




*The Nations' Report Card
New Hampshire
Department of Education
2007 NAEP State Report
Grade 8 Reading*



FORWARD

Although this report was put together in final form by New Hampshire Department of Education staff there are a number of other significant contributors who made its outcome possible.

First, we acknowledge the many schools' students and staff who gave of their time and energy to participate in the 2007 State National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). As the New Hampshire sample they allowed an estimate of what grade four and grade eight students in our state know and can do in mathematics, reading, and writing. Without the cooperation of the many students, staff and schools we could not gather the data and aggregate it into the estimates that provide valuable insights for policy-makers and educators. The 2007 reports provide the third consecutive cycle of data for mathematics and reading in New Hampshire; 2003, 2005, and now 2007. It provides a first year of data for writing.

Equally as important is the work done by the National Center of Education Statistics and its contractors who systematically gathered, scored, and organized the results in usable tables and graphs. This work made the monumental task of ferreting out recognizable results manageable, providing valuable opportunities for analysis. The enhanced State Report Generator (SRG) has provided the essential capacity to report these results. We are once again in debt as well to the wonderful and helpful people at the NAEP State Service Center. They continue to provide excellent training and support on a continual basis to assure the highest level of success in all the state NAEP endeavors.

As with the 2003 and 2005 state reports, a very special "Thank You" is given to Carol Angowski whose creative and technical skill is a prerequisite to producing these 2007 reports and a number of New Hampshire NAEP-related published documents. Her talent in making what otherwise might be very dry and uninviting tables of data into visually pleasing and inviting presentation is no small contribution.

Contact Information

Testing Director: Tim Kurtz
NAEP Coordinator: [David Gebhardt](#)
[NH State Dept. of Education](#)



Table of Contents

Eighth Grade Reading Report

Forward	p. ii
Table of Contents	p. iii
Overall Student/School District Characteristics	p. iv
Key Findings	p. 1
Introduction	p. 2
Reading Achievement Level Descriptions	p. 5
Cautions in Interpreting Results	p. 7
Overall Results	p. 8
Comparisons with Other Jurisdictions	p. 12
Performance by Demographic Characteristics	p. 15
Inclusiveness	p. 26
Appendix	p. 30

Overall Student, School/District Characteristics 2005 - 2006

Student Characteristics

Number enrolled: **205767**

Percent in limited-English proficiency programs: **1.37%**

Percent eligible for free/reduced lunch: **18.21%**

Racial/Ethnic Background

White: **93.3%**

Black: **1.7%**

Hispanic: **2.8%**

Asian/Pacific Islander: **1.9%**

American Indian/Alaskan Native: **0.3%**

School/District Characteristics

Number of SAUs: **80**

Number of school districts: **177**

Number of schools: **466**

Number of charter schools: **7**

Per-pupil expenditures: **\$9,100¹**

Pupil/teacher ratio: **12.9**

Number of FTE teachers: **15,535**

¹ Common Core of Data, 2005-2006 school year.



The Nations' Report Card READING 2007

New Hampshire
Grade 8
Public Schools

NEW HAMPSHIRE NAEP STATE REPORT



This report provides selected results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for New Hampshire's public school students at grade 8. Beginning in 1992, reading has been assessed in seven different years at the state level (at grade 4 in 1992 and 1994, and at both grades 4 and 8 in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007).

In the 2007 assessment, 52 jurisdictions participated: the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Schools (domestic and overseas). New Hampshire participated and met the criteria for reporting public school results. Reading results are reported by average scale scores (on a 0–500 point scale) and by achievement levels (Basic, Proficient, and Advanced).

NAEP is a project of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). For more information about the assessment, see The Nation's Report Card, Reading 2007, which is available on the NAEP website along with the full set of national and state results in an interactive database (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>). Released

test questions, scoring guides, and question-level performance data are also available on the website.

KEY FINDINGS FOR 2007

For grade 8:

- The average reading score for students in New Hampshire was 270. This was not significantly different from that in 2003 (271) and was not significantly different from that in 2005 (270).
- New Hampshire's average score (270) was higher than that of the nation's public schools (261).
- The percentage of students in New Hampshire who performed at or above *Proficient* was 37 percent. This was not significantly different from that in 2003 (40 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2005 (38 percent).
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* was greater than that for the nation's public schools (29 percent).
- The percentage of students in New Hampshire who performed at or above *Basic* was 82 percent. This was not significantly different from that in 2003 (81 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2005 (80 percent).
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Basic* was greater than that for the nation's public schools (73 percent).

The U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has provided software that generated user-selectable data, statistical significance test result statements, and technical descriptions of the NAEP assessments for this report. Content may be added or edited by states or other jurisdictions. This document, therefore, is not an official publication of the National Center for Education Statistics.

Introduction

What Was Assessed?

The content for each NAEP assessment is determined by the National Assessment Governing Board. The objectives for each NAEP assessment are described in a "framework," a document that delineates the important content and process areas to be measured, as well as the types of questions to be included in the assessment. The development process for reading required the active participation of teachers, curriculum specialists, subject-matter specialists, local school administrators, parents, and members of the general public. The reading framework is available on the Governing Board's website (http://www.nagb.org/pubs/r_framework_05/761507-ReadingFramework.pdf).

The reading framework for the 1992 and 1994 reading assessments also guided the 1998, 2000 (national grade 4 only), 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007 assessments. This framework was developed under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and directed by the Governing Board. In 2002, the framework was updated to provide more explicit detail regarding the assessment design. In the process, some of the terms used to describe elements of the reading assessment were altered slightly. It should be noted, however, that these alterations do not represent a change in the content or design of the NAEP reading assessment.

The framework is founded on a body of research from the field of education that defines reading as an interactive and constructive process involving the reader, the text, and the context of the reading experience. Reading involves the development of an understanding of text, thinking about the text in different ways, and using a variety of text types for different purposes.

Recognizing that readers vary their approach to reading different texts, the framework specifies the assessment of reading in three contexts: 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 grades 8 and 12, but reading to perform a task is not assessed at grade 4.

As readers attempt to develop an understanding of a 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" (forming a general understanding, developing interpretation, making reader/text connections, and examining content and structure) that represent the types of comprehension questions asked of students. All four aspects of reading are assessed at all three grades within each context for reading. The reading framework specifies the percentage distribution of questions by grade level for each of the contexts for and aspects of reading.

The assessment contains reading materials that were drawn from sources commonly available to students both in and out of the school environment. These authentic materials were considered to be representative of students' typical reading experiences. Each student in the state assessment was asked to complete two 25-minute sections, each consisting of a reading passage and associated comprehension questions. A combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions was used to assess students' understanding of the passages. Released NAEP reading passages and questions, along with student performance data by state, are available on the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/itmrls/>).

Who Was Assessed?

Fifty-two jurisdictions participated in NAEP in 2007: the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity Schools (domestic and overseas). The target sample for each state or other jurisdiction was approximately 100 schools at each grade tested and approximately 3,000 students for each subject at each grade. States containing trial urban districts had larger samples.

The sample of schools and students was chosen in a two-stage sampling process. First, the sample of schools was selected by probability sampling methods. Then, within the participating schools, random samples of students were chosen.

Beginning in 2002, the national sample was obtained by aggregating the samples from each state. The national results include the results from the states and from a sample of private schools, weighted appropriately to represent the U.S. student population. Only public schools, however, are included in the state reports.

The overall participation rates for schools and students must meet guidelines established by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the National Assessment Governing Board for assessment results to be reported publicly. A participation rate of at least 85 percent for schools in each subject and grade was required.

Participation rates for the 2007 reading assessment are available at the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/sampledesign.asp>).



How Is Student Reading Performance Reported?

The results of student performance on the NAEP assessments in 2007 are reported for various groups of students (e.g., fourth-grade female students or students who took the assessment in a particular year). NAEP does not produce scores for individual students, nor does it report scores for schools or for school districts. Some large urban districts, however, have voluntarily participated in the assessment on a trial basis and were sampled as states were sampled. Reading performance for groups of students is reported in two ways: as average scale scores and as percentages of students performing at various achievement levels.

Scale Scores: Student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500 and is linked to the corresponding scales in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003, and 2005. Subscales were created to reflect performance on each of the contexts for reading defined in the NAEP reading framework.

An overall composite scale was developed by weighting each of the reading subscales for the grade (two at grade 4 and three at grade 8) based on its relative importance in the framework. This composite scale is used to present the average scale scores and selected percentiles used in NAEP reports.

Achievement Levels: Student reading performance is also reported in terms of three achievement levels—*Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced*. Results based on achievement levels are expressed in terms of the percentage of students who attained each level. The three achievement levels are defined as follows:

- *Basic*: This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.
- *Proficient*: 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.
- *Advanced*: This level signifies superior performance.

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 demonstrate the competencies associated with both the *Basic* and the *Proficient* levels.

The achievement levels are performance standards adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board as part of its statutory responsibilities mandated by Congress. The levels represent collective judgments of what students should know and be able to do for each grade tested. They are based on recommendations made by broadly representative panels of classroom teachers, education specialists, and members of the general public from throughout the United States. As provided by law, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), upon review of congressionally mandated evaluations of NAEP, has determined that the achievement levels are to be used on a trial basis until it is determined that they are “reasonable, valid, and informative to the public” (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L., 107-110, 115 Stat.1425 [2002]). They have been widely used by national and state officials. The reading achievement-level descriptions are summarized in figure 1.

Figure	The Nation's Report Card 2007 State Assessment
	Descriptions of eighth-grade achievement levels for 2007 NAEP reading assessment

Basic Level (243)	Eighth-grade students performing at the <i>Basic</i> 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 and chronological 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 Level (281)	Eighth-grade students performing at the <i>Proficient</i> 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. <i>Proficient</i> 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 Level (323)	Eighth-grade students performing at the <i>Advanced</i> 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 critically to 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.

NOTE: The scores in parentheses indicate the lowest point on the scale at which the achievement-level range begins.

SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2006). *Reading Framework for the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.

Assessing Students With Disabilities (SD) and/or English Language Learners (ELL)

The results displayed in this report and official publications of NAEP 2007 results are based on representative samples that include students with disabilities (SD) and students who are English language learners (ELL). Some of these students were assessed using accommodations (such as extra time and testing in small groups). In state NAEP reading assessments prior to 1998 no testing accommodations or adaptations were permitted for SD or ELL students. However, research carried out by NAEP showed that the results for students who were accommodated could be combined with the results for unaccommodated students without compromising the validity of the NAEP scales in trend comparisons. Therefore, the identified SD and ELL students who typically received accommodations in their classroom testing and required these accommodations to participate, also received them in the NAEP assessment, provided the accommodations did not change the nature of what was tested.

School staff make the decisions about whether to include an SD or ELL student in a NAEP assessment, and which testing accommodations, if any, they should receive. The NAEP program furnishes tools to assist school personnel in making those decisions.

A sampling procedure is used to select students at each grade being tested. Students are selected on a random basis, without regard to SD or ELL status. Once the students are selected, the schools identify which have SD or ELL status. School staff who are familiar with these students are asked a series of questions to help them decide whether each student should participate in the assessment and whether the student needs accommodations.

Inclusion in NAEP of an SD or ELL student is encouraged if that student (a) participated in the regular state academic assessment in the subject being tested, and (b) if that student can participate in NAEP with the accommodations NAEP allows. Even if the student did not participate in the regular state assessment, or if he/she needs accommodations NAEP does not allow, school staff are asked whether that student could participate in NAEP with the allowable accommodations. (Examples of testing accommodations not allowed in NAEP are giving the reading assessment in a language other than English, or reading the reading passages aloud to the student. Also, extending testing over several days is not allowed for NAEP because NAEP administrators are in each school only one day.)



Cautions in Interpreting Results

The averages and percentages in this report are estimates based on samples of students rather than on entire populations. Moreover, the collection of questions used at each grade level is but a sample of the many questions that could have been asked to assess the skills and abilities described in the NAEP framework. Therefore, the results are subject to a measure of uncertainty, reflected in the standard error of the estimates—a range of up to a few points above or below the score or percentage—which takes into account potential score fluctuation due to sampling error and measurement error. Statistical tests that factor in these standard errors are used to determine whether the differences between average scores or percentages are significant. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level.

NAEP sample sizes have increased since 2002 compared to previous years, resulting in smaller standard errors. As a consequence, smaller differences are detected as statistically significant than detected in previous assessments. In addition, estimates based on smaller groups are likely to have relatively large standard errors. Thus, some seemingly large differences may not be statistically significant. That is, it cannot be determined whether these differences are due to sampling error, or to true differences in the population of interest.

Differences between scores or between percentages are discussed in this report only when they are significant from a statistical perspective. Statistically significant differences are referred to as “significant differences” or “significantly different.” Significant differences between 2007 and prior assessments are marked with a notation (*) in the tables. Any differences in scores within a year or across years that are mentioned in the text as “higher,” “lower,” “greater,” or “smaller” are statistically significant.

It is important to note that simple cross-tabulations of a variable with measures of educational achievement, like the ones presented in this report, cannot constitute proof that a difference in the variable causes differences in educational achievement. There might be several reasons why the performance of one group of students might differ from another. Only through controlled experiments with random assignment of students to groups can hypotheses about the causes of performance differences be tested.




NAEP 2007 Reading Overall Scale Score and Achievement-Level Results for Public School Students

Overall Scale Score Results

In this section student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500. Scores on this scale are comparable from 1992 through 2007.

Prior to 1998, testing accommodations were not provided for students with special needs in NAEP state reading assessments. In 1998 only, results were reported for two samples of students: one in which accommodations were permitted and one in which accommodations were not permitted. Subsequent assessment results were based on the more inclusive samples. In the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

Table 1-A shows the overall performance results of grade 8 public school students in New Hampshire, the nation (public), and the region. The list of states making up a given region for NAEP prior to 2003 differed from the list used by the U.S. Census Bureau, which has been used in NAEP from 2003 onward. Therefore, the data for the state's region are given only for 2003, 2005, and 2007. The first column of results presents the average score on the NAEP reading scale. The remaining columns show the scores at selected percentiles. A percentile indicates the percentage of students whose scores fell at or below a particular score. For example, the 25th percentile demarks the cut point for the lowest 25 percent of students within the distribution of scale scores.



Grade 8 Scale Score Results

- In 2007, the average scale score for students in New Hampshire was 270. This was higher than that for students across the nation (261).
- In New Hampshire, the average scale score for students in 2007 was not significantly different from that in 2005 (270).
- In New Hampshire, the average scale score for students in 2007 was not significantly different from the score in 2003 (270). However, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2007 was higher than that in 2005 (260).
- In New Hampshire, the average scale score for students in 2007 was not significantly different from the score in 2003.

Table 1-A

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average scale scores and selected percentile scores in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students, by assessment year and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007

Year and jurisdiction		Average scale score	10th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	90th Percentile
2003	Nation (public)	261	215	240	264	286*	304*
	Northeast ²	267	221	246	270	291	308
	New Hampshire	271	227	251	273	293	310
2005	Nation (public)	260*	214*	238*	263*	285	303
	Northeast ²	267	222	246	270	291	309
	New Hampshire	270	226	249	271	292	310
2007	Nation (public)	261	216	240	264	285	303
	Northeast ²	267	223	247	270	290	308
	New Hampshire	270	230	251	271	290	307

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

² Region in which state is located. Regional data are not provided for years prior to 2003 because the region definitions were changed. In 2003, NAEP adopted the U.S. Census Bureau defined regions: Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.




Overall Achievement-Level Results

In this section, student performance is reported as the percentage of students performing relative to performance standards set by the National Assessment Governing Board. These performance standards for what students should know and be able to do were based on the recommendations of broadly representative panels of educators and members of the public.

In 1998 only, results were obtained for two student samples: one for which accommodations were permitted and one for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

Table 2-A shows the percentage of students at grade 8 who performed below *Basic*, at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at the *Advanced* level. Because the percentages are cumulative from *Basic* to *Proficient* to *Advanced*, they sum to more than 100 percent. Only the percentage of students performing at or above *Basic* (which includes the students at *Proficient* and *Advanced*) plus the students below *Basic* will sum to 100 percent (except for rounding).



Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2007, the percentage of New Hampshire's students who performed at or above *Proficient* was 37 percent. This was greater than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Proficient* (29 percent).
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2007 was not significantly different from the percentages in 2003 and 2005.
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Basic* in 2007 was not significantly different from the percentages in 2003 and 2005.

