade 8, White and Asian/Pacific Islander students had higher average scores in 2003 than Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native students.

- The average scores for White, Black, and Asian/Pacific Islander fourth-graders were higher in 2003 than in 1992. The average scores for White, Black, and Hispanic eighth-graders were higher in 2003 than in 1992.

- At both grades 4 and 8, the average score gap between White students and Black students and between White students and Hispanic students showed no measurable change from 1992 to 2003.

- The percentages of White, Black, and Asian/Pacific Islander fourth-graders performing at or above Proficient were higher in 2003 than in 1992. At grade 8, the percentages of White students and Black students performing at or above Proficient were higher in 2003 than in 1992.

**Eligibility for Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch**

NAEP collects data on students’ eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch as an indicator of family economic status. Eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch is determined by students’ family income in relation to the federally established poverty level. The reading results are reported for students classified by their eligibility from 1998 on.

- In 2003, both fourth- and eighth-grade students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch scored lower on average than students who were not eligible.

- The average reading score for fourth-graders was higher in 2003 than in 1998 both for students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and for those who were not eligible. The average score for eighth-graders who were eligible showed a decrease between 2002 and 2003 but showed no measurable difference between 1998 and 2003.

- For fourth-graders who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above Proficient was higher in 2003 than in 1998.
Parents’ Level of Education
Eighth-grade students who participated in the NAEP reading assessment were asked to indicate the highest level of education completed by each parent. Results are reported based on the highest level of education for either parent. Information about parental education was not collected at grade 4.

Overall, in 2003 there was a positive relationship between student-reported parental education and student achievement: the higher the parental education level, the higher the average reading score.

The average score for eighth-grade students was lower in 2003 than in 2002 for students who reported that at least one parent had graduated from high school. The average score increased between 1992 and 2003 for students who reported that at least one parent had graduated from high school, and for students who reported that at least one parent had graduated from college.

Type of School
The schools that participate in the NAEP assessment are classified as either public or nonpublic. A further distinction is then made between nonpublic schools that are Catholic schools and those that are some other type of nonpublic school.

Performance results in 2003 show that, at both grades 4 and 8, students who attended nonpublic schools had a higher average reading score than students who attended public schools.

The average fourth-grade reading score for Catholic school students increased between 1992 and 2003. The average eighth-grade score was also higher in 2003 than in 1992 for Catholic school students. The average score for students in public schools declined between 2002 and 2003; however, the average public school score was higher in 2003 than that in 1992.

The percentage of fourth-grade Catholic school students performing at or above Proficient was higher in 2003 than in 1992.

Type of Location
The schools from which NAEP draws its samples of students are classified according to their type of location (central city, rural/small town, or urban fringe/large town). The methods used to identify the type of school location in 2000 (at grade 4), 2002, and 2003 were different from those used for prior assessment years; therefore, only the data from the 2000, 2002, and 2003 assessments are reported.

In 2003, fourth- and eighth-graders in urban fringe/large town and rural/small town locations had higher average scores than students in central city locations, and students in urban fringe/large town locations scored higher on average than those in rural/small town locations.
The average reading scores for fourth-graders in central city and urban fringe/large town locations were higher in 2003 than in 2000. The average score for eighth-graders in rural/small town locations declined between 2002 and 2003.

In 2003, higher percentages of fourth- and eighth-graders performed at or above Proficient in urban fringe/large town and rural/small town locations than in central city locations.

State and Other Jurisdiction Results

Gender

In 2003, female students scored higher on average than male students in all 53 of the jurisdictions that participated at grades 4 and 8.

Among the 42 jurisdictions that participated in both the 1992 and 2003 fourth-grade reading assessments, 10 showed increases in the average score for both male and female students. New Mexico and Oklahoma showed decreases for both male and female students.

Among the 39 jurisdictions that participated in both the 1998 and 2003 eighth-grade reading assessments, Delaware and Missouri showed average score increases for both male and female students, and Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico showed decreases for both male and female students.

Race/Ethnicity

The average fourth-grade reading score was higher in 2003 than in 1992 for White students in 19 jurisdictions, for Black students in 8 jurisdictions, for Hispanic students in 5 jurisdictions, and for Asian/Pacific Islander students in 4 jurisdictions. The average score declined between 1992 and 2003 for Black students in Iowa and for American Indian/Alaska Native students in New Mexico. Average score increases were observed between 1992 and 2003 for three or more racial/ethnic subgroups in California, Florida, Maryland, and New York.

The average eighth-grade reading score was higher in 2003 than in 1998 for White students in six jurisdictions, Black students in Delaware, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Hawaii and Minnesota. A decrease in the average score was detected between 1998 and 2003 for White students in Maine, Black students in Oklahoma, and Hispanic students in New Mexico.

