

THE NATIONAL  
EDUCATION  
GOALS  
REPORT



BUILDING A  
NATION OF  
LEARNERS

1999

# National Education Goals Panel

## Governors

Paul E. Patton, Kentucky (Chair, 1999)

John Engler, Michigan

Jim Geringer, Wyoming

James B. Hunt, Jr., North Carolina

Frank Keating, Oklahoma

Frank O'Bannon, Indiana

Tommy G. Thompson, Wisconsin

Cecil H. Underwood, West Virginia

## Members of the Administration

Richard W. Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education

Michael Cohen, Senior Advisor to the U.S. Secretary of Education

## Members of Congress

U.S. Senator Jeff Bingaman, New Mexico

U.S. Senator Jim Jeffords, Vermont

U.S. Representative William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania

U.S. Representative Matthew G. Martínez, California

## State Legislators

Representative G. Spencer Coggs, Wisconsin

Representative Mary Lou Cowlshaw, Illinois

Representative Douglas R. Jones, Idaho

Senator Stephen M. Stoll, Missouri

## National Education Goals Panel Staff

Ken Nelson, Executive Director

John W. Barth, Senior Education Associate

Burt A. Glassman, Education Program Specialist

Christopher R. Harrington, Education Associate

Cynthia D. Prince, Associate Director for Analysis and Reporting

Emily O. Wurtz, Senior Education Associate

Cynthia M. Dixon, Program Assistant


John J. Masaitis, Executive Officer

Artesia L. Robinson, Secretary

# THE NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS REPORT

Building a Nation  
of Learners

1999



# The National Education Goals Panel

The National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) is a unique bipartisan and intergovernmental body of federal and state officials created in July 1990 to assess and report state and national progress toward achieving the National Education Goals. In 1994, the Goals Panel became a fully independent federal agency charged with monitoring and speeding progress toward the eight National Education Goals. Under the legislation, the Panel is charged with a variety of responsibilities to support systemwide reform, including:

- Reporting on national and state progress toward the National Education Goals;
- Encouraging the development and use of high academic standards and assessments;
- Identifying promising practices for improving education and reaching the Goals; and
- Building a nationwide, bipartisan consensus to achieve the Goals.

Panel members include eight governors, four members of Congress, four state legislators, and two members appointed by the President.

Please provide any comments you may have about this report by using the response card in the back of this document. Additional copies are available at no charge from:

**National Education Goals Panel**

1255 22nd Street, NW, Suite 502

Washington, DC 20037

PHONE: (202) 724-0015

FAX: (202) 632-0957

E-MAIL: [NEGP@ed.gov](mailto:NEGP@ed.gov)

This report is also available on-line at [www.negp.gov](http://www.negp.gov)

Suggested citation: National Education Goals Panel. (1999). *The National Education Goals report: Building a nation of learners, 1999*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

---

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office  
Superintendent of Documents, Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-9328



On behalf of the National Education Goals Panel, I am pleased to present the *1999 National Education Goals Report*. This year marks the tenth anniversary of the first National Education Summit, an historic meeting convened by President Bush and the nation's governors in September 1989. The purpose of that Summit was to discuss ways to strengthen America's educational performance and ensure that the nation's workforce would have the knowledge and skills needed to compete in an increasingly global economy. The Summit led to the adoption of a set of National Education Goals targeted for the year 2000 that would guide education improvement efforts at every stage of a learner's life.

For nine years now, the National Education Goals Panel has issued an annual report to show how much progress the nation and the states have made toward those Goals. Soon we will have an entire decade of data to judge our educational progress. Even now, we see evidence that the National Education Goals have had an important impact. We believe that they have helped move the nation and the states forward, encouraged greater progress in education, focused attention on results, and helped sustain public support for education improvement. As this report shows, some states have already made significant progress toward the Goals on multiple measures. In addition, the nation has made gains on some of the most critical indicators of progress. For example, fewer infants are born with health risks, compared to where we stood at the beginning of the decade. More toddlers are fully immunized. More parents are reading and telling stories regularly to their young children. The gap in preschool participation between rich and poor has narrowed. The proportions of college degrees awarded in mathematics and science have risen. Student achievement has improved significantly in reading at Grade 8, and in mathematics at Grades 4, 8, and 12.

We applaud these accomplishments and commend the students, teachers, parents, and education leaders who are responsible for them. Granted, we still have far to go before we attain the level of success envisioned by the President and the nation's governors ten years ago. In particular, we must work harder to provide the necessary support and training for our teachers and to create the conditions that will enable them to teach well. We must concentrate on raising student achievement in mathematics and science to internationally competitive levels, especially in the upper grades. And we must redouble our efforts to ensure that our schools are free of drugs, alcohol, and violence. The improvements called for in the National Education Goals are as important today as they were ten years ago. I urge every state to make them a priority and to continue working toward their attainment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul E. Patton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Paul" being the most prominent.

Paul E. Patton, Chair (1999)  
National Education Goals Panel,  
and Governor of Kentucky

# Table of Contents

	Page
<b>Foreword</b> .....	.iii
<b>The National Education Goals</b> .....	.vi
<b>Part 1: Goals Work</b> .....	.1
<b>Part 2: Summary of Progress to Date</b> .....	.7
<b>Part 3: National Progress</b> .....	.15
Guide to reading the U.S. scorecard .....	.16
U.S. scorecard .....	.17
<b>Part 4: State Progress</b> .....	.23
<b>Goal 1: Ready to Learn</b>	
Indicator 1: Children’s Health Index .....	.24
Indicator 2: Immunizations .....	.25
Indicator 3: Low birthweight .....	.26
Indicator 4: Early prenatal care .....	.27
Indicator 5: Preschool programs for children with disabilities .....	.28
<b>Goal 2: School Completion</b>	
Indicator 6: High school completion rates .....	.29
Indicator 7: High school dropout rates .....	.30
<b>Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship</b>	
Indicator 8a: Reading achievement — 4th grade .....	.31
8b: Reading achievement — 8th grade .....	.32
Indicator 9: Writing achievement — 8th grade .....	.33
Indicator 10a: Mathematics achievement — 4th grade .....	.34
10b: Mathematics achievement — 8th grade .....	.35
Indicator 11: Science achievement — 8th grade .....	.36
Indicator 12: Advanced Placement performance .....	.37
<b>Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development</b>	
Indicator 13a: Teacher preparation — Academic degrees .....	.38
13b: Teacher preparation — Teaching certificates .....	.39
Indicator 14: Teacher professional development .....	.40
Indicator 15: Preparation to teach limited English proficient students .....	.41
Indicator 16: Teacher support .....	.42

**Goal 5: Mathematics and Science**

Indicator 17a: International mathematics achievement — 8th grade	.43
17b: International science achievement — 8th grade	.44
Indicator 18a: Mathematics instructional practices — Small groups	.45
18b: Mathematics instructional practices — Algebra and functions	.46
18c: Mathematics instructional practices — Reasoning and analytical ability	.47
Indicator 19: Mathematics resources — Computers	.48
Indicator 20a: Mathematics and science degrees — All students	.49
20b: Mathematics and science degrees — Minority students	.50
20c: Mathematics and science degrees — Female students	.51

**Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning**

Indicator 21: Adult literacy	.52
Indicator 22a: Voter registration	.53
22b: Voting	.54
Indicator 23: Participation in higher education	.55

**Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools**

Indicator 24: Student marijuana use	.56
Indicator 25: Student alcohol use	.57
Indicator 26: Availability of drugs on school property	.58
Indicator 27: Student victimization	.59
Indicator 28: Physical fights	.60
Indicator 29: Carrying a weapon	.61
Indicator 30: Student safety	.62
Indicator 31: Teacher victimization	.63
Indicator 32: Disruptions in class by students	.64

**Goal 8: Parental Participation**

Indicator 33a: Parental involvement in schools — Teachers' perspective	.65
33b: Parental involvement in schools — Principals' perspective	.66
Indicator 34: Influence of parent associations	.67

<b>Appendix A: Technical Notes and Sources for the National Indicators</b>	.69
--	-----


<b>Appendix B: Technical Notes and Sources for the State Indicators</b>	.75
---	-----

<b>Appendix C: Acknowledgements</b>	.85
-------------------------------------	-----

<b>Response Card</b>	.87
----------------------	-----




# The National Education Goals



## Goal 1: Ready to Learn

By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.



## Goal 2: School Completion

By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.



## Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

By the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics,

science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our Nation's modern economy.




## Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

By the year 2000, the Nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional

skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.


## Goal 5: Mathematics and Science

By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.




## Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.



## Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

By the year 2000, every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.



## Goal 8: Parental Participation

By the year 2000, every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.



# Part 1: Goals Work

This year marks the tenth anniversary of an event that has helped change the nation's thinking about what we expect from our schools. That event was the first National Education Summit, an historic meeting between President George Bush and the nation's governors, held in Charlottesville, Virginia in September 1989. The Charlottesville Education Summit was significant because it was the very first time that a meeting between a President and the nation's governors focused on how to improve America's educational performance.

The need to improve the quality of American education was widely recognized during the early 1980s. High school students' average scores on most standardized achievement tests were lower than they had been two decades earlier. Verbal and mathematics scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SATs) were in decline. U.S. students performed poorly in comparison to students in other countries on international mathematics and science assessments.

Concern about the nation's educational performance increased when the National Commission on Excellence in Education warned in its 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, that the skills and knowledge of the U.S. workforce would have to improve dramatically in order for the nation to remain internationally competitive.<sup>1</sup> State-level organizations such as the National Governors' Association and the Southern Regional Education Board called for states to step up efforts to improve education. The time had come for serious discussion at the highest levels of leadership about ways to improve America's schools. The nation's economic future was at stake.

When the President and the governors met at Charlottesville in 1989, they agreed that the United States needed clear national performance goals and needed to launch an earnest state-by-state effort to improve education in order to attain them. National goals would provide a common direction for educational improvement in all states, yet still allow states and local communities to determine for themselves how best to achieve the desired results.

The 1989 Education Summit led to the adoption of six National Education Goals, later expanded to eight by Congress.<sup>2</sup> Essentially, the Goals state that by the year 2000:

1. All children will start school ready to learn.
2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90%.
3. All students will become competent in challenging subject matter.
4. Teachers will have the knowledge and skills that they need.
5. U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
6. Every adult American will be literate.
7. Schools will be safe, disciplined, and free of guns, drugs, and alcohol.
8. Schools will promote parental involvement and participation.

The National Education Goals Panel was formed shortly after the Goals were announced in 1990. The Panel was charged with reporting national and state progress toward the Goals, identifying promising practices for improving education, and helping to build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus to achieve the Goals.

The eve of the year 2000 and the ten-year anniversary of Charlottesville is an appropriate time to reflect upon what has taken place since that historic Education Summit was held and the National Education Goals were established. Has this bold venture to improve American education worked? We are convinced that it has. It is too soon to tell how close the nation and the states actually came to achieving the National Education Goals, since the Panel is awaiting a number of critical end-of-decade updates in key areas such as mathematics and science achievement and teacher education and professional development. However, we do already know that many of the purposes for setting

<sup>1</sup> National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

<sup>2</sup> The two Goals that were added by Congress in 1994 were Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development, and Goal 8: Parental Participation.

National Education Goals have been achieved. State policymakers, members of the business community, and respected leaders in education affirm that the National Education Goals have helped stimulate critical education reforms that have moved the nation and the states forward. The Goals and the Goals Panel have helped this nation by:

1. Focusing education improvement efforts on results;
2. Sustaining strong, broad-based support for education reform over the last decade;
3. Helping to launch and support academic standards;
4. Supplying comparable data that enable states to monitor their progress toward the National Education Goals and to benchmark their educational performance against the best in the nation and the best in the world; and
5. Informing local and state efforts nationwide to improve educational performance, particularly higher levels of student academic achievement and better learning environments for young children.

### 1. Focusing education improvement efforts on results.

The Charlottesville Education Summit was the very first time in the history of American education that national and state political leaders from both parties, with very diverse views on education reform, reached consensus on what the nation's highest education priorities should be.<sup>3</sup> Setting National Education Goals effectively elevated education reform to the top of the public policy agenda. The Goals focused debate on what we needed to do in order to ensure that our students and our future workforce would be prepared to meet the technological, scientific, and economic challenges of the 21st century.

The Goals had a very important feature in common: they all focused on results. Higher levels of student achievement, particularly in mathematics and science, were among the most important results to be attained. However, better academic achievement was not the *only* result to be achieved. Boosting America's educational performance to internationally competitive levels would demand higher expectations at every stage of a learner's life, from the preschool years through adulthood. The National Education Goals acknowledged that better academic achievement by itself was not sufficient to meet the needs of the nation's children and to guarantee the continued growth and prosperity of the United States. The nation also wanted and needed:

- young children who were healthier and better prepared for school and learning;
- stronger links between home and school, and between school and work;
- better qualified teachers;
- safer schools;
- higher rates of high school graduation;
- responsible, literate, well-informed citizens; and
- a productive, highly trained, and internationally competitive workforce.

Because the Goals focused on results, they helped change the way that states judged the success of their education systems. Previously, states were primarily concerned with monitoring inputs, such as funding and facilities, and compliance with rules and regulations.<sup>4</sup> Today, desired results and accountability for student learning drive policy decisions. Thirty-six states now issue annual report cards on individual schools' performance, and five more are expected to do so by 2001. Nineteen states routinely identify low-performing schools as part of state accountability plans to target support and raise student achievement.<sup>5</sup> The Goals Panel's own annual state-by-state reports have helped

<sup>3</sup> Elmore, R.F. (1998, November). *The National Education Goals Panel: Purposes, progress, and prospects*. Paper commissioned by the National Education Goals Panel.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Education Week. (1999, January 11). *Quality counts '99: Rewarding results, punishing failure*. 18(17).

keep public interest in education high and helped exert pressure to improve results at the state level, where critical education decisions are made.<sup>6</sup>

## 2. Sustaining strong, broad-based support for education reform over the last decade.

Historically, education reform efforts in the United States have not had much staying power. Changes in educators' priorities or leadership at the national, state, or local levels often signaled abrupt changes in the direction of education policy before the results of education reforms could be fully realized. Before Charlottesville, decade-long commitments to educational improvement were virtually unknown.

The National Education Goals are an exception. Although there have been changes in Presidential administrations, Congressional leadership, and the gubernatorial leadership of nearly every state during the past ten years, the National Education Goals have remained constant. The Goals Panel's bipartisan, intergovernmental structure has helped provide the consistency and continuity required to sustain a focus on long-term education improvement efforts. The Goals Panel is a unique federal-state partnership, balanced between Democrats and Republicans, whose members are drawn from the highest levels of political leadership: governors, members of Congress, state legislators, and representatives chosen by the President. These unique characteristics ensure bipartisan policy reports and implementation strategies that are essential to school reform efforts. In an era of intense opposition to federal intervention in state and local education decisions, states have been remarkably consistent in voluntarily adopting reforms that the Panel has encouraged, such as higher standards, more challenging assessments, and greater accountability for school performance and student learning.

The decade-long commitment to the National Education Goals applies to the American public, as well as to

political leaders. A 1990 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll administered shortly after the Charlottesville Education Summit was held revealed widespread support for the Goals, even though Americans were skeptical that all of them could be met by the end of the decade.<sup>7</sup> Public Agenda's 1998 review of public opinion data on education concluded that the public continues to believe that the educational improvements called for in the National Education Goals are important, and that achieving the Goals would benefit the nation and their communities.<sup>8</sup>

## 3. Helping to launch and support academic standards.

Prior to the Charlottesville Education Summit, policy-makers rarely discussed standards in education. Standards that did exist were usually set at very low levels to define minimally acceptable levels of performance for promotion to a higher grade or graduation from high school. These standards varied widely in both their scope and their quality from one school district to the next. Growing concern that American students were leaving school without the knowledge and skills that they would need for jobs of the future led to a resounding call for more challenging academic standards — ones that would clearly define what we expect all students to learn and the levels of performance that we expect them to achieve.

