

UCLA

K-12 Integration and Diversity

Title

Data Proposals Threaten Education and Civil Rights Accountability

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6pn934nm>

Authors

Lee, Chungmei

Orfield, Gary

Publication Date

2006-09-01



Data Proposals Threaten Education and Civil Rights Accountability

By

Chungmei Lee and Gary Orfield

September 2006

Copyright © 2006 by President and Fellows of Harvard College

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from The Civil Rights Project.

This publication should be cited as:

Lee, C. and Orfield, G. (2006). *Data Proposals Threaten Education and Civil Rights Accountability*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from our website at:
<http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank John Yun at the University of California, Santa Barbara and the research team at The Civil Rights Project--Gail Sunderman, Patricia Marin, Stella Flores, and Erica Frankenberg-- for their insightful suggestions and dedicated support in completing this project. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge Lori Kelley who provided editorial review and wonderful technical assistance for the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. Department of Education has proposed sweeping changes in the way we count minority and white students in our schools, changes that would dramatically alter the reported enrollment by race and ethnicity in our states and in many of our educational institutions. The changes are partly in response to a need recognized in the 2000 Census to collect information on students who are biracial or multiracial. However, the Department of Education has proposed changes that are very different from the Census changes and would make it extremely difficult, and sometimes impossible, to conduct meaningful research or monitor civil rights compliance and educational accountability for students by race and ethnicity. The guidelines published August 7, 2006 in the Federal Register, specify the changes by which schools, colleges, and state governments will collect and report individual-level data and aggregate data on race and ethnicity.

Using 2005 data collected by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which has data on students both under the new rule as proposed by the August 7 guidelines as well as the current method of only one race or ethnicity per child, we have been able to examine the impact of the proposed guidelines on the collection of racial and ethnic data compared to the existing method. Our findings show that the proposed changes would suddenly produce vast changes in the apparent racial composition of our educational system, create a large new category that is a grab bag of many forms of multiracial backgrounds, and would very seriously undermine both research and policy analysis work that is essential to understanding racial change and racial inequality as well as to monitor civil rights enforcement. We believe that these proposed changes are not supported by good research and that the goal of including multiracial students in our counts can much better be accomplished with procedures that parallel those devised for the Census. We also find that the policy changes that would rely on fourth graders to respond to complex questions about their race and ethnicity are mistaken and will produce data that is questionable and often meaningless, undermining the valuable data on achievement by racial subgroups that is a valuable result of the No Child Left Behind law. Suddenly schools and their communities would find subgroups growing or shrinking and changing size or even suddenly emerging or disappearing in ways that would be confusing and disruptive to the accountability system

We recommend that these proposed changes be rescinded and that better procedures for accurate counts be devised in collaboration with researchers and community leaders. In addition, we also recommend that the processes for collecting accurate data from children, families and teachers be carefully researched and tested before implementation. We must avoid procedures that cause a serious loss of vital information and accountability for educational institutions and a fundamental undermining of civil rights research and enforcement.

Three relatively simple parts of the new policy create the problems that will be described in the statistics presented in this report:

1. The decision that institutions should report Hispanics in a separate category and not to report them as members of racial groups or multiracial. This breaks with the Census policy that Hispanic is not a racial category but that Hispanics can be of any race or of mixed racial background. The U.S. Census reports millions of Hispanics who see themselves as white, or black or "other." Ending this reporting mechanism will cut down the number of students in those races. Since the Hispanic question is asked first, the proposed system tends to produce large Hispanic counts.
2. The decision that students reporting more than one racial background should only be reported as mixed race without the breakdown of their racial backgrounds. This is in contrast to the U.S. Census policy of reporting the racial combinations of multiracial individuals so that researchers can look at a category, for example, of blacks and black mixed race students or Asians plus those with mixed Asian and Pacific Islander backgrounds. Since "mixed race" does not define any kind of ethnic community, it will be impossible to interpret statistics that will combine unknown groups of students from extremely different backgrounds.
3. The decision that fourth graders should be asked to respond to the question about whether they are Hispanic or not and then to choose from one or more of five racial categories, without any research to show that these questions are intelligible to young children in an extremely wide range of community contexts.

If the proposed guidelines are adopted, it would become the only available source of educational data on race and ethnicity and would make it impossible to compare future patterns and trends with past ones or to know whether various institutions were making progress in educational outcomes by racial and ethnic group. Moreover, the proposed system of accounting is incompatible both with the data that has been collected consistently for the past 40 years for the Office for Civil Rights and with the much more thoughtful way the Census has handled the collection and reporting of multiracial statistics after very extensive work and research with experts across the country. Our findings show that because the proposed system treats Hispanic as a preferential category and precludes counting multiracial students within the various racial categories, the resulting data will exclude from the various racial counts many students who may consider themselves and be seen as "white", "black", "American Indian" or any other race or ethnicity.

The data collected under the proposed guidelines would very seriously undermine both research and policy analysis work that is essential to understanding and successfully dealing with racial change and racial inequality. It would undermine civil rights enforcement. It would make the nation's white enrollment appear to have suddenly dropped substantially and would have a similar impact on the black population and on

American Indian and Asian enrollments in some states. The mixed race category would be an essentially meaningless category for civil rights and research purposes since it would include large and unknown numbers of people who were from two historically underrepresented groups, others from two groups that are not underrepresented, and various other combinations. It would provide, of course, no information on how many of these students were overwhelmingly of one race with some distant connection with another versus those who now have two parents from different races and ethnicities.

The problems with these categories are not only apparent in terms of the huge changes in the number of students in different groups in many states but also that even within the same state there are often very large changes between the 4th and 8th grade, suggesting the categories may not be intelligible for small children. The changes also make it impossible to track achievement and graduation trends within a racial or ethnic category over time within a school, a district or a state. Data tracing trends over time is, of course, a central requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act, essential for judging compliance with various civil rights court orders, and required by the special education law, IDEA. In some states, the change will make it appear that individual racial groups suddenly are performing substantially better or worse on some achievement tests even when nothing has changed about actual test results.

We request a delay in implementing this radical change in policy and believe that full congressional hearings are needed before embarking on changes that will produce a fundamental change in the description of American school and college populations. We see no serious risk in continuing the present method of counting until a full review can take place. We believe that the most appropriate method of implementing an accounting solution that would reflect the growth of multiracial families would be to use the procedures for data collection and reporting adopted by the U.S. Census, subject to serious research and investigation on the issue of the intelligibility of the categories to young children. That research is an obvious prerequisite before any change should be made in counting methods.

INTRODUCTION

On August 7, 2006, the U.S. Department of Education published proposed guidelines in the Federal Register that specify changes in how it will collect and report individual-level data and aggregate data on race and ethnicity. Under these guideline, institutions (including public schools and school districts) will be required to collect data using a two-question format in which respondents will be asked to first specify whether they are Hispanic or non-Hispanic and then choose their race amongst the following 5 categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and White. Respondents will be allowed to choose more than one race.

Before reporting the data to the Department of Education, institutions will be required to aggregate the data in the following 7 categories:

- (1) Hispanics of any race; and, *for Non-Hispanics only*, (italics added)
- (2) American Indian or Alaska Native,
- (3) Asian,
- (4) Black or African American,
- (5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
- (6) White, and
- (7) Two or more races

Under the proposed guidelines, respondents who identify themselves as Hispanic are reported only as Hispanics, regardless of which racial categories they check. Further, if non-Hispanic students choose more than one race, they will be reported as “more than one” race and dropped from the totals of the racial categories they specify. Institutions will not be required to report the breakdown of the races and will only be required to retain those records for as long as is required by the Department, which is usually three years unless otherwise specified.¹

This report, using 2005 data collected by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), shows the impact that these proposed guidelines will have on the reporting of racial and ethnic data and on the achievement levels of subgroups, and discusses the policy and research implications of these changes for the nation. The NAEP reports for 2005 include national and state average reading and math performance outcomes from nationally representative samples of more than 300,000 4th and 8th graders. Because NAEP has been collecting both student records on race/ethnicity data in the same format and with the same aggregation rule as that proposed in the August 7 guidelines as well as collecting school records that report only one race or ethnicity per child since 2003, it is ideally suited for comparisons between the new, proposed system of collecting racial data and the current system now in place. All of our tabulations were

¹ *Federal Register*, Vol. 71, No. 151, Monday, August 7, 2006, pg. 44869.

conducted using the NAEP tool provided on their website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nde/>) and designed for such comparisons.²

IMPACT ON RACIAL COUNTS

This section presents data how the proposed changes affect the reported percentages of public school students in each racial/ethnic category who took the NAEP. Since the proposed changes are likely to affect the number of students in each racial category, it is important to understand how the racial/ethnic reporting categories may change under the proposed rules. Since the NAEP sample is designed to be representative of both the nation and the individual states, these changes give the best available evidence of the likely official student counts if the changes were to be implemented. These findings show marked decreases, on average, in the percentages of white and black test-taking and dramatic increases in the percentages of Hispanic test-taking, both nationally and in many states, although the results vary depending on the state. While there were no changes in the percentages of Asian test-taking at the national level, there were changes in some states. Under the proposed guidelines, the percentage of Native American test-taking would also change significantly in some states. Because the proposed guidelines change the percentages of students in each racial category and do not affect all racial categories in the same way, they have the potential to distort the NAEP scoring profile in each state. If there were similar results on the overall official reports of enrollment there would be many sudden changes in the reported racial composition of schools and colleges and state student populations.

