Appendix A

Technical Procedures for the NAEP 2013 Mathematics Assessment

This appendix provides an overview of some of the technical procedures for the NAEP 2013 mathematics assessment. Information is included about the content of the assessment, school and student samples and participation, inclusion of students with disabilities and/or English language learners, analysis procedures, and interpretation of results. Additional technical information about NAEP assessments is available on the Web at http://www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/.

Development of the Mathematics Framework

The National Assessment Governing Board oversees the creation of the NAEP frameworks that provide the theoretical basis for the assessment, the direction for what types of items should be included, and how the items should be designed and scored. While the frameworks describe the general content and design of NAEP subject area assessments, the specifications provide the detailed information used by test developers for constructing the assessments. Both the *Mathematics Framework for the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress* and *Assessment and Item Specifications for the NAEP 2013 Mathematics Assessment* are available on the Governing Board's website at http://www.nagb.org/publications/frameworks.htm.

The frameworks for main NAEP assessments are periodically updated or changed to reflect current curricula and standards. Whenever changes are made to a subject framework, every effort is made to try to maintain the trend lines that permit the reporting of changes in student achievement over time. If, however, the nature of the changes made to an assessment are such that the results would not be comparable to earlier assessments, a new trend line is started.

The 1990 and 1992 mathematics frameworks reflected a two-dimensional "content by ability" matrix design in which questions were classified according to one of five content areas and one of three types of mathematical abilities (conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge, and problem solving). A third dimension, mathematical power (reasoning, connections, and communication), was introduced in the 1996 framework to form a "content by mathematical ability by mathematical power" matrix design that also guided the development of the 2000 and 2003 assessments.

For the 2005 framework, the dimensions of mathematical ability and power were replaced with the dimension of mathematical complexity, which indicates the level of cognitive demand (low, moderate, or high) of each item. In addition, the proportions of assessment questions by content area were changed for grade 8 to reflect the increasing importance of algebraic concepts, and for grade 12 to correspond more closely to the mathematics that high school students experience in a three-year sequence of courses (the equivalent of one year of geometry and two years of algebra). Because of changes in the framework and in administration procedures for grade 12, results from the 2005 twelfth-grade assessment could not be compared to results from previous years. A new trend line was started for grade 12 in 2005, and new mathematics achievement-level descriptions were applied.

There were no changes to the objectives at grades 4 and 8. The 2009 framework was unchanged for the 2011 and 2013 assessments. In 2011, only the grade 4 and grade 8 assessments were administered, but in 2013 the grade 4, grade 8, and grade 12 assessments were administered.

Each question in the 2013 mathematics assessment was classified based on two criteria: mathematical content and mathematical complexity. By considering these two criteria for each question, the framework ensures that NAEP assesses an appropriate balance of content along with a variety of ways of knowing and doing mathematics.

Content Areas: Although the names of the content areas have changed from one framework to the next, there is a consistent focus across frameworks on collecting information on student performance in five key areas:

- Number Properties and Operations (including computation and the understanding of number concepts)
- Measurement (including use of instruments, application of processes, and understanding concepts of area and volume)
- Geometry (including spatial reasoning and applying geometric properties)
- Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability (including interpreting and using graphical displays or statistics)
- Algebra (including analyzing representations and relationships)

All five content areas apply to each of the three grades assessed. In 2005, the five content areas were collapsed into four for grade 12, combining geometry and measurement because most measurement topics suitable for twelfth-grade students are geometric in nature. Detailed descriptions and specific objectives of each content area are included in the *Mathematics Framework for the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress*.

Because of differences in curricular emphasis, the proportion of the assessment devoted to each content area varies by grade (table A-1). For example, there is more emphasis on number properties and operations than on algebra at grade 4. In comparison, the percentage of algebra questions increases at grades 8 and 12, and the percentage of number properties and operations questions decreases.

Table A-1. Target percentage distribution of questions in NAEP mathematics, by grade and content area: Various years, 1990–2013

Grade and content area	1990 and 1992	1996, 2000, and 2003	2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013	Content area[1]
Grade 4				
Number sense, properties, and operations	45	40	40	Number properties and operations
Measurement	20	20	20	Measurement
Geometry and spatial sense	15	15	15	Geometry
Data analysis, statistics, and probability	10	10	10	Data analysis, statistics, and probability
Algebra and functions	10	15	15	Algebra
Grade 8				
Number sense, properties, and operations	30	25	20	Number properties and operations
Measurement	15	15	15	Measurement
Geometry and spatial sense	20	20	20	Geometry
Data analysis, statistics, and probability	15	15	15	Data analysis, statistics, and probability
Algebra and functions	20	25	30	Algebra
Grade 12 [2]				
Number sense, properties, and operations	TBA	TBA	TBA	Number properties and operations
Measurement	TBA	TBA		
			TBA	Measurement and geometry[3]
Geometry and spatial sense	TBA	TBA		
Data analysis, statistics, and probability	TBA	TBA	TBA	Data analysis, statistics, and probability
Algebra and functions	TBA	TBA	TBA	Algebra

† Not applicable. Item distributions from previous years are not comparable because of changes in the framework for grade 12 in 2005.

[1] The content area labels were revised in 2005, but test item content remains comparable to previous years.

[2] Grade 12 was not assessed in 2003, 2007, and 2011.

[3] At grade 12, the five content areas were collapsed into four, with geometry and measurement combined into one.

NOTE: The data analysis, statistics, and probability content area was called data analysis and probability in the 2005 and 2007 frameworks. 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, 1990–2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Complexity: The three levels of mathematical complexity—low, moderate, and high—form an ordered description of the demands a question makes on a student's thinking. Questions with a low level of complexity, for example, may ask students to recall a property. At the moderate level, a question may ask the student to make a connection between two properties, and questions at the high level may ask students to analyze the assumptions made in a mathematical model. Using the dimension of complexity to describe each question allows for a balance of mathematical thinking in the design of the assessment.

Content of the 2013 Mathematics Assessment

Each NAEP assessment contains two major components: subject-specific cognitive items that measure the achievement of students in an academic subject; and noncognitive items that collect information from students, teachers, and school administrators about background variables that are related to student achievement. Both the cognitive and noncognitive items are developed through a process that includes reviews by external advisory groups and pilot testing. Results from the cognitive items provide information about what students know and can do in a subject area. Information from the background items gives context to NAEP results and/or allows researchers to track factors associated with academic achievement.

The 2013 mathematics assessment was made up of 150 cognitive questions at fourth grade, 153 questions at eighth grade, and 191 cognitive questions at twelfth-grade. The number of questions used for reporting results at each grade has remained relatively constant across assessment years. Students spend about one-half of the assessment time responding to multiple-choice questions and one-half responding to two types of constructed-response questions. Short constructed-response questions require students to provide answers to computation problems or to describe solutions in one or two sentences, while extended constructed-response questions require more detailed responses or explanations. Table A-2 shows the approximate percentage distribution of questions administered from 1990 to 2013 by the type of question for each grade level.

Table A-2. Percentage distribution of administered NAEP mathematics questions, by grade and question type: Various years, 1990–2013

Grade and question type	1990	1992	1996	2000	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013
Grade 4										
Multiple-choice	71	61	51	60	63	64	69	68	70	70
Short constructed-response	29	36	41	34	33	32	27	27	26	27
Extended constructed-response	0	3	8	6	4	4	4	5	4	3
Grade 8										
Multiple-choice	78	62	56	63	65	69	74	72	74	75
Short constructed-response	22	34	38	32	29	28	23	23	23	22
Extended constructed-response	0	3	7	6	5	4	4	4	3	3
Grade 12										
Multiple-choice	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Short constructed-response	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Extended constructed-response	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

† Not applicable. Item distributions from previous years are not comparable because of changes in the framework for grade 12 in 2005.

NOTE: Short constructed-response questions included in the 1990 and 1992 assessments were scored dichotomously (i.e., credit or no credit). Beginning with the 1996 assessment, some of the new short constructed-response questions were scored allowing for partial credit. 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, 1990–2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Cognitive Blocks:. The assessment design allowed for broad coverage of the five mathematics content areas and levels of mathematical complexity at each grade, while minimizing the time burden for any one student. This was accomplished through the use of matrix sampling of items in which each student was required to take only a small portion of the entire pool of assessment questions.

The mathematics item pool for each grade was divided up into subsets or "blocks." In 2013, there were a total of 10 cognitive blocks at fourth grade, 10 blocks at eighth grade, and 14 blocks at twelfth grade. Each mathematics assessment booklet contained two separately timed 25-minute blocks. Each block contained between 13 and 17 questions depending on the balance between multiple-choice and constructed-response questions.

The procedure used for distributing blocks across booklets controlled for position and context effects by balancing the positioning of blocks across booklets and balancing the pairing of blocks within booklets. The procedure also cycled the booklets for administration so that no more than a few students in an assessment section received the same test booklet.

Sample released questions at all three grade levels can be viewed at the NAEP website at http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/itmrls/. Questions released from the 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013 assessments are classified by content area and level of complexity. Those released from assessments administered in 2003 and earlier are classified by content area and mathematical ability. Items also may be sorted by difficulty and question type.

NAEP Samples

NAEP assesses representative samples of students rather than the entire population of students. The sample selection process utilizes a probability sample design in which each school and each student has a known probability of being selected (the probabilities are proportionate to the estimated number of students in the grade assessed). Samples are selected according to a multistage design, with students drawn from within sampled public and private schools nationwide.

The 2009–10 Common Core of Data (CCD) file, a comprehensive list of operating public schools in each jurisdiction that is compiled each school year by the National Center for Education Statistics, served as the sampling frame for the selection of public schools in each state/jurisdiction. The sample of students in districts participating in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) represents an augmentation of the sample of students selected as part of the state samples. All students at more local geographic sampling levels also make up part of the broader samples. For example, the TUDA samples are included as part of the corresponding state samples, and the state samples are included as part of the national sample.

The 2009–10 Private School Survey (PSS), a mail survey of all U.S. private schools carried out biennially by the Census Bureau under contract to NCES, served as the sampling frame for private schools. While state and district results are based on samples of public schools only, the national results are based on the combined samples of public and private schools. Although information about the combined public and private school national samples is provided here for context, perfomance results in the State Report Generator and the District Report Generator are for public school students only.

Table A-3 shows the target populations and sample sizes in 2013 for the nation and participating states and jurisdictions at grades 4, 8, and 12. Table A-4 shows the same information for participating urban districts for grades 4 and 8.

Because each school that participated in the assessment, and each student assessed, represents only a portion of the larger population of interest, the results are weighted to make appropriate inferences between the student samples and the respective populations from which they are drawn. Sampling weights are adjusted for the disproportionate representation of some groups in the selected sample. This includes oversampling of schools with high concentrations of students from certain racial/ethnic groups and the lower sampling rates of students who attend very small schools.

Table A-3. Student sample sizes and target populations in NAEP mathematics at grades 4, 8, and 12, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

	Grade 4		Grade 8		Grade 12	
State/jurisdiction	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Nation	**189,600**	**3,895,000**	**173,000**	**3,881,000**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Public	183,300	3,578,000	167,400	3,556,000	TBA	TBA
Private	3,100	307,000	3,200	317,000	TBA	TBA
Alabama	2,900	53,000	2,700	53,000	TBA	TBA
Alaska	2,700	9,000	2,600	9,000	TBA	TBA
Arizona	3,100	80,000	2,800	80,000	TBA	TBA
Arkansas	3,100	34,000	2,800	35,000	TBA	TBA
California	8,200	447,000	7,500	476,000	TBA	TBA
Colorado	3,000	60,000	2,800	57,000	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	3,000	41,000	2,800	41,000	TBA	TBA
Delaware	3,100	10,000	2,800	10,000	TBA	TBA
Florida	6,200	193,000	5,600	185,000	TBA	TBA
Georgia	4,700	122,000	4,200	121,000	TBA	TBA
Hawaii	3,100	14,000	2,800	12,000	TBA	TBA
Idaho	3,100	21,000	2,800	20,000	TBA	TBA
Illinois	4,700	150,000	4,400	146,000	TBA	TBA
Indiana	3,000	76,000	2,600	76,000	TBA	TBA
Iowa	2,800	33,000	2,800	33,000	TBA	TBA
Kansas	3,100	35,000	2,900	35,000	TBA	TBA
Kentucky	4,200	49,000	3,800	48,000	TBA	TBA
Louisiana	2,900	54,000	2,800	49,000	TBA	TBA
Maine	3,100	13,000	2,600	13,000	TBA	TBA
Maryland	4,300	63,000	3,800	60,000	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	4,700	68,000	4,300	71,000	TBA	TBA
Michigan	4,100	106,000	3,700	112,000	TBA	TBA
Minnesota	3,200	62,000	2,600	58,000	TBA	TBA
Mississippi	3,000	35,000	2,800	34,000	TBA	TBA
Missouri	3,100	67,000	2,700	65,000	TBA	TBA
Montana	3,000	11,000	2,800	11,000	TBA	TBA
Nebraska	3,200	22,000	2,800	21,000	TBA	TBA
Nevada	3,200	32,000	2,900	33,000	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	3,100	14,000	2,800	15,000	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	3,100	98,000	2,800	102,000	TBA	TBA
New Mexico	3,700	25,000	3,400	24,000	TBA	TBA
New York	4,100	186,000	3,900	199,000	TBA	TBA
North Carolina	4,400	115,000	4,000	111,000	TBA	TBA
North Dakota	3,400	7,000	3,300	7,000	TBA	TBA
Ohio	4,200	125,000	3,900	130,000	TBA	TBA
Oklahoma	3,200	50,000	2,700	45,000	TBA	TBA
Oregon	3,200	42,000	2,700	40,000	TBA	TBA
Pennsylvania	4,100	121,000	3,800	122,000	TBA	TBA
Rhode Island	3,100	11,000	3,000	10,000	TBA	TBA
South Carolina	2,900	50,000	2,800	50,000	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	3,200	10,000	2,900	9,000	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	3,000	71,000	2,800	70,000	TBA	TBA
Texas	8,400	376,000	7,700	353,000	TBA	TBA
Utah	3,200	46,000	3,000	44,000	TBA	TBA
Vermont	2,800	6,000	2,800	6,000	TBA	TBA
Virginia	3,000	93,000	2,900	89,000	TBA	TBA
Washington	3,200	81,000	2,800	76,000	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	2,900	19,000	2,800	20,000	TBA	TBA
Wisconsin	4,100	60,000	3,900	60,000	TBA	TBA
Wyoming	3,200	7,000	2,900	7,000	TBA	TBA
Other jurisdictions						
BIE[1]	—	—	—	—	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia	2,100	5,000	1,800	4,000	TBA	TBA
DoDEA[2]	3,100	7,000	2,300	5,000	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

[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. Data for BIE and DoDEA schools are counted in the overall national totals, but not in the public school totals. Data for the District of Columbia public schools are counted, along with the states, in the national public school totals. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-4. Student sample sizes and target populations for Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in mathematics at grades 4 and 8, by urban district: 2013

Urban district	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	Sample size	Target population	Sample size	Target population
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

NOTE: The sample size is rounded to the nearest hundred. The target population is rounded to the nearest thousand. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

School and Student Participation

National Participation

To ensure unbiased samples, NAEP requires that participation rates be 70 percent or higher to report national results separately for public and private schools. In instances where participation rates meet the 70 percent criteria but fall below 85 percent, a nonresponse bias analysis is conducted; however, results may still be reported.

National school and student participation rates for the 2013 mathematics assessment are presented in table A-5. Student-weighted school participation rates were 97 percent for grade 4 (100 percent for public schools and 71 percent for private schools), 97 percent for grade 8 (99 percent for public schools and 70 percent for private schools), and 90 percent at grade 12 (93 percent for public schools and 53 percent for private schools).

State and District Participation

Standards established by the Governing Board require that school participation rates for the original state and district samples need to be at least 85 percent for results to be reported. In 2013, all 52 states and jurisdictions participating in the mathematics assessment at grades 4 and 8, and all 13 states participating at grade 12, met this participation rate requirement (tables A-6 through A-8). The 21 urban districts participating at grades 4 and 8 also met the criteria for reporting (table A-9).

Table A-5. National school and student participation rates in NAEP mathematics, by grade and type of school: 2013

	School participation					Student participation	
	Student-weighted		School-weighted				
Grade and type of school	Percent before substitution	Percent after substitution	Percent before substitution	Percent after substitution	Number of schools participating after substitution	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Grade 4							
Nation	**97**	**98**	**90**	**93**	**7,930**	**95**	**186,500**
Public	100	100	100	100	7,540	94	180,200
Private	71	84	65	76	280	96	3,100
Grade 8							
Nation	**97**	**98**	**85**	**90**	**6,520**	**93**	**170,100**
Public	99	99	100	100	6,200	93	164,600
Private	70	82	60	75	250	95	3,200
Grade 12							
Nation	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Public	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Private	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

NOTE: The national totals for schools include Department of Defense Education Activity (overseas and domestic schools) and Bureau of Indian Education schools, which are not included in either the public or private school totals. The national totals for students include students in these schools. Columns of percentages have different denominators. The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-6. Public school and student participation rates in NAEP mathematics at grade 4, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

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**	**7,540**	**94**	**180,200**
Alabama	100	100	110	95	2,900
Alaska	99	97	170	93	2,700
Arizona	100	100	110	95	3,000
Arkansas	100	100	120	95	3,000
California	99	99	290	95	8,000
Colorado	100	100	120	92	3,000
Connecticut	97	97	110	94	2,900
Delaware	100	100	90	94	3,100
Florida	100	100	220	94	6,100
Georgia	100	100	150	94	4,600
Hawaii	100	100	120	95	3,100
Idaho	100	100	120	95	3,100
Illinois	98	98	180	94	4,600
Indiana	100	100	110	95	3,000
Iowa	100	100	130	95	2,800
Kansas	100	100	140	95	3,100
Kentucky	100	100	150	95	4,200
Louisiana	100	100	110	94	2,900
Maine	100	100	150	94	3,000
Maryland	100	100	170	94	4,200
Massachusetts	100	100	170	94	4,600
Michigan	100	100	150	94	3,900
Minnesota	100	100	120	95	3,100
Mississippi	100	100	110	95	3,000
Missouri	100	100	130	95	3,100
Montana	100	98	180	94	3,000
Nebraska	100	100	160	95	3,100
Nevada	100	100	120	96	3,100
New Hampshire	100	100	130	94	3,000
New Jersey	100	100	120	95	3,000
New Mexico	100	99	150	95	3,700
New York	99	97	150	92	4,000
North Carolina	100	100	160	94	4,300
North Dakota	100	99	240	96	3,300
Ohio	100	100	180	94	4,100
Oklahoma	100	100	140	94	3,100
Oregon	100	100	130	94	3,100
Pennsylvania	100	100	160	94	4,000
Rhode Island	100	100	120	95	3,100
South Carolina	100	100	110	96	2,900
South Dakota	100	100	180	95	3,100
Tennessee	100	100	110	94	3,000
Texas	100	100	290	95	8,200
Utah	99	99	110	95	3,200
Vermont	100	100	220	95	2,700
Virginia	100	100	110	94	3,000
Washington	99	99	120	94	3,200
West Virginia	100	100	140	95	2,800
Wisconsin	100	100	180	95	4,000
Wyoming	100	100	180	95	3,100
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	120	95	2,100
DoDEA[1]	99	98	100	95	3,100

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

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. Columns of percentages have different denominators. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-7. Public school and student participation rates in NAEP mathematics at grade 8, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

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)	**99**	**100**	**6,200**	**93**	**164,600**
Alabama	100	100	100	94	2,600
Alaska	100	99	110	92	2,600
Arizona	99	99	110	93	2,700
Arkansas	100	100	110	95	2,700
California	100	100	230	94	7,300
Colorado	100	100	110	93	2,700
Connecticut	98	98	110	92	2,700
Delaware	100	100	50	91	2,800
Florida	100	100	200	91	5,500
Georgia	100	100	120	93	4,100
Hawaii	100	100	60	90	2,700
Idaho	100	100	100	94	2,700
Illinois	100	100	180	94	4,300
Indiana	97	97	100	92	2,600
Iowa	100	100	110	94	2,700
Kansas	100	100	120	94	2,900
Kentucky	99	99	130	95	3,800
Louisiana	100	100	120	94	2,700
Maine	100	100	110	93	2,500
Maryland	100	100	160	92	3,800
Massachusetts	100	100	140	92	4,200
Michigan	100	100	150	93	3,500
Minnesota	99	100	110	92	2,500
Mississippi	100	100	110	94	2,800
Missouri	100	100	120	94	2,700
Montana	100	99	140	92	2,700
Nebraska	100	100	120	93	2,700
Nevada	100	100	90	93	2,900
New Hampshire	100	100	90	92	2,800
New Jersey	100	100	110	92	2,800
New Mexico	100	99	120	93	3,400
New York	93	96	150	91	3,800
North Carolina	100	100	130	93	3,900
North Dakota	100	99	180	95	3,200
Ohio	100	100	170	93	3,800
Oklahoma	100	100	130	93	2,700
Oregon	100	100	120	93	2,700
Pennsylvania	100	100	150	92	3,700
Rhode Island	100	100	60	94	2,900
South Carolina	100	100	110	94	2,800
South Dakota	100	100	140	94	2,800
Tennessee	100	100	110	93	2,700
Texas	100	100	210	94	7,500
Utah	100	100	110	92	2,900
Vermont	100	100	120	94	2,700
Virginia	100	100	110	93	2,800
Washington	100	100	110	91	2,700
West Virginia	100	100	100	93	2,700
Wisconsin	100	100	150	94	3,800
Wyoming	100	100	90	94	2,900
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	100	100	70	91	1,800
DoDEA[1]	99	97	60	94	2,200

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

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. Columns of percentages have different denominators. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-8. Public school and student participation rates in NAEP mathematics at grade 12, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

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)	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Arkansas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. Columns of percentages have different denominators. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-9. Public school and student participation rates for Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in mathematics, by grade and urban district: 2013

Grade and urban district	School participation			Student participation	
	Student-weighted percent	School-weighted percent	Number of schools participating	Student-weighted percent	Number of students assessed
Grade 4					
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Grade 8					
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

NOTE: The number of schools is rounded to the nearest ten. The number of students is rounded to the nearest hundred. The school participation rates are student-weighted percentages before substitution. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Inclusion of Students With Disabilities and/or English Language Learners

It is important for NAEP to assess as many students selected to participate as possible. Assessing representative samples of students, including students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), helps to ensure that NAEP results accurately reflect the educational performance of all students in the target population, and can continue to serve as a meaningful measure of U.S. students' academic achievement over time.