Over the past ten years the nation has witnessed an unprecedented level of effort at the national, state, and local levels to set more rigorous academic standards and design more challenging assessments. The National Education Goals Panel played an important role in supporting this movement, calling for the development of world-class, academic standards in key subject areas to inspire greater effort, encourage higher levels of achievement, and measure progress. In 1991, upon recommendation of the Goals Panel, Congress established a bipartisan National Council on Education

<sup>6</sup> Raizen, S.A. (1999, February). *Goal 5: Mathematics and science*. Paper commissioned by the National Education Goals Panel.

<sup>7</sup> Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (1990, September). *22nd annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa International, Inc.

<sup>8</sup> Johnson, J., & Aulicino, C. (1998, December). *Summing it up: A review of survey data on education and the National Education Goals. A report from Public Agenda*. Paper prepared for the National Education Goals Panel.

Standards and Testing to consider the desirability and feasibility of developing national standards that described what all students should know and be able to do. The following year, the Council endorsed both the desirability and feasibility of establishing voluntary national education standards.<sup>9</sup> The Council recommended that such standards should:

- reflect high expectations, not minimal competency;
- provide focus and direction, not become a national curriculum;
- be national in scope, but not federally mandated; and
- be dynamic, not static, in order to keep pace with the development of knowledge.

Following the release of the Council's report, the U.S. Department of Education, other federal agencies, and private foundations awarded grants to private professional organizations to begin a multi-year effort to develop voluntary national standards in key subject areas. These efforts followed the pattern established three years earlier by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, who were the first to create standards in their academic discipline.<sup>10</sup> The Goals Panel convened an advisory group of experts to suggest specific guidelines that might be used to review the quality of proposed standards developed by these national professional organizations or by states. The advisors' 1993 report, *Promises to Keep: Creating High Standards for American Students*, proposed criteria to ensure that newly-designed standards were voluntary, academic, useful, adaptable, developed through a broad-based participatory process, and as challenging as standards established for students in other parts of the world.<sup>11</sup>

The Goals Panel joined forces with numerous professional organizations, states, and school districts to advance standards-based reforms. Voluntary national standards have been created in the academic subjects specified in Goal 3, and have served as models or resources for the development of state and local standards. Every state but one has adopted challenging statewide standards in some subjects, and 40 have established standards in all four core subjects of English, mathematics, science, and social studies. Forty-eight states report that they have statewide assessment systems, and 39 states have aligned their assessments in one or more subject areas to measure progress against their standards.<sup>12</sup> Though much work remains to be done, there is widespread agreement that the longevity and success of the academic standards movement to date have been extraordinary.

#### **4. Supplying comparable data that enable states to monitor their progress toward the National Education Goals and to benchmark their educational performance against the best in the nation and the best in the world.**

Concern about American competitiveness during the 1980s spurred interest in better comparative data that would allow states to benchmark their performance against the best in the nation and the best in the world. For six consecutive years leading up to Charlottesville, the U.S. Department of Education had published a *Wall Chart*, which ranked states on a variety of education indicators such as SAT and ACT college entrance test scores. These annual state rankings were widely criticized by state policymakers as unfair.

When the National Education Goals were adopted and the Goals Panel was charged with reporting progress toward their attainment, the Panel insisted that only

<sup>9</sup> National Council on Education Standards and Testing. (1992). *Raising standards for American education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

<sup>10</sup> National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: author.

<sup>11</sup> Goals 3 and 4 Technical Planning Group. (1993). *Promises to keep: Creating high standards for American students*. (Technical Report No. 94-01). Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

<sup>12</sup> Education Week. (1999, January 11). *Quality counts '99: Rewarding results, punishing failure*. 18(17).

*comparable* state data be reported to ensure that state comparisons were fair. The Panel also decided that its annual reports would focus on *results*, not how hard states were trying or the obstacles that hindered their progress. Given these requirements, the amount of information (particularly state-level information) that the Goals Panel could report at the beginning of the decade was meager. Consider, for example, just a few of the key indicators that did not exist prior to the 1989 Education Summit:

- We had no comparable state-by-state data on student academic achievement.
- We had no commonly accepted achievement levels or performance standards to tell us how many students were competent in challenging subject matter.
- We had no comparable state-level data on high school completion or dropout rates.
- We had no way to benchmark states against the highest-performing nations in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
- We had no recent national data on the literacy skills of American adults and no comparable state-level literacy data at all.
- We had no comparable state-level data on school crime, student drug use at school, and availability of drugs on school property.

*We now have this information.* By identifying serious gaps in our ability to measure progress toward the National Education Goals, the Goals Panel helped focus national, state, and local data collection efforts. Over the past ten years, both the quantity and the quality of education data, particularly at the state level, have improved markedly. In 1990, for example, Congress expanded the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to allow the reporting of comparable state-by-state results in mathematics. Since then, the overwhelming majority of states have participated voluntarily in eight state-level NAEP assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science. States can now benchmark their academic performance in all four

core subjects against the highest-performing states in the nation, and they can benchmark their performance in mathematics and science against the highest-performing nations in the world.

During the same period, the National Assessment Governing Board established student achievement levels for NAEP in reading, writing, mathematics, science, civics, history, and geography, so that now we can characterize the level of performance students must reach in order to be considered competent in challenging subject matter. Comparable high school completion rates are now available for every state, and comparable dropout rates are available for 26 states. We now have baseline data on adult literacy rates for the nation and for 13 states. We now have comparable state data for more than 25 states on measures of school safety and student drug use. And we will soon have for the very first time, comprehensive national data on kindergartners and direct measures of their readiness for school.

The Goals and the work of the Goals Panel have also helped promote and build interest in international comparisons. When the Goals were announced there was considerable skepticism about our ability to attain “first in the world” status in mathematics and science achievement. However, according to one mathematics and science expert, “the formulation of Goal 5 and the steady annual reporting on it have helped to lend importance and credibility to international studies and comparisons, with people more willing to learn from the educational practices of other countries.”<sup>13</sup>

### **5. Informing local and state efforts nationwide to improve educational performance, particularly higher levels of student academic achievement and better learning environments for young children.**

Although we are still awaiting end-of-the-decade updates and this report shows mixed results on many indicators, we already know that the nation has improved its educational performance in several important areas. Since the Goals were established, we have seen significant declines in the proportion of infants born with

<sup>13</sup> Raizen, S.A. (1999, February). *Goal 5: Mathematics and science*, p. 6. Paper commissioned by the National Education Goals Panel.

health risks, and significant increases in immunization rates among 2-year-olds. More parents are reading and telling stories regularly to young children. The gap in preschool participation rates between children from high-income and low-income families has narrowed. More 8th graders are proficient in reading and more 4th, 8th, and 12th graders are proficient in mathematics. The proportion of college degrees awarded in mathematics and science has increased for minority students and female students, as well as for all students. The percentage of students who report that they have been threatened or injured at school has decreased.

We also know that some individual states have made remarkable progress toward the Goals, and that some have made progress in multiple areas. Fifty states have increased the percentage of mothers receiving early prenatal care. Forty-nine states have increased the proportion of children with disabilities participating in preschool. Twelve states have reduced their high school dropout rates. Twenty-seven states have increased the percentage of 8th graders who are proficient in mathematics. Fifty states have increased the proportion of scores on Advanced Placement examinations that are high enough to qualify for college credit. Thirty-nine states have increased the percentage of their high school graduates who immediately enroll in college. Seventeen states have witnessed a significant increase in the influence of parent associations on public school policies. And 23 states have made significant improvements toward the National Education Goals on ten or more measures of progress.

The National Education Goals have prompted new investments in education and new federal and state legislation to raise expectations for all students and speed educational progress. New initiatives focused on young children have been mandated in the majority of states.<sup>14</sup> The federal government has increased investments in early childhood programs such as child nutrition, immunization, Head Start, Even Start, and Early Head Start to improve the chances that children will arrive at school ready to learn. The federal student loan

program has been improved to ensure continued access to higher education. Emphasis has been placed on the identification of promising and effective actions to achieve the National Education Goals, and on helping states, communities, and schools develop and implement comprehensive, long-term education improvement plans.

However, much remains to be accomplished. Progress has not been uniform across the Goals or across the states. Much more must be done, especially to strengthen teacher education and professional development, improve mathematics and science achievement in the upper grades, reduce student drug and alcohol use, and ensure that our schools are safe and orderly places of learning. Clearly, the Goals are very ambitious and will require continued and intensified effort to reach them. Nonetheless, the existence of the Goals has helped inspire the educational system at all levels to aim higher, to stretch further, and to expect more in order to improve performance. And that is, after all, the fundamental purpose of Goals.

## Conclusions

We believe that the National Education Goals have moved America forward and, on balance, encouraged greater progress in education. We are clearer about what appropriate Goals are and how to measure progress toward them at the national and state levels. There is no doubt that the National Education Goals have encouraged a broad spectrum of educators, parents, students, business and community leaders, policymakers, and the public to work toward their attainment. Reporting progress toward the Goals has provided valuable information to states and inspired them to reach higher. Can we do better? Of course we can. But we are convinced that our gains have been greater because we have had National Education Goals to guide our efforts. Ten years of progress have shown us that the Goals are working.

<sup>14</sup> Kagan, S.L., & Rubin, R. (1998, December). *Examining children's readiness for school: Progress over the decade*. Paper commissioned by the National Education Goals Panel.

## Part 2: Summary of Progress to Date

This section of the report evaluates national and state progress made since 1990, the year that the National Education Goals were established.<sup>1</sup> In addition to summarizing how we stand in relation to achieving the ambitious targets specified in the Goals, this report gives special emphasis to state improvement over time. The Panel is committed to providing the most recent data available in its annual reports. Some of the data sets used to monitor state and national progress are updated annually, but most are updated every two, three, or four years. The Panel is awaiting end-of-decade updates in a number of critical areas, such as reading, national and international mathematics and science achievement, teacher education and professional development, and school safety. The Panel intends to include these updates in its next report in order to evaluate a complete decade of national and state progress toward the Goals.

### New and updated information

This year's report presents new data on:

- reading achievement (state data for Grade 8);
- writing achievement (national data for Grades 4, 8, and 12, and state data for Grade 8); and
- civics achievement (national data for Grades 4, 8, and 12).

These data appear in this year's *Goals Report* for the very first time.

In addition, the following indicators have been updated with more recent data since last year's report:

#### Goal 1: Ready to Learn

- Children's Health Index (national and state data);
- low birthweight (state data);
- early prenatal care (state data);
- family-child reading and storytelling (national data);

- preschool participation (national data); and
- preschool programs for children with disabilities (state data).

#### Goal 2: School Completion

- high school completion rates (national and state data) and
- high school dropout rates (state data).

#### Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

- reading achievement (national data for Grades 4, 8, and 12, and state data for Grade 4) and
- Advanced Placement performance (national and state data).

#### Goal 5: Mathematics and Science

- mathematics and science degrees (national and state data).

#### Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

- participation in adult education (national data) and
- college enrollment and completion (national data).

#### Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

- overall student drug and alcohol use (national data);
- sale of drugs at school (national data);
- student victimization (national data); and
- student reports of disruptions in class by students (national data).

#### Goal 8: Parental Participation

- parents' reports of their involvement in school activities (national data).

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used hereafter in this report to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and five outlying areas (American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands).

## Measuring progress toward the Goals

The Goals Panel uses 27 national and 34 state-level indicators to measure progress toward the eight National Education Goals.<sup>2</sup> These indicators were selected with the assistance of the Goals Panel's advisors, who were asked to recommend a set of measures that were, to the extent possible:

- comprehensive across the Goals;
- most critical in determining whether the Goals were actually achieved; and
- updated at frequent intervals, so that the Panel could provide regular progress reports.

The sources of the national and state data are large-scale data collections, research studies, and assessments conducted by universities, education organizations, and federal agencies such as the National Center for Education Statistics and the National Center for Health Statistics. Many of the indicators are identical at the national and state levels, such as student achievement in mathematics, science, and reading. However, in some cases, only national data are available and there is no comparable state indicator (for example, student achievement in history and geography). In other cases, we do have a measure at both the national and state levels, but the data are drawn from different sources and differ in the way they are collected or reported (for example, student drug and alcohol use).

In some cases, limited information is available to measure progress, particularly at the state level. Data gaps exist because states may choose not to participate in some data collections for reasons such as cost or the amount of time required for testing. In other cases, states may have participated in a data collection only

once, and change over time cannot be determined without a second data point.

It is important to bear in mind that variations in state demographics account for some differences in performance on the state indicators. For example, states with the highest enrollments of limited English proficient students tend to have the highest percentages of teachers with specific training to teach limited English proficient students.

It is also important to note that this report does not include all Goal-related data that a state may collect. States do collect Goal-related information individually (for example, student achievement on their own state assessments), but this information is not comparable across states. Only comparable state data are presented in the annual *Goals Reports* to ensure that state comparisons are fair and that changes over time are not caused by changes in sampling or the wording of items.<sup>3</sup> The Goals Panel is committed to using a common, reliable yardstick to ensure that differences over time reflect real changes in performance.

### Report format – National data

National progress toward the Goals is presented in Part 3 of this report, beginning on page 15. This section includes America's 1999 scorecard, which summarizes progress on the 27 national indicators. A detailed guide to interpreting the scorecard appears on page 16.

Baseline measures of progress, which appear in the first column on the scorecard, were established as close as possible to 1990. These serve as our starting points. For some of the indicators, such as student achievement in mathematics and reading, we hope to reach 100%. For others, such as student drug use and alcohol use, we hope to reach 0%. The most recent measures of performance for each indicator appear in the second column.

<sup>2</sup> Because some of the indicators have multiple parts, there are 53 national measures and 44 state measures of progress toward the Goals. For example, the national indicator on reading achievement is composed of three measures of progress for Grades 4, 8, and 12. However, only 28 of the national measures and 31 of the state measures have been collected more than once since 1990; these are the maximum numbers of areas in which the Goals Panel can report progress over time.

<sup>3</sup> Although the state data presented in this report are comparable, the reader should bear in mind that many variables can contribute to differences in state performance, such as available resources, curricula, and educational practices. The results presented in this report do not control for these variables.

The arrows in the third column show our overall progress on each indicator:

- ↑ Arrows that point upward indicate where we have made significant<sup>4</sup> progress.
- ↔ Horizontal arrows indicate where we have seen no significant change in our performance.
- ↓ Arrows that point downward indicate where we have fallen further behind.

No arrows are shown in cases where we do not yet have a second data point to determine whether performance has improved or declined since the baseline.

## Report format – State data

State progress toward the National Education Goals is presented in Part 4 of this report, beginning on page 23. Each of the 34 state-level indicators is profiled on a separate page. Four types of information are presented:

**1. State status report.** At the top of each state page is a tally of the numbers of states in which performance on the indicator:

- ↑ has become significantly better;
- ↔ has not changed significantly; or
- ↓ has become significantly worse.

*Only states that have participated in at least two data collections (so that they have both a baseline measure and an update) are included in these counts. Without at least two data points, changes in performance cannot be measured. For some indicators, such as science achievement, data have been collected only once at the state level. In these cases, changes in state performance cannot be reported for any state.*

**2. Improvement over time.** The first box on each of the state pages identifies all of the states that have

made significant progress on the indicator, as measured against their own starting points.

*Only states that have made statistically significant improvements are included on these lists. If data have been collected only once at the state level, improvement over time cannot be reported for any state.*

**3. Highest-performing states.** The second box on each of the state pages lists the states that were among the highest performers on the most recent assessment. “Highest-performing” does not necessarily mean that the Goals Panel considers performance in these states to be as high as it should be in order to meet the Goal. It is simply a means of recognizing those states that are doing particularly well relative to others, and that are closest to achieving the Goal by this measure of progress.

