

# *Education*

## **Briefing Series**

### *K-12 Student Achievement Testing*



# Education Briefing Series

**A**ppplied Analysis has been asked by the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce to examine various aspects of Nevada's system of elementary and secondary education in public schools ("K-12"). Among the relevant issues is student achievement, as measured by various forms of testing required under federal and state laws. Although the vigorous debate over student achievement has been widely publicized in general terms, the labyrinth of reporting requirements and testing instruments is not well understood outside the K-12 education community. The ongoing controversy among educators as to the usefulness and accuracy of various tests in measuring desired skills and abilities is not treated here. Rather, this paper simply provides some recent historical background for today's continuing interest in student proficiency at both state and federal levels, a brief description of several of the tests prominently discussed in Nevada today, and, where available, comparisons among states and among Nevada school districts.

## FINDINGS IN SUMMARY

In Nevada, measurable strides have been made to recognize and remediate areas of weakness in student proficiency, although the pace of improvement remains at issue. Nevada continues to rank well below national averages on standardized student proficiency exams administered to elementary school, middle school, and college-bound high-school students. While these facts are compelling and concerning, relative scores on national exams alone may fall short of providing a complete picture of student achievement and the progress made in Nevada's schools during the past several years.

Nationwide standardized tests include the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) exams given to fourth and eighth-grade students as well as the College Board (SAT) and American College Testing (ACT) exams taken by many college-bound high school students. While these tests allow for state-to-state comparisons, they are not taken by all students in all years and are subject to some sampling bias. Nevada's fourth and eighth graders placed no higher than 43<sup>rd</sup> in math or reading on any of the most recent NAEP exams. Only 26 percent of high school seniors and 11 percent of high school juniors sat for the SAT; placing 35<sup>th</sup> nationally in critical reading, 39<sup>th</sup> in math, and 40<sup>th</sup> in writing. A slightly higher percent of high school students fared better on the ACT, ranking 28<sup>th</sup> nationally in composite score, 27<sup>th</sup> in English, 28<sup>th</sup> in math, 28<sup>th</sup> in reading, and 31<sup>st</sup> in science.



# Education Briefing Series

A second set of criterion reference exams are taken by nearly all Nevada students each year. This testing is in direct response to “No Child Left Behind”<sup>1</sup> (NCLB) and its requirement that schools and school districts make “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP) toward student proficiency. Public Law 107-110 (HR1), signed by the President in 2002, re-authorized a number of preexisting sections of the federal education code and established the goal that all students will demonstrate proficiency in English/language arts and in mathematics by the school year 2013-2014. NCLB gives each state flexibility in selecting its own tests and its own plan for demonstrating AYP toward meeting the 2013-2014 goal. Until 2013-2014, the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency, including designated subgroups of students, must increase according to a schedule culminating at 100 percent in 2013-2014. Hypothetically, when 2013-2014 arrives, and 100 percent of the students in a school are not proficient as measured by the tests, that school would be reported as “failing.”

Under NCLB, both individual school performance and district-level performance is reported annually by the Nevada Department of Education as either making or not making AYP for English/language arts and for mathematics in elementary, middle school, and high school. For 2008-2009, six Nevada school districts, including the Clark County School District (CCSD), were reported as not making AYP. Although substantial progress has been made in terms of overall student proficiency, consistent progress has not been the norm for all student population subgroups that require individualized assessment under the NCLB regime (e.g., certain minority groups, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities). Notably, while the CCSD did not make AYP in 2009, elementary school students meeting or exceeding standards have increased from 45.5 percent to 57.2 percent in English/language arts and 49.5 percent to 63.0 percent in math between 2003 and 2009. Middle school students reported increases from 44.2 percent to 62.7 percent in English/language arts and from 37.4 percent to 61.0 percent in math during the same period, at the same time high school students reported proficiency increases from 79.1 percent in to 89.5 percent in English/language arts and 52.1 percent to 69.6 percent in math.<sup>2</sup> These district-wide gains notwithstanding, if one of 37 possible subgroups fails to make AYP, then the entire school is designated as failing. These requirements disparately impact large, diversified school districts; they also tend to mask some meaningful improvements

---

<sup>1</sup> Actual PL 107-110 requirements for proficiency of all students are a condition of eligibility for Title 1 funding in designated schools. However, Nevada elected to extend the concept of NCLB to all students in all schools. Also, NCLB requires testing in science beginning in 2005-2006. While Nevada is now testing in science, standards for these tests are still pending approval.

<sup>2</sup> Notably, students meeting or exceeding standards decreased in some categories for all students between the 2008 and 2009 school years. A complete analysis of student performance is provided in Appendix 1 at that end of this report.

in the overall rate of core academic proficiency among Nevada's school children during the past several years.

## STUDENT TESTING NATIONALLY AND IN NEVADA

Concern regarding the effectiveness of our nation's schools has existed for decades. As the first baby-boomers reached school age in the 1950's, Why Johnny Can't Read, a widely-publicized book written by Rudolph Flesch; strongly criticized the teaching of reading through word recognition rather than through phonics, and pronounced American schools inferior to European schools in this regard.<sup>3</sup> Since public education was at that time organizationally subordinate to other functions at the federal level, and as no substantial body of case law regarding state responsibility for equity in school funding had yet accumulated, policy regarding instruction of students then rested predominantly in the hands of local school officials.

In 1979, Congress established the United States Department of Education as a cabinet-level agency; and, in 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education released "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform", which characterized our schools as offering a "smorgasbord" curriculum with too little time invested in mathematics and science, short school days, "written-down" textbooks, and undercompensated teachers drawn from the lower echelons of graduating classes, among other maladies.<sup>4</sup> Political appetite for proficiency testing increased nationwide, with Nevada being no exception.

Four years prior to release of that study, Nevada had enacted a significant centralization of its school funding plan, substantially reducing local control of fiscal matters.<sup>5</sup> While the Nevada State Legislature had long been constitutionally responsible to "provide" for a public school system, state involvement in instructional matters had generally been limited to that of the Nevada Department of Education in concert with local school boards.<sup>6</sup> Taken together, these events in the late 1970's and early 1980's resulted in more direct involvement by the Nevada State Legislature in K-12 instructional and financial matters, notwithstanding the fact that local school boards are ostensibly elected to govern their respective districts. Every legislative session since 1983, has included substantial deliberation regarding the content, timing, security, and financing of student proficiency testing;

<sup>3</sup> "Education: Why Johnny Can't Read", Time Magazine, March 14, 1955, <http://www.time.com>.

<sup>4</sup> "A Nation at Risk", transmittal letter by David Pierpont Gardner, Chairman, April 26, 1983, <http://www.ed.gov>.

<sup>5</sup> Senate Bill 204, 1979 Nevada Legislature.

<sup>6</sup> Nevada Constitution, Article 11.



