What is The Nation’s Report Card?

THE NATION’S REPORT CARD, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas. Since 1969, assessments have been conducted periodically in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography, and other fields. By making objective information on student performance available to policymakers at the national, state, and local levels, NAEP is an integral part of our nation’s evaluation of the condition and progress of education. Only information related to academic achievement is collected under this program. NAEP guarantees the privacy of individual students and their families.

NAEP is a congressionally mandated project of the National Center for Education Statistics, the U.S. Department of Education. The Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible, by law, for carrying out the NAEP project through competitive awards to qualified organizations. NAEP reports directly to the Commissioner, who is also responsible for providing continuing reviews, including validation studies and solicitation of public comment, on NAEP’s conduct and usefulness.

In 1988, Congress established the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) to formulate policy guidelines for NAEP. The Board is responsible for selecting the subject areas to be assessed from among those included in the National Education Goals; for setting appropriate student performance levels; for developing assessment objectives and test specifications through a national consensus approach; for designing the assessment methodology; for developing guidelines for reporting and disseminating NAEP results; for developing standards and procedures for interstate, regional, and national comparisons; for determining the appropriateness of test items and ensuring they are free from bias; and for taking actions to improve the form and use of the National Assessment.
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SECTION 1

Overview of the NAEP Reading Assessment

What Is NAEP?

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what students in the United States know and can do in various academic subjects. NAEP is authorized by Congress and directed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB), an independent body, provides policy guidance for NAEP. The NAEP assessments are administered to representative samples of students at the national level as well as at the state level for those states that want to participate. To ensure comparability in a particular subject across all jurisdictions, NCES has established guidelines for school and student participation rates. These guidelines, as well as other technical aspects of the assessment, are detailed in the NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card.

The 1998 NAEP program included state-level assessments in reading at grades 4 and 8 and in writing at grade 8, and national-level assessments in civics, reading, and writing at grades 4, 8, and 12. This report and its companion, the NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card, provide a first look at the results of the NAEP 1998 reading assessment. The Reading Report Card offers additional state-level data. Each participating jurisdiction receives its own customized State Report. Summary data tables providing information for all jurisdictions for which public school results are reported in 1998 are available at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/, the NAEP Web site.

What Is Reported Here?

The NAEP reading assessment has been administered at the state level three times: in public schools at grade 4 in 1992, in public and nonpublic schools at grade 4 in 1994, and in public and nonpublic schools at grades 4 and 8 in 1998. Illinois participated in the NAEP reading assessment for the first time in 1998. Both public and nonpublic schools participated. However, public schools at grades 4 and 8 and nonpublic schools at grade 8 failed to meet minimum participation guidelines for reporting. Illinois’ grade 4 nonpublic school results for 1998 are presented here, along with national and regional results for comparison.

This report provides basic information on NAEP and the overall results for nonpublic schools in data tables. It describes the assessment, the sample of students assessed, the metrics for reporting student performance, and how the differences in performance are reported. In addition, Appendix A to this report, Where to Find More Information, describes the data available on the Web and provides information on sources of related data.

---

How Are Results Reported?

In this report, as in other NAEP reports, only those results based on preestablished minimum sample sizes are reported. For details, see the forthcoming NAEP 1998 Technical Report. The results are reported in terms of two metrics, descriptions of which follow and details of which can be found in the Reading Report Card.

- **Average NAEP reading scale scores** are reported for all students or for subgroups of students.

- **Percentages of students in each achievement level**, that is, the students’ scale scores place them into three categories: at or above the *Basic* level, at or above the *Proficient* level, and at the *Advanced* level. Also reported are the percentages of students whose scores are below the *Basic* level.

The bulleted statements in the text are based on the results of statistical tests of the data. The reader is cautioned to rely on the results of these statistical tests rather than on the apparent magnitude of any difference in scale scores or percentages in making inferences from the data.

The NAEP Reading Scale

Students’ responses to the NAEP 1998 reading assessment were analyzed to determine the percentages of students responding correctly to each multiple-choice question or in each of several score categories for constructed-response questions (requiring a short or long written answer). Three scales were developed, one for each of the three purposes for reading: *reading for literary experience*; *reading to gain information*; and *reading to perform a task* (grades 8 and 12 only). The purposes for reading are described fully in the companion Reading Report Card and in the Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, both available on the Web (see Appendix A).