Eligibility for Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch

The average fourth-grade reading score was higher in 2003 than in 1998 both for students who were eligible and students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch in 11 jurisdictions, for eligible students in 5 jurisdictions, and for students who were not eligible in 5 jurisdictions. In the District of Columbia, the average score increased for eligible students and decreased for students who were not eligible.
The average eighth-grade reading score was higher in 2003 than in 1998 both for students who were eligible and students who were not eligible in Delaware and Missouri. Average scores were lower in 2003 than in 1998 for eligible students in New Mexico and Oklahoma, and for students who were not eligible in Nevada.

Urban District Results

Overall Reading Results for the Urban Districts

At grade 4
The average fourth-grade reading score in 9 of the 10 districts participating in 2003 was lower than the national public school score. Average fourth-grade reading scores in Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, the District of Columbia, and Los Angeles were lower than the average score for large central cities. Average scores in Charlotte and New York were higher than the large central city score.

When compared to fourth-grade public school students in large central cities, scores at the 10th percentile were higher in Boston, Charlotte, Houston, and New York; scores at the 25th percentile were higher in Charlotte, Houston, and New York; scores at the 50th percentile were higher in Charlotte and New York; and scores at the 75th and 90th percentiles were higher in Charlotte.

The percentage of fourth-graders at or above Proficient in 2003 was lower in 9 of the 10 districts when compared to the nation. In Charlotte, the percentage of students at or above Proficient was higher than the percentage for large central cities.

At grade 8
Average eighth-grade reading scores in 9 of the 10 districts that participated in 2003 were lower than the national average score. Students in Atlanta, Cleveland, the District of Columbia, Houston, and Los Angeles scored lower on average than students in large central cities. Students in Boston and Charlotte had higher average scores than students in large central cities.

In comparison to the scores for eighth-grade public school students in large central cities, scores at the 10th and 25th percentiles were higher in Charlotte, scores at the 50th percentile were higher in Charlotte and New York, and scores at the 75th and 90th percentiles were higher in Boston and Charlotte.
In 2003, the percentage of eighth-graders at or above Proficient was lower in 9 of the 10 districts as compared to the nation. The percentages at or above Proficient were higher in Boston and Charlotte than in large central cities.

Results for Student Subgroups in Urban Districts

Gender

At grade 4, the average score for female students in Charlotte was higher than that in the nation. Reading scores for male and female students in Charlotte were both higher on average than for male and female students in large central cities. Female students in New York had higher average scores than female students in large central cities.

At grade 8, male and female students in all the districts that participated in 2003, except Charlotte, had lower average scores than their counterparts in the nation. Average scores for both male and female students in Charlotte were higher than for their counterparts in large central cities.

Race/Ethnicity

At grade 4, the average scores in 2003 for White students in Atlanta, Charlotte, the District of Columbia, and Houston; Black students in Charlotte and Houston; and Hispanic students in New York were higher than the corresponding scores in the nation and large central cities. The average scores for White students in Cleveland and Los Angeles; Black students in the District of Columbia; and Hispanic students in the District of Columbia and Los Angeles were lower than the corresponding scores in the nation and large central cities.

In 2003 at grade 8, average reading scores for both White and Black students in Charlotte, and Hispanic students in Chicago were higher than comparable scores in the nation and large central cities. The average scores for White students in Cleveland; Black students in Atlanta, the District of Columbia, and Los Angeles; and Hispanic students in Los Angeles were lower than the scores in the nation and large central cities.
Eligibility for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch

- At grade 4, average scores in 2003 were higher for eligible students in New York and for students who were not eligible in Charlotte and New York compared to the corresponding scores in the nation and large central cities. Eligible students in Atlanta, the District of Columbia, and Los Angeles, and students who were not eligible in the District of Columbia, scored lower on average than comparable groups of students in the nation and large central cities.

- At grade 8, eligible students in Boston, Chicago, and New York, and students who were not eligible in Charlotte and New York scored higher on average than their counterparts in large central cities. Eligible students in Atlanta, the District of Columbia, and Los Angeles, and students who were not eligible in Atlanta, the District of Columbia, Houston, and Los Angeles, scored lower on average than their counterparts in the nation and large central cities.

Parents’ Level of Education

- In 2003, the average score for eighth-grade students who indicated that a parent had graduated from college was lower in Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, the District of Columbia, and Los Angeles than the average score for students in the same parental education category in public schools in the nation and large central cities. The average score for students who reported that a parent graduated from college was higher in Charlotte than for comparable students in large central cities.
Introduction

The importance of being able to read has long been acknowledged as the foundation for learning and as essential for participation in society. This report presents major results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2003 reading assessment of the nation’s fourth- and eighth-grade students. Results are presented for the nation overall, for the 53 states and other jurisdictions that participated in the 2003 assessment, and for the 9 districts that participated in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA). The results reported here are intended to inform educators, policymakers, parents, and the general public about students’ progress in reading.