WHITE

Reading, Grade 4³

For public schools nationally, under the proposed reporting system the percentage of white students who took the 4th grade reading test in 2005 would drop 11 percentage points from 57 to 46 percent (see Table 1). When examined state by state, there would be substantial drops in the percentage of students who identify themselves as white under the proposed system with the exceptions of Alaska and District of Columbia, both of which show a one percentage point increase. With the exception of eight states (Georgia, North Carolina, New York, New Jersey, Texas, New Mexico, California, and Hawaii), the percent of white students would drop by at least 10 percentage points if the proposed system had been used to report the data. In addition, since several of the states with smaller percentage drops in white share have very large populations these smaller decreases in white NAEP participation may still have very wide-ranging impacts on student accountability and reporting, both school-by-school and district-by-district. In several states (Colorado, Oklahoma, Alabama, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, and New York), the percent of 4th grade reading

² Numbers for Washington, D.C. and Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) are not included in the state analysis.

³ We crossed checked the results with Math test scores and found small discrepancies between the two subjects in terms of racial categorizations.

NAEP testers who identified themselves as white would have dropped from being majority white to less than 50 percent white.

As marked as these changes are in terms of percentage points decreases, they are even more dramatic relative to the current share of white students who take the NAEP examination. Using the proposed guidelines, the share of white students taking the NAEP dropped by 25 percent in 30 states.⁴ For example, the percent change in white test-taking was greatest in Wyoming where it would drop by 22 percentage points (from 84% to 62%), a 26 percent change in white share. In some states, such as Texas, a seemingly small seven percentage point decrease between the current and the proposed system (from 40% to 33%) represents a drop of 18 percent in the share of white test-taking. In California, a five percentage point difference (from 31% to 26%) represents a 16 percent drop in the share of white test-taking in NAEP and in Hawaii, a 2 percentage point decrease (from 17% to 15%) represents a 12 percent drop in the share of white test-taking in that state. Depending on the size of one racial group relative to the others, slight differences in reporting can result in large percent changes in the proportion of white test-taking. In addition, the large student populations in Texas and California make even small drops in test-taking share important since they represent such large numbers of students changing from one group representation to another.

⁴ The percent change is calculated by subtracting the percentages under the proposed system from the current system and then dividing the difference by the percentages under the current system.

Table 1: Change in Percentage of White Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference	%
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>	(Proposed-Current)	Change
National Public	57	46	-11	-19
Wyoming	84	62	-22	-26
Arkansas	69	51	-18	-26
Montana	85	63	-22	-26
Nevada	47	35	-12	-26
Missouri	76	57	-19	-25
Colorado	64	48	-16	-25
Maine	97	73	-24	-25
West Virginia	93	70	-23	-25
Louisiana	49	37	-12	-24
Idaho	83	63	-20	-24
Oregon	71	54	-17	-24
Kansas	74	57	-17	-23
Ohio	74	57	-17	-23
Michigan	71	55	-16	-23
Washington	71	55	-16	-23
Indiana	76	59	-17	-22
South Carolina	54	42	-12	-22
Vermont	96	75	-21	-22
Arizona	46	36	-10	-22
Oklahoma	61	48	-13	-21
Mississippi	47	37	-10	-21
Nebraska	77	61	-16	-21
Wisconsin	77	61	-16	-21
Utah	82	65	-17	-21
Alabama	58	46	-12	-21
Florida	49	39	-10	-20
Kentucky	85	68	-17	-20
Tennessee	70	56	-14	-20
Minnesota	81	65	-16	-20
Virginia	61	49	-12	-20
New Mexico	31	25	-6	-19
Maryland	52	42	-10	-19
New Hampshire	94	76	-18	-19
Iowa	85	69	-16	-19
DoDEA	48	39	-9	-19
Pennsylvania	75	61	-14	-19
Georgia	49	40	-9	-18
North Dakota	88	72	-16	-18
Illinois	55	45	-10	-18
Rhode Island	72	59	-13	-18
Delaware	56	46	-10	-18

Table 1: Change in Percentage of White Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference	%
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>	(Proposed-Current)	Change
Texas	40	33	-7	-18
Connecticut	69	57	-12	-17
Massachusetts	76	63	-13	-17
South Dakota	84	70	-14	-17
California	31	26	-5	-16
North Carolina	58	49	-9	-16
New York	53	45	-8	-15
New Jersey	58	51	-7	-12
Hawaii	17	15	-2	-12
Alaska	55	56	1	2
District of Columbia	4	5	1	25

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 4th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

Reading, Grade 8

The story for white students on the 8th grade NAEP is similar to the story for 4th grade students, but with slightly smaller reductions in white test-taking share. Nationally, using the proposed guidelines on current data, the percentage of students identified as White taking the 8th grade reading test would drop 9 percentage points from 60 percent to 51 percent (see Table 2). In states such as Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Florida, and Delaware, the share of White student NAEP test-taking drops from a majority of the student body to less than half. The largest decreases are found in Maine and Washington with drops of sixteen percentage points apiece. In 21 states, the percent of white test-taking decreases by at least 10 percentage points. The only state where there are no changes in percent of white students taking the 4th grade reading test between the current and proposed system of racial classification is Alaska.

The percent change in share of NAEP test-taking between the current and proposed system ranges from zero percent in Alaska to 36 percent in Hawaii, where a 5 percentage point decrease represents a 36 percent drop. Other states which show large negative percent changes are mostly western states such as California (27%), New Mexico (27%), Nevada (23%), and Washington (21%). In these five states, the percent of white test taking under the proposed system would result in more than a 20 percent drop. In 43 other states, the proposed guidelines would result in at least a decrease of 10 percent white test-taking share.

Table 2: Change in Percentage of White Students Taking 8th Grade Reading Test, By State 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	60	51	-9	-15
Hawaii	14	9	-5	-36
California	33	24	-9	-27
New Mexico	33	24	-9	-27
Nevada	53	41	-12	-23
Washington	75	59	-16	-21
Texas	42	34	-8	-19
DoDEA	43	35	-8	-19
Colorado	65	53	-12	-18
Florida	51	42	-9	-18
Idaho	87	72	-15	-17
Wyoming	87	72	-15	-17
Oregon	77	64	-13	-17
Maine	96	80	-16	-17
Arizona	49	41	-8	-16
Rhode Island	74	62	-12	-16
Montana	87	73	-14	-16
New York	57	48	-9	-16
Delaware	58	49	-9	-16
Utah	84	71	-13	-15
Ohio	78	66	-12	-15
Michigan	73	62	-11	-15
West Virginia	94	80	-14	-15
Virginia	61	52	-9	-15
New Hampshire	95	81	-14	-15
Missouri	78	67	-11	-14
Maryland	51	44	-7	-14
New Jersey	59	51	-8	-14
Vermont	96	83	-13	-14
Illinois	61	53	-8	-13
Arkansas	69	60	-9	-13
Connecticut	69	60	-9	-13
Kansas	77	67	-10	-13
Massachusetts	77	67	-10	-13
Wisconsin	80	70	-10	-13
South Carolina	58	51	-7	-12
Nebraska	84	74	-10	-12
Pennsylvania	78	69	-9	-12
Louisiana	52	46	-6	-12
Kentucky	88	78	-10	-11
Oklahoma	62	55	-7	-11

Table 2: Change in Percentage of White Students Taking 8th Grade Reading Test, By State 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Indiana	81	72	-9	-11
Minnesota	81	72	-9	-11
Tennessee	75	67	-8	-11
South Dakota	86	77	-9	-10
Mississippi	48	43	-5	-10
Alabama	58	52	-6	-10
Iowa	89	80	-9	-10
North Dakota	89	80	-9	-10
Georgia	52	47	-5	-10
North Carolina	61	56	-5	-8
Alaska	57	57	0	0
District of Columbia	3	3	0	0

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 8th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

BLACK Reading, Grade 4

Nationally, the percentage of black students taking the 4th grade reading test decreases by four percentage points between the current and the proposed system (see Table 3). The largest declines in the percentages of black students taking the NAEP are found in Southern states such as Mississippi, Delaware, and Louisiana, all of which show at least a ten percentage point difference between the two systems. There are eleven states that show no difference between the current and the proposed system. Two states, Hawaii and North Dakota, show a small increase in percent black of two and one percentage points respectively. Many of these states with small or no changes represent locations with very few black students enrolled overall. In addition, the proposed system is most likely to effect states that have significant shares of Hispanic students from diverse backgrounds, and large numbers of multiracial students.⁵

Despite the seemingly small four percentage point decrease in black share between the two systems at the national level, it actually represents a 24 percent drop in black test-taking share. Because of the relatively small proportions of black students in many of these states, some will be more sensitive to changes in the reporting of black share than others. Perhaps the most obvious example of this can be found in Hawaii and North Dakota, where two and one percentage point differences between the two systems result in a 67 and 100 percent increase in black NAEP test-taking share respectively. In Connecticut, Nebraska, and West Virginia, where at least a full third of black students are

⁵ In cases where there are fewer than 63 students within each racial group within a state, data are not reported for the group and scores for the students are not provided, as in the case for states such as Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, etc.

re-classified as another racial/ethnic group, the magnitude of the change is due in part to the relatively small share of black students in these states (13%, 8%, and 6% respectively). Other examples include Colorado, Iowa, and Washington where a one percentage point difference represents a 20 percent change.

