Since 2003, BPS’ has participated in the NAEP Trial for Urban District Assessment (TUDA) program and demonstrated a long history of being one of the highest performing urban school districts in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Grade 4 Reading</th>
<th>2017 Grade 4 Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>equivalent or higher</strong> than participating TUDA districts.</td>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>equivalent or higher</strong> than TUDA districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>lower</strong> than only 6 TUDA districts.</td>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>lower</strong> than only 7 TUDA districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Grade 8 Reading</th>
<th>2017 Grade 8 Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>equivalent or higher</strong> than <strong>ALL</strong> 26 other participating TUDA districts.</td>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>equivalent or higher</strong> than 25 participating TUDA districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boston only scored <strong>lower</strong> than 1 other TUDA district.</td>
<td>• Boston scored <strong>lower</strong> than only 1 other TUDA district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** NAEP employs statistical tests to assess whether differences in average scaled scores are significant.
Since 2013-14, Massachusetts transitioned assessments twice. MA is also transitioning all grades and subjects to digital based assessments. In 2017, NAEP fully transitioned to digital based assessments, as well.

Boston Public Schools participated in the **NAEP Trial for Urban District Assessment (TUDA)** program since 2003 and took the assessment **online** in 2016-17.

- **2003-2004**: Massachusetts piloted PARCC and computer based assessments.
- **2013-14**: Massachusetts administered **Next Generation MCAS** in grades 3 – 8.
- **2016-17**: Massachusetts phased computer based assessments into new grades and subjects each year.
Performance of BPS students on NAEP is comparable to their performance on Next Generation MCAS in 2016-17.
## Statistically Significant Trends in 4th and 8th Grade Reading & Mathematics Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th grade Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>= (–2 pts)</td>
<td>↑ (+11 pts)</td>
<td>↑ (+ 4 pts)</td>
<td>↓ (–4 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>= (–3 pts)</td>
<td>↑ (+13 pts)</td>
<td>= (+ 1 pts)</td>
<td>↓ (–6 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>↑ (+3 pts)</td>
<td>↑ (+ 9 pts)</td>
<td>↑ (+ 3 pts)</td>
<td>↓ (–4 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>= (–1 pt)</td>
<td>↑ (+18 pts)</td>
<td>↑ (+ 6 pts)</td>
<td>= (-2 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Term trends:** Observed between 2015 and 2017.

**Long Term trends:** Observed between 2003 and 2017.

**Note:** NAEP employs statistical tests to assess whether differences in average scaled scores are significant.
## Statistically Significant Performance Trends for Racial Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade &amp; Subject</th>
<th>Long Term Trends for African-American / Black Students</th>
<th>Black vs. White Achievement Gap</th>
<th>Long Term Trends for Hispanic / Latino Students</th>
<th>Hispanic vs. White Achievement Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th grade Reading</td>
<td>4th grade Reading</td>
<td>(+8 pts)</td>
<td>23 pts</td>
<td>(+ 11 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>(-5 pts)</td>
<td>29 pts</td>
<td>(- 1 pt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade Reading</td>
<td>8th grade Reading</td>
<td>(+ 6 pts)</td>
<td>28 pts</td>
<td>(+ 8 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>(- 1 pt)</td>
<td>35 pts</td>
<td>(+ 4 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade Math</td>
<td>4th grade Math</td>
<td>(+ 10 pts)</td>
<td>19 pts</td>
<td>(+ 12 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>(- 2 pts)</td>
<td>27 pts</td>
<td>(- 2 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade Math</td>
<td>8th grade Math</td>
<td>(+ 10 pts)</td>
<td>38 pts</td>
<td>(+ 16 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>(- 8 pts)</td>
<td>53 pts</td>
<td>(- 3 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: NAEP employs statistical tests to assess whether differences in average scaled scores are significant.*

*Short Term:* Trends shown from 2015 and 2017 and gaps measured in 2017.