Overview of the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading

For more than 30 years, NAEP has regularly collected, analyzed, and reported valid and reliable information about what students know and can do in a variety of subject areas. As authorized by the U.S. Congress, NAEP assesses representative national samples of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade students. Since 1992, NAEP has also assessed representative samples of fourth- and eighth-grade students in states and other jurisdictions that participate in the NAEP state-by-state assessments.
NAEP is administered and overseen by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), within the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences.

The content of all NAEP assessments is determined by subject-area frameworks that are developed by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) in a comprehensive process involving a broad spectrum of interested parties, including teachers, curriculum specialists, subject-matter specialists, school administrators, parents, and members of the general public. The framework for the NAEP 2003 reading assessment, while updated and expanded, is in essence the same framework that has guided development of the NAEP reading assessments since 1992.

This report describes the results of the NAEP 2003 reading assessment at grades 4 and 8. National results for 2003 are compared to those from 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, and 2002 at grade 4, and 1992, 1994, 1998, and 2002 at grade 8. Comparisons across assessment years are possible because the assessments were developed under the same basic framework and shared a common set of reading questions.

Using the same test as that used nationally, state-level assessments were conducted at grade 4 in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, and 2003. At grade 8, state-level assessments were conducted in 1998, 2002, and 2003. District-level results are presented for 9 districts in 2003 and for 5 districts in 2002.

Prior to 1998, administration procedures for NAEP reading assessments did not permit the use of accommodations for special needs students who could not participate without them (e.g., extra time; individual rather than group administration). For the 1998 assessment, however, administration procedures were introduced that allowed the use of accommodations by students with disabilities (SD) and limited-English-proficient (LEP) students (see appendix A). A split-sample design was used in 1998 at all three grades (and again in 2000 at grade 4) so that both administration procedures could be used during the same assessment, but with different samples of students. This made it possible to report trends in students’ reading achievement across all the assessment years and, at the same time, examine the effects of including students assessed with accommodations in overall assessment results. Based on an examination of how permitting accommodations affected overall population results, it was decided that, beginning with the 2002 assessment, NAEP would use only one set of procedures—permitting the use of accommodations.

During the period in which accommodations were not permitted, special-needs students could only be included in the assessment if it was determined by school staff that they could be assessed meaningfully without accommodations. The change in administration procedures makes it possible for more students to be included in the assessments; however, it also represents an important altering of procedures from previous assessments. (See the section on Students with Disabilities and/or Limited-English-Proficient students in appendix A for a more detailed discussion.) The reader is encouraged to consider the difference in accommodation procedures when interpreting comparisons between the two sets of results.
The charts and tables throughout this report distinguish between results from assessment years in which accommodations were not permitted and results from assessment years in which accommodations were permitted. In the tables and charts that display results across assessment years, all previous assessment results that were found to be significantly different (at the .05 level) from the 2003 results are marked with an asterisk (*). Two sets of results are presented for assessment years in which both administration procedures were used (accommodations not permitted and accommodations permitted). Both sets of results may be notated, if found to be significantly different from 2003. The text that accompanies these tables and charts indicates which previous assessment results were significantly different from 2003. Comparisons between the 2003 results, when accommodations were permitted, and the 1992 and 1994 results, when they were not permitted, are discussed in the text. However, for assessment years with both accommodations-not-permitted results and accommodations-permitted results, the text describes comparisons only between the accommodations-permitted results and 2003.


The reading framework is the blueprint that has specified the content and guided the development of each NAEP reading assessment administered since 1992. The framework resulted from a national process involving many organizations concerned with reading education. This cooperative effort was directed by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) and managed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). In 2002, the NAEP reading framework was updated to provide more explicit detail regarding the assessment design. At that time, NAGB altered slightly some of the terms used to describe elements of the reading assessment. The following description of the reading framework incorporates these changes. It should be noted, however, that this updating of the framework does not represent a change in the content or design of the NAEP reading assessment.

The framework is founded on research from the field of education that defines reading as an interactive and dynamic process involving the reader, the text, and the context of the reading experience. Reading involves the development of an understanding of text, thinking about text in different ways, and using a variety of text types for different purposes. For example, readers may read stories to enjoy and appreciate the human experience, study science texts to form new hypotheses about knowledge, or use directions to learn how to do something.