*“Highest-performing states” were defined as follows:*

- *When comparable national data were available, states that performed significantly better than the national average were designated “highest-performing states.” This does not mean that merely being “above average” is the target to which states should aspire. It is simply a statistical means of determining which states would be clustered at the upper levels of performance. U.S. averages are shown only when data were comparable at the national and state levels.*
- *For some of the state indicators, (a) no comparable national data were available, (b) the indicators differed at the national and state levels, or (c) the data were based on entire populations rather than samples. In such cases, “highest-performing states” were defined as those that placed among the top five states when ranked from top to bottom. More than five states are shown in cases of ties.*

<sup>4</sup> In this report, “significance” refers to statistical significance and indicates that the observed differences are not likely to have occurred by chance. All differences in this report that are termed “statistically significant” are measured at the 0.05 level. For more information, see Appendix A.

- For the international mathematics and science achievement indicators (17a and 17b), “highest-performing states” were defined as those that would be expected to be outperformed by the fewest countries on international mathematics and science assessments.<sup>5</sup>

**4. Most-improved states.** The third box on each of the state pages gives special recognition to the states that have made the greatest improvements over time. These states may not yet be among the highest-performing states in the nation, but they were the most successful at pushing their performance in the right direction. “Most-improved” does not necessarily mean that the Goals Panel considers the amount of progress made to be sufficient. It is simply a means of recognizing those states that have made the greatest progress toward the Goal by this measure.

*“Most-improved states” were defined as the five states that had the greatest percentage-point changes in performance in the appropriate direction, as measured against their own baselines. States are listed only if the amount of change was statistically significant. More than five states are shown in cases of ties, and fewer are shown in cases where fewer than five states made significant improvements.*

## National Findings

In this year’s report the United States received:

- ↑ 12 arrows pointing upward for significant improvement;
- ↔ 11 horizontal arrows indicating no significant change in performance; and
- ↓ 5 arrows pointing downward for significant declines in performance.

## Areas of improvement

The 12 arrows that were awarded for significant improvement are associated with Goals 1, 3, 5, and 7:

### Goal 1: Ready to Learn

- ↑ The proportion of infants born with one or more of four health risks has decreased.
- ↑ The percentage of 2-year-olds who have been fully immunized against preventable childhood diseases has increased.
- ↑ The percentage of families who are reading and telling stories to their children on a regular basis has increased.
- ↑ The gap in preschool participation between 3- to 5-year-olds from high- and low-income families has decreased.

### Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

The percentage of students who are proficient in reading has risen in:

- ↑ Grade 8.

The percentages of students who are proficient in mathematics have risen in:

- ↑ Grade 4;
- ↑ Grade 8; and
- ↑ Grade 12.

### Goal 5: Mathematics and Science

The proportion of college degrees awarded in mathematics and science has increased. This is true for:

- ↑ all students;
- ↑ minority students; and
- ↑ female students.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix B for more detailed information.

### Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

- ↑ The percentage of students who report that they have been threatened or injured at school has decreased.

### Areas of decline

The 5 arrows that were awarded for significant declines in national performance are associated with Goals 4 and 7:

### Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

- ↓ The percentage of secondary school teachers who hold a degree in their main teaching assignment has decreased.

### Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

- ↓ The percentage of students reporting that they used an illicit drug has increased.
- ↓ The percentage of students reporting that someone offered to sell or give them drugs at school has increased.
- ↓ The percentage of public school teachers reporting that they were threatened or injured at school has increased.
- ↓ A higher percentage of secondary school teachers report that disruptions in their classrooms interfere with their teaching.

## State Findings

### Areas of improvement

In this year's report 23 states received 10 or more arrows pointing upward for significant improvement during the 1990s. Colorado, Connecticut, Kentucky, North Carolina, and South Carolina led the states with significant improvement on 13 measures, followed by Texas, with significant improvement on 12.

Key improvements made by states during the 1990s are as follows:

### Goal 1: Ready to Learn

- ↑ 37 states reduced the percentage of infants born with one or more of four health risks.
- ↑ 50 states increased the percentage of mothers receiving early prenatal care.
- ↑ 49 states increased the proportion of children with disabilities participating in preschool.

### Goal 2: School Completion

- ↑ 12 states have reduced their high school dropout rates.

### Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

- ↑ 27 states increased the percentage of 8th graders who are proficient in mathematics.
- ↑ 50 states increased the proportion of scores on Advanced Placement examinations that were high enough to qualify for college credit.

### Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

- ↑ 17 states increased the percentage of public school teachers who received support from a master or mentor teacher during their first year of teaching.

### Goal 5: Mathematics and Science

- ↑ 51 states increased the percentage of degrees earned by all students that were awarded in mathematics and science.
- ↑ 37 states increased the percentage of degrees earned by minority students that were awarded in mathematics and science.
- ↑ 51 states increased the percentage of degrees earned by female students that were awarded in mathematics and science.

### Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

- ↑ 10 states increased voter registration.
- ↑ 39 states increased the percentage of high school graduates who immediately enrolled in college.

### Goal 8: Parental Participation

- ↑ 17 states increased the influence of parent associations on public school policies.

## Areas of decline

Areas in which large numbers of states showed significant declines in performance during the 1990s are as follows:

### Goal 1: Ready to Learn

- ↓ In 36 states, the percentage of infants born at low birthweight has increased.

### Goal 2: School Completion

- ↓ In 11 states, the high school dropout rate has increased.

### Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

- ↓ In 11 states, lower percentages of students are enrolling in college immediately after high school.

### Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

- ↓ In 16 states, higher percentages of students report using marijuana.
- ↓ In 15 states, higher percentages of students report that drugs are available on school property.
- ↓ In 37 states, higher percentages of public school teachers report that student disruptions in class interfere with their teaching.

## Highest-performing states

The states that were most frequently among the top performers on measures of progress toward the National

Education Goals were Maine (21 times), Connecticut (20 times), and North Dakota (17 times).

## Most-improved states

The states that ranked among the most-improved states the greatest number of times were Connecticut and the District of Columbia (8 times each), and North Carolina and South Carolina (6 times each).

## For further information

For more detailed information about each state's progress toward the National Education Goals, please see the *1999 Data Volume for the National Education Goals Report*. This companion volume to the *1999 Goals Report* contains four-page scorecards for each state, the District of Columbia, and the five outlying areas.

Each of the indicators on the state scorecards includes a baseline measure, the most recent update, an arrow indicating the direction of change, and the range of state scores in order to show how the state performed in relation to others. National averages are also shown if the data are comparable at the national and state levels. A limited number of printed copies of the *1999 Data Volume* are available free of charge from the National Education Goals Panel. In addition, the scorecards and the complete *1999 Data Volume* are available on the Goals Panel's Web site, at [www.negp.gov](http://www.negp.gov).

A new "Lessons from the States" series of publications is also available from the National Education Goals Panel to examine gains made by individual states in more detail. *Promising Practices: Progress Toward the Goals* examines programs and policies that state and local officials believe account for the success of some of the highest-performing and most-improved states. Each volume of *Promising Practices* focuses on one indicator of progress for each of the eight Goals and includes case studies of states that are making significant progress on individual indicators, such as raising student academic achievement in mathematics. In addition, the Goals Panel highlights a different indicator each month in its newsletter, the *NEGP Monthly*.



Other recent publications in the “Lessons from the States” series include *Exploring Rapid Achievement Gains in North Carolina and Texas*, which presents case studies of two states that have made gains on multiple measures of progress toward the National Education Goals. The newest publication in the series, *Exploring High and Improving Reading Achievement in Connecticut*, examines state-level and school district-level policies, programs, and other factors believed to contribute to the significant gains in reading scores in Connecticut during the 1990s. Interested readers should look for the next volume of *Promising Practices*, as well as a case study of science achievement in Minnesota, in early 2000. Each of these publications can be found on the Goals Panel’s Web site, at [www.negp.gov](http://www.negp.gov). Printed copies can also be obtained free of charge from the National Education Goals Panel.



## Part 3: National Progress

# Guide to Reading the U.S. Scorecard

	1	2	3
	Baseline	Update	Progress?
5 1. <b>Children's Health Index:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the percentage of infants born with 1 or more of 4 health risks? (1990 vs. 1997)	37%	33%	↑
6 6. <b>Reading Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in reading? (1992 vs. 1998)	29%	31% <sup>ns</sup>	↔
	29%	33%	↑
	40%	40%	↔
7 7. <b>Writing Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in writing? (1998)	23%	—	4 ↓
	27%	—	
	22%	—	

- 1 Data in this column represent our starting points. Baselines were established as close as possible to 1990, the year that the National Education Goals were adopted.
- 2 Data in this column represent our current level of performance and are the most recent data available.
- 3 Progress represents progress from the baseline year to the most recent update year.
- 4 Progress is shown by an arrow. Arrows that point upward indicate that we have made progress. Arrows that point downward indicate that we have fallen further behind. Horizontal arrows indicate that performance has not changed or that the change was not statistically significant. (See Appendix A for an explanation of statistical significance.)
- 5 The source of the data and any technical notes for each national indicator are referenced by this number in Appendix A.
- 6 The date(s) in parentheses indicates the year(s) in which data were collected for the national indicator. If there are two dates, the first indicates the baseline year and the second indicates the most recent year in which data were collected.
- 7 ns means that a change from the baseline year to the most recent year was not statistically significant. (See Appendix A for an explanation of statistical significance.)
- 8 — means data not available.

## GOAL 1 Ready to Learn

1. <b>Children's Health Index:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the percentage of infants born with 1 or more of 4 health risks? (1990 vs. 1997)	37%	33%	↑
2. <b>Immunizations:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of 2-year-olds who have been fully immunized against preventable childhood diseases? (1994 vs. 1997)	75%	78%	↑
3. <b>Family-Child Reading and Storytelling:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of 3- to 5-year-olds whose parents read to them or tell them stories regularly? (1993 vs. 1999)	66%	69%	↑
4. <b>Preschool Participation:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the gap (in percentage points) in preschool participation between 3- to 5-year-olds from high- and low-income families? (1991 vs. 1999)	28 points	13 points	↑

## GOAL 2 School Completion

5. <b>High School Completion:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who have a high school credential? (1990 vs. 1998)	86%	85%	↔
---	-----	-----	---

## GOAL 3 Student Achievement and Citizenship

6. <b>Reading Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in reading? (1992 vs. 1998)			
• Grade 4	29%	31% <sup>ns</sup>	↔
• Grade 8	29%	33%	↑
• Grade 12	40%	40%	↔
7. <b>Writing Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in writing? (1998)			
• Grade 4	23%	—	
• Grade 8	27%	—	
• Grade 12	22%	—	

— Data not available.

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

## GOAL 3

### Student Achievement and Citizenship (continued)

<b>8. Mathematics Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in mathematics? (1990 vs. 1996)			
• Grade 4	13%	21%	↑
• Grade 8	15%	24%	↑
• Grade 12	12%	16%	↑
<b>9. Science Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in science? (1996)			
• Grade 4	29%	—	
• Grade 8	29%	—	
• Grade 12	21%	—	
<b>10. Civics Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in civics? (1998)			
• Grade 4	23%	—	
• Grade 8	22%	—	
• Grade 12	26%	—	
<b>11. History Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in U.S. history? (1994)			
• Grade 4	17%	—	
• Grade 8	14%	—	
• Grade 12	11%	—	
<b>12. Geography Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient in geography? (1994)			
• Grade 4	22%	—	
• Grade 8	28%	—	
• Grade 12	27%	—	

— Data not available.

## GOAL 4

### Teacher Education and Professional Development

<p><b>13. Teacher Preparation:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of secondary school teachers who hold an undergraduate or graduate degree in their main teaching assignment? (1991 vs. 1994)</p>	66%	63%	↓
<p><b>14. Teacher Professional Development:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of teachers reporting that they participated in professional development programs on 1 or more topics since the end of the previous school year? (1994)</p>	85%	—	

## GOAL 5

### Mathematics and Science

<p><b>15. International Mathematics Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. improved its standing on international mathematics assessments? (1995)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 4</li> <li>• Grade 8</li> <li>• Grade 12</li> </ul>	<p>7 out of 25 countries scored above the U.S. 20 out of 40 countries scored above the U.S. 14 out of 20 countries scored above the U.S.</p>
<p><b>16. International Science Achievement:</b> Has the U.S. improved its standing on international science assessments? (1995)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 4</li> <li>• Grade 8</li> <li>• Grade 12</li> </ul>	<p>1 out of 25 countries scored above the U.S. 9 out of 40 countries scored above the U.S. 11 out of 20 countries scored above the U.S.</p>
<p><b>17. Mathematics and Science Degrees:</b> Has the U.S. increased mathematics and science degrees (as a percentage of all degrees) awarded to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all students? (1991 vs. 1996)</li> <li>• minorities (Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians/Alaskan Natives)? (1991 vs. 1996)</li> <li>• females? (1991 vs. 1996)</li> </ul>	<p>39%                      43%                      ↑</p> <p>39%                      40%                      ↑</p> <p>35%                      41%                      ↑</p>

— Data not available.  
ns Interpret with caution. Change was not statistically significant.

### GOAL 6

### Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

<b>18. Adult Literacy:</b> Has the U.S. increased the percentage of adults who score at the three highest levels in prose literacy? (1992)	52%	—	
<b>19. Participation in Adult Education:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the gap (in percentage points) in adult education participation between adults who have a high school diploma or less, and those who have additional postsecondary education or technical training? (1991 vs. 1999)	27 points	29 points <sup>ns</sup>	↔
<b>20. Participation in Higher Education:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the gap (in percentage points) between White and Black high school graduates who:			
• enroll in college? (1990 vs. 1997)	14 points	9 points <sup>ns</sup>	↔
• complete a college degree? (1992 vs. 1998)	16 points	19 points <sup>ns</sup>	↔
Has the U.S. reduced the gap (in percentage points) between White and Hispanic high school graduates who:			
• enroll in college? (1990 vs. 1997)	11 points	13 points <sup>ns</sup>	↔
• complete a college degree? (1992 vs. 1998)	15 points	19 points <sup>ns</sup>	↔

### GOAL 7

### Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

<b>21. Overall Student Drug and Alcohol Use:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the percentage of 10th graders reporting doing the following during the previous year:			
• using any illicit drug? (1991 vs. 1998)	24%	37%	↓
• using alcohol? (1993 vs. 1998)	63%	63%	↔
<b>22. Sale of Drugs at School:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the percentage of 10th graders reporting that someone offered to sell or give them an illegal drug at school during the previous year? (1992 vs. 1998)	18%	29%	↓
<b>23. Student and Teacher Victimization:</b> Has the U.S. reduced the percentage of students and teachers reporting that they were threatened or injured at school during the previous year?			
• 10th grade students (1991 vs. 1998)	40%	33%	↑
• public school teachers (1991 vs. 1994)	10%	15%	↓

— Data not available.

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

## GOAL 7

### Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools (continued)

**24. Disruptions in Class by Students:** Has the U.S. reduced the percentage of students and teachers reporting that student disruptions interfere with teaching and learning?