Student performance by each of the purposes for reading appears in the percentile data tables at the NAEP Web site. The scales summarize results across all three grades. The scale for each of the purposes for reading ranges from 0 to 500 and is linked to its corresponding scale from 1992 and 1994. An overall composite scale was developed by weighting each of the three subscales based on its relative importance in the NAEP reading framework. This composite scale is the metric used to present the average scale scores and selected percentiles in this and other reports.

---

Illinois

The Reading Achievement Levels

In addition to the NAEP reading scale, results are also reported in terms of the reading achievement levels authorized by the NAEP legislation\(^3\) and adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board. The achievement levels are performance standards based on the collective judgments about what students should be expected to know and to do. Viewing students’ performance from this perspective provides some insight into the adequacy of students’ knowledge and skills and the extent to which they achieved expected levels of performance. The Board reviewed and adopted the recommended achievement levels derived from the judgments of a broadly representative panel that included teachers, education specialists, and members of the general public.

For each grade tested, the Board has adopted three achievement levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. For reporting purposes, the achievement level cut scores for each grade represent the boundaries between four ranges on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The policy definitions of the achievement levels are shown below. The text of the descriptions of expected reading performance at each achievement level at grades 4 and 8 can be found under the heading What Should Students Be Able to Do? later in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions of the achievement levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NAEP legislation requires that the achievement levels be used on a developmental basis until the Commissioner of Education Statistics determines, as the result of a congressionally mandated evaluation by one or more nationally recognized evaluation organizations, that the achievement levels are “reasonable, valid, and informative to the public.” Upon review of the available information, the Commissioner of Education Statistics agrees with the National Academy’s recommendation that caution needs to be exercised in the use of the current achievement levels, since in the opinion of the Academy “… appropriate validity evidence for the cut scores is lacking; and the process has produced unreasonable results.”\(^4\) Therefore, the Commissioner concludes that these achievement levels should continue to be considered developmental and should continue to be interpreted and used with caution. The Reading Report Card contains further information on the current status of the development of achievement levels. The Commissioner and the Governing Board believe that the achievement levels are useful for reporting trends in the educational achievement of students in the United States.

---

\(^3\) The National Education Statistics Act of 1994 requires that the National Assessment Governing Board develop “appropriate student performance levels” for reporting NAEP results.

Reading Scale Score Results for Nonpublic School Students

Table 1A below shows Illinois’ performance in terms of average scale scores as compared to that of the Central region and the nation.

Nonpublic School Students, Grade 4

- The average scale score for Illinois’ nonpublic school students (237) was not significantly different from that for students in the nation’s nonpublic schools (233) in 1998.

Additional findings from the 1998 reading assessment can be found in the NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card and on the NAEP Web site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonpublic School Students, Grade 4</th>
<th>Average reading scale scores and selected percentiles for nonpublic school students: 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average scale score</td>
<td>Scale score distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th percentile</td>
<td>25th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>237 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>232 (4.4)!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>233 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. ! Interpret with caution—the nature of the sample does not allow accurate determination of the variability of this statistic. ** Sample size is insufficient to permit a reliable estimate. **** Standard error estimates cannot be accurately determined.

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1998 Reading Assessment.
Achievement Level Results for Nonpublic School Students

Table 1B below shows Illinois’ performance in terms of achievement levels (see page 3 for a description) as compared to that of the Central region and the nation. Because the percentages in the levels are cumulative from Basic to Proficient to Advanced, they sum to more than 100 percent. Only the percentage of students at or above Basic (which includes Proficient and Advanced) plus the percentage of students below Basic will always sum to 100 percent.