The National Assessment Governing Board, which sets policy for NAEP, has been exploring ways to ensure that NAEP continues to appropriately include as many students as possible and to do so in a consistent manner for all jurisdictions assessed and reported. In March 2010, the Governing Board adopted a new policy, NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. This policy was the culmination of work with experts in testing and curriculum, and those who work with exceptional children and students learning to speak English. The policy aims to

- maximize participation of sampled students in NAEP,
- reduce variation in exclusion rates for SD and ELL students across states and districts,
- develop uniform national rules for including students in NAEP, and
- ensure that NAEP is fully representative of SD and ELL students.

The policy defines specific inclusion goals for NAEP samples. At the national, state, and district levels, the goal is to include 95 percent of all students selected for the NAEP samples, and 85 percent of those in the NAEP sample who are identified as SD or ELL.

Students are selected to participate in NAEP based on a sampling procedure designed to yield a sample of students that is representative of students in all schools nationwide and in public schools within each state. First, schools are selected, and then students are sampled from within those schools without regard to disability or English language proficiency. Once students are selected, those previously identified as SD or ELL may be offered accommodations or excluded.

States and jurisdictions vary in their proportions of special-needs students and in their policies on inclusion and the use of accommodations. While identification of rates SD and ELL students in some states, have leveled off in recent years, NAEP inclusion rates have generally remained steady or increased since 2003. Only a small number of states included a smaller percentage of students in the 2013 NAEP mathematics assessments than in 2011, and these decreases in inclusion rates were all a percentage point or less. Inclusion rates did not decrease since 2009 for any of the 11 jurisdictions that participated in both 2009 and 2013 at grade 12. This reflects efforts on the part of states and jurisdictions to include all students who can meaningfully participate in the NAEP assessments. The NAEP inclusion policy is an effort to ensure that this trend continues.

Determining whether each jurisdiction has met the NAEP inclusion goals involves looking at three different inclusion rates—an overall inclusion rate, an inclusion rate for SD students, and an inclusion rate for ELL students. Each inclusion rate is calculated as the percentage of sampled students who were included in the assessment (i.e., were not excluded).

Inclusion rate percentages are estimates because they are based on representative samples of students rather than on the entire population of students. As such, the inclusion rates are associated with a margin of error. The margin of error for each jurisdiction's inclusion rate was taken into account when comparing it to the corresponding inclusion goal. For example, if the point estimate of a state's overall inclusion rate was 93 percent and had a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points, the state was considered to have met the 95 percent inclusion goal because the 95 percent goal falls within the margin of error, which ranges from 90 percent to 96 percent. Refer to the Technical Notes for more details about how the margin of error was used in these calculations.

Confidence intervals for state inclusion rates

NAEP endeavors to include as many sampled students as possible in the assessment, including students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), and has established specific inclusion goals: 95 percent of all sampled students and 85 percent of sampled students identified as SD or ELL. Inclusion rates were computed for each state/jurisdiction participating in the 2013 assessment and compared to NAEP inclusion goals. Three inclusion percentages were computed for each state/jurisdiction. An overall inclusion percentage represents included students as a percentage of all students sampled within the state/jurisdiction. In addition, separate percentages were computed to report included students as a percentage of the state/jurisdiction sample that was

identified as SD (not including students having a Section 504 plan) or ELL.

Inclusion percentages are estimates based on a sample, and each estimate has a measure of uncertainty or margin of error. Confidence intervals quantify this uncertainty due to sampling, resulting in interval estimates of the inclusion percentages. Therefore, confidence intervals for inclusion percentages were used to determine upper and lower confidence bounds around the inclusion point estimates.

When determining whether each state/jurisdiction met the NAEP inclusion goals, the confidence intervals were used, rather than just the point estimates. This means that if the inclusion goal of either 95 percent or 85 percent fell within the corresponding confidence interval, the state/jurisdiction was considered as having met the goal. States/jurisdictions for which the upper bound of the confidence interval was less than 95 percent (or 85 percent) did not meet the inclusion goal.

See the National Assessment Governing Board's policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners at http://www.nagb.org/content/nagb/assets/documents/policies/naep_testandreport_studentswithdisabilities.pdf.

All of the states/jurisdictions participating in the 2013 mathematics assessment met the 95 percent inclusion goal at all three grades. See appendix table A-11 for the inclusion rates as a percentage of all students selected in each state/jurisdiction, and table A-12 for the rates as a percentage of the SD or ELL students.

All of districts participating in the 2013 mathematics assessment met the 95 percent inclusion goal at both grades 4 and 8. See appendix table A-13 for the inclusion rates as a percentage of all students selected in each urban district, and table A-14 for the rates as a percentage of the SD or ELL students.

Table A-10. Percentage of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) assessed in NAEP mathematics with accommodations, by SD/ELL category and type of accommodation: 2013

	Grade 4			Grade 8			Grade 12		
Type of accommodation	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL	SD and/or ELL	SD	ELL
Bilingual dictionary	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.7	TBA	TBA	TBA
Braille presentation	#	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Braille response	#	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Breaks	4.1	3.4	1.1	2.5	2.3	0.4	TBA	TBA	TBA
Calculator	1.1	1.1	0.1	2.3	2.3	0.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cue to stay on task	1.2	1.1	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.1	TBA	TBA	TBA
Directions read aloud in English	3.3	2.5	1.2	2.9	2.5	0.6	TBA	TBA	TBA
Directions read aloud in Spanish	0.1	#	0.1	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Extended time	11.4	8.1	4.4	9.8	8.2	2.3	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large-print booklet	#	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Magnification device	#	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
One-on-one	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	TBA	TBA	TBA
Other	0.3	0.3	#	0.3	0.3	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Read aloud (all)	5.7	5.0	1.5	3.6	3.3	0.5	TBA	TBA	TBA
Read aloud (occasional)	1.3	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.1	0.3	TBA	TBA	TBA
Read aloud in Spanish	0.1	#	0.1	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
School staff administers	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.3	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Scribe	0.5	0.5	#	0.2	0.2	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Sign language presentation	#	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Sign language response	#	#	#	#	#	#	TBA	TBA	TBA
Small group	9.8	8.0	2.9	8.4	7.6	1.5	TBA	TBA	TBA
Spanish-English booklet	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2	#	0.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
Special equipment	0.4	0.4	#	0.3	0.3	#	TBA	TBA	TBA

Rounds to zero.

† Not applicable. These accommodations are not offered at grade 12.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-11. Inclusion rate and confidence interval in NAEP mathematics for fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade public school students, as a percentage of all students, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

	Grade 4			Grade 8			Grade 12		
		95% confidence interval			95% confidence interval			95% confidence interval	
State/jurisdiction	Inclusion rate	Lower	Upper	Inclusion rate	Lower	Upper	Inclusion rate	Lower	Upper
Nation (public)	98 [1]	98.4	98.6	98 [1]	98.3	98.5	TBA **TBA**	TBA	TBA
Alabama	99 [1]	98.1	99.4	99 [1]	98.6	99.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
Alaska	99 [1]	98.4	99.2	99 [1]	98.5	99.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
Arizona	99 [1]	98.3	99.1	99 [1]	98.2	99.1	TBA	TBA	TBA
Arkansas	99 [1]	98.3	99.1	98 [1]	97.5	98.5	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
California	98 [1]	97.4	98.6	99 [1]	98.0	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Colorado	99 [1]	98.3	99.2	99 [1]	98.3	99.3	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	99 [1]	98.1	99.1	98 [1]	97.4	98.4	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Delaware	98 [1]	97.1	98.5	99 [1]	98.2	99.0	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	98 [1]	97.5	98.6	98 [1]	97.7	98.8	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Georgia	99 [1]	97.9	99.0	98 [1]	97.7	99.0	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hawaii	99 [1]	98.3	99.1	98 [1]	97.8	98.8	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	99 [1]	98.3	99.0	99 [1]	98.5	99.3	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	99 [1]	98.4	99.4	99 [1]	98.6	99.3	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Indiana	98 [1]	97.9	98.9	98 [1]	97.7	98.8	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	99 [1]	98.8	99.6	99 [1]	98.8	99.5	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Kansas	98 [1]	97.9	98.8	98 [1]	97.7	98.8	TBA	TBA	TBA
Kentucky	99 [1]	98.0	99.0	98 [1]	97.2	98.5	TBA	TBA	TBA
Louisiana	99 [1]	98.3	99.3	99 [1]	98.5	99.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
Maine	98 [1]	97.3	98.4	99 [1]	98.2	99.0	TBA	TBA	TBA
Maryland	99 [1]	98.6	99.3	98 [1]	97.7	98.7	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	98 [1]	97.3	98.5	98 [1]	97.1	98.6	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	98 [1]	97.3	98.6	98 [1]	95.8	98.6	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Minnesota	99 [1]	98.1	99.0	98 [1]	97.6	98.8	TBA	TBA	TBA
Mississippi	99 [1]	98.7	99.5	99 [1]	98.5	99.6	TBA	TBA	TBA
Missouri	99 [1]	98.0	99.0	99 [1]	98.2	99.1	TBA	TBA	TBA
Montana	98 [1]	97.8	98.7	99 [1]	98.0	99.0	TBA	TBA	TBA
Nebraska	98 [1]	97.6	98.8	98 [1]	97.6	98.6	TBA	TBA	TBA
Nevada	99 [1]	98.1	99.0	99 [1]	98.4	99.3	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	99 [1]	98.3	99.1	99 [1]	98.5	99.3	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	99 [1]	98.3	99.2	98 [1]	97.7	98.8	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
New Mexico	99 [1]	98.2	99.2	98 [1]	97.9	98.8	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York	99 [1]	98.1	99.2	98 [1]	97.1	98.7	TBA	TBA	TBA
North Carolina	99 [1]	98.3	99.1	99 [1]	98.2	99.1	TBA	TBA	TBA
North Dakota	97 [1]	96.8	97.9	97 [1]	96.5	97.5	TBA	TBA	TBA
Ohio	99 [1]	98.2	99.0	98 [1]	98.0	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Oklahoma	98 [1]	97.5	98.6	98 [1]	97.7	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Oregon	98 [1]	97.2	98.4	99 [1]	97.9	99.0	TBA	TBA	TBA
Pennsylvania	98 [1]	97.8	98.8	98 [1]	97.4	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Rhode Island	99 [1]	98.4	99.2	99 [1]	98.5	99.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Carolina	99 [1]	98.2	99.3	99 [1]	98.0	99.1	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	99 [1]	98.0	99.0	99 [1]	98.2	99.1	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	99 [1]	98.0	99.1	98 [1]	97.7	98.7	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Texas	98 [1]	97.9	98.7	98 [1]	97.4	98.6	TBA	TBA	TBA
Utah	99 [1]	98.1	99.2	98 [1]	97.9	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Vermont	99 [1]	98.2	99.0	99 [1]	98.8	99.4	TBA	TBA	TBA
Virginia	98 [1]	98.0	98.9	99 [1]	98.6	99.2	TBA	TBA	TBA
Washington	98 [1]	97.0	98.4	98 [1]	97.3	98.5	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	98 [1]	97.6	98.8	98 [1]	97.8	98.7	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Wisconsin	98 [1]	97.7	98.6	98 [1]	97.9	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Wyoming	99 [1]	98.6	99.3	98 [1]	98.0	98.9	TBA	TBA	TBA
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	99 [1]	98.1	99.0	99 [1]	98.5	99.4	TBA	TBA	TBA
DoDEA[2]	98 [1]	97.9	98.7	99 [1]	98.4	99.2	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

[1] The state/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board goal of 95 percent.

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

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-12. Inclusion rate and standard error (SE) in NAEP mathematics for fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), as a percentage of identified SD and ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

	Percentage of identified SD or ELL students											
	Grade 4				Grade 8				Grade 12			
	SD		ELL		SD		ELL		SD		ELL	
State/jurisdiction	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE
Nation (public)	90 [1]	0.4	96 [1]	0.3	89 [1]	0.4	93 [1]	0.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Alabama	90 [1]	2.7	96 [1]	2.3	91 [1]	1.6	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Alaska	94 [1]	1.3	98 [1]	0.5	93 [1]	1.4	98 [1]	0.7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Arizona	91 [1]	1.9	95 [1]	1.2	91 [1]	1.6	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Arkansas	90 [1]	1.8	99 [1]	0.6	84 [1]	2.1	96 [1]	1.4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
California	83 [1]	2.8	95 [1]	0.6	88 [1]	2.2	94 [1]	1.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Colorado	89 [1]	1.9	98 [1]	0.9	89 [1]	2.2	97 [1]	1.1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	90 [1]	1.8	96 [1]	1.7	85 [1]	2.0	91 [1]	3.1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Delaware	86 [1]	2.0	93 [1]	2.9	92 [1]	1.2	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	90 [1]	1.7	93 [1]	1.7	90 [1]	1.7	87 [1]	3.2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Georgia	88 [1]	2.0	97 [1]	1.5	88 [1]	1.9	88 [1]	8.2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hawaii	92 [1]	1.5	93 [1]	1.7	92 [1]	1.7	92 [1]	1.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	90 [1]	1.7	90 [1]	2.6	87 [1]	2.2	97 [1]	1.8	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	94 [1]	1.4	96 [1]	1.3	94 [1]	1.2	95 [1]	1.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Indiana	92 [1]	1.5	97 [1]	1.6	89 [1]	1.7	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	96 [1]	1.1	96 [1]	2.4	94 [1]	1.3	99 [1]	1.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Kansas	91 [1]	1.5	98 [1]	0.6	87 [1]	2.1	99 [1]	0.9	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Kentucky	89 [1]	1.8	93 [1]	2.7	82 [1]	2.6	89 [1]	3.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Louisiana	93 [1]	1.6	96 [1]	2.9	89 [1]	1.8	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Maine	89 [1]	1.3	88 [1]	4.0	93 [1]	1.2	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Maryland	93 [1]	1.5	97 [1]	0.8	89 [1]	2.0	83 [1]	4.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	90 [1]	1.6	96 [1]	1.2	91 [1]	1.3	87 [1]	4.3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	87 [1]	1.9	95 [1]	2.0	84 [1]	3.6	84 [1]	5.2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Minnesota	91 [1]	1.4	98 [1]	0.9	88 [1]	2.1	95 [1]	2.7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Mississippi	93 [1]	1.7	‡	†	91 [1]	2.7	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Missouri	90 [1]	1.8	96 [1]	2.9	89 [1]	1.9	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Montana	86 [1]	1.9	95 [1]	2.5	87 [1]	2.1	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Nebraska	91 [1]	1.7	96 [1]	1.1	88 [1]	1.7	90 [1]	3.1	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Nevada	90 [1]	1.6	98 [1]	0.5	93 [1]	1.8	96 [1]	1.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	92 [1]	1.3	97 [1]	2.6	94 [1]	1.2	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	93 [1]	1.5	93 [1]	3.0	92 [1]	1.8	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Mexico	92 [1]	1.5	98 [1]	0.6	89 [1]	1.5	98 [1]	0.7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York	94 [1]	1.6	93 [1]	1.5	89 [1]	2.3	94 [1]	2.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
North Carolina	92 [1]	1.3	95 [1]	1.3	92 [1]	1.5	94 [1]	1.9	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
North Dakota	81 [1]	2.1	89 [1]	3.4	79 [1]	1.8	85 [1]	3.5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Ohio	91 [1]	1.4	96 [1]	1.7	89 [1]	1.5	97 [1]	1.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Oklahoma	89 [1]	1.6	97 [1]	1.0	91 [1]	1.5	92 [1]	2.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Oregon	87 [1]	1.6	96 [1]	0.8	90 [1]	1.9	97 [1]	2.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Pennsylvania	91 [1]	1.2	90 [1]	3.3	91 [1]	1.6	89 [1]	4.7	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Rhode Island	93 [1]	1.5	97 [1]	0.9	95 [1]	1.0	92 [1]	2.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Carolina	93 [1]	1.7	99 [1]	0.9	90 [1]	2.1	95 [1]	2.2	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	91 [1]	1.4	98 [1]	1.4	89 [1]	1.7	91 [1]	4.6	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	92 [1]	1.6	91 [1]	3.4	85 [1]	2.1	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Texas	85 [1]	2.0	97 [1]	0.6	85 [1]	2.8	90 [1]	2.5	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Utah	92 [1]	1.9	93 [1]	1.9	88 [1]	1.8	92 [1]	2.8	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Vermont	92 [1]	1.1	‡	†	95 [1]	0.9	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Virginia	90 [1]	1.6	95 [1]	2.2	94 [1]	1.1	95 [1]	1.9	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Washington	85 [1]	2.4	96 [1]	1.5	86 [1]	2.4	92 [1]	2.3	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	91 [1]	1.5	‡	†	86 [1]	1.9	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Wisconsin	89 [1]	1.4	96 [1]	1.0	90 [1]	1.9	96 [1]	1.4	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Wyoming	94 [1]	0.9	94 [1]	2.3	89 [1]	1.5	‡	†	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	94 [1]	1.3	91 [1]	2.3	98 [1]	0.7	89 [1]	3.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
DoDEA[2]	90 [1]	1.3	88 [1]	2.3	90 [1]	2.0	87 [1]	3.0	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

† Not applicable. Standard error estimate cannot be accurately determined.

‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

[1] The state/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board goal of 85 percent.

