


## 1. Improvement Over Time

Have Alabama's 4th graders improved in mathematics achievement?

*Not yet. Between 1992 and 1996, there was no significant change in the percentage of public school 4th graders who met the Goals Panel's performance standard in mathematics.*

*The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement – Proficient or Advanced – on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.*

Percentage of public school 4th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP mathematics assessment



<sup>ns</sup> Interpret with caution. Change was not statistically significant.

Mathematics performance will be tested again in 2000.

## 2. State Comparisons<sup>†</sup>

How did Alabama compare with other states in 4th grade mathematics achievement in public schools in 1996?

**33 states had significantly higher<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Connecticut	31%	<b>U.S.*</b> Alaska, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington	<b>21%</b>
Minnesota	29%	Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania	20%
Maine, Wisconsin	27%	Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming	19%
New Jersey, Texas	25%	Rhode Island, Tennessee	17%
Indiana, Massachusetts, Nebraska, North Dakota	24%	Delaware, Hawaii, Kentucky	16%
Michigan, Utah, Vermont	23%	Florida <sup>2</sup>	15%
Colorado, Iowa, Maryland, Montana	22%		

**7 states had similar<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**


Arizona <sup>2</sup>	15%	South Carolina	12%
Nevada	14%	<b>Alabama</b> , California	<b>11%</b>
Arkansas, Georgia, New Mexico	13%		

**4 states had significantly lower<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Louisiana, Mississippi	8%	Guam	3%
District of Columbia	5%		

## 3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 4th graders in different subgroups<sup>1</sup> in Alabama were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?



<sup>1</sup> Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 3-4 and Appendix D.

<sup>2</sup> Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

<sup>†</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

<sup>1</sup> See explanation on pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> State may appear to be out of place; however, statistically, its placement is correct. See pp. 3-4.

\* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.


## 1. Improvement Over Time

Have Alabama's 8th graders improved in mathematics achievement?

*Not yet. Between 1990 and 1996, there was no significant change in the percentage of public school 8th graders who met the Goals Panel's performance standard in mathematics.*

*The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement – Proficient or Advanced – on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.*

Percentage of public school 8th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP mathematics assessment



<sup>ns</sup> Interpret with caution. Change was not statistically significant. Mathematics performance will be tested again in 2000.

## 2. State Comparisons<sup>†</sup>

How did Alabama compare with other states in 8th grade mathematics achievement in public schools in 1996?

**29 states had significantly higher<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Minnesota	34%	Colorado	25%
North Dakota	33%	<b>U.S.*</b> Indiana, Maryland, Utah	<b>24%</b>
Montana, Wisconsin	32%	Missouri, New York, Wyoming	22%
Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska	31%	Texas, Virginia	21%
Alaska	30%	North Carolina, Rhode Island	20%
Massachusetts, Michigan	28%	Delaware	19%
Vermont	27%	Arizona	18%
Oregon, Washington	26%	California, Florida	17%

**8 states had similar<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky	16%	Arkansas	13%
Tennessee	15%	<b>Alabama</b>	<b>12%</b>
New Mexico, South Carolina, West Virginia	14%		

**4 states had significantly lower<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Louisiana, Mississippi	7%	District of Columbia	5%
Guam	6%		


<sup>†</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

<sup>1</sup> See explanation on pp. 3-4.

\* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

## 3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 8th graders in different subgroups<sup>1</sup> in Alabama were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?



<sup>1</sup> Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 3-4 and Appendix D.

<sup>2</sup> Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.


## 1. Improvement Over Time

Have Alabama's 8th graders improved in science achievement?

In 1996, 18% of Alabama's public school 8th graders met the Goals Panel's performance standard in science. The Goals Panel will report whether science performance has improved over time when science is assessed again in 2000.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement – Proficient or Advanced – on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 8th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP science assessment



## 2. State Comparisons<sup>†</sup>

How did Alabama compare with other states in 8th grade science achievement in public schools in 1996?