• 10th grade students (1992 vs. 1998)	17%	16% <sup>ns</sup>	↔
• secondary school teachers (1991 vs. 1994)	37%	46%	↓

## GOAL 8

### Parental Participation

**25. Schools' Reports of Parent Attendance at Parent-Teacher Conferences:** Has the U.S. increased the percentage of K-8 public schools which reported that more than half of their parents attended parent-teacher conferences during the school year? (1996)

78%	—
-----	---

**26. Schools' Reports of Parent Involvement in School Policy Decisions:** Has the U.S. increased the percentage of K-8 public schools which reported that parent input is considered when making policy decisions in three or more areas? (1996)

41%	—
-----	---

**27. Parents' Reports of Their Involvement in School Activities:** Has the U.S. increased the percentage of students in Grades 3 to 12 whose parents reported that they participated in two or more activities in their child's school during the current school year? (1993 vs. 1999)

63%	62% <sup>ns</sup>	↔
-----	-------------------	---



## Part 4: State Progress

# GOAL 1: Ready to Learn

## State Indicator 1. Children's Health Index

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of infants born with one or more of four health risks?<sup>2</sup>

↑ Better 37 states and the U.S.  
 ↔ No Change 8 states  
 ↓ Worse 4 states



### Improvement over time

Between 1990 and 1997, the U.S. and 37 states (out of 49) significantly reduced the percentages of infants born with one or more of four health risks:

1. Alabama	11. Idaho	21. Nebraska	31. Texas
2. Arizona	12. Illinois	22. Nevada	32. Vermont
3. Arkansas	13. Iowa	23. New Hampshire	33. Virginia
4. Colorado	14. Kentucky	24. New Mexico	34. Washington
5. Connecticut	15. Louisiana	25. North Carolina	35. West Virginia
6. Delaware	16. Maryland	26. Ohio	36. Wisconsin
7. District of Columbia	17. Massachusetts	27. Oregon	37. Wyoming
8. Florida	18. Michigan	28. Pennsylvania	
9. Georgia	19. Mississippi	29. Rhode Island	
10. Hawaii	20. Missouri	30. South Carolina	

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of infants born with one or more of four health risks:

	(1997)		(1997)
Connecticut	24%	Arizona	31%
Maryland	28%	Georgia	31%
Utah	28%	Virginia	31%
Florida	29%	Idaho	32%
Hawaii	29%	Illinois	32%
Texas	29%	Kansas	32%
Colorado	30%	Massachusetts	32%
Minnesota	30%	Nevada	32%
Rhode Island	30%	Washington	32%
	<b>U.S.</b>		<b>33%</b>

\* States that had a significantly lower percentage than the U.S. average.

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of infants born with one or more of four health risks:

	(1990)	(1997)	Change*
District of Columbia	48%	35%	-13
Massachusetts	42%	32%	-10
Florida	37%	29%	-8
Arizona	37%	31%	-6
Delaware	40%	35%	-6
Nevada	38%	32%	-6
Rhode Island	36%	30%	-6

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

<sup>2</sup> Risks are: late (in third trimester) or no prenatal care; low maternal weight gain (less than 21 pounds); mother smoked during pregnancy; or mother drank alcohol during pregnancy.

# GOAL 1: Ready to Learn

## State Indicator 2. Immunizations

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of 2-year-olds who have been fully immunized against preventable childhood diseases?

↑	Better	6 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	45 states
↓	Worse	0 states

### Improvement over time

Between 1994 and 1997, the U.S. and 6 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of 2-year-olds who had been fully immunized against preventable childhood diseases:

- |             |             |                  |
|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| 1. Alabama  | 3. Michigan | 5. Washington    |
| 2. Illinois | 4. Missouri | 6. West Virginia |

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of fully-immunized 2-year-olds:

	(1997)
Connecticut	87%
Maine	87%
Massachusetts	87%
Alabama	86%
Vermont	86%
New Hampshire	85%
Rhode Island	84%
North Dakota	83%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>78%</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of fully-immunized 2-year-olds:

	(1994)	(1997)	Change*
Michigan	61%	77%	+16
West Virginia	66%	82%	+16
Missouri	64%	78%	+14
Alabama	75%	86%	+11
Illinois	68%	76%	+8

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 1: Ready to Learn

### State Indicator 3. Low Birthweight

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of infants born at low birthweight (less than 5.5 pounds)?

↑	Better	2 states
↔	No Change	17 states and the U.S.
↓	Worse	36 states

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1990 and 1997, 2 states (out of 55) significantly reduced the percentages of infants born at low birthweight (less than 5.5 pounds):

1. District of Columbia
2. Virgin Islands

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of infants born at low birthweight (less than 5.5 pounds):

	(1997)
Oregon	5%
Alaska	6%
California	6%
Idaho	6%
Iowa	6%
Maine	6%
Minnesota	6%
Montana	6%
New Hampshire	6%
North Dakota	6%
South Dakota	6%
Vermont	6%
Washington	6%
Wisconsin	6%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>8%</b>

\* Top 14 states (out of 55).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of infants born at low birthweight (less than 5.5 pounds):

	(1990)	(1997)	Change*
District of Columbia	15%	13%	-2
Virgin Islands	9%	8%	-1

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

# GOAL 1: Ready to Learn

## State Indicator 4. Early Prenatal Care

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of mothers who began receiving prenatal care during their first trimester of pregnancy?

↑	Better	50 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	2 states
↓	Worse	2 states

Update

### Improvement over time

Between 1990 and 1997, the U.S. and 50 states (out of 54) significantly increased the percentages of mothers who began receiving prenatal care during their first trimester of pregnancy:

1. Alabama	14. Indiana	27. Nebraska	40. South Dakota
2. Arizona	15. Iowa	28. Nevada	41. Tennessee
3. Arkansas	16. Kansas	29. New Hampshire	42. Texas
4. California	17. Kentucky	30. New Mexico	43. Vermont
5. Colorado	18. Louisiana	31. New York	44. Virginia
6. Connecticut	19. Maine	32. North Carolina	45. Washington
7. Delaware	20. Maryland	33. North Dakota	46. West Virginia
8. District of Columbia	21. Massachusetts	34. Ohio	47. Wisconsin
9. Florida	22. Michigan	35. Oklahoma	48. Wyoming
10. Georgia	23. Minnesota	36. Oregon	49. Puerto Rico
11. Hawaii	24. Mississippi	37. Pennsylvania	50. Virgin Islands
12. Idaho	25. Missouri	38. Rhode Island	
13. Illinois	26. Montana	39. South Carolina	

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of mothers who began receiving prenatal care during their first trimester of pregnancy:

	(1997)
New Hampshire	90%
Connecticut	89%
Maine	89%
Maryland	89%
Massachusetts	89%
Rhode Island	89%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>83%</b>

\* Top 6 states (out of 54).

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of mothers who began receiving prenatal care during their first trimester of pregnancy:

	(1990)	(1997)	Change*
Georgia	73%	86%	+13
New Mexico	57%	70%	+13
South Carolina	69%	80%	+12
Florida	72%	84%	+11
District of Columbia	56%	67%	+10
Hawaii	73%	83%	+10
Texas	68%	79%	+10
Virgin Islands	47%	57%	+10

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

# GOAL 1: Ready to Learn

## State Indicator 5. Preschool Programs for Children with Disabilities

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the numbers of children with disabilities enrolled in preschool (per 1,000 3- to 5-year-olds)?

↑ Better 49 states  
 ↔ No Change 0 states  
 ↓ Worse 2 states

Update

### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1998, 49 states (out of 51) significantly increased the numbers of children with disabilities enrolled in preschool (per 1,000 3- to 5-year-olds):

1. Alabama	14. Iowa	27. Nevada	40. South Dakota
2. Alaska	15. Kansas	28. New Hampshire	41. Tennessee
3. Arizona	16. Kentucky	29. New Jersey	42. Texas
4. Arkansas	17. Louisiana	30. New Mexico	43. Utah
5. California	18. Maine	31. New York	44. Vermont
6. Colorado	19. Maryland	32. North Carolina	45. Virginia
7. Connecticut	20. Massachusetts	33. North Dakota	46. Washington
8. Delaware	21. Michigan	34. Ohio	47. West Virginia
9. Florida	22. Minnesota	35. Oklahoma	48. Wisconsin
10. Georgia	23. Mississippi	36. Oregon	49. Wyoming
11. Hawaii	24. Missouri	37. Pennsylvania	
12. Idaho	25. Montana	38. Rhode Island	
13. Indiana	26. Nebraska	39. South Carolina	

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest numbers of children with disabilities enrolled in preschool (per 1,000 3- to 5-year-olds):

	(1998)
Kentucky	96
Maine	82
Wyoming	81
West Virginia	80
Arkansas	78

No comparable national data available.

\* Top 5 states (out of 51).

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the numbers of children with disabilities enrolled in preschool (per 1,000 3- to 5-year-olds):

	(1991)	(1998)	Change*
West Virginia	43	80	+37
Arkansas	45	78	+33
New Mexico	28	60	+32
Kansas	33	61	+28
Kentucky	68	96	+28
Maine	54	82	+28

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 2: School Completion

### State Indicator 6. High School Completion Rates

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of 18- to 24-year-olds who have a high school credential?

↑	Better	5 states
↔	No Change	41 states and the U.S.
↓	Worse	5 states

Update

#### Achieved the Goal

Goal 2 states that by the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90%. In 1997, 18- to 24-year-olds in 17 (out of 51) states had already achieved a 90% high school completion rate:

1. Connecticut	6. Massachusetts	11. Nebraska	16. Vermont
2. Hawaii	7. Michigan	12. New Jersey	17. Wisconsin
3. Kansas	8. Minnesota	13. North Dakota	
4. Maine	9. Missouri	14. South Dakota	
5. Maryland	10. Montana	15. Utah	

#### Improvement over time

Between 1990 and 1997, 5 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of 18- to 24-year-olds who have a high school credential:

1. California	3. Michigan	5. Tennessee
2. Maryland	4. South Carolina	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of 18- to 24-year-olds with a high school credential:

	(1997)		(1997)
Maryland	95%	Nebraska	91%
North Dakota	95%	Utah	91%
Connecticut	92%	Wisconsin	91%
Hawaii	92%	Minnesota	90%
Kansas	92%	Missouri	90%
Maine	92%	Indiana	89%
New Jersey	92%	Ohio	89%
Massachusetts	91%	Pennsylvania	88%
Michigan	91%	<b>U.S.</b>	<b>85%</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of 18- to 24-year-olds with a high school credential:

	(1990)	(1997)	Change*
Tennessee	77%	87%	+10
Maryland	87%	95%	+7
Michigan	86%	91%	+5
South Carolina	83%	88%	+5
California	77%	81%	+4

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 2: School Completion

### State Indicator 7. High School Dropout Rates

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of students in Grades 9-12 who leave school without completing a recognized secondary program?

↑	Better	12 states
↔	No Change	3 states
↓	Worse	11 states

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1992 and 1997, 12 states (out of 26) significantly reduced the percentages of students in Grades 9-12 who left school without completing a recognized secondary program:

1. Connecticut	5. Missouri	9. Rhode Island
2. District of Columbia	6. Montana	10. West Virginia
3. Georgia	7. New York	11. Wyoming
4. Iowa	8. Ohio	12. Puerto Rico

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of students in Grades 9-12 who left school without completing a recognized secondary program:

	(1997)
Iowa	3%
Maine	3%
Massachusetts	3%
New York	3%
North Dakota	3%

No comparable national data available.

\* Top 5 states (out of 26).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of students in Grades 9-12 who left school without completing a recognized secondary program:

	(1992)	(1997)	Change*
Connecticut**	5%	4%	-1
District of Columbia**	12%	11%	-1
Georgia**	9%	8%	-1
Montana**	6%	5%	-1
Puerto Rico**	2%	2%	-1
Wyoming**	7%	6%	-1

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

\*\* Data for the District of Columbia were collected in 1992 and 1995.

Data for Connecticut were collected in 1993 and 1997.

Data for Georgia were collected in 1994 and 1997.

Data for Puerto Rico were collected in 1995 and 1996.

Data for Wyoming were collected in 1995 and 1997.

Data for Montana were collected in 1996 and 1997.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 8a. Reading Achievement — 4th grade

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement—Proficient or Advanced—on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 4th graders who score at or above Proficient in reading?

↑	Better	8 states
↔	No Change	36 states and the U.S.
↓	Worse	0 states

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1992 and 1998, 8 states (out of 44) significantly increased the percentage of public school 4th graders who scored at or above Proficient in reading:

1. Colorado	3. Kentucky	5. Maryland	7. Mississippi
2. Connecticut	4. Louisiana	6. Minnesota	8. Virgin Islands

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of public school 4th graders who scored at or above Proficient in reading:

	(1998)
Connecticut	46%
New Hampshire	38%
Massachusetts	37%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>31%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 4th graders who scored at or above Proficient in reading:

	(1992)	(1998)	Change*
Connecticut	34%	46%	+12
Colorado	25%	34%	+9
Kentucky	23%	29%	+6
Maryland	24%	29%	+5
Minnesota	31%	36%	+5
Virgin Islands	3%	8%	+5

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 8b. Reading Achievement — 8th grade

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders who score at or above Proficient in reading?

New

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because NAEP has assessed 8th grade reading only once at the state level. Reading will be assessed again in 2002.

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in reading:

	(1998)
Connecticut	42%
Maine	42%
Montana	38%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>33%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in reading:

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because NAEP has assessed 8th grade reading only once at the state level. Reading will be assessed again in 2002.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 9. Writing Achievement — 8th grade

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders who score at or above Proficient in writing?

New

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because NAEP has assessed 8th grade writing only once at the state level. Writing will be assessed again in 2002.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in writing:*

	(1998)
Connecticut	44%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>27%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in writing:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because NAEP has assessed 8th grade writing only once at the state level. Writing will be assessed again in 2002.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 10a. Mathematics Achievement — 4th grade

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 4th graders who score at or above Proficient in mathematics?

↑	Better	7 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	32 states
↓	Worse	0 states

#### Improvement over time

*Between 1992 and 1996, the U.S. and 7 states (out of 39) significantly increased the percentages of public school 4th graders who scored at or above Proficient in mathematics:*

1. Colorado	3. Indiana	5. Tennessee	7. West Virginia
2. Connecticut	4. North Carolina	6. Texas	

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 4th graders who scored at or above Proficient in mathematics:*

	(1996)
Connecticut	31%
Minnesota	29%
Maine	27%
Wisconsin	27%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>21%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 4th graders who scored at or above Proficient in mathematics:*

	(1992)	(1996)	Change*
Texas	15%	25%	+10
Indiana	16%	24%	+8
North Carolina	13%	21%	+8
Connecticut	24%	31%	+7
Tennessee	10%	17%	+7
West Virginia	12%	19%	+7

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 10b. Mathematics Achievement — 8th grade

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders who score at or above Proficient in mathematics?

↑	Better	27 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	19 states
↓	Worse	0 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1990 and 1996, the U.S. and 27 states (out of 46) significantly increased the percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in mathematics:

1. Arizona	8. Hawaii	15. Montana	22. Oregon
2. Arkansas	9. Indiana	16. Nebraska	23. Rhode Island
3. California	10. Iowa	17. New Hampshire*	24. Texas
4. Colorado	11. Kentucky	18. New Mexico	25. West Virginia
5. Connecticut	12. Maryland	19. New York	26. Wisconsin
6. Delaware	13. Michigan	20. North Carolina	27. Wyoming
7. Florida	14. Minnesota	21. North Dakota	

\* Data for New Hampshire were collected in 1990 and 1992.

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in mathematics:

	(1996)
Minnesota	34%
North Dakota	33%
Montana	32%
Wisconsin	32%
Connecticut	31%
Iowa	31%
Maine	31%
Nebraska	31%
Alaska	30%

**U.S.** 24%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in mathematics:

	(1990)	(1996)	Change*
Michigan	16%	28%	+12
Minnesota	23%	34%	+11
North Carolina	9%	20%	+11
Connecticut	22%	31%	+9
Wisconsin	23%	32%	+9

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 11. Science Achievement — 8th grade

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders who score at or above Proficient in science?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because NAEP has assessed science only once at the state level. Science will be assessed again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in science:*

	(1996)
Maine	41%
Montana	41%
North Dakota	41%
Wisconsin	39%
Massachusetts	37%
Minnesota	37%
Connecticut	36%
Iowa	36%
Nebraska	35%
Wyoming	34%

**U.S.** 29%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders who scored at or above Proficient in science:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because NAEP has assessed science only once at the state level. Science will be assessed again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### State Indicator 12. Advanced Placement Performance

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the number of Advanced Placement examinations receiving a grade of 3 or higher (per 1,000 11th and 12th graders)?