*Long Term:* Trends shown from 2003 and 2017 and gaps measured in 2003.
# Statistically Significant Performance Trends for Other Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade &amp; Subject</th>
<th>Trends for Low Income Students</th>
<th>Trends for English Learners</th>
<th>Trends for Students with Disabilities</th>
<th>Trends for Male Students</th>
<th>Trends for Female Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th grade Reading</td>
<td>Long Term: (+8 pts)</td>
<td>(+9 pts)</td>
<td>(+6 pts)</td>
<td>(+13 pts)</td>
<td>(+10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term: (-4 pts)</td>
<td>(-5 pts)</td>
<td>(-1 pt)</td>
<td>(-3 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade Reading</td>
<td>Long Term: (+7 pts)</td>
<td>(+15 pts)</td>
<td>(+16 pts)</td>
<td>(+11 pts)</td>
<td>(+8 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term: (+3 pts)</td>
<td>(+5 pts)</td>
<td>(+3 pts)</td>
<td>(+4 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade Math</td>
<td>Long Term: (+11 pts)</td>
<td>(+15 pts)</td>
<td>(+10 pts)</td>
<td>(+14 pts)</td>
<td>(+12 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term: (-2 pts)</td>
<td>(-4 pts)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>(No change)</td>
<td>(-5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade Math</td>
<td>Long Term: (+15 pts)</td>
<td>(+18 pts)</td>
<td>(+23 pts)</td>
<td>(+18 pts)</td>
<td>(+18 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term: No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>(No change)</td>
<td>(-4 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** NAEP employs statistical tests to assess whether differences in average scaled scores are significant.

**Short Term trends:** Observed between 2015 and 2017.

**Long Term trends:** Observed between 2003 and 2017.
## Statistically Significant Performance Trends, by Percentile Bands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade &amp; Subject</th>
<th>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile Trends</th>
<th>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile Trends</th>
<th>50&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile Trends</th>
<th>75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile Trends</th>
<th>90&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade Reading</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+6 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+8 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+11 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+14 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+17 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-6 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-6 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-3 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> No change</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+4 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade Reading</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+6 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+7 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+11 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+10 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+9 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+2 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+2 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+5 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+4 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+2 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade Math</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+6 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+10 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+14 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+18 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+20 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-3 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-3 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-3 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-2 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade Math</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+11 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+11 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+17 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+24 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Long Term" /> (+25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-2 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-5 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (-4 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+2 pts)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Short Term" /> (+4 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** NAEP employs statistical tests to assess whether differences in average scaled scores are significant.

**Short Term trends:** Observed between 2015 and 2017.

**Long Term trends:** Observed between 2003 and 2017.
How does BPS fit into the national context?

- 4th grade Reading and 4th & 8th grade Mathematics scores remained unchanged nationally between 2015 and 2017

- Average scores in 8th grade Reading improved nationally

- Average scores for students at the higher percentile bands improved nationally, while scores for students at the lower percentile bands declined or remained unchanged

Note: NAEP employs statistical tests to assess whether differences in average scaled scores are significant.
## TUDA District Long and Short Term Gains over Time

Average scores and score-point changes between 2017 & 2015 and 2017 & 2007 for public school students, by participating district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mathematics - Grade 4</th>
<th>Reading - Grade 4</th>
<th>Mathematics - Grade 8</th>
<th>Reading - Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>'17-'15</td>
<td>'17-'07</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National public</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city¹</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County (NV)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia (DCPS)</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval County (FL)</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth (TX)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford County (NC)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County (FL)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County (KY)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby County (TN)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Districts with increase**
  - Mathematics: 4, 1
  - Reading: 4, 1
  - Mathematics - Grade 8: 0, 0
  - Reading - Grade 8: 0, 1

- **Districts with decrease**
  - Mathematics: 3, 1
  - Reading: 6, 0
  - Mathematics - Grade 8: 6, 0
  - Reading - Grade 8: 2, 8

---

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

Average Score in 2017 is higher; Significant Gain
Average Score in 2017 is lower; Significant Decline

---

NOTE: The NAEP mathematics and reading scales range from 0–500. Score differences are calculated based on differences between unrounded average scores.

APPENDIX
4TH GRADE READING 2003 - 2017

Grade 4 Reading
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
** Significantly different (P < .05) from Large City in 2017.
*** Significantly different (P < .05) from Nation in 2017.
4TH GRADE READING 2003 – 2017, SUBGROUPS

Grade 4 Reading by Race/Ethnicity
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
Grade 4 Reading by Other Subgroup
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
4th grade Reading: African-American student performance

Grade 4 Black Students
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
4th grade Reading: Hispanic student performance

Grade 4 Hispanic Students
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
4th grade Reading: Low Income Students

Grade 4 Low-Income Students
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
4th grade Reading: English Learners

Grade 4 English Language Learners
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
4th grade Reading: At or Above Proficient

- **BOSTON**
  - % at or above Proficient: 40%
  - Below Proficient: 32%
  - At or above Proficient: 21%

- **Miami-Dade**
  - % at or above Proficient: 24%
  - Below Proficient: 34%
  - At or above Proficient: 32%

- **Charlotte**
  - % at or above Proficient: 30%
  - Below Proficient: 30%
  - At or above Proficient: 29%