Table 2-A The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students at or above NAEP reading achievement levels, by assessment year and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007


Year and jurisdiction		Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>
2003	Nation (public) ²	28	72	30*	3*
	Northeast ²	23	77	36	4
	New Hampshire	19	81	40	4
2005	Nation (public) ²	29*	71*	29	3
	Northeast ²	22	78	36	4
	New Hampshire	20	80	38	4
2007	Nation (public) ²	27	73	29	2
	Northeast ²	22	78	36	3
	New Hampshire	18	82	37	3

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

² Region in which state is located. Regional data are not provided for years prior to 2003 because the region definitions were changed. In 2003, NAEP adopted the U.S. Census Bureau defined regions: Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

NOTE: The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.



Comparisons Between New Hampshire, the Nation, and Other Participating States and Jurisdictions

Fifty-two jurisdictions participated in the reading assessment in 2007. These include the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools (domestic and overseas). Previous NAEP reports presented results for the Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DoDDS) overseas and the Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS) in the United States separately. Data for the two jurisdictions in prior years have been retroactively combined to provide comparable data for the single DoDEA jurisdiction.

Comparisons by Average Scale Scores

Figure 1 compares New Hampshire's 2007 overall reading scale scores at grade 8 with those of public schools in the nation and all other participating states and jurisdictions. The different shadings indicate whether the average score of the nation (public), a state, or a jurisdiction was found to be higher than, lower than, or not significantly different from that of New Hampshire in the NAEP 2007 reading assessment.

Grade 8 Scale Score Comparisons Results


- Students' average score in New Hampshire was higher than the scores in 36 jurisdictions, not significantly different from those in 12 jurisdictions, and lower than those in 3 jurisdictions.



Figure 1

The Nation's Report Card 2007 State Assessment

New Hampshire's average scale score in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students compared with scores for the nation and other participating jurisdictions: 2007



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

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.




Comparisons by Achievement Levels

Figure 2 permits comparisons of all jurisdictions participating in the NAEP 2007 reading assessment in terms of percentages of grade 8 students performing at or above *Basic*. The participating states and jurisdictions are grouped into categories reflecting whether the percentage of their students performing at or above *Basic* (including *Proficient* and *Advanced*) was found to be higher than, not significantly different from, or lower than the percentage in New Hampshire. The states and the nation are ordered by the percentage of students performing at or above *Basic* within each of the three comparison categories.

Figure 2

The Nation's Report Card 2007 State Assessment
Average scale scores in NAEP reading for eighth-grade public school students, percentage within each achievement level, and New Hampshire's percentage at or above Basic compared with the nation and other participating jurisdictions, by state: 2007



¹ Department of Defense Education Activity schools (domestic and overseas).
 NOTE: The bars above contain percentages of students in each NAEP reading achievement level. Achievement levels corresponding to each population of students are aligned at the point where the *Basic* category begins, so that they may be compared at *Basic* and above. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. The shaded bars are graphed using unrounded numbers. Significance tests used a multiple-comparison procedure based on all jurisdictions that participated.
 SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.

Reading Performance of Selected Student Groups

This section of the report presents trend results for students in New Hampshire and the nation by demographic characteristics. Student performance data are reported for

- gender
- race/ethnicity
- student eligibility for student eligibility for student eligibility for
- parents' highest level of education (for grade 8 only)

Definitions of NAEP reporting groups are available on the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results2007/interpret-results.asp#RepGroups>).

Each of the variables is reported in tables that present the percentage of students belonging to each group in the first column and the average scale score in the second column. The columns to the right show the percentage of students at or above each achievement level.

Differences between scores or percentages mentioned in the text are calculated using unrounded values. The result of subtracting the rounded values displayed in the tables may differ (usually by one point) from the results that would be obtained by subtracting the unrounded values.

The reader is cautioned against making causal inferences about the performance of groups of students relative to demographic variables. Many factors other than those discussed here, including home and school factors, may affect student performance.

NAEP collects information on many additional variables, including school and home factors related to achievement. All of this information is in an interactive database available on the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>).



Stowe



Austen

Gender

Information on student gender is reported by the student's school when rosters of the students eligible to be assessed are submitted to NAEP.

Table 3 shows average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grade 8 in New Hampshire and the nation by gender. In 1998 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and those for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample for which accommodations were permitted.

Score "gaps". In the bulleted text that follows, statements that compare the score gap between male and female students first make the comparison for the current year, and then for the initial year of the assessment. Intervening years are not compared. If the size of the score gap has changed significantly from the initial assessment year to the current year, the bullet will indicate a narrowing or widening of the score gap.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Gender

- In 2007, male students in New Hampshire had an average score that was lower than that of female students by 11 points. In 2003, the average score for male students was lower than that of female students by 11 points.
- In 2007, male students in New Hampshire had an average scale score in reading (264) that was higher than that of male students in public schools across the nation (256). Similarly, female students in New Hampshire had an average scale score (275) that was higher than that of female students across the nation (266).

- In New Hampshire, the average scale score of male students in 2007 was not found to be significantly different from the scores of students in 2003 and 2005.
- In New Hampshire, the average scale score of female students in 2007 was not found to be significantly different from the scores of students in 2003 and 2005.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Gender

- In the 2007 assessment, 31 percent of male students and 44 percent of female students performed at or above *Proficient* in New Hampshire. The difference between these percentages was statistically significant.
- The percentage of male students in New Hampshire's public schools who were at or above *Proficient* in 2007 (31 percent) was greater than that of males in the nation (24 percent).
- The percentage of female students in New Hampshire's public schools who were at or above *Proficient* in 2007 (44 percent) was greater than that of females in the nation (34 percent).
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of male students performing at or above *Proficient* in 2007 was not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 2003 and 2005.
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of female students performing at or above *Proficient* in 2007 was not significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 2003 and 2005.

**Table
3**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by gender, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007

Gender, year, and jurisdiction		Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Male							
2003	Nation (public)	50	256	33	67	25	2
	New Hampshire	49	265	24	76	34	2
2005	Nation (public)	50	255	34*	66*	24	2
	New Hampshire	51	264	25	75	32	2
2007	Nation (public)	50	256	32	68	24	1
	New Hampshire	50	264	23	77	31	2
Female							
2003	Nation (public)	50	267	23	77	35	4
	New Hampshire	51	276	14	86	47	5
2005	Nation (public)	50	266	24*	76*	34	3
	New Hampshire	49	275	15	85	44	5
2007	Nation (public)	50	266	23	77	34	3
	New Hampshire	50	275	13	87	44	4

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.



Race/Ethnicity

Schools reported the racial/ethnic subgroups that best describe the students eligible to be assessed. The six mutually exclusive categories are White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Unclassified. Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin. Table 4 shows average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grade 8 in New Hampshire and the nation by race/ethnicity. In 1998 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and those for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample for which accommodations were permitted.

Score “gaps”. In the bulleted text that follows, statements that compare the score gap between White and Black or White and Hispanic students first make the comparison for the current year, and then for the initial year of the assessment. Intervening years are not compared. If the size of the score gap has changed significantly from the initial assessment year to the current year, the bullet will indicate a narrowing or widening of the score gap.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2007, White students in New Hampshire had an average scale score that was higher than the score of Hispanic students.
- In 2007, the average scale score of White students in New Hampshire was not found to be significantly different from the scores of their corresponding peers in 2003 and 2005.
- Data are not reported for Black students in 2007 because reporting standards were not met.
- In 2007, Hispanic students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 18 points. Data are not reported for Hispanic students in 2003 because reporting standards were not met.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In New Hampshire in 2007, the percentage of White students performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than the percentage of Hispanic students.
- In 2007, the percentage of White students in New Hampshire performing at or above *Proficient* was not found to be significantly different from the percentages of their respective peers in 2003 and 2005.

Table 4 The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007—Continued

Race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction	Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
White						
2003						
Nation (public)	61*	270	18	82	39	4
New Hampshire	94	272	18	82	41	4
2005						
Nation (public)	60*	269*	19*	81*	37	3
New Hampshire	95	270	19	81	38	4
2007						
Nation (public)	58	270	17	83	38	3
New Hampshire	94	270	18	82	37	3
Black						
2003						
Nation (public)	17	244	47	53	12	#
New Hampshire	2	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2005						
Nation (public)	17	242*	49*	51*	11	#
New Hampshire	2	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007						
Nation (public)	17	244	46	54	12	#
New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

See notes at end of table.

Table 4 The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007—Continued

Race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction	Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Hispanic						
2003						
Nation (public)	15*	244	46	54	14	1
New Hampshire	2	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2005						
Nation (public)	17*	245	45*	55*	14	1
New Hampshire	2	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007						
Nation (public)	18	246	43	57	14	1
New Hampshire	2	252	40	60	20	1
Asian/Pacific Islander						
2003						
Nation (public)	4	268	22	78	38	5
New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2005						
Nation (public)	4*	270	21	79	39	5
New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007						
Nation (public)	5	269	21	79	40	5
New Hampshire	2	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

See notes at end of table.

**Table
4**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by race/ethnicity, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007

Race/ethnicity, year, and jurisdiction		Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
American Indian/Alaska Native							
2003	Nation (public)	1	248	41	59	18	1
	New Hampshire	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2005	Nation (public)	1	251	39	61	18	1
	New Hampshire	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007	Nation (public)	1	248	42	58	19	2
	New Hampshire	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Unclassified²							
2003	Nation (public)	1*	261	27	73	28	2
	New Hampshire	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2005	Nation (public)	1*	261	30	70	30	3
	New Hampshire	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007	Nation (public)	1	262	26	74	32	4
	New Hampshire	#	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

² The Unclassified category includes students whose school-reported race/ethnicity was "other" or unavailable, or was missing, and whose race/ethnicity category could not be determined from self-reported information.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes. Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.



Student Eligibility for the National School Lunch Program

NAEP collects data on eligibility for the federal program providing free or reduced-price school lunches. The free/reduced-price lunch component of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) offered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is designed to ensure that children near or below the poverty line receive nourishing meals. Eligibility is determined through the USDA's Income Eligibility Guidelines, and results for this category of students are included as an indicator of lower family income. NAEP first collected information on participation in this program in 1996; therefore, cross-year comparisons to assessments prior to 1996 cannot be made.

Table 5 shows average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grade 8 in New Hampshire and the nation by student eligibility for the National School Lunch program. In 1998 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and those for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample for which accommodations were permitted.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility

- In 2007, students in New Hampshire eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 257. This was lower than that of students in New Hampshire not eligible for this program (272).
- In 2007, students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 15 points. In 2003, the

average score for students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch was lower than the score of those not eligible by 18 points.

- Students in New Hampshire eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (257) in 2007 that was higher than that of students in the nation who were eligible (247).
- In New Hampshire, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2007 that was not found to be significantly different from that of eligible students in 2003 and 2005.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility

- In New Hampshire in 2007, 25 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 40 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above *Proficient*. These percentages were found to be significantly different from one another.
- For students in New Hampshire in 2007 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above *Proficient* (25 percent) was greater than the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation (15 percent).
- In New Hampshire, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2007 was not found to be significantly different from the corresponding percentages for 2003 and 2005.



Table 5 The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by eligibility for National School Lunch Program, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007


Eligibility status, year, and jurisdiction	Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Eligible						
2003						
Nation (public)	36*	246*	44*	56*	15	1
New Hampshire	14	255	34	66	22	3
2005						
Nation (public)	39*	247	43*	57*	15	1
New Hampshire	16	255	34	66	21	1
2007						
Nation (public)	40	247	42	58	15	1
New Hampshire	16	257	31	69	25	1
Not eligible						
2003						
Nation (public)	58	271	18	82	39	4
New Hampshire	79	273	17	83	43	4
2005						
Nation (public)	59	270*	19*	81*	38	4
New Hampshire	82	273	17	83	41	4
2007						
Nation (public)	58	271	18	82	39	4
New Hampshire	81	272	16	84	40	3
Information not available						
2003						
Nation (public)	6*	262	28	72	31	3
New Hampshire	7*	278	15	85	49	6
2005						
Nation (public)	3*	258	31	69	28	3
New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007						
Nation (public)	1	255	34	66	27	3
New Hampshire	3	270	14	86	36	2

‡ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.



Parents' Highest Level of Education

Eighth-grade students who participated in the NAEP 2007 assessment were asked to indicate the highest level of education they thought their father and their mother had completed. Five response options—did not finish high school, graduated from high school, some education after high school, graduated from college, and “I don’t know”—were offered. The highest level of education reported for either parent was used in the analysis. Fourth-graders’ replies to this question are not provided in NAEP reports because their responses in previous NAEP assessments were unreliable, and a large percentage of them chose the “I don’t know” option.

The results by highest level of parental education are shown in table 6.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Parents' Highest Level of Education

- In 2007, students in New Hampshire who reported that a parent had graduated from college had an average scale score that was higher than the average scores of students with a parent in any of the following education categories: did not finish high school, graduated from high school, and some education after high school.
- In 2007, the average scale score for students in New Hampshire who reported that a parent had graduated from college, or had not finished high school, or had graduated from high school, or had some education after high school was not found to be significantly different from the scores of students in 2003 and 2005.
- In 2007, the average scale score for students in New Hampshire who reported that a parent had not finished high school was not found to be significantly different

from the scores of students in 2003 and 2005.

- In 2007, the average scale score for students in New Hampshire who reported that a parent had graduated from high school was not found to be significantly different from the scores of students in 2003 and 2005.
- In 2007, the average scale score for students in New Hampshire who reported that a parent had some education after high school was not found to be significantly different from the scores of students in 2003 and 2005.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Parents' Highest Level of Education

- In 2007, the percentage of students performing at or above *Proficient* in New Hampshire who reported that a parent had graduated from college was higher than the percentage for students whose parents' highest level of education was in any of the following education categories: did not finish high school, graduated from high school, and some education after high school.
- In 2007, the respective percentages of students reporting that a parent had graduated from college, or had not finished high school, or had graduated from high school, or had some education after high school who performed at or above *Proficient* were not found to be significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 2003 and 2005.
- In 2007, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had not finished high school who performed at or above *Proficient* was not found to be significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 2003 and 2005.

- In 2007, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had graduated from high school who performed at or above *Proficient* was not found to be significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 2003 and 2005.
- In 2007, the percentage of students reporting that a parent had some education after high school who performed at or above *Proficient* was not found to be significantly different from the corresponding percentages of students in 2003 and 2005.

Table 6 The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by student-reported highest level of parental education, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007—Continued

Parental education level, year, and jurisdiction	Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Did not finished high school						
2003						
Nation (public)	7*	245	45	55	13	#
New Hampshire	5	253	37	63	18	2
2005						
Nation (public)	8	244	47*	53*	12	#
New Hampshire	5	257	30	70	24	1
2007						
Nation (public)	8	245	44	56	12	#
New Hampshire	4	247	40	60	13	#
Graduated from high school						
2003						
Nation (public)	18*	253	35	65	19	1
New Hampshire	16	261	26	74	26	2
2005						
Nation (public)	18*	252	37	63	18	1
New Hampshire	16	260	29	71	26	2
2007						
Nation (public)	17	252	36	64	18	1
New Hampshire	16	257	29	71	19	1

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table 6 The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by student-reported highest level of parental education, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007—Continued

Parental education level, year, and jurisdiction	Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced	
Some education after high school							
2003							
	Nation (public)	18*	266	21	79	32	2
	New Hampshire	16	273	15	85	40	4
2005							
	Nation (public)	18	265	23	77	31	2
	New Hampshire	15	268	19	81	33	2
2007							
	Nation (public)	17	265	21	79	31	2
	New Hampshire	17	271	15	85	37	2
Graduated from college							
2003							
	Nation (public)	46	271	19	81	41	4
	New Hampshire	55	278	13	87	50	6
2005							
	Nation (public)	46	270	20*	80*	40	4
	New Hampshire	56	277	13	87	48	6
2007							
	Nation (public)	46	271	18	82	40	4
	New Hampshire	56	277	12	88	47	4

See notes at end of table.

Table 6 The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
Percentage of eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by student-reported highest level of parental education, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007

Parental education level, year, and jurisdiction	Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced	
Unknown							
2003							
	Nation (public)	11	242	48	52	13	#
	New Hampshire	8	253	35	65	21	#
2005							
	Nation (public)	11*	242	49	51	12	#
	New Hampshire	9	249	37	63	14	#
2007							
	Nation (public)	11	243	47	53	12	1
	New Hampshire	8	253	34	66	17	#

Rounds to zero.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.

Toward a More Inclusive NAEP: Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners

It is important to assess all students selected in the complex statistical sampling process, including students with disabilities (SD) and students who are classified by their schools as English language learners (ELL). Some students sampled for participation in NAEP can be excluded from the sample according to carefully defined criteria.