↑	Better	50 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	0 states
↓	Worse	1 state

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1999, the U.S. and 50 states (out of 51) significantly increased the numbers of Advanced Placement examinations receiving a grade of 3 or higher (per 1,000 11th and 12th graders):

1. Alabama	14. Illinois	27. Montana	40. Rhode Island
2. Alaska	15. Indiana	28. Nebraska	41. South Carolina
3. Arizona	16. Iowa	29. Nevada	42. South Dakota
4. Arkansas	17. Kansas	30. New Hampshire	43. Tennessee
5. California	18. Kentucky	31. New Jersey	44. Texas
6. Colorado	19. Louisiana	32. New Mexico	45. Utah
7. Connecticut	20. Maine	33. New York	46. Vermont
8. Delaware	21. Maryland	34. North Carolina	47. Virginia
9. District of Columbia	22. Massachusetts	35. North Dakota	48. Washington
10. Florida	23. Michigan	36. Ohio	49. West Virginia
11. Georgia	24. Minnesota	37. Oklahoma	50. Wisconsin
12. Hawaii	25. Mississippi	38. Oregon	
13. Idaho	26. Missouri	39. Pennsylvania	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest numbers of Advanced Placement examinations receiving a grade of 3 or higher (per 1,000 11th and 12th graders):

	(1999)
District of Columbia	244
New York	155
Virginia	152
Connecticut	148
Utah	144
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>97</b>

\* Top 5 states (out of 51).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the numbers of Advanced Placement examinations receiving a grade of 3 or higher (per 1,000 11th and 12th graders):

	(1991)	(1999)	Change*
District of Columbia	177	244	+67
Connecticut	83	148	+64
Massachusetts	82	142	+60
New Jersey	81	139	+59
New York	97	155	+58

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### State Indicator 13a. Teacher Preparation — Academic Degrees

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public secondary school teachers who hold an undergraduate or graduate degree in their main teaching assignment?

↑	Better	0 states
↔	No Change	42 states
↓	Worse	9 states and the U.S.

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, no state (out of 51) significantly increased the percentage of public secondary school teachers who hold an undergraduate or graduate degree in their main teaching assignment.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public secondary school teachers who hold an undergraduate or graduate degree in their main teaching assignment:*

	(1994)
Minnesota	81%
North Dakota	76%
Rhode Island	76%
Nebraska	75%
New York	75%
Connecticut	74%
District of Columbia	73%
Vermont	73%
Illinois	72%
Maryland	72%
Massachusetts	72%
Pennsylvania	72%
Wyoming	72%
New Hampshire	71%
Indiana	70%
Iowa	70%

**U.S.** 63%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public secondary school teachers who hold an undergraduate or graduate degree in their main teaching assignment:*

No state made a significant improvement between 1991 and 1994.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### State Indicator 13b. Teacher Preparation — Teaching Certificates

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public secondary school teachers who hold a teaching certificate in their main teaching assignment?

↑	Better	1 state
↔	No Change	41 states
↓	Worse	9 states and the U.S.

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, 1 state (out of 51) significantly increased the percentage of public secondary school teachers who hold a teaching certificate in their main teaching assignment:

- Oklahoma

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of public secondary school teachers who hold a teaching certificate in their main teaching assignment:

	(1994)		(1994)
North Dakota	100%	Vermont	98%
Rhode Island	100%	Arkansas	97%
Connecticut	99%	New Jersey	97%
Kansas	99%	North Carolina	97%
Michigan	99%	Ohio	97%
Nebraska	99%	Oregon	97%
Oklahoma	99%	Utah	97%
Pennsylvania	99%	Wisconsin	97%
West Virginia	99%	Alabama	96%
Wyoming	99%	Idaho	96%
Indiana	98%	Illinois	96%
Iowa	98%	Mississippi	96%
Minnesota	98%	New Hampshire	96%
Missouri	98%	New Mexico	96%
Montana	98%	Texas	96%
Nevada	98%	Arizona	95%
South Dakota	98%	<b>U.S.</b>	<b>93%**</b>
Tennessee	98%		

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public secondary school teachers who hold a teaching certificate in their main teaching assignment:

	(1991)	(1994)	Change*
Oklahoma	98%	99%	+1

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### State Indicator 14. Teacher Professional Development

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school teachers reporting that they participated in in-service or professional development programs on one or more topics since the end of the previous school year?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school teachers reporting that they participated in in-service or professional development programs on one or more topics since the end of the previous school year:*

	(1994)
Kentucky	98%
California	94%
North Carolina	93%
Texas	93%
Connecticut	92%
District of Columbia	92%
Alaska	90%
Iowa	89%
Kansas	89%
Washington	89%
Colorado	88%
Florida	88%
Hawaii	88%
Mississippi	88%
Oklahoma	88%

**U.S.** 85%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school teachers reporting that they participated in in-service or professional development programs on one or more topics since the end of the previous school year:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### State Indicator 15. Preparation to Teach Limited English Proficient Students

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school teachers with training to teach limited English proficient students?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school teachers with training to teach limited English proficient students:*

	(1994)
Florida	81%
California	64%
Hawaii	41%
Arizona	40%
New Mexico	39%
Alaska	33%
New York	32%
Rhode Island	29%
Texas	28%
Nevada	27%
Idaho	26%
District of Columbia	25%
Washington	23%
Oregon	22%

**U.S.** 16%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school teachers with training to teach limited English proficient students:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### State Indicator 16. Teacher Support

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school teachers who report that during their first year of teaching they participated in a formal teacher induction program to help beginning teachers by assigning them to a master or mentor teacher?

↑	Better	17 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	33 states
↓	Worse	1 state

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, the U.S. and 17 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of public school teachers who reported that during their first year of teaching they participated in a formal teacher induction program to help beginning teachers by assigning them to a master or mentor teacher:

1. Arizona	7. Indiana	13. South Carolina
2. California	8. Kentucky	14. Texas
3. Connecticut	9. Missouri	15. Utah
4. Delaware	10. New York	16. Virginia
5. Florida	11. North Carolina	17. Wisconsin
6. Idaho	12. Pennsylvania	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of public school teachers who reported that during their first year of teaching they participated in a formal teacher induction program to help beginning teachers by assigning them to a master or mentor teacher:

	(1994)
Florida	48%
Oklahoma	45%
Utah	40%
District of Columbia	39%
North Carolina	36%
California	35%
Kentucky	34%
Hawaii	33%

**U.S.** 27%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school teachers who reported that during their first year of teaching they participated in a formal teacher induction program to help beginning teachers by assigning them to a master or mentor teacher:

	(1991)	(1994)	Change*
North Carolina	24%	36%	+12
Pennsylvania	20%	31%	+11
Kentucky	24%	34%	+10
New York	21%	31%	+10
Indiana	14%	22%	+9
Virginia	21%	30%	+9

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 17a. International Mathematics Achievement — 8th grade

Have states<sup>1</sup> improved their international standing in 8th grade mathematics achievement?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because a research study designed to predict state performance on international mathematics assessments has been conducted only once. The Goals Panel will report changes in standing in mathematics achievement when new results become available from international assessments conducted in 1999.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States that would be expected to score as well as, or better than, 35 out of 41 nations<sup>°</sup> in 8th grade mathematics in 1995-1996:*

Iowa  
Maine  
Minnesota<sup>†</sup>  
Montana  
Nebraska  
North Dakota  
Wisconsin

*The U.S. scored as well as, or better than, 20 out of 40 nations in 8th grade mathematics.*

<sup>°</sup> Only Belgium (Flemish educational system), the Czech Republic, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, and Singapore would be expected to outperform these seven states in 8th grade mathematics.

<sup>†</sup> Results for Minnesota are based on actual scores, not estimated scores.  
See Appendix B.

\* Top 7 states.

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest reductions in the numbers of countries that would be expected to outperform them on international 8th grade mathematics assessments:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet, because a research study designed to predict state performance on international mathematics assessments has been conducted only once. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when new results become available from international mathematics assessments conducted in 1999.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 17b. International Science Achievement — 8th grade

Have states<sup>1</sup> improved their international standing in 8th grade science achievement?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because a research study designed to predict state performance on international science assessments has been conducted only once. The Goals Panel will report changes in standing in science achievement when new results become available from international assessments conducted in 1999.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States that would be expected to score as well as, or better than, 40 out of 41 nations<sup>°</sup> in 8th grade science in 1995-1996:*

Colorado  
Connecticut  
Iowa  
Maine  
Massachusetts  
Minnesota<sup>†</sup>  
Missouri<sup>†</sup>  
Montana  
Nebraska  
North Dakota  
Oregon<sup>†</sup>  
Utah  
Vermont  
Wisconsin  
Wyoming

*The U.S. scored as well as, or better than, 31 out of 40 nations in 8th grade science.*

<sup>°</sup> *Only Singapore would be expected to outperform these 15 states in 8th grade science.*

<sup>†</sup> *Results for Minnesota, Missouri, and Oregon are based on actual scores, not estimated scores. See Appendix B.*

<sup>\*</sup> *Top 15 states.*

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest reductions in the numbers of countries that would be expected to outperform them on international 8th grade science assessments:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet, because a research study designed to predict state performance on international science assessments has been conducted only once. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when new results become available from international science assessments conducted in 1999.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 18a. Mathematics Instructional Practices — Small Groups

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers report that they have students work in small groups or with a partner at least once a week?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they had students work in small groups or with a partner at least once a week:*

	(1996)
District of Columbia	92%
Guam	81%
California	79%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>66%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they had students work in small groups or with a partner at least once a week:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 18b. Mathematics Instructional Practices — Algebra and Functions

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers report that they address algebra and functions “a lot”?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they addressed algebra and functions “a lot”:*

	(1996)
Guam	82%
Virginia	73%
Utah	71%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>57%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they addressed algebra and functions “a lot”:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term “state” is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 18c. Mathematics Instructional Practices — Reasoning and Analytical Ability

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers report that they address reasoning and analytical ability “a lot”?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they addressed reasoning and analytical ability “a lot”:*

	(1996)
District of Columbia	64%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>52%**</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they addressed reasoning and analytical ability “a lot”:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term “state” is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 19. Mathematics Resources — Computers

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers report that they have computers available in their mathematics classrooms?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they had computers available in their mathematics classrooms:*

	(1996)
Tennessee	54%
Alaska	50%
Vermont	44%
District of Columbia	42%
Wyoming	41%

**U.S.** 30%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school 8th graders whose mathematics teachers reported that they had computers available in their mathematics classrooms:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 20a. Mathematics and Science Degrees — All Students

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentage of degrees earned by all students that were awarded in mathematics or science?

↑	Better	51 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	1 state
↓	Worse	2 states

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1996, the U.S. and 51 states (out of 54) significantly increased the percentage of degrees earned by all students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

1. Alabama	14. Iowa	27. Nevada	40. South Dakota
2. Alaska	15. Kansas	28. New Hampshire	41. Tennessee
3. Arizona	16. Kentucky	29. New Jersey	42. Texas
4. Arkansas	17. Louisiana	30. New Mexico	43. Utah
5. California	18. Maine	31. New York	44. Vermont
6. Colorado	19. Maryland	32. North Carolina	45. Virginia
7. Connecticut	20. Massachusetts	33. North Dakota	46. Washington
8. District of Columbia	21. Michigan	34. Ohio	47. West Virginia
9. Florida	22. Minnesota	35. Oklahoma	48. Wisconsin
10. Georgia	23. Mississippi	36. Oregon	49. Wyoming
11. Idaho	24. Missouri	37. Pennsylvania	50. Puerto Rico
12. Illinois	25. Montana	38. Rhode Island	51. Virgin Islands
13. Indiana	26. Nebraska	39. South Carolina	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of degrees earned by all students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

	(1996)
District of Columbia	54%
Maine	53%
Colorado	51%
Massachusetts	51%
Virginia	50%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>43%</b>

\* Top 5 states (out of 54).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of degrees earned by all students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

	(1991)	(1996)	Change*
Wyoming	40%	49%	+9
Arizona	26%	35%	+8
Mississippi	33%	41%	+8
West Virginia	32%	41%	+8
Connecticut	43%	49%	+7
Louisiana	37%	44%	+7
Montana	38%	45%	+7
Oregon	41%	47%	+7
Tennessee	36%	43%	+7

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 20b. Mathematics and Science Degrees — Minority Students

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentage of degrees earned by minority students (Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians/Alaskan Natives) that were awarded in mathematics or science?

↑	Better	37 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	9 states
↓	Worse	7 states

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1996, the U.S. and 37 states (out of 53) significantly increased the percentage of degrees earned by minority students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

1. Alabama	11. Kansas	21. New Jersey	31. Texas
2. Arizona	12. Kentucky	22. New Mexico	32. Vermont
3. Arkansas	13. Louisiana	23. North Carolina	33. Virginia
4. California	14. Maryland	24. North Dakota	34. Washington
5. Colorado	15. Minnesota	25. Oklahoma	35. Wisconsin
6. Connecticut	16. Mississippi	26. Oregon	36. Puerto Rico
7. District of Columbia	17. Montana	27. Rhode Island	37. Virgin Islands
8. Florida	18. Nebraska	28. South Carolina	
9. Indiana	19. Nevada	29. South Dakota	
10. Iowa	20. New Hampshire	30. Tennessee	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of degrees earned by minority students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

	(1996)
Maine	57%
Connecticut	54%
Montana	52%
Massachusetts	51%
New Hampshire	50%
New Jersey	50%
Oregon	50%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>40%</b>

\* Top 7 states (out of 53).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of degrees earned by minority students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

	(1991)	(1996)	Change*
Montana	39%	52%	+12
North Carolina	38%	47%	+9
Oregon	41%	50%	+9
Arizona	22%	29%	+7
Connecticut	47%	54%	+7

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 5: Mathematics and Science

### State Indicator 20c. Mathematics and Science Degrees — Female Students

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentage of degrees earned by female students that were awarded in mathematics or science?

↑	Better	51 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	1 state
↓	Worse	2 states

Update

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1996, the U.S. and 51 states (out of 54) significantly increased the percentage of degrees earned by female students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

1. Alabama	14. Iowa	27. Nevada	40. South Dakota
2. Alaska	15. Kansas	28. New Hampshire	41. Tennessee
3. Arizona	16. Kentucky	29. New Jersey	42. Texas
4. Arkansas	17. Louisiana	30. New Mexico	43. Utah
5. California	18. Maine	31. New York	44. Vermont
6. Colorado	19. Maryland	32. North Carolina	45. Virginia
7. Connecticut	20. Massachusetts	33. North Dakota	46. Washington
8. District of Columbia	21. Michigan	34. Ohio	47. West Virginia
9. Florida	22. Minnesota	35. Oklahoma	48. Wisconsin
10. Georgia	23. Mississippi	36. Oregon	49. Wyoming
11. Idaho	24. Missouri	37. Pennsylvania	50. Puerto Rico
12. Illinois	25. Montana	38. Rhode Island	51. Virgin Islands
13. Indiana	26. Nebraska	39. South Carolina	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of degrees earned by female students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

	(1996)
District of Columbia	52%
Massachusetts	50%
Maine	49%
Colorado	48%
Virginia	48%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>41%</b>

\* Top 5 states (out of 54).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of degrees earned by female students that were awarded in mathematics or science:

	(1991)	(1996)	Change*
Connecticut	37%	47%	+11
West Virginia	29%	39%	+10
Mississippi	30%	39%	+9
Montana	29%	38%	+9
Virginia	39%	48%	+9

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

### State Indicator 21. Adult Literacy

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of adults who score at or above Level 3 in prose literacy?

#### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the highest percentages of adults scoring at or above Level 3 in prose literacy:*

	(1992)
Washington	69%
Indiana	58%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>52%</b>

*\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.*

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of adults scoring at or above Level 3 in prose literacy:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

### State Indicator 22a. Voter Registration

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they registered to vote?

↑	Better	10 states and the U.S.
↔	No Change	41 states
↓	Worse	0 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1988 and 1996, the U.S. and 10 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of U.S. citizens registered to vote:

1. District of Columbia	4. Nevada	7. North Carolina	10. South Carolina
2. Georgia	5. New Hampshire	8. Oklahoma	
3. Kentucky	6. New York	9. Pennsylvania	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they registered to vote:

	(1996)
North Dakota	91%
Maine	84%
Minnesota	81%
Wisconsin	81%
District of Columbia	78%
Alaska	77%
Missouri	76%
Montana	76%
Nebraska	76%
Oregon	76%
Rhode Island	76%
Alabama	75%
Iowa	75%
Louisiana	75%
South Dakota	75%
Michigan	74%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>71%</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they registered to vote:

	(1988)	(1996)	Change*
District of Columbia	69%	78%	+8
Nevada	58%	66%	+8
South Carolina	61%	68%	+8
Kentucky	63%	70%	+7
New Hampshire	67%	73%	+6
North Carolina	65%	70%	+6

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

### State Indicator 22b. Voting

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they voted?

↑	Better	2 states
↔	No Change	49 states
↓	Worse	0 states and the U.S.

#### Improvement over time

Between 1988 and 1996, 2 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they voted:

1. District of Columbia
2. South Carolina

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they voted:

	(1996)
Maine	69%
Minnesota	69%
Montana	68%
Wyoming	67%
North Dakota	66%
South Dakota	65%
Wisconsin	65%
Oregon	64%
Rhode Island	64%
District of Columbia	63%
Iowa	63%
Kansas	63%
Louisiana	63%
Nebraska	63%
Idaho	62%
Washington	62%
California	61%
New Jersey	61%
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>58%</b>

\* States that had a significantly higher percentage than the U.S. average.

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of U.S. citizens who reported that they voted:

	(1988)	(1996)	Change*
District of Columbia	56%	63%	+7
South Carolina	50%	55%	+5

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

### State Indicator 23. Participation in Higher Education

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of high school graduates who immediately enroll in 2-year or 4-year colleges in any state?

↑	Better	39 states
↔	No Change	1 state
↓	Worse	11 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1992 and 1996, 39 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of high school graduates who immediately enrolled in 2-year or 4-year colleges in any state:

1. Alabama	11. Georgia	21. Mississippi	31. Ohio
2. Alaska	12. Hawaii	22. Missouri	32. Pennsylvania
3. Arizona	13. Indiana	23. Montana	33. Rhode Island
4. Arkansas	14. Kansas	24. Nevada	34. South Carolina
5. California	15. Kentucky	25. New Hampshire	35. Tennessee
6. Colorado	16. Maine	26. New Jersey	36. Texas
7. Connecticut	17. Maryland	27. New Mexico	37. Virginia
8. Delaware	18. Massachusetts	28. New York	38. West Virginia
9. District of Columbia	19. Michigan	29. North Carolina	39. Wyoming
10. Florida	20. Minnesota	30. North Dakota	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of high school graduates who immediately enrolled in 2-year or 4-year colleges in any state:

	(1996)
Massachusetts	73%
New York	71%
North Dakota	71%
Delaware	67%
California	66%
Rhode Island	66%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 6 states (out of 51).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of high school graduates who immediately enrolled in 2-year or 4-year colleges in any state:

	(1992)	(1996)	Change*
District of Columbia	33%	58%	+25
California	50%	66%	+16
South Carolina	43%	59%	+16
Massachusetts	60%	73%	+14
Delaware	57%	67%	+10

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### State Indicator 24. Student Marijuana Use

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public high school students who reported using marijuana at least once in the past 30 days?

↑	Better	0 states
↔	No Change	11 states
↓	Worse	16 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1997, no state (out of 27) significantly reduced the percentage of public high school students who reported using marijuana at least once during the past 30 days.

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of public high school students who reported using marijuana at least once during the past 30 days:

	(1997)
Utah	12%
American Samoa	14%
Virgin Islands	15%
Iowa	18%
South Dakota	20%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 5 states (out of 27).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public high school students who reported using marijuana at least once during the past 30 days:

No state has made a significant improvement during the 1990s.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### State Indicator 25. Student Alcohol Use

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public high school students who reported having five or more drinks in a row at least once during the past 30 days?

↑	Better	0 states
↔	No Change	27 states
↓	Worse	1 state

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1997, no state (out of 28) significantly reduced the percentage of public high school students who reported having five or more drinks in a row at least once during the past 30 days.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the lowest percentages of public high school students who reported having five or more drinks in a row at least once during the past 30 days:*

*(1997)*

Virgin Islands	11%
Utah	17%
District of Columbia	18%
American Samoa	20%
Guam	23%

*Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.*

*\* Top 5 states (out of 28).*

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public high school students who reported having five or more drinks in a row at least once during the past 30 days:*

No state has made a significant improvement during the 1990s.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### State Indicator 26. Availability of Drugs on School Property

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public high school students reporting that someone offered, sold, or gave them an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months?

↑	Better	1 state
↔	No Change	7 states
↓	Worse	15 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1993 and 1997, 1 state (out of 23) significantly reduced the percentage of public high school students reporting that someone offered, sold, or gave them an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months:

1. Virgin Islands

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of public high school students reporting that someone offered, sold, or gave them an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months:

	(1997)
Virgin Islands	15%
Iowa	23%
Mississippi	24%
District of Columbia	25%
American Samoa	25%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 5 states (out of 23).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public high school students reporting that someone offered, sold, or gave them an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months:

	(1993)	(1997)	Change*
Virgin Islands	27%	15%	-12

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

# GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

## State Indicator 27. Student Victimization

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public high school students reporting that they were threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property during the past 12 months?

↑	Better	1 state
↔	No Change	23 states
↓	Worse	0 states

### Improvement over time

Between 1993 and 1997, 1 state (out of 24) significantly reduced the percentage of public high school students reporting that they were threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property during the past 12 months:

- American Samoa

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of public high school students reporting that they were threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property during the past 12 months:

	(1997)
South Dakota	5%
Connecticut	6%
Hawaii	6%
Iowa	7%
Kentucky	7%
Montana	7%
New York	7%
Ohio	7%
Vermont	7%
Wyoming	7%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 10 states (out of 24).

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public high school students reporting that they were threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property during the past 12 months:

	(1993)	(1997)	Change*
American Samoa	15%	9%	-6

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

# GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

## State Indicator 28. Physical Fights

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public high school students reporting that they were in a physical fight on school property at least once during the past 12 months?

↑	Better	1 state
↔	No Change	23 states
↓	Worse	0 states

### Improvement over time

Between 1993 and 1997, 1 state (out of 24) significantly reduced the percentage of public high school students reporting that they were in a physical fight on school property at least once during the past 12 months:

1. Nevada

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of public high school students reporting that they were in a physical fight on school property at least once during the past 12 months:

	(1997)
South Dakota	11%
Connecticut	13%
Hawaii	13%
Kentucky	13%
Massachusetts	13%
Missouri	13%
Ohio	13%
South Carolina	13%
Vermont	13%
West Virginia	13%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 10 states (out of 24).

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public high school students reporting that they were in a physical fight on school property at least once during the past 12 months:

	(1993)	(1997)	Change*
Nevada	20%	15%	-5

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

# GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

## State Indicator 29. Carrying a Weapon

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public high school students reporting that they carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property at least once during the past 30 days?

↑	Better	4 states
↔	No Change	20 states
↓	Worse	0 states

### Improvement over time

Between 1993 and 1997, 4 states (out of 24) significantly reduced the percentages of public high school students reporting that they carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property at least once during the past 30 days:

- |                    |                   |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1. North Carolina* | 3. Wisconsin      |
| 2. South Carolina  | 4. American Samoa |

\* Data for North Carolina were collected in 1993 and 1995.

### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of public high school students reporting that they carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property at least once during the past 30 days:

	(1997)
Wisconsin	5%
Hawaii	6%
Guam	6%
Connecticut	7%
Louisiana	7%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 5 states (out of 24).

### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public high school students reporting that they carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property at least once during the past 30 days:

	(1993)	(1997)	Change*
North Carolina**	14%	9%	-5
American Samoa	14%	9%	-5
South Carolina	14%	10%	-4
Wisconsin	9%	5%	-4

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

\*\* Data for North Carolina were collected in 1993 and 1995.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### State Indicator 30. Student Safety

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of students reporting that they did not go to school at least once during the past 30 days because they did not feel safe?

↑	Better	1 state
↔	No Change	22 states
↓	Worse	1 state

#### Improvement over time

Between 1993 and 1997, 1 state (out of 24) significantly reduced the percentage of students reporting that they did not go to school at least once during the past 30 days because they did not feel safe:

- American Samoa

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of students reporting that they did not go to school at least once during the past 30 days because they did not feel safe:

	(1997)
Connecticut	3%
Iowa	3%
South Dakota	3%
Wisconsin	3%
Kentucky	4%
Maine	4%
Missouri	4%
Montana	4%
Ohio	4%
Vermont	4%
Wyoming	4%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 11 states (out of 24).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of students reporting that they did not go to school at least once during the past 30 days because they did not feel safe:

	(1993)	(1997)	Change*
American Samoa	23%	12%	-11

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

# GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

## State Indicator 31. Teacher Victimization

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public school teachers reporting that they were threatened or physically attacked by a student from their school during the past 12 months?

### Improvement over time

Improvement over time cannot be determined yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will report state improvements when this information is collected again in 2000.

### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the lowest percentages of public school teachers reporting that they were threatened or physically attacked by a student from their school during the past 12 months:*

	(1994)
North Dakota	8%
South Dakota	8%
California	9%
Maine	9%
Montana	9%
New Jersey	9%
Idaho	11%
Wyoming	11%
Illinois	12%
Kansas	12%

**U.S.** 15%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly lower percentage than the U.S. average.

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

### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public school teachers reporting that they were threatened or physically attacked by a student from their school during the past 12 months:*

The states that made the greatest improvements over time cannot be identified yet because this information has been collected only once at the state level since 1990. The Goals Panel will recognize the most-improved states when this information is collected again in 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### State Indicator 32. Disruptions in Class by Students

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public secondary school teachers reporting that student disruptions interfere with teaching?

↑	Better	0 states
↔	No Change	14 states
↓	Worse	37 states and the U.S.

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, no state (out of 51) significantly reduced the percentage of public secondary school teachers reporting that student disruptions interfere with teaching.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the lowest percentages of public secondary school teachers reporting that student disruptions interfere with teaching:*

(1994)

Montana	33%
North Dakota	33%
Oklahoma	39%
Wyoming	39%

**U.S.** 46%\*\*

\* States that had a significantly lower percentage than the U.S. average.

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

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public secondary school teachers reporting that student disruptions interfere with teaching:*

No state made a significant improvement between 1991 and 1994.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 8: Parental Participation

### State Indicator 33a. Parental Involvement in Schools — Teachers' Perspective

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public school teachers reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem?

↑	Better	0 states
↔	No Change	45 states
↓	Worse	6 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, no state (out of 51) significantly reduced the percentage of public school teachers reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem.

#### Highest-performing states\*

*States with the lowest percentages of public school teachers reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem:*

	(1994)
North Dakota	13%
Minnesota	14%
Nebraska	15%
Maine	17%
Vermont	17%
Wyoming	17%

*Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.*

*\* Top 6 states (out of 51).*

#### Most-improved states

*States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public school teachers reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem:*

No state made a significant improvement between 1991 and 1994.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 8: Parental Participation

### State Indicator 33b. Parental Involvement in Schools — Principals' Perspective

Have states<sup>1</sup> reduced the percentages of public school principals reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem?

↑	Better	3 states
↔	No Change	46 states
↓	Worse	2 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, 3 states (out of 51) significantly reduced the percentages of public school principals reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem:

1. California
2. Colorado
3. Indiana

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the lowest percentages of public school principals reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem:

	(1994)
North Dakota	3%
Maine	5%
Massachusetts	5%
Minnesota	6%
Nebraska	6%
Vermont	6%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 6 states (out of 51).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest reductions in the percentages of public school principals reporting that lack of parental involvement in their schools is a serious problem:

	(1991)	(1994)	Change*
Indiana	19%	9%	-10
California	20%	11%	-8
Colorado	17%	8%	-8

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.

## GOAL 8: Parental Participation

### State Indicator 34. Influence of Parent Associations

Have states<sup>1</sup> increased the percentages of public school principals reporting that the parent associations in their schools have influence in one or more of three areas of school policy?

↑	Better	17 states
↔	No Change	34 states
↓	Worse	0 states

#### Improvement over time

Between 1991 and 1994, 17 states (out of 51) significantly increased the percentages of public school principals reporting that the parent associations in their schools have influence in one or more of three areas of school policy:

1. Alaska	6. Kentucky	11. Oklahoma	16. Vermont
2. Arizona	7. Massachusetts	12. Pennsylvania	17. Wisconsin
3. Colorado	8. Nevada	13. Rhode Island	
4. Idaho	9. New Mexico	14. Texas	
5. Iowa	10. New York	15. Utah	

#### Highest-performing states\*

States with the highest percentages of public school principals reporting that the parent associations in their schools have influence in one or more of three areas of school policy:

	(1994)
Colorado	50%
Alaska	43%
New Mexico	40%
Kentucky	37%
California	36%

Indicators are not the same at the national and state levels.

\* Top 5 states (out of 51).

#### Most-improved states

States that made the greatest gains in the percentages of public school principals reporting that the parent associations in their schools have influence in one or more of three areas of school policy:

	(1991)	(1994)	Change*
Colorado	28%	50%	+22
Kentucky	17%	37%	+20
Pennsylvania	10%	28%	+18
Vermont	8%	24%	+17
Alaska	27%	43%	+16
New York	18%	34%	+16
Utah	17%	33%	+16

\* Differences between the first two columns may differ slightly from the figures reported in the "change" column due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas.



## Technical Notes and Sources for the National Indicators

### General Information

#### Statistical significance

In this report, the term “significance” refers to statistical significance and indicates that change over time is not likely to have occurred by chance. The majority of indicators in this report are based on samples and not entire populations. For example, mathematics achievement results were obtained by sampling a portion of the nation’s 4th, 8th, and 12th graders. This enables the nation and the states to use smaller, cost-efficient samples to predict how the entire student population would have performed on an assessment without testing all of them. This is similar to a public opinion poll that predicts, with a certain degree of confidence, how all individuals would have responded to a set of questions had they all been polled.

It is important to note that any estimate based on a sample contains a small amount of imprecision, or sampling error. The estimate would be slightly higher or slightly lower if a different sample were chosen. Public opinion polls account for this error when they caution that their results are “accurate within plus or minus three percentage points.”

If we want to determine whether the nation and the states have made progress over time, we must apply a statistical test to tell us whether there are likely to be differences in actual performance over time in the entire population. The statistical test takes into account not only the difference between the measures, but also the precision of the estimate for each measure. If the test indicates that there are likely to be differences in performance between groups in the entire population, we say that the difference is statistically significant. This means that the differences are not likely to have occurred by chance, and we can be confident that performance has changed over time.

All differences in this report that are termed “statistically significant” are measured at the 0.05 level. For formulas and more detailed technical information, see the 1999 *Data Volume for the National Education Goals Report*.