Recognizing that readers vary their approach to reading according to the demands of any particular text, the framework specifies the assessment of reading in three “contexts for reading”: reading for literary experience, reading to gain information, and reading to perform a task. Each context for reading is associated with a range of different types of texts that are included in the NAEP reading assessment. All three contexts for reading are assessed at grade 8, but reading to perform a task is not assessed at grade 4. The three contexts for reading as specified in the framework are described in figure 1.1.

---

As readers attempt to develop understanding of text, they focus on general topics or themes, interpret and integrate ideas, make connections to background knowledge and experiences, and examine the content and structure of the text. The framework accounts for these different approaches to understanding text by specifying four “aspects of reading” that represent the types of comprehension questions asked of students. All four aspects of reading are assessed at both grades 4 and 8 within each context of reading described above. The four aspects of reading as specified in the framework are described in figure 1.2.
The 2003 NAEP Reading Assessment Instrument

The NAEP reading assessment is the only federally authorized, ongoing, nationwide assessment of student reading achievement. It is governed by the framework and reflects expert perspectives on the measurement of reading comprehension. During the development process, the assessment undergoes stringent review by teachers and teacher educators, as well as by state officials and measurement specialists. All components of the assessment are evaluated for curricular relevance, developmental appropriateness, and fairness concerns.

The NAEP reading assessment measures understanding by having students read passages and answer comprehension questions. The reading passages used in the NAEP assessment are drawn from the types of books and publications that students might encounter in school, in the library, or at home. NAEP assessment developers strive to replicate authentic reading experiences in the assessment items presented to student participants. The passages students are asked to read are neither abridged nor contrived especially for the assessment. Instead, full-length reading selections are reprinted in test booklets to resemble as closely as possible the format of their

---

1 This aspect of reading was referred to as “forming an initial understanding” in previous versions of the NAEP reading framework.
2 This aspect of reading was referred to as “personal reflection and response” in previous versions of the NAEP reading framework.
3 This aspect of reading was referred to as “demonstrating a critical stance” in previous versions of the NAEP reading framework.

original publication. To demonstrate their comprehension of these passages, students answer a combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. The multiple-choice questions include four options from which students are asked to select the best answer. The constructed-response questions require students to write their own responses. Short constructed-response questions can be completed in no more than a few sentences, while extended constructed-response questions may require students to provide responses as long as a paragraph or a full page. Both types of constructed-response questions require students to support their answers by using information in the reading passage.

In order to ensure reliable and valid scoring of constructed-response questions, a unique scoring guide, describing the specific criteria for assigning a score level to each student’s response, is developed for each question. Expert scorers go through extensive training to understand how to apply these scoring criteria fairly and consistently. Scorers are consistently monitored to ensure that scoring standards are being applied appropriately and to ensure a high degree of scorer agreement (i.e., interrater reliability). In addition, for those constructed-response questions that were used in previous assessments, monitoring of scorers includes checking to make sure that scoring standards remain consistent from year to year.

At each grade, the entire reading assessment is divided into sections referred to as blocks. Each block contains at least one text and a related set of approximately 10 to 12 comprehension questions (a combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response). Most of the blocks are presented to students as 25-minute timed sections, but some are presented as 50-minute timed sections. The total number of blocks that make up the NAEP reading assessment at each grade are as follows:

Grade 4—five 25-minute literary blocks and five 25-minute informative blocks

Grade 8—four 25-minute literary blocks, four 25-minute informative blocks, four 25-minute task blocks, and one 50-minute informative block

In order to minimize the burden on any individual student, NAEP uses a procedure referred to as matrix sampling, in which an individual student is administered only a small portion of the entire assessment at any grade. For example, at grade 4, students are given a test booklet that contains only two 25-minute blocks. At grade 8, students are given a test booklet that contains either two 25-minute blocks or one 50-minute block. Because each block is administered to a representative sample at each grade, the results can then be combined to produce average group and subgroup results based on the entire assessment. In addition to the two 25-minute blocks or one 50-minute block in each student’s test booklet, students are asked to complete two sections of background questions that ask about their background and home or school experiences related to reading achievement. The time required for each student to participate in the NAEP reading assessment is approximately one hour.
Description of School and Student Samples

The NAEP 2003 reading assessment was administered to fourth- and eighth-graders at the national and the state levels. At the national level, results are reported for both public and nonpublic school students. At the state or jurisdiction level, results are reported only for public school students. In order to obtain a representative sample of students for reporting national and state or jurisdiction results, approximately 188,000 fourth-graders from 7,500 schools and 155,000 eighth-graders from 6,100 schools were sampled and assessed. All 50 states and 3 jurisdictions participated and met the minimum guidelines for reporting their results in 2003. The national samples were larger in 2002 and 2003 than in previous assessment years because they were based on the combined sample of public school students assessed in each participating state, plus an additional sample from nonpublic schools. In 1992–2000 the national samples were drawn separately from the state samples and were smaller than the samples resulting from aggregating the state samples. Each selected school that participated in the assessment and each student assessed represents a portion of the population of interest. For information on sample sizes and participation rates for the nation and by state or jurisdiction, see tables A.6–A.9 in appendix A.