School staff make the decisions about whether to include an SD or ELL student in a NAEP assessment, and which testing accommodations, if any, they should receive. The NAEP program furnishes tools to assist school personnel in making those decisions.

A sampling procedure is used to select students at each grade being tested. Students are selected on a random basis, without regard to SD or ELL status. Once the students are selected, the schools identify which have SD or ELL status. School staff who are familiar with these students are asked a series of questions to help them decide whether each student should participate in the assessment and whether the student needs accommodations.

Inclusion in NAEP of an SD or ELL student is encouraged if that student (a) participated in the regular state academic assessment in the subject being tested, and (b) if that student can participate in NAEP with the accommodations NAEP allows. Even if the student did not participate in the regular state assessment, or took the state's alternate assessment, or if he/she needs accommodations NAEP does not allow, school staff are asked whether that student could participate in NAEP with the allowable accommodations. (Examples of testing accommodations not allowed in NAEP are giving the reading assessment in a language other than English, or reading the reading passages aloud to the student. Also, extending testing over several days is not allowed for NAEP because NAEP administrators are in each school only one day.)

The results displayed in this report and in other publications of the NAEP 2007 reading results are based on representative samples that include SD and ELL students who were assessed either with or without accommodations, based on NAEP's guidelines.

Percentages of students excluded from NAEP may vary considerably across states, and, within a state, across years. Comparisons of results across states and within a state across years should be interpreted with caution if the exclusion rates vary widely. The percentages of assessed students classified as SD or ELL, as well as their NAEP performance in each participating state and jurisdiction, are available in an interactive database at the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>.

Prior to 1998, no testing accommodations were made available to the students with disabilities and English language learners in the samples in state NAEP reading assessments that served as the basis for reported results. In the 1998 national and state reading assessments and the 2000 national (grade 4 only) reading assessment, NAEP researchers drew a second representative sample of schools. Accommodations were made available for students in this sample who required them, provided the accommodation did not change the nature of what was tested. For example, students could be assessed one-on-one or in small groups, receive extended time, or use a large-print test book. However, in the reading assessment, students were not permitted to have passages or test items read aloud or translated into another language. These comparable samples were used to study the effects of allowing accommodations for SD and ELL students in the assessments. A series of technical research papers covering various NAEP subject areas has been published with the results of these comparisons (visit <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/inclusion.asp#research>).

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table 7 displays the percentages of students with disabilities and English language learners in New Hampshire identified, excluded, and assessed under standard and accommodated conditions at grade 8.

Table 8 shows the percentage of students assessed in New Hampshire by disability status and their performance on the NAEP assessment in terms of average scale scores and percentages performing below *Basic*, at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at *Advanced* for grade 8.

Table 9 presents the percentage of students assessed in New Hampshire by ELL status, their average scale scores, and their performance in terms of the percentage below *Basic*, the percentages at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at *Advanced*.

**Table
7**

The Nation's Report Card 2007 State Assessment

Eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) in NAEP reading, by assessment year and testing status as a percentage of all students: Various years, 2003–2007

Year and testing status	SD and/or ELL		SD		ELL		
	New Hampshire	Nation	New Hampshire	Nation	New Hampshire	Nation	
2003	Identified	19	19	18	14	2	6
	Excluded	3	5	3	4	#	2
	Assessed under standard conditions	6	8	6	5	1	4
	Assessed with accommodations	9	5	9	5	1	1
2005	Identified	20	19	19	13	1	6
	Excluded	2	5	2	4	#	1
	Assessed under standard conditions	7	7	7	3	1	4
	Assessed with accommodations	10	6	10	6	#	1
2007	Identified	19	19	18	13	1	7
	Excluded	4	5	3	5	#	2
	Assessed under standard conditions	5	7	4	3	#	4
	Assessed with accommodations	10	7	10	6	1	1

[†] Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

Rounds to zero.

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

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 Reading Assessments.



**Table
8**

The Nation's Report Card 2007 State Assessment

Percentage of assessed eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by students with disabilities (SD) status, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007

SD status, year, and jurisdiction		Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
SD							
2003	Nation (public)	10*	224*	68	32	5*	#
	New Hampshire	16	238*	56	44	8	#
2005	Nation (public)	9*	226	67	33	6	#
	New Hampshire	17	244	47	53	10	#
2007	Nation (public)	9	226	66	34	7	#
	New Hampshire	15	244	47	53	11	#
Not SD							
2003	Nation (public)	90*	266*	23	77	33*	3*
	New Hampshire	84	277*	12	88	46	5
2005	Nation (public)	91*	264	25*	75*	31	3
	New Hampshire	83	275	14	86	43	5
2007	Nation (public)	91	265	24	76	31	3
	New Hampshire	85	274	13	87	42	3

Rounds to zero.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table 9 The Nation's Report Card 2007 State Assessment
Percentage of assessed eighth-grade public school students, average scale scores, and percentage at or above achievement levels in NAEP reading, by English language learners (ELL) status, assessment year, and jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–2007

ELL status, year, and jurisdiction		Percentage of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
ELL							
2003	Nation (public)	5	222	71	29	5	#
	New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2005	Nation (public)	5	224	71	29	4	#
	New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
2007	Nation (public)	6	222	71	29	4	#
	New Hampshire	1	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Not ELL							
2003	Nation (public)	95	263	25	75	31	3*
	New Hampshire	99	271	18	82	41	4
2005	Nation (public)	95	262*	27*	73*	30	3
	New Hampshire	99	270	19	81	38	4
2007	Nation (public)	94	263	25	75	31	2
	New Hampshire	99	270	18	82	37	3

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2007.

NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. The standard errors of the statistics in the table appear in parentheses. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below Basic, 242 or lower; Basic, 243–280; Proficient, 281–322; and Advanced, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the .05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–2007 reading Assessments.



Appendix A

Overview of Procedures Used for the NAEP 2007 Reading Assessment

This appendix provides an overview of the NAEP 2007 reading assessment's primary components—framework, development, administration, scoring, and analysis. The information provided about the state and national assessments covers grades 4 and 8 (grade 12 was not assessed in 2007), as well as NAEP's Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA).

The NAEP 2007 Reading Assessment

The National Assessment Governing Board, created by Congress in 1988, is responsible for formulating policy for NAEP. The Governing Board is specifically charged with developing assessment objectives and test specifications. The design of the NAEP 2007 reading assessment follows the guidelines first provided in the framework developed for the 1992 assessment*. The framework underlying the 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000 (fourth grade only), 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007 reading assessments reflects the expert opinions of educators and researchers about reading. The development of this framework and the specifications that guided the development of the assessment involved the critical input of hundreds of individuals across the country, including representatives of national education organizations, teachers, parents, policymakers, business leaders, and the interested general public. The framework development process was managed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) for the Governing Board. (A revised reading framework will guide the NAEP assessment in 2009.)

The framework sets forth a broad definition of “reading literacy” that includes developing a general understanding of written text, thinking about it, and using various texts for different purposes. In addition, the framework views reading as an interactive and dynamic process involving the reader, the text, and the context of the reading experience. For example, readers may read stories to enjoy and appreciate the human experience, study science texts to form new hypotheses about knowledge, or follow directions to fill out a form. NAEP reflects current definitions of literacy by differentiating among three contexts for reading and four aspects of reading. The contexts for reading and aspects of reading provide the foundation of the NAEP reading assessment.

The “contexts for reading” dimension of the NAEP reading framework provides guidance for the types of texts to be included in the assessment. Although many

commonalities exist among the different types of reading contexts, different contexts do lead to real differences in what readers do. For example, when *reading for literary experience*, readers make plot summaries and abstract major themes. They describe the interactions of various literary elements (e.g., setting, plot, characters, and theme). When *reading for information*, readers critically judge the organization and content of the text and explain their judgments. They also look for specific pieces of information. When *reading to perform a task*, readers apply what they learn from reading materials such as bus or train schedules, directions for repairs or games, classroom procedures, and maps.

The “aspects of reading” dimension of the NAEP reading framework provides guidance for the types of comprehension questions to be included in the assessment. The four aspects are 1) *forming a general understanding*, 2) *developing interpretation*, 3) *making reader/text connections*, and 4) *examining content and structure*. These four aspects represent different ways in which readers develop understanding of a text. In *forming a general understanding*, readers must consider the text as a whole and provide a global understanding of it. As readers engage in *developing interpretation*, they must extend initial impressions in order to develop a more complete understanding of what was read. This involves linking information across parts of a text or focusing on specific information. When *making reader/text connections*, the reader must connect information in the text with knowledge and experience. This might include applying ideas in the text to the real world. Finally, *examining content and structure* requires critically evaluating, comparing and contrasting, and understanding the effect of such features as irony, humor, and organization.

* National Assessment Governing Board. (2002). *Reading Framework for the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Figure A-1 demonstrates the relationship between these reading contexts and aspects of reading in the NAEP reading assessment. Included in the figure are sample questions that illustrate how each aspect of reading is assessed within each reading context. (Note that reading to perform a task is not assessed at grade 4.)

Figure A-1
Sample questions for aspect of reading and context for reading as specified in the NAEP reading framework: 2007

Context for reading	Aspect of reading			
	Forming a general understanding	Developing interpretation	Making reader/text connections	Examining content and structure
Reading for literary experience	<i>What is the story/plot about?</i>	<i>How did this character change from the beginning to the end of the story?</i>	<i>What other character that you have read about had a similar problem?</i>	<i>What is the mood of this story and how does the author use language to achieve it?</i>
Reading for information	<i>What point is the author making about this topic?</i>	<i>What caused this change?</i>	<i>What other event in history or recent news is similar to this one?</i>	<i>Is this author biased? Support your answer with information about this article.</i>
Reading to perform a task	<i>What time can you get a nonstop flight to X?</i>	<i>What must you do before step 3?</i>	<i>Describe a situation in which you would omit step 5.</i>	<i>Is the information in this brochure easy to use?</i>

SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2006). *Reading Framework for the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.

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

Table A-1
Target and actual percentage distribution of questions in NAEP reading, by context for reading and grade: 2007

Grade	Context for reading		
	Reading for literary experience	Reading for information	Reading to perform a task
Grade 4			
Target	55	45	†
Actual	51	49	†
Grade 8			
Target	40	40	20
Actual	36	40	24

† Not applicable. Reading to perform a task was not assessed at grade 4.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-2
Target and actual percentage distribution of student time in NAEP reading, by aspect of reading and grade: 2007

Grade	Aspect of reading		
	Forming a general understanding and developing interpretation ¹	Making reader/text connections	Examining content and structure
Grade 4			
Target	60	15	25
Actual	68	14	17
Grade 8			
Target	55	15	30
Actual	59	17	24

¹Two aspects of reading are combined in this column.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.

The actual content of the assessment has varied from the targeted distribution. For example, at grade 8, reading for literary experience falls below the target proportions, and the percent of reading to perform a task items is above the target proportions specified in the framework. The reading instrument development panel responsible for overseeing the development of the assessment recognized this variance, but felt strongly that assessment questions must be sensitive to the unique elements of the authentic reading materials being used. Thus, the distribution of question classifications will vary across reading passages and reading contexts. However, in creating the subscales for the reading assessment, the performance results from the contexts for reading were weighted according to the percentages specified by the framework.



The Assessment Design

Each student who participated in the 2007 reading assessment received a booklet containing three or four sections: a set of general background questions, a set of subject-specific background questions, and one or two sets of questions assessing students' comprehension of a text or texts. The sets of questions assessing students' comprehension are referred to as "blocks." Each block contains one or more reading passages and a set of comprehension questions. At grade 8, students were given either two 25-minute blocks or one 50-minute block. At grade 4, however, only 25-minute blocks were used. Following the schedule set by the Governing Board, the reading assessment was not administered at grade 12 in 2007.

The blocks contain a combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. Multiple-choice questions require students to select the best answer from a set of four options. Constructed-response questions require students to provide their own written response to an open-ended question. Short constructed-response questions may require a response of only a sentence or two for the answer to be considered complete. Extended constructed-response questions, however, may require a response of a paragraph or more for the answer to receive full credit. Each constructed-response question has its own unique scoring guide that is used by trained scorers to rate students' responses. (See the "Data Collection and Scoring" section of this appendix.)

The grade 4 assessment consisted of ten 25-minute blocks: five blocks of literary texts and questions and five blocks of informative texts and questions. Each block contained one passage corresponding to one of the contexts for reading and 9 to 12 multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. In most blocks, one of the constructed-response questions required an extended response. As a whole, the 2007 fourth-grade assessment consisted of 57 multiple-choice questions, 35 short constructed-response questions, and 8 extended constructed-response questions.

The grade 8 assessment consisted of twelve 25-minute blocks (four literary, four informative, and four to perform a task) and one 50-minute block (informative). Each block contained at least one passage corresponding to one of the contexts for reading and 9 to 13 multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. Most blocks contained at least one extended constructed-response question. As a whole, the eighth-grade assessment consisted of 65 multiple-choice questions, 58 short constructed-response questions, and 17 extended constructed-response questions.

The assessment design allowed maximum coverage of a range of reading abilities at each grade, while minimizing the time burden for any one student. This was accomplished through the use of a matrix sampling of items in which representative samples of students took various portions of the entire pool of assessment questions. Individual students are required to take only a small portion, but the aggregate results across the entire assessment allow for a broad reporting of reading abilities for the targeted population.

In addition to matrix sampling, the assessment design utilized a procedure for distributing blocks across booklets that controlled for position and context effects. Students received different blocks of passages and comprehension questions in their booklets according to a procedure that assigned blocks of questions, balancing the positioning of blocks across booklets, and balancing the pairing of blocks within booklets according to the context for reading. Blocks were balanced within each context for reading and were partially balanced across contexts for reading. The procedure also cycled the booklets for administration so that, typically, only a few students in any assessment session received the same booklet.

In addition to the student assessment booklets, three other instruments provided data relating to the assessment: a teacher questionnaire, a school questionnaire, and questionnaires about students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL). The teacher questionnaire was administered to teachers of fourth- and eighth-grade students participating in the assessment. The questionnaire focused on the teacher's general background and experience, the teacher's background related to reading, and type of classroom organization. The fourth-grade teacher questionnaire also included questions on reading instruction. The school questionnaire was given to the principal or other administrator in each participating school. The questions asked about school policies, programs, facilities, and the demographic composition and background of the students and teachers at the school.

The SD and ELL questionnaires were completed by a school staff member knowledgeable about those students selected to participate in the assessment who were identified as having an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or equivalent plan (for reasons other than being gifted or talented), or as being an English language learner. An SD or ELL questionnaire was completed for each identified student in the NAEP sample. Each SD or ELL questionnaire asked about the student (for example, type of disability or language spoken other than English) and the special instructional programs (i.e., proportion of time spent in mainstream/general education classes, or specially designed instruction) in which he or she participated.

NAEP Samples

National Sample

The national results presented in this report are based on nationally representative probability samples of fourth- and eighth-grade students. The national sample consisted of the combined sample of public school students assessed in each state and an additional nonpublic school sample. The method of creating the national sample as an aggregate of the state samples has been used since 2002. Prior to 2002, separate samples were drawn for the NAEP national and state assessments. For 2007, the sampling frame for public schools was the Common Core of Data (CCD) file corresponding to the 2004–05 school year. The CCD file provided the frame for all regular public, state-operated public, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Department of Defense domestic schools that were open during the 2004–05 school year. The sampling frame for private schools was developed from the 2003–04 Private School Survey (PSS), which was carried out by the U.S. Census Bureau for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The PSS is a biennial mail survey of all private schools in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The combined sample was chosen using a stratified two-stage design that involved sampling students from selected schools (public and nonpublic).

Each selected school that participated in the assessment and each student assessed represents a portion of the population of interest. Sampling weights are needed to make valid inferences from the student samples to the respective populations from which they were drawn. Sampling weights account for disproportionate representation of students from different states and for students who attend nonpublic schools. Sampling weights also account for lower sampling rates for very small schools and are used to adjust for school and student nonresponse.

For the 2007 national assessment, as for the 2002, 2003 and 2005 assessments, accommodations for students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL) were permitted for the entire sample of students. This procedure differs from the one for the 1998 and 2000 national assessments, in which data were collected from samples of students where assessment accommodations were not permitted and from samples of students where accommodations were permitted. In 2007, accommodations were offered when a student had an Individualized Education Program (IEP) indicating the need for accommodations because of a disability, or was protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 because of a disability, or was identified as being an

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

English language learner, or was normally offered accommodations in other assessment situations*. All other students were asked to participate in the assessment under standard conditions. Prior to 1998, testing accommodations (e.g., extended time, small group testing) were not permitted for students with disabilities and English language learners selected to participate in the NAEP reading assessments.