Table 3: Change in Percentage of Black Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	17	13	-4	-24
Connecticut	13	8	-5	-38
Nebraska	8	5	-3	-38
West Virginia	6	4	-2	-33
Delaware	32	22	-10	-31
Wisconsin	13	9	-4	-31
Oklahoma	10	7	-3	-30
Pennsylvania	17	12	-5	-29
Missouri	18	13	-5	-28
Michigan	19	14	-5	-26
Maryland	35	26	-9	-26
Arkansas	24	18	-6	-25
Illinois	20	15	-5	-25
New York	20	15	-5	-25
Ohio	20	15	-5	-25
Nevada	12	9	-3	-25
Kansas	8	6	-2	-25
Minnesota	8	6	-2	-25
Rhode Island	8	6	-2	-25
Oregon	4	3	-1	-25
Tennessee	25	19	-6	-24
Virginia	25	19	-6	-24
District of Columbia	85	65	-20	-24
Massachusetts	9	7	-2	-22
Mississippi	51	40	-11	-22
Alabama	38	30	-8	-21
Louisiana	48	38	-10	-21
Colorado	5	4	-1	-20
Iowa	5	4	-1	-20
Washington	5	4	-1	-20
South Carolina	41	33	-8	-20
North Carolina	27	22	-5	-19
Kentucky	11	9	-2	-18
Georgia	39	32	-7	-18
New Jersey	17	14	-3	-18
Florida	23	19	-4	-17
DoDEA	19	16	-3	-16

Table 3: Change in Percentage of Black Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Texas	14	12	-2	-14
Indiana	15	13	-2	-13
California	8	7	-1	-13
Alaska	4	4	0	0
Arizona	5	5	0	0
Idaho	1	1	0	0
Maine	1	1	0	0
Montana	1	1	0	0
New Hampshire	1	1	0	0
New Mexico	3	3	0	0
South Dakota	2	2	0	0
Utah	1	1	0	0
Vermont	1	1	0	0
Wyoming	1	1	0	0
Hawaii	3	5	2	67
North Dakota	1	2	1	100

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 4th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

Reading, Grade 8

Nationally, using the proposed guidelines on current data, the percentage of students identified as black taking the 8th grade reading test would drop 3 percentage points from 17 percent to 14 percent (see Table 4). The largest decreases would be in Delaware (from 32 percent to 24 percent) and Maryland (from 40 percent to 33 percent). Only one state, New Mexico, would show a one percentage point increase in share of black test taking under the proposed guidelines (from 2% to 3%).

As seen earlier, state-by-state variations, however small, in percentage black can result in large percent changes if the black test-taking share is small relative to the entire student population. For example, a one percentage point increase in black percentage in New Mexico represents a 50 percent increase in black share in the state. A two percentage point decrease in Arizona, Nebraska, and Washington between the current and the proposed system represent a 33 percent drop in share of black test-taking; in other words, a full third of black students in these states would be reclassified into another racial category under the proposed guidelines. In another eight states (Delaware, California, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Rhode Island, Iowa, and West Virginia), the share of black students taking the test dropped by 25 percent.

Table 4: Change in Percentage of Black Students Taking the 8th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	17	14	-3	-18
Arizona	6	4	-2	-33
Nebraska	6	4	-2	-33
Washington	6	4	-2	-33
Connecticut	16	11	-5	-31
New Jersey	20	14	-6	-30
Colorado	7	5	-2	-29
DoDEA	22	16	-6	-27
Delaware	32	24	-8	-25
California	8	6	-2	-25
Kansas	8	6	-2	-25
Massachusetts	8	6	-2	-25
Minnesota	8	6	-2	-25
Rhode Island	8	6	-2	-25
Iowa	4	3	-1	-25
West Virginia	4	3	-1	-25
Ohio	17	13	-4	-24
Indiana	13	10	-3	-23
Virginia	27	21	-6	-22
Pennsylvania	15	12	-3	-20
Nevada	10	8	-2	-20
Wisconsin	10	8	-2	-20
Michigan	21	17	-4	-19
Oklahoma	11	9	-2	-18
Maryland	40	33	-7	-18
New York	18	15	-3	-17
District of Columbia	89	76	-13	-15
Texas	15	13	-2	-13
Florida	23	20	-3	-13
Missouri	18	16	-2	-11
Georgia	37	33	-4	-11
Alabama	38	34	-4	-11
South Carolina	38	34	-4	-11
Mississippi	50	45	-5	-10
Illinois	21	19	-2	-10
Louisiana	44	40	-4	-9
Tennessee	22	20	-2	-9
Arkansas	25	23	-2	-8
North Carolina	29	27	-2	-7
Alaska	5	5	0	0
Hawaii	2	2	0	0
Idaho	1	1	0	0

Table 4: Change in Percentage of Black Students Taking the 8th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Kentucky	9	9	0	0
Maine	2	2	0	0
Montana	1	1	0	0
New Hampshire	2	2	0	0
North Dakota	1	1	0	0
Oregon	3	3	0	0
South Dakota	1	1	0	0
Utah	1	1	0	0
Vermont	1	1	0	0
Wyoming	1	1	0	0
New Mexico	2	3	1	50

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 8th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

HISPANIC

Reading, Grade 4

While on average, both white and black students would experience a drop under the proposed guidelines, the national proportion of Hispanic students taking 4th grade reading would increase by 10 percentage points (see Table 5). This is not surprising given the new system of reporting which classifies students under the Hispanic category if the student responds “yes” to the Hispanic origin question regardless of any other racial category they may have checked. The largest increases are found in Montana and Ohio with spikes of 16 percentage points each, followed closely by Michigan, Indiana, and Louisiana at 15 percentage points. Except for Alaska, the percentage of Hispanic test-taking increased in every state and except for six other states (California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Illinois), there is at least a 10 percentage point increase in Hispanic share. In California, the percent of Hispanic students taking the 4th grade NAEP Reading test increased from less than half of the student body (49%) to 52 percent. In no state did the share of Hispanic students drop as a result of the proposed guidelines.

While the percentage point increase in Hispanic students might not be as marked as some of the decreases in white student percentages, the state-by-state percent change in the share of Hispanic test-taking is quite dramatic. In Mississippi, Maine, West Virginia, North Dakota, and Vermont, Hispanic share increased by at least 10 times. In 34 states, the share of Hispanic students at least doubled under the proposed guidelines. Among these states are Massachusetts, Utah, Kansas, and Wyoming where at least a tenth of its student body is Hispanic. Such changes have the potential to distort the NAEP scoring profile in each state.

Table 5: Change in Percentage of Hispanic Students taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	19	29	10	53
Alaska	5	5	0	0
California	49	52	3	6
Texas	43	46	3	7
New Mexico	54	58	4	7
Arizona	40	47	7	18
Nevada	32	42	10	31
Colorado	27	36	9	33
Florida	23	34	11	48
Illinois	21	32	11	52
New Jersey	16	25	9	56
New York	18	29	11	61
Rhode Island	16	26	10	63
Oregon	16	27	11	69
Washington	13	23	10	77
DoDEA	14	25	11	79
Nebraska	12	22	10	83
Connecticut	13	25	12	92
Idaho	13	25	12	92
Massachusetts	10	20	10	100
Utah	12	25	13	108
Kansas	11	24	13	118
Delaware	9	20	11	122
North Carolina	8	18	10	125
Wyoming	11	25	14	127
Maryland	8	20	12	150
District of Columbia	9	23	14	156
Georgia	7	18	11	157
Oklahoma	8	21	13	163
Iowa	6	18	12	200
Virginia	6	18	12	200
Pennsylvania	6	19	13	217
Wisconsin	6	20	14	233
Minnesota	5	18	13	260
Arkansas	5	19	14	280
Michigan	5	20	15	300
Missouri	4	17	13	325
Hawaii	3	14	11	367
South Carolina	3	14	11	367
Tennessee	3	14	11	367
Indiana	4	19	15	375
Kentucky	2	13	11	550

Table 5: Change in Percentage of Hispanic Students taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Alabama	2	14	12	600
New Hampshire	2	14	12	600
South Dakota	2	16	14	700
Louisiana	2	17	15	750
Montana	2	18	16	800
Ohio	2	18	16	800
Vermont	1	12	11	1100
North Dakota	1	14	13	1300
West Virginia	1	15	14	1400
Maine	1	16	15	1500
Mississippi	1	16	15	1500

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 4th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

Reading, Grade 8

Nationally, the percentages of Hispanic students who took the eighth grade NAEP reading test would increase from 17 percentage points under the current system to 24 percentage points under the proposed guidelines (see Table 6). With the exception of Alaska, all states would show a percentage increase in Hispanic test-taking. The largest increases are found in Hawaii (from 3% to 14%), Wyoming (from 7% to 17%), and Montana (from 2% to 12%), each with at least a 10 percentage point increase. In five other states (New Mexico, Nevada, Florida, New York, and Ohio), the percentage of Hispanic test-taking would increase by nine percentage points. In another example, the percentage of students in California identified as Hispanic would increase from 45 percent to 53 percent under the proposed guidelines.