Results from the 2002 and 2003 Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) are reported for the participating districts for public school students at grades 4 and 8. The TUDA employed larger-than-usual samples within the districts, making reliable district-level data possible. The samples were also large enough to provide reliable estimates on subgroups within the districts, such as female students or Hispanic students.

Reporting the Assessment Results

Results from the NAEP reading assessment are presented in terms of scale scores and percentages of students attaining achievement levels. The scale score results, indicating how much students know and can do in reading, are presented as average scale scores and as scale scores at selected percentiles. The achievement-level results indicate the degree to which student performance meets the standards set for what they should know and be able to do. Results are reported only for groups or subgroups of students; individual student performance cannot be reported based on the NAEP assessment.

Average scale score results are based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500. In order to calculate students’ average scores on the NAEP reading assessment, the analysis begins by determining the percentages of students responding correctly to each multiple-choice question and the percentages of students responding at each score level for each constructed-response question. The analysis entails summarizing the results on separate subscales for each reading context (reading for literary experience, reading for information, and reading to perform a task) and then combining the separate scales to form a single composite reading scale. The relative contribution of each reading purpose at each grade is displayed in table 1.1. (See appendix A for more information on scaling procedures.)

Achievement-level results are presented in terms of reading achievement levels as authorized by the NAEP legislation and adopted by NAGB. For each
grade assessed, NAGB has adopted three achievement levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. For reporting purposes, achievement-level cut scores are placed on the reading scale, resulting in four ranges: below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The achievement-level results are then reported as percentages of students within each achievement-level range, as well as the percentage of students at or above Basic and at or above Proficient.

The Setting of Achievement Levels
The 1988 NAEP legislation that created NAGB directed the Board to identify “appropriate achievement goals . . . for each subject area” that NAEP measures. The NAEP 2001 reauthorization reaffirmed many of the Board’s statutory responsibilities, including developing “appropriate student achievement levels for each grade or age in each subject area to be tested. . . .” In order to follow this directive and achieve the mandate of the 1988 statute “to improve the form and use of NAEP results,” NAGB undertook the development of student performance standards (called “achievement levels”). Since 1990, the Board has adopted achievement levels in mathematics, reading, U.S. history, world geography, science, writing, and civics.

The Board defined three levels for each grade: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The Basic level denotes partial mastery of the knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at a given grade. The Proficient level represents solid academic performance. Students reaching this level demonstrate competency over challenging subject matter. The Advanced level presumes mastery of both the Basic and Proficient levels and represents superior performance. Figure 1.3 presents the policy definitions of the achievement levels that apply across grades and subject areas. The policy definitions guided the development of the reading achievement levels, as well as the achievement levels established in all other subject areas assessed by NAEP.

Adopting three levels of achievement for each grade signals the importance of looking at more than one standard of

---

Table 1.1 Percentage weighting of the “context for reading” subscales on the NAEP composite reading scale, grades 4 and 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAEP Reading Subscales</th>
<th>Reading for literary experience</th>
<th>Reading for information</th>
<th>Reading to perform a task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not available. Not assessed at grade 4.*


---

performance. In the Board’s view, the overall achievement goal for students is performance that qualifies at the Proficient level or higher as measured by NAEP. The Basic level is not the desired goal, but represents partial mastery that is a step toward Proficient.

The achievement levels in this report were adopted by the Board based on a standard-setting process designed and conducted under a contract with ACT. To develop these levels, ACT convened a cross section of educators and interested citizens from across the nation and asked them to judge what students should know and be able to do relative to a body of content reflected in the reading framework. This achievement-level-setting process was reviewed by numerous individuals including policymakers, representatives of professional organizations, teachers, parents, and other members of the general public. Prior to adopting these levels of student achievement, NAGB engaged a large number of persons to comment on the recommended levels and to review the results.

The results of the achievement-level-setting process, after NAGB’s approval, became a set of achievement-level descriptions and a set of achievement-level cut scores. The cut scores are the scores on the 0–500 NAEP reading scale that define the lower boundaries of Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance levels at grades 4, 8, and 12.