# Education Briefing Series

punctuated in 1997 by the establishment of the Legislative Committee on Education to investigate specified K-12 issues and prescribe standards for review and evaluation of reports by the Nevada Department of Education, thereby extending the reach of the Legislature beyond regular sessions in K-12 matters.<sup>7</sup>

In general, testing practices are now converging around federal requirements, a trend likely to continue. The passage by Congress and signature by the President of HR1 in 2002 began the era of “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB), accelerating the migration toward “criterion-referenced” tests (CRTs), which measure student proficiency against predetermined benchmarks and away from “norm-referenced” tests, which emphasize how students perform against averages. Since each state selects or creates its own NCLB tests, comparability among school districts within each state is possible, but comparability among states is not, although support is gathering within the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers for eventual implementation of national standards.<sup>8</sup> NCLB requires states to establish a timeline for increasing the percentage of proficient students; ensuring that, not later than the 2013-2014 school year, all students, including those in each identified subgroup, will meet or exceed state proficiency standards.<sup>9</sup>

“Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP) is expected against a set of percentage thresholds, increasing to 100 percent of all students achieving proficiency by 2013-2014. To prevent the skewing of scores by pre-selection of the tested population, 95 percent of students in each identified student subgroup must be tested. Sanctions are imposed on schools for prolonged failure to achieve AYP. Testing is mandated by federal law in grades 3 through 8, and high school. Nevada also uses its NCLB high school test to determine eligibility for graduation. Individual grade results are aggregated and reported for elementary, middle, and high school English/language arts and mathematics.

Student subgroups are identified by ethnicity, limited English proficiency (“LEP”), free and reduced price lunch eligibility (“FRL”), and special education status (individual education plan or “IEP”). Separate measurement of both proficiency and participation is provided for all students tested; five ethnic groups; and LEP, IEP, and FRL student populations in the two subject matter areas of English/language arts and mathematics resulting in as many as 36 different subgroup permutations, any of which may cause a school to “fail” to meet AYP. Further, if a school has low average daily attendance or graduation rates, it is deemed failing, regardless of whether it meets its proficiency and participation targets – creating a 37<sup>th</sup>

<sup>7</sup> NRS 218.5352

<sup>8</sup> See: Signed Memorandum of Agreement for Nevada To Participate in Common Core Standards Initiative, Dr. Keith Rheault, Nevada Superintendent of Public Instruction, May 20, 2009.

<sup>9</sup> PL 107-110 Section 1111.

# Education Briefing Series

opportunity for failure. Again, regardless of whether all students tested in a school together achieve the percentage proficiency and participation targets, failure in a single category, (e.g. insufficient participation among Asian-Pacific Islanders or insufficient proficiency in mathematics among LEP students) marks that entire school as not achieving AYP.<sup>10</sup>

An alternative to meeting the proficiency target outright is the “safe harbor” of a year-to-year 10 percent or more reduction in the number of non-proficient students in a subgroup.<sup>11</sup> Since any subgroup with 25 or more students must be separately reported, small schools are more likely to escape separate reporting, regardless of what percentage any subgroup comprises of their enrollment. Accommodations may be made for IEP students with severe disabilities through use of alternative testing procedures and adjustments to the testing environment. In Nevada, all tests instruments are written in English.

The fact that NCLB imposes consequences on school operations has likely contributed to the convergence of testing efforts around NCLB. The consequences imposed through NCLB on schools not making AYP represent an unprecedented extension of federal involvement in local education outcomes. Corrective action at the school level is required based on the number of consecutive years of non-achievement of the AYP percentage threshold.

A school not meeting AYP is identified as “in need of improvement.” For the first year of such status, the school faces no consequences. For the second through the fifth consecutive year in which a school does not meet AYP, incremental efforts including, without limitation, revision of the curriculum, outside expert consultation, structured parent involvement, school transfer options for parents, school schedule changes, and planning for restructuring are required. A school failing to meet AYP for five or more consecutive years must implement a restructuring plan, with the expectation that the administration of the school may be completely changed, and that all teachers may have to reapply for their positions if they wish to remain at that school. Such a school may also be converted to a charter school or have its operations contracted out to a private company.

In contrast to NCLB, under which different tests are given in every state, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the College Board (SAT), and American College Testing (ACT) give the same tests in all states, which allows

---

<sup>10</sup> “No Child Left Behind 2008-2009”, presentation by Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.

<sup>11</sup> Id. Also see: “The Nevada Adequate Yearly Progress Technical Manual”, Nevada Department of Education, May 2009.



comparisons among states. However, such comparisons may not be entirely conclusive as most students do not take the NAEP, SAT, or SAT tests.

## NEVADA'S PERFORMANCE TRENDS

### Progress Relative to Nevada's AYP Objectives

While media attention has typically focused on identifying schools as "achieving" or "failing" in a particular year, the longer-term notion that *all* students must achieve proficiency by school year 2013-2014 raises the question of where is Nevada on the continuum toward this ideal vision. Since the Clark County School District comprises nearly three-fourths of state-wide enrollment, its annual targets and progress are highly relevant in answering this question. Appendix 1 compares, for each school year from 2002-2003 forward, the proficiency target and the percentage of Clark County students demonstrating proficiency for all students tested, for each ethnic group, and for IEP, LEP, and FRL students. It is noteworthy that, if all students tested were combined as a single subgroup, the district as a whole would be meeting its annual percentage targets. However, since a number of student subgroups are not, many Clark County schools and the district as a whole are reported as failing to achieve AYP.

It has been anecdotally asserted that publicly declaring an entire school as "failing" based on lack of progress by any one subgroup of 25 or more students, including those with learning challenges, unfairly penalizes large or diverse school systems; and, statistically, such assertions are well founded. However, under No Child Left Behind, such declaration of school "failure" is the unavoidable manifestation, reasonable or not, of the expectation that every student in the United States will be proficient within the next five years. Accordingly, organizations and individuals basing decisions in part on school performance should be cautioned against hasty categorization of schools and districts without careful analysis of data for each school and the subgroups of students for which separate reporting is required.

As the school year 2013-2014 approaches, the gaps between the proficiency actually achieved and 100 percent are certain to be closely observed, and a scenario of 100 percent proficiency is difficult to imagine. Again, if all Clark County students tested were combined in a single subgroup, the District would be reported as achieving proficiency targets. However, several subgroups are not meeting these targets. This fact considered, it is noteworthy that closing the gaps between current proficiency and 100 percent proficiency by 2013-2014 will require considerable acceleration in the pace of improvement as indicated in Appendix 1.

