Oregon

1. Improvement Over Time

Have Oregon’s 4th graders improved in mathematics achievement?

In 1996, 21% of Oregon’s public school 4th graders met the Goals Panel’s performance standard in mathematics. The Goals Panel will report whether mathematics performance has improved over time when mathematics 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.

2. State Comparisons†

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

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 4th graders in different subgroups1 in Oregon were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?

See Appendix A for definitions, sources, and technical notes.
### Mathematics Grade 8

#### 1. Improvement Over Time

Have Oregon’s 8th graders improved in mathematics achievement?

Yes. The percentage of Oregon’s public school 8th graders who met the Goals Panel’s performance standard in mathematics increased from 21% in 1990, to 26% in 1996.

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.

#### 2. State Comparisons†

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Proficient on NAEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana, Wisconsin</td>
<td>32% (Oregon, Washington) 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska</td>
<td>31% (Colorado) 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>30% (U.S.*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts, Michigan</td>
<td>28% (Missouri, New York, Wyoming) 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas, Virginia</td>
<td>21% (New Mexico, South Carolina) 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina, Rhode Island</td>
<td>20% (West Virginia) 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>19% (Arkansas) 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18% (Alabama) 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, Florida</td>
<td>17% (Louisiana, Mississippi) 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky</td>
<td>16% (Guam) 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>15% (District of Columbia) 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 states had significantly higher percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana, Wisconsin</td>
<td>32% (Oregon, Washington) 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska</td>
<td>31% (Colorado) 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>30% (U.S.*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts, Michigan</td>
<td>28% (Missouri, New York, Wyoming) 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 states had significantly lower percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas, Virginia</td>
<td>21% (New Mexico, South Carolina) 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina, Rhode Island</td>
<td>20% (West Virginia) 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>19% (Arkansas) 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18% (Alabama) 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, Florida</td>
<td>17% (Louisiana, Mississippi) 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky</td>
<td>16% (Guam) 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>15% (District of Columbia) 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† The term “state” is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.
†† 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† in Oregon were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some education beyond high school</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central city</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fringe/large town</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/small town</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for free/reduced-price lunch</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible for free/reduced-price lunch</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 3-4 and Appendix D.
2 Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

See Appendix A for definitions, sources, and technical notes.
1. Improvement Over Time

Have Oregon’s 8th graders improved in science achievement?

In 1996, 32% of Oregon’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.

2. State Comparisons†

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

![Graph showing state comparisons in science achievement in 1996.]

- 3 states had significantly higher percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:
  - Maine, Montana, North Dakota 41%

- 17 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:
  - Wisconsin 39%
  - Massachusetts, Minnesota 37%
  - Connecticut, Iowa 36%
  - Nebraska 35%
  - Vermont, Wyoming 34%
  - Oregon, Colorado, Michigan, Utah 32%

- 21 states had significantly lower percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:
  - Rhode Island 26%
  - Maryland 25%
  - North Carolina 24%
  - Arizona, Kentucky, Texas 23%
  - Arkansas, Tennessee 22%
  - Delaware, Florida, Georgia, West Virginia 21%
  - California 20%

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 8th graders in different subgroups in Oregon were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP science assessment?

![Graph showing subgroup performance.]

- **Sex**
  - Male 35%
  - Female 29%

- **Race/ethnicity**
  - American Indian/Alaskan Native 21%
  - Asian/Pacific Islander 35%
  - Black 13%
  - Hispanic 34%
  - White 31%

- **Parents’ highest level of education**
  - Less than high school 11%
  - High school graduate 16%
  - Some education beyond high school 31%
  - College graduate 44%

- **School location**
  - Central city 33%
  - Urban fringe/large town 37%
  - Rural/small town 20%

- **Poverty measure**
  - Eligible for free/reduced-price lunch 20%
  - Not eligible for free/reduced-price lunch 37%

† The term “state” is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

†† See explanation on pp. 3-4.

* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.
### International Comparisons

#### Mathematics Grade 8

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly higher:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium – Flemish²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19 nations’ would be expected to perform similarly:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – French)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bulgaria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† 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.

1 See explanation on pp. 3-4.
2 The Flemish and French educational systems in Belgium participated separately.
3 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† participated in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) in 8th grade science in 1995. If public school 8th graders in Oregon participated in the TIMSS science assessment, how would their average performance compare to that of students who took TIMSS in these nations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 nation’ would be expected to perform significantly higher:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22 nations’ would be expected to perform similarly:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – Flemish)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bulgaria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(United States)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – French)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† 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.

1 See explanation on pp. 3-4.
2 The Flemish and French educational systems in Belgium participated separately.
3 Latvia is designated LSS because only Latvian-speaking schools were tested, which represent less than 65% of the population.