**Reading Achievement-Level Descriptions for Each Grade**

Specific definitions of the Basic, Proficient, and Advanced reading achievement levels for grades 4 and 8 are presented in figures 1.4 and 1.5. The achievement levels are cumulative; therefore, students performing at the Proficient level also display the competencies associated with the Basic level, and students at the Advanced level also demonstrate the competencies associated with both the Basic and the Proficient levels. For each achievement level listed in figures 1.4 and 1.5, the scale score that corresponds to the lowest score within that level on the NAEP reading scale is shown in parentheses. For example, in figure 1.4 the scale score of 238 corresponds to the lowest score in the range defining the grade 4 Proficient level of achievement in reading.

---

**Figure 1.3 Policy definitions of the three NAEP achievement levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic</strong></td>
<td>This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong></td>
<td>This level represents solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced</strong></td>
<td>This level signifies superior performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic

Fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should demonstrate an understanding of the overall meaning of what they read. When reading text appropriate for fourth graders, they should be able to make relatively obvious connections between the text and their own experiences, and extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences.

For example, when reading literary text, they should be able to tell what the story is generally about—providing details to support their understanding—and be able to connect aspects of the stories to their own experiences.

When reading informational text, Basic-level fourth graders should be able to tell what the selection is generally about or identify the purpose for reading it, provide details to support their understanding, and connect ideas from the text to their background knowledge and experiences.

Proficient

Fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to demonstrate an overall understanding of the text, providing inferential as well as literal information. When reading text appropriate to fourth grade, they should be able to extend the ideas in the text by making inferences, drawing conclusions, and making connections to their own experiences. The connections between the text and what the student infers should be clear.

For example, when reading literary text, Proficient-level fourth graders should be able to summarize the story, draw conclusions about the characters or plot, and recognize relationships such as cause and effect.

When reading informational text, Proficient-level students should be able to summarize the information and identify the author’s intent or purpose. They should be able to draw reasonable conclusions from the text, recognize relationships such as cause and effect or similarities and differences, and identify the meaning of the selection’s key concepts.

Advanced

Fourth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to generalize about topics in the reading selection and demonstrate an awareness of how authors compose and use literary devices. When reading text appropriate to fourth grade, they should be able to judge texts critically and, in general, give thorough answers that indicate careful thought.

For example, when reading literary text, Advanced-level students should be able to make generalizations about the point of the story and extend its meaning by integrating personal experiences and other readings with ideas suggested by the text. They should be able to identify literary devices such as figurative language.

When reading informational text, Advanced-level fourth graders should be able to explain the author’s intent by using supporting material from the text. They should be able to make critical judgments of the form and content of the text and explain their judgments clearly.

### Grade 8 Achievement Levels

| Basic (243) | Eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should demonstrate a literal understanding of what they read and be able to make some interpretations. When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to identify specific aspects of the text that reflect the overall meaning, extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences, recognize and relate interpretations and connections among ideas in the text to personal experience, and draw conclusions based on the text. For example, when reading literary text, Basic-level eighth graders should be able to identify themes and make inferences and logical predictions about aspects such as plot and characters. When reading informational text, they should be able to identify the main idea and the author's purpose. They should make inferences and draw conclusions supported by information in the text. They should recognize the relationships among the facts, ideas, events, and concepts of the text (e.g., cause and effect, order). When reading practical text, they should be able to identify the main purpose and make predictions about the relatively obvious outcomes of procedures in the text. |
| Proficient (281) | Eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to show an overall understanding of the text, including inferential as well as literal information. When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to extend the ideas in the text by making clear inferences from it, by drawing conclusions, and by making connections to their own experiences—including other reading experiences. Proficient eighth graders should be able to identify some of the devices authors use in composing text. For example, when reading literary text, students at the Proficient level should be able to give details and examples to support themes that they identify. They should be able to use implied as well as explicit information in articulating themes; to interpret the actions, behaviors, and motives of characters; and to identify the use of literary devices such as personification and foreshadowing. When reading informational text, they should be able to summarize the text using explicit and implied information and support conclusions with inferences based on the text. When reading practical text, Proficient-level students should be able to describe its purpose and support their views with examples and details. They should be able to judge the importance of certain steps and procedures. |
| Advanced (323) | Eighth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to describe the more abstract themes and ideas of the overall text. When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to analyze both meaning and form and support their analyses explicitly with examples from the text, and they should be able to extend text information by relating it to their experiences and to world events. At this level, student responses should be thorough, thoughtful, and extensive. For example, when reading literary text, Advanced-level eighth graders should be able to make complex, abstract summaries and theme statements. They should be able to describe the interactions of various literary elements (i.e., setting, plot, characters, and theme) and explain how the use of literary devices affects both the meaning of the text and their response to the author's style. They should be able to critically analyze and evaluate the composition of the text. When reading informational text, they should be able to analyze the author's purpose and point of view. They should be able to use cultural and historical background information to develop perspectives on the text and be able to apply text information to broad issues and world situations. When reading practical text, Advanced-level students should be able to synthesize information that will guide their performance, apply text information to new situations, and critique the usefulness of the form and content. |