# Education Briefing Series

As noted above, nationally-administered tests such as NAEP, SAT, and ACT do not measure the proficiency of the entire student population as they are based on samplings of students, either through self-selection in college entrance examinations or through sampling techniques imposed by the testing organization. That said, some comparisons among Nevada school districts are possible because of the uniform testing regime prescribed to meet NCLB requirements. In making such in-state comparisons observers should be cautioned to also look beyond the broad-brush designations of “making” or “not making” AYP, as the system clearly creates more avenues for failure for large or diverse schools and districts. With this factor in mind, Appendix 2 shows the results for elementary, middle, and high school English/language arts and mathematics tests for each Nevada school district, whether that district as a whole is making AYP in that subject, and whether that district is making AYP at that grade level (e.g. elementary, middle, or high school).

Under the classification system, a district as a whole is deemed to be making AYP in a subject if AYP is being met in at least one of the three aggregated grade levels. Therefore, Appendix 2 shows some districts as a whole are making AYP in a tested subject, but not at a particular grade level: and such districts are shown, for example, as “District Yes – Elementary Math No”. Appendix 2 shows that, if all students were combined in a single subgroup, virtually all school districts as a whole would be meeting the percentage proficiency targets for 2009. However, as in the case of Clark County, other districts are not making AYP in some subjects and grade levels due to the requirement that all subgroups and schools have to meet the same thresholds, statistically a much more difficult task. While, for purposes of brevity, student subgroups are not reflected in Appendix 2, the importance of this requirement is made clear by the many indications of failure to meet AYP in a particular subject at a particular grade level in most districts.

Nevada defines a district as meeting AYP in a tested subject if proficiency is achieved at any one aggregated grade level – elementary, middle, or high school. If a district does not achieve proficiency in a subject at any of these three grade levels, that district is deemed as not making AYP for that subject and for that district as a whole. Appendix 2 shows that, among districts not making AYP, Churchill and Nye did not make AYP in English/language arts at any grade level; Lyon did not make AYP in mathematics at any grade level; and Clark, Elko, and Washoe did not make AYP in either English/language arts or mathematics at any of the three aggregated grade levels. All remaining districts met the definition of AYP in both subjects in at least one grade level.

While some might argue the threshold for a district to meet AYP in a subject is too low - merely meeting AYP at the elementary, or middle school, or high school level - at least two points should be raised. First, as shown in Appendix 1, the dramatic



# Education Briefing Series

increase in the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency since inception of the program, coupled with the requirement for 100 percent proficiency by 2013-2014 can significantly reduce the number of non-proficient students at all levels. Second, for example, even if a district is struggling to meet proficiency targets in the lower grades; but is meeting the high school targets, the proof of that district's success might lay in a higher likelihood of high school graduation irrespective of possible issues in the lower grades. Also, hypothetically, even if a district faces challenges within the current cohort of high school students, that district could be in process of measurable improvement for the future if their elementary and middle school students score well and maintain that pattern through high school. While not justifying any particular definition of Adequate Yearly Progress, such points are simply intended to recognize that assessing improvement in educational outcomes over time is a highly complex issue.

### Performance on Standardized National Examinations

Comparisons of student achievement among states based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and college entrance examinations (i.e., ACT and SAT) have been published for many years. Although NAEP results are commonly cited as a benchmark for elementary and middle school performance; as are SAT and ACT results for high school, comparisons based on these tests may be somewhat flawed as all students do not take them. Ideally, administering these tests to all students nationally every year would provide the most comprehensive comparisons. That said, there is no test currently administered to all students nationally at any grade level.

NAEP does not administer tests every year and those tests are given only to a sampling of students drawn by NAEP, only in selected schools (140 of 608 Nevada public schools), only in grades 4 and 8, and not based on the Nevada curriculum.<sup>12</sup> The fit of the sampling to the makeup of the total student population is critical to the accuracy of any conclusion, and sampling techniques may be subject to debate. Also, anecdotally, because NAEP does not test all students in any grade; and as there is no consequence attached to the test scores in Nevada; preparation of students for NAEP testing may have received less emphasis in the classroom than for other tests (e.g., the criterion-referenced tests tied to NCLB and its associated Adequate Yearly Progress requirements). Respecting that any conclusions based on NAEP data should be strongly qualified; Appendix 3 shows that Nevada fourth and eighth graders in the sample tested in 2009 scored visibly lower than the national

---

<sup>12</sup> Sources: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement and Office of the Superintendent, Nevada Department of Education. NCLB requires NAEP participation by states in grades 4 and 8 to maintain eligibility for Title 1 funding. Nevada has participated in some long term high school studies only on a limited basis. Also see: Research Bulletin, Nevada Department of Education, February, 2007.

# Education Briefing Series

average, with rankings from 43<sup>rd</sup> to 48<sup>th</sup> in math and reading. Flaws in the testing process aside, such rankings are noteworthy and compelling.

The SAT Reasoning Test (formerly Scholastic Aptitude Test) administered by the College Board, a non-profit organization, is widely used by higher education institutions in screening students applying for enrollment. Since the same tests are given in all states, it is also perceived as one means by which the proficiency of high school students can be compared among states. In 2009, 6,145 12<sup>th</sup> grade students and 2,763 11<sup>th</sup> grade students took the SAT in Nevada, representing 26 percent and 11 percent of the fall enrollment in those grades, respectively.<sup>13</sup> It is likely that many 11<sup>th</sup> grade students taking the test will also do so in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, attempting to better their earlier scores.

Most students need not take the SAT because they are either not college-bound, or they intend to apply to one or more of over 800 accredited, bachelor-degree granting institutions in the United States which do not require it for admission, although many use these scores for student placement and other purposes.<sup>14</sup> Restriction of the tested population to those students who consider themselves college-bound and who intend to apply to institutions requiring the SAT limits the usefulness of the test results as an indicator of proficiency for the high school student population. Despite this lack of direct applicability to the performance of students in general, comparisons among college-bound high school students are considered by many as a reasonable measure of instructional rigor and effectiveness in meeting the needs of students capable of success as adults; and, thereby the needs of society at large. Hence, the importance placed on college entrance examinations. Appendix 4 shows Nevada students taking the SAT scored 35<sup>th</sup> nationally in critical reading, 39<sup>th</sup> nationally in math, and 40<sup>th</sup> nationally in writing.

The college entrance examination conducted by ACT, Inc. (formerly American College Testing Program), is the major competitor to the SAT. The same student self-selection issues bearing upon the SAT test results also apply to ACT testing. Accordingly, the ACT is limited in its applicability to the performance of students in general. However, the ACT results for Nevada students appear more favorable than for the SAT. Appendix 5 shows that in 2009, Nevada students' ACT scores ranked higher against students in other states than for the NAEP and SAT tests - 28<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> "Research Bulletin, Nevada Department of Education, Fall Enrollment, February 2009. Also see: "State Profile Report: Nevada", College Board, 2009. Note: percentage participation rates shown here are estimated by Applied Analysis based on students reported as tested compared to total fall enrollment in the affected grades. Other reported percentages may vary.