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

NOTE: SD includes students identified as having an Individualized Education Program but excludes other students protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-13. Inclusion rate and confidence interval in NAEP mathematics for fourth- and eighth-grade public school students, as a percentage of all students, by urban district/jurisdiction: 2013

	Grade 4			Grade 8		
		95% confidence interval			95% confidence interval	
Urban district/jurisdiction	Inclusion rate	Lower	Upper	Inclusion rate	Lower	Upper
Nation (public)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA

[1] Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

[2] The urban district/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board goal of 95 percent.

NOTE: DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Accommodations

Prior to 1996, no testing accommodations were provided to students taking the NAEP mathematics assessment, resulting in the exclusion of students who could not be assessed without them. As the number of identified students with disabilities and English language learners increased over the years, the exclusion of those needing accommodations to participate in NAEP threatened the stability of trend lines (excluding more students in one assessment year than in another might lead to apparent rather than real differences), and threatened to compromise NAEP samples as optimally representative of target populations. Therefore, administration procedures allowing for many of the same testing accommodations provided on state and district assessments (e.g., extra testing time or individual rather than group administration) were introduced in 1996 for national NAEP mathematics assessments and in 2000 for NAEP state assessments.

The percentages of SD/ELL students assessed with the available accommodations in 2013 are presented in table A-14. Students assessed with accommodations typically received some combination of accommodations. In contrast to assessment years prior to 2009 in which students were only counted once in the category reflecting the primary accommodation provided, students are counted in the categories for each accommodation they received in 2013. For example, students assessed in small groups (as compared with standard NAEP sessions of about 30 students) were also usually given extended time and are included in counts for both groups in table A-14.

Since providing accommodations represented a change in testing conditions that could potentially affect the measurement of changes over time, split national samples of students were assessed in mathematics in 1996 and 2000, and split state samples were assessed in 2000. In each of these years, one sample permitted accommodations, and the other did not. This eased the transition to single samples in which accommodations were permitted beginning in 2003 while maintaining trends back to 1990.

Table A-14. Inclusion rate and standard error (SE) in NAEP mathematics for fourth- and eighth-grade public school students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL), as a percentage of identified SD and ELL students, by urban district/jurisdiction: 2013

	Percentage of identified SD or ELL students							
	Grade 4				Grade 8			
	SD		ELL		SD		ELL	
Urban district/jurisdiction	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE	Inclusion rate	SE
Nation (public)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA	TBA TBA	TBA

† Not applicable. Standard error estimate cannot be accurately determined.

‡ Reporting standards not met. Sample size insufficient to permit a reliable estimate.

[1] Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

[2] The urban district/jurisdiction's inclusion rate is higher than or not significantly different from the National Assessment Governing Board goal of 85 percent.

NOTE: SD includes students identified as having an Individualized Education Program but excludes other students protected under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Exclusion Rates

Even with the availability of accommodations, some students are excluded from the NAEP assessments by their schools. The decision to exclude any student is made by school staff, who, using NAEP guidelines and each student's Individualized Education Program (IEP), decide whether the student can meaningfully be assessed.

In 2013, the method used by school staff to determine whether or not a student should be excluded from the NAEP assessment was revised. Previously, a student who required an accommodation specified in their IEP that was not allowed by NAEP was excluded. Beginning in 2013, SD students could be excluded only if they took an alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards, and ELL students could be excluded only if they had been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than one year. All other students were encouraged to take the assessment, even if their accommodation was not allowed by NAEP. Schools, students, or parents could, however, refuse to allow such a student to be assessed. For weighting and reporting purposes, these refusals were counted as exclusions.

Jurisdictions vary in their proportions of special-needs students. These variations, as well as differences in policies and practices regarding the identification and inclusion of special-needs students, lead to differences in exclusion and accommodation rates. These differences should be considered when comparing student performance over time and across jurisdictions. While the effect of exclusion is not precisely known, the validity of comparisons of performance results could be affected if exclusion rates are comparatively high or vary widely over time.

National Exclusion Rates (public and nonpublic school students): In the 1992 national sample, when accommodations were not permitted, 9 percent of students at grade 4 and 9 percent at grade 8 were identified as SD and/or ELL, 6 percent were excluded at grades 4 and 8 (table A-15). In 2013, 13 and 22 percent of students across the three grades were identified as SD and/or ELL, with 1 percent excluded at grade 4, 1 percent excluded at grade 8, and 2 percent excluded at grade 12 (table A-16). The percentage of SD and/or ELL students assessed with accommodations in 2013 was 13 percent at grade 4, 12 percent at grade 8, and 9 percent at grade 12. (Note that the denominator for these percentages includes assessed students plus excluded students; it does not include sampled students who were absent or refused to participate. The proportions of SD and/or ELL students excluded and assessed with and without accommodations as a percentage of students identified are provided in table A-17).

State Exclusion Rates (public school students only): Across the states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1992 mathematics assessment at grade 4, the percentage of students identified as SD and/or ELL ranged from 7 to 28 percent, and the percentage excluded ranged from 2 to 12 percent (table A-18). In comparison, the state percentages of fourth-graders identified as SD and/or ELL in 2013 ranged from 9 to 24 percent, and exclusion rates ranged from 1 to 3 percent (table A-19).

Across the states/jurisdictions that participated in the 1990 mathematics assessment at grade 8, the percentage of students identified as SD and/or ELL ranged from 6 to 15 percent, and the percentage excluded ranged from 2 to 7 percent (table A-19). In comparison, the state percentages of eighth-graders identified as SD and/or ELL in 2013 ranged from 8 to 23 percent, and exclusion rates ranged from 1 to 10 percent (table A-20).

Rates by state are reported separately for SD and ELL students at each grade in tables A-23 through A-32. Rates are also reported as the percentage of SD and/or ELL students identified in each state in tables A-33 through A-35.

Table A-15. Percentage of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted: 1992 and 1996

Grade and SD/ELL category	1992	1996
Grade 4		
SD and/or ELL		
Identified	9	14
Excluded	6	6
Assessed	3	8
SD		
Identified	7	11
Excluded	4	5
Assessed	3	6
ELL		
Identified	3	3
Excluded	2	1
Assessed	1	2
Grade 8		
SD and/or ELL		
Identified	9	11
Excluded	6	4
Assessed	4	6
SD		
Identified	7	9
Excluded	4	4
Assessed	3	5
ELL		
Identified	2	3
Excluded	2	1
Assessed	1	2
Grade 12		
SD and/or ELL		
Identified	TBA	TBA
Excluded	TBA	TBA
Assessed	TBA	TBA
SD		
Identified	TBA	TBA
Excluded	TBA	TBA
Assessed	TBA	TBA
ELL		
Identified	TBA	TBA
Excluded	TBA	TBA
Assessed	TBA	TBA

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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 and 1996 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-16. Percentage of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted: Various years, 1996–2013

Grade and SD/ELL category	1996	2000	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011	2013
Grade 4								
SD and/or ELL								
Identified	15	18	21	21	21	21	22	22
Excluded	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	1
Assessed	11	14	17	18	19	19	20	20
Without accommodations	7	9	9	9	9	8	8	7
With accommodations	5	5	8	9	10	10	12	13
SD								
Identified	10	12	13	13	13	13	13	13
Excluded	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
Assessed	7	9	10	10	10	11	11	12
Without accommodations	4	5	4	3	3	3	2	2
With accommodations	4	4	6	7	7	8	8	10
ELL								
Identified	6	7	10	10	10	10	11	10
Excluded	1	1	1	1	1	1	#	#
Assessed	5	6	8	8	9	9	10	10
Without accommodations	3	4	6	6	6	6	6	5
With accommodations	2	1	2	2	3	3	4	5
Grade 8								
SD and/or ELL								
Identified	12	13	17	17	17	17	17	16
Excluded	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	1
Assessed	8	10	14	14	13	14	14	15
Without accommodations	6	7	7	6	6	5	4	3
With accommodations	3	3	6	8	7	9	10	12
SD								
Identified	9	10	13	12	12	12	12	12
Excluded	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1
Assessed	6	7	10	10	8	9	10	11
Without accommodations	4	5	4	3	2	2	2	1
With accommodations	2	2	6	7	6	8	8	10
ELL								
Identified	3	4	6	6	6	5	6	5
Excluded	1	1	1	1	1	#	#	#
Assessed	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
Without accommodations	2	2	4	4	4	3	3	2
With accommodations	#	1	1	1	2	2	2	3
Grade 12								
SD and/or ELL								
Identified	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Excluded	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Assessed	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Without accommodations	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
With accommodations	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD								
Identified	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Excluded	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Assessed	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Without accommodations	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
With accommodations	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL								
Identified	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Excluded	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Assessed	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Without accommodations	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
With accommodations	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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, 1996–2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-17. Percentage of fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade public and nonpublic school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, as a percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students, by grade and SD/ELL category: 2013

	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students			
Grade and SD/ELL category	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Grade 4				
SD and/or ELL	7	93	31	62
SD	9	91	16	75
ELL	4	96	47	49
Grade 8				
SD and/or ELL	9	91	19	72
SD	10	90	10	80
ELL	7	93	40	53
Grade 12				
SD and/or ELL	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-18. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1992, 1996, and 2000

	1992			1996			2000		
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	**10**	**7**	**4**	**16**	**6**	**9**	**16**	**7**	**9**
Alabama	10	5	6	12	6	5	13	6	7
Alaska	—	—	—	20	4	16	—	—	—
Arizona	15	5	10	21	12	9	25	12	13
Arkansas	12	5	6	10	7	3	14	7	7
California	28	12	16	33	16	17	33	9	24
Colorado	10	5	5	15	8	7	—	—	—
Connecticut	14	7	7	16	8	8	15	10	5
Delaware	12	5	6	14	7	7	—	—	—
Florida	17	8	8	19	10	9	—	—	—
Georgia	10	5	4	13	7	6	11	7	4
Hawaii	13	6	8	14	6	9	19	10	9
Idaho	9	3	6	—	—	—	16	6	10
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—	17	10	6
Indiana	7	3	4	11	5	6	11	7	5
Iowa	9	3	6	13	6	7	15	10	5
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	7	9
Kentucky	8	3	5	10	6	4	12	8	3
Louisiana	8	4	4	14	8	7	16	8	8
Maine	14	6	8	15	8	7	16	10	6
Maryland	11	4	7	14	8	7	12	9	4
Massachusetts	18	7	11	18	9	9	19	10	9
Michigan	7	5	2	11	6	5	11	8	3
Minnesota	9	3	6	14	6	8	16	6	10
Mississippi	7	5	2	8	6	2	6	4	2
Missouri	12	4	7	14	5	9	15	10	6
Montana	—	—	—	10	5	5	12	5	7
Nebraska	13	4	8	15	5	10	18	8	10
Nevada	—	—	—	16	9	8	20	10	9
New Hampshire	12	4	8	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	11	6	6	11	6	5	—	—	—
New Mexico	15	7	8	22	12	10	31	12	19
New York	12	5	6	15	8	7	16	12	4
North Carolina	12	4	8	14	7	7	16	13	3
North Dakota	9	2	7	11	4	7	12	6	6
Ohio	10	6	4	—	—	—	12	10	2
Oklahoma	13	7	6	—	—	—	20	10	10
Oregon	—	—	—	19	9	10	18	8	11
Pennsylvania	9	4	5	9	5	4	—	—	—
Rhode Island	15	6	10	18	6	12	23	12	11
South Carolina	10	5	5	12	6	7	17	7	10
Tennessee	12	4	8	13	6	6	11	4	7
Texas	17	8	9	24	10	14	25	15	10
Utah	10	4	6	13	6	7	14	7	7
Vermont	—	—	—	14	6	8	15	11	5
Virginia	11	5	6	14	7	7	16	11	5
Washington	—	—	—	13	5	8	—	—	—
West Virginia	9	4	4	13	8	5	13	10	3
Wisconsin	11	5	5	12	8	4	19	12	8
Wyoming	10	4	7	13	4	9	15	6	9
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	11	9	2	14	11	3	19	9	10
DoDEA[1]	—	—	—	9	4	5	11	5	6

— Not available.

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

NOTE: South Dakota did not participate in NAEP mathematics assessments from 1992 to 2000. 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, 1996, and 2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-19. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13

State/jurisdiction	2000					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**19**	**4**	**15**	**10**	**5**	**22**	**4**	**18**	**10**	**8**
Alabama	13	3	10	7	3	12	2	10	8	2
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	31	1	30	20	10
Arizona	25	4	21	12	9	27	5	23	18	5
Arkansas	14	4	10	6	4	17	2	14	7	8
California	33	6	27	19	8	38	3	35	31	4
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	20	2	17	7	11
Connecticut	14	5	10	5	4	16	4	12	5	8
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	18	7	11	4	7
Florida	—	—	—	—	—	26	3	23	8	15
Georgia	11	3	8	4	4	16	2	14	6	7
Hawaii	19	9	11	8	3	17	3	14	5	8
Idaho	16	2	13	7	7	18	2	16	9	7
Illinois	17	3	14	5	9	23	4	18	7	11
Indiana	11	2	9	3	6	17	2	14	8	7
Iowa	15	2	12	5	7	18	3	15	4	11
Kansas	16	3	13	9	4	16	2	14	3	11
Kentucky	12	3	9	4	5	14	3	11	5	7
Louisiana	16	3	13	2	11	22	3	19	3	16
Maine	16	5	12	5	7	18	3	15	4	11
Maryland	12	2	10	4	6	16	4	12	6	6
Massachusetts	19	3	17	7	10	22	3	19	4	15
Michigan	11	3	8	3	4	15	4	11	5	6
Minnesota	16	2	14	7	7	18	3	16	8	7
Mississippi	6	3	3	1	2	10	5	5	4	1
Missouri	15	3	13	5	8	17	4	13	4	10
Montana	12	2	11	5	6	16	2	14	7	7
Nebraska	18	3	15	10	4	20	3	17	9	9
Nevada	20	7	13	8	5	26	4	22	14	8
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	20	3	17	5	12
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	18	2	16	1	14
New Mexico	31	6	26	16	10	40	4	36	22	15
New York	16	5	11	2	9	19	5	14	2	11
North Carolina	16	5	11	3	8	21	4	17	5	12
North Dakota	12	1	11	7	4	18	2	16	8	7
Ohio	12	5	7	2	5	13	4	9	2	7
Oklahoma	20	5	15	11	5	22	4	18	10	8
Oregon	18	3	16	8	8	27	4	23	11	11
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	15	3	12	3	9
Rhode Island	23	3	20	10	10	27	3	24	9	15
South Carolina	17	5	12	7	5	18	6	12	7	4
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	18	1	16	9	7
Tennessee	11	3	9	7	1	14	3	11	7	5
Texas	25	7	18	12	6	27	7	20	14	6
Utah	14	3	11	7	4	21	3	19	11	7
Vermont	15	3	13	4	9	18	4	14	4	10
Virginia	16	4	12	5	7	19	6	13	5	8
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	19	3	16	8	8
West Virginia	13	3	11	3	8	15	3	12	3	9
Wisconsin	19	5	14	7	8	20	4	16	4	12
Wyoming	15	2	13	8	6	18	1	17	6	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	19	5	14	7	7	18	4	14	4	10
DoDEA[1]	11	3	8	4	4	14	1	13	6	7

See notes at end of table.

Table A-19. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**23**	**3**	**20**	**10**	**10**	**23**	**3**	**20**	**10**	**10**
Alabama	13	1	12	9	3	13	2	12	8	4
Alaska	32	2	30	15	15	30	2	28	13	15
Arizona	29	4	25	17	8	25	3	22	14	7
Arkansas	16	3	13	5	8	18	3	15	4	11
California	39	4	35	31	5	40	2	38	33	5
Colorado	22	3	19	5	14	25	2	24	9	15
Connecticut	16	2	14	4	10	18	1	17	4	13
Delaware	20	8	12	5	7	20	5	15	5	10
Florida	25	3	21	5	17	22	3	18	2	16
Georgia	16	2	14	6	8	15	2	13	4	9
Hawaii	18	3	16	6	9	19	1	18	7	11
Idaho	18	1	17	9	8	18	2	16	8	8
Illinois	22	3	20	9	10	23	5	18	8	10
Indiana	18	2	16	5	11	22	3	19	7	12
Iowa	18	2	16	4	12	17	1	16	4	12
Kansas	19	3	16	6	10	20	3	17	7	10
Kentucky	15	3	13	3	9	17	3	14	6	8
Louisiana	24	4	20	3	18	19	2	16	3	13
Maine	20	4	16	5	12	19	3	16	4	12
Maryland	17	4	13	5	9	16	4	12	4	9
Massachusetts	24	4	19	6	13	23	5	18	6	12
Michigan	17	4	13	4	9	15	3	12	5	7
Minnesota	19	2	17	9	9	21	2	18	8	10
Mississippi	11	2	9	5	4	11	1	10	5	6
Missouri	18	2	16	6	10	16	4	13	5	8
Montana	14	2	12	4	8	16	2	14	5	9
Nebraska	23	2	21	9	12	23	3	20	10	10
Nevada	26	3	23	13	10	32	3	29	16	13
New Hampshire	22	2	20	5	14	21	2	18	4	14
New Jersey	18	3	15	4	11	18	2	16	2	14
New Mexico	36	3	33	15	18	32	4	29	14	15
New York	20	4	17	2	14	22	2	20	2	17
North Carolina	21	2	18	4	14	21	2	19	5	14
North Dakota	17	3	14	6	8	17	4	13	5	9
Ohio	13	3	9	2	8	17	5	12	3	9
Oklahoma	21	4	17	7	10	19	5	14	7	7
Oregon	27	4	23	11	11	26	3	23	9	14
Pennsylvania	18	3	15	4	11	18	2	16	5	11
Rhode Island	26	3	23	8	15	25	2	23	7	16
South Carolina	16	4	12	7	5	17	2	15	7	8
South Dakota	19	2	17	9	8	19	1	17	9	8
Tennessee	13	3	10	4	6	16	6	10	5	5
Texas	27	6	21	13	8	26	5	21	12	9
Utah	23	2	20	11	9	22	2	20	11	9
Vermont	18	3	15	5	10	19	2	16	4	12
Virginia	22	5	17	5	12	22	5	17	7	10
Washington	21	3	18	8	10	22	3	19	8	11
West Virginia	20	2	17	9	8	18	1	17	8	8
Wisconsin	19	2	17	5	12	21	3	18	5	13
Wyoming	19	2	17	6	11	18	2	16	6	10
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	20	6	14	4	10	20	6	14	2	13
DoDEA[1]	17	2	15	6	8	17	2	15	6	9

See notes at end of table.