State-by-state, the number of Hispanic students would increase by ten-fold in West Virginia and eight-fold in Maine and North Dakota under the proposed guidelines. In Vermont, Mississippi, and Kentucky, the number of Hispanic students would increase seven-fold. Many states that would experience dramatic increases under the proposed guidelines in fourth grade would also experience similar trends in eighth grade. These dramatic increases in the Hispanic numbers under the proposed guidelines would render longitudinal research extremely difficult.

Table 6: Change in Percentage of Hispanic Students Taking the 8th Grade Reading Test, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	17	24	7	41
Alaska	4	4	0	0
Texas	39	45	6	15
New Mexico	53	62	9	17
California	45	53	8	18
Arizona	37	44	7	19
Nevada	28	37	9	32
Colorado	24	32	8	33
Illinois	14	20	6	43
Florida	21	30	9	43
New York	18	27	9	50
Connecticut	13	20	7	54
New Jersey	14	22	8	57
Rhode Island	14	22	8	57
Massachusetts	10	16	6	60
Utah	10	17	7	70
Oregon	11	19	8	73
Nebraska	8	14	6	75
Kansas	9	16	7	78
North Carolina	5	9	4	80
Idaho	10	18	8	80
Washington	10	18	8	80
DoDEA	13	25	12	92
Georgia	6	12	6	100
Oklahoma	7	14	7	100
Virginia	7	14	7	100
Delaware	7	15	8	114
District of Columbia	6	13	7	117
Wisconsin	6	13	7	117
Pennsylvania	5	11	6	120
Iowa	4	9	5	125
Minnesota	4	9	5	125
Wyoming	7	17	10	143
Arkansas	4	10	6	150
Maryland	4	11	7	175
Indiana	3	9	6	200
Michigan	3	10	7	233
Missouri	3	10	7	233
South Carolina	2	7	5	250
Louisiana	2	8	6	300
New Hampshire	2	8	6	300
Tennessee	2	8	6	300

Table 6: Change in Percentage of Hispanic Students Taking the 8th Grade Reading Test, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Alabama	2	9	7	350
Hawaii	3	14	11	367
South Dakota	2	10	8	400
Ohio	2	11	9	450
Montana	2	12	10	500
Kentucky	1	7	6	600
Mississippi	1	7	6	600
Vermont	1	7	6	600
Maine	1	8	7	700
North Dakota	1	8	7	700
West Virginia	1	10	9	900

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 8th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

ASIAN Reading, Grade 4

Unlike other racial and ethnic groups discussed so far, the national share of Asian students taking 4th grade reading showed no change under the proposed system (see Table 7). The largest declines in percentage of Asian students taking the test are found in Hawaii where it dropped by 10 percentage points (from 65% to 55%). This is likely due to the large number of mixed race population who would be categorized under the mixed race category and therefore excluded from Asian category under the proposed guidelines. Hawaii is one of thirteen states that show a drop in percentage of Asian test-taking; 24 other states show no change and in 12 states, there is a one percentage point increase in Asian share.

Despite these seemingly small differences in Asian share between the two systems, the percent change in NAEP test-taking between the current and proposed systems is quite marked in some states. For example, a one percentage point decrease in Delaware and Michigan represents a 33 percent drop in Asian share in those states. There are six other states (Minnesota, Massachusetts, Maryland, Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York) where the share of Asian test-taking drops by at least twenty percent. In Virginia, Nevada, Washington, and California, a one percentage point decrease represents at least a 10 percent drop in Asian share. Further, the number of Asian students would double in eight states (Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Tennessee) using the proposed guidelines. In another three states, Arizona, Florida, and Kansas, a one percentage point difference would represent a positive increase of 50 percent in the share of Asian test-taking.

Table 7: Change in Percentage of Asian Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	4	4	0	0
Delaware	3	2	-1	-33
Michigan	3	2	-1	-33
New York	7	5	-2	-29
New Jersey	8	6	-2	-25
Connecticut	4	3	-1	-25
Maryland	5	4	-1	-20
Massachusetts	5	4	-1	-20
Minnesota	5	4	-1	-20
Virginia	6	5	-1	-17
Hawaii	65	55	-10	-15
Nevada	8	7	-1	-13
Washington	8	7	-1	-13
California	10	9	-1	-10
Alabama	1	1	0	0
Alaska	7	7	0	0
Arkansas	1	1	0	0
Colorado	3	3	0	0
District of Columbia	2	2	0	0
Georgia	3	3	0	0
Illinois	3	3	0	0
Indiana	1	1	0	0
Iowa	2	2	0	0
Kentucky	1	1	0	0
Maine	1	1	0	0
Mississippi	1	1	0	0
Missouri	2	2	0	0
Nebraska	2	2	0	0
New Hampshire	2	2	0	0
North Carolina	3	3	0	0
North Dakota	1	1	0	0
Oregon	5	5	0	0
Pennsylvania	3	3	0	0
Rhode Island	3	3	0	0
South Dakota	1	1	0	0
Texas	3	3	0	0
Vermont	2	2	0	0
Wisconsin	3	3	0	0
Wyoming	1	1	0	0
DoDEA	7	8	1	14
Utah	3	4	1	33
Arizona	2	3	1	50

Table 7: Change in Percentage of Asian Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Florida	2	3	1	50
Kansas	2	3	1	50
Idaho	1	2	1	100
Louisiana	1	2	1	100
Montana	1	2	1	100
New Mexico	1	2	1	100
Ohio	1	2	1	100
Oklahoma	1	2	1	100
South Carolina	1	2	1	100
Tennessee	1	2	1	100
West Virginia	#	1	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 4th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

Reading, Grade 8

The story for Asian students on the 8th grade NAEP is similar to the story for 4th grade students. The percentages of Asians who took the 8th grade reading test would remain largely unchanged at the national level under the proposed guidelines (see Table 8). The proportion of Asian test-taking drops in two states, Hawaii and California; in Hawaii, the proportion of Asian test-taking drops by six percentage points (from 68% to 62%) and by one percentage point in California (12% to 11%). With the exception of nine other states (New Jersey, Utah, Michigan, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Ohio) where the percentage of Asian test-taking would increase by one percentage point using the proposed guidelines, it would remain unchanged.

State-by-state, these percentage point differences between the current and the proposed system would result in marked percent changes. In six states (Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Ohio) the number of Asian students taking the test would double under the proposed guidelines. In Michigan, a one percentage point increase represents a 50 percent increase in the share of Asian test taking. In California and Hawaii, where there is almost a 10 percent drop in Asian share under the proposed guidelines, one would expect very wide-ranging impacts on student accountability and reporting in these states, given the large Asian population in these states.

Table 8: Change in Percent of Asian Students taking the 8th Grade Reading Test by Grade, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	4	4	0	0
DoDEA	10	9	-1	-10
Hawaii	68	62	-6	-9
California	12	11	-1	-8
Alabama	1	1	0	0
Alaska	7	7	0	0
Arizona	2	2	0	0
Arkansas	1	1	0	0
Colorado	3	3	0	0
Connecticut	3	3	0	0
Delaware	3	3	0	0
Florida	2	2	0	0
Georgia	3	3	0	0
Illinois	3	3	0	0
Indiana	1	1	0	0
Iowa	2	2	0	0
Kansas	2	2	0	0
Kentucky	1	1	0	0
Maryland	4	4	0	0
Massachusetts	5	5	0	0
Minnesota	6	6	0	0
Mississippi	1	1	0	0
Missouri	1	1	0	0
Montana	1	1	0	0
Nevada	6	6	0	0
New Mexico	1	1	0	0
New York	6	6	0	0
North Carolina	2	2	0	0
North Dakota	1	1	0	0
Oklahoma	2	2	0	0
Oregon	5	5	0	0
Pennsylvania	2	2	0	0
Rhode Island	3	3	0	0
South Carolina	1	1	0	0
South Dakota	1	1	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	0	0
Texas	3	3	0	0
Vermont	1	1	0	0
Virginia	4	4	0	0
Washington	7	7	0	0
West Virginia	1	1	0	0
Wisconsin	3	3	0	0

Table 8: Change in Percent of Asian Students taking the 8th Grade Reading Test by Grade, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
New Jersey	6	7	1	17
Utah	3	4	1	33
Michigan	2	3	1	50
District of Columbia	1	2	1	100
Idaho	1	2	1	100
Louisiana	1	2	1	100
Maine	1	2	1	100
Nebraska	1	2	1	100
New Hampshire	1	2	1	100
Ohio	1	2	1	100
Wyoming	#	1	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 8th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

AMERICAN INDIAN

Reading, Grade 4

Nationally, the percentage of American Indian students taking the 4th Grade NAEP reading test would increase from one percent to three percent under the proposed guidelines (see Table 9). Due to small populations of American Indians in 23 states, many do not meet reporting standards under the current system. Of the states that had a large enough American Indian population to report data for both systems, the largest decreases are found in Oklahoma where American Indian test-taking decreases by 10 percentage points, (21% to 11%). Other states which show decreases in percentage of American Indian test-taking under the proposed guidelines are South Dakota (from 11% to 7%), North Dakota (from 9% to 7%), Montana (10% to 9%), Arizona (6% to 5%), and New Mexico (11% to 10%). In contrast, the proportion of American Indian test-taking increased from one percent to four percent in Arkansas and increased by two percentage points in seven other states (Idaho, Washington, Alabama, California, Colorado, Nevada, and Vermont).

