1. Improvement Over Time

Have Georgia’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 Georgia 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 subgroups† in Georgia were at or above Proficient on the 1996 NAEP mathematics assessment?

†The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.
1 See explanation on pp. 3-4.
2 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.

Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 3-4 and Appendix D.

Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

Interpret with caution. Change was not statistically significant. Mathematics performance will be tested again in 2000.

ns Interpret with caution. Change was not statistically significant.
1. Improvement Over Time

Have Georgia’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.

2. State Comparisons†

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

22 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%
- Oregon, Washington 26%
- Colorado 25%
- Indiana, Maryland, Utah 24%
- Missouri, New York, Wyoming 22%
- Virginia 21%

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

- Texas 21%
- North Carolina, Rhode Island 20%
- Delaware 19%
- Arizona 18%
- California, Florida 17%
- Tennessee 15%

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.

1 State may appear to be out of place; however, statistically, its placement is correct. See pp. 3–4.

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

3 Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 3–4 and Appendix D.

4 Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

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

- Louisiana, Mississippi 7%
- Guam 6%

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

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

In 1996, 21% of Georgia’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 Georgia compare with other states in 8th grade science achievement in public schools in 1996?

20 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
- U.S.
- Missouri
- New York

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

- Virginia
- Rhode Island
- Maryland
- North Carolina
- Arizona, Kentucky, Texas
- Arkansas, Tennessee
- Georgia, Delaware, Florida
- West Virginia
- California
- New Mexico
- Alabama
- South Carolina
- Colorado, Michigan, Oregon, Utah

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

- Hawaii
- Louisiana
- Mississippi
- Guam
- District of Columbia

3. Subgroup Performance

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

- Male
- Female
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black
- Hispanic
- White
- Less than high school
- High school graduate
- Some education beyond high school
- College graduate
- Central city
- Urban fringe/large town
- Rural/small town
- Eligible for free/reduced-price lunch
- Not eligible for free/reduced-price lunch

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

1 See explanation on pp. 3-4.

2 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.
### 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 Georgia 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:†</th>
<th>14 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly higher:†</th>
<th>17 nations’ would be expected to perform similarly:†</th>
<th>10 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australia)</td>
<td>(Japan)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(Kuwait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Austria)</td>
<td>(Korea)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium – Flemish‡</td>
<td>(Belgium – Flemish)</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>(Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – French)‡</td>
<td>(Bulgaria)</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bulgaria)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>(Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Canada)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>(Slovenia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Czech Republic)</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Denmark)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(England)</td>
<td>(Scotland)</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(France)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Germany)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>(Switzerland)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>(Thailand)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greece)</td>
<td>(Romania)</td>
<td>(Romania)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Iceland)</td>
<td>(Scotland)</td>
<td>(Scotland)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)³</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lithuania)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:†</th>
<th>10 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia)</td>
<td>(Kuwait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic</td>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(South Africa)</td>
<td>(Lithuania)</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.

‡ 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 Georgia 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>14 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly higher:†</th>
<th>17 nations’ would be expected to perform similarly:†</th>
<th>10 nations’ would be expected to perform significantly lower:†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australia)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(Kuwait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Austria)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium – Flemish‡</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Belgium – French)‡</td>
<td>(Greece)</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bulgaria)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>(Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Czech Republic)</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>(Slovenia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(England)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(France)</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Germany)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Latvia – LSS)³</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lithuania)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>(Thailand)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spain)</td>
<td>(United States)</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sweden)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Switzerland)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(United States)</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</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.

‡ 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.