Nonpublic School Students, Grade 4

- In 1998, the percentage of nonpublic school students at or above the Proficient level in Illinois (50 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage for students in the nation’s nonpublic schools (46 percent).

| The Nation’s Report Card | TABLE 1B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 State Assessment</td>
<td>Percentage of nonpublic school students attaining achievement levels: 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonpublic Grade 4</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>At or Above Basic</th>
<th>At or Above Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 Illinois</td>
<td>17 (2.9)</td>
<td>83 (2.9)</td>
<td>50 (6.0)</td>
<td>14 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>23 (4.6)!</td>
<td>77 (4.6)!</td>
<td>46 (5.3)!</td>
<td>14 (2.8)!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>22 (2.6)</td>
<td>78 (2.6)</td>
<td>46 (2.9)</td>
<td>14 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale at grade 4: Basic, 208-237; Proficient, 238-267; and Advanced, 268 and above. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses.

! Interpret with caution—the nature of the sample does not allow accurate determination of the variability of this statistic.

*** Sample size is insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1998 Reading Assessment.
What Was Assessed?

The subject area content for each NAEP assessment is developed through a congressionally mandated national consensus process directed by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). The objectives for each NAEP assessment are described in a framework document that delineates the important content and process areas to be measured, as well as the types of exercises to be included in the assessment.

The *Reading Framework* for the 1992 and 1994 NAEP reading assessments also guided the 1998 reading assessment. This framework was developed under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Reflecting current theories of reading, the *Reading Framework* describes reading as a complex interaction among the reader, the text, and the context of the reading situation. According to this interactive view of reading, readers use different strategies and processes depending on the type of text being read and the purposes for reading it.

The framework specifies that students be assessed in reading for three different purposes: *reading for literary experience, reading to gain information*, and *reading to perform a task*. The last purpose is not assessed at grade 4. In order to measure students’ abilities to read for different purposes, the assessment is composed of three different types of texts, each associated with one purpose for reading.

While responding to text, readers take different approaches in order to understand what is being read. The comprehension process typically involves changing stances, or orientations toward the text. The framework describes four reading stances: *initial understanding, developing an interpretation, personal response*, and *critical stance*. These stances are not intended to represent a sequential routine of reading abilities nor are they considered hierarchical; rather, they describe reading processes that all readers use at any level of development.

The assessment contains reading materials that were drawn from sources commonly available to students in and out of school. These authentic materials were considered to be representative of the types of reading experiences typically encountered by students. Each student in the state assessment was asked to complete two 25-minute blocks, each consisting of a reading passage and associated comprehension questions at the appropriate grade level. A combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions was used to assess students’ understanding of the passages. The passages and associated items followed a distribution specified by the framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For literary experience</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain information</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To perform a task</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Should Students Be Able to Do?

The following grade-specific achievement level descriptions focus on the interaction of the reader, the text, and the context. The achievement level descriptions reflect what readers performing at each achievement level should be able to do. The achievement levels are cumulative from Basic to Proficient to Advanced. Each level builds on the previous level such that knowledge at the Proficient level presumes mastery of the Basic level, and knowledge at the Advanced level presumes mastery of both the Basic and Proficient levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE NATION’S REPORT CARD</th>
<th>FIGURE 1A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Reading Achievement at Grade 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BASIC LEVEL (208) | 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. |
| PROFICIENT LEVEL (238) | 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 connection between the text and what the student infers should be clear. |
| ADVANCED LEVEL (268) | 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 text critically and, in general, give thorough answers that indicate careful thought. |
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.

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.

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; 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.
Who Was Assessed?

Selection of Schools and Students
For the NAEP state assessment, participating schools within a given jurisdiction, and students in those schools, were selected using probability sampling methods. These methods are described in the *NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card*.

Illinois’ Participation
The overall participation rate for schools and students must meet guidelines established by NCES and NAGB in order for assessment results to be reported publicly. The NAEP state assessment in reading was administered in public schools at grade 4 in 1992, in public and nonpublic schools at grade 4 in 1994, and in public and nonpublic schools at grades 4 and 8 in 1998. Illinois participated in the NAEP reading assessment for the first time in 1998. Both public and nonpublic schools participated at grades 4 and 8. However, only grade 4 nonpublic schools met the minimum guidelines for publication of results. Details on participation rates and guidelines for all participating jurisdictions can be found in Appendix A of the *Reading Report Card*.