Many of these changes under the proposed guidelines represent large percent changes in share of American Indian test-taking. For example, in Delaware, the number of American Indians quadrupled and in five other states (Vermont, Nevada, Colorado, California, and Alabama), a two percentage point increase represents a 200 percent increase in the American Indian share. The share of American Indian test-taking increased by 100 percent in Washington, Idaho, Wisconsin, Utah, New York, Iowa, and Connecticut.

Table 9: Change in Percentage of American Indian Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	1	3	2	200
Oklahoma	21	11	-10	-48
South Dakota	11	7	-4	-36
North Dakota	9	7	-2	-22
Arizona	6	5	-1	-17
Montana	10	9	-1	-10
New Mexico	11	10	-1	-9
Alaska	26	26	0	0
Minnesota	2	2	0	0
Rhode Island	1	1	0	0
Oregon	3	4	1	33
Kansas	2	3	1	50
Nebraska	2	3	1	50
North Carolina	2	3	1	50
Wyoming	3	5	2	67
Connecticut	1	2	1	100
DoDEA	1	2	1	100
Iowa	1	2	1	100
New York	1	2	1	100
Utah	1	2	1	100
Wisconsin	1	2	1	100
Idaho	2	4	2	100
Washington	2	4	2	100
Alabama	1	3	2	200
California	1	3	2	200
Colorado	1	3	2	200
Nevada	1	3	2	200
Vermont	1	3	2	200
Arkansas	1	4	3	300
Delaware	#	1	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	#	1	N/A	N/A
Florida	#	2	N/A	N/A
Georgia	#	2	N/A	N/A
Hawaii	#	2	N/A	N/A
Illinois	#	1	N/A	N/A
Indiana	#	2	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	#	3	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	#	2	N/A	N/A
Maine	#	3	N/A	N/A
Maryland	#	2	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	#	1	N/A	N/A
Michigan	#	2	N/A	N/A

Table 9: Change in Percentage of American Indian Students Taking the 4th Grade Reading Test by State, 2005

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Mississippi	#	3	N/A	N/A
Missouri	#	3	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	#	2	N/A	N/A
New Jersey	#	2	N/A	N/A
Ohio	#	2	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	#	1	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	#	2	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	#	3	N/A	N/A
Texas	#	2	N/A	N/A
Virginia	#	2	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	#	3	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 4th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

Reading, Grade 8

Nationally, there would be no change in the percentage of American Indians taking the 8th grade NAEP reading test under the proposed system (see Table 10). Under the proposed guidelines, the largest declines in the proportion of American Indian test taking share would be in Oklahoma, with a nine percentage point decrease (from 19% to 10%). Conversely, the state showing the largest increases would be Idaho with a two percentage point increase (from 1% to 3%). Seventeen other states show no change between the current and the proposed systems.

As shown earlier, some of these differences represent large percent changes in share of American Indian test-taking within states. For example, the number of American Indian students taking the test in Idaho would triple under the proposed guidelines and would double in Michigan, Nebraska, and Vermont. In North Carolina, the number of American Indian students dropped by a half in North Carolina (2% to 1%) and by at least two-fifths in Oklahoma (19% to 10%) and South Dakota (10% to 6%), and by more than a third in North Dakota (8% to 5%).

Table 10: Change in Percentage of American Indian Students Taking the 8th Grade Reading Test

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	1	1	0	0
North Carolina	2	1	-1	-50
Oklahoma	19	10	-9	-47
South Dakota	10	6	-4	-40
North Dakota	8	5	-3	-38
Montana	10	7	-3	-30
New Mexico	11	8	-3	-27
Arizona	6	5	-1	-17
Alabama	1	1	0	0
Alaska	25	25	0	0
Arkansas	1	1	0	0
California	1	1	0	0
Colorado	2	2	0	0
DoDEA	1	1	0	0
Iowa	1	1	0	0
Kansas	2	2	0	0
Louisiana	1	1	0	0
Minnesota	1	1	0	0
Nevada	2	2	0	0
Oregon	2	2	0	0
Rhode Island	1	1	0	0
Utah	2	2	0	0
Washington	3	3	0	0
Wisconsin	1	1	0	0
Wyoming	4	4	0	0
Michigan	1	2	1	100
Nebraska	1	2	1	100
Vermont	1	2	1	100
Idaho	1	3	2	200
Connecticut	#	#	N/A	N/A
Delaware	#	1	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	#	1	N/A	N/A
Florida	#	1	N/A	N/A
Georgia	#	1	N/A	N/A
Hawaii	#	1	N/A	N/A
Illinois	#	1	N/A	N/A
Indiana	#	1	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	#	1	N/A	N/A
Maine	#	2	N/A	N/A
Maryland	#	1	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	#	#	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	#	1	N/A	N/A

Table 10: Change in Percentage of American Indian Students Taking the 8th Grade Reading Test

	Percentages		Difference (Proposed-Current)	% Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Missouri	#	1	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	#	1	N/A	N/A
New Jersey	#	1	N/A	N/A
New York	#	1	N/A	N/A
Ohio	#	2	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	#	1	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	#	1	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	#	1	N/A	N/A
Texas	#	1	N/A	N/A
Virginia	#	1	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	#	1	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 8th Grade Reading Assessment, 2005.

IMPACT ON SCORES

If the proposed guidelines are adopted, it would affect not only NAEP reporting, but it would also have a profound affect on state accountability systems put in place to meet the NCLB requirements. Under NCLB, states are required to develop an accountability system based on state achievement tests and to report test scores by subgroups (including by racial/ethnic categories). To meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements, each subgroup of students must meet the state’s proficiency goals (among other requirements). If the new classification system were imposed and adopted by states for reporting on racial/ethnic categories, many schools may meet, or fail to meet AYP based on the reclassification of students and not through any educational improvements or curricular changes in the schools themselves. In addition, if schools lose students (particularly schools with low enrollments), there is the strong possibility that an entire racial group would fall below the reporting threshold and not be counted for accountability purposes (each subgroup must have a minimum number of students, determined by the state, before it is counted for accountability purposes). By rearranging the number of students in each subgroup, the proposed reporting guidelines would render state accountability meaningless.

While the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) does not require NAEP be part of a state’s accountability system, it was expected that NAEP could be used as an independent measure to confirm state test results, evaluate the rigor of state standards, and measure the growth in student achievement and the reduction in achievement gaps between different racial/ethnic groups of students. The importance of NAEP as an independent measure of state academic progress was recognized in NCLB with the requirement that all states participate in the test. Previous studies have shown that smaller percentages of

students reach NAEP's proficient level than the proficiency level on state tests, suggesting that NAEP proficiency standards are more rigorous than that states' own and that scores on state tests can become inflated when tied to high-stakes accountability, which is the case under NCLB (Fuller, Gesicki, Kang, & Wright, 2006; Lee, 2006; Linn, 2003). Because it is administered nationally, NAEP can also be used to compare achievement levels of racial/ethnic groups across states instead of relying on state tests, whose standards vary by state. This section focuses on the differences in the proportions of students achieving the NAEP proficiency level under the two different categorization systems.

WHITE

Reading, Grade 4

Except for District of Columbia, there were relatively small changes in the average scale scores for white students taking the 4th grade reading test (see Table 11). The average scale score for white students increased except in four states (Hawaii, New Mexico, California, and Texas) where average scale scores dropped under the proposed guidelines and eight other states (Alaska, Arizona, Maryland, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Vermont, and Virginia) where there were no changes between the two systems. In Minnesota, Oregon, Wyoming, and Kansas, average scale scores for white 4th graders rose by 3 scale score points, the most for any state.