- **Hillsborough County (FL)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 27%
  - Below Proficient: 35%
  - At or above Proficient: 28%

- **Duval Co. (FL)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 28%
  - Below Proficient: 34%
  - At or above Proficient: 29%

- **San Diego**
  - % at or above Proficient: 34%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 27%

- **Guilford County (NC)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 33%
  - Below Proficient: 30%
  - At or above Proficient: 28%

- **NATION (Public)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 33%
  - Below Proficient: 31%
  - At or above Proficient: 27%

- **Jefferson Co. (KY)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 35%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 25%

- **Austin**
  - % at or above Proficient: 40%
  - Below Proficient: 26%
  - At or above Proficient: 24%

- **Atlanta**
  - % at or above Proficient: 44%
  - Below Proficient: 27%
  - At or above Proficient: 21%

- **District of Columbia**
  - % at or above Proficient: 45%
  - Below Proficient: 26%
  - At or above Proficient: 19%

- **Clark County**
  - % at or above Proficient: 41%
  - Below Proficient: 31%
  - At or above Proficient: 23%

- **Denver**
  - % at or above Proficient: 43%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 21%

- **New York City**
  - % at or above Proficient: 40%
  - Below Proficient: 32%
  - At or above Proficient: 22%

- **LARGE CITY (Public)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 42%
  - Below Proficient: 30%
  - At or above Proficient: 21%

- **Chicago**
  - % at or above Proficient: 44%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 20%

- **Albuquerque**
  - % at or above Proficient: 47%
  - Below Proficient: 28%
  - At or above Proficient: 19%

- **Los Angeles**
  - % at or above Proficient: 47%
  - Below Proficient: 30%
  - At or above Proficient: 18%

- **Houston**
  - % at or above Proficient: 51%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 11%

- **Fort Worth**
  - % at or above Proficient: 50%
  - Below Proficient: 31%
  - At or above Proficient: 16%

- **Fresno**
  - % at or above Proficient: 53%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 16%

- **Philadelphia**
  - % at or above Proficient: 60%
  - Below Proficient: 23%
  - At or above Proficient: 12%

- **Shelby County (TN)**
  - % at or above Proficient: 55%
  - Below Proficient: 29%
  - At or above Proficient: 14%

- **Milwaukee**
  - % at or above Proficient: 60%
  - Below Proficient: 25%
  - At or above Proficient: 13%

- **Dallas**
  - % at or above Proficient: 55%
  - Below Proficient: 30%
  - At or above Proficient: 13%

- **Baltimore City**
  - % at or above Proficient: 51%
  - Below Proficient: 25%
  - At or above Proficient: 11%

- **Cleveland**
  - % at or above Proficient: 62%
  - Below Proficient: 26%
  - At or above Proficient: 10%

- **Detroit**
  - % at or above Proficient: 78%
  - Below Basic: 17%
  - At or above Proficient: 1%
Trend in Grade 4 Reading Percentile Scores

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
8th GRADE READING 2003 - 2017

Grade 8 Reading
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
** Significantly different (P < .05) from Large City in 2017.
*** Significantly different (P < .05) from Nation in 2017.
Grade 8 Reading by Race/Ethnicity
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
‡ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met.
8th grade Reading: African-American student performance

Grade 8 Black Students
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Reading: Latino students performance

Grade 8 Hispanic Students
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Reading: Low Income Students

Grade 8 Low-Income Students
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts

Average Scale Score

- National (Public): 253
- Large City (Public): 251
- Detroit: 235
- Cleveland (TN): 237
- Detroit County: 238
- Baltimore City: 239
- Fresno: 241
- Milwaukee: 241
- Philadelphia: 243
- Austin: 244
- Atlanta: 245
- Dallas: 245
- Fort Worth (TX): 245
- Houston: 245
- Albuquerque: 246
- Charlotte: 249
- Guilford County (NC): 249
- Jefferson County (KY): 249
- Los Angeles: 250
- Clark County (NV): 250
- Denver: 256
- New York City: 252
- San Diego: 252
- Chicago: 252
- Duval County (FL): 253
- Hillsborough County (FL): 253
- Boston: 256
- Miami-Dade: 256
8th grade Reading: Students with disabilities

Grade 8 Students with Disabilities
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Reading: English Learners

Grade 8 English Language Learners
2017 Reading Average Scale Score Comparisons: Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Reading: At or above Proficient