<sup>14</sup> "Schools That Do Not Use SAT or ACT Scores for Admitting Substantial Numbers of Students into Bachelor Degree Programs", Fair Test National Center for Fair and Open Testing, Boston, Massachusetts, Summer 2009.



nationally in composite score, 27<sup>th</sup> nationally in English, 28<sup>th</sup> nationally in math, 28<sup>th</sup> nationally in reading, and 31<sup>st</sup> nationally in science.

## CONCLUSION

While both supporters and opponents of increased public school funding have made their respective arguments based on test scores, the truth is that no comprehensive, national comparison of the proficiency of all students has ever been undertaken, let alone published. That said, national comparisons of subsets of students indicate that Nevada students fare no better than mid-range, and are most often well below students in other states when evaluating achievement based on standardized test performance.

Within Nevada results vary; but, predictably, the more diverse school systems with more reportable subgroups tend to have greater difficulty achieving Adequate Yearly Progress in NCLB reports. The gaps between current percentages of students found proficient and any target approaching 100 percent vary dramatically among the subgroups, highlighting the challenges for teachers, schools, school districts, and the State Legislature.<sup>15</sup>

As Nevada seeks to survive the current recession and strengthen its competitive position nationally, the status of the public school system may be especially precarious given the state's present fiscal circumstances. Advocates for K-12 will likely continue to cite Nevada's historically large class sizes and low operating allocations per student as causal factors for lack of progress, while others may assert that the arrival of economic recovery combined with academic rigor will resolve any legitimate concerns for the level of resources for improving student performance. This debate is certainly not new; but, under the requirements of No Child Left Behind, the obvious challenges confronting the 2011 Legislature and the rapid approach of the 2013-2014 school year loudly beg the question, "Now what?"

## APPLICABILITY OF FINDINGS AND LIMITATIONS OF DATA

As the information herein includes both gains already made and gains yet to be made in student proficiency; this report is intended to be read and interpreted as a whole, and in its complete context.

Any comparison of student achievement should be made with the clear understanding that measuring student proficiency is not only subject to the

---

<sup>15</sup> Nevada Constitution, Article 11.

# Education Briefing Series

accuracy and statistical soundness of the testing processes conducted by school jurisdictions and national testing organizations, but is also highly subject to the alignment between the knowledge and skills as taught and the knowledge and skills tested. The ongoing controversy among educators as to the usefulness and accuracy of various tests in measuring desired skills and abilities is a significant consideration not treated here.

NCLB requirements cited in this briefing represent a composite of mandates directly imposed by PL 107-110, and Nevada's own NCLB-related laws and regulations intended to enable the state's compliance with NCLB. It is noted that, in addition to testing in English/ language Arts and in mathematics, Public Law 107-110 also requires testing in science beginning in 2005-2006. However, while Nevada is now testing in science, the standards for these tests are pending approval. Since the Nevada Department of Education Report Card does not yet include science testing in determining AYP, science test results are not treated in this report.

As with any analysis, there are limitations that must be considered when drawing conclusions from the data utilized, including without limitation the fact that information contained in this report is subject to change due to timing of reporting and future events.



*Education*  
**Briefing  
Series**

# Appendices



**Appendix 1A – No Child Left Behind**

**Target and Actual Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards**  
By Year and by Subject for Clark County School District

**District as a Whole and Defined Student Subgroups**  
Elementary Schools

Target Percentage of Students	30.00%	27.50%	39.60%	39.60%	39.60%	51.70%	51.70%	63.80%	63.80%	75.90%	88.00%	100.00%
<b>English/Language Arts - Elementary</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
District Actual - All Students Tested	45.54%	42.01%	41.41%	45.46%	56.48%	54.36%	57.19%	<hr/> Progress To Be Determined By Testing in Future Years				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	43.20%	37.35%	36.49%	40.49%	55.31%	49.59%	51.47%					
Asian/Pacific Islander	59.79%	54.56%	56.43%	60.02%	70.22%	68.62%	69.97%					
Hispanic/Latino	29.33%	27.22%	27.77%	33.61%	44.94%	43.84%	47.39%					
Black/African American	31.20%	30.14%	29.79%	33.05%	45.12%	42.89%	44.56%					
White/Caucasian	60.87%	55.92%	55.11%	58.76%	69.68%	67.54%	70.72%					
IEP	10.11%	18.01%	20.06%	20.94%	29.11%	29.83%	29.79%					
LEP	18.28%	22.16%	19.25%	27.27%	37.13%	36.45%	41.82%					
FRL	29.69%	27.33%	27.60%	31.92%	43.17%	42.49%	45.82%					

Targets	36.00%	34.50%	45.40%	45.40%	43.30%	54.60%	54.60%	65.90%	65.90%	77.20%	88.50%	100.00%
<b>Math - Elementary</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
District Actual - All Students Tested	49.48%	48.02%	50.27%	52.38%	61.45%	63.60%	62.99%	<hr/> Progress To Be Determined By Testing in Future Years				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	48.04%	44.65%	43.60%	46.29%	56.79%	60.04%	55.81%					
Asian/Pacific Islander	67.88%	62.11%	67.24%	68.85%	76.08%	77.66%	76.95%					
Hispanic/Latino	36.34%	35.59%	38.52%	42.15%	52.50%	56.29%	56.10%					
Black/African American	32.30%	30.05%	32.72%	34.88%	45.40%	47.63%	46.57%					
White/Caucasian	62.69%	61.22%	63.98%	65.54%	73.14%	74.62%	74.12%					
IEP	12.67%	23.33%	26.56%	27.43%	36.09%	41.13%	38.42%					
LEP	28.72%	33.04%	29.03%	38.51%	47.98%	43.05%	53.72%					
FRL	35.47%	34.35%	36.48%	39.24%	50.05%	54.01%	53.66%					

Source: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.



**Appendix 1B – No Child Left Behind**

**Target and Actual Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards**  
By Year and by Subject for Clark County School District

**District as a Whole and Defined Student Subgroups**  
Middle Schools

Target Percentage of Students	37.00%	37.00%	47.50%	47.50%	39.60%	51.70%	51.70%	63.80%	63.80%	75.90%	88.00%	100.00%
English/Language Arts- Middle School	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
District Actual - All Students Tested	44.20%	55.03%	53.44%	49.94%	58.77%	58.51%	62.71%	Progress To Be Determined By Testing in Future Years				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	42.68%	50.00%	50.00%	47.43%	59.03%	53.87%	60.21%					
Asian/Pacific Islander	59.23%	66.83%	68.13%	66.67%	74.16%	74.92%	77.33%					
Hispanic/Latino	28.84%	39.56%	38.71%	36.44%	46.22%	47.07%	52.41%					
Black/African American	31.21%	42.58%	39.89%	36.54%	45.94%	46.01%	50.53%					
White/Caucasian	55.67%	68.06%	67.16%	64.17%	72.07%	71.82%	74.97%					
IEP	7.55%	18.96%	19.41%	15.21%	19.74%	28.04%	25.63%					
LEP	8.68%	33.75%	29.91%	32.11%	41.04%	42.41%	47.35%					
FRL	19.11%	39.79%	38.19%	35.47%	44.98%	46.23%	51.48%					