Nationally, the percentage of white students achieving proficiency in 4th grade reading increased by two percentage points under the proposed system. With the exception of 12 states, the proposed guidelines result in greater percentages of white students meeting proficiency standards. For example, in Wyoming, Oregon, Minnesota, and Kansas, the percentage of white students scoring at proficiency would increase by 3 percentage points under the proposed guidelines. In Wyoming and Kansas, the three percentage points represent an 8 percent change in the number of white students scoring at proficient level. In Oregon, the number of white students scoring at proficient level was raised by as much as 9 percent by the proposed guidelines. In other words, nine percent more of white students are scoring at proficient level under the proposed guidelines than under the current system of classification simply by the re-categorization of students.

Table 11: Percentage of White Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	39	41	2	5
District of Columbia	70	54	-16	-23
Hawaii	37	32	-5	-14
New Mexico	36	32	-4	-11
California	37	34	-3	-8
New Jersey	46	45	-1	-2
Texas	44	43	-1	-2
Alaska	36	36	0	0
Maryland	45	45	0	0
Mississippi	31	31	0	0
Missouri	38	38	0	0
New York	43	43	0	0
Oklahoma	30	30	0	0
South Dakota	37	37	0	0
Alabama	32	33	1	3
Arkansas	37	38	1	3
Colorado	46	47	1	2
Connecticut	47	48	1	2
Georgia	37	38	1	3
Illinois	42	43	1	2
Iowa	36	37	1	3
Kentucky	33	34	1	3
Massachusetts	51	52	1	2
Nebraska	40	41	1	3
New Hampshire	39	40	1	3
Rhode Island	36	37	1	3
Vermont	38	39	1	3
Virginia	45	46	1	2
West Virginia	26	27	1	4
Arizona	37	39	2	5
Delaware	46	48	2	4
DoDEA	44	46	2	5
Florida	39	41	2	5
Idaho	37	39	2	5
Indiana	35	37	2	6
Louisiana	32	34	2	6
Maine	35	37	2	6
Michigan	38	40	2	5
Montana	39	41	2	5
Nevada	28	30	2	7
North Carolina	39	41	2	5
North Dakota	38	40	2	5

Table 11: Percentage of White Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
Ohio	41	43	2	5
Pennsylvania	42	44	2	5
South Carolina	36	38	2	6
Tennessee	33	35	2	6
Utah	38	40	2	5
Washington	40	42	2	5
Wisconsin	38	40	2	5
Kansas	37	40	3	8
Minnesota	43	46	3	7
Oregon	34	37	3	9
Wyoming	38	41	3	8

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

WHITE

Reading, Grade 8

Nationally, the percent of white 8th graders scoring at the proficient level in reading would increase from 37 percent to 39 percent under the proposed guidelines, representing a 5 percent increase in the numbers of white students achieving proficiency levels nationwide (see Table 12). The increase in share of white students reaching proficiency in 8th grade reading is especially noticeable in New Mexico where a 5 percentage point difference represents a 15 percent increase in the number of white students achieving proficiency. In other words, with the proposed re-categorization of students, the number of white students reaching proficiency on the 8th grade reading test would increase by 15 percent. Two other states show more than a 10 percent increase in the number of white students achieving proficiency under the new system, Nevada and Arizona. In fact, most of the states with the largest increases in share of white students achieving proficiency are located in the West. With the exception of two states (Alaska and Hawaii), the share of white students scoring at proficiency would increase in every state under the proposed system.

Table 12: Percentage of White Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	37	39	2	5
District of Columbia	74	73	-1	-1
Alaska	35	35	0	0
Hawaii	29	29	0	0
New Jersey	48	49	1	2
Maryland	42	43	1	2
Montana	40	41	1	3
Iowa	36	37	1	3
Georgia	35	36	1	3
North Carolina	35	36	1	3
South Carolina	34	35	1	3
Arkansas	33	34	1	3
Florida	33	34	1	3
Kentucky	32	33	1	3
Alabama	31	32	1	3
Tennessee	31	32	1	3
Louisiana	30	31	1	3
Mississippi	30	31	1	3
Oklahoma	30	31	1	3
New York	45	47	2	4
Virginia	45	47	2	4
Connecticut	42	44	2	5
Minnesota	42	44	2	5
Delaware	41	43	2	5
Pennsylvania	41	43	2	5
Wisconsin	40	42	2	5
Texas	39	41	2	5
Nebraska	38	40	2	5
New Hampshire	38	40	2	5
North Dakota	38	40	2	5
South Dakota	38	40	2	5
Vermont	38	40	2	5
Wyoming	38	40	2	5
Missouri	36	38	2	6
Rhode Island	36	38	2	6
Idaho	34	36	2	6
Michigan	34	36	2	6
Massachusetts	50	53	3	6
Indiana	32	34	2	6
Ohio	41	44	3	7
Colorado	40	43	3	8
Illinois	39	42	3	8

Table 12: Percentage of White Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Kansas	39	42	3	8
Maine	39	42	3	8
Washington	38	41	3	8
Oregon	36	39	3	8
DoDEA	47	51	4	9
West Virginia	22	24	2	9
California	32	35	3	9
Utah	32	35	3	9
Nevada	29	32	3	10
Arizona	34	38	4	12
New Mexico	33	38	5	15

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

BLACK Reading, Grade 4

Nationally, the share of black students achieving proficiency level on the 4th grade reading test would increase by 1 percentage point (see Table 13). Under the proposed guidelines, a greater percentage of black students would achieve proficiency in 19 states, and in another 10 states, the proposed guidelines would lower the percentage of students meeting proficiency standards. In New Mexico, the proposed guidelines lowered the share of black student from 24 percent to 12 percent, a 50 percent decrease. In other words, the number of black students meeting proficiency standards in New Mexico would drop by a half under the proposed guidelines simply with the re-categorization of students. In Nevada and Hawaii, a decrease of five and two percentage points between the current and the proposed system of categorization represent at least a 20 percent drop in the number of black students meeting proficiency in 4th grade reading. Amongst the states where the guidelines would raise the share of black students achieving proficiency, the largest increases are found in Oregon, Kansas, and Michigan, with a 3 percentage point increase in each state. In Michigan and Kansas, the 3 percentage point increase represent a 30 percent increase in the numbers of black students achieving proficiency in the 4th grade reading test. In twelve states, there was no change.

Table 13: Percentage of Black Students Scoring At or Above Proficient
in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	12	13	1	8
New Mexico	24	12	-12	-50
Hawaii	21	16	-5	-24
Nevada	10	8	-2	-20
California	11	9	-2	-18
Washington	20	17	-3	-15
Pennsylvania	15	13	-2	-13
Massachusetts	20	18	-2	-10
Minnesota	10	9	-1	-10
Texas	15	14	-1	-7
Colorado	18	17	-1	-6
Alaska	24	24	0	0
Connecticut	12	12	0	0
District of Columbia	8	8	0	0
DoDEA	24	24	0	0
Kentucky	15	15	0	0
Louisiana	9	9	0	0
Mississippi	7	7	0	0
Nebraska	10	10	0	0
New Jersey	15	15	0	0
New York	17	17	0	0
North Carolina	13	13	0	0
Oklahoma	10	10	0	0
Rhode Island	15	15	0	0
Wisconsin	10	10	0	0
Delaware	15	16	1	7
Virginia	15	16	1	7
West Virginia	15	16	1	7
Missouri	14	15	1	7
Florida	13	14	1	8
Arizona	12	13	1	8
Indiana	12	13	1	8
Iowa	12	13	1	8
Maryland	12	13	1	8
South Carolina	11	12	1	9
Arkansas	10	11	1	10
Illinois	9	10	1	11
Alabama	8	9	1	13
Georgia	12	14	2	17
Tennessee	11	13	2	18
Ohio	10	12	2	20
Oregon	15	18	3	20

Table 13: Percentage of Black Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Kansas	10	13	3	30
Michigan	10	13	3	30
Idaho	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Montana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Utah	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

BLACK Reading, Grade 8

The proposed guidelines lower the share of black students achieving proficiency on the 8th grade reading test from one percentage point to five percentage points in 20 states (see Table 14). For example, in Minnesota, the proposed guidelines lowered the number of black students meeting proficiency standards by as much as 45 percent and by a third in Iowa and Arizona. In Rhode Island, Washington, and Kentucky, the number of black students achieving proficiency in reading drops by at least 20 percent. There is at least a 10 percent drop in the number of black students meeting proficiency standards in twelve other states.

The four states where the guidelines increase the share of black students achieving proficiency in 8th grade reading are Tennessee (from 9% to 10%), Nebraska (from 13% to 15%), Oregon (from 18% to 21%) and New York (from 11% to 13%). In these states, there is at least a 10 percent increase in the number of black students meeting proficiency standards. There are 15 other states where the share of black students meeting proficiency levels are unaffected by the proposed guidelines.