### Goal 1: Ready to Learn

#### 1. Children’s Health Index

The percentages of infants at risk are based on the number of births used to calculate the health index, not the actual number of births. The percentage of complete and usable birth records used to calculate the 1997 health index varied from a high of 99.9% to a low of 75.3%. Four states (California, Indiana, New York, and South Dakota) did not collect information on all four risks in 1997; five states (California, Indiana, New York, Oklahoma, and South Dakota) did not collect information on all four risks in 1990. These states and the outlying areas are not included in the U.S. total.

Risks are late (in third trimester) or no prenatal care, low maternal weight gain (less than 21 pounds), mother smoked during pregnancy, or mother drank alcohol during pregnancy. The National Center for Health Statistics notes that alcohol use during pregnancy is likely to be underreported on the birth certificate.

**Source:** Nicholas Zill and Christine Winquist Nord of Westat developed the concept of the Children’s Health Index. Stephanie Ventura and Sally Curtin of the National Center for Health Statistics provided the special tabulations of the 1990 and 1997 birth certificate data needed to produce the index, July 1999.

#### 2. Immunizations

The Goals Panel reports data from 1994 as the baseline year for immunizations. This was the first year for which data were collected using the National Immunization Survey (NIS). In prior years, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention collected data on immunizations using the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS). The

Goals Panel does not compare data from NIS and NHIS, due to methodological differences between the two instruments.

“Two-year-olds” are defined as children 19 to 35 months of age. “Fully immunized” is defined as four doses of diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine, three doses of polio vaccine, and one dose of measles or measles-mumps-rubella vaccine.

**Sources:** 1994 National Immunization Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, August 25, 1995, 619; unpublished tabulations from Abt Associates, July 1997.

1997 National Immunization Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, July 10, 1998, 547; unpublished tabulations from Abt Associates, August 1998.

### 3. Family-Child Reading and Storytelling

The population estimates for the National Household Education Survey (NHES) cover 3- to 5-year-old children who are not yet enrolled in kindergarten. Age from the NHES:93 was established as of January 1, 1993; age from the NHES:99 was established as of December 31, 1998.

In the NHES:93, information on daily reading was collected using two approaches with split-half samples. The two approaches did not result in significantly different estimates for daily reading among 3- to 5-year-old preschoolers. A combined measure using both items for NHES:93 is included in this report.

“Parents” includes parents or other family members. Figures combine responses of “read to every day” and “told a story three or more times a week.”

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1993 School Readiness Interview, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1994.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education

Survey: 1999 Parent Interview, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1999.

### 4. Preschool Participation

The population estimates for the NHES cover 3- to 5-year-old children who are not yet enrolled in kindergarten. Age from the NHES:91 was established as of January 1, 1991; age from the NHES:99 was established as of December 31, 1998. Preschool participation includes children enrolled in any center-based program, including nursery schools, prekindergarten programs, preschools, day care centers, and Head Start.

“High income” is defined as a family income of \$50,000 or more. “Low income” is defined as family income of \$10,000 or less.

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1991 Early Childhood Component, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1994.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1999 Parent Interview, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1999.

## Goal 2: School Completion

### 5. High School Completion

The high school completion rates for 18- to 24-year-olds are computed as a percentage of the non-high school enrolled population at these ages who hold a high school credential (either a high school diploma or an alternative credential, such as a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, Individualized Education Program (IEP) credential, or certificate of attendance).

**Source:** U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990 and 1998 October Current Population Surveys, unpublished tabulations prepared by the National Center for Education Statistics and MPR Associates, Inc., October 1999.

## Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

### 6. Reading Achievement

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). These levels were established by the National Assessment Governing Board.

**Source:** Donahue, P., Voelkl, K., Campbell, J., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP 1998 reading report card for the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

### 7. Writing Achievement

During 1999, student achievement levels were established for writing by the National Assessment Governing Board. The percentages of U.S. 4th, 8th, and 12th graders who performed at the two highest levels of achievement—Proficient or Advanced—on the 1998 NAEP writing assessment are presented for the first time in this year’s *Goals Report*. This information replaces data that were previously reported from the 1992 NAEP Writing Portfolio Study before the student achievement levels were available.

**Source:** Greenwald, E., Persky, H., Campbell J., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP 1998 writing report card for the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

### 8. Mathematics Achievement

See technical note under indicator 6.

**Source:** Reese, C.M., Miller, K.E., Mazzeo, J., & Dossey, J.A. (1997). *NAEP 1996 mathematics report card for the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

### 9. Science Achievement

See technical note under indicator 6.

**Source:** Bourque, M.L., Champagne, A., & Crissman, S. (1997). *1996 science performance standards: Achievement results for the nation and states, a first look*. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board.

### 10. Civics Achievement

See technical note under indicator 6.

**Source:** National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), *1998 civics assessment*. [Table 1.2]

### 11. History Achievement

See technical note under indicator 6.

**Source:** Williams, P.L., Lazer, S., Reese, C.M., & Carr, P. (1995). *1994 NAEP U.S. history: A first look*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

### 12. Geography Achievement

See technical note under indicator 6.

**Source:** Williams, P.L., Reese, C.M., Lazer, S., & Shakrani, S. (1995). *1994 NAEP world geography: A first look*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

## Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### 13. Teacher Preparation

Only secondary school teachers whose main assignment was in mathematics, science, English, social studies, fine arts, foreign language, and special education were included in the analysis of whether a teacher had a degree in his/her main assignment. Information is not reported for bilingual education or English as a Second Language (ESL) degrees, since relatively few higher education institutions grant degrees in those fields.

“Undergraduate or graduate degree” includes academic or education majors, but does not include minors or second majors.

A secondary teacher is one who, when asked about grades taught, checked:

- “Ungraded” and was designated as a secondary teacher on the list of teachers provided by the school; or
- 6th grade or lower and 7th grade or higher, and reported a primary assignment other than prekindergarten, kindergarten, or general elementary; or
- 9th grade or higher, or 9th grade or higher and “ungraded;” or
- 7th and 8th grades only, and reported a primary assignment other than kindergarten, general elementary, or special education; or
- 7th and 8th grades only, and reported a primary assignment of special education and was designated as a secondary teacher on the list of teachers provided by the school; or
- 6th grade or lower and 7th grade or higher, or 7th and 8th grades only, and was not categorized above as either elementary or secondary.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Teacher Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

#### 14. Teacher Professional Development

Selected topics for professional development include uses of educational technology, methods of teaching subject field, in-depth study in subject field, and student assessment.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Teacher Survey of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

## Goal 5: Mathematics and Science

### 15. International Mathematics Achievement

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Pursuing excellence: A study of U.S. eighth-grade mathematics and science teaching, learning, curriculum, and achievement in international context.* NCES 97-198. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Pursuing excellence: A study of U.S. fourth-grade mathematics and science achievement in international context.* NCES 97-255. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Pursuing excellence: A study of U.S. twelfth-grade mathematics and science achievement in international context,* NCES 98-049, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

### 16. International Science Achievement

**Sources:** *Ibid.*

### 17. Mathematics and Science Degrees

Data include only U.S. citizens and resident aliens on permanent visas. Degrees awarded by institutions in the outlying areas are included in the U.S. percentages.

Mathematical sciences is the only field of study included in the mathematics category for this report. Fields of study in the science category for this report include: engineering; physical sciences; geosciences; computer science; life sciences (includes medical and agricultural sciences); social sciences; and science and engineering technologies (includes health technologies).

**Source:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS 1991 and 1996), which is conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics. The data were analyzed by Westat, using the National Science Foundation’s WebCASPAR Database System, August 1999.

## Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

### 18. Adult Literacy

The U.S. Department of Education and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) characterized the literacy of America's adults in terms of three "literacy scales" representing distinct and important aspects of literacy: prose, document, and quantitative literacy. Each of the literacy scales has five levels, with Level 1 being least proficient and Level 5 being most proficient.

Prose literacy, selected as a national indicator for this report, is defined as the knowledge and skills needed to understand and use information from texts that include editorials, news stories, poems, and fiction — for example, finding a piece of information in a newspaper article, interpreting instructions from a warranty, inferring a theme from a poem, or contrasting views expressed in an editorial.

**Source:** Kirsch, I.S., Jungeblut, A., Jenkins, L., & Kolstad, A. (1993, September). *Adult literacy in America: A first look at the results of the National Adult Literacy Survey*, p. 17. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

### 19. Participation in Adult Education

Adults 17 years old and older who participated in one or more adult education activities on a full-time, but not on a part-time, basis in the previous 12 months are excluded from both the numerator and denominator in the calculations of adult education participation.

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1991 Adult Education Component, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1994.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1999 Adult Education Interview, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1999.

### 20. Participation in Higher Education

Disparities in college entrance rates between White and minority high school graduates are based on three-year

averages (1989-1991 for 1990; 1996-1998 for 1997). College completion rates are based on adults aged 25 to 29. "College" includes junior colleges, community colleges, and universities. "College degree" includes Associate's degrees, Bachelor's degrees, and graduate/professional degrees.

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, October Current Population Surveys, 1989-1991 and 1996-1998; unpublished tabulations from the National Center for Education Statistics, prepared by Pinkerton Computer Consultants, Inc., July 1999.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1992 and 1998 March Current Population Surveys; unpublished tabulations from the National Center for Education Statistics, prepared by Pinkerton Computer Consultants, Inc., July 1999.

## Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### 21. Overall Student Drug and Alcohol Use

Use of any illicit drug includes any use of marijuana, hallucinogens, cocaine, heroin, inhalants, or any use of stimulants or tranquilizers not under a doctor's orders.

**Source:** Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., & Bachman, J.G. (1999, July). *Selected outcome measures from the Monitoring the Future Study for Goal 7 of the National Education Goals: A special report for the National Education Goals Panel*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

### 22. Sale of Drugs at School

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 23. Student and Teacher Victimization

- Student Victimization.

Threats and injuries to students include those made with or without a weapon.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

- Teacher Victimization

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-free Schools, FRSS 42, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1994.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Teacher Survey of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

## 24. Disruptions in Class by Students

- Student Reports.

Figure represents responses from students who reported that during an average week, misbehavior by other students interfered with their own learning six times a week or more.

**Source:** Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., & Bachman, J.G. (1999, July). Selected outcome measures from the Monitoring the Future Study for Goal 7 of the National Education Goals: A special report for the National Education Goals Panel. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

- Teacher Reports.

Figure represents responses from teachers who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that student misbehavior interferes with their teaching.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Teacher Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

## Goal 8: Parental Participation

### 25. Schools' Reports of Parent Attendance at Parent-Teacher Conferences

Survey respondents were principals or their designees. "More than half" included responses of "more than half"

and "most or all" combined. Data include only those public schools in which the school reported that it held regularly scheduled schoolwide parent-teacher conferences during the year.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, Survey on Family and School Partnerships in Public Schools, K-8, FRSS 58, 1996, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1996.

### 26. Schools' Reports of Parent Involvement in School Policy Decisions

Survey respondents were principals or their designees. Data include responses of "moderate extent" and "great extent" combined. Policy areas include: allocation of funds; curriculum or overall instructional program; the design of special programs; library books and materials; discipline policies and procedures; health-related topics or policies; monitoring or evaluating teachers; or developing parent involvement activities.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 27. Parents' Reports of Their Involvement in School Activities

In the NHES:99, data for the three variables included in this report (attendance at a general school meeting, attendance at a school or class event, and acting as a volunteer at the school or serving on a school committee) were collected for a split-half of the sample. The other split-half of the sample included items that were worded slightly differently.

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1993 School Safety and Discipline Component, unpublished tabulations, National Center for Education Statistics, August 1995.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey: 1999 Parent Interview, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1999.

## Technical Notes and Sources for the State Indicators

### General Information

See general technical notes regarding statistical significance in Appendix A.

### State and U.S. Comparisons

For the state-level indicators on student achievement (8-11) and the mathematics instructional practices (18-19), the state data include public school students only, while the U.S. data include both public and nonpublic school students. For the indicators on teacher education and professional development (13-16), and teacher victimization and student disruptions (31-32), the state data include public school teachers only, while the U.S. data include both public and nonpublic school teachers.

### Goal 1: Ready to Learn

#### 1. Children's Health Index

The percentages of infants at risk are based on the number of births used to calculate the health index, not the actual number of births. The percentage of complete and usable birth records used to calculate the 1997 health index varied from a high of 99.9% to a low of 75.3%. Four states (California, Indiana, New York, and South Dakota) did not collect information on all four risks in 1997; five states (California, Indiana, New York, Oklahoma, and South Dakota) did not collect information on all four risks in 1990. These states and the outlying areas are not included in the U.S. total.

Risks are late (in third trimester) or no prenatal care, low maternal weight gain (less than 21 pounds), mother smoked during pregnancy, or mother drank alcohol during pregnancy.

The National Center for Health Statistics notes that alcohol use during pregnancy is likely to be underreported on the birth certificate.

**Source:** Nicholas Zill and Christine Winquist Nord of Westat developed the concept of the Children's Health Index. Stephanie Ventura and Sally Curtin of the National Center for Health Statistics provided the special tabulations of the 1990 and 1997 birth certificate data needed to produce the index, July 1999.

#### 2. Immunizations

The Goals Panel reports data from 1994 as the baseline year for immunizations. This was the first year for which data were collected using the National Immunization Survey (NIS). In prior years, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention collected data on immunization using the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS). The Goals Panel does not compare data from NIS and NHIS, due to methodological differences between the two instruments.

"Two-year-olds" are defined as children 19 to 35 months of age. "Fully immunized" is defined as four doses of diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine, three doses of polio vaccine, and one dose of measles or measles-mumps-rubella vaccine.

**Sources:** 1994 National Immunization Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, August 25, 1995, 619; unpublished tabulations from Abt Associates, July 1997.

1997 National Immunization Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, July 10, 1998, 547; unpublished tabulations from Abt Associates, August 1998.

#### 3. Low Birthweight

**Source:** U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, unpublished tabulations from Division of Vital Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics; prepared by Westat, July 1999.

#### 4. Early Prenatal Care

Prenatal care refers to the first visit for health care services during pregnancy.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

#### 5. Preschool Programs for Children with Disabilities

The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) supports the improvement of services for very young children with disabilities through several programs, including the Program for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities (Part C), the Preschool Grants Program (Section 619 of Part B), and the Early Education Program for Children with Disabilities (Section 623 of Part C). The Congressional mandate required states to have a mandate in place by school year 1991-1992 that ensures a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for all eligible 3- to 5-year-old children with disabilities.

Data are based on state information submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) on the number of children with disabilities served under IDEA, Part B and Chapter 1 (ESEA State-Operated Programs [SOP]) programs. Data for the outlying areas are presented for the first time in this year's *Goals Report*.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, July 1999. Percentage of children served is based on U.S. Census Bureau Estimated Resident Population, by state, for July 1997.

### Goal 2: School Completion

#### 6. High School Completion Rates

The high school completion rates for 18- to 24-year-olds are computed as a percentage of the non-high school enrolled population at these ages who hold a high school credential (either a high school diploma or an alternative credential, such as a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, Individualized Education Program (IEP) credential, or certificate of attendance).

Because of small sample sizes, the state-level completion data are calculated using three-year averages. For example, for the baseline year, state data for 1990 reflect an average of 1989, 1990, and 1991. For the most recent update year, state data for 1997 reflect an average of 1996, 1997, and 1998. The percentage for the U.S. that is shown on page 29 is for 1998.

Although Vermont and Montana did have 1997 high school completion rates of 94% and 91%, respectively, they do not appear in the list of highest-performing states. This is also the case for South Dakota, which had a high school completion rate of 90%. Because the standard errors for these states were fairly large, their high school completion rates were not significantly higher than the 85% national average when tests of statistical significance were performed. Adjustments for multiple comparisons were made using the Benjamini/Hochberg application of the False Discovery Rate (FDR) criterion.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1989-1991 and 1996-1998 October Current Population Surveys; unpublished tabulations prepared by the National Center for Education Statistics and MPR Associates, Inc., October 1999.