Target Percentage of Students	32.00%	32.00%	43.30%	43.30%	43.30%	54.60%	54.60%	65.90%	65.90%	77.20%	88.50%	100.00%
Math - Middle School	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
District Actual - All Students Tested	37.44%	46.31%	45.30%	49.27%	57.19%	56.96%	60.98%	Progress To Be Determined By Testing in Future Years				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	29.59%	41.14%	44.00%	45.40%	49.46%	52.16%	59.08%					
Asian/Pacific Islander	56.58%	61.57%	63.18%	69.58%	76.60%	75.93%	78.39%					
Hispanic/Latino	22.85%	30.52%	32.30%	36.44%	44.13%	46.05%	50.98%					
Black/African American	20.59%	28.78%	27.67%	32.81%	40.73%	40.22%	43.83%					
White/Caucasian	49.91%	60.44%	58.45%	63.27%	71.20%	70.61%	74.03%					
IEP	3.59%	11.08%	14.58%	14.90%	19.48%	28.47%	26.74%					
LEP	7.00%	27.48%	15.85%	34.09%	40.63%	43.27%	48.21%					
FRL	22.47%	30.63%	30.79%	35.19%	43.11%	44.81%	50.33%					

Source: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.

**Appendix 1C – No Child Left Behind**

**Target and Actual Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards**  
By Year and by Subject for Clark County School District

**District as a Whole and Defined Student Subgroups**  
High Schools

Target Percentage of Students	73.50%	73.50%	77.90%	77.90%	77.90%	82.30%	82.30%	86.70%	86.70%	91.10%	95.50%	100.00%
<b>English/Language Arts-High School</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
District Actual - All Students Tested	79.09%	79.66%	81.59%	87.60%	90.15%	90.83%	89.52%	<hr/> Progress To Be Determined <hr/> By Testing in Future Years				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	77.65%	75.57%	78.60%	90.10%	83.33%	87.39%	88.43%					
Asian/Pacific Islander	84.23%	84.96%	88.07%	91.75%	93.91%	93.69%	95.52%					
Hispanic/Latino	65.10%	67.47%	72.11%	80.72%	84.37%	85.44%	84.40%					
Black/African American	70.20%	71.55%	71.71%	80.22%	84.26%	85.65%	85.01%					
White/Caucasian	87.52%	87.71%	88.48%	92.70%	94.80%	95.63%	93.93%					
IEP	32.55%	40.59%	43.10%	45.68%	51.97%	60.87%	50.42%					
LEP	33.50%	59.99%	67.53%	75.97%	78.95%	70.37%	81.25%					
FRL	NA	62.32%	74.25%	76.97%	81.10%	83.37%	83.22%					

Target Percentage of Students	42.80%	42.80%	52.30%	52.30%	52.30%	61.80%	61.80%	71.30%	71.30%	80.80%	90.30%	100.00%
<b>Math - High School</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
District Actual - All Students Tested	52.06%	55.57%	58.42%	68.43%	63.68%	74.26%	69.64%	<hr/> Progress To Be Determined <hr/> By Testing in Future Years				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	41.75%	50.86%	42.66%	64.58%	65.52%	68.47%	62.81%					
Asian/Pacific Islander	62.30%	69.06%	71.32%	79.52%	76.40%	83.68%	81.96%					
Hispanic/Latino	32.82%	39.24%	43.01%	55.68%	49.72%	63.43%	59.80%					
Black/African American	31.98%	35.67%	37.80%	46.41%	43.29%	55.84%	51.40%					
White/Caucasian	65.95%	68.18%	71.25%	79.66%	75.62%	85.52%	80.25%					
IEP	12.35%	13.73%	18.05%	20.49%	21.34%	33.66%	25.19%					
LEP	16.91%	29.94%	41.86%	53.16%	45.63%	59.27%	59.73%					
FRL	28.81%	32.97%	38.07%	51.05%	47.37%	59.90%	57.49%					

Source: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.

Appendix 2A – No Child Left Behind School Year 2008-2009

Target and Actual Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards

By Year and Subject for Each Nevada School District - All Students Tested  
Elementary Schools

Districts Not Meeting AYP in One Subject - English or Math  
 Districts Not Meeting AYP in Both English and Math

Target Percentage of Students	51.70%	63.80%	63.80%	75.90%	88.00%	100.00%	
English/Language Arts - Elementary	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	AYP Status By Subject for District as a Whole and for Grade Level
Carson City	63.85%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Churchill	66.05%						District No - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Clark	57.19%						District No - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Douglas	75.28%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts Yes
Elko	61.13%						District No - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Esmeralda	-						Report Not Available
Eureka	76.56%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts Yes
Humboldt	63.13%			Progress To Be Determined			District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts Yes
Lander	74.53%			By Testing in Future Years			District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Lincoln	65.01%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Lyon	65.18%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts Yes
Mineral	55.13%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Nye	56.79%						District No - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Pershing	53.42%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts No
Storey	58.71%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts Yes
Washoe	61.42%						District No - Elementary English/Language Arts No
White Pine	45.39%						District Yes - Elementary English/Language Arts No

Target Percentage of Students	54.60%	65.90%	65.90%	77.20%	88.50%	100.00%	
Math - Elementary	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	AYP Status By Subject for District as a Whole and for Grade Level
Carson City	66.92%						District Yes - Elementary Math No
Churchill	68.23%						District Yes - Elementary Math No
Clark	62.99%						District No - Elementary Math No
Douglas	72.54%						District Yes - Elementary Math Yes
Elko	60.19%						District No - Elementary Math No
Esmeralda	-						Report Not Available
Eureka	84.38%						District Yes - Elementary Math Yes
Humboldt	69.00%			Progress To Be Determined			District Yes - Elementary Math No
Lander	73.56%			By Testing in Future Years			District Yes - Elementary Math No
Lincoln	67.33%						District Yes - Elementary Math Yes
Lyon	65.53%						District No - Elementary Math No
Mineral	51.36%						District Yes - Elementary Math No
Nye	57.36%						District Yes - Elementary Math No
Pershing	58.17%						District Yes - Elementary Math No
Storey	72.73%						District Yes - Elementary Math Yes
Washoe	65.93%						District No - Elementary Math No
White Pine	44.15%						District Yes - Elementary Math No

Source: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.