The sample sizes and target populations for the 2007 reading assessment are listed for the nation (public) and states in table A-3. In 2005 and 2007, Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools are reported as a single jurisdiction; in past years, domestic (Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools or DDESS) and overseas (Department of Defense Dependents Schools or DoDDS) schools were considered separate jurisdictions.

In the 2007 assessment, as in the 2002, 2003, and 2005 NAEP assessments, a number of large urban school districts participated on a voluntary basis in a Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA), and larger than normal NAEP samples were drawn in these districts to permit reliable reporting of student group performance. Reports from these Trial Urban District Assessments (TUDAs) for 2002, 2003, and 2005 are available on the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>; a report for 2007 is forthcoming. The sample sizes and target populations for the districts participating in TUDA are given in table A-4.

* Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is a civil rights law designed to prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in programs and activities, including education, that receive federal financial assistance.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-3
Sample sizes and target populations in NAEP reading at grades 4 and 8, by state: 2007

State/jurisdiction	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Nation	204,400	3,795,000	170,600	3,911,000
Public	196,500	3,439,000	164,500	3,558,000
Nonpublic	7,900	356,000	6,100	352,000
Alabama	3,500	56,000	2,900	56,000
Alaska	3,000	9,000	2,700	9,000
Arizona	3,900	73,000	3,000	73,000
Arkansas	3,200	35,000	2,600	34,000
California	10,600	434,000	8,900	477,000
Colorado	3,500	54,000	2,900	57,000
Connecticut	3,200	41,000	2,800	42,000
Delaware	3,400	9,000	3,000	10,000
Florida	5,600	192,000	4,400	193,000
Georgia	4,900	119,000	3,800	120,000
Hawaii	3,500	13,000	2,900	13,000
Idaho	3,600	21,000	3,000	20,000
Illinois	5,100	149,000	4,200	150,000
Indiana	3,300	73,000	2,900	80,000
Iowa	3,000	32,000	3,000	36,000
Kansas	3,000	31,000	3,000	34,000
Kentucky	3,400	44,000	2,900	46,000
Louisiana	3,200	51,000	2,500	47,000
Maine	3,100	13,000	2,800	15,000
Maryland	3,800	61,000	2,900	64,000
Massachusetts	4,500	68,000	4,000	70,000
Michigan	3,500	116,000	2,800	119,000
Minnesota	3,600	57,000	3,100	62,000
Mississippi	3,400	39,000	2,800	36,000
Missouri	3,400	63,000	3,000	70,000
Montana	3,100	11,000	2,800	11,000
Nebraska	3,000	19,000	2,800	21,000
Nevada	4,200	30,000	2,800	28,000
New Hampshire	3,500	14,000	3,000	16,000
New Jersey	3,500	103,000	3,000	104,000
New Mexico	3,300	23,000	2,900	25,000
New York	4,700	195,000	4,000	206,000
North Carolina	5,700	106,000	4,500	104,000
North Dakota	3,000	7,000	2,500	8,000
Ohio	4,200	121,000	4,000	135,000
Oklahoma	3,400	44,000	2,800	42,000
Oregon	3,600	39,000	2,800	39,000
Pennsylvania	3,600	124,000	3,000	140,000
Rhode Island	3,300	11,000	2,900	12,000
South Carolina	3,600	48,000	3,000	52,000
South Dakota	3,200	9,000	3,000	10,000
Tennessee	3,400	71,000	3,000	74,000
Texas	10,000	321,000	7,700	294,000
Utah	3,800	37,000	2,900	36,000
Vermont	2,800	7,000	2,100	7,000
Virginia	3,800	86,000	3,000	91,000

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Washington	3,900	71,000	3,200	78,000
West Virginia	3,200	20,000	3,000	21,000
Wisconsin	3,400	59,000	2,900	62,000
Wyoming	2,800	6,000	2,100	7,000
Other jurisdictions				
BIE ¹	1,100	3,000	1,100	3,000
District of Columbia	2,100	5,000	2,100	5,000
DoDEA ²	3,300	7,000	1,700	5,000

¹ Bureau of Indian Education.

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

NOTE: The sample size is rounded to the nearest hundred. The target population is rounded to the nearest thousand. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Data for DoDEA and BIE schools are counted in the overall Nation total, but not in the Nation (public) total. Data for the District of Columbia public schools are counted, along with states, in Nation (public).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.




Table A-4
 Student sample sizes and target populations for Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in reading at grades 4 and 8, by urban district: 2007

District	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Atlanta	1,500	4,000	1,000	3,000
Austin	2,000	6,000	1,700	5,000
Boston	1,400	4,000	1,300	4,000
Charlotte	1,800	10,000	1,400	9,000
Chicago	2,400	30,000	1,900	25,000
Cleveland	1,300	4,000	1,300	4,000
District of Columbia	2,100	5,000	2,100	5,000
Houston	2,900	15,000	2,200	13,000
Los Angeles	2,700	54,000	2,200	52,000
New York City	2,600	67,000	2,100	69,000
San Diego	1,700	10,000	1,500	9,000

NOTE: The sample size is rounded to the nearest hundred. The target population is rounded to the nearest thousand.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Trial Urban District Reading Assessment.

State Samples

The results of the 2007 state assessment in reading provided in this report are based on state-level samples of fourth- and eighth-grade public school students. The samples were selected using a two-stage sample design that first selected schools within each state or other jurisdiction and then selected students within schools. The samples were weighted to allow valid inferences about the populations of interest. Participation rates for the states and other jurisdictions were calculated the same way that rates were computed for the nation. Tables A-5 and A-6 display weighted school and student participation rates, for the state samples at grades 4 and 8, respectively.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-5
Public school and student participation rates in NAEP reading at grade 4, by state: 2007

State/jurisdiction	School participation			Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	School-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Nation (public)	100	100	7,310	95	183,400
Alabama	100	100	110	95	3,400
Alaska	100	98	180	93	2,900
Arizona	99	99	120	95	3,600
Arkansas	100	100	120	94	3,000
California	100	100	320	95	10,200
Colorado	99	99	120	95	3,300
Connecticut	100	100	110	94	3,100
Delaware	100	100	100	94	3,000
Florida	100	100	160	93	5,200
Georgia	100	100	160	95	4,500
Hawaii	100	100	120	95	3,400
Idaho	100	100	130	95	3,500
Illinois	98	99	180	96	4,700
Indiana	100	100	110	95	3,100
Iowa	99	99	140	95	2,900
Kansas	100	100	140	95	2,800
Kentucky	100	100	120	95	3,200
Louisiana	100	100	110	94	3,000
Maine	100	100	150	94	2,900
Maryland	100	100	110	95	3,400
Massachusetts	100	100	170	93	4,200
Michigan	100	100	120	94	3,300
Minnesota	98	98	130	94	3,500
Mississippi	100	100	120	95	3,400
Missouri	100	100	130	95	3,200
Montana	100	99	190	95	3,000
Nebraska	100	100	160	95	2,800
Nevada	100	100	110	95	3,900
New Hampshire	100	100	130	95	3,300
New Jersey	98	99	110	95	3,200
New Mexico	99	100	130	94	2,900
New York	99	99	150	93	4,400
North Carolina	100	100	170	94	5,500
North Dakota	100	98	210	96	2,700
Ohio	100	100	160	95	3,700
Oklahoma	100	100	140	95	3,100
Oregon	100	100	140	94	3,400
Pennsylvania	100	100	110	95	3,400
Rhode Island	100	100	110	94	3,100
South Carolina	100	100	110	96	3,500
South Dakota	100	100	190	95	3,000
Tennessee	100	100	120	95	3,100
Texas	100	100	300	95	8,500
Utah	100	100	110	95	3,600
Vermont	100	100	190	94	2,600
Virginia	100	100	110	96	3,400
Washington	100	98	130	94	3,700
West Virginia	100	100	150	94	3,100

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Wisconsin	100	100	130	94	3,200
Wyoming	100	100	170	95	2,700
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	120	93	1,800
DoDEA ¹	100	99	120	93	3,200

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

NOTE: The numbers of schools are rounded to the nearest ten, and the numbers of students are rounded to the nearest hundred. Columns of percentages have different denominators; see accompanying text for definitions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Substitutions of reserve schools for initially sampled schools were not needed in 2007 because school participation rates were high.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-6
Public school and student participation rates in NAEP reading at grade 8, by state: 2007

State/jurisdiction	School participation			Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	School-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Nation (public)	100	100	6,410	92	154,700
Alabama	100	100	120	93	2,800
Alaska	100	99	110	91	2,600
Arizona	100	100	130	90	2,800
Arkansas	100	100	120	93	2,500
California	100	100	310	92	8,600
Colorado	96	98	120	92	2,800
Connecticut	97	97	100	92	2,700
Delaware	100	100	50	93	2,800
Florida	100	100	160	91	4,100
Georgia	100	100	120	93	3,500
Hawaii	100	100	70	91	2,800
Idaho	99	99	110	93	2,900
Illinois	100	100	200	93	4,000
Indiana	100	100	110	92	2,700
Iowa	100	100	130	93	2,800
Kansas	100	100	150	94	2,800
Kentucky	100	100	110	93	2,600
Louisiana	100	100	110	92	2,400
Maine	96	98	130	93	2,700
Maryland	100	100	110	90	2,700
Massachusetts	100	100	140	93	3,600
Michigan	100	100	120	91	2,600
Minnesota	98	99	140	92	3,000
Mississippi	100	100	110	93	2,700
Missouri	100	100	130	92	2,900
Montana	100	98	170	92	2,600
Nebraska	100	100	120	94	2,700
Nevada	100	100	70	88	2,600
New Hampshire	98	98	90	92	2,900
New Jersey	98	97	110	92	2,800
New Mexico	100	100	110	89	2,600
New York	100	100	160	90	3,800
North Carolina	100	100	150	91	4,300
North Dakota	99	98	190	95	2,200
Ohio	100	100	190	92	3,500
Oklahoma	100	100	150	92	2,600
Oregon	100	100	110	92	2,700
Pennsylvania	100	100	110	92	2,800
Rhode Island	100	100	60	92	2,800
South Carolina	100	100	110	94	2,700
South Dakota	100	99	140	95	2,800
Tennessee	100	100	120	92	2,800
Texas	100	100	220	92	7,100
Utah	100	100	100	91	2,800
Vermont	100	100	120	93	2,000
Virginia	100	100	110	93	2,800
Washington	100	100	130	91	3,000
West Virginia	100	100	120	92	2,900

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Wisconsin	98	98	130	92	2,700
Wyoming	100	100	80	92	2,000
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	50	88	1,800
DoDEA ¹	100	98	60	94	1,700

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

NOTE: The numbers of schools are rounded to the nearest ten, and the numbers of students are rounded to the nearest hundred. Columns of percentages have different denominators; see accompanying text for definitions. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Substitutions of reserve schools for initially sampled schools were not needed in 2007 because school participation rates were high.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Reading Assessment.



District Samples

Results from the 2007 reading assessment are also reported for district-level samples of fourth- and eighth-grade students in the large urban school districts that participated in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA)—Atlanta City, Austin, Boston School District, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, City of Chicago School District 299, Cleveland Municipal School District, Houston Independent School District, Los Angeles Unified, New York City Public Schools, and San Diego City Unified. The District of Columbia, which is regularly included in NAEP assessments as a jurisdiction, also participated in the TUDA. The sample of students in the urban school districts represents an augmentation of the sample of students who would usually be selected as part of the state samples. These samples allow reliable reporting of student groups within these districts. Furthermore, all students at more local geographic sampling levels are assumed to be part of broader samples. For example, Houston is one of the urban districts included in the TUDA. Data from students tested in the Houston sample were used to report results for Houston, but also contributed to the Texas and national estimates. Participation rates for the urban district samples are presented in table A-7.

Table A-7

Public school and student participation rates for Trial Urban District Assessment in reading, by grade and urban district: 2007

Grade and district	School participation		Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Grade 4				
Atlanta	100	50	96	1,400
Austin	100	60	95	1,600
Boston	100	60	95	1,300
Charlotte	100	50	95	1,700
Chicago	100	90	95	2,300
Cleveland	100	60	93	1,100
District of Columbia	100	120	93	1,800
Houston	100	80	96	2,400
Los Angeles	100	80	95	2,700
New York City	100	80	93	2,500
San Diego	100	60	94	1,700
Grade 8				
Atlanta	100	20	90	900
Austin	100	20	92	1,500
Boston	100	30	91	1,200
Charlotte	100	30	90	1,400
Chicago	100	100	94	1,800
Cleveland	100	80	89	1,100
District of Columbia	100	50	88	1,800
Houston	100	50	91	2,000
Los Angeles	100	70	90	2,100
New York City	100	80	87	2,000
San Diego	100	30	93	1,400

NOTE: The numbers of schools are rounded to the nearest ten, and the numbers of students are rounded to the nearest hundred. Substitutions of reserve schools for initially sampled schools were not needed in 2007 because school participation rates were high. The percentages for school-weighted and student-weighted school participation are both at 100 percent for the participating districts in 2007.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2007 Trial Urban District Reading Assessment.

Standards for State Sample Participation and Reporting of Results

In carrying out the 2007 state assessment program, the NAEP program in the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) established participation rate standards that states and other jurisdictions were required to meet for their results to be reported. NAEP state assessment results are based only on public schools. Participation rates before substitution needed to be at least 80 percent for schools and at least 85 percent for students. In the 2007 reading assessment at both fourth and eighth grades, all jurisdictions met NAEP participation rate standards and the National Assessment Governing Board standard of 85 percent school participation. Further information on the NCES guidelines used to report results in the state assessments, and the guidelines for notations when there was some risk of nonresponse bias in the reported results prior to the 2003 assessments, can be found in the NAEP 2002 reading report card (NCES 2003–521; see appendix A, “Standards for Sample Participation and Reporting of Results”).

Students With Disabilities (SD) and/or English Language Learners (ELL)

It is important to assess all selected students from the target population. Therefore, every effort is made to ensure that all selected students who are capable of participating in the assessment are assessed. Some students sampled for participation in NAEP can be excluded from the sample according to carefully defined criteria. These criteria were revised in 1996 to communicate more clearly a presumption of inclusion except under special circumstances. According to these criteria, students who had an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or were protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 were to be included in the NAEP assessment except when:

- the school’s IEP team determined that the student could not participate because the student’s cognitive functioning was so severely impaired that he or she could not participate, or
- the student’s IEP required that the student had to be tested with an accommodation or adaptation that NAEP does not allow and the student could not demonstrate his or her knowledge without that accommodation.

All English language learners who received academic instruction in English for one year or more were to be included in the assessment. Those students identified as ELL who received instruction in English for less than one year were to be included unless school staff judged them to be incapable of participating in the assessment in English.

Participation of SD/ELL Students in the NAEP Samples

Testing all sampled students is the best way for NAEP to ensure that the statistics generated by the assessment are as representative as possible of the performance of the entire national population and the populations of participating jurisdictions. However, all groups of students

include certain proportions that cannot be tested in large-scale assessments (such as students who have profound mental disabilities) or who can only be tested through the use of testing accommodations such as extra time, one-on-one administration, or use of magnifying equipment. Some students with disabilities and some English language learners cannot show on a test what they know and can do unless they are provided with accommodations. When such accommodations are not allowed, students requiring such adjustments are often excluded from large-scale assessments such as NAEP. This phenomenon has become more common since the 1990s, particularly with the passage of the 1997 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which led schools and states to identify increasing proportions of students as needing accommodations on assessments to best show what they know and can do*. Furthermore, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 requires that, when students with disabilities are tested, schools must provide them with appropriate accommodations so that the test results accurately reflect students' achievement. In addition, as the proportion of ELL students in the population has increased, some states have started offering accommodations such as translations of assessments or the use of bilingual dictionaries as part of the assessments.

Before 1996, no testing under nonstandard conditions was allowed in NAEP, and accommodations were not permitted. At that time, NAEP samples were able to include almost all sampled students in standard assessment sessions. However, as the influence of IDEA became more widespread, the failure to provide accommodations led to increasing levels of exclusion in the assessment. Such increases posed two threats to the program: they threatened the stability of trend lines (because excluding more students in one assessment year than in another might lead to apparent rather than real differences), and they made NAEP samples less than optimally representative of target populations.