Trial Status of Achievement Levels

The law requires that the achievement levels are to be used on a trial basis until the Commissioner of Education Statistics determines “that such levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public.” Until that determination is made, the law requires the Commissioner and the Board to state clearly the trial status of the achievement levels in all NAEP reports. In 1993, the first of several congressionally mandated evaluations of the achievement-level-setting process concluded that the procedures used to set the achievement levels were flawed and that the percentage of students at or above any particular achievement-level cut point may be underestimated. Others have critiqued these evaluations, asserting that the weight of the empirical evidence does not support such conclusions.

In response to the evaluations and critiques, NAGB sponsored an additional study of the 1992 reading achievement levels before deciding to use them for reporting NAEP 1994 results. When reviewing the findings of this study, the National Academy of Education (NAE) panel expressed concern about what it saw as a “confirmatory bias” in the study and about the inability of this study to “address the panel’s perception that the levels had been set too high.” In 1997, the NAE panel summarized its concerns with interpreting NAEP results based on the achievement levels as follows:

First, the potential instability of the levels may interfere with the accurate portrayal of trends. Second, the perception that few American students are attaining the higher standards we have set for them may deflect attention to the wrong aspects of education reform. The public has indicated its interest in benchmarking against international standards, yet it is noteworthy that when American students performed very well on a 1991 international reading assessment, these results were discounted because they were contradicted by poor performance against the possibly flawed NAEP reading achievement levels in the following year.

---

NCES and NAGB have sought and continue to seek new and better ways to set performance standards for NAEP.\footnote{Reckase, M. D. (2000). *The Evolution of the NAEP Achievement Levels Setting Process: A Summary of the Research and Development Efforts Conducted by ACT*. Iowa City, IA: ACT, Inc.} For example, NCES and NAGB jointly sponsored a national conference that explored many issues related to standard setting in large-scale assessments.\footnote{National Assessment Governing Board and National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *Proceedings of the Joint Conference on Standard Setting for Large-Scale Assessments of the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.} Although new directions were presented and discussed, a proven alternative to the current process has not yet been identified. NCES and NAGB continue to call on the research community to assist in finding ways to improve standard setting for reporting NAEP results.

The most recent congressionally mandated evaluation conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) relied on prior studies of achievement levels, rather than carrying out new evaluations, on the grounds that the process has not changed substantially since the initial problems were identified. Instead, the NAS panel studied the development of the 1996 science achievement levels. The NAS panel basically concurred with earlier congressionally mandated studies. The panel concluded that “NAEP’s current achievement-level-setting procedures remain fundamentally flawed. The judgment tasks are difficult and confusing; raters’ judgments of different item types are internally inconsistent; appropriate validity evidence for the cut scores is lacking; and the process has produced unreasonable results.”\footnote{Pellegrino, J. W., Jones, L. R., and Mitchell, K. J. (Eds.). (1998). *Grading the Nation’s Report Card: Evaluating NAEP and Transforming the Assessment of Educational Progress*. Committee on the Evaluation of National Assessments of Educational Progress, Board on Testing and Assessment, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.}

The NAS panel accepted the continuing use of achievement levels in reporting NAEP results on a trial basis, until such time as better procedures can be developed. Specifically, the NAS panel concluded that “... tracking changes in the percentages of students performing at or above those cut scores (or in fact, any selected cut scores) can be of use in describing changes in student performance over time.”\footnote{Ibid., 176.}

NAGB urges all who are concerned about student performance levels to recognize that the use of these achievement levels is a developing process and is subject to various interpretations. NAGB and NCES believe that the achievement levels are useful for reporting trends in the educational achievement of students in the United States.\footnote{ForSYTH, R. A. (2000). A Description of the Standard-Setting Procedures Used by Three Standardized Test Publishers. In *Student Performance Standards on the National Assessment of Educational Progress: Affirmations and Improvements*. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board.} In fact, achievement-level results have been used in reports by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Education, state governors, legislators, and members of Congress. Government leaders in the

nation and in more than 40 states use these results in their annual reports. However, based on the congressionally mandated evaluations so far, NCES agrees with the NAS panel’s recommendation that caution needs to be exercised in the use of the current achievement levels. NCES has concluded that these achievement levels should continue to be used on a trial basis and be interpreted with caution.