Table A-19. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**23**	**2**	**20**	**9**	**11**	**23**	**2**	**21**	**9**	**12**
Alabama	12	1	11	8	4	12	1	11	6	4
Alaska	25	1	24	6	17	27	3	25	7	18
Arizona	26	1	24	11	14	22	1	21	5	15
Arkansas	17	1	16	4	12	20	1	19	5	14
California	36	2	34	28	5	38	2	36	29	7
Colorado	21	2	19	6	13	25	1	24	9	14
Connecticut	18	2	16	2	14	19	1	17	2	16
Delaware	18	3	15	2	13	19	4	15	3	12
Florida	23	2	21	4	18	23	2	22	3	19
Georgia	14	1	13	4	9	16	2	15	4	10
Hawaii	20	1	18	5	13	20	2	18	7	11
Idaho	15	1	14	5	8	15	1	13	5	9
Illinois	22	3	19	6	13	21	2	18	6	13
Indiana	19	2	17	6	11	22	2	20	6	14
Iowa	18	2	16	3	13	19	1	18	3	15
Kansas	22	3	19	7	12	24	2	23	10	13
Kentucky	17	3	14	5	8	16	3	13	5	9
Louisiana	22	2	20	4	16	22	2	20	3	18
Maine	20	2	18	3	15	20	2	19	4	15
Maryland	19	5	14	3	12	19	6	13	2	11
Massachusetts	24	5	19	7	13	25	3	21	6	15
Michigan	17	3	14	6	8	16	2	14	6	9
Minnesota	21	2	19	8	11	23	1	22	9	13
Mississippi	10	1	9	3	6	11	1	10	5	6
Missouri	16	3	14	5	9	16	2	15	5	10
Montana	14	2	13	4	9	14	2	12	4	8
Nebraska	24	3	21	10	11	23	2	22	8	14
Nevada	30	3	27	11	17	35	2	33	11	22
New Hampshire	21	2	18	3	15	19	2	17	2	15
New Jersey	19	3	16	2	14	20	3	16	2	14
New Mexico	26	2	24	8	15	27	3	24	9	15
New York	22	1	21	1	20	23	1	22	1	21
North Carolina	19	2	17	4	13	21	2	19	7	12
North Dakota	17	4	14	4	9	17	4	13	4	9
Ohio	16	3	13	2	11	17	2	15	2	13
Oklahoma	19	4	15	6	8	21	8	12	6	7
Oregon	26	3	23	8	15	28	3	25	10	15
Pennsylvania	18	3	15	4	11	18	1	16	4	13
Rhode Island	22	2	20	5	15	19	1	18	5	13
South Carolina	19	2	17	7	10	18	1	17	7	10
South Dakota	16	2	14	6	8	19	2	18	9	9
Tennessee	16	3	12	3	9	17	3	13	3	10
Texas	29	3	26	18	8	30	4	26	18	8
Utah	19	2	17	6	11	19	2	17	6	10
Vermont	21	2	18	4	14	19	2	18	3	15
Virginia	20	2	18	5	13	19	2	17	5	12
Washington	21	2	19	8	12	22	2	20	7	14
West Virginia	17	2	16	7	9	18	2	16	8	9
Wisconsin	20	2	18	4	15	21	2	19	4	16
Wyoming	18	1	17	5	12	19	2	17	5	12
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	20	4	16	3	13	21	5	16	2	14
DoDEA[1]	18	2	16	6	10	19	3	16	5	10

See notes at end of table.

Table A-19. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**23**	**2**	**21**	**7**	**14**
Alabama	12	1	11	6	5
Alaska	27	1	26	4	22
Arizona	17	1	15	2	13
Arkansas	21	1	20	5	15
California	32	2	30	22	9
Colorado	23	1	21	9	12
Connecticut	19	1	17	2	16
Delaware	18	2	16	2	14
Florida	25	2	23	2	20
Georgia	16	1	15	3	11
Hawaii	17	1	16	5	11
Idaho	15	1	13	4	10
Illinois	20	1	19	4	15
Indiana	22	2	20	3	17
Iowa	18	1	17	3	14
Kansas	26	2	25	10	15
Kentucky	15	1	14	3	11
Louisiana	22	1	21	3	18
Maine	22	2	20	2	17
Maryland	21	1	20	2	17
Massachusetts	27	2	25	8	17
Michigan	20	2	18	7	11
Minnesota	22	1	20	10	11
Mississippi	12	1	11	4	7
Missouri	16	1	14	3	11
Montana	15	2	13	5	9
Nebraska	22	2	21	6	14
Nevada	31	1	30	7	23
New Hampshire	18	1	17	2	15
New Jersey	19	1	18	1	17
New Mexico	28	1	27	10	17
New York	22	1	21	1	20
North Carolina	20	1	19	5	14
North Dakota	16	3	13	3	10
Ohio	17	1	16	3	14
Oklahoma	22	2	20	6	14
Oregon	27	2	24	9	15
Pennsylvania	18	2	17	4	13
Rhode Island	19	1	18	3	15
South Carolina	20	1	19	7	12
South Dakota	19	1	17	7	11
Tennessee	18	1	16	3	14
Texas	33	2	31	13	18
Utah	18	1	16	4	13
Vermont	19	1	18	2	16
Virginia	19	2	18	5	13
Washington	22	2	20	6	14
West Virginia	19	2	17	7	10
Wisconsin	21	2	20	3	16
Wyoming	18	1	17	4	13
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	20	1	19	1	18
DoDEA[1]	19	2	17	5	12

— Not available.

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

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, 2000–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-20. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1990–2000

	1990			1992			1996			2000		
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	**—**	**—**	**—**	**10**	**6**	**4**	**11**	**5**	**7**	**15**	**7**	**8**
Alabama	9	5	4	10	5	5	13	7	6	14	5	9
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	5	10	—	—	—
Arizona	12	5	7	12	6	7	17	9	8	19	9	10
Arkansas	11	7	3	11	6	5	11	7	4	14	8	5
California	15	7	8	20	8	12	20	10	10	27	9	18
Colorado	10	4	5	10	4	5	12	4	8	—	—	—
Connecticut	11	6	5	14	7	8	15	8	7	16	10	6
Delaware	9	4	5	10	4	6	13	9	4	—	—	—
Florida	11	6	5	13	6	7	16	10	6	—	—	—
Georgia	7	3	3	8	5	3	10	7	3	11	7	3
Hawaii	10	4	5	13	5	8	12	5	7	20	7	13
Idaho	6	2	4	7	3	4	—	—	—	14	5	9
Illinois	9	5	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	8	7
Indiana	7	5	2	9	5	4	12	6	7	12	7	5
Iowa	10	4	6	11	4	6	13	5	7	—	—	—
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	6	8
Kentucky	7	5	3	9	5	4	9	5	5	14	9	4
Louisiana	6	4	2	7	4	3	10	6	4	13	6	7
Maine	—	—	—	11	4	6	12	5	7	15	9	6
Maryland	11	4	6	11	5	6	12	7	5	13	11	3
Massachusetts	—	—	—	18	8	9	17	8	9	19	12	7
Michigan	8	4	4	9	6	3	9	5	4	11	7	4
Minnesota	9	3	6	7	3	4	11	3	8	15	5	10
Mississippi	—	—	—	10	7	3	11	7	4	11	7	3
Missouri	—	—	—	11	4	6	12	7	5	15	9	6
Montana	6	2	4	—	—	—	9	3	6	12	5	6
Nebraska	9	3	6	10	4	6	12	4	8	13	3	10
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	8	8	16	10	6
New Hampshire	12	4	8	12	5	7	15	4	11	—	—	—
New Jersey	12	7	5	14	7	7	13	7	6	—	—	—
New Mexico	9	6	3	12	5	7	18	8	10	25	12	14
New York	12	6	6	13	8	4	14	8	6	16	13	3
North Carolina	9	3	6	12	3	9	9	4	5	16	14	2
North Dakota	8	3	5	8	2	5	10	3	6	11	4	7
Ohio	8	5	3	10	6	4	—	—	—	11	9	3
Oklahoma	8	5	3	10	6	4	—	—	—	15	9	6
Oregon	8	3	5	—	—	—	12	4	8	17	6	11
Pennsylvania	10	5	5	9	4	5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	14	6	8	14	5	8	17	7	10	20	12	8
South Carolina	—	—	—	10	6	4	10	6	4	13	7	6
Tennessee	—	—	—	10	5	5	11	4	7	13	5	8
Texas	12	6	6	14	7	7	17	9	8	20	10	11
Utah	—	—	—	9	4	5	11	6	5	14	6	8
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	4	8	17	10	7
Virginia	9	5	4	12	5	7	13	7	6	15	10	5
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	6	7	—	—	—
West Virginia	9	5	4	10	6	4	13	8	4	15	11	3
Wisconsin	8	4	4	10	4	6	12	7	5	17	10	7
Wyoming	8	3	5	9	4	5	10	2	8	13	4	9
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	6	5	1	11	10	2	13	10	4	15	9	6
DoDEA[1]	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	3	5	9	5	3

— Not available.

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

NOTE: South Dakota did not participate in NAEP mathematics assessments from 1990 to 2000. 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, 1990–2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-21. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13

State/jurisdiction	2000					2003				
	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**	**19**	**4**	**15**	**8**	**7**
Alabama	14	6	8	7	1	14	2	11	9	3
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	23	1	22	14	8
Arizona	19	3	16	11	4	24	4	20	15	6
Arkansas	14	2	11	8	4	17	2	15	7	8
California	27	4	22	17	5	27	3	25	22	3
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	15	2	14	5	8
Connecticut	16	6	10	6	4	17	4	13	5	8
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	18	9	9	3	6
Florida	—	—	—	—	—	19	3	16	5	11
Georgia	11	5	6	3	3	13	2	11	5	6
Hawaii	20	5	15	13	2	20	4	17	8	9
Idaho	14	2	12	8	4	15	1	14	9	5
Illinois	15	5	11	7	3	18	4	14	4	9
Indiana	12	3	9	6	3	15	2	13	6	7
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	17	2	15	6	9
Kansas	14	3	10	8	3	16	3	13	4	9
Kentucky	14	4	9	5	4	14	4	9	4	5
Louisiana	13	3	10	4	6	16	5	12	2	10
Maine	15	3	12	7	5	17	4	13	5	8
Maryland	13	3	11	7	4	16	4	12	7	5
Massachusetts	19	3	17	8	9	18	3	15	4	11
Michigan	11	4	7	5	2	15	5	10	4	6
Minnesota	15	2	13	11	3	16	2	14	8	6
Mississippi	11	5	5	4	1	9	5	4	3	2
Missouri	15	3	12	5	7	16	4	12	3	9
Montana	12	2	9	6	3	14	2	12	5	6
Nebraska	13	4	10	7	2	16	4	13	7	5
Nevada	16	4	12	8	5	18	2	16	9	6
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	20	3	16	6	10
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	18	2	16	2	14
New Mexico	25	7	18	14	4	32	2	30	16	14
New York	16	4	12	5	7	20	5	15	3	12
North Carolina	16	5	11	4	7	18	4	15	3	12
North Dakota	11	2	9	8	2	16	1	14	7	7
Ohio	11	4	7	4	3	13	5	8	3	5
Oklahoma	15	4	11	8	3	19	2	17	10	7
Oregon	17	3	14	8	6	20	3	16	11	6
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	15	2	14	3	11
Rhode Island	20	3	16	12	4	23	4	20	7	13
South Carolina	13	4	9	7	2	15	7	8	5	4
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	13	2	11	6	6
Tennessee	13	2	10	9	1	16	3	13	12	1
Texas	20	8	12	10	2	20	7	13	11	2
Utah	14	3	11	8	3	16	3	14	9	5
Vermont	17	3	14	10	4	18	3	15	7	7
Virginia	15	6	9	5	4	17	7	10	4	6
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	16	2	14	10	5
West Virginia	15	3	12	4	8	16	3	14	5	9
Wisconsin	17	4	13	6	6	17	3	14	3	11
Wyoming	13	1	12	9	3	17	1	15	6	10
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	15	6	9	3	6	20	6	14	5	9
DoDEA[1]	9	1	8	6	2	11	1	10	4	6

See notes at end of table.

Table A-21. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**19**	**4**	**15**	**7**	**8**	**18**	**4**	**14**	**6**	**8**
Alabama	14	1	13	10	3	14	3	11	9	2
Alaska	27	2	25	14	11	26	4	22	13	9
Arizona	23	5	18	12	6	19	3	15	9	6
Arkansas	15	3	12	5	7	15	2	13	3	10
California	28	2	25	21	4	28	2	26	21	5
Colorado	17	3	14	5	9	16	2	14	4	10
Connecticut	16	3	13	5	9	16	2	15	4	11
Delaware	18	11	7	4	3	16	7	10	3	7
Florida	21	3	18	4	13	19	3	15	2	13
Georgia	14	2	11	4	7	11	5	7	3	4
Hawaii	20	3	17	8	9	19	2	18	8	10
Idaho	17	2	15	8	7	15	2	13	7	7
Illinois	18	3	14	4	11	18	6	12	3	9
Indiana	17	4	13	3	10	18	6	13	3	9
Iowa	17	3	15	4	10	18	2	15	3	12
Kansas	17	4	13	4	9	16	4	12	5	8
Kentucky	12	3	9	2	6	14	7	8	2	6
Louisiana	15	4	11	1	10	13	3	10	1	9
Maine	19	5	14	5	9	18	5	13	4	9
Maryland	13	4	9	4	4	13	7	6	2	4
Massachusetts	20	6	13	4	10	20	9	11	3	7
Michigan	16	4	12	4	8	15	5	11	3	8
Minnesota	18	2	15	8	7	16	2	14	6	8
Mississippi	10	3	7	3	3	11	2	9	2	7
Missouri	15	4	11	3	8	15	5	10	3	7
Montana	16	2	14	5	9	17	3	14	4	9
Nebraska	16	1	14	6	9	15	3	13	5	8
Nevada	19	2	17	10	7	20	4	17	9	8
New Hampshire	19	2	17	6	11	21	3	17	6	12
New Jersey	18	4	15	2	12	18	3	15	2	12
New Mexico	30	3	26	13	13	26	3	23	14	9
New York	19	4	15	2	13	18	3	14	1	14
North Carolina	17	3	15	3	12	17	2	15	3	12
North Dakota	17	4	13	4	8	16	6	10	3	7
Ohio	14	6	9	2	7	16	7	9	2	7
Oklahoma	20	4	15	7	8	18	8	9	5	5
Oregon	19	3	16	9	8	19	3	16	8	8
Pennsylvania	16	3	13	3	10	17	4	13	3	10
Rhode Island	21	3	18	7	11	20	3	17	5	12
South Carolina	15	6	9	5	4	15	5	10	4	5
South Dakota	14	2	11	4	7	12	2	9	3	6
Tennessee	15	5	11	5	5	13	6	7	4	3
Texas	19	6	13	9	4	17	6	12	7	5
Utah	17	2	14	6	8	18	3	15	8	7
Vermont	19	4	15	7	9	21	4	16	5	11
Virginia	18	5	13	5	8	17	7	11	4	7
Washington	16	2	13	5	8	16	4	13	5	8
West Virginia	17	3	14	6	8	17	2	15	6	10
Wisconsin	18	4	13	3	10	18	5	13	2	11
Wyoming	17	2	15	5	10	15	2	13	4	9
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	19	6	14	2	11	21	10	11	3	8
DoDEA[1]	13	2	11	4	7	12	2	10	3	7

See notes at end of table.

Table A-21. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**18**	**3**	**15**	**5**	**10**	**18**	**3**	**15**	**5**	**10**
Alabama	11	2	10	7	3	12	1	11	7	4
Alaska	21	3	18	5	13	21	3	18	4	14
Arizona	16	2	14	5	9	12	1	11	2	9
Arkansas	16	1	15	3	11	16	1	14	3	12
California	25	2	24	18	6	23	1	22	15	7
Colorado	17	2	15	5	10	16	1	15	5	10
Connecticut	16	2	14	3	11	16	1	15	2	12
Delaware	17	3	14	1	13	16	3	13	2	11
Florida	19	2	17	1	16	19	2	17	1	16
Georgia	13	3	10	2	9	12	3	9	2	7
Hawaii	18	2	16	6	10	20	2	18	7	11
Idaho	12	1	11	5	6	12	1	10	3	7
Illinois	16	3	13	3	11	17	2	15	3	12
Indiana	16	4	12	3	9	17	3	14	2	12
Iowa	16	3	14	2	11	17	1	16	2	14
Kansas	17	3	14	4	9	18	1	16	7	9
Kentucky	13	5	8	2	7	13	3	10	2	8
Louisiana	16	2	14	2	12	15	1	14	1	13
Maine	19	2	16	4	13	20	2	18	4	14
Maryland	14	7	7	1	6	14	6	8	1	7
Massachusetts	21	6	15	4	11	22	4	18	3	15
Michigan	15	3	12	3	8	14	4	11	3	8
Minnesota	17	3	15	6	9	17	2	15	6	9
Mississippi	10	2	8	2	7	8	1	7	1	6
Missouri	14	3	10	3	8	14	1	12	2	10
Montana	14	3	11	3	8	13	2	12	2	9
Nebraska	17	3	13	4	9	16	4	13	4	9
Nevada	17	2	15	6	9	18	3	15	6	9
New Hampshire	21	3	18	6	13	20	2	18	4	14
New Jersey	18	2	16	2	14	19	4	15	1	14
New Mexico	21	3	18	7	11	22	2	20	10	10
New York	20	3	17	1	16	20	1	19	#	18
North Carolina	17	2	15	3	13	18	2	16	3	12
North Dakota	16	5	11	4	7	16	4	11	3	9
Ohio	15	5	10	1	9	16	5	11	1	10
Oklahoma	18	6	11	4	8	18	10	8	4	4
Oregon	18	3	16	7	8	18	1	16	6	11
Pennsylvania	19	3	16	3	13	17	2	15	2	13
Rhode Island	21	2	18	4	14	19	1	18	4	13
South Carolina	16	4	12	5	7	15	4	11	4	8
South Dakota	12	2	10	3	7	13	2	11	4	7
Tennessee	12	4	8	1	7	13	4	9	1	8
Texas	17	5	13	6	6	18	5	13	8	5
Utah	14	3	11	4	7	14	3	11	3	8
Vermont	21	2	19	5	13	20	1	18	4	15
Virginia	17	4	13	4	9	18	3	15	6	9
Washington	14	2	12	4	8	16	2	14	4	10
West Virginia	15	2	14	4	10	14	2	12	3	9
Wisconsin	18	3	15	3	12	18	2	16	2	14
Wyoming	15	2	13	3	10	14	1	13	2	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	20	6	14	2	12	21	4	17	2	15
DoDEA[1]	13	2	11	4	7	14	3	11	3	8

See notes at end of table.

