South Carolina

Mathematics Grade 4

1. Improvement Over Time

Have South Carolina’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.

2. State Comparisons†

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

32 states had significantly higher percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

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

8 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Arizona, Florida 15% South Carolina 12%
Nevada 14% Alabama, California 11%
Arkansas, Georgia, New Mexico 13%

4 states had significantly lower 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† in South Carolina were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?

Sex

Male 13%
Female 11%

Race/ethnicity

American Indian/Alaskan Native2
Asian/Pacific Islander2
Black 2%
Hispanic 5%
White 19%

Parents’ highest level of education

Less than high school 8%
High school graduate 7%
Some education beyond high school 16%
College graduate 17%

School location

Central city 15%
Urban fringe/large town 14%
Rural/small town 8%

Poverty measure

Eligible for free/reduced-price lunch 4%
Not eligible for free/reduced-price lunch 20%

† See explanation on pp. 3-4.
* Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

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

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

Have South Carolina’s 8th graders improved in mathematics achievement?

Not yet. Between 1992 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.

2. State Comparisons†

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

27 states had significantly higher percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

- Minnesota 34%
- North Dakota 33%
- Montana, Wisconsin 32%
- Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska 31%
- Alaska 30%
- Massachusetts, Michigan 28%
- Vermont 27%
- Oregon, Washington 26%

10 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

- California, Florida 17%
- Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky 16%
- Tennessee 15%
- South Carolina, New Mexico, West Virginia 14%

4 states had significantly lower percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

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

† 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 subgroups¹ in South Carolina were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?

- Sex
  - Male 16%
  - Female 12%

- Race/ethnicity
  - American Indian/Alaskan Native² 3%
  - Asian/Pacific Islander² 4%
  - Black 22%
  - Hispanic 21%
  - White 16%

- Parent’s highest level of education
  - Less than high school 15%
  - High school graduate 23%
  - Some education beyond high school 3%
  - College graduate 6%

- School location
  - Central city 15%
  - Urban fringe/large town 21%
  - Rural/small town 10%

- Poverty measure
  - Eligible for free/reduced-price lunch 5%
  - Not eligible for free/reduced-price lunch 21%

¹ 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 South Carolina’s 8th graders improved in science achievement?

In 1996, 17% of South Carolina’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 South Carolina compare with other states in 8th grade science achievement in public schools in 1996?

31 states had significantly higher† percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

- Maine, Montana, North Dakota
- Wisconsin
- Massachusetts, Minnesota
- Connecticut, Iowa
- Nebraska
- Vermont, Wyoming
- Colorado, Michigan, Oregon, Utah
- Alaska
- Indiana

6 states had similar† percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

- Florida, Georgia
- California
- New Mexico

4 states had significantly lower† percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

- Louisiana
- Mississippi

3. Subgroup Performance

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

See Appendix A for definitions, sources, and technical notes.
### 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 South Carolina 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>27 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly higher:¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium – Flemish²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – French)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bulgaria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 nations’ would be expected to perform similarly:¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia)</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.

### 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 South Carolina 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>20 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly higher:¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium – Flemish²</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 nations’ would be expected to perform similarly:¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greece)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – French)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</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.

See Appendix A for definitions, sources, and technical notes.