Possible Sources of Bias in Reported Results
Within a certain state sample that meets the guidelines for publication of results, there still may exist possible sources of bias of the results due to nonparticipation of selected schools or due to nonparticipation of certain student groups. These possible sources of bias are indicated by notations and are specified and described in Appendix A of the *Reading Report Card*.

Participation by Students with Disabilities or Who Are Learning English
NAEP endeavors to assess all students selected in the randomized sampling process including students with disabilities (SD) as well as students who are beginning to learn English and are classified by their schools as limited English proficient (LEP). Although the guidelines used to classify students into these two categories vary from state to state, NAEP criteria for inclusion standardize the selection of students. The recent Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) should bring further consistency to classification criteria. The percentages of students classified as SD or LEP in all participating states and jurisdictions are available at the NAEP Web site in the all-jurisdiction summary data tables (SDTs). Participation guidelines specify levels of SD/LEP student nonparticipation that put the sample at risk for nonresponse bias; however, no jurisdiction failed to meet these guidelines for the 1998 reading assessment.

NAEP offers certain accommodations for SD or LEP students who need them (for example, large print test booklets or extended time), as described in the *NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card* and in a special report to follow. However, school personnel make the ultimate decision as to whether or not a particular student should take the assessment and whether accommodations are needed. The following table shows the percentage of students in Illinois who were classified as SD or LEP in 1998 and also the percentage of those students who were excluded from NAEP at the discretion of school personnel.
Students in Illinois who are classified as limited English proficient (LEP) or having disabilities, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of students who are:</th>
<th>School Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonpublic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as LEP</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded from the assessment due to LEP</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as students with disabilities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded from the assessment due to disability</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1998 Reading Assessment.

How Are Performance Differences Reported?

Because the percentages of students and the average reading scale scores presented in this report are based on samples—rather than on the entire population of fourth graders in a jurisdiction—the numbers reported are necessarily estimates. As such, they are subject to sampling error, a measure of uncertainty reflected in the standard error of the estimate. When the percentages or average scale scores of certain groups are compared, it is essential to take the standard error into account rather than to rely solely on observed similarities or differences. The comparisons discussed in this report are based on statistical tests that consider both the magnitude of the differences between the averages or percentages and the standard errors of those statistics.

The statistical tests determine whether the evidence—based on the data from the groups in the sample—is strong enough to conclude that there is an actual difference in the averages or percentages for those groups in the population. If the evidence is strong (i.e., the difference is statistically significant), the report describes the group averages or percentages as being different (e.g., one group performed higher than or lower than another group) regardless of whether the sample averages or percentages appear to be about the same or not. If the evidence is not sufficiently strong (i.e., the difference is not statistically significant), the averages or percentages are described as being not significantly different—again, regardless of whether the sample averages or sample percentages appear to be about the same or widely discrepant.

In this report, statements that compare students in Illinois with students in the nation by using terms such as “higher” or “no significant difference” are based on the results of statistical tests. The reader is cautioned to rely on the results of the statistical tests (as expressed in the bulleted text) rather than on the apparent magnitude of any difference in scale scores or percentages in making inferences from the data. The statistical tests are discussed in greater detail in the NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card and the forthcoming NAEP 1998 Technical Report.

5 Standard errors measure the uncertainty that another sample drawn from the same population could have yielded somewhat different results.
Appendix A Where to Find More Information

Below are only a few suggestions for finding additional NAEP results and related information. In spring 1999, a hyperlinked version of this section will be available from the Web page that introduces the 1998 state reports, http://nces.ed.gov/naep/. Many of the reports and data files on the Web will require the use of the (free) Adobe Acrobat Reader; for tips on installing the Reader, click on the Help button.

Details of the NAEP Reading Assessment
For details of the assessment, refer to the companion report, the NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card. Both that report and the NAEP 1998 Reading State Reports are available on the NCES Web site, http://nces.ed.gov/naep/. For details of the framework on which the reading assessment was developed, see http://www.nagb.org/. Click on the Publications button on the left, and then click on Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: 1992–1998.