Appendix 2B – No Child Left Behind School Year 2008-2009

Target and Actual Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards

By Year and Subject for Each Nevada School District - All Students Tested  
Middle Schools

Districts Not Meeting AYP in One Subject - English or Math  
 Districts Not Meeting AYP in Both English and Math



Target Percentage of Students	51.70%	63.80%	63.80%	75.90%	88.00%	100.00%	
English/Language Arts- Middle School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	AYP Status By Subject for District as a Whole and for Grade Level
Carson City	67.44%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Churchill	71.45%						District No - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Clark	62.71%						District No - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Douglas	79.94%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Elko	65.00%						District No - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Esmeralda	-						Report Not Available
Eureka	61.54%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Humboldt	64.54%			Progress To Be Determined			District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Lander	65.54%			By Testing in Future Years			District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Lincoln	71.64%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Lyon	68.78%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Mineral	N/A						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Nye	68.01%						District No - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
Pershing	54.36%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Storey	75.12%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes
Washoe	66.44%						District No - Middle School English/ Language Arts No
White Pine	65.56%						District Yes - Middle School English/ Language Arts Yes

Target Percentage of Students	54.60%	65.90%	65.90%	77.20%	88.50%	100.00%	
Math - Middle School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	AYP Status By Subject for District as a Whole and for Grade Level
Carson City	63.29%						District Yes - Middle School Math No
Churchill	61.54%						District Yes - Middle School Math No
Clark	60.98%						District No - Middle School Math No
Douglas	77.35%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Elko	62.72%						District No - Middle School Math No
Esmeralda	-						Report Not Available
Eureka	70.97%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Humboldt	58.62%			Progress To Be Determined			District Yes - Middle School Math No
Lander	57.96%			By Testing in Future Years			District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Lincoln	68.94%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Lyon	63.41%						District No - Middle School Math No
Mineral	N/A						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Nye	65.01%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Pershing	57.68%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Storey	68.69%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes
Washoe	65.86%						District No - Middle School Math No
White Pine	56.05%						District Yes - Middle School Math Yes

Source: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.

Appendix 2C – No Child Left Behind School Year 2008-2009

Target and Actual Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards  
By Year and Subject for Each Nevada School District - All Students Tested  
High Schools

 Districts Not Meeting AYP in One Subject - English or Math  
 Districts Not Meeting AYP in Both English and Math

Target Percentage of Students	82.30%	86.70%	86.70%	91.10%	95.50%	100.00%	
English/Language Arts- High School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	AYP Status By Subject for District as a Whole and for Grade Level
Carson City	91.76%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Churchill	90.94%						District No - High School English/Language Arts No
Clark	89.52%						District No - High School English/Language Arts No
Douglas	94.32%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Elko	90.94%						District No - High School English/Language Arts No
Esmeralda	-						Report Not Available
Eureka	92.31%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Humboldt	92.25%			Progress To Be Determined			District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Lander	89.90%			By Testing in Future Years			District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Lincoln	84.94%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts No
Lyon	89.12%						District No - High School English/Language Arts No
Mineral	88.71%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Nye	89.79%						District No - High School English/Language Arts No
Pershing	92.11%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Storey	95.95%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes
Washoe	90.97%						District No - High School English/Language Arts No
White Pine	85.35%						District Yes - High School English/Language Arts Yes

Target Percentage of Students	61.80%	71.30%	71.30%	80.80%	90.30%	100.00%	
Math - High School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	AYP Status By Subject for District as a Whole and for Grade Level
Carson City	80.49%						District Yes - High School Math Yes
Churchill	82.58%						District Yes - High School Math Yes
Clark	69.64%						District No - High School Math No
Douglas	80.28%						District Yes - High School Math No
Elko	72.97%						District No - High School Math No
Esmeralda	-						Report Not Available
Eureka	84.62%						District Yes - High School Math Yes
Humboldt	69.50%			Progress To Be Determined			District Yes - High School Math Yes
Lander	69.70%			By Testing in Future Years			District Yes - High School Math Yes
Lincoln	63.86%						District Yes - High School Math No
Lyon	71.29%						District No - High School Math No
Mineral	51.61%						District Yes - High School Math Yes
Nye	64.40%						District Yes - High School Math No
Pershing	78.95%						District Yes - High School Math Yes
Storey	75.68%						District Yes - High School Math Yes
Washoe	75.47%						District No - High School Math No
White Pine	70.71%						District Yes - High School Math Yes

Source: Clark County School District Division of Assessment, Accountability, Research, and School Improvement.

Appendix 3 – National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

Average Math and Reading Scale Scores 2009

Grade 4, By State <sup>1</sup>

State	Math Scores	Math Rank	State	Reading Scores	Reading Rank
United States	239.09		United States	219.60	
Massachusetts	252.25	1	Massachusetts	233.75	1
New Hampshire	251.07	2	New Jersey	229.39	2
Minnesota	249.46	3	New Hampshire	229.14	3
Vermont	247.77	4	Connecticut	228.97	4
New Jersey	246.53	5	Vermont	228.74	5
Kansas	245.31	6	DoDEA	228.32	6
North Dakota	245.19	7	Virginia	226.53	7
Connecticut	244.72	8	Maryland	226.05	8
Maine	244.46	9	North Dakota	225.97	9
Montana	244.40	10	Colorado	225.70	10
Maryland	243.80	11	Florida	225.67	11
North Carolina	243.78	12	Kentucky	225.61	12
Ohio	243.69	13	Delaware	225.51	13
Pennsylvania	243.59	14	Montana	224.65	14
Wisconsin	243.59	15	Ohio	224.53	15
Colorado	243.13	16	New York	224.37	16
Virginia	243.07	17	Kansas	223.92	17
Indiana	242.62	18	Missouri	223.84	18
Iowa	242.60	19	Maine	223.79	19
Washington	242.26	20	Pennsylvania	223.68	20
South Dakota	242.10	21	Minnesota	223.34	21
Wyoming	242.01	22	Rhode Island	222.70	22
Florida	241.94	23	Indiana	222.66	23
Idaho	241.04	24	Wyoming	222.65	24
Missouri	240.68	25	Nebraska	222.52	25
New York	240.64	26	South Dakota	222.17	26
Texas	240.46	27	Iowa	221.42	27
Utah	240.32	28	Washington	221.33	28
DoDEA	240.29	29	Idaho	221.02	29
Delaware	239.49	30	Wisconsin	220.14	30
Kentucky	238.84	31	North Carolina	219.30	31
Rhode Island	238.77	32	Utah	219.20	32
Nebraska	238.75	33	Illinois	219.17	33
Illinois	238.29	34	Texas	218.86	34
Oregon	238.03	35	Michigan	218.24	35
Arkansas	237.54	36	Oregon	218.14	36
Alaska	237.21	37	Georgia	217.85	37
Oklahoma	236.78	38	Oklahoma	217.19	38
Michigan	236.28	39	Tennessee	216.74	39
Georgia	236.03	40	Alabama	216.27	40
Hawaii	235.68	41	Arkansas	216.15	41
South Carolina	235.67	42	South Carolina	215.94	42
<b>Nevada</b>	<b>235.15</b>	<b>43</b>	West Virginia	214.52	43
West Virginia	232.98	44	<b>Nevada</b>	<b>211.14</b>	<b>44</b>
Tennessee	231.83	45	Alaska	211.13	45
California	231.67	46	Hawaii	210.62	46
New Mexico	230.03	47	Mississippi	210.51	47
Arizona	229.99	48	Arizona	209.99	48
Louisiana	229.43	49	California	209.76	49
Alabama	227.96	50	New Mexico	207.65	50
Mississippi	227.26	51	Louisiana	207.49	51
District of Columbia	219.26	52	District of Columbia	201.98	52

<sup>1</sup>Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Mathematics Assessment. Includes District of Columbia and Department of Defense Schools.