A multipart strategy was adopted as a response to this challenge. The program had to move toward allowing the same assessment accommodations that were afforded students in state and district testing programs for NAEP samples to be as inclusive as possible. However, to allow accommodations represents a change in testing conditions that might affect measurement of changes over time. Therefore, beginning with the 1996 national assessments (in mathematics and science) and the 1998 state assessments (reading and writing), and up to 2000, NAEP assessed a series of parallel samples of students. In one set of samples, testing accommodations were not permitted; this allowed NAEP to maintain the measurement of achievement trends. Parallel samples in which accommodations were permitted were also assessed. By having two overlapping samples* and two sets of related data points, NAEP could meet two core program goals. First, data trends could be maintained. Second, parallel trend lines could be reported during the interim until the program transitioned to a sample with accommodations permitted as its only reporting format. Starting in 2002, NAEP has used only the more inclusive samples, in which assessment

accommodations are permitted. In reading, national and state data from 1992, 1994, and 1998 are reported for the sample in which accommodations were not permitted. National and state data for the sample in which accommodations were permitted are reported for 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007. National-only data at grade 4 for both accommodated and non-accommodated samples are reported for 2000. The 2000 reading assessment was conducted only at grade 4 with a national sample; there were no state-level samples, and grades 8 and 12 were not assessed.

To make it possible to evaluate both the impact of increasing exclusion rates in some jurisdictions and differences between jurisdictions, complete data on exclusion in all years are included in this appendix. Because the exclusion rates may affect trend measurement within a jurisdiction, readers should consider the magnitude of exclusion rate changes when interpreting score changes in jurisdictions. In addition, different rates of exclusion may influence the meaning of state comparisons. Thus, exclusion data should be reviewed in this context as well.

Table A-8 presents the percentages of all public and nonpublic school students who were identified as students with disabilities (SD) or as English language learners (ELL), or both, for assessments where accommodations were not permitted. The table also includes the percentages of all students who were excluded SD and/or ELL and the percentages of all students who were assessed SD and/or ELL for those assessments. The denominator for these percentages includes assessed students plus excluded students; it does not include sampled students who were absent or refused to participate. Tables A-9 through A-14 show similar information by state and jurisdiction.

Table A-15 presents the percentages of all public and nonpublic school students who were identified as SD and/or ELL for assessments where accommodations were permitted. This table also includes the percentages of all students who were SD and/or ELL who were excluded, assessed, assessed without accommodations, and assessed with accommodations. Similar information is presented for states and jurisdictions in tables A-16 through A-21, and for districts that participated in the Trial Urban District Assessment in tables A-22 and A-23.

In the 2007 national sample, 6 percent of students at grade 4 and 5 percent of students at grade 8 were excluded from the assessment (see table A-15). Across the various jurisdictions that participated in the 2007 state assessment, the percentage of students excluded ranged from 2 to 14 percent at grade 4 (see table A-16) and from 2 to 13 percent at grade 8 (see table A-19). At the district level, between 3 and 20 percent of students were excluded at grade 4 (see table A-22), and between 4 and 16 percent were excluded at grade 8 (see table A-23).

* Office of Special Education Programs. (1997). *To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of all Children with Disabilities. Nineteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act.* Archived at the U.S. Department of Education website: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/index.html>.

* The two samples are described as "overlapping" because, in 1998 and 2000, the same group of non-SD and/or ELL students was included in both samples.

Table A-8

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

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

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

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-9

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

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	12	10	3	12	9	3	16	11	6
DoDEA ¹	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	4	3

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: States that did not participate in any of the NAEP reading assessments from 1992 to 1998 are not included in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

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

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

District of Columbia	9	7	2	7	5	1	10	9	1
DoDEA ¹	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	4	3

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: States that did not participate in any of the NAEP reading assessments from 1992 to 1998 are not included in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-11

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

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	4	3	1	6	4	2	7	2	4
DoDEA ¹	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: States that did not participate in any of the NAEP reading assessments from 1992 to 1998 are not included in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-12

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

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

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: States that did not participate in the 1998 NAEP reading assessment are not included in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-13

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

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

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: States that did not participate in the 1998 NAEP reading assessment are not included in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-14

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

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

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: States that did not participate in the 1998 NAEP reading assessment are not included in the table. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-15

Percentage of fourth- and eighth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL), and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted: Various years, 1998–2007

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

— Not available. Data were not collected at grade 8 in 2000.

Rounds to zero.

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

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-16


Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	18	7	11	7	3	21	7	14	10	4
Alabama	13	8	4	3	1	14	3	12	9	2
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	22	10	12	10	1	28	8	21	18	3
Arkansas	11	5	6	4	2	14	5	10	8	2
California	31	14	16	15	1	34	5	29	28	1
Colorado	15	6	9	6	3	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	18	10	8	5	3	16	5	11	5	6
Delaware	16	1	15	11	4	17	8	9	4	5
Florida	18	6	12	8	5	25	7	18	10	8
Georgia	11	5	6	3	3	13	4	9	6	3
Hawaii	15	5	10	9	1	18	6	12	7	5
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	17	4	13	11	2
Illinois	14	6	8	6	2	20	7	14	8	6
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	13	5	9	7	2
Iowa	15	5	10	7	3	16	8	8	3	5
Kansas	12	4	8	5	4	19	5	14	7	7
Kentucky	13	7	5	3	2	12	8	4	3	1
Louisiana	15	7	8	3	5	19	10	9	3	6
Maine	15	7	7	4	3	17	6	11	5	6
Maryland	13	6	8	4	4	14	7	7	5	2
Massachusetts	19	5	14	9	5	19	6	13	4	9
Michigan	10	6	4	3	1	14	7	6	5	1
Minnesota	15	3	12	9	3	19	5	13	10	4
Mississippi	7	4	3	2	#	7	4	3	2	1
Missouri	14	6	8	3	4	16	9	8	4	3
Montana	10	2	7	5	2	15	6	8	4	4
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	21	5	15	9	6
Nevada	20	11	9	8	1	27	10	17	14	3

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	14	3	11	6	5	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	28	9	18	16	2	37	10	27	23	4
New York	14	7	7	2	4	18	8	9	3	6
North Carolina	15	7	9	3	6	19	12	7	3	4
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	18	5	13	9	3
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	14	8	5	4	2
Oklahoma	15	9	6	5	1	21	5	15	10	5
Oregon	20	6	14	10	4	25	8	17	13	4
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	14	5	10	4	5
Rhode Island	20	7	13	9	4	25	6	19	8	11
South Carolina	16	8	9	6	3	16	5	12	9	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	13	4	9	8	2	14	3	10	9	1
Texas	26	13	14	11	3	27	11	16	14	2
Utah	14	6	8	6	2	19	6	13	9	4
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	15	5	10	4	6
Virginia	15	6	9	4	5	18	10	8	5	3
Washington	15	5	10	7	3	15	5	11	7	4
West Virginia	12	8	4	2	1	16	10	5	3	2
Wisconsin	16	8	8	5	3	19	8	10	5	5
Wyoming	14	3	10	6	4	17	3	15	7	7
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	16	9	8	5	3	19	8	11	5	5
DoDEA ¹	8	3	4	3	1	16	3	12	8	4

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-16

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	22	6	16	10	5	23	7	16	10	7
Alabama	12	2	10	7	3	13	2	11	8	3
Alaska	29	3	27	20	7	32	3	28	17	12
Arizona	28	7	21	18	2	29	6	23	16	7
Arkansas	16	6	10	7	3	17	8	9	5	3
California	38	5	32	30	2	39	5	34	31	3
Colorado	18	3	15	7	8	22	4	18	5	13
Connecticut	15	5	10	4	6	17	3	13	4	9
Delaware	18	11	7	4	3	20	13	7	4	3
Florida	25	5	20	9	11	25	6	18	5	14
Georgia	16	4	12	6	5	15	6	10	6	4
Hawaii	17	4	13	6	7	18	3	15	7	8
Idaho	18	4	14	12	3	17	3	14	11	3
Illinois	22	8	14	7	7	22	7	14	8	6
Indiana	15	4	11	6	5	19	5	14	6	8
Iowa	17	7	11	4	6	19	6	13	4	9
Kansas	15	3	12	4	9	19	4	15	6	8
Kentucky	15	9	6	5	1	15	9	7	3	3
Louisiana	21	6	15	3	12	24	14	10	3	7
Maine	19	7	12	5	7	18	6	12	5	7
Maryland	16	7	9	6	3	15	6	9	4	5
Massachusetts	22	4	17	4	13	25	8	17	6	11
Michigan	15	7	8	5	3	16	7	9	5	5
Minnesota	19	3	16	10	6	20	3	17	9	8
Mississippi	10	6	4	3	1	13	4	9	7	2
Missouri	18	8	10	5	5	17	8	10	5	5
Montana	16	5	12	6	6	16	5	11	4	6
Nebraska	20	5	15	9	6	23	5	17	9	8
Nevada	26	8	17	13	5	25	7	18	13	5

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	19	4	15	5	10	21	4	17	5	12
New Jersey	17	5	12	2	10	18	5	12	3	9
New Mexico	41	8	33	23	10	34	10	24	16	8
New York	19	8	11	3	8	20	6	14	2	13
North Carolina	20	7	13	5	8	22	4	18	5	13
North Dakota	17	4	13	9	4	16	5	10	6	4
Ohio	13	6	7	2	5	14	8	6	2	4
Oklahoma	22	6	16	11	5	22	6	16	7	9
Oregon	26	9	17	12	5	28	7	21	15	7
Pennsylvania	15	4	12	3	9	17	5	13	5	8
Rhode Island	26	5	21	8	13	25	4	22	9	13
South Carolina	18	8	10	8	2	17	7	11	8	3
South Dakota	18	4	14	8	5	18	5	13	8	5
Tennessee	15	4	11	8	2	13	7	6	3	2
Texas	26	11	15	14	1	26	11	16	13	3
Utah	22	5	17	11	6	21	4	17	11	6
Vermont	18	6	12	4	7	16	5	11	5	7
Virginia	19	10	9	5	4	23	12	11	7	4
Washington	20	5	15	10	5	20	4	16	8	8
West Virginia	15	9	6	4	2	18	5	12	9	4
Wisconsin	19	6	13	4	9	20	6	14	5	9
Wyoming	18	2	16	7	10	20	2	18	7	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	18	6	12	3	9	20	7	12	3	9
DoDEA ¹	15	3	12	7	6	16	4	12	7	6

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-16

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Vermont	21	7	14	6	9
Virginia	21	8	13	7	6
Washington	21	5	16	10	6
West Virginia	18	2	16	10	7
Wisconsin	20	5	14	6	8
Wyoming	19	4	15	7	8
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	22	14	8	2	7
DoDEA ¹	16	5	11	6	5




— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-17

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	5	7	4	3	13	5	8	4	4
Alabama	13	8	4	3	1	13	2	11	8	2
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	10	5	5	4	1	11	5	7	5	2
Arkansas	10	4	6	4	2	12	4	7	5	2
California	6	3	2	2	1	7	3	4	3	1
Colorado	10	3	8	4	3	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	14	7	7	4	3	13	4	9	4	6
Delaware	14	1	12	9	4	15	7	8	3	5
Florida	14	5	9	5	4	17	5	13	6	7
Georgia	9	4	6	3	3	10	3	7	4	3
Hawaii	10	4	7	5	1	12	4	8	3	4
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	13	4	9	7	2
Illinois	10	3	6	4	2	13	4	9	4	5
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	12	4	8	6	2
Iowa	14	5	9	6	3	15	7	8	3	5
Kansas	9	3	6	3	3	14	4	10	4	5
Kentucky	12	7	5	3	2	11	8	4	2	1
Louisiana	14	7	7	2	5	19	10	8	3	5
Maine	15	7	7	4	3	16	6	10	5	6
Maryland	11	5	6	2	4	12	6	6	4	2
Massachusetts	16	4	12	7	5	16	4	12	3	9
Michigan	9	5	3	2	1	11	7	4	3	1
Minnesota	12	3	9	6	3	13	4	10	6	3
Mississippi	7	4	3	2	#	7	4	3	2	1
Missouri	14	6	7	3	4	15	8	7	4	3
Montana	10	2	7	5	2	13	5	8	4	4
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	18	4	13	7	6
Nevada	10	6	4	4	1	12	5	7	5	2

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	13	3	10	5	5	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	14	7	7	5	2	15	7	9	6	3
New York	9	4	5	1	4	14	6	8	2	5
North Carolina	14	6	8	2	6	17	10	6	3	4
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	16	5	11	8	3
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	13	8	5	3	2
Oklahoma	13	9	5	3	1	17	5	13	8	5
Oregon	14	4	10	6	4	16	5	10	7	3
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	13	4	9	4	5
Rhode Island	14	5	10	6	3	19	3	15	6	10
South Carolina	15	7	8	5	3	16	4	11	8	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	12	3	9	7	2	11	3	8	6	1
Texas	14	7	8	5	2	14	8	6	5	2
Utah	10	4	6	4	1	12	4	7	5	3
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	13	5	9	3	6
Virginia	14	6	8	4	4	14	8	6	3	3
Washington	11	4	8	5	3	13	4	9	6	4
West Virginia	12	8	4	2	1	15	10	5	3	2
Wisconsin	13	7	6	4	2	13	6	8	3	4
Wyoming	13	3	10	6	4	14	2	12	5	7
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	10	6	4	2	2	14	7	7	3	4
DoDEA ¹	6	3	4	2	1	10	3	7	4	4

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-17

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	5	9	4	5	14	5	9	4	5
Alabama	12	2	10	7	3	12	2	10	7	3
Alaska	16	2	14	7	7	15	3	12	5	8
Arizona	11	5	6	4	2	12	4	8	3	4
Arkansas	13	5	8	5	3	13	6	7	4	3
California	10	3	8	6	2	9	3	7	4	2
Colorado	11	2	9	3	6	12	3	9	2	7
Connecticut	12	4	9	3	6	12	3	9	2	7
Delaware	17	10	6	3	3	17	12	5	2	2
Florida	16	3	13	4	9	19	5	14	4	10
Georgia	13	3	10	5	5	13	5	8	5	3
Hawaii	11	3	9	3	5	10	2	8	2	6
Idaho	12	3	10	7	3	10	3	7	5	2
Illinois	16	5	10	4	7	13	5	8	3	5
Indiana	13	4	10	5	4	16	4	12	5	7
Iowa	15	7	8	2	5	15	5	10	2	8
Kansas	13	2	11	3	8	13	3	10	3	6
Kentucky	14	8	6	4	1	14	8	6	3	3
Louisiana	20	6	14	3	12	23	14	9	2	7
Maine	18	7	11	4	7	18	6	11	5	7
Maryland	13	6	7	4	3	13	5	8	3	4
Massachusetts	17	3	15	2	12	20	7	13	3	10
Michigan	11	6	5	2	3	14	7	7	3	4
Minnesota	13	3	11	6	5	14	3	11	5	6
Mississippi	10	6	4	3	1	12	4	8	6	2
Missouri	16	7	9	4	5	15	7	8	4	4
Montana	14	5	9	4	5	13	5	8	2	6
Nebraska	17	4	13	7	6	17	5	12	6	7
Nevada	13	5	8	5	4	12	5	6	3	3

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	17	3	14	4	10	19	3	15	4	11
New Jersey	13	3	10	1	8	15	4	11	2	8
New Mexico	18	4	14	7	7	14	6	8	4	5
New York	14	5	9	1	7	15	4	10	1	10
North Carolina	17	6	10	3	7	17	3	13	3	10
North Dakota	15	4	11	7	4	15	5	9	5	4
Ohio	12	6	7	2	5	13	8	5	1	4
Oklahoma	17	5	11	7	5	18	5	12	5	7
Oregon	17	7	10	6	4	15	5	11	6	4
Pennsylvania	14	3	11	2	8	15	4	11	4	7
Rhode Island	19	3	16	5	11	20	2	17	6	11
South Carolina	16	7	9	7	2	15	6	9	7	3
South Dakota	14	4	10	6	4	15	4	10	6	4
Tennessee	14	4	10	8	2	11	7	4	2	2
Texas	14	7	7	6	1	14	7	7	5	2
Utah	13	3	10	5	5	13	4	9	4	5
Vermont	17	6	11	3	7	15	5	10	4	6
Virginia	14	8	6	3	3	15	10	6	3	2
Washington	14	4	9	5	4	13	3	10	4	6
West Virginia	15	9	6	3	2	17	5	12	8	4
Wisconsin	14	4	9	2	7	14	4	9	2	7
Wyoming	15	2	13	4	10	16	2	14	4	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	13	5	8	2	6	15	7	9	2	7
DoDEA ¹	9	2	7	3	5	11	3	7	3	4

See notes at end of table.