**Interpreting NAEP Results**

The average scores and percentages presented 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 but a sample of the many questions that could have been asked to assess the skills and abilities described in the NAEP reading framework. As such, 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 accounts for potential score or percentage fluctuation due to sampling and measurement error. The estimated standard errors for the estimated scale scores and percentages in this report are accessible through the NAEP Data Tool on the NAEP web site (http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/). Examples of these estimated standard errors are also provided in appendix A of this report.

The differences between scale scores and between percentages discussed in the following chapters take into account the standard errors associated with the estimates. Comparisons are based on statistical tests that consider both the magnitude of the difference between the group average scores or percentages and the standard errors of those statistics. Estimates based on smaller subgroups are likely to have relatively large standard errors. As a consequence, some seemingly large differences may not be statistically significant. That is, it cannot be determined whether these differences are due to the particular make-up of the samples of students who were selected, or to true differences in the population of interest. When this is the case, the term “apparent difference” or “no measurable difference” is used in this report. Differences between scores or between percentages are discussed in this report only when they are significant from a statistical perspective.

Beginning in 2002, the NAEP national sample was obtained by aggregating the samples from each state, rather than obtaining an independently selected national sample. Consequently, the national sample size increased and smaller differences between years or between subgroups of students were found to be statistically significant than would have been detected in previous assessment years. In keeping with past practice, all statistically significant differences are indicated in this report. All differences reported are significant at the .05 level with appropriate adjustments for multiple comparisons. The term “significant” is not intended to imply a judgment about the absolute magnitude or the educational relevance of the differences. It is intended to identify statistically dependable differences in average scores or percentages to help inform dialogue among policymakers, educators, and the public.
While the score ranges at each grade in reading are identical, the scale was derived independently at each grade. Therefore, average scale scores across grades cannot be compared. For example, equal scale scores on the grade 4 and grade 8 scales do not imply equal levels of reading achievement.

Comparisons of performance results may be affected by changes in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students in the NAEP samples. Percentages of students excluded from NAEP may vary considerably across states or districts, as well as across years. Comparisons of achievement results should be interpreted with caution if the exclusion rates vary widely. Percentages of students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students identified, excluded, and assessed are presented in tables A.10–A.21 in appendix A.

The results presented are meant to describe some aspects of the condition of education. They are best viewed as suggesting various ideas to be further examined in light of other data, including state and local data, and in the context of the large research literature elaborating on the many factors contributing to educational achievement.

However, some readers are tempted to make unwarranted causal inferences from simple cross tabulations. At the risk of sounding dogmatic, it is almost never the case that a simple cross tabulation of any variable with a measure of educational achievement is conclusive proof that differences in that variable are a cause of differential educational achievement. The old adage that “correlation is not causation” is a wise precaution to be kept in mind when viewing the results presented here. Experienced researchers routinely formulate multiple hypotheses to take these possibilities into account and readers of this volume are encouraged to do likewise.

Additional NAEP data are available in the NAEP data tool and in restricted-access research databases. Researchers and policy analysts are free to make use of the data (subject to various confidentiality restrictions) as they wish. However, as part of the Institute for Education Sciences, NCES has a responsibility to try to discourage misleading inferences from the data presented and to educate the public on the difficulty of making valid causal inferences in a field as complex as education.

**Overview of the Remaining Report**
This report describes the reading performance of fourth- and eighth-graders in the nation, in participating states and other jurisdictions, in large central city school districts, and in selected urban school districts. Chapter 2 presents overall reading scale-score and achievement-level results across years for both the nation and participating states and other jurisdictions. Chapter 3 discusses national results for subgroups of students by gender, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch, parents’ highest level of education (for grade 8 only), type of school (public and nonpublic), and school’s type of location (central city, urban fringe/large town, rural/small town). State and jurisdiction results are reported by gender, race/ethnicity, and eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch. Overall and subgroup results for selected urban districts are presented in chapter 4.
Chapter 5 presents sample assessment questions and student responses at each grade level, including samples of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. A table showing the percentage of students who answered the question successfully accompanies each sample question. In addition, item maps for each grade level describe the skill or ability needed to answer particular reading questions and show the score points at which individual students had a high probability of successfully answering particular questions, thereby indicating the relative difficulty of each question.

The appendices of this report contain information to expand the results presented in chapters 2–5. Appendix A contains an overview of assessment development, sampling, administration, and analysis procedures. Appendix B presents the percentages of students in each of the subgroups reported for the nation, states and other jurisdictions, and districts. Appendix C includes additional state-level results by subgroup. Appendix D shows state-level and district-level contextual data from sources other than NAEP. Appendix E contains the reading passages corresponding with the sample questions discussed in chapter 5.