Table A-21. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**17**	**2**	**16**	**3**	**12**
Alabama	11	1	10	5	5
Alaska	23	1	22	3	19
Arizona	13	1	12	1	11
Arkansas	19	2	17	3	14
California	19	1	18	10	8
Colorado	18	1	17	5	11
Connecticut	18	2	16	2	14
Delaware	17	1	16	1	15
Florida	18	2	16	1	15
Georgia	13	2	12	2	10
Hawaii	21	2	19	7	12
Idaho	12	1	11	2	8
Illinois	17	1	16	2	14
Indiana	18	2	16	2	14
Iowa	15	1	14	1	13
Kansas	19	2	18	7	11
Kentucky	13	2	11	1	10
Louisiana	16	1	15	1	14
Maine	20	1	18	2	16
Maryland	16	2	14	1	13
Massachusetts	22	2	20	4	16
Michigan	16	2	13	3	11
Minnesota	18	2	16	7	9
Mississippi	9	1	8	2	7
Missouri	13	1	12	2	11
Montana	13	1	12	2	9
Nebraska	16	2	14	2	12
Nevada	16	1	15	3	12
New Hampshire	20	1	19	3	16
New Jersey	18	2	17	#	16
New Mexico	24	2	22	10	12
New York	22	2	20	#	19
North Carolina	18	1	17	3	14
North Dakota	16	3	13	1	11
Ohio	16	2	14	1	14
Oklahoma	19	2	17	3	14
Oregon	16	1	15	4	11
Pennsylvania	19	2	17	2	15
Rhode Island	19	1	18	2	16
South Carolina	15	1	14	4	10
South Dakota	13	1	12	3	9
Tennessee	12	2	10	1	10
Texas	18	2	16	4	12
Utah	14	2	12	2	10
Vermont	18	1	17	2	15
Virginia	17	1	16	4	12
Washington	16	2	14	3	11
West Virginia	13	2	12	3	9
Wisconsin	18	2	17	2	15
Wyoming	16	2	14	2	13
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	23	1	22	1	21
DoDEA[1]	14	1	12	3	9

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

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, 2000–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-22. Percentage of twelfth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities and/or English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 2009 and 2013

State/jurisdiction	2009					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Arkansas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: States/jurisdictions that did not participate at the state level in 2009 and/or 2013 are not shown. 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), 2009 and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-23. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1992, 1996, and 2000

	1992			1996			2000		
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	**7**	**5**	**3**	**12**	**5**	**7**	**12**	**6**	**6**
Alabama	10	4	6	11	6	5	12	6	7
Alaska	—	—	—	13	4	10	—	—	—
Arizona	7	3	4	10	7	3	11	6	4
Arkansas	11	5	6	9	6	3	13	7	6
California	7	3	4	8	5	3	8	3	5
Colorado	8	4	4	12	7	5	—	—	—
Connecticut	10	4	6	14	7	7	11	8	3
Delaware	11	5	6	12	6	6	—	—	—
Florida	13	7	6	14	7	7	—	—	—
Georgia	9	5	4	11	6	5	9	6	4
Hawaii	10	5	5	10	4	5	13	8	5
Idaho	8	3	5	—	—	—	12	5	6
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	7	4
Indiana	6	3	3	11	5	6	11	6	4
Iowa	8	3	5	11	5	6	14	10	4
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	6	6
Kentucky	8	3	5	10	6	4	11	8	3
Louisiana	7	4	3	13	7	6	15	7	8
Maine	14	6	8	14	7	7	16	10	6
Maryland	10	3	7	13	7	6	11	8	3
Massachusetts	15	6	9	15	7	8	14	8	6
Michigan	7	5	2	10	6	4	9	7	2
Minnesota	7	3	4	11	5	6	12	4	7
Mississippi	7	5	2	8	6	2	6	4	2
Missouri	12	4	7	14	5	9	15	9	5
Montana	—	—	—	10	5	5	11	5	5
Nebraska	12	4	8	14	4	10	16	6	9
Nevada	—	—	—	9	5	4	10	6	4
New Hampshire	12	4	8	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	8	3	5	9	5	4	—	—	—
New Mexico	12	6	6	14	8	6	15	9	6
New York	7	3	3	10	5	5	11	9	2
North Carolina	11	3	8	13	6	6	14	12	2
North Dakota	8	2	7	10	3	7	12	6	6
Ohio	10	6	4	—	—	—	12	10	2
Oklahoma	11	7	4	—	—	—	16	10	6
Oregon	—	—	—	13	6	7	14	6	7
Pennsylvania	8	3	5	8	4	4	—	—	—
Rhode Island	10	4	7	13	5	8	16	9	7
South Carolina	10	5	5	12	5	7	17	7	9
Tennessee	11	4	8	12	6	6	10	4	7
Texas	9	5	5	12	7	5	15	10	5
Utah	9	4	5	11	5	6	9	5	4
Vermont	—	—	—	14	6	8	14	10	4
Virginia	10	5	5	12	6	6	13	10	3
Washington	—	—	—	10	5	6	—	—	—
West Virginia	9	4	4	13	8	5	13	10	3
Wisconsin	9	5	5	10	7	3	15	10	5
Wyoming	9	3	6	12	4	8	13	5	8
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	8	7	1	9	7	1	14	7	7
DoDEA[1]	—	—	—	8	4	4	8	4	4

— Not available.

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

NOTE: South Dakota did not participate in NAEP mathematics assessments from 1992 to 2000. 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, 1996, and 2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-24. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13

State/jurisdiction	2000					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**13**	**3**	**9**	**5**	**4**	**14**	**3**	**11**	**4**	**7**
Alabama	13	3	9	7	3	11	2	10	7	2
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	16	1	15	6	9
Arizona	11	3	8	4	4	12	3	9	5	3
Arkansas	12	4	8	5	4	14	1	12	5	8
California	8	3	5	4	1	10	2	8	6	2
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	12	2	11	3	7
Connecticut	11	3	8	4	4	13	3	10	3	6
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	16	6	10	3	7
Florida	—	—	—	—	—	18	2	16	4	12
Georgia	9	3	7	3	4	12	2	11	4	7
Hawaii	13	6	7	5	2	11	2	10	3	6
Idaho	12	1	11	5	6	12	1	11	4	7
Illinois	11	2	9	3	6	15	3	13	4	9
Indiana	10	2	8	3	5	14	2	12	6	6
Iowa	13	1	11	4	7	15	2	13	3	10
Kansas	12	3	9	5	4	14	1	12	2	10
Kentucky	11	3	8	3	5	13	3	11	4	7
Louisiana	15	3	13	2	11	21	3	18	3	16
Maine	15	4	11	4	7	18	3	14	4	10
Maryland	11	2	9	4	5	13	3	10	4	6
Massachusetts	14	1	14	5	9	18	2	16	2	14
Michigan	10	3	7	3	4	11	3	7	2	5
Minnesota	12	2	10	5	5	14	2	11	5	6
Mississippi	6	3	3	1	2	10	5	5	3	1
Missouri	14	2	12	5	7	15	3	12	3	9
Montana	12	2	10	5	6	14	2	12	5	7
Nebraska	15	2	13	9	4	16	2	14	6	8
Nevada	10	3	7	3	4	13	3	10	5	5
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	18	3	16	4	11
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	14	2	13	1	12
New Mexico	15	5	10	5	5	17	2	15	7	9
New York	11	2	8	#	8	13	3	10	1	10
North Carolina	14	4	10	3	7	17	4	14	3	10
North Dakota	11	1	9	5	4	15	2	14	6	7
Ohio	12	4	7	2	5	12	4	8	2	7
Oklahoma	16	4	12	7	4	17	3	14	6	8
Oregon	14	2	12	6	5	17	4	14	7	7
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	13	2	11	2	9
Rhode Island	16	2	14	6	8	20	2	18	5	13
South Carolina	17	5	12	7	5	17	6	11	6	4
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	15	1	13	7	6
Tennessee	10	2	8	7	1	13	2	11	6	5
Texas	15	6	9	6	3	15	7	8	5	3
Utah	9	3	6	4	2	12	2	10	5	5
Vermont	15	3	12	4	8	17	4	13	4	10
Virginia	13	3	10	4	6	13	4	9	3	6
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	14	2	12	5	7
West Virginia	13	3	11	3	8	15	3	12	3	9
Wisconsin	15	4	10	5	6	15	3	12	2	10
Wyoming	14	2	12	6	6	15	1	14	3	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	13	3	10	5	5	13	4	10	2	7
DoDEA[1]	8	2	6	3	4	10	1	9	2	6

See notes at end of table.

Table A-24. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**14**	**3**	**11**	**4**	**8**	**14**	**3**	**11**	**3**	**8**
Alabama	11	1	10	7	3	11	1	10	6	4
Alaska	15	1	14	4	10	16	1	15	4	10
Arizona	11	3	9	3	5	11	2	9	4	5
Arkansas	13	2	11	3	8	12	2	9	2	7
California	10	2	8	4	3	10	2	8	4	4
Colorado	12	2	10	2	8	12	2	11	2	9
Connecticut	13	2	11	3	8	13	1	11	2	9
Delaware	16	7	9	2	7	17	5	12	3	9
Florida	18	2	16	3	12	15	2	13	1	12
Georgia	14	2	12	5	7	12	2	10	3	7
Hawaii	11	2	10	3	7	11	1	10	2	8
Idaho	11	1	10	3	7	11	1	9	3	6
Illinois	14	2	12	4	8	15	3	11	4	8
Indiana	15	1	14	4	10	17	3	14	6	9
Iowa	14	2	13	2	11	13	1	12	2	10
Kansas	14	2	11	3	8	13	3	10	3	7
Kentucky	14	2	12	3	9	15	2	13	5	7
Louisiana	24	4	20	3	17	18	2	15	3	13
Maine	19	3	16	4	12	18	3	15	3	11
Maryland	13	3	10	3	7	12	4	9	3	6
Massachusetts	18	3	15	3	12	18	5	13	3	11
Michigan	14	4	11	3	7	13	3	10	4	7
Minnesota	13	2	11	5	6	13	2	12	4	7
Mississippi	11	2	8	5	4	10	1	9	4	6
Missouri	16	2	14	5	9	15	3	11	4	7
Montana	12	2	10	2	7	13	2	10	2	8
Nebraska	18	2	16	6	10	17	2	14	5	9
Nevada	12	3	10	3	6	13	2	11	5	6
New Hampshire	20	2	18	4	14	19	2	16	3	13
New Jersey	15	2	13	3	10	14	2	12	1	11
New Mexico	14	2	13	3	10	13	3	10	3	7
New York	15	3	12	1	11	15	1	13	1	12
North Carolina	15	2	13	3	10	15	2	13	3	10
North Dakota	16	2	13	5	8	15	4	11	3	8
Ohio	12	3	9	2	7	15	4	11	2	8
Oklahoma	16	4	12	4	9	14	5	10	3	6
Oregon	15	3	11	5	7	15	2	13	5	8
Pennsylvania	16	2	13	3	10	17	2	14	4	10
Rhode Island	20	2	18	6	12	19	2	17	5	12
South Carolina	14	4	10	6	5	13	2	12	5	6
South Dakota	16	1	14	7	7	15	1	14	7	7
Tennessee	11	3	8	3	6	14	6	8	4	4
Texas	14	5	8	4	4	13	5	8	3	5
Utah	12	2	11	4	6	12	2	10	4	6
Vermont	16	3	13	4	9	17	2	14	3	11
Virginia	16	4	11	3	8	15	4	11	4	7
Washington	13	2	11	4	7	15	2	13	5	8
West Virginia	19	2	17	9	8	17	1	16	8	8
Wisconsin	14	2	12	2	10	15	2	12	3	9
Wyoming	15	1	14	3	11	15	2	13	4	9
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	16	5	11	2	8	14	5	9	1	8
DoDEA[1]	10	1	9	2	7	11	1	10	3	7

See notes at end of table.

Table A-24. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**13**	**2**	**11**	**3**	**8**	**13**	**2**	**11**	**3**	**9**
Alabama	10	1	9	6	4	10	1	9	5	4
Alaska	17	1	16	4	12	16	2	14	3	11
Arizona	13	1	12	4	8	12	1	11	2	8
Arkansas	12	1	11	2	8	13	1	12	2	10
California	10	2	7	3	5	10	1	8	2	6
Colorado	11	1	10	1	9	11	1	10	1	9
Connecticut	13	2	12	2	10	14	1	13	1	11
Delaware	15	3	12	2	11	16	3	13	3	10
Florida	17	2	15	3	12	16	1	14	3	12
Georgia	11	1	9	3	7	12	1	10	3	8
Hawaii	10	1	9	1	8	10	2	8	1	7
Idaho	10	1	9	3	7	11	1	9	2	7
Illinois	15	2	13	4	9	14	2	12	4	8
Indiana	16	2	13	5	8	16	2	14	4	9
Iowa	14	2	12	2	10	15	1	14	2	12
Kansas	14	3	11	3	9	14	2	13	4	9
Kentucky	15	3	12	5	7	15	3	12	4	8
Louisiana	20	2	18	3	15	20	2	18	2	16
Maine	18	1	17	3	14	17	2	16	2	14
Maryland	14	4	9	2	7	14	5	8	2	7
Massachusetts	19	5	14	2	12	18	3	15	1	14
Michigan	14	2	11	4	8	13	2	11	3	8
Minnesota	14	2	13	5	8	15	1	13	4	9
Mississippi	10	1	9	3	6	9	1	9	4	5
Missouri	14	3	12	4	8	13	2	11	3	8
Montana	12	2	10	2	8	12	1	10	3	7
Nebraska	18	2	16	7	9	17	1	15	5	10
Nevada	12	2	10	3	6	11	2	9	3	6
New Hampshire	18	2	16	3	14	17	2	15	1	14
New Jersey	16	2	13	2	12	17	3	14	2	12
New Mexico	13	2	11	2	8	13	2	11	2	9
New York	16	1	15	1	14	16	1	15	1	14
North Carolina	15	2	13	3	10	15	2	13	3	10
North Dakota	16	4	12	4	8	15	3	11	3	8
Ohio	14	3	11	2	9	14	2	12	2	10
Oklahoma	15	4	11	4	7	15	8	8	3	5
Oregon	16	2	13	5	9	15	2	13	4	9
Pennsylvania	15	2	13	3	10	15	1	14	3	11
Rhode Island	17	2	16	3	13	14	1	13	1	12
South Carolina	14	2	13	5	8	14	1	12	4	8
South Dakota	15	2	13	5	8	16	2	14	7	7
Tennessee	14	3	10	3	7	14	3	10	3	7
Texas	10	3	7	2	5	10	4	7	2	5
Utah	12	2	10	3	7	13	2	11	4	7
Vermont	19	2	16	3	13	17	1	16	2	14
Virginia	14	2	12	3	9	13	2	11	3	8
Washington	12	2	11	3	7	14	2	12	3	9
West Virginia	17	2	16	7	9	18	1	16	7	9
Wisconsin	15	2	13	2	11	14	2	13	2	10
Wyoming	16	1	15	4	11	16	2	14	4	11
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	14	4	10	2	8	15	5	11	#	10
DoDEA[1]	12	1	11	3	8	13	2	11	3	8

See notes at end of table.

Table A-24. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

	2013				
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**14**	**1**	**12**	**2**	**10**
Alabama	10	1	9	4	5
Alaska	16	1	15	2	13
Arizona	10	1	10	2	8
Arkansas	14	1	13	2	11
California	10	2	8	2	7
Colorado	10	1	9	2	8
Connecticut	14	1	13	1	12
Delaware	16	2	14	2	12
Florida	16	1	15	2	12
Georgia	12	1	11	2	9
Hawaii	10	1	9	1	8
Idaho	11	1	10	2	8
Illinois	14	1	13	2	11
Indiana	17	1	15	2	13
Iowa	13	1	13	2	11
Kansas	15	1	14	3	11
Kentucky	13	1	12	2	9
Louisiana	20	1	19	2	17
Maine	20	2	18	2	16
Maryland	14	1	13	1	12
Massachusetts	19	2	17	1	16
Michigan	13	2	11	3	9
Minnesota	14	1	13	5	8
Mississippi	10	1	10	3	6
Missouri	14	1	13	3	9
Montana	12	2	10	2	8
Nebraska	17	1	15	4	11
Nevada	13	1	12	3	9
New Hampshire	16	1	15	1	14
New Jersey	16	1	15	1	14
New Mexico	14	1	13	2	10
New York	17	1	16	1	15
North Carolina	15	1	14	2	12
North Dakota	14	2	12	3	9
Ohio	15	1	14	2	11
Oklahoma	17	2	16	3	12
Oregon	16	2	14	4	10
Pennsylvania	16	1	15	3	12
Rhode Island	14	1	13	1	12
South Carolina	14	1	13	3	10
South Dakota	16	1	15	6	9
Tennessee	14	1	13	2	11
Texas	12	1	10	1	9
Utah	13	1	12	3	9
Vermont	17	1	16	1	15
Virginia	14	1	13	3	10
Washington	14	2	12	3	9
West Virginia	18	2	17	7	10
Wisconsin	15	2	13	2	11
Wyoming	15	1	15	3	11
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	15	1	14	1	14
DoDEA[1]	14	1	13	3	10

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

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, 2000–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-25. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1990–2000

	1990			1992			1996			2000		
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	**—**	**—**	**—**	**8**	**5**	**3**	**9**	**4**	**5**	**12**	**6**	**6**
Alabama	9	5	4	10	5	5	13	7	6	14	5	9
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	5	6	—	—	—
Arizona	7	3	3	6	4	2	9	5	4	11	7	4
Arkansas	10	7	3	11	6	5	11	7	4	12	8	4
California	7	3	4	8	4	4	8	5	4	10	6	5
Colorado	8	4	5	8	4	5	11	4	7	—	—	—
Connecticut	9	5	4	12	5	6	13	7	6	14	9	5
Delaware	9	4	5	9	4	5	12	8	4	—	—	—
Florida	8	5	4	9	5	4	12	7	5	—	—	—
Georgia	6	3	3	7	4	3	9	6	3	10	7	3
Hawaii	7	3	3	9	3	5	9	4	5	15	6	9
Idaho	6	2	4	7	3	4	—	—	—	10	5	6
Illinois	8	4	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	6	5
Indiana	7	5	2	8	4	4	12	5	6	11	7	4
Iowa	9	4	6	10	4	6	12	5	7	—	—	—
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	5	5
Kentucky	7	5	3	9	5	4	9	4	5	13	9	4
Louisiana	6	4	2	7	4	3	9	6	3	13	6	7
Maine	—	—	—	11	4	6	11	5	6	14	9	5
Maryland	9	4	5	9	4	5	11	6	5	12	10	3
Massachusetts	—	—	—	14	6	8	15	7	9	16	10	6
Michigan	8	4	4	9	6	3	8	5	3	10	6	4
Minnesota	8	3	6	7	3	4	10	3	7	13	4	8
Mississippi	—	—	—	10	7	3	11	7	4	10	7	3
Missouri	—	—	—	11	4	6	11	6	4	14	8	6
Montana	6	2	4	—	—	—	9	3	6	11	5	5
Nebraska	8	3	5	9	4	6	11	4	7	11	3	8
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	5	4	12	8	3
New Hampshire	12	4	7	12	5	7	14	4	11	—	—	—
New Jersey	10	5	4	12	6	6	10	5	5	—	—	—
New Mexico	8	6	3	10	4	6	13	5	9	17	10	7
New York	8	4	4	10	6	4	10	5	4	12	10	1
North Carolina	9	3	6	12	3	9	8	4	5	14	13	2
North Dakota	7	2	5	7	2	5	9	3	6	11	4	7
Ohio	8	5	3	9	6	4	—	—	—	11	9	3
Oklahoma	7	5	2	9	6	3	—	—	—	13	8	5
Oregon	7	2	5	—	—	—	10	3	7	13	4	9
Pennsylvania	10	5	5	8	4	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	11	5	6	10	4	7	13	5	7	16	9	7
South Carolina	—	—	—	10	6	4	10	6	4	13	7	6
Tennessee	—	—	—	10	5	5	11	4	7	12	4	8
Texas	8	4	3	9	5	4	11	6	5	14	8	6
Utah	—	—	—	9	4	5	10	5	5	10	5	6
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	4	8	16	9	7
Virginia	8	4	4	10	5	5	12	7	5	14	10	4
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	5	6	—	—	—
West Virginia	9	5	4	10	6	4	13	8	4	14	11	3
Wisconsin	7	4	3	9	4	5	11	7	4	16	10	6
Wyoming	8	3	4	9	4	5	10	2	8	12	4	8
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	5	4	1	9	8	1	10	8	2	11	7	4
DoDEA[1]	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	2	5	6	4	3

— Not available.

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

NOTE: South Dakota did not participate in NAEP mathematics assessments from 1990 to 2000. 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, 1990–2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-26. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13

State/jurisdiction	2000					2003				
	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**	**14**	**3**	**11**	**5**	**6**
Alabama	14	6	7	7	1	13	2	11	8	3
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	15	1	14	6	8
Arizona	11	2	9	6	2	11	3	9	4	4
Arkansas	13	2	11	7	4	15	1	13	6	7
California	10	3	7	5	3	11	1	9	7	2
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	12	1	10	4	7
Connecticut	14	5	9	6	3	14	3	11	4	7
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	16	8	8	3	5
Florida	—	—	—	—	—	14	2	12	3	9
Georgia	9	4	6	3	3	11	2	10	4	6
Hawaii	15	4	11	10	2	16	3	13	5	8
Idaho	11	2	9	6	3	10	1	10	6	4
Illinois	11	3	8	5	3	15	4	12	3	8
Indiana	11	3	8	5	3	14	2	11	5	6
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	16	2	14	5	9
Kansas	12	3	9	6	3	13	2	11	3	8
Kentucky	12	4	8	4	4	13	4	9	4	5
Louisiana	12	2	10	4	6	16	4	11	2	9
Maine	14	3	12	7	4	16	4	12	5	7
Maryland	12	2	10	7	4	14	3	10	6	5
Massachusetts	16	2	15	7	8	16	2	14	4	10
Michigan	10	4	7	5	2	13	4	8	3	5
Minnesota	12	1	11	9	2	13	2	11	6	5
Mississippi	10	5	5	4	1	9	5	4	2	2
Missouri	14	3	12	5	7	15	4	12	3	9
Montana	12	2	9	6	3	12	2	10	5	6
Nebraska	11	3	8	6	2	14	3	11	6	5
Nevada	12	3	9	5	4	12	2	10	5	5
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	19	3	15	6	9
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	15	1	14	2	12
New Mexico	17	7	10	8	3	20	2	18	8	10
New York	12	3	9	2	6	16	4	12	2	10
North Carolina	14	4	10	3	7	16	3	12	2	10
North Dakota	11	2	9	7	2	14	1	13	6	7
Ohio	11	4	7	4	3	13	5	8	3	5
Oklahoma	13	4	9	7	3	16	2	14	8	6
Oregon	13	2	11	6	5	14	3	12	7	4
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	14	1	13	2	10
Rhode Island	16	3	14	10	4	20	3	17	5	12
South Carolina	13	4	9	7	2	15	7	8	4	4
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	11	2	9	4	5
Tennessee	11	2	9	9	1	14	3	12	11	1
Texas	14	7	7	5	1	15	6	9	8	2
Utah	10	2	8	6	2	11	2	9	5	4
Vermont	16	3	13	9	4	17	3	15	7	7
Virginia	13	5	7	4	4	15	6	9	3	6
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	13	2	11	7	4
West Virginia	14	3	12	4	8	16	3	13	5	9
Wisconsin	15	4	12	6	6	15	3	13	2	10
Wyoming	12	1	11	8	3	15	1	14	4	9
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	11	5	7	2	4	16	5	11	3	8
DoDEA[1]	6	1	5	4	2	8	1	7	1	5

See notes at end of table.