Appendix 3 – National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Continued

Average Math and Reading Scale Scores 2009  
Grade 8, By State <sup>1</sup>

State	Math Scores	Math Rank	State	Reading Scores	Reading Rank
United States	281.67		United States	262.29	
Massachusetts	298.85	1	Massachusetts	273.59	1
Minnesota	294.44	2	New Jersey	272.80	2
Vermont	292.87	3	DoDEA	272.46	3
North Dakota	292.84	4	Vermont	272.31	4
New Jersey	292.66	5	Connecticut	271.81	5
New Hampshire	292.32	6	New Hampshire	270.75	6
Montana	291.54	7	Pennsylvania	270.70	7
South Dakota	290.62	8	Montana	270.39	8
Washington	288.72	9	South Dakota	270.06	9
Connecticut	288.61	10	Minnesota	269.74	10
Kansas	288.60	11	North Dakota	269.24	11
Maryland	288.34	12	Ohio	268.68	12
Pennsylvania	288.30	13	Wyoming	268.16	13
Wisconsin	288.14	14	Maine	267.71	14
Colorado	287.37	15	Maryland	267.30	15
Idaho	287.31	16	Nebraska	267.07	16
DoDEA	287.15	17	Washington	266.92	17
Indiana	286.81	18	Missouri	266.88	18
Texas	286.69	19	Kentucky	266.85	19
Maine	286.36	20	Kansas	266.80	20
Wyoming	286.10	21	Wisconsin	265.81	21
Virginia	286.07	22	Indiana	265.69	22
Missouri	285.81	23	Virginia	265.64	23
Ohio	285.58	24	Utah	265.59	24
Oregon	285.04	25	Colorado	265.51	25
North Carolina	284.33	26	Oregon	265.09	26
Nebraska	284.26	27	Delaware	265.00	27
Iowa	284.17	28	Iowa	264.89	28
Utah	284.07	29	Idaho	264.84	29
Delaware	283.83	30	Illinois	264.51	30
Alaska	283.05	31	Florida	264.36	31
New York	282.58	32	New York	264.29	32
Illinois	282.43	33	Michigan	261.90	33
South Carolina	280.38	34	Tennessee	260.95	34
Florida	279.34	35	Texas	260.37	35
Kentucky	279.28	36	Georgia	260.24	36
Michigan	278.27	37	Rhode Island	259.89	37
Rhode Island	277.92	38	North Carolina	259.53	38
Georgia	277.56	39	Oklahoma	259.50	39
Arizona	277.33	40	Alaska	259.45	40
Arkansas	276.00	41	Arkansas	258.05	41
Oklahoma	275.71	42	Arizona	257.60	42
Tennessee	274.76	43	South Carolina	257.27	43
<b>Nevada</b>	<b>274.15</b>	<b>44</b>	Alabama	254.90	44
Hawaii	273.76	45	West Virginia	254.80	45
Louisiana	272.38	46	Hawaii	254.74	46
California	270.45	47	New Mexico	254.13	47
West Virginia	270.42	48	<b>Nevada</b>	<b>253.84</b>	<b>48</b>
New Mexico	269.70	49	Louisiana	253.33	49
Alabama	268.52	50	California	252.63	50
Mississippi	265.00	51	Mississippi	251.31	51
District of Columbia	253.60	52	District of Columbia	242.49	52

<sup>1</sup>Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Mathematics Assessment. Includes District of Columbia and Department of Defense Schools.

Appendix 4 – Assessment of SAT Scores by College Bound High School Seniors

Mean SAT Score for High School Graduates in 2009 by State<sup>1</sup>

State	Test Takers	Critical Reading Score	Critical Reading Rank	Math Score	Math Rank	Writing Score	Writing Rank	Total Score	Total Rank
<b>United States</b>	<b>1,443,974</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,509</b>	<b>-</b>
Alabama	3,473	557	20	552	20	549	19	1,658	19
Alaska	3,589	520	28	516	31	492	38	1,528	32
Arizona	21,007	516	30	521	29	497	34	1,534	30
Arkansas	1,460	572	13	572	13	556	15	1,700	14
California	207,301	500	36	513	32	498	32	1,511	34
Colorado	9,986	568	15	575	11	555	16	1,698	15
Connecticut	35,799	509	34	513	32	512	25	1,534	30
Delaware	6,707	495	42	498	45	484	39	1,477	42
District of Columbia	4,029	466	51	451	51	461	50	1,378	51
Florida	100,179	497	39	498	45	480	41	1,475	44
Georgia	63,440	490	45	491	49	479	44	1,460	47
Hawaii	8,313	479	49	502	40	469	49	1,450	49
Idaho	3,165	541	22	540	24	520	23	1,601	24
Illinois	8,857	588	7	604	4	583	3	1,775	5
Indiana	44,511	496	40	507	37	480	41	1,483	41
Iowa	1,105	610	1	615	1	588	1	1,813	1
Kansas	2,067	581	10	589	10	564	11	1,734	10
Kentucky	3,115	573	12	573	12	561	12	1,707	11
Louisiana	2,556	563	18	558	17	555	16	1,676	18
Maine	14,954	468	50	467	50	455	51	1,390	50
Maryland	46,562	500	36	502	40	495	36	1,497	37
Massachusetts	60,591	514	31	526	26	510	26	1,550	27
Michigan	6,055	584	9	603	5	575	6	1,762	6
Minnesota	4,685	595	2	609	2	578	5	1,782	3
Mississippi	996	567	16	554	19	559	13	1,680	17
Missouri	3,153	595	2	600	6	584	2	1,779	4
Montana	2,456	541	22	542	23	519	24	1,602	23
Nebraska	1,002	587	8	594	8	572	7	1,753	8
<b>Nevada</b>	<b>8,919</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>1,485</b>	<b>40</b>
New Hampshire	12,351	523	26	523	28	510	26	1,556	26
New Jersey	84,417	496	40	513	32	496	35	1,505	36
New Mexico	2,209	553	21	546	21	534	21	1,633	21
New York	159,886	485	48	502	40	478	46	1,465	46
North Carolina	57,147	495	42	511	36	480	41	1,486	39
North Dakota	238	590	5	593	9	566	9	1,749	9
Ohio	30,706	537	24	546	21	523	22	1,606	22
Oklahoma	2,002	575	11	571	14	557	14	1,703	12
Oregon	18,016	523	26	525	27	499	30	1,547	28
Pennsylvania	105,066	493	44	501	43	483	40	1,477	42
Rhode Island	8,293	498	38	496	47	494	37	1,488	38
South Carolina	25,217	486	46	496	47	470	48	1,452	48
South Dakota	283	589	6	600	6	569	8	1,758	7
Tennessee	5,911	571	14	565	16	565	10	1,701	13
Texas	141,733	486	46	506	38	475	47	1,467	45
Utah	2,023	559	19	558	17	540	20	1,657	20
Vermont	5,306	518	29	518	30	506	29	1,542	29
Virginia	59,612	511	32	512	35	498	32	1,521	33
Washington	36,687	524	25	531	25	507	28	1,562	25
West Virginia	3,373	511	32	501	43	499	30	1,511	34
Wisconsin	3,192	594	4	608	3	582	4	1,784	2
Wyoming	274	567	16	568	15	550	18	1,685	16