Table 14: Percentage of Black Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	11	11	0	0
Minnesota	11	6	-5	-45
Iowa	15	10	-5	-33
Arizona	12	8	-4	-33
Rhode Island	11	8	-3	-27
Washington	27	21	-6	-22
Kentucky	15	12	-3	-20
Massachusetts	18	15	-3	-17
Delaware	13	11	-2	-15
Oklahoma	13	11	-2	-15
Arkansas	9	8	-1	-11
District of Columbia	9	8	-1	-11
Louisiana	9	8	-1	-11
Missouri	9	8	-1	-11
Wisconsin	9	8	-1	-11
West Virginia	10	9	-1	-10
California	11	10	-1	-9
Connecticut	11	10	-1	-9
Florida	11	10	-1	-9
Nevada	12	11	-1	-8
Texas	14	13	-1	-7
Kansas	15	14	-1	-7
Alabama	9	9	0	0
Alaska	18	18	0	0
Colorado	18	18	0	0
Georgia	10	10	0	0
Illinois	12	12	0	0
Indiana	10	10	0	0
Maryland	12	12	0	0
Michigan	10	10	0	0
Mississippi	7	7	0	0
New Jersey	14	14	0	0
North Carolina	10	10	0	0
Ohio	10	10	0	0
Pennsylvania	12	12	0	0
South Carolina	11	11	0	0
Virginia	16	16	0	0
DoDEA	20	21	1	5
Tennessee	9	10	1	11
Nebraska	13	15	2	15
Oregon	18	21	3	17
New York	11	13	2	18

Table 14: Percentage of Black Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Hawaii	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Idaho	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Montana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Utah	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

HISPANIC

Reading, Grade 4

Using the proposed guidelines on current data, the percent of Hispanic students achieving proficiency in 4th grade reading would increase by 4 percentage points at the national level (see Table 15). The largest increases are found in Indiana and Massachusetts, where the number of Hispanic students meeting proficiency standards would double with the re-classification of the proposed guidelines. In seven states (Utah, Iowa, Rhode Island, Oregon, Connecticut, Nebraska, and Idaho), the number would increase by at least 50 percent. Twenty-six other states also show increases in shares of Hispanic students meeting that standard. In contrast, there is a 34 percent drop in the number of Hispanic students meeting 4th grade reading proficiency standards in South Carolina. Three other states (Montana, Arkansas, and Delaware) also show a drop in percent of Hispanic students meeting proficiency levels. It is important to remember that the proposed guidelines do not document actual gains or losses in achievement for Hispanic students. With the sole exception of Alaska, which shows no change between the current and proposed systems, these changes resulted from a simple re-categorization of racial/ethnic groups. These changes would make it difficult, if not impossible, to conduct longitudinal research on the achievement gains of various subgroups.

Table 15: Percentage of Hispanic Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	15	19	4	27
Alabama	‡	12	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	29	19	-10	-34
District of Columbia	12	8	-4	-33
Montana	36	30	-6	-17
Arkansas	21	20	-1	-5
Delaware	22	21	-1	-5
Alaska	19	19	0	0
Hawaii	27	28	1	4
DoDEA	26	27	1	4
Virginia	26	27	1	4
Florida	25	26	1	4
Ohio	24	25	1	4
North Carolina	17	18	1	6
Tennessee	13	14	1	8
Maryland	21	23	2	10
Wisconsin	20	22	2	10
Texas	19	21	2	11
Oklahoma	17	19	2	12
Georgia	14	16	2	14
New Mexico	14	16	2	14
Nevada	12	14	2	17
Missouri	21	25	4	19
Illinois	14	17	3	21
Michigan	18	22	4	22
New Jersey	19	24	5	26
Pennsylvania	19	24	5	26
Arizona	11	14	3	27
New York	17	22	5	29
Kansas	14	19	5	36
Minnesota	18	25	7	39
California	10	14	4	40
Colorado	17	24	7	41
Washington	14	20	6	43
Wyoming	16	23	7	44
Utah	14	21	7	50
Iowa	15	23	8	53
Rhode Island	11	17	6	55
Oregon	10	16	6	60
Connecticut	15	24	9	60
Nebraska	12	20	8	67
Idaho	11	20	9	82

Table 15: Percentage of Hispanic Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Indiana	11	22	11	100
Massachusetts	11	22	11	100
Kentucky	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	‡	14	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	27	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	‡	13	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	‡	32	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	‡	24	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	‡	26	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	35	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	‡	17	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

HISPANIC Reading, Grade 8

Nationally, the share of Hispanic students who score at the proficient level in 8th grade reading increased by two percentage points under the proposed system (see Table 16). The state with the largest difference in share of Hispanic students scoring at or above proficient level is Ohio, with a nine percentage point difference, representing a 64 percent increase in the number of Hispanic students who passed the proficiency level. This marked increase is followed by Nebraska and New Jersey, both with percent increases of more than 40 percent in the number of Hispanics who scored above proficiency. There are 14 other states where the percent increase in the number of Hispanic students scoring at proficient exceeds 10 percent. In five states (Alaska, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Oregon), there are no differences in the share of Hispanic students scoring at the proficient level in 8th grade reading. In five other states (Missouri, Maryland, Indiana, Illinois, and Virginia), the percent of Hispanic students reaching proficiency in reading dropped. This decrease was particularly marked in Missouri, where a four percentage point decrease represented a 17 percent drop in the number of Hispanic students meeting proficiency standards.

Table 16: Percentage of Hispanic Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	14	16	2	14
Alabama	‡	11	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	18	13	-5	-28
Missouri	23	19	-4	-17
Maryland	23	20	-3	-13
Indiana	17	15	-2	-12
DoDEA	30	27	-3	-10
Illinois	19	18	-1	-5
Virginia	23	22	-1	-4
Alaska	20	20	0	0
Florida	21	21	0	0
Georgia	14	14	0	0
North Carolina	17	17	0	0
Oregon	15	15	0	0
Wisconsin	18	19	1	6
Pennsylvania	17	18	1	6
Delaware	16	17	1	6
Michigan	16	17	1	6
New York	16	17	1	6
Massachusetts	15	16	1	7
New Mexico	12	13	1	8
Utah	12	13	1	8
Arizona	11	12	1	9
Nevada	11	12	1	9
Wyoming	21	23	2	10
California	10	11	1	10
Iowa	20	22	2	10
Colorado	15	17	2	13
Texas	15	17	2	13
Kansas	14	16	2	14
Arkansas	13	15	2	15
Minnesota	14	17	3	21
Rhode Island	9	11	2	22
Connecticut	13	16	3	23
Oklahoma	13	16	3	23
Washington	15	19	4	27
Idaho	14	18	4	29
New Jersey	14	19	5	36
Nebraska	12	17	5	42
Hawaii	15	22	7	47
Ohio	14	23	9	64
Kentucky	‡	26	N/A	N/A

Table 16: Percentage of Hispanic Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Louisiana	‡	13	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	‡	12	N/A	N/A
Montana	‡	24	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	‡	23	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	‡	22	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	‡	18	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	‡	20	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	‡	19	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	23	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	‡	11	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

ASIAN Reading, Grade 4

Whereas the proposed guidelines raised the percentages of white, black, and Hispanic students meeting proficiency standards at the national level, the share of Asian students who meet the 4th grade reading standards dropped by 1 percentage point, from 40 percent to 39 percent (see Table 17). In Arizona, it dropped by 12 percentage points, which meant that the number of Asian students achieving proficiency dropped by a full third. Further, the proposed guidelines resulted in a 10 percent or more drop in the share of Asian students meeting 4th grade reading proficiency standards in fourteen other states (Pennsylvania, Utah, Iowa, Oregon, Minnesota, Georgia, Kansas, Florida, Wisconsin, Texas, Nevada, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Washington). Three states (Alaska, Colorado, and Hawaii) show no change in their proportion of Asian students meeting proficiency. Under the proposed guidelines, 8 other states (Virginia, New York, California, Illinois, Connecticut, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Massachusetts) show an increased proportion of Asian students meeting proficiency standards. In North Carolina, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, the number of Asian students scoring at proficient level was raised by as much as 13 percent by the proposed guidelines.

Table 17: Percentage of Asian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	40	39	-1	-3
Alabama	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Arizona	36	24	-12	-33
Pennsylvania	47	38	-9	-19
Utah	30	25	-5	-17
Iowa	40	34	-6	-15
Oregon	35	30	-5	-14
Minnesota	28	24	-4	-14
Georgia	57	49	-8	-14
Kansas	55	48	-7	-13
Florida	43	38	-5	-12
Wisconsin	34	31	-3	-9
Texas	47	43	-4	-9
Nevada	24	22	-2	-8
Maryland	55	51	-4	-7
Rhode Island	29	27	-2	-7
Washington	40	39	-1	-3
Alaska	19	19	0	0
Colorado	42	42	0	0
Hawaii	19	19	0	0
Virginia	53	54	1	2
New York	50	51	1	2
California	35	36	1	3
Illinois	44	46	2	5
Connecticut	49	53	4	8
DoDEA	33	36	3	9
North Carolina	31	34	3	10
New Jersey	57	64	7	12
Massachusetts	47	53	6	13
Arkansas	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Delaware	55	‡	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Idaho	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Indiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Michigan	38	‡	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Missouri	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Montana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	‡	41	N/A	N/A

Table 17: Percentage of Asian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
New Hampshire	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	‡	32	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Ohio	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

ASIAN Reading, Grade 8

Nationally, there is no change in the proportion of Asians achieving proficiency in 8th grade reading between the current and proposed system of reporting (see Table 18). There are 14 states in which the proposed guidelines lowered the percentages of Asian students achieving proficiency. In eight states (Utah, Connecticut, North Carolina, Colorado, Washington, Florida, Oregon, and Pennsylvania), the number of Asian students reaching proficiency dropped by at least 10 percent. In five other states (California, Nevada, New York, Virginia, and Rhode Island) the share of Asian students would increase under the proposed guidelines. In Rhode Island, the proportion of Asian students achieving proficiency increased from 26% to 29%, an increase of 3 percentage points, representing a 12 percent increase in the number of Asian students reaching proficiency. There were no changes between the current and the proposed systems of reporting in five other states (Alaska, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, and Minnesota).