Table A-26. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**13**	**3**	**10**	**3**	**7**	**13**	**4**	**9**	**2**	**6**
Alabama	13	1	12	9	3	12	3	9	7	2
Alaska	14	2	12	3	10	12	4	8	3	6
Arizona	10	3	7	3	4	11	3	8	3	5
Arkansas	14	3	11	5	7	12	2	10	2	8
California	9	2	8	4	3	9	2	7	4	3
Colorado	10	2	9	2	6	10	2	9	1	7
Connecticut	13	2	11	4	7	13	1	12	3	9
Delaware	15	10	5	2	3	14	6	8	2	6
Florida	16	2	14	3	11	13	2	11	1	10
Georgia	12	2	9	3	6	9	5	5	2	3
Hawaii	14	2	12	5	7	13	1	12	4	7
Idaho	12	2	10	4	6	10	1	8	3	5
Illinois	15	3	13	2	10	14	5	9	2	8
Indiana	15	4	11	2	9	15	5	10	2	8
Iowa	15	2	13	3	10	15	2	13	2	11
Kansas	14	3	10	2	8	12	4	9	2	7
Kentucky	11	3	8	2	6	13	6	7	2	5
Louisiana	14	4	10	1	9	12	3	9	1	8
Maine	18	4	14	5	8	17	5	12	3	9
Maryland	11	4	7	3	4	11	7	4	1	3
Massachusetts	17	6	12	2	9	17	9	8	2	6
Michigan	14	4	10	2	7	14	4	9	2	8
Minnesota	12	2	10	4	6	12	2	10	3	7
Mississippi	9	3	6	3	3	11	2	8	2	6
Missouri	14	4	10	2	8	13	5	9	2	6
Montana	13	2	11	3	8	13	3	10	2	8
Nebraska	13	1	12	4	8	13	2	11	3	7
Nevada	11	2	9	4	5	12	3	9	4	5
New Hampshire	18	2	16	6	10	19	3	16	5	12
New Jersey	16	3	14	2	12	14	3	12	1	11
New Mexico	16	2	14	4	9	12	2	10	4	7
New York	15	3	12	1	11	14	3	11	1	11
North Carolina	14	2	12	2	11	13	2	11	1	10
North Dakota	16	4	12	4	8	14	6	8	2	6
Ohio	14	5	8	2	7	15	7	8	1	7
Oklahoma	16	4	12	5	7	14	8	6	2	4
Oregon	13	2	10	4	6	12	3	9	4	5
Pennsylvania	15	3	12	3	10	15	4	12	3	9
Rhode Island	17	3	15	6	9	17	2	15	3	12
South Carolina	14	6	8	4	4	13	5	8	3	5
South Dakota	12	2	10	3	6	11	2	9	2	6
Tennessee	14	5	10	5	5	12	6	5	3	3
Texas	13	5	8	5	3	11	5	6	3	3
Utah	11	2	9	3	6	10	2	8	2	6
Vermont	18	4	14	6	8	19	4	15	5	10
Virginia	15	4	10	3	7	14	6	8	2	6
Washington	11	2	9	3	7	11	3	8	2	6
West Virginia	17	3	14	6	8	17	2	15	5	10
Wisconsin	14	3	11	2	9	14	4	10	2	9
Wyoming	14	2	13	3	10	13	2	11	3	9
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	17	5	12	2	10	17	9	8	2	6
DoDEA[1]	9	1	8	2	5	7	1	7	1	6

See notes at end of table.

Table A-26. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**13**	**3**	**10**	**2**	**8**	**13**	**2**	**10**	**2**	**9**
Alabama	10	1	9	6	3	10	1	9	6	3
Alaska	13	3	10	1	9	13	3	10	1	9
Arizona	12	2	10	2	7	11	1	9	1	8
Arkansas	12	1	11	2	9	11	1	10	1	9
California	9	1	8	2	5	10	1	9	3	6
Colorado	11	2	9	1	7	10	1	9	1	8
Connecticut	13	2	11	2	9	12	1	11	1	10
Delaware	15	2	13	1	12	14	3	12	2	10
Florida	15	2	13	1	12	14	2	13	1	12
Georgia	11	3	9	1	8	10	3	8	1	6
Hawaii	12	1	11	3	8	11	1	10	2	8
Idaho	9	1	8	3	5	8	1	7	1	6
Illinois	14	3	11	2	9	14	2	12	1	10
Indiana	14	4	10	2	8	14	2	12	1	11
Iowa	14	2	12	2	10	15	1	13	1	12
Kansas	12	3	9	1	8	12	1	10	2	8
Kentucky	12	4	7	1	6	12	3	8	1	7
Louisiana	15	2	13	2	12	14	1	13	1	12
Maine	17	2	15	3	12	18	1	17	3	14
Maryland	12	7	5	1	4	11	6	5	1	5
Massachusetts	19	5	13	3	10	19	3	15	1	14
Michigan	13	3	10	2	8	12	3	9	2	7
Minnesota	12	2	10	3	7	13	2	11	3	8
Mississippi	9	2	8	1	6	8	1	7	1	6
Missouri	13	3	10	2	7	13	1	12	2	10
Montana	12	3	9	2	8	12	2	11	2	9
Nebraska	14	3	11	3	8	14	3	11	2	8
Nevada	11	2	8	2	6	10	3	7	2	5
New Hampshire	20	3	17	5	12	18	2	16	3	13
New Jersey	16	2	14	1	13	17	4	13	1	12
New Mexico	13	3	10	3	8	12	2	11	3	8
New York	16	2	14	1	13	16	1	15	#	14
North Carolina	12	1	11	1	10	14	2	12	1	10
North Dakota	15	5	10	4	6	14	4	10	2	8
Ohio	15	5	10	1	9	15	5	10	1	9
Oklahoma	15	6	9	2	7	16	9	6	3	3
Oregon	13	3	10	4	6	13	1	12	3	9
Pennsylvania	17	3	14	2	12	16	2	13	2	11
Rhode Island	18	2	16	3	13	16	1	15	3	12
South Carolina	14	4	9	4	5	11	4	7	2	6
South Dakota	10	2	9	2	6	11	1	9	3	7
Tennessee	11	4	7	1	6	12	4	8	1	7
Texas	12	5	7	2	5	11	5	6	2	4
Utah	10	3	7	2	6	10	3	8	1	7
Vermont	20	2	18	5	13	18	1	17	3	14
Virginia	14	3	10	3	7	13	2	11	3	8
Washington	11	2	9	2	7	12	1	10	2	9
West Virginia	15	2	13	4	10	13	2	12	3	9
Wisconsin	14	2	12	2	10	14	2	12	1	11
Wyoming	14	2	12	2	10	13	1	12	1	10
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	17	6	11	1	10	17	4	13	1	12
DoDEA[1]	8	1	7	2	5	10	2	8	1	7

See notes at end of table.

Table A-26. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

	2013				
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**13**	**1**	**12**	**1**	**10**
Alabama	10	1	9	4	5
Alaska	14	1	13	1	12
Arizona	12	1	11	1	10
Arkansas	13	2	11	1	11
California	10	1	8	2	7
Colorado	11	1	10	1	9
Connecticut	15	2	13	1	12
Delaware	15	1	14	1	14
Florida	13	1	12	1	11
Georgia	12	1	10	2	9
Hawaii	12	1	11	2	8
Idaho	9	1	8	1	7
Illinois	13	1	13	1	12
Indiana	15	2	13	1	12
Iowa	13	1	12	1	12
Kansas	13	2	11	1	10
Kentucky	11	2	10	#	9
Louisiana	15	1	14	#	13
Maine	18	1	17	2	15
Maryland	13	1	12	#	11
Massachusetts	17	1	16	1	15
Michigan	13	2	11	2	9
Minnesota	13	1	11	4	8
Mississippi	8	1	8	1	6
Missouri	12	1	11	1	10
Montana	12	1	10	1	9
Nebraska	14	2	12	2	11
Nevada	11	1	10	1	9
New Hampshire	18	1	17	2	15
New Jersey	17	1	15	#	15
New Mexico	13	2	12	3	9
New York	16	2	15	#	15
North Carolina	14	1	13	1	12
North Dakota	14	3	11	1	10
Ohio	15	1	13	1	13
Oklahoma	16	1	14	2	13
Oregon	14	1	13	3	10
Pennsylvania	16	1	15	2	13
Rhode Island	15	1	14	1	13
South Carolina	12	1	11	2	9
South Dakota	11	1	10	2	8
Tennessee	11	2	10	1	9
Texas	11	1	10	1	9
Utah	11	1	10	1	9
Vermont	17	1	17	2	15
Virginia	13	1	12	2	10
Washington	12	2	10	1	9
West Virginia	13	2	11	2	9
Wisconsin	14	1	13	1	12
Wyoming	14	1	13	1	11
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	18	#	17	#	17
DoDEA[1]	11	1	10	1	8

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

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, 2000–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-27. Percentage of twelfth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 2009 and 2013

State/jurisdiction	2009					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Arkansas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: States/jurisdictions that did not participate at the state level in 2009 and/or 2013 are not shown. 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), 2009 and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-28. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 1992, 1996, and 2000

	1992			1996			2000		
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	**3**	**2**	**1**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**6**	**2**	**3**
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Alaska	—	—	—	8	1	6	—	—	—
Arizona	8	2	6	12	7	6	16	7	9
Arkansas	1	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1
California	22	10	12	26	12	14	27	7	20
Colorado	2	1	1	4	2	2	—	—	—
Connecticut	4	2	1	3	2	1	4	2	1
Delaware	1	1	#	2	1	1	—	—	—
Florida	4	2	2	6	3	3	—	—	—
Georgia	1	1	#	2	2	1	2	1	1
Hawaii	4	2	3	5	1	4	7	3	4
Idaho	2	1	1	—	—	—	5	2	4
Illinois	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	4	2
Indiana	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#
Iowa	1	#	1	2	1	1	1	1	#
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	2	3
Kentucky	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Louisiana	1	#	1	1	1	#	1	1	1
Maine	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Maryland	1	1	1	1	1	#	2	2	#
Massachusetts	3	1	2	4	2	1	6	3	3
Michigan	1	1	#	2	1	1	2	2	1
Minnesota	2	#	2	3	1	2	5	2	3
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	#	#	#	1	#	#	1	#	#
Montana	—	—	—	#	#	#	2	#	2
Nebraska	1	#	1	2	1	1	4	3	1
Nevada	—	—	—	8	4	4	11	5	6
New Hampshire	#	#	#	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey	4	2	1	2	1	1	—	—	—
New Mexico	4	1	2	10	5	5	20	6	14
New York	5	2	3	6	3	3	6	4	3
North Carolina	1	#	#	2	1	1	3	2	1
North Dakota	1	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Ohio	1	#	1	—	—	—	1	#	#
Oklahoma	2	#	1	—	—	—	5	2	4
Oregon	—	—	—	6	3	3	6	2	3
Pennsylvania	1	1	#	1	1	#	—	—	—
Rhode Island	6	3	3	5	2	4	7	3	4
South Carolina	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#
Tennessee	#	#	#	1	1	#	1	#	#
Texas	9	4	5	13	5	9	13	7	5
Utah	1	1	#	2	1	1	6	3	3
Vermont	—	—	—	1	#	#	2	1	1
Virginia	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	2	2
Washington	—	—	—	3	1	2	—	—	—
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	1	1	1	2	1	1	5	3	3
Wyoming	1	#	1	1	#	#	2	1	2
Other jurisdictions									
District of Columbia	4	2	1	6	4	1	6	3	4
DoDEA[1]	—	—	—	2	1	1	3	1	2

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: South Dakota did not participate in NAEP mathematics assessments from 1992 to 2000. 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, 1996, and 2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-29. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13

State/jurisdiction	2000					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**7**	**1**	**6**	**5**	**1**	**11**	**1**	**9**	**7**	**2**
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	18	#	18	15	3
Arizona	16	3	13	8	5	19	2	17	15	2
Arkansas	1	#	1	1	#	4	1	3	2	#
California	27	3	24	16	7	33	2	30	27	3
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	9	1	9	4	4
Connecticut	3	1	2	1	1	4	1	3	1	2
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	1	1
Florida	—	—	—	—	—	11	2	9	5	4
Georgia	2	1	1	1	#	4	1	4	3	1
Hawaii	7	3	4	4	#	7	2	5	3	2
Idaho	5	2	4	3	1	7	1	6	5	2
Illinois	7	2	5	2	3	9	2	7	4	3
Indiana	1	1	1	#	1	3	#	2	2	1
Iowa	2	1	1	1	#	4	1	3	2	1
Kansas	5	#	5	4	1	3	#	3	1	1
Kentucky	1	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	1	#
Louisiana	1	#	#	#	#	2	#	2	#	1
Maine	1	#	1	1	#	1	1	1	1	#
Maryland	2	1	1	1	#	4	2	2	2	1
Massachusetts	6	2	4	2	2	5	1	4	2	2
Michigan	1	1	#	#	#	5	1	4	3	1
Minnesota	5	1	4	2	3	6	1	5	3	2
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#	#	#
Missouri	1	1	1	1	#	2	1	2	#	1
Montana	#	#	#	#	#	4	#	4	3	1
Nebraska	3	1	2	2	#	5	1	4	3	1
Nevada	11	4	7	6	1	17	2	14	11	4
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	1	1
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	3	1	3
New Mexico	20	2	18	12	6	29	2	27	18	9
New York	6	3	3	1	2	8	3	4	2	3
North Carolina	3	1	2	1	1	5	1	4	2	2
North Dakota	1	#	1	1	#	4	#	4	3	1
Ohio	#	#	#	#	#	2	1	1	#	1
Oklahoma	5	1	5	3	1	7	1	6	5	1
Oregon	6	1	4	2	2	12	1	11	6	5
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	1	1
Rhode Island	7	1	6	4	2	10	2	7	4	3
South Carolina	1	1	#	#	#	2	#	2	1	#
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	4	#	4	2	2
Tennessee	1	1	1	1	#	1	#	1	1	#
Texas	13	2	11	8	3	16	2	14	10	4
Utah	6	1	5	3	2	12	1	10	8	3
Vermont	#	#	#	#	#	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	4	2	2	1	1	8	2	6	2	3
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	7	1	6	4	2
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	5	1	4	2	3	7	1	6	2	3
Wyoming	2	#	2	2	#	4	#	4	3	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	6	2	4	2	2	7	1	5	2	3
DoDEA[1]	3	1	2	2	#	6	1	5	4	2

See notes at end of table.

Table A-29. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**10**	**1**	**9**	**7**	**3**	**11**	**1**	**10**	**7**	**3**
Alabama	2	#	2	1	#	2	#	2	2	#
Alaska	19	1	19	11	7	16	1	15	9	6
Arizona	20	2	18	14	5	16	2	14	11	3
Arkansas	4	2	3	2	1	7	1	6	2	5
California	33	3	30	28	2	34	1	33	30	3
Colorado	11	1	11	4	7	15	#	14	7	7
Connecticut	5	1	4	2	2	7	#	7	2	5
Delaware	5	1	3	2	1	5	1	4	2	2
Florida	8	1	6	1	5	8	2	7	1	5
Georgia	3	1	2	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Hawaii	8	1	7	4	3	10	1	9	5	4
Idaho	8	1	8	6	2	8	#	8	5	2
Illinois	9	1	9	6	3	9	1	8	4	3
Indiana	4	1	3	1	2	5	#	5	2	3
Iowa	4	#	4	2	2	5	#	5	2	3
Kansas	6	1	5	3	3	8	#	8	4	4
Kentucky	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	1
Maine	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Maryland	4	1	3	1	2	4	1	4	1	3
Massachusetts	7	1	6	3	2	6	1	5	4	2
Michigan	3	1	3	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Minnesota	7	1	7	4	3	8	1	7	4	3
Mississippi	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Missouri	3	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Montana	3	#	3	2	1	4	#	4	2	2
Nebraska	7	1	7	4	3	8	1	7	5	2
Nevada	17	1	15	10	5	22	2	21	11	9
New Hampshire	3	#	2	2	1	3	#	2	1	1
New Jersey	3	1	3	1	1	4	#	3	#	3
New Mexico	25	1	24	13	11	23	2	21	12	9
New York	6	1	5	1	4	9	1	8	1	7
North Carolina	6	1	6	2	4	7	1	7	2	4
North Dakota	2	#	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	1
Ohio	1	#	1	#	#	3	1	2	1	1
Oklahoma	6	1	5	3	2	5	#	5	4	1
Oregon	14	1	12	7	5	13	1	12	5	7
Pennsylvania	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Rhode Island	7	1	6	2	4	7	1	6	3	4
South Carolina	2	#	2	1	#	4	#	4	2	1
South Dakota	4	#	3	2	2	4	#	4	3	1
Tennessee	2	1	2	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Texas	15	2	13	9	4	16	2	14	9	5
Utah	12	1	11	7	4	12	1	11	8	4
Vermont	2	#	2	1	1	3	#	2	1	1
Virginia	8	1	7	2	5	8	1	7	3	4
Washington	9	1	8	5	3	9	1	8	4	4
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	6	1	6	2	3	7	1	6	2	4
Wyoming	5	#	4	3	1	4	#	4	2	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	5	1	4	1	2	8	2	6	1	5
DoDEA[1]	8	1	7	4	2	7	1	5	3	2

See notes at end of table.