Late in 1999, technical information about the assessment will be available in the NAEP 1998 Technical Report. Until that technical report is available, many questions may be answered by searching in the Technical Report of the NAEP 1996 State Assessment Program in Mathematics, to be found at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/naep1996.html. The mathematics assessment was also on a cross-grade scale, so mathematics scaling procedures would be more similar to reading than would the scaling procedures in the science assessment (which was on a within-grade scale).

Participation by All Jurisdictions in 1998
Information on each jurisdiction’s participation rates for schools and students is in Appendix A of the companion report, the NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card, to be found at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/. Participation rates from previous years are included in the Technical Report for the given year.

Additional Results from the Reading Assessment
For more findings from the 1998 reading assessments, refer to the 1998 results at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/. On the release date, the summary data tables (SDTs) at this site will include student and school variables for all jurisdictions, the nation, and the four NAEP geographic regions. In the spring of 1999, complete SDTs will be available for all jurisdictions, with all background questions cross-tabulated with the major demographic reporting variables (for instance, hours of television watched by level of parental education or limited English proficiency by race/ethnicity). Summary tables will also be available for the jurisdictions’ schools and teachers. Results by the purposes for reading will also appear in summary data tables in spring 1999.
Illinois

The variables reported in the State Reports may be found in the summary data tables at http://nces.ed.naep/. The variables reported here, with their labels in the tables are:


- **Race/Ethnicity.** This is DRACE in the tables. An instructive explanation of the derivation appears in Appendix A of the Reading Report Card, at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/.


- **Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Program Eligibility.** The variable reported here is SLUNCH1, which is a version of SLUNCH with several of the categories of SLUNCH (e.g., reduced and free) combined. A description of the program is available at http://www.usda.gov/fcs/cnp/school†2.htm.

- **Type of Location.** TOL3 is the label in the summary data tables. The TOL variable uses data from Common Core of Data (see http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/index.html), Private School Survey (see http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss.html), and Quality Education Data (see http://www.qeddata.com/).

- **Type of School.** SCHTYPE is the label in the tables. Note that the Nonpublic school sample includes Private and Catholic school students. BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs) and DoDEA (Department of Defense Education Activity) students are in the Combined sample only.

At http://nces.ed.gov/naep/, there is a Help button leading to more information on these variables, including how the derived variables were created, and other useful information about the summary data tables.
Publications from NAEP Reading Assessments

NAEP also offers various special reports on reading that may be of particular interest to teachers. These may be ordered from the source at the end of this section, and some of them can be accessed and printed from the Web.


- **NAEP 1998 Reading Sample Questions and Student Responses: Results from Public School Students in the States and Nationwide**, a forthcoming brochure with state-level results for the released items

- **The NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card National Highlights**, a brochure with student samples, covering the national and state NAEP 1998 Reading Assessment (available at the NAEP Web site)

- **Listening to Children Read Aloud, Data from NAEP’s Integrated Reading Performance Record (IRPR) at Grade 4**, results from the 1992 IRPR, a special study conducted with a subgroup of fourth graders who participated in the 1992 NAEP Reading Assessment (available in print only)

- **Interviewing Children About their Literacy Experiences, Data from NAEP’s Integrated Reading Performance Record (IRPR) at Grade 4**, results from the 1992 IRPR, a special study conducted with a subgroup of fourth graders who participated in the 1992 NAEP Reading Assessment (available in print only)

- **Students Selecting Stories: The Effects of Choice in Reading Assessment**, results from the NAEP Reader Special Survey of the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress (available at the NAEP Web site)

For ordering information on these reports, write:

U.S. Department of Education
ED Pubs
P.O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 20794-1398
or call toll free 1-877-4 ED PUBS (1-877-433-7827)

NAEP reading reports in addition to those listed above are available at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/.
Sample NAEP Questions for Classroom Use

Sample reading questions and student responses from the 1994 reading assessment are now available at http://nces.ed.gov/naep/; look for the sample questions. There are also instructions at this site for copying individual items from the files on the Web into a word processor.

All of the 1998 released items are available now in the Reading Report Card. The released items from the 1998 Reading Assessment will appear on the Web in the spring of 1999. Also available will be state-level results for the released items at grades 4 and 8, in a brochure suitable for distribution to schools, *NAEP 1998 Sample Questions and Student Responses*.
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