**27 states had significantly higher<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Maine, Montana, North Dakota	41%	Indiana	30%
Wisconsin	39%	<b>U.S.*</b>	<b>29%</b>
Massachusetts, Minnesota	37%	Missouri	28%
Connecticut, Iowa	36%	New York, Virginia, Washington	27%
Nebraska	35%	Rhode Island	26%
Vermont, Wyoming	34%	Maryland	25%
Colorado, Michigan, Oregon, Utah	32%	North Carolina	24%
Alaska	31%	Arizona, Kentucky, Texas	23%

**10 states had similar<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**


Arkansas, Tennessee	22%	New Mexico	19%
Delaware, Florida, Georgia, West Virginia	21%	<b>Alabama</b>	<b>18%</b>
California	20%	South Carolina	17%
		Hawaii	15%

**4 states had significantly lower<sup>1</sup> percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:**

Louisiana	13%	Guam	7%
Mississippi	12%	District of Columbia	5%

## 3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 8th graders in different subgroups<sup>1</sup> in Alabama were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP science assessment?



<sup>†</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

<sup>1</sup> See explanation on pp. 3-4.

\* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

<sup>1</sup> Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 3-4 and Appendix D.

<sup>2</sup> Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

\*\* No school location data for science in 1996.

## Mathematics Grade 8

Forty-one nations<sup>†</sup> participated in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) in 8th grade mathematics in 1995. If public school 8th graders in Alabama participated in the TIMSS mathematics assessment, how would their average performance compare to that of students who took TIMSS in these nations?

**30 nations<sup>†</sup> would be expected to perform significantly higher:<sup>1</sup>**

(Australia)	Japan
(Austria)	Korea
Belgium – Flemish <sup>2</sup>	(Latvia – LSS) <sup>3</sup>
(Belgium – French) <sup>2</sup>	(Netherlands)
(Bulgaria)	New Zealand
Canada	Norway
Czech Republic	Russian Federation
(Denmark)	(Scotland)
(England)	Singapore
France	Slovak Republic
(Germany)	(Slovenia)
Hong Kong	Sweden
Hungary	(Switzerland)
Ireland	(Thailand)
(Israel)	<b>United States</b>

**7 nations<sup>†</sup> would be expected to perform similarly:<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Alabama</b>	(Lithuania)
Cyprus	Portugal
(Greece)	(Romania)
Iceland	Spain

**4 nations<sup>†</sup> would be expected to perform significantly lower:<sup>1</sup>**

(Colombia)	(Kuwait)
Iran, Islamic Republic	(South Africa)

<sup>†</sup> The term "nation" is used to refer to nations, states, or jurisdictions. Performance for nations is based on public school data only. Nations not meeting international guidelines are shown in parentheses.

<sup>1</sup> See explanation on pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> The Flemish and French educational systems in Belgium participated separately.

<sup>3</sup> Latvia is designated LSS because only Latvian-speaking schools were tested, which represent less than 65% of the population.

## Science Grade 8

Forty-one nations<sup>†</sup> participated in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) in 8th grade science in 1995. If public school 8th graders in Alabama participated in the TIMSS science assessment, how would their average performance compare to that of students who took TIMSS in these nations?

**19 nations<sup>†</sup> would be expected to perform significantly higher:<sup>1</sup>**

(Australia)	Japan
(Austria)	Korea
Belgium – Flemish <sup>2</sup>	(Netherlands)
(Bulgaria)	Russian Federation
Canada	Singapore
Czech Republic	Slovak Republic
(England)	(Slovenia)
(Germany)	Sweden
Hungary	<b>United States</b>
Ireland	

**16 nations<sup>†</sup> would be expected to perform similarly:<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Alabama</b>	New Zealand
(Denmark)	Norway
France	Portugal
(Greece)	(Romania)
Hong Kong	(Scotland)
Iceland	Spain
(Israel)	(Switzerland)
(Latvia – LSS) <sup>3</sup>	(Thailand)
(Lithuania)	

**6 nations<sup>†</sup> would be expected to perform significantly lower:<sup>1</sup>**

(Belgium – French) <sup>2</sup>	Iran, Islamic Republic
(Colombia)	(Kuwait)
Cyprus	(South Africa)

<sup>†</sup> The term "nation" is used to refer to nations, states, or jurisdictions. Performance for nations is based on public school data only. Nations not meeting international guidelines are shown in parentheses.

<sup>1</sup> See explanation on pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> The Flemish and French educational systems in Belgium participated separately.

<sup>3</sup> Latvia is designated LSS because only Latvian-speaking schools were tested, which represent less than 65% of the population.