Table 18: Percentage of Asian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	39	39	0	0
Alabama	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Utah	31	23	-8	-26
Connecticut	50	39	-11	-22
North Carolina	46	36	-10	-22
Colorado	42	35	-7	-17
Washington	36	30	-6	-17
Florida	47	41	-6	-13
Oregon	35	31	-4	-11
Pennsylvania	47	42	-5	-11
Wisconsin	28	26	-2	-7
Hawaii	16	15	-1	-6
Texas	50	47	-3	-6
Delaware	42	40	-2	-5
Massachusetts	52	51	-1	-2
New Jersey	66	65	-1	-2
Alaska	24	24	0	0
Georgia	47	47	0	0
Illinois	49	49	0	0
Maryland	58	58	0	0
Minnesota	29	29	0	0
California	33	34	1	3
Nevada	32	33	1	3
DoDEA	41	43	2	5
New York	45	48	3	7
Virginia	52	56	4	8
Rhode Island	26	29	3	12
Arizona	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Arkansas	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Idaho	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Indiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Iowa	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Kansas	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Michigan	‡	45	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Missouri	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Montana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Table 18: Percentage of Asian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
New Hampshire	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
North Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Ohio	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Dakota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

AMERICAN INDIAN Reading, Grade 4

In California, the proposed guideline decreased the percent of American Indian students scoring at proficient level in 4th grade reading by 10 percentage points (from 23% to 13%). South Dakota and Oklahoma are two other states where the number of American Indians scoring at proficiency level would be adversely affected by the proposed guidelines (see Table 19). In South Dakota, particularly, this represents a 29 percent change in the share of American Indian students meeting proficiency standards. In North Dakota and New Mexico, the number of American Indian students testing at the proficiency level or higher was raised by more than half by the proposed guidelines. Alaska is the only state where there was no change in the share of American Indian students scoring at proficiency.

Table 19: Percentage of American Indian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
National Public	19	22	3	16
Alabama	‡	22	N/A	N/A
California	23	13	-10	-43
South Dakota	14	10	-4	-29
Oklahoma	22	21	-1	-5
Alaska	9	9	0	0
Oregon	15	19	4	27
Montana	13	17	4	31
North Carolina	12	17	5	42
Arizona	9	13	4	44
North Dakota	9	14	5	56
New Mexico	8	13	5	63
Arkansas	‡	38	N/A	N/A
Colorado	‡	34	N/A	N/A
Connecticut	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Delaware	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
DoDEA	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Florida	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Georgia	‡	25	N/A	N/A
Hawaii	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Idaho	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Illinois	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Indiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Iowa	‡	22	N/A	N/A
Kansas	‡	23	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	‡	25	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	29	N/A	N/A
Maryland	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Michigan	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	‡	18	N/A	N/A
Missouri	‡	34	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	‡	16	N/A	N/A
Nevada	‡	21	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Jersey	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New York	‡	33	N/A	N/A

Table 19: Percentage of American Indian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 4th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Ohio	‡	36	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	‡	19	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	‡	19	N/A	N/A
Texas	‡	19	N/A	N/A
Utah	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Virginia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Washington	‡	30	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Wisconsin	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	‡	24	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

AMERICAN INDIAN

Reading, Grade 8

In Washington, the percentage of American Indian students scoring at proficient level in 8th grade reading dropped by 9 percentage points (from 24% to 15%) under the proposed guidelines (see Table 20). In Washington, this represents a 38 percent decrease in the share of American Indian students meeting proficiency standards. Montana and Oklahoma are two other states where the number of American Indians scoring at proficiency level would be adversely affected by the proposed guidelines. In Montana, particularly, this represents a 25 percent change in the share of American Indian students meeting proficiency standards. In Wyoming and North Dakota, there was a slight increase in the percentage of American Indian students scoring above proficiency.

Table 20: Percentage of American Indian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	<i>Current System</i>	<i>Proposed System</i>		
National Public	18	18	0	0
Alabama	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Washington	24	15	-9	-38
Montana	16	12	-4	-25
Arizona	12	10	-2	-17
Oklahoma	19	16	-3	-16
South Dakota	13	11	-2	-15
New Mexico	7	6	-1	-14
Alaska	10	10	0	0
Wyoming	15	16	1	7
North Dakota	15	18	3	20
Arkansas	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
California	‡	18	N/A	N/A
Colorado	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Connecticut	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Delaware	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
DoDEA	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Florida	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Georgia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Hawaii	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Idaho	‡	21	N/A	N/A
Illinois	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Indiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Iowa	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Kansas	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Kentucky	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Louisiana	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maine	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Maryland	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Michigan	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Mississippi	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Missouri	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Nevada	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New Jersey	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
New York	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Ohio	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Table 20: Percentage of American Indian Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in 8th Grade Reading by State, 2005

	At or above Proficient		Difference (Proposed-Current)	Percent Change
	Current System	Proposed System		
Oregon	22	‡	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Texas	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Utah	‡	9	N/A	N/A
Vermont	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Virginia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
West Virginia	‡	‡	N/A	N/A
Wisconsin	‡	‡	N/A	N/A

Rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2005 Reading Assessment.

IMPLICATIONS OF ADOPTING THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

Our findings show that because the proposed system treats Hispanic as a preferential category and precludes counting multiracial students within the various racial categories, the resulting data will exclude from the various racial counts many students who would doubtless count themselves and be seen as “white” or “black,” or “American Indian,” or any other race or ethnicity. If the proposed guidelines are adopted, it would become the only available source of data on race and ethnicity and make it impossible to compare future patterns and trends with past ones and to know whether various institutions were going forward or backward in terms of race. The system is incompatible both with the data that has been collected consistently for the past 40 years for the Office for Civil Rights and with the much more thoughtful way the Census has handled the collection and reporting of multiracial statistics after very extensive work with experts across the country.

The data collected under the proposed guidelines would very seriously undermine both research and policy analysis work that is essential to understanding and successfully dealing with racial change and racial inequality. It would undermine civil rights enforcement. It would make the nation’s black enrollment appear to have suddenly dropped substantially and would have the same impact on white population and on American Indian and Asian enrollments in some states. The mixed race category would be an essentially meaningless category for civil rights and research purposes since it would include large and unknown numbers of people who were from two historically underrepresented groups, others from two groups that are not, and various other combinations. It would provide, of course, no information on how many of these

students were overwhelmingly of one race with some distant historic connection with another versus those who now have two parents from different races and ethnicities.

The problems with these categories are not only apparent in terms of the huge changes in the apparent number of students in different groups in many states but also in the fact that even within the same state there are often very large proportionate changes between the 4th and 8th grade, suggesting the categories may not be intelligible for small children. The changes also make it impossible to track achievement and graduation trends within a racial or ethnic category over time within a school, a district or a state. Data tracing trends over time is, of course, a central requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act, essential for judging compliance with various civil rights court orders, and required by the special education law. In some states, the change will make it appear that individual racial groups suddenly are performing substantially better or worse on some achievement tests even when nothing has changed about actual test results. One must not confuse the increases and losses in proficiency levels with actual achievement. In fact, policymakers would do well to be wary that the proposed guidelines do not result in unfair and arbitrary sanctions on schools and districts since the changes do not reflect actual improvements or losses in achievement levels.

We request a delay in implementing this radical change in policy and believe that full congressional hearings are needed before embarking on changes that will produce a fundamental change in the description of American school and college populations. We see no serious risk in continuing the present method of counting until a full review can take place and believe that the most appropriate method of implementing a counting solution that would reflect the growth of multiracial families would be to use the procedures for data collection and reporting adopted by the Census, subject of course to serious research and investigation on the issue of the intelligibility of the categories to young children. That research is an obvious prerequisite before any change should be made in counting methods.

References:

- Fuller, B., Gesicki, K., Kang, E., & Wright, J. (2006). *Is the No Child Left Behind Act working? The reliability of how states track achievement*. Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California, University of California, Berkeley.
- Lee, J. (2006). *Tracking achievement gaps and assessing the impact of NCLB on the gaps: An in-depth look into national and state reading and math outcome trends*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Linn, R. L. (2003). Accountability: Responsibility and reasonable expectations. *Educational Researcher*, 32, 3-13.