Table A-29. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**10**	**1**	**10**	**6**	**4**	11	#	11	6	4
Alabama	2	#	2	2	#	2	#	2	2	1
Alaska	10	#	10	3	7	14	1	13	4	9
Arizona	15	#	14	7	8	12	#	12	3	9
Arkansas	6	#	5	1	4	8	#	8	2	5
California	30	1	28	26	2	32	1	31	27	4
Colorado	11	#	10	5	6	16	#	16	8	7
Connecticut	6	1	5	1	5	6	#	6	1	5
Delaware	4	#	3	#	3	4	#	3	1	2
Florida	8	#	7	#	7	9	#	9	#	8
Georgia	4	#	4	1	3	5	#	5	2	3
Hawaii	10	#	10	4	6	11	#	11	6	5
Idaho	5	#	5	3	2	5	#	4	2	2
Illinois	8	1	7	2	5	8	1	7	2	6
Indiana	4	#	4	1	3	7	#	7	2	5
Iowa	5	#	4	1	3	6	#	5	1	4
Kansas	9	#	9	5	4	11	#	11	6	5
Kentucky	2	#	2	1	1	2	1	1	#	1
Louisiana	2	#	2	1	2	2	#	2	1	1
Maine	2	#	1	1	1	3	#	3	2	2
Maryland	6	1	5	1	4	6	1	5	1	5
Massachusetts	7	1	6	5	2	8	1	7	5	2
Michigan	3	#	3	2	1	4	#	3	3	1
Minnesota	8	1	8	4	4	10	#	9	5	4
Mississippi	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
Missouri	2	#	2	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Montana	3	#	3	1	1	2	#	2	2	#
Nebraska	7	#	6	4	3	8	#	8	3	5
Nevada	20	1	20	8	12	27	#	26	8	18
New Hampshire	3	#	2	1	2	3	#	2	1	2
New Jersey	4	1	3	#	3	3	#	3	#	3
New Mexico	17	1	16	7	9	17	1	16	8	8
New York	8	1	7	#	7	9	1	9	#	8
North Carolina	6	#	5	2	4	7	#	7	4	3
North Dakota	2	#	1	1	1	3	#	3	1	1
Ohio	2	#	2	1	2	3	#	3	#	3
Oklahoma	4	#	4	2	2	6	1	5	3	3
Oregon	12	1	11	4	7	14	1	13	6	7
Pennsylvania	3	#	3	1	2	3	#	3	1	2
Rhode Island	6	1	6	2	3	6	#	6	4	2
South Carolina	5	#	5	2	2	6	#	6	3	2
South Dakota	2	#	2	1	1	5	#	4	2	2
Tennessee	2	#	2	#	2	4	#	3	#	3
Texas	21	1	20	16	4	22	1	21	16	4
Utah	9	1	8	3	5	7	#	6	3	4
Vermont	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	7	#	6	2	5	7	#	7	2	5
Washington	10	#	10	4	5	11	#	11	4	7
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	7	1	6	1	4	8	#	8	1	6
Wyoming	2	#	2	1	1	4	#	3	2	2
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	8	1	6	1	5	7	1	6	1	5
DoDEA[1]	7	1	6	3	3	7	1	5	3	2

See notes at end of table.

Table A-29. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**11**	**#**	**11**	**5**	**5**
Alabama	2	#	2	2	1
Alaska	14	#	14	2	11
Arizona	7	#	7	1	6
Arkansas	8	#	8	3	6
California	26	1	25	20	4
Colorado	14	#	14	8	6
Connecticut	6	#	6	#	5
Delaware	3	#	3	1	2
Florida	10	1	10	#	10
Georgia	5	#	5	1	3
Hawaii	8	1	7	4	4
Idaho	5	#	4	2	2
Illinois	9	#	8	1	7
Indiana	6	#	6	1	5
Iowa	6	#	5	1	5
Kansas	13	#	13	6	6
Kentucky	3	#	3	#	2
Louisiana	3	#	3	1	2
Maine	2	#	2	1	2
Maryland	8	#	8	1	7
Massachusetts	11	#	10	7	3
Michigan	8	#	8	5	3
Minnesota	8	#	8	5	4
Mississippi	2	#	1	1	1
Missouri	2	#	2	#	2
Montana	4	#	3	3	1
Nebraska	7	#	7	2	5
Nevada	23	#	22	4	18
New Hampshire	2	#	2	1	1
New Jersey	3	#	3	#	3
New Mexico	18	#	18	8	10
New York	8	1	7	#	7
North Carolina	7	#	6	3	4
North Dakota	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	3	#	3	#	3
Oklahoma	7	#	6	3	3
Oregon	14	1	13	5	8
Pennsylvania	3	#	3	#	2
Rhode Island	7	#	6	2	4
South Carolina	7	#	7	4	3
South Dakota	4	#	4	1	3
Tennessee	4	#	4	#	4
Texas	23	1	23	12	11
Utah	6	#	6	1	5
Vermont	2	#	2	1	1
Virginia	7	#	7	2	5
Washington	9	#	9	2	7
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	8	#	8	1	7
Wyoming	3	#	3	1	2
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	7	1	6	1	6
DoDEA[1]	6	1	6	2	3

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

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, 2000–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-30. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were not permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 1990–2000

	1990			1992			1996			2000		
State/jurisdiction	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Identified	Excluded	Assessed
Nation (public)	**—**	**—**	**—**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**3**
Alabama	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	1	4	—	—	—
Arizona	5	1	4	6	2	4	9	4	5	10	4	6
Arkansas	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	2	1	1
California	8	4	4	13	5	8	13	6	7	19	4	15
Colorado	1	1	#	1	1	1	2	1	1	—	—	—
Connecticut	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1
Delaware	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	#	#	—	—	—
Florida	2	2	1	4	2	2	4	3	1	—	—	—
Georgia	#	#	#	1	#	#	2	1	#	1	1	#
Hawaii	3	1	2	5	2	3	4	1	2	6	2	4
Idaho	1	#	#	1	#	#	—	—	—	4	1	3
Illinois	1	1	#	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	2	3
Indiana	#	#	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	2	1	1
Iowa	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#	#	—	—	—
Kansas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	2	2
Kentucky	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#
Louisiana	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#	#
Maine	—	—	—	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#	1
Maryland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	#	2	1	#
Massachusetts	—	—	—	4	2	1	2	1	#	4	3	1
Michigan	#	#	#	1	#	#	1	1	1	1	1	#
Minnesota	1	#	1	#	#	#	1	#	1	2	1	1
Mississippi	—	—	—	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	—	—	—	1	#	#	1	1	#	1	#	#
Montana	#	#	#	—	—	—	#	#	#	1	#	1
Nebraska	#	#	#	1	#	#	1	1	#	2	1	1
Nevada	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	3	4	5	3	2
New Hampshire	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	—	—	—
New Jersey	2	2	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	—	—	—
New Mexico	1	1	1	3	1	2	6	4	2	11	4	8
New York	4	2	2	3	3	1	5	3	2	6	4	2
North Carolina	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#	3	3	#
North Dakota	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	#	#	1	#	#
Ohio	#	#	#	#	#	#	—	—	—	1	1	#
Oklahoma	1	#	#	1	#	1	—	—	—	2	1	1
Oregon	1	#	1	—	—	—	2	1	1	5	3	2
Pennsylvania	#	#	#	1	#	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rhode Island	4	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	2	4	3	1
South Carolina	—	—	—	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Tennessee	—	—	—	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	1	#
Texas	5	2	3	6	2	4	7	3	4	8	3	5
Utah	—	—	—	1	1	#	2	1	#	4	2	2
Vermont	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	#	1	1	1	#
Virginia	1	1	#	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	—	—	—
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	1	#	1	1	#
Wyoming	1	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	2	#	1
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	1	1	#	3	2	1	4	3	2	4	3	2
DoDEA[1]	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	#	3	2	1

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

NOTE: South Dakota did not participate in NAEP mathematics assessments from 1990 to 2000. 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, 1990–2000 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-31. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13

State/jurisdiction	2000					2003				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**4**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**6**	**1**	**5**	**4**	**1**
Alabama	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	—	—	—	—	—	11	#	11	10	1
Arizona	10	1	8	6	2	16	2	14	12	2
Arkansas	1	#	#	#	#	3	1	2	1	1
California	19	2	17	13	4	20	2	19	17	1
Colorado	—	—	—	—	—	5	1	4	2	2
Connecticut	2	2	1	#	1	4	1	3	1	1
Delaware	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	1
Florida	—	—	—	—	—	7	1	5	3	3
Georgia	2	1	#	#	#	2	1	2	1	1
Hawaii	6	1	4	4	#	6	1	5	3	2
Idaho	4	1	4	3	1	6	#	5	4	1
Illinois	5	2	3	3	#	4	1	3	1	2
Indiana	1	#	1	1	#	3	#	2	1	1
Iowa	—	—	—	—	—	2	#	2	1	1
Kansas	1	#	1	1	#	4	1	3	1	2
Kentucky	1	1	1	1	#	1	1	1	1	#
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	#	1	1	1	#	#
Maine	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Maryland	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	2	#
Massachusetts	4	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Michigan	#	#	#	#	#	3	1	2	1	1
Minnesota	3	1	3	2	#	4	1	3	2	1
Mississippi	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Missouri	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	1
Montana	#	#	#	#	#	3	#	2	1	1
Nebraska	2	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	#
Nevada	5	1	4	3	#	7	1	6	5	2
New Hampshire	—	—	—	—	—	1	#	1	#	1
New Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	#	2
New Mexico	11	2	9	7	2	20	1	19	11	7
New York	6	2	4	3	1	6	2	4	1	3
North Carolina	2	1	1	1	#	4	1	3	1	2
North Dakota	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	2	1	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Oklahoma	2	#	1	1	#	5	1	5	3	1
Oregon	5	1	4	3	1	7	1	6	4	2
Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	2	#	2	1	1
Rhode Island	4	1	3	2	1	5	2	4	2	2
South Carolina	1	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
South Dakota	—	—	—	—	—	3	#	3	2	1
Tennessee	1	1	1	1	#	3	1	2	2	#
Texas	8	2	6	5	1	8	2	6	5	1
Utah	4	#	3	3	1	7	1	6	5	2
Vermont	1	1	1	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Virginia	3	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	5	1	4	3	1
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	#	#	#
Wisconsin	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Wyoming	2	#	2	2	#	3	#	3	2	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	4	2	2	1	2	5	1	4	2	2
DoDEA[1]	3	1	2	2	#	5	1	4	2	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-31. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2005					2007				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**6**	**1**	**5**	**4**	**1**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**4**	**2**
Alabama	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	2	#
Alaska	15	#	15	11	4	17	1	16	11	5
Arizona	14	2	12	10	2	10	1	9	7	2
Arkansas	1	1	1	#	#	3	#	3	1	2
California	21	1	20	18	2	22	1	21	19	2
Colorado	7	1	6	3	3	7	#	6	3	3
Connecticut	3	#	3	1	2	4	#	4	1	2
Delaware	4	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	1
Florida	6	1	4	1	3	6	1	5	1	4
Georgia	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Hawaii	7	1	6	4	2	7	1	6	4	3
Idaho	6	1	6	4	2	6	#	5	4	2
Illinois	3	1	2	1	1	4	1	3	2	1
Indiana	2	#	2	1	1	4	#	3	2	1
Iowa	2	#	2	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Kansas	4	1	3	2	1	4	#	4	3	1
Kentucky	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	1	#	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	1	1
Maine	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	1	1	#
Maryland	2	#	2	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Massachusetts	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	3	1	1
Michigan	3	#	2	2	1	2	#	2	1	#
Minnesota	7	1	6	5	1	5	#	4	4	1
Mississippi	1	#	1	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Missouri	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
Montana	5	#	4	2	2	5	#	4	3	2
Nebraska	3	#	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	1
Nevada	9	1	9	6	2	11	1	9	6	4
New Hampshire	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
New Jersey	2	1	1	#	1	4	1	3	1	2
New Mexico	17	2	15	9	6	17	2	15	11	4
New York	5	1	4	1	3	5	1	4	#	4
North Carolina	4	1	3	1	2	4	#	4	2	2
North Dakota	1	#	1	1	#	3	#	2	1	1
Ohio	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Oklahoma	4	1	4	2	1	4	1	3	2	1
Oregon	8	1	7	5	3	9	1	8	5	3
Pennsylvania	1	#	1	#	#	2	1	1	#	1
Rhode Island	5	1	4	2	2	4	1	3	2	1
South Carolina	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
South Dakota	2	#	2	1	1	1	#	1	#	#
Tennessee	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Texas	8	2	6	5	1	8	2	6	4	2
Utah	7	1	6	4	2	9	1	8	6	2
Vermont	1	#	1	#	#	2	#	1	1	1
Virginia	4	1	3	2	1	4	1	3	2	1
Washington	5	1	4	3	2	6	1	5	3	2
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	1	#
Wisconsin	4	1	3	1	1	5	1	3	1	2
Wyoming	4	#	4	3	1	3	#	3	1	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	4	1	3	1	2	4	1	3	1	2
DoDEA[1]	4	1	4	2	1	5	1	3	2	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-31. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2009					2011				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**6**	**#**	**5**	**3**	**2**	6	#	6	3	2
Alabama	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	#
Alaska	11	1	10	4	6	11	1	10	3	7
Arizona	6	1	6	2	3	2	#	2	1	1
Arkansas	4	#	4	1	2	5	#	5	2	3
California	20	1	19	16	3	17	1	17	13	4
Colorado	7	#	7	3	4	7	#	7	4	3
Connecticut	3	#	3	1	2	4	#	4	1	3
Delaware	2	1	2	#	1	2	#	2	1	1
Florida	5	#	5	#	4	5	#	5	#	4
Georgia	2	#	2	#	1	2	#	2	#	1
Hawaii	7	1	6	3	3	9	1	9	5	3
Idaho	4	#	3	2	1	4	#	4	2	2
Illinois	3	1	3	1	2	4	#	3	2	2
Indiana	3	#	3	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Iowa	2	#	2	1	1	3	#	3	1	2
Kansas	6	#	5	3	2	7	#	7	5	2
Kentucky	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	1	1	#	1	#	1
Maine	2	#	1	1	1	3	#	3	2	1
Maryland	3	#	2	#	2	3	1	2	#	2
Massachusetts	3	1	2	1	1	4	1	3	2	2
Michigan	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Minnesota	5	1	5	3	2	5	#	5	3	2
Mississippi	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Missouri	1	#	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	1
Montana	3	#	3	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Nebraska	3	#	3	2	1	3	#	2	1	1
Nevada	8	#	8	4	4	10	1	9	5	4
New Hampshire	1	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
New Jersey	2	#	2	#	2	2	#	2	#	2
New Mexico	11	1	10	5	5	12	1	11	7	4
New York	5	1	4	#	4	6	#	5	#	5
North Carolina	5	#	5	2	3	5	#	5	2	3
North Dakota	2	1	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	1	1	1	#	#	1	#	1	#	1
Oklahoma	3	#	3	2	1	3	1	3	1	1
Oregon	6	#	6	4	2	6	#	6	3	3
Pennsylvania	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	#	2
Rhode Island	3	1	3	1	2	3	#	3	1	2
South Carolina	3	#	3	1	1	4	#	4	2	3
South Dakota	2	#	1	1	#	2	#	2	1	1
Tennessee	1	#	1	#	1	2	#	1	#	1
Texas	7	1	6	4	1	9	1	8	6	1
Utah	5	#	4	3	2	5	1	4	2	2
Vermont	2	#	1	1	1	1	#	1	1	1
Virginia	4	#	3	1	2	6	1	5	3	2
Washington	4	#	3	2	2	5	#	5	3	2
West Virginia	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	4	1	3	1	2	5	#	5	1	4
Wyoming	2	#	2	1	1	2	#	2	1	1
Other jurisdictions										
District of Columbia	4	1	3	1	2	6	1	5	1	4
DoDEA[1]	5	1	4	2	2	5	1	4	2	1

See notes at end of table.

Table A-31. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: Various years, 2000–13—Continued

State/jurisdiction	2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	**6**	**#**	**5**	**2**	**3**
Alabama	1	#	1	1	#
Alaska	11	#	11	2	9
Arizona	2	#	1	#	1
Arkansas	7	#	6	2	4
California	13	1	12	9	3
Colorado	8	#	8	4	4
Connecticut	4	#	4	#	3
Delaware	2	#	2	#	1
Florida	5	1	4	#	4
Georgia	2	#	2	#	2
Hawaii	10	1	10	5	5
Idaho	3	#	3	1	2
Illinois	5	#	4	1	3
Indiana	4	#	3	1	3
Iowa	3	#	3	#	2
Kansas	8	#	8	5	2
Kentucky	2	#	2	#	1
Louisiana	1	#	1	#	1
Maine	2	#	2	#	1
Maryland	3	1	3	#	2
Massachusetts	6	1	5	3	2
Michigan	4	1	3	1	2
Minnesota	6	#	5	3	2
Mississippi	1	#	1	1	#
Missouri	1	#	1	#	1
Montana	2	#	2	1	1
Nebraska	3	#	2	1	2
Nevada	7	#	7	2	5
New Hampshire	2	#	2	#	2
New Jersey	2	#	1	#	1
New Mexico	14	#	13	7	6
New York	7	#	6	#	6
North Carolina	5	#	4	2	3
North Dakota	2	#	2	1	1
Ohio	2	#	2	#	1
Oklahoma	4	#	4	2	2
Oregon	4	#	3	1	2
Pennsylvania	3	#	3	#	2
Rhode Island	5	#	5	1	4
South Carolina	4	#	3	2	1
South Dakota	3	#	2	1	1
Tennessee	1	#	1	#	1
Texas	8	1	7	3	4
Utah	4	#	4	1	3
Vermont	1	#	1	#	1
Virginia	5	#	5	1	4
Washington	5	#	5	2	3
West Virginia	1	#	1	#	#
Wisconsin	5	#	5	1	4
Wyoming	2	#	2	#	2
Other jurisdictions					
District of Columbia	6	1	6	1	5
DoDEA[1]	4	#	3	2	2

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

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

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, 2000–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-32. Percentage of twelfth-grade public school students identified as English language learners excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics when accommodations were permitted, by state/jurisdiction: 2009 and 2013

State/jurisdiction	2009					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accommodations	Assessed with accommodations
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Arkansas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

NOTE: States/jurisdictions that did not participate at the state level in 2009 and/or 2013 are not shown. 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), 2009 and 2013 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-33. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, as a percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students											
	SD and/or ELL				SD				ELL			
State/jurisdiction	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
Nation (public)	**7**	**93**	**32**	**62**	**9**	**91**	**16**	**75**	**4**	**96**	**47**	**49**
Alabama	9	91	49	42	10	90	43	47	4	96	72	24
Alaska	4	96	16	80	6	94	13	81	2	98	17	82
Arizona	7	93	14	79	8	92	17	74	5	95	7	88
Arkansas	6	94	22	72	8	92	15	77	1	99	31	67
California	6	94	67	27	16	84	16	68	5	95	79	16
Colorado	5	95	41	54	10	90	15	75	2	98	55	43
Connecticut	7	93	9	84	8	92	10	81	4	96	4	92
Delaware	12	88	13	75	13	87	11	76	7	93	18	75
Florida	8	92	10	83	8	92	15	77	7	93	1	92
Georgia	9	91	21	70	11	89	17	73	3	97	29	68
Hawaii	7	93	30	63	8	92	15	77	7	93	45	49
Idaho	9	91	26	65	9	91	19	72	10	90	37	53
Illinois	5	95	19	77	5	95	17	78	4	96	17	79
Indiana	7	93	15	78	8	92	15	77	3	97	14	83
Iowa	4	96	15	81	4	96	15	81	4	96	14	83
Kansas	6	94	36	58	9	91	21	69	2	98	49	48
Kentucky	9	91	17	73	10	90	18	72	7	93	13	81
Louisiana	5	95	11	84	5	95	10	85	4	96	22	73
Maine	10	90	10	80	10	90	8	82	12	88	22	66
Maryland	5	95	12	83	6	94	10	85	3	97	14	83
Massachusetts	7	93	30	63	9	91	7	83	4	96	64	32
Michigan	10	90	36	54	12	88	22	66	5	95	55	40
Minnesota	6	94	44	49	9	91	35	56	2	98	56	41
Mississippi	7	93	35	59	7	93	33	61	‡	‡	‡	‡
Missouri	9	91	20	71	10	90	23	68	4	96	3	92
Montana	11	89	32	57	14	86	20	66	5	95	70	25
Nebraska	8	92	28	64	9	91	27	64	4	96	27	69
Nevada	4	96	23	73	9	91	21	70	2	98	20	78
New Hampshire	7	93	11	82	7	93	7	86	3	97	35	62
New Jersey	6	94	6	88	6	94	7	87	7	93	2	91
New Mexico	4	96	35	61	8	92	17	76	2	98	42	55
New York	6	94	4	90	5	95	5	89	7	93	1	93
North Carolina	6	94	23	70	7	93	14	78	5	95	38	57
North Dakota	16	84	21	63	17	83	19	64	11	89	31	58
Ohio	8	92	15	78	8	92	15	77	4	96	11	85
Oklahoma	8	92	29	63	10	90	20	70	3	97	45	53
Oregon	8	92	35	57	13	87	26	62	4	96	40	56
Pennsylvania	9	91	20	71	9	91	21	71	10	90	12	78
Rhode Island	6	94	15	79	7	93	6	87	3	97	30	67
South Carolina	5	95	35	59	7	93	22	71	1	99	60	38
South Dakota	8	92	36	56	9	91	35	56	2	98	32	66
Tennessee	8	92	15	77	7	93	17	76	9	91	7	85
Texas	5	95	40	55	11	89	12	77	3	97	51	47
Utah	7	93	21	72	8	92	21	71	7	93	17	76
Vermont	7	93	10	83	7	93	8	85	‡	‡	‡	‡
Virginia	8	92	24	68	9	91	19	72	5	95	30	65
Washington	10	90	26	65	14	86	23	62	4	96	26	71
West Virginia	9	91	38	53	9	91	38	53	‡	‡	‡	‡
Wisconsin	8	92	16	76	11	89	16	73	4	96	14	82
Wyoming	6	94	22	72	6	94	21	73	6	94	21	73
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	7	93	7	87	6	94	4	90	9	91	10	81
DoDEA[1]	9	91	26	65	9	91	20	72	12	88	37	51

‡ Reporting standards not met.