% at or above Proficient is NOT significantly different from Boston:
- Austin: 29% Below Proficient, 36% Basic, 31% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- San Diego: 26% Below Proficient, 38% Basic, 32% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- Nation (Public): 25% Below Proficient, 41% Basic, 31% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- Hillsborough County (FL): 26% Below Proficient, 40% Basic, 31% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Duval Co. (FL): 26% Below Proficient, 43% Basic, 27% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Jefferson Co. (KY): 31% Below Proficient, 38% Basic, 26% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- Guilford County (NC): 31% Below Proficient, 39% Basic, 27% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Miami-Dade: 28% Below Proficient, 42% Basic, 28% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- Charlotte: 29% Below Proficient, 42% Basic, 27% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Denver: 33% Below Proficient, 38% Basic, 25% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- New York City: 33% Below Proficient, 39% Basic, 24% Proficient, 4% Advanced

% at or above Proficient is LOWER than Boston:
- Clark County: 30% Below Proficient, 43% Basic, 25% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- Large City (Public): 32% Below Proficient, 41% Basic, 24% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Chicago: 30% Below Proficient, 43% Basic, 24% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Albuquerque: 36% Below Proficient, 38% Basic, 23% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Atlanta: 38% Below Proficient, 38% Basic, 21% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Los Angeles: 35% Below Proficient, 42% Basic, 21% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- District of Columbia: 47% Below Proficient, 32% Basic, 17% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- Philadelphia: 43% Below Proficient, 37% Basic, 17% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Houston: 41% Below Proficient, 41% Basic, 17% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Shelby County (TN): 43% Below Proficient, 40% Basic, 16% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Fort Worth: 41% Below Proficient, 42% Basic, 16% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Dallas: 44% Below Proficient, 41% Basic, 15% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Milwaukee: 46% Below Proficient, 39% Basic, 14% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Fresno: 47% Below Proficient, 39% Basic, 13% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Baltimore City: 50% Below Proficient, 37% Basic, 12% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Cleveland: 54% Below Proficient, 35% Basic, 9% Proficient, #
- Detroit: 59% Below Proficient, 34% Basic, 7% Proficient, #
8TH GRADE READING 2003 – 2017, PERCENTILE BANDS

Trend in Grade 8 Reading Percentile Scores

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P<.05) from 2017.
Grade 4 Mathematics
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
** Significantly different (P < .05) from Large City in 2017.
*** Significantly different (P < .05) from Nation in 2017.
Grade 4 Mathematics by Race/Ethnicity
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
Grade 4 Mathematics by Other Subgroup
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
4th grade Math: African-American student performance

Grade 4 Black Students
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
4th grade Math: Latino student performance

Grade 4 Hispanic Students
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts

Average Scale Score
4th grade Math: Low Income Students

Grade 4 Low-Income Students
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts

Average Scale Score

NATION (Public) 228
LARGE CITY (Public) 225*
Detroit 213
Philadelphia City 212
Baltimore City 218
Cleveland 210
Milwaukee 208
Denver 217
Atlanta 218
Fresno 219
Shelby County (TN) 219
Jefferson County (KY) 221*
Albuquerque 221*
New York City 224*
Clark County 225*
San Diego 225*
Chicago 227
Fort Worth 227
BOSTON 227
Guilford County (NC) 229
Houston 229
Austin 230
Charlotte 230
Dallas (FL) 232
Fresno 234* 236* 238* 241*
4th grade Math: Students with Disabilities

Grade 4 Students with Disabilities
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
4th grade Math: English Language Learners

Grade 4 English Language Learners
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts

Average Scale Score

- Nation (Public)
- 217* 214*
- Boston (Public)
- 235*
- Atlanta County (FL)
- 196*
- Philadelphia
- 200*
- Los Angeles
- 201*
- New York City
- 202*
- Baltimore County (MD)
- 203*
- Detroit
- 204*
- Fresno
- 205*
- Albuquerque
- 206*
- Clark County (NV)
- 209*
- Shelby County (TN)
- 210*
- District of Columbia
- 213*
- Milwaukee
- 213*
- Cleveland
- 213*
- Charlotte
- 215*
- Denver
- 218*
- Chicago
- 224
- San Diego County (FL)
- 224
- Miami-Dade
- 229*
- BOSTON
- 229*
- Fort Worth
- 228
- Houston
- 224
- Austin
- 224
- Dallas

Note: * indicates statistically significant difference from Boston Public Schools.
4th grade Math: At or above Proficient

**BOSTON**

- Basic or Below
- At or Above Proficient

**% at or above Proficient is HIGHER than Boston**
- Duval County (FL): 40% vs. 26%
- Charlotte: 36% vs. 26%
- Miami-Dade: 44% vs. 26%
- Austin: 32% vs. 26%
- Hillsborough County (FL): 39% vs. 26%
- Guilford County (NC): 35% vs. 26%
- National public: 32% vs. 26%
- San Diego: 39% vs. 26%