<sup>1</sup>Source: The College Board, 2009 SAT State Reports, <http://professionals.collegeboard.com/data-reports-research/sat/cb-seniors-2009>. Note: number of students taking test also includes grades 10 and 11.

Appendix 5 – Assessment of ACT Scores by College Bound High School Seniors

Average ACT Scores in 2009 by State<sup>1</sup>

State	Percent of Graduates Tested	Composite	Rank	English	Rank	Math	Rank	Reading	Rank	Science	Rank
United States	45	21.1	-	20.6	-	21.0	-	21.4	-	20.9	-
Alabama	76	20.3	42	20.5	35	19.5	48	20.7	42	20.1	43
Alaska	29	21.0	33	20.1	40	21.1	32	21.7	32	20.7	34
Arizona	15	21.9	20	21.3	23	22.1	16	22.4	19	21.3	28
Arkansas	73	20.6	39	20.6	34	20.1	38	21.0	37	20.2	41
California	19	22.2	14	21.8	15	22.8	9	22.4	19	21.4	25
Colorado	100	20.8	34	20.1	40	20.5	37	21.1	36	20.8	33
Connecticut	21	23.5	2	23.6	2	23.5	2	24.0	3	22.6	3
Delaware	11	22.6	11	22.2	10	22.5	11	23.1	10	22.0	12
District of Columbia	30	19.4	49	19.1	46	19.5	48	19.7	49	18.6	51
Florida	62	19.5	48	18.7	50	19.7	43	20.2	45	19.0	49
Georgia	40	20.6	39	20.1	40	20.6	36	20.9	39	20.3	40
Hawaii	22	21.5	28	20.9	27	22.1	16	21.4	33	21.0	31
Idaho	58	21.6	25	20.9	27	21.3	30	22.3	23	21.4	25
Illinois	97	20.8	34	20.5	35	20.7	35	20.8	41	20.7	34
Indiana	24	22.2	14	21.6	19	22.4	13	22.6	14	21.6	19
Iowa	59	22.4	12	21.9	12	21.9	20	22.9	12	22.4	7
Kansas	74	21.9	20	21.4	21	21.7	24	22.4	19	21.8	15
Kentucky	100	19.4	49	18.8	49	19.0	50	19.8	48	19.7	48
Louisiana	89	20.1	43	20.3	39	19.6	44	20.2	45	20.0	45
Maine	9	23.1	4	23.0	4	23.0	6	23.6	5	22.3	8
Maryland	17	22.1	16	21.9	12	22.1	16	22.5	17	21.5	22
Massachusetts	18	23.9	1	23.9	1	24.3	1	24.3	1	22.8	1
Michigan	100	19.6	47	18.6	51	19.6	44	19.6	50	20.1	43
Minnesota	68	22.7	10	22.0	11	22.7	10	23.1	10	22.6	3
Mississippi	93	18.9	51	19.1	46	18.3	51	19.0	51	18.7	50
Missouri	67	21.6	25	21.5	20	20.9	34	22.1	27	21.5	22
Montana	54	22.0	18	21.2	24	21.7	24	22.7	13	21.7	17
Nebraska	72	21.1	32	21.9	12	21.8	21	22.5	17	22.0	12
Nevada	30	21.5	28	20.9	27	21.4	28	22.0	28	21.0	31
New Hampshire	15	23.5	2	23.3	3	23.4	4	24.1	2	22.6	3
New Jersey	16	23.1	4	22.9	6	23.5	2	23.2	9	22.1	10
New Mexico	65	20.0	44	19.3	44	19.6	44	20.7	42	20.0	45
New York	25	23.1	4	22.5	8	23.4	4	23.3	8	22.7	2
North Carolina	15	21.6	25	20.9	27	22.0	19	21.9	29	21.1	29
North Dakota	78	21.5	28	20.7	31	21.5	26	21.8	31	21.6	19
Ohio	64	21.7	24	21.1	26	21.4	28	22.2	26	21.7	17
Oklahoma	71	20.7	37	20.5	35	19.9	40	21.4	33	20.5	37
Oregon	33	21.4	31	20.5	35	21.5	26	21.9	29	21.1	29
Pennsylvania	14	22.1	16	21.7	16	22.2	14	22.4	19	21.5	22
Rhode Island	10	22.8	8	23.0	4	22.5	11	23.4	7	21.8	15
South Carolina	50	19.8	46	19.2	45	20.0	39	19.9	47	19.8	47
South Dakota	74	22.0	18	21.2	24	21.8	21	22.3	23	22.0	12
Tennessee	92	20.6	39	20.7	32	19.8	41	21.0	37	20.4	39
Texas	30	20.8	34	19.9	43	21.3	30	20.9	39	20.6	36
Utah	68	21.8	23	21.4	21	21.1	32	22.6	14	21.6	19
Vermont	24	23.1	4	22.9	6	22.9	7	23.7	4	22.5	6
Virginia	20	21.9	20	21.7	16	21.8	21	22.3	23	21.4	25
Washington	18	22.8	8	22.4	9	22.9	7	23.5	6	22.1	10
West Virginia	62	20.7	37	20.8	31	19.6	44	21.4	33	20.5	37
Wisconsin	67	22.3	13	21.7	16	22.2	14	22.6	14	22.3	8
Wyoming	99	20.0	44	18.9	48	19.8	41	20.4	44	20.2	41

<sup>1</sup>Source: ACT, 2009 ACT State Reports. <http://www.act.org/news/data/09/states.html>

In Spring 2008, all public high school eleventh graders in the states of Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Wyoming were tested with the ACT as required by each state. Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Wyoming students who met ACT's 2009 graduating class criteria are included in the 2009 graduating class average score results. Consistent with ACT's reporting policies, graduating class test results are reported only for students tested under standard time conditions.