READING IS KNOWLEDGE

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-17

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Vermont	18	6	12	4	8
Virginia	15	7	8	3	4
Washington	15	4	11	6	5
West Virginia	17	2	15	9	7
Wisconsin	14	4	9	3	6
Wyoming	16	4	12	4	8
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	15	11	4	1	3
DoDEA ¹	10	3	7	3	4

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-18


Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	7	3	4	4	1	9	2	7	6	1
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	14	6	7	6	1	21	5	16	15	1
Arkansas	1	1	1	1	#	3	1	3	3	#
California	26	12	14	13	1	29	3	26	26	#
Colorado	5	3	2	2	#	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	5	4	1	1	#	4	2	2	2	#
Delaware	3	#	2	2	#	3	2	1	1	#
Florida	5	1	3	3	#	10	3	7	5	2
Georgia	2	1	#	#	#	4	1	2	2	#
Hawaii	6	2	4	4	#	8	2	6	4	1
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	7	1	6	5	#
Illinois	5	3	2	2	#	9	4	5	4	1
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	#
Iowa	1	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Kansas	3	1	2	2	#	7	2	6	4	2
Kentucky	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Louisiana	1	1	1	1	#	1	1	1	#	#
Maine	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Maryland	2	1	2	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Massachusetts	4	2	2	2	1	4	2	2	1	1
Michigan	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	2	#
Minnesota	4	1	3	3	1	7	2	5	4	1
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	1	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
Montana	#	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	4	2	3	2	#
Nevada	10	6	4	4	#	18	7	11	10	1

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	1	#	1	1	#	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	16	4	12	11	1	27	6	21	19	2
New York	5	4	1	1	#	6	3	3	1	1
North Carolina	2	1	1	1	#	5	3	1	1	1
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	2	1	#
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	#
Oklahoma	2	#	1	1	#	5	1	4	3	1
Oregon	7	2	5	4	1	12	4	8	6	2
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	#
Rhode Island	6	3	4	3	1	9	3	5	4	2
South Carolina	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	1	1	#	#	#	3	1	3	3	#
Texas	13	7	6	6	#	16	5	11	10	1
Utah	5	2	3	2	#	9	3	7	5	1
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	2	#	1	1	#
Virginia	2	1	1	1	1	6	3	3	2	1
Washington	4	2	3	2	#	3	1	2	2	#
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	3	1	2	1	#	6	3	3	2	1
Wyoming	1	1	#	#	#	5	1	4	3	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	3	4	2	1	7	3	4	3	2
DoDEA ¹	2	1	1	1	#	7	1	6	5	1

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-18

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	10	2	8	7	1	11	2	8	7	2
Alabama	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	#
Alaska	17	1	16	15	2	19	1	18	13	5
Arizona	21	4	16	15	1	20	3	17	13	3
Arkansas	4	1	3	3	#	5	2	2	2	#
California	32	4	28	27	1	33	4	30	28	2
Colorado	9	2	7	4	3	11	2	9	3	6
Connecticut	3	1	2	1	1	5	1	4	2	2
Delaware	3	1	2	1	#	4	2	2	2	#
Florida	12	3	9	6	3	8	2	5	1	4
Georgia	4	1	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	1
Hawaii	7	2	5	3	2	9	1	8	5	3
Idaho	7	1	6	5	#	8	1	7	7	1
Illinois	9	4	5	4	1	10	3	7	5	1
Indiana	2	#	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Iowa	4	1	3	2	1	4	1	3	2	1
Kansas	3	1	2	1	1	7	2	5	3	2
Kentucky	1	1	#	#	#	2	1	#	#	#
Louisiana	2	1	1	#	1	1	#	1	1	#
Maine	1	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Maryland	4	2	2	2	#	4	2	2	1	1
Massachusetts	6	2	4	2	1	6	2	4	3	1
Michigan	5	2	3	3	#	3	1	2	2	1
Minnesota	7	1	6	5	1	7	1	6	4	2
Mississippi	1	1	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Missouri	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Montana	4	1	4	2	1	3	#	3	2	1
Nebraska	4	2	3	2	1	7	1	6	4	2
Nevada	16	5	11	9	2	16	3	13	10	3

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
New Jersey	4	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
New Mexico	30	5	24	19	6	24	7	17	13	5
New York	7	3	3	1	2	7	2	4	1	3
North Carolina	6	2	4	2	2	7	1	6	2	4
North Dakota	4	1	3	3	#	2	#	1	1	#
Ohio	2	1	1	1	#	1	1	1	#	#
Oklahoma	6	1	5	5	#	5	1	4	3	1
Oregon	13	4	9	7	2	14	2	12	9	3
Pennsylvania	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Rhode Island	9	2	7	4	3	7	1	5	3	3
South Carolina	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
South Dakota	5	1	4	2	2	4	1	3	2	1
Tennessee	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	2	1	#
Texas	15	5	10	10	#	16	6	9	9	1
Utah	12	3	9	7	2	10	1	9	7	2
Vermont	2	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	7	3	4	3	1	9	3	5	4	2
Washington	8	2	6	5	1	9	2	7	5	3
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	6	2	4	2	2	7	2	5	3	2
Wyoming	5	#	4	3	1	5	1	4	3	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	7	1	6	2	4	6	1	4	2	3
DoDEA ¹	7	1	6	4	1	7	1	5	4	2

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-18

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Vermont	3	1	2	1	#
Virginia	7	2	5	3	2
Washington	8	1	6	5	1
West Virginia	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	7	2	5	3	2
Wyoming	4	1	3	3	#
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	9	4	5	1	4
DoDEA ¹	6	2	4	3	2

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-19

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	4	10	7	3	18	6	12	8	4
Alabama	12	6	6	5	#	14	2	12	11	1
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	17	5	12	10	1	21	5	16	14	2
Arkansas	12	5	6	5	1	15	5	10	9	2
California	23	4	19	17	2	26	4	23	21	2
Colorado	14	4	10	7	3	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	15	6	9	7	3	17	4	12	6	6
Delaware	14	2	13	10	2	15	6	9	2	6
Florida	17	5	12	9	3	21	6	15	8	8
Georgia	12	4	8	5	3	13	4	8	5	3
Hawaii	15	5	10	7	3	20	5	15	10	5
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	10	8	2
Illinois	12	4	8	6	3	16	4	13	7	6
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	11	7	3
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	12	4	8	6	2	16	5	11	6	5
Kentucky	10	3	6	4	3	12	7	5	4	1
Louisiana	14	5	9	4	5	16	10	6	3	3
Maine	14	5	9	6	3	17	4	13	8	6
Maryland	12	3	9	3	5	15	4	10	8	2
Massachusetts	17	4	12	8	5	20	6	14	6	8
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	13	7	6	4	2
Minnesota	13	1	12	9	3	15	3	12	9	3
Mississippi	11	6	5	4	1	10	5	5	3	1
Missouri	13	4	9	6	3	15	8	8	4	4
Montana	11	4	8	6	1	13	4	9	7	2
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	17	7	10	7	2

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Nevada	15	6	9	8	2	20	6	14	12	2
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	22	8	14	10	4	31	8	23	17	5
New York	16	8	8	3	5	20	9	11	4	7
North Carolina	14	6	8	3	5	18	9	9	3	6
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	15	4	11	8	2
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	12	7	5	4	1
Oklahoma	13	9	4	4	1	17	4	13	10	4
Oregon	14	4	10	6	4	18	5	13	10	3
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	15	3	12	4	8
Rhode Island	16	6	10	9	1	20	5	15	8	7
South Carolina	12	5	7	5	1	14	5	9	6	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	14	6	8	7	1	13	3	9	9	1
Texas	19	5	13	11	3	20	8	12	11	1
Utah	11	4	7	6	2	15	4	11	9	2
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	18	5	13	8	6
Virginia	13	5	8	4	3	17	8	9	5	4
Washington	13	4	9	6	3	14	4	10	6	5
West Virginia	14	7	7	4	2	16	10	7	4	2
Wisconsin	14	5	9	5	4	16	7	9	4	5
Wyoming	10	2	8	7	1	14	3	11	6	6
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	14	5	9	6	3	21	7	13	5	8
DoDEA ¹	9	1	7	5	2	11	2	9	6	3

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-19

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	19	5	13	8	5	19	5	13	7	6
Alabama	14	3	11	9	2	14	2	12	10	2
Alaska	25	2	23	15	7	25	2	23	14	9
Arizona	25	6	19	15	3	23	4	18	11	8
Arkansas	16	5	11	7	4	15	6	9	5	4
California	29	4	25	22	3	28	3	25	21	4
Colorado	15	3	11	6	6	15	4	12	4	8
Connecticut	16	4	12	5	7	17	3	13	4	9
Delaware	17	9	8	3	5	17	11	6	4	2
Florida	23	6	17	6	12	20	5	15	3	12
Georgia	12	3	9	5	5	14	5	9	4	5
Hawaii	21	5	16	9	7	19	4	15	7	8
Idaho	17	4	13	12	1	15	3	12	9	4
Illinois	17	5	11	5	7	17	5	12	4	8
Indiana	16	4	12	7	5	16	4	12	4	8
Iowa	17	5	12	5	7	17	4	13	6	7
Kansas	16	4	12	3	9	15	4	11	4	7
Kentucky	14	7	7	5	1	13	7	6	3	3
Louisiana	15	6	9	3	6	16	8	8	2	7
Maine	17	5	12	6	6	20	7	13	5	8
Maryland	15	3	12	7	5	13	4	8	4	5
Massachusetts	18	4	14	5	9	20	7	13	3	10
Michigan	13	6	7	4	3	15	6	9	5	4
Minnesota	17	3	14	8	5	17	3	14	8	7
Mississippi	9	5	4	3	1	10	4	6	3	2
Missouri	17	8	8	3	5	16	8	8	3	5
Montana	16	5	11	6	5	17	5	12	5	7
Nebraska	18	5	13	8	4	16	4	13	5	7
Nevada	18	4	14	9	5	22	4	18	12	6

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	19	3	16	6	9	20	2	17	7	10
New Jersey	18	3	15	3	12	18	5	13	3	10
New Mexico	31	8	23	14	9	27	8	20	13	7
New York	19	7	12	3	9	17	6	11	2	9
North Carolina	18	7	11	3	8	18	4	14	3	11
North Dakota	16	4	11	8	4	17	7	10	5	5
Ohio	13	6	7	3	4	14	7	7	2	5
Oklahoma	18	4	14	9	5	19	5	14	7	7
Oregon	20	6	14	11	4	19	4	14	8	6
Pennsylvania	16	2	14	4	10	16	3	13	3	10
Rhode Island	24	4	19	8	12	23	4	19	8	11
South Carolina	15	8	7	4	3	14	7	7	4	3
South Dakota	13	3	9	6	4	13	3	9	5	4
Tennessee	15	3	12	11	1	13	7	6	4	2
Texas	20	8	12	11	1	20	7	13	10	3
Utah	16	3	12	8	4	17	5	13	7	6
Vermont	18	4	13	7	6	20	4	15	7	9
Virginia	17	9	8	4	4	17	7	10	5	4
Washington	16	4	13	9	4	17	4	12	6	6
West Virginia	18	9	9	4	4	18	6	11	7	5
Wisconsin	16	5	11	3	8	17	6	11	3	8
Wyoming	16	2	13	6	8	17	3	14	6	8
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	20	8	12	4	8	19	8	11	3	9
DoDEA ¹	11	2	10	3	6	11	3	9	4	5

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-19

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Vermont	21	5	16	6	10
Virginia	18	8	10	4	5
Washington	16	5	11	5	6
West Virginia	16	2	14	8	6
Wisconsin	18	7	11	3	9
Wyoming	16	4	13	5	8
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	21	13	8	3	5
DoDEA ¹	11	3	7	2	5


— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-20

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	11	3	7	5	2	13	5	8	5	4
Alabama	12	6	6	5	#	14	2	12	11	1
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	9	3	6	4	1	11	4	7	6	2
Arkansas	10	4	6	5	1	13	4	9	7	2
California	8	2	6	5	1	10	2	7	6	2
Colorado	10	3	7	5	2	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	13	5	9	6	3	15	3	11	5	6
Delaware	14	2	12	10	2	14	6	8	2	6
Florida	13	4	9	6	2	16	4	12	6	6
Georgia	10	4	6	4	2	10	3	7	4	3
Hawaii	11	4	7	6	2	15	4	12	7	5
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	11	3	8	6	2
Illinois	9	3	7	4	3	12	3	10	4	6
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	10	7	3
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	9	3	7	5	2	13	4	9	5	4
Kentucky	9	3	6	4	3	12	6	5	4	1
Louisiana	13	5	9	4	5	16	10	6	3	3
Maine	13	5	8	6	3	16	4	12	7	6
Maryland	10	3	8	3	5	13	4	9	7	2
Massachusetts	15	3	11	7	5	17	4	13	5	8
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	11	6	5	3	2
Minnesota	10	1	9	7	2	11	2	9	7	3
Mississippi	10	5	5	4	1	10	5	5	3	1
Missouri	12	3	9	6	3	15	7	7	3	4
Montana	11	4	7	6	1	11	4	8	6	2
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	14	5	9	7	2
Nevada	10	4	6	5	1	13	4	9	7	2

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	15	5	10	6	3	18	7	12	7	5
New York	10	4	6	2	5	15	8	8	2	6
North Carolina	13	5	8	3	5	16	8	8	2	6
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	14	4	10	7	2
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	12	7	5	4	1
Oklahoma	11	8	3	2	1	15	4	11	8	4
Oregon	12	3	9	5	4	13	4	9	7	2
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	14	2	11	4	8
Rhode Island	13	5	9	7	1	16	4	12	5	7
South Carolina	11	5	6	5	1	14	5	9	6	3
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	13	5	8	7	1	12	3	9	8	1
Texas	13	4	9	6	2	14	6	8	7	1
Utah	10	3	6	5	1	10	3	7	5	2
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	17	4	13	7	6
Virginia	12	5	7	4	3	14	7	7	4	4
Washington	10	3	7	4	3	11	3	8	4	4
West Virginia	14	7	6	4	2	16	10	7	4	2
Wisconsin	13	5	9	4	4	14	5	8	3	5
Wyoming	10	2	8	7	1	13	3	10	4	6
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	13	4	8	6	3	16	6	11	4	7
DoDEA ¹	7	1	6	4	2	7	1	6	3	3

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-20

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	14	4	10	5	5	13	4	9	3	6
Alabama	13	2	10	8	2	12	1	11	9	2
Alaska	15	2	13	6	7	12	1	10	3	8
Arizona	12	5	8	5	3	11	3	8	3	5
Arkansas	14	4	10	6	4	14	5	8	5	4
California	11	3	9	7	2	9	2	7	4	3
Colorado	10	2	8	3	5	9	2	7	2	5
Connecticut	14	3	11	5	6	14	2	12	4	8
Delaware	16	8	8	3	5	14	10	5	2	2
Florida	17	4	13	3	10	15	3	12	3	9
Georgia	10	2	8	4	4	12	5	7	3	5
Hawaii	16	3	12	6	6	14	3	11	4	6
Idaho	12	3	9	8	1	11	2	8	5	3
Illinois	14	4	10	4	7	15	4	11	3	8
Indiana	14	3	11	5	5	15	4	11	3	8
Iowa	15	4	11	4	6	15	4	12	5	7
Kansas	13	3	11	3	8	13	4	9	2	7
Kentucky	13	7	6	5	1	12	7	5	2	3
Louisiana	14	5	9	2	6	16	8	8	1	6
Maine	16	5	12	5	6	19	7	13	5	8
Maryland	13	3	11	6	4	12	4	8	3	5
Massachusetts	16	3	13	4	9	18	6	12	2	10
Michigan	12	6	6	3	3	13	6	7	3	4
Minnesota	13	3	10	6	4	12	2	10	4	6
Mississippi	8	5	3	2	1	9	4	5	3	2
Missouri	16	8	8	3	5	16	8	8	3	5
Montana	15	5	10	5	5	13	5	9	3	6
Nebraska	16	4	12	7	4	14	3	11	4	7
Nevada	12	2	10	5	5	12	3	9	4	5