**% at or above Proficient is NOT significantly different from Boston**
- Jefferson County (KY): 29% vs. 26%
- Houston: 26% vs. 26%
- District of Columbia (DCPS): 27% vs. 26%
- Dallas: 27% vs. 26%
- Large city: 25% vs. 26%
- Atlanta: 22% vs. 26%
- Chicago: 25% vs. 26%
- Albuquerque: 24% vs. 26%
- Clark County (NV): 26% vs. 26%
- Denver: 27% vs. 26%
- New York City: 24% vs. 26%
- Fort Worth (TX): 24% vs. 26%

**% at or above Proficient is LOWER than Boston**
- Los Angeles: 18% vs. 26%
- Shelby County (TN): 18% vs. 26%
- Fresno: 18% vs. 26%
- Philadelphia: 16% vs. 26%
- Milwaukee: 14% vs. 26%
- Baltimore City: 13% vs. 26%
- Cleveland: 9% vs. 26%
- Detroit: 4% vs. 26%

Percent of Students

- Basic
- Below Basic
- Proficient
- Advanced
4TH GRADE MATH 2003 – 2017, PERCENTILE BANDS

Trend in Grade 4 Mathematics Percentile Scores

NOTE: The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P<.05) from 2017.
Grade 8 Mathematics Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
** Significantly different (P < .05) from Large City in 2017.
*** Significantly different (P < .05) from Nation in 2017.
Grade 8 Mathematics by Race/Ethnicity
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
**8th Grade Math 2003 – 2017, Subgroups**

Grade 8 Mathematics by Other Subgroup
Average scale scores: 2003-2017

NOTE: The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P < .05) from 2017.
‡ A significance test could not be performed because reporting standards were not met.
8TH GRADE MATHEMATICS 2017 - SUBGROUPS

Grade 8 Black Students
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Math: Latino student performance

Grade 8 Hispanic Students
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Math: Low Income Students

Grade 8 Low-Income Students
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Math: Students with disabilities

Grade 8 Students with Disabilities
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts
8th grade Math: English Language Learners

Grade 8 English Language Learners
2017 Mathematics Average Scale Score Comparisons Boston and Nation, Large City & TUDA Districts

Average Scale Score

NATION (Public) 245 244
LARGE CITY (Public) ❍ ❍ ❍ ❍ ❍ ❍
Atlanta City ❍
Baltimore County (FL) ❍
Duval County (KY) ❍
Jefferson County (NC) ❍
Shelby County (TN) ❍
Fresno ❍
Los Angeles ❍
San Diego ❍
District of Columbia ❍
Philadelphia ❍
Albuquerque ❍
Charlotte ❍
New York City ❍
Milwaukee ❍
Clark County ❍
Denver ❍
Austin ❍
Miami-Dade ❍
Fort Worth ❍
BOSTON ❍
Detroit ❍
Chicago ❍
Houston ❍
Cleveland ❍
Dallas ❍

219* 223* 234 236 236* 237* 238 239 241 243 243 244 246 246 247 247 248 249 252 260*
8th grade Math: At or Above Proficient

% at or above Proficient is HIGHER than Boston
- Boston: 43% Proficient
- Charlotte: 39% Proficient
- Austin: 39% Proficient

% at or above Proficient is NOT significantly different from Boston
- San Diego: 32% Proficient
- Guilford County (NC): 32% Proficient
- Hillsborough County (FL): 32% Proficient
- New York City: 32% Proficient

% at or above Proficient is LOWER than Boston
- Large city: 34% Proficient
- Chicago: 35% Proficient
- Denver: 36% Proficient
- Clark County (NV): 36% Proficient
- Jefferson County (KY): 36% Proficient
- Duval County (FL): 36% Proficient
- Miami-Dade: 37% Proficient
- Houston: 37% Proficient
- Albuquearak: 37% Proficient
- Los Angeles: 37% Proficient
- District of Columbia (DCPS): 37% Proficient
- Dallas: 38% Proficient
- Atlanta: 38% Proficient
- Fort Worth (TX): 38% Proficient
- Philadelphia: 38% Proficient
- Shelby County (TN): 39% Proficient
- Milwaukee: 39% Proficient
- Cleveland: 39% Proficient
- Baltimore City: 40% Proficient
- Fresno: 40% Proficient
- Detroit: 40% Proficient
Trend in Grade 8 Mathematics Percentile Scores

NOTE: The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500.
* Significantly different (P<.05) from 2017.