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

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-34. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, as a percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students											
	SD and/or ELL				SD				ELL			
State/jurisdiction	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
Nation (public)	**9**	**91**	**20**	**71**	**10**	**90**	**10**	**80**	**7**	**93**	**40**	**53**
Alabama	9	91	44	47	9	91	41	50	‡	‡	‡	‡
Alaska	5	95	14	82	7	93	8	85	2	98	18	80
Arizona	10	90	8	82	8	92	9	83	‡	‡	‡	‡
Arkansas	10	90	16	74	14	86	5	81	4	96	34	62
California	8	92	52	41	12	88	18	69	6	94	69	26
Colorado	6	94	28	65	10	90	11	79	3	97	49	49
Connecticut	12	88	10	78	12	88	10	78	9	91	8	83
Delaware	8	92	5	87	7	93	4	89	‡	‡	‡	‡
Florida	10	90	3	87	9	91	4	87	13	87	1	87
Georgia	12	88	15	73	11	89	16	73	12	88	8	80
Hawaii	8	92	33	59	8	92	20	72	8	92	44	47
Idaho	9	91	18	72	12	88	11	77	3	97	34	63
Illinois	6	94	12	82	6	94	7	87	5	95	24	71
Indiana	9	91	11	80	11	89	9	80	‡	‡	‡	‡
Iowa	5	95	7	88	6	94	5	89	1	99	19	79
Kansas	9	91	34	58	12	88	11	77	1	99	68	30
Kentucky	16	84	6	78	17	83	4	79	11	89	15	74
Louisiana	7	93	5	88	7	93	3	90	‡	‡	‡	‡
Maine	7	93	12	81	7	93	11	83	‡	‡	‡	‡
Maryland	11	89	5	84	9	91	3	88	17	83	12	71
Massachusetts	9	91	17	74	8	92	4	87	13	87	53	34
Michigan	16	84	18	67	15	85	14	71	16	84	31	53
Minnesota	9	91	39	51	12	88	29	59	5	95	60	36
Mississippi	9	91	21	70	9	91	16	75	‡	‡	‡	‡
Missouri	10	90	12	79	10	90	9	81	‡	‡	‡	‡
Montana	11	89	18	70	12	88	13	75	‡	‡	‡	‡
Nebraska	12	88	13	75	12	88	11	77	10	90	21	69
Nevada	7	93	18	75	7	93	13	80	4	96	25	71
New Hampshire	5	95	14	81	5	95	13	82	‡	‡	‡	‡
New Jersey	9	91	2	89	7	93	1	91	‡	‡	‡	‡
New Mexico	7	93	42	51	11	89	24	64	2	98	53	45
New York	9	91	1	90	10	90	1	90	6	94	1	92
North Carolina	7	93	17	76	7	93	10	82	6	94	33	61
North Dakota	19	81	8	73	19	81	6	75	15	85	24	61
Ohio	9	91	6	85	10	90	5	85	3	97	17	80
Oklahoma	9	91	17	75	9	91	10	81	8	92	44	49
Oregon	9	91	25	66	10	90	21	69	3	97	33	63
Pennsylvania	9	91	12	79	9	91	12	80	11	89	13	77
Rhode Island	6	94	11	83	5	95	9	87	8	92	16	76
South Carolina	9	91	27	64	10	90	18	72	5	95	56	39
South Dakota	10	90	25	65	10	90	21	69	9	91	38	53
Tennessee	14	86	6	80	14	86	6	80	‡	‡	‡	‡
Texas	11	89	21	68	12	88	11	78	10	90	34	56
Utah	11	89	16	73	12	88	11	77	8	92	27	65
Vermont	5	95	11	85	4	96	10	86	‡	‡	‡	‡
Virginia	6	94	21	73	6	94	17	77	5	95	28	67
Washington	12	88	18	70	14	86	10	76	8	92	33	59
West Virginia	13	87	19	68	13	87	17	69	‡	‡	‡	‡
Wisconsin	8	92	11	81	10	90	8	82	4	96	17	80
Wyoming	10	90	10	80	10	90	9	81	‡	‡	‡	‡
Other jurisdictions												
District of Columbia	4	96	4	91	2	98	1	97	11	89	14	75
DoDEA[1]	8	92	24	68	8	92	14	78	13	87	45	43

‡ Reporting standards not met.

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

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-35. Percentage of twelfth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, as a percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students, by state/jurisdiction: 2013

	Percentage of identified SD and/or ELL students											
	SD and/or ELL				SD				ELL			
State/jurisdiction	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
Nation (public)	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**	**TBA**
Arkansas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Connecticut	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Florida	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Idaho	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Illinois	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Iowa	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Massachusetts	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Michigan	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Hampshire	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New Jersey	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
South Dakota	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Tennessee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
West Virginia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. States/jurisdictions that did not participate at the state level are not shown. 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), 2013 Mathematics Assessment.

Table A-36. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, by SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–13

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

See notes at end of table.

Table A-36. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, by SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–13—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

See notes at end of table.

Table A-36. Percentage of fourth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, by SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–13—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

[1] Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

NOTE: Beginning in 2009, if the results for charter schools are not included in the school district's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report to the U.S. Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, they are excluded from that district's Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) results. 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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Table A-37. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, by SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–13

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2003					2005				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

See notes at end of table.

Table A-37. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, by SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–13—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2007					2009				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

See notes at end of table.

Table A-37. Percentage of eighth-grade public school students identified as students with disabilities (SD) and/or English language learners (ELL) excluded and assessed in NAEP mathematics, by SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction: Various years, 2003–13—Continued

SD/ELL category and urban district/jurisdiction	2011					2013				
	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations	Identified	Excluded	Assessed	Assessed without accom-modations	Assessed with accom-modations
SD and/or ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
SD										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
ELL										
Nation (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Large city[1] (public)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Albuquerque	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Atlanta	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Austin	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Baltimore City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Boston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Charlotte	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Chicago	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Cleveland	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Dallas	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Detroit	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
District of Columbia (DCPS)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Fresno	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Hillsborough County (FL)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Houston	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Jefferson County (KY)	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Los Angeles	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Miami-Dade	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Milwaukee	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
New York City	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA
Philadelphia	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

San Diego	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA	TBA

— Not available.

Rounds to zero.

[1] Large city includes students from all cities in the nation with populations of 250,000 or more including the participating districts.

NOTE: Beginning in 2009, if the results for charter schools are not included in the school district's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report to the U.S. Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, they are excluded from that district's Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) results. 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. SD includes students identified as having either an Individualized Education Program or protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. DCPS = District of Columbia Public Schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 2003–13 Mathematics Assessments.

Data Collection

The NAEP 2013 mathematics assessment was conducted from January to March 2013 by contractors to the U.S. Department of Education. Data collection for NAEP involves a collaborative effort among the participating schools, school districts, states, and NAEP staff. To reduce the burden on the participating schools, NAEP field staff perform most of the work associated with the assessment. The cooperation of the schools involves enlisting a school staff member to assist in coordinating selected students and providing space to administer the assessments.

Assessment sessions are scripted so that all students are given the same instructions and opportunity to demonstrate what they know and can do. Assessment administrators conduct the sessions under the supervision of their team's assessment coordinator. Training of assessment administrators focuses on their responsibilities in the classroom and on reading the scripts verbatim to administer the sessions in a uniform manner.

NAEP procedures guarantee the anonymity of participants. The names of students are never removed from the schools. The results of NAEP are reported on the national level and by region of the country, state, and for some urban districts—not by school or individual student.

Scoring

Three types of cognitive items were scored for the NAEP mathematics assessment. Responses to multiple-choice questions were scored by high-speed scanners during student booklet processing. Short constructed-response questions (those with two or three valid score points) and extended constructed-response questions (those with four or five valid score points) were scored by trained personnel using high-definition images of student responses also captured during processing.

Scoring a large number of short and extended constructed-responses with a high level of accuracy and reliability within a limited time frame is essential to the success of NAEP. To ensure reliable, efficient scoring, NAEP

- develops focused, explicit scoring guides for each item that match the criteria delineated in the assessment frameworks,
- pilot tests all items and adjusts the scoring guides (if necessary) to reflect actual student responses,
- recruits qualified and experienced scorers, trains them, and verifies their ability to score particular questions through qualifying tests,
- employs an image-processing and scoring system that routes images of student responses directly to the scorers so they can focus on scoring rather than paper routing,
- monitors scorer consistency through a second scoring a percentage of responses,
- assesses the quality of scorer decision-making through constant monitoring by NAEP assessment experts, and
- documents all training, scoring, and quality control procedures in the technical reports.

For the 2013 mathematics assessment, almost three and a half million individual student responses were scored across all three grades (including rescoring to monitor interrater reliability). Most of the mathematics items were scored with 90 percent or higher exact agreement between raters of the same student responses.

Data Analysis and Scaling

The goal of the analysis of NAEP data is to summarize the performance of groups of students. Initial analysis activities verify the accuracy of the data and data files used in the analysis and provide the first indication of aspects of the data and analysis that require special consideration and attention. The first step is to determine the percentages of students who gave various responses to each cognitive item. Next, the properties of the items are further examined using classical test theory measures of item difficulty and item discrimination. Some of these activities are conducted without student weights or with preliminary student weights, but final student weights are used whenever possible.

After the initial activities are completed, NAEP score scales are created using Item Response Theory (IRT), and scale score distributions are estimated for groups of students. Not all students take the same blocks of items in a NAEP assessment, so results cannot be summarized using the total number of correct item responses. Instead, IRT models are used to describe the relationships between the item responses provided by students and the underlying scale (e.g., mathematics ability). The primary purpose of IRT scaling is to provide a common scale on which performance can be compared even when students receive different blocks of items. Item parameters that are used in the models are estimated from student response data for each item. Different IRT models with different types of item parameters are used to describe multiple-choice items, constructed-response items that are scored simply right or wrong, and complex constructed-response items that have three or more categories.

Because the NAEP design gives each student a small proportion of the pool of assessment items, the assessment cannot provide reliable information about individual student performance. Traditional test scores for individual students, even those based on IRT, would result in misleading estimates of population characteristics, such as student 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. This is accomplished using marginal estimation techniques for latent variables. Under the assumptions of the analysis models, these population estimates will be consistent in the sense that the estimates approach the population values as the sample size increases.

IRT and the NAEP marginal estimation methodology are used to estimate score scales for each of the mathematics content areas at each grade (e.g., at grades 4 and 8, score scales are estimated for number properties and operations; measurement; geometry; data analysis, statistics, and probability; and algebra). The scales summarize student performance across all three types of questions in the assessment (multiple-choice, short constructed-response, and extended constructed-response). Each scale score distribution is transformed to a NAEP scale that ranges from 0 to 500. A mathematics composite scale is subsequently created by combining the content area scales. Summary statistics of the scale scores are estimated, and statistical tests are used to make inferences about the comparisons of results for different groups of students or for different assessment years. Finally, NAEP scale score distributions are described via achievement levels and/or item mapping procedures. For more information about NAEP analysis, IRT, and scaling see http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tdw/analysis/.

Variance Estimation

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 only 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.

Because NAEP uses complex sampling procedures, conventional formulas for estimating sampling variability that assume simple random sampling are inappropriate. NAEP uses a jackknife replication procedure to estimate standard errors. The jackknife standard error provides a reasonable measure of uncertainty for any student information that can be observed without error. However, because each student typically responds to only a few questions within any mathematics content area, the estimated scale score for any single student would be imprecise. In this case, NAEP's marginal estimation methodology is used to describe the performance of groups of students without requiring precise estimates of individual student performance. The estimate of the variance of the students' scale score distributions (which reflect the imprecision due to lack of measurement accuracy) is computed. This component of variability is then included in the standard errors of NAEP scale scores.

Drawing Inferences from the NAEP Results

Drawing correct inferences from NAEP assessment results depends on the use of appropriate statistical procedures for comparing assessment results for population groups of interest and following guidelines to ensure the validity of the inferences. Comparisons of different groups of students with respect to scores or percentages of a certain attribute are of primary interest to users of NAEP results. The user is cautioned to rely on the results of statistical tests, rather than on the apparent magnitude of the difference between two numbers when determining whether differences are likely to represent actual differences among the groups in the population.

***t* Test Comparison:** By convention, references to differences in NAEP reports indicate that scores or percentages from two groups are different (e.g., one group performed higher or lower than another group) only when the difference in the point estimates for the groups being compared is statistically significant at an approximate level of .05.

Since 1998, *t* tests have been used for most NAEP comparisons. These tests are more appropriate than *z* tests (based on normal distribution approximations) when the statistics that are being compared are from distributions with proportionally larger extremes (i.e., thicker tails) than the normal distribution. One aspect of the use of *t* tests that contributes to the difficulty in their use for large-scale surveys is the determination of the appropriate degrees of freedom for the *t* distribution of interest.

Multiple Comparison Procedures: The *t* test used by NAEP and the certainty ascribed to intervals (e.g., a 95 percent confidence interval) are based on statistical theory that assumes that only one confidence interval or test of statistical significance is being performed. However, in some sections of a report, many different groups may be compared (i.e., multiple sets of confidence intervals are being analyzed). In sets of confidence intervals, statistical theory indicates that certainty associated with the entire set of intervals is less than that attributable to each individual comparison from the set. To hold the significance level for the set of comparisons at a particular level (e.g., .05), adjustments—called multiple comparison procedures—must be made to the methods.

To ensure that comparisons made using NAEP data are as accurate as possible, error rates are controlled when multiple comparisons are made. When making a number of comparisons in a single analysis, such as analyzing White student performance versus the performance of Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native students, the probability of finding significant differences by chance, for at least one comparison, increases with the family size or number of comparisons. There are several ways to take into account how many related comparisons are being made. In NAEP, the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) procedure is used to control for this.

Unlike other multiple comparison procedures (e.g., the Bonferroni procedure) that control the familywise error rate (i.e., the probability of making even one false rejection in the set of comparisons), the FDR procedure controls the expected proportion of falsely rejected hypotheses. Familywise procedures are considered conservative for large families of comparisons; therefore the FDR procedure is more suitable for multiple comparisons in NAEP than other procedures. There are two exceptions where the FDR is not applied: when comparing multiple years and when comparing a state's overall results to the nation.

NAEP Reporting Groups

In addition to overall results for each grade assessed, NAEP results are reported for certain student groups provided there are sufficient numbers of students and adequate school representation. Results for some student groups may not be available for certain years, grades, or jurisdictions.

Race/Ethnicity: The school-recorded race/ethnicity variable records the race/ethnicity of each student as reported by the student's school. When the school-recorded information is missing, student-reported data derived from the student background questions are used. For 2013, the mutually exclusive racial/ethnic categories are White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or more races. Black includes African American and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin unless specified.

Gender: The gender of the student assessed is taken from school records.

Eligibility for the National School Lunch Program: The school lunch variable is based on available school records. Students are classified as either currently eligible or not currently eligible for the national lunch component of the Department of Agriculture's National School Lunch Program. The classification refers only to the school year when the assessment was administered and is not based on eligibility in previous years. If school records are not available, the student is classified as "Information not available." If the school did not participate in the program, all students in that school were classified as "Information not available." Eligibility for the program is determined by students' family income in relation to the federally established poverty level. Free lunch qualification is set at 130 percent of the poverty level or below, and reduced-price lunch qualification is set at between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty level. (For the period July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, for a family of four, 130 percent of the poverty level was $29,965, and 185 percent was $42,642.) Additional information on eligibility may be found at the U.S. Department of Agriculture website at http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/.

Type of Location: Results for four mutually exclusive categories of school location are also reported: city, suburb, town, and rural. The categories are based on standard definitions established by the Federal Office of Management and Budget using population and geographic information from the U.S. Census Bureau. Schools are assigned to these categories in the NCES Common Core of Data based on their physical address. The classification system was revised for 2007; therefore, trend comparisons to previous years are not available. The new locale codes are based on an address's proximity to an urbanized area (a densely settled core with densely settled surrounding areas). This is a change from the original system based on metropolitan statistical areas. To distinguish the two systems, the new system is referred to as "urban-centric locale codes."

Parental Education: Eighth- and twelfth-graders were asked the following two questions, the responses to which were combined to derive the parental education variable:

How far in school did your mother go?

- She did not finish high school.
- She graduated from high school.
- She had some education after high school.
- She graduated from college.
- I don't know.

How far in school did your father go?

- He did not finish high school.
- He graduated from high school.
- He had some education after high school.
- He graduated from college.
- I don't know.

The information was combined into one parental-education reporting variable in the following way:

- If a student indicated the extent of education for only one parent, that level was included in the data. If a student indicated the extent of education for both parents, the higher of the two levels was included in the data.

- If a student responded "I don't know" for both parents, or responded "I don't know" for one parent and did not respond for the other, the parental education level was classified as "I don't know."

- If the student did not respond for either parent, the student was recorded as having provided no response.

Because fourth-graders' responses to the questions tend to be highly variable, the questions are not presented to students at grade 4.

Region of the Country: Prior to 2003, NAEP results were reported for four NAEP-defined regions of the nation: Northeast, Southeast, Central, and West. To align NAEP with other federal data collections, NAEP analysis and reports have used the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of "region" beginning in 2003. The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West. Therefore, trend data by region are not provided for assessment years prior to 2003

Figure A-1 shows how states are subdivided into these census regions. All 50 states and the District of Columbia are listed. Other jurisdictions, including the Department of Defense Education Activity schools, are not assigned to any region.

Figure A-1. States within regions of the country defined by the U.S. Census Bureau

Northeast	South	Midwest	West
Connecticut	Alabama	Illinois	Alaska
Maine	Arkansas	Indiana	Arizona
Massachusetts	Delaware	Iowa	California
New Hampshire	District of Columbia	Kansas	Colorado
New Jersey	Florida	Michigan	Hawaii
New York	Georgia	Minnesota	Idaho
Pennsylvania	Kentucky	Missouri	Montana
Rhode Island	Louisiana	Nebraska	Nevada
Vermont	Maryland	North Dakota	New Mexico
	Mississippi	Ohio	Oregon
	North Carolina	South Dakota	Utah
	Oklahoma	Wisconsin	Washington
	South Carolina		Wyoming
	Tennessee		
	Texas		
	Virginia		
	West Virginia		

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.

Caution in Interpretations

As previously stated, the NAEP mathematics scale makes it possible to examine relationships between students' performance and various background factors that NAEP measures. However, the relationship 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 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.

Caution in interpretation 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 changes with extreme caution. The effects of exclusion-rate changes for small student groups may be more marked for small groups than they are for the whole population. In addition, 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.