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	18	3	15	6	9	19	2	16	7	10
New Jersey	15	2	13	2	11	16	4	13	3	10
New Mexico	19	5	15	7	8	16	5	10	5	5
New York	15	5	10	2	8	14	5	9	1	8
North Carolina	16	6	10	2	7	15	3	12	2	10
North Dakota	15	4	10	7	4	15	7	9	4	5
Ohio	12	5	7	3	4	13	7	7	2	5
Oklahoma	15	4	11	7	4	15	4	11	5	6
Oregon	14	4	10	7	3	11	3	8	4	4
Pennsylvania	15	2	13	3	10	15	3	12	2	10
Rhode Island	19	3	16	5	11	20	3	17	7	10
South Carolina	15	8	7	4	3	13	7	7	4	3
South Dakota	11	3	7	4	3	11	3	8	4	4
Tennessee	13	2	11	10	1	12	7	5	3	2
Texas	15	7	8	8	1	14	5	8	6	2
Utah	11	2	8	5	4	11	3	7	3	4
Vermont	17	4	13	7	6	19	4	15	6	9
Virginia	14	8	7	3	3	14	6	7	4	4
Washington	13	3	10	7	3	12	3	8	3	5
West Virginia	18	9	9	4	4	17	6	11	6	5
Wisconsin	14	5	10	2	8	14	4	9	2	7
Wyoming	14	2	12	4	8	14	3	11	3	8
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	16	6	10	3	7	16	6	10	2	8
DoDEA ¹	8	1	7	1	6	8	2	6	2	5

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-20

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Vermont	20	5	14	5	9
Virginia	14	6	8	2	5
Washington	11	4	7	2	5
West Virginia	15	2	13	7	6
Wisconsin	14	6	9	2	7
Wyoming	14	3	10	3	7
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	18	12	6	2	4
DoDEA ¹	7	2	5	1	5

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-21

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007

State/jurisdiction	1998					2002				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	3	1	2	2	#	6	2	4	4	1
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona	9	3	7	6	#	13	3	10	10	#
Arkansas	1	1	1	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
California	18	3	14	14	1	20	2	18	17	1
Colorado	5	1	3	3	1	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut	2	1	1	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Delaware	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	#	#
Florida	4	2	3	3	#	7	2	4	2	2
Georgia	2	#	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	#
Hawaii	4	1	3	2	1	7	2	5	4	1
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	3	3	#
Illinois	3	1	2	2	#	5	1	4	3	#
Indiana	—	—	—	—	—	1	#	1	1	#
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kansas	2	1	2	1	#	4	2	2	1	1
Kentucky	1	#	#	#	#	1	1	#	#	#
Louisiana	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Maine	1	#	#	#	#	2	#	1	1	#
Maryland	1	#	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	#
Massachusetts	3	2	1	1	#	5	3	2	1	1
Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	#
Minnesota	3	#	3	2	1	5	1	3	3	#
Mississippi	1	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	1	1	#
Montana	1	#	#	#	#	3	1	2	2	#
Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	1	1	#
Nevada	6	2	4	3	#	9	3	6	6	#

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Mexico	9	4	5	4	1	20	5	15	13	2
New York	6	4	2	1	#	6	3	4	2	2
North Carolina	1	1	#	#	#	3	2	1	1	#
North Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	2	#	2	2	#
Ohio	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	#	#	#
Oklahoma	3	2	1	1	#	4	1	3	3	#
Oregon	3	1	2	1	1	7	2	5	4	1
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	#
Rhode Island	4	2	1	1	#	5	2	3	3	1
South Carolina	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee	1	1	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Texas	7	2	5	5	#	9	3	6	6	#
Utah	2	1	2	1	#	7	2	5	5	1
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	1	1	#	#	#	3	2	2	1	#
Washington	3	1	2	2	#	5	1	3	2	2
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	1	1	#	#	#	3	2	1	1	#
Wyoming	#	#	#	#	#	2	#	2	2	#
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	1	1	1	#	#	5	2	3	1	2
DoDEA ¹	1	1	1	1	#	4	1	3	3	1

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-21

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	6	2	5	4	1	6	1	5	4	1
Alabama	1	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	13	#	12	11	1	14	1	14	12	2
Arizona	17	4	13	12	1	13	2	11	8	3
Arkansas	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
California	21	2	19	18	1	22	2	20	18	2
Colorado	5	2	3	3	1	7	2	5	2	3
Connecticut	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Delaware	3	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	#
Florida	8	2	5	3	2	6	2	3	1	3
Georgia	3	1	2	1	#	2	1	1	1	1
Hawaii	7	2	5	4	2	7	2	5	3	2
Idaho	6	1	5	4	#	5	1	4	4	#
Illinois	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	#
Indiana	2	1	2	2	#	2	#	1	1	1
Iowa	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	#
Kansas	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Kentucky	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	#	1	1	1	#	#
Maine	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Maryland	3	1	2	2	#	1	1	#	#	#
Massachusetts	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Michigan	2	1	1	1	#	2	1	2	2	#
Minnesota	5	1	4	3	1	6	1	5	4	1
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	#	#	#
Missouri	1	1	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Montana	2	#	2	1	#	4	1	4	3	1
Nebraska	3	2	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Nevada	7	2	5	4	1	11	2	10	8	2
New Hampshire	2	#	1	1	1	1	#	1	1	#
New Jersey	2	1	2	#	1	2	1	1	#	#
New Mexico	19	5	14	10	4	16	4	12	8	3
New York	5	2	3	1	2	5	2	3	1	2
North Carolina	4	2	2	1	1	4	1	3	1	1
North Dakota	2	#	1	1	#	2	#	1	1	#
Ohio	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Oklahoma	5	1	4	3	1	4	1	3	2	1
Oregon	7	3	5	4	1	8	2	6	5	2
Pennsylvania	2	#	2	1	1	1	#	1	#	1
Rhode Island	6	2	4	2	1	4	1	3	1	2
South Carolina	1	#	#	#	#	1	1	1	#	#
South Dakota	3	#	2	2	1	2	#	2	1	#
Tennessee	2	#	2	2	#	2	1	1	1	#
Texas	8	3	5	5	#	8	2	6	5	1
Utah	7	1	6	4	2	8	2	6	4	1
Vermont	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	3	2	2	1	1	4	1	2	2	#
Washington	5	1	3	3	#	6	1	4	3	1
West Virginia	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	3	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1
Wyoming	3	#	3	2	#	4	#	3	3	#
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	5	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	1	1
DoDEA ¹	4	1	4	2	1	4	1	3	2	1

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-21

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners, and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading when accommodations were permitted, by state: Various years, 1998–2007—Continued

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

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Utah	9	1	7	6	1
Vermont	2	#	2	1	#
Virginia	4	2	2	2	#
Washington	6	2	4	3	1
West Virginia	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	5	2	3	1	2
Wyoming	3	1	3	2	1
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	4	2	2	1	1
DoDEA ¹	4	2	2	2	#

— Not available. The jurisdiction did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

¹ Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools). Before 2005, DoDEA overseas and domestic schools were separate jurisdictions in NAEP. Pre-2005 data presented here were recalculated for comparability.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2007 Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-22

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL), and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–2007

SD/ELL category and district	2002					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	21	7	14	10	4	22	6	16	10	5
Large central city (public)	28	8	20	17	4	31	8	22	17	5
Atlanta	8	2	6	5	1	9	2	7	5	3
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	33	9	24	12	11
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	21	5	16	6	11
Chicago	30	9	21	16	5	31	9	22	16	6
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	18	12	6	2	3
District of Columbia	19	8	11	5	5	18	6	12	3	9
Houston	43	17	26	25	1	42	24	19	18	1
Los Angeles	51	8	43	41	2	59	6	53	49	5
New York City	22	8	14	6	8	21	6	15	3	12
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	42	5	37	33	4
SD										
Nation (public)	13	5	8	4	4	14	5	9	4	5
Large central city (public)	12	5	7	4	3	13	5	8	4	5
Atlanta	5	1	4	3	1	8	2	6	4	3
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	19	4	15	5	10
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	16	4	13	4	8
Chicago	16	4	12	8	4	15	6	9	4	5
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	15	11	4	2	3
District of Columbia	14	7	7	3	4	13	5	8	2	6
Houston	12	4	8	7	1	18	9	9	8	1
Los Angeles	11	3	8	5	2	12	3	9	5	4
New York City	14	5	9	3	6	13	2	11	1	10
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	13	3	10	8	2

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

ELL										
Nation (public)	9	2	7	6	1	10	2	8	7	1
Large central city (public)	19	5	15	13	1	21	5	16	14	2
Atlanta	4	1	3	3	#	2	1	2	1	1
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	18	6	12	9	3
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	10	3	7	2	4
Chicago	19	7	12	9	2	21	6	15	13	1
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	2	1	1
District of Columbia	7	3	4	3	2	7	1	6	2	4
Houston	36	16	20	20	#	33	20	14	14	#
Los Angeles	46	6	40	38	1	56	5	50	47	3
New York City	11	6	6	3	3	11	5	6	2	3
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	35	4	31	29	2

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-22

Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL), and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–2007—Continued

SD/ELL category and district	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	23	7	16	10	7	23	6	17	10	7
Large central city (public)	32	8	24	17	7	32	7	25	17	8
Atlanta	11	4	8	3	5	12	7	5	4	1
Austin	37	20	18	14	4	42	20	22	18	4
Boston	35	10	24	11	13	45	8	36	23	13
Charlotte	21	4	16	6	10	22	4	18	7	11
Chicago	29	9	21	15	6	30	7	23	16	7
Cleveland	19	12	7	3	4	23	17	6	1	5
District of Columbia	20	7	12	3	9	22	14	8	2	7
Houston	44	23	21	19	2	45	17	28	25	3
Los Angeles	59	6	54	49	5	53	3	50	43	7
New York City	24	6	17	2	16	29	5	24	2	22
San Diego	46	6	40	34	6	49	4	45	38	6
SD										
Nation (public)	14	5	9	4	5	14	5	9	3	6
Large central city (public)	13	5	8	3	5	13	5	8	3	5
Atlanta	10	3	7	2	5	10	6	5	3	1
Austin	15	9	6	3	3	14	8	6	2	4
Boston	24	9	15	3	12	21	7	15	3	12
Charlotte	13	3	10	2	7	12	3	10	3	7
Chicago	14	5	9	4	5	12	4	8	4	5
Cleveland	16	12	4	1	3	18	15	3	#	3
District of Columbia	15	7	9	2	7	15	11	4	1	3
Houston	12	7	5	3	2	11	6	5	3	2
Los Angeles	9	2	6	2	4	11	2	8	3	5
New York City	14	3	11	1	10	15	3	12	1	11
San Diego	13	3	11	5	5	14	3	11	5	6
ELL										

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Nation (public)	11	2	8	7	2	11	2	9	7	2
Large central city (public)	22	4	17	14	3	22	4	18	14	4
Atlanta	1	1	1	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Austin	27	14	12	12	#	32	14	17	16	1
Boston	14	4	10	8	2	29	4	24	21	3
Charlotte	9	2	7	4	3	11	2	9	4	5
Chicago	17	4	13	11	1	21	4	16	13	3
Cleveland	5	2	3	2	1	7	3	3	1	2
District of Columbia	6	1	4	2	3	9	4	5	1	4
Houston	36	19	17	16	1	37	13	24	23	1
Los Angeles	56	5	51	48	4	48	2	46	41	5
New York City	12	5	8	1	7	18	3	14	1	13
San Diego	36	4	33	30	2	42	3	40	36	3

— Not available. The district did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. As of 2005, "large central city" includes nationally representative public schools located in large central cities (population of 250,000 or more) within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2002–2007 Trial Urban District Reading Assessments.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-23

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL), and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–2007

SD/ELL category and district	2002					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	18	6	12	8	4	19	5	13	8	5
Large central city (public)	23	6	17	14	4	24	6	17	12	5
Atlanta	6	2	4	3	1	12	4	8	5	4
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	31	9	21	11	11
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	16	4	12	4	7
Chicago	21	6	15	9	7	21	7	13	8	6
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	24	15	9	2	7
District of Columbia	21	7	13	5	8	20	8	12	4	8
Houston	27	7	19	19	#	27	10	17	16	#
Los Angeles	35	5	29	27	2	37	4	33	28	5
New York City	24	9	15	7	8	22	5	17	4	12
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	29	3	26	22	3
SD										
Nation (public)	13	5	8	5	4	14	4	10	5	5
Large central city (public)	13	4	9	6	3	14	4	10	5	5
Atlanta	5	1	4	3	1	11	3	8	4	3
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	20	5	16	6	9
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	13	3	9	3	7
Chicago	15	3	12	6	6	16	5	11	5	6
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	20	12	8	2	6
District of Columbia	16	6	11	4	7	16	6	10	3	7
Houston	15	5	10	10	#	18	7	11	11	#
Los Angeles	12	3	10	7	2	13	3	10	5	5
New York City	14	6	8	3	5	14	2	12	2	10
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	11	1	9	7	3

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

ELL										
Nation (public)	6	2	4	4	1	6	2	5	4	1
Large central city (public)	13	3	10	9	1	13	3	10	8	2
Atlanta	1	#	1	1	#	2	1	1	1	#
Austin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boston	—	—	—	—	—	15	7	8	5	3
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	6	1	5	3	2
Chicago	8	4	4	3	1	7	3	4	3	1
Cleveland	—	—	—	—	—	6	5	1	#	1
District of Columbia	5	2	3	1	2	5	2	3	2	1
Houston	16	4	12	12	#	16	6	10	10	#
Los Angeles	30	5	25	24	1	33	3	30	26	3
New York City	13	5	8	4	4	11	4	7	3	4
San Diego	—	—	—	—	—	21	2	19	18	1

See notes at end of table.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-23

Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL), and percentage excluded and assessed in NAEP reading, by SD/ELL category and urban district: Various years, 2002–2007—Continued

SD/ELL category and district	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	19	5	13	7	6	19	5	13	7	7
Large central city (public)	23	5	18	12	7	24	6	18	10	8
Atlanta	11	4	8	3	5	13	8	5	3	3
Austin	27	12	15	13	2	29	7	22	17	5
Boston	24	6	18	8	10	28	8	20	7	13
Charlotte	18	3	15	6	9	19	5	14	5	9
Chicago	21	5	16	6	10	23	6	17	4	13
Cleveland	21	14	7	3	4	24	16	8	2	6
District of Columbia	19	8	11	3	9	21	13	8	3	5
Houston	24	7	16	13	3	23	9	14	10	4
Los Angeles	40	5	35	31	4	35	4	32	27	5
New York City	18	5	13	2	11	23	4	19	2	17
San Diego	31	7	24	18	6	29	4	25	19	6
SD										
Nation (public)	13	4	9	3	6	13	5	9	3	6
Large central city (public)	12	4	9	3	5	13	4	9	3	6
Atlanta	10	3	7	2	5	12	7	4	2	2
Austin	15	8	7	5	2	17	5	12	7	5
Boston	17	5	12	3	9	21	6	15	2	12
Charlotte	11	1	9	2	7	11	2	9	2	7
Chicago	16	3	13	4	10	19	4	14	2	12
Cleveland	18	12	6	2	4	20	15	5	1	4
District of Columbia	16	6	10	2	8	18	12	6	2	4
Houston	13	5	8	6	2	13	6	7	3	4
Los Angeles	12	3	9	5	3	11	2	9	4	5
New York City	10	2	8	1	8	15	1	13	1	12
San Diego	12	4	9	5	4	12	3	8	4	5
ELL										

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Nation (public)	6	1	5	4	1	7	2	5	4	1
Large central city (public)	13	2	11	9	2	13	3	10	8	2
Atlanta	1	#	1	1	#	3	2	1	1	#
Austin	16	6	10	9	1	15	3	12	11	1
Boston	9	3	6	5	1	11	4	7	5	2
Charlotte	8	1	7	4	2	9	3	6	3	2
Chicago	6	2	3	2	1	7	3	4	2	1
Cleveland	4	3	1	1	1	5	2	3	1	2
District of Columbia	3	2	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1
Houston	14	4	10	9	1	13	4	8	7	1
Los Angeles	35	3	31	29	2	30	3	27	25	3
New York City	10	4	6	2	4	10	3	7	1	6
San Diego	24	5	18	15	4	21	2	20	17	3

— Not available. The district did not participate or did not meet the minimum participation guidelines for reporting.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Students identified as both SD and ELL were counted only once under the combined SD and/or ELL category, but were counted separately under the SD and ELL categories. As of 2005, "large central city" includes nationally representative public schools located in large central cities (population of 250,000 or more) within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2002–2007 Trial Urban District Reading Assessments.



Data Analysis and IRT Scaling

After the professional scoring, all information was transcribed into the NAEP database at ETS. Each processing activity was conducted with rigorous quality control. After the assessment information was compiled in the database, the data were weighted according to the population structure. The weighting for the national and state samples reflected the probability of selection for each student as a result of the sampling design, adjusted for nonresponse.ⁱ

Analyses were then conducted to determine the percentages of students who gave various responses to each cognitive and background question. In determining these percentages for the cognitive questions, a distinction was made between missing responses at the end of a block (i.e., missing responses after the last question the student answered) and missing responses before the last observed response. Missing responses before the last observed response were considered intentional omissions. In analysis, omitted responses to multiple-choice items were scored as fractionally correct.ⁱⁱ Omitted responses for constructed-response items were placed into the lowest score category. Missing responses after the last observed response were considered “not reached” and treated as if the questions had not been presented to the student. In calculating response percentages for each question, only students classified as having been presented the question were included in the denominator of the statistic.

It is standard NAEP practice to treat all nonrespondents to the last question in a block as if they had not reached the question. For multiple-choice and short constructed-response questions, this practice produces a reasonable pattern of results in that the proportion reaching the last question is not dramatically smaller than the proportion reaching the next-to-last question. However, for reading blocks that ended with extended constructed-response questions, there may be extremely large drops in the proportion of students attempting some of the final questions. Therefore, for blocks ending with an extended constructed-response question, students who answered the next-to-last question, but did not respond to the extended constructed-response question, were classified as having intentionally omitted the last question.

Item Response Theory (IRT) was used to estimate average reading scale scores for the nation and for various student groups of interest within the nation. IRT models the probability of answering a question in a certain way as a mathematical function of proficiency or skill. The main purpose of IRT analysis is to provide a common scale on which performance can be compared among groups, such as those defined by characteristics including gender and race/ethnicity, even when students receive different blocks of items. One desirable feature of IRT is that it locates items and students on this common scale. In contrast to classical test theory, IRT does not rely

solely on the total number of correct item responses, but uses the particular patterns of student responses to items in determining the student location on the scale. As a result, adding items that function at a particular point on the scale to the assessment does not change the location of the students on the scale, even though students may respond correctly to more items. It does increase the relative precision with which students are measured, particularly those students whose scale locations are close to the additional items.

The results for 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007 are presented on the NAEP composite reading scale developed in 1992. For the NAEP 1992 reading assessment, a scale ranging from 0 to 500 was created to report performance for each reading context: literary and informative at grade 4; and literary, informative, and task-oriented at grade 8. The scales summarize student performance across all three types of questions in the assessment (multiple-choice, short constructed-response, and extended constructed-response). Results from subsequent reading assessments (1994, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007) are reported on these scales.

Each reading scale was initially based on the distribution of student performance across all three grades in the 1992 national assessment (grades 4, 8, and 12) and had an average of 250 and a standard deviation of 50. The composite scale was created as an overall measure of students' reading performance. This composite scale is a weighted average of the three separate scales for the reading contexts (two at grade 4). The weight for each reading context is proportional to the relative importance assigned to the reading context by the specifications developed through the consensus planning process and given in the framework.

In producing these content-area scales, three distinct IRT models were used. Multiple-choice questions were scaled using the three-parameter logistic (3PL) model; short constructed-response questions rated as acceptable or unacceptable were scaled using the two-parameter logistic (2PL) model; and short constructed-response questions rated according to a three-level guide, as well as extended constructed-response questions rated on a four-level guide, were scaled using a Generalized Partial-Credit (GPC) model.ⁱⁱⁱ Developed by ETS and first used in 1992, the GPC model permits the scaling of questions scored according to multipoint rating schemes. The model takes full advantage of the information available from each of the student response categories used for these more complex constructed-response questions.^{iv}

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

*Reading is to the mind
what exercise is to the body.*

~ Joseph Addison ~

Drawing Inferences from the Results

The reported statistics are estimates and are therefore subject to a measure of uncertainty. There are two sources of such uncertainty. First, NAEP uses a sample of students rather than testing all students. Second, all assessments have some amount of uncertainty because they cannot ask all the questions that might be asked in a content area. The magnitude of this uncertainty is reflected in the standard error of each of the estimates. When the percentages or average scale scores of certain groups are compared, the estimated standard error should be taken into account. Therefore, the comparisons are based on statistical tests that consider the estimated standard errors of those statistics and the magnitude of the difference among the averages or percentages.

For the data in this report, all the estimates have corresponding estimated standard errors of the estimates. For example, tables A-25 and A-26 show the average national scale score for the NAEP 1992–2005 national assessments and the percentage of students within each achievement-level range and at or above achievement levels. In both tables, estimated standard errors appear in parentheses next to each estimated scale score or percentage. For the estimated standard errors corresponding to other data in this report, the reader can go to the NAEP Data Explorer tool on the NCES website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata>.

Using confidence intervals based on the standard errors provides a way to take into account the uncertainty associated with sample estimates and to make inferences about the population averages and percentages in a manner that reflects that uncertainty. An estimated sample average scale score plus or minus 1.96 standard errors approximates a 95 percent confidence interval for the corresponding population quantity. This statement means that one can conclude with an approximately 95 percent level of confidence that the average performance of the entire population of interest (e.g., all fourth-grade students in public and nonpublic schools) is within plus or minus 1.96 standard errors of the sample average.

For example, suppose that the average reading scale score of the students in a particular group was 256 with an estimated standard error of 1.2. An approximately 95 percent confidence interval for the population quantity would be as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Average} \pm 1.96 \text{ standard errors} \\ & = 256 \pm 1.96 \times 1.2 \\ & = 256 \pm 2.4 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the 95% confidence interval is bounded by: (253.6, 258.4).

Thus, one can conclude with a 95 percent level of confidence that the average scale score for the entire population of students in that group is between 253.6 and 258.4. It should be noted that this example and the examples in the following sections are illustrative. More precise estimates carried out to one or more decimal places are used in the actual analyses.

Similar symmetric confidence intervals can be constructed for percentages, if the percentages are not extremely large or small. For extreme percentages, a symmetric interval based on a normal distribution is not appropriate, and the common standard error calculation is possibly problematic. Standard errors of extreme percentages should be interpreted with caution.



NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Table A-25

Average scale scores and standard errors for public and nonpublic school students in NAEP reading, by grade: Various years, 1992–2007

Grade	Accommodations not permitted			Accommodations permitted					
	1992	1994	1998	1998	2000	2002	2003	2005	2007
Grade 4	217 (0.9) *	214 (1.0) *	217 (0.8) *	215 (1.1) *	213 (1.3) *	219 (0.4) *	218 (0.3) *	219 (0.2) *	221 (0.3)
Grade 8	260 (0.9) *	260 (0.8) *	264 (0.8)	263 (0.8)	—	264 (0.4) *	263 (0.3)	262 (0.2) *	263 (0.2)

— Not available. Data were not collected at grade 8 in 2000.

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2007.

NOTE: Standard errors of the estimated scale scores appear in parentheses. Beginning in 2002, NAEP reading sample sizes have increased compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2007 Reading Assessments.

Table A-26

Percentage of public and nonpublic school students and standard errors in NAEP reading, by achievement-level performance, grade, and assessment year: Various years, 1992–2007

Grade and year	Below <i>Basic</i>	At <i>Basic</i>	At <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>
Grade 4						
Accommodations not permitted						
1992	38 (1.1) *	34 (0.9)	22 (0.9) *	6 (0.6) *	62 (1.1) *	29 (1.2) *
1994	40 (1.0) *	31 (0.7) *	22 (0.8) *	7 (0.7)	60 (1.0) *	30 (1.1) *
1998	38 (0.9) *	32 (0.7) *	24 (0.7) *	7 (0.5)	62 (0.9) *	31 (0.9) *
Accommodations permitted						
1998	40 (1.2) *	30 (0.8) *	22 (0.8) *	7 (0.5)	60 (1.2) *	29 (0.9) *
2000	41 (1.4) *	30 (1.1) *	23 (1.0) *	7 (0.6)	59 (1.4) *	29 (1.1) *
2002	36 (0.5) *	32 (0.3) *	24 (0.3) *	7 (0.2) *	64 (0.5) *	31 (0.4) *
2003	37 (0.3) *	32 (0.2) *	24 (0.3) *	8 (0.1)	63 (0.3) *	31 (0.3) *
2005	36 (0.3) *	33 (0.2) *	24 (0.2) *	8 (0.1)	64 (0.3) *	31 (0.2) *
2007	33 (0.3)	34 (0.2)	25 (0.2)	8 (0.2)	67 (0.3)	33 (0.3)
Grade 8						
Accommodations not permitted						
1992	31 (1.0) *	40 (0.7) *	26 (1.0) *	3 (0.3)	69 (1.0) *	29 (1.1)
1994	30 (0.9) *	40 (0.7) *	27 (0.8) *	3 (0.3)	70 (0.9) *	30 (0.9)
1998	26 (0.9)	41 (0.8) *	31 (0.9) *	3 (0.4)	74 (0.9)	33 (0.9) *

NAEP 2007 Reading Report in New Hampshire

Accommodations permitted						
1998	27 (0.8)	41 (0.9)	30 (0.9)	3 (0.3)	73 (0.8)	32 (1.1)
2002	25 (0.5) *	43 (0.4)	30 (0.5) *	3 (0.2)	75 (0.5) *	33 (0.5) *
2003	26 (0.3)	42 (0.2) *	29 (0.2)	3 (0.1) *	74 (0.3)	32 (0.3) *
2005	27 (0.2) *	42 (0.2) *	28 (0.2) *	3 (0.1)	73 (0.2) *	31 (0.2)
2007	26 (0.2)	43 (0.2)	28 (0.2)	3 (0.1)	74 (0.2)	31 (0.2)

* Significantly different ($p < .05$) from 2007.

NOTE: Standard errors of the estimated percentages appear in parentheses. Beginning in 2002, NAEP reading sample sizes have increased compared to previous years, resulting in smaller detectable differences than in previous assessments. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2007 Reading Assessments.



Cautions in Interpretations

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

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

ⁱ Weighting procedures are described more fully in the "Weighting and Variance Estimation" section in this document.

ⁱⁱ Lord, F.M. (1980). *Applications of Item Response Theory to Practical Testing Problems*, (p. 229). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

ⁱⁱⁱ Muraki, E. (1992). A Generalized Partial Credit Model: Application of an EM Algorithm. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 16(2): 159–176.

^{iv} More detailed information regarding the IRT analyses used in NAEP will be included in the technical documentation section of the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard>).

^v Mislevy, R.J. and Sheehan, K.M. (1987). Marginal Estimation Procedures. In A.E. Beaton (Ed.), *Implementing the New Design: The NAEP 1983–1984 Technical Report* (Technical Rep. No. 15-TR-20), pp. 293–260. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

^{vi} For theoretical and empirical justification of the procedures employed, see Mislevy, R.J. (1988). Randomization-Based Inferences About Latent Variables From Complex Samples. *Psychometrika*, 56(2): 177–196.

Where to Find More Information

The NAEP Reading Assessment The latest news about the NAEP 2007 reading assessment and the national results can be found on the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results/>. The individual snapshot reports for each participating state and other jurisdictions are also available in the state results section of the website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/>.

The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2007 may be ordered or downloaded from the NAEP website.

The *Reading Framework for the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress*, on which this assessment is based, is available at the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) website (http://www.nagb.org/pubs/r_framework_05/761507-ReadingFramework.pdf).

Additional Results from the Reading Assessment

For more findings from the 2007 reading assessments, refer to the NAEP 2007 results at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>. The interactive database at this site includes student, teacher, and school variables for all participating states and other jurisdictions, the nation, and the four regions. Data tables are also available for each jurisdiction, with all background questions cross-tabulated with the major demographic variables. Users can design and create tables and can perform tests of statistical significance at this website.

Technical Documentation

For explanations of NAEP survey procedures, see: Allen, N.L., Donoghue, J.R., and Schoeps, T.L. (2001). *The NAEP 1998 Technical Report*. (NCES 2001–509). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics. Technical information may also be found on the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/>.

Publications on the inclusion of students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students

Olson, J.F., and Goldstein, A.A. (1997). *The Inclusion of Students With Disabilities and Limited-English-Proficient Students in Large-Scale Assessments: A Summary of Recent Progress* (NCES 97–482). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.

Mazzeo, J., Carlson, J.E., Voelkl, K.E., and Lutkus, A.D. (2000). *Increasing the Participation of Special-Needs Students in NAEP: A Report on 1996 Research Activities* (NCES 2000–473). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.

Lutkus, A.D., and Mazzeo, J. (2003). *Including Special-Needs Students in the NAEP 1998 Reading Assessment, Part I: Comparison of Overall Results With and Without Accommodations* (NCES 2003–467). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.

Lutkus, A.D. (2004). *Including Special-Needs Students in the NAEP 1998 Reading Assessment, Part II: Results for Students With Disabilities and Limited-English-Proficient Students* (ETS-NAEP 04-R01). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

To Order Publications

Recent NAEP publications related to reading are listed on the reading page of the NAEP website and are available electronically. Publications can also be ordered from:

Education Publications Center (ED Pubs)
U.S. Department of Education
P.O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 20794–1398

Call toll free: 1-877-4ED Pubs (1-877-433-7827)
TTY/TDD: 1-877-576-7734
FAX: 1-301-470-1244

<p>The NAEP State Report Generator was developed for the NAEP 2007 reports by Phillip Leung, Anthony Lutkus, Paul Gazzillo, Mike Narcowich, Ming Kuang, Jan Lukas, and Linda Myers.</p>

What is the Nation's Report Card™?

The Nation's Report Card informs the public about the academic achievement of elementary and secondary students in the United States. Report cards communicate the findings of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the only continuing and nationally representative measure of achievement in various subjects over time. *The Nation's Report Card* compares performance among states, urban districts, public and private schools, and student demographic groups.

For over three decades, NAEP assessments have been conducted periodically in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography, and other subjects. By making objective information available on student performance 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 and relevant variables is collected. The privacy of individual students is protected, and the identities of participating schools are not released.

NAEP is a congressionally authorized project of the National Center for Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. By law, the Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible for carrying out the NAEP project. The National Assessment Governing Board oversees and sets policy for NAEP. The Governing Board is an independent, bipartisan group whose members include governors, state legislators, local and state officials, educators, business representatives and members of the general public. The Governing Board's mission is, "to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation."

The National Assessment Governing Board

Darvin M. Winick, Chair
President
Winick & Associates
Austin, Texas

Amanda P. Avallone, Vice Chair
Assistant Principal and Eighth-Grade Teacher
Summit Middle School
Boulder, Colorado

Francie Alexander
Chief Academic Officer
Scholastic, Inc.
Senior Vice President
Scholastic Education
New York, New York

David J. Alukonis
Chairman
Hudson School Board
Hudson, New Hampshire

Barbara Byrd-Bennett
Executive Superintendent-in-Residence
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

Gregory Cizek
Professor of Educational Measurement
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Shirley V. Dickson
Educational Consultant
Aliso Viejo, California

Honorable David P. Driscoll
Former Commissioner of Education
Massachusetts Department of Education
Malden, Massachusetts

John Q. Easton
Executive Director
Consortium on Chicago School Research
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Alan J. Friedman
Consultant
Museum Development and Science Communication
New York, New York

David W. Gordon
County Superintendent of Schools
Sacramento County Office of Education
Sacramento, California

Robin C. Hall
Principal
Beecher Hills Elementary School
Atlanta, Georgia

Kathi M. King
Twelfth-Grade Teacher
Messalonskee High School
Oakland, Maine

Honorable Keith King
Former Member
Colorado House of Representatives
Denver, Colorado

Kim Kozbial-Hess
Fourth-Grade Teacher
Hawkins Elementary School
Toledo, Ohio

James S. Lanich
President
California Business for Education Excellence
Sacramento, California

Honorable Cynthia L. Nava
Senator
New Mexico State Senate
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Andrew C. Porter
Dean
Graduate School of Education University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Luis A. Ramos
Community Relations Manager
PPL Susquehanna
Berwick, Pennsylvania

Mary Frances Taymans, SND
Executive Director
Secondary Schools Department National Catholic Educational Association
Washington, D.C.

Oscar A. Troncoso
Principal
Anthony High School
Anthony, Texas

Grover J. Whitehurst (Ex officio)
Director
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Charles E. Smith
Executive Director
National Assessment Governing Board
Washington, D.C.