#### 7. High School Dropout Rates

The Common Core of Data (CCD) defines a dropout as an individual who: (1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; (2) was not enrolled on October 1 of the current school year; (3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and (4) does not meet any exclusionary conditions. The 1991-1992 school year was the first for which states reported school district-level data on the numbers and types of dropouts in the CCD Agency Universe Survey. For the 1991-1992 school year, 10 states and the District of Columbia reported data that were considered to meet the CCD standards to allow publication of their dropout data. For the 1996-1997 school year, 26 states reported data that met CCD standards.

**Sources:** Hoffman, L.M. (1995). *State dropout data collection practices: 1991-1992 school year*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

McMillen, M.M., & Kaufman, P. (1996). *Dropout rates in the United States: 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

McMillen, M.M., Kaufman, P., & Klein, S. (1997). *Dropout rates in the United States: 1995*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

McMillen, M.M. (1998). *Dropout rates in the United States: 1996*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Hoffman, L. (1999). *Overview of public elementary and secondary schools and districts: School year 1996-1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Hoffman, L. (1999). *Overview of public elementary and secondary schools and districts: School year 1997-1998*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

### Goal 3: Student Achievement and Citizenship

#### 8. Reading Achievement

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). These levels were established by the National Assessment Governing Board.

In 1992, 44 jurisdictions (states, the District of Columbia, and outlying areas) participated in the 4th-grade state-level NAEP reading assessment.

In 1994, 43 jurisdictions participated in the voluntary assessment of 4th graders. However, two states, Idaho and Michigan, did not meet the minimum school participation guidelines for public schools; therefore, their results were not released. It should be noted that Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Wisconsin did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates in 1994.

In 1998, 42 jurisdictions participated in the state-level reading assessment of 4th graders, and 39 jurisdictions participated in the first state-level reading assessment of 8th graders. One state, Illinois, failed to meet the minimum school participation guidelines for public schools at both Grade 4 and Grade 8; therefore, no results for Illinois were released. Nine states did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates at Grade 4: California, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, and Wisconsin. Seven states did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates at Grade 8: California, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New York, and Wisconsin.

Students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency are included in the samples of students who take NAEP assessments unless they meet well-defined criteria for exclusion. In some states, the exclusion rates for these groups of students changed between the 1994 and 1998 NAEP reading assessments. The National Center for Education Statistics is examining possible relationships between changes in state-level performance at Grade 4 between 1994 and 1998, and changes in exclusion rates for these groups of students. For further information, please contact Peggy Carr of the National Center for Education Statistics, at (202) 219-1576, [peggy\\_carr@ed.gov](mailto:peggy_carr@ed.gov).

**Source:** Donahue, P., Voelkl, K., Campbell, J., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP 1998 reading report card for the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

## 9. Writing Achievement

During 1999, student achievement levels were established for writing by the National Assessment Governing Board. The percentages of 8th graders who performed at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the state-level NAEP writing assessment in 1998 are presented in this year's Goals Report. This is the first year that NAEP assessed writing at the state level.

In 1998, 38 jurisdictions (states, the District of Columbia, and outlying areas) participated in the 8th grade state-level NAEP writing assessment. One state, Illinois, failed to meet the minimum school participation guidelines for public schools; therefore, no results for Illinois were released. Five states did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates: California, Minnesota, Montana, New York, and Wisconsin.

**Source:** Greenwald, E., Persky, H., Campbell, J., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP 1998 writing report card for the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

## 10. Mathematics Achievement

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. These levels were established by the National Assessment Governing Board.

Forty jurisdictions (states, the District of Columbia, and outlying areas) participated in the 1990 trial mathematics assessment of 8th graders, and 44 jurisdictions participated in the 1992 state mathematics assessments of 4th and 8th graders.

In 1996, 45 jurisdictions participated in the voluntary assessment of 4th and 8th graders. However, three states (Nevada, New Hampshire, and New Jersey) failed to meet the minimum school participation guidelines for

public schools at Grade 8; therefore, their results were not released. The following states did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates at Grade 4: Alaska, Arkansas, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Vermont. The following states did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates at Grade 8: Alaska, Arkansas, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New York, South Carolina, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

**Sources:** Reese, C.M., Miller, K.E., Mazzeo, J., & Dossey, J.A. (1997). *NAEP 1996 mathematics report card for the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 and 1992 NAEP Mathematics Data (revised), October 1996.

## 11. Science Achievement

The National Education Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. These levels were established by the National Assessment Governing Board.

In 1996, 45 states participated in the voluntary program. However, three states (Nevada, New Hampshire, and New Jersey) failed to meet the minimum school participation guidelines for public schools; therefore, their results were not released. The following states did not satisfy one of the guidelines for school sample participation rates: Alaska, Arkansas, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New York, South Carolina, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

**Source:** Bourque, M.L., Champagne, A., & Crissman, S. (1997). *1996 science performance standards: Achievement results for the nation and states, a first look*. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board.

## 12. Advanced Placement Performance

The Advanced Placement program, sponsored by the College Board, provides a way for high schools to offer college-level coursework to students. At present, one or more course descriptions, examinations, and sets of curricular materials are available in art, biology, chemistry, computer science, economics, English, French, German, government and politics, history, Latin, mathematics, music, physics, and Spanish. Advanced Placement examinations, which are given in May, are graded on a five-point scale: 5 — extremely well qualified; 4 — well qualified; 3 — qualified; 2 — possibly qualified; and 1 — no recommendation. Grades of 3 and above generally are accepted for college credit and advanced placement at participating colleges and universities.

The number of Advanced Placement examinations graded 3 or above per 1,000 11th and 12th graders is presented in this report. The number of 11th and 12th graders includes public and private students. The enrollment figures were arrived at by multiplying the public enrollment by a private-enrollment adjustment factor.

**Source:** The College Board, Advanced Placement Program, Results from the 1991 and 1999 Advanced Placement Examinations, unpublished tabulations, August 1991 and August 1999.

## Goal 4: Teacher Education and Professional Development

### 13. Teacher Preparation

Only secondary school teachers whose main assignment was in mathematics, science, English, social studies, fine arts, foreign language, and special education were included in the analysis of whether a teacher had a degree in his/her main assignment. Information is not reported for bilingual education or English as a Second Language (ESL) degrees, since relatively few higher education institutions grant degrees in those fields. "Undergraduate or graduate degrees" includes academic or education majors, but does not include minors or second majors.

A secondary teacher is one who, when asked about grades taught, checked:

- "Ungraded" and was designated as a secondary teacher on the list of teachers provided by the school; or
- 6th grade or lower and 7th grade or higher, and reported a primary assignment other than prekindergarten, kindergarten, or general elementary; or
- 9th grade or higher, or 9th grade or higher and "ungraded;" or
- 7th and 8th grades only, and reported a primary assignment other than kindergarten, general elementary, or special education; or
- 7th and 8th grades only, and reported a primary assignment of special education and was designated as a secondary teacher on the list of teachers provided by the school; or
- 6th grade or lower and 7th grade or higher, or 7th and 8th grades only, and was not categorized above as either elementary or secondary.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Teacher Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

### 14. Teacher Professional Development

Selected topics for professional development include uses of educational technology, methods of teaching subject field, in-depth study in subject field, and student assessment.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Teacher Survey of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

## 15. Preparation to Teach Limited English Proficient Students

**Source:** *Ibid.*

## 16. Teacher Support

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Teacher Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

## Goal 5: Mathematics and Science

### 17. International Mathematics and Science Achievement

International comparisons of student achievement in 8th grade mathematics and science are presented, using data from a 1998 research study. This study statistically links state results from the 1996 NAEP with country results from the 1995 Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). TIMSS is the most comprehensive international study of mathematics and science achievement conducted to date. TIMSS tested half a million students in 41 countries in 30 different languages. Participating countries included the United States and some of the United States' chief economic competitors and trading partners, such as Japan, Germany, Canada, England, France, Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, and the Russian Federation.

Linking the two assessments allows us to predict how each state would have performed on TIMSS, relative to the 41 countries that actually participated in the international assessment, on the basis of each state's NAEP performance. The authors of the linking study caution that the technique used to link the two tests can provide only limited information, since NAEP and TIMSS cover different content and were taken by different groups of students at different times. Nevertheless, the technique can provide broad comparisons that tell states which countries' students would be expected to score significantly higher than, similar to, or significantly lower than their own students in mathematics and science on this international assessment.

In 1995, representative samples of 8th graders in Illinois and Minnesota took the same mathematics and science assessments as the students in the 41 participating TIMSS nations. Results shown for Illinois and Minnesota, therefore, are based on actual scores, not estimated scores. Missouri and Oregon also took the same TIMSS assessments in 1997. Their results are also based on actual scores, not estimated scores.

**Sources:** Johnson, E.G., & Siegendorf, A. (1998). *Linking the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the Third International Mathematics and Science Study: Eighth grade results*. Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 98-500. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Mullis, I., Martin, M., Beaton, A., Gonzalez, E., Kelly, D., & Smith, T. (1998). *Mathematics achievement in Missouri and Oregon in an international context: 1997 TIMSS benchmarking*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Boston College.

Martin, M., Mullis, I., Beaton, A., Gonzalez, E., Smith, T., & Kelly, D. (1998). *Science achievement in Missouri and Oregon in an international context: 1997 TIMSS benchmarking*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Boston College.

Illinois TIMSS Task Force. (1997, September). *An initial analysis of the Illinois results from the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)*. Author.

### 18. Mathematics Instructional Practices

**Source:** NAEP 1996 Mathematics Cross-State Data Compendium for the Grade 4 and Grade 8 Assessment. Findings from the State Assessment in Mathematics of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NCES 97-495; and unpublished tabulations from the Educational Testing Service, August 1997.

## 19. Mathematics Resources

**Source:** *Ibid.*

## 20. Mathematics and Science Degrees

Data include only U.S. citizens and resident aliens on permanent visas. Degrees awarded by institutions in the outlying areas are included in the U.S. percentages.

Mathematical sciences is the only field of study included in the mathematics category for this report. Fields of study in the science category for this report include: engineering; physical sciences; geosciences; computer science; life sciences (includes medical and agricultural sciences); social sciences; and science and engineering technologies (includes health technologies).

No percentages are reported for mathematics and science degrees awarded to minority students in Guam due to insufficient population size.

Baseline data on mathematics and science degrees have been modified from previous *Goals Reports* for California and New Hampshire. Degree-granting institutions in these states that had been classified as “state unknown” in 1991 have since been reassigned to the appropriate states.

**Source:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS 1991 and 1996), which is conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics. The data were analyzed by Westat, using the National Science Foundation’s WebCASPAR Database System, August 1999.

## Goal 6: Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning

### 21. Adult Literacy

The U.S. Department of Education and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) characterized the literacy of America’s adults in terms of three “literacy scales” representing distinct and important aspects of literacy: prose, document, and quantitative literacy. Each of the

literacy scales has five levels, with Level 1 being least proficient and Level 5 being most proficient.

Prose literacy, presented in this report, is defined as the knowledge and skills needed to understand and use information from texts that include editorials, news stories, poems, and fiction — for example, finding a piece of information in a newspaper article, interpreting instructions from a warranty, inferring a theme from a poem, or contrasting views expressed in an editorial.

Twelve states (California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington) participated in the 1992 State Adult Literacy Survey. The Oregon Progress Board conducted an independent study in 1990, which was validated by the Educational Testing Service. Adults aged 16 to 65 participated in the 1990 Oregon study; in other states that participated in 1992, the sample included adults aged 16 and older.

**Sources:** Educational Testing Service, unpublished tabulations from the 1992 State Adult Literacy Survey, August 1993. The Oregon Progress Board conducted an independent study in 1990, which was validated by the Educational Testing Service.

### 22. Voter Registration and Voting

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1988, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 440 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989), and unpublished tabulations, calculations by Westat.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Voting and Voter Registration in the Election of November 1996, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 504 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998), and unpublished tabulations, calculations by Westat.

## 23. Participation in Higher Education

Higher education participation rates for 1992 were computed by adding 1991-1992 high school graduates from public schools (reported in the Common Core of Data) and 1990-1991 high school graduates from nonpublic schools (reported in the Private School Universe Survey). Rates for 1998 were computed the same way, using 1997-1998 public school data and 1996-1997 nonpublic school data.

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Residence and Migration of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Higher Education Institutions: Fall 1992; Common Core of Data 1992-1993; and Private School Universe Survey, 1991-1992.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Residence and Migration of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Higher Education Institutions: Fall 1998; Common Core of Data 1997-1998; and Private School Universe Survey, 1996-1997.

## Goal 7: Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol- and Drug-free Schools

### 24. Student Marijuana Use

The information from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) includes only states with weighted data.

**Sources:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1992). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1991*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1994). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1993*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1996). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1995*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1998). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1997*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

### 25. Student Alcohol Use

See technical note under indicator 24.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 26. Availability of Drugs on School Property

See technical note under indicator 24.

**Sources:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1994). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1993*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1996). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1995*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1998). *Current tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine use among high school students — United States, 1997*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

### 27. Student Victimization

See technical note under indicator 24.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 28. Physical Fights

See technical note under indicator 24.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 29. Carrying a Weapon

See technical note under indicator 24.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 30. Student Safety

See technical note under indicator 24.

**Source:** *Ibid.*

### 31. Teacher Victimization

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Teacher Survey of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

### 32. Disruptions in Class by Students

See technical note for Goal 4, indicator 13, regarding the definition of a secondary teacher.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Teacher Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-94, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

## Goal 8: Parental Participation

### 33. Parental Involvement in Schools

**Sources:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Teacher Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Principal Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.

### 34. Influence of Parent Associations

Areas of school policy include establishing curricula, hiring new full-time teachers, and setting discipline policy.

In 1990-1991, data from principals reporting that the parent association in their school has substantial influence on hiring new teachers were not reported for

the following states due to small sample size: Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

In 1993-1994, data from principals reporting that the parent association in their school has substantial influence on hiring new teachers were not reported for the following states due to small sample size: South Carolina and West Virginia.

In 1990-1991, data from principals reporting that the parent association in their school has substantial influence on setting discipline policy were not reported for the state of Maine due to small sample size.

**Source:** U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Public School Principal Surveys of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-1991 and 1993-1994, unpublished tabulations prepared by Westat, August 1995.



## Acknowledgements

The *1999 National Education Goals Report* was designed and written by Cynthia Prince. It was produced with the assistance of Babette Gutmann and Jennifer Hamilton of Westat, who supplied invaluable technical assistance and statistical support services. The Graphics Department of Westat contributed expertise in graphic design, layout, and report production. Editorial support was provided by the Westat Editorial Department. Many thanks are due to the members of the National Education Goals Panel's Working Group for feedback on earlier drafts of this report, especially Ed Ford, advisor to the 1999 Chair of the Panel, Governor Paul E. Patton of Kentucky. We also wish to thank Stephanie Drea and Brian Turmail of Hager Sharp for their input and helpful recommendations. Occasional departures from advice received and any errors of fact or interpretation are the responsibility of the author. Special thanks go to the individuals listed below who assisted with report production and data acquisition.

### Report Production

Julie Daft, Westat  
 Babette Gutmann, Westat  
 Jennifer Hamilton, Westat  
 Richard Hamilton, Westat  
 Christopher Harrington, National Education Goals Panel  
 Cathy Lease, Westat  
 Westat Editorial Department  
 Westat Graphics Department  
 John Woods, U.S. Department of Education

### Working Group

#### Governors' Representatives

Schuyler Baab, Office of the Governor of Wisconsin  
 Tracy Carr, Office of the Governor of West Virginia  
 Floyd Coppedge, Office of the Governor of Oklahoma  
 Ed Ford, Office of the Governor of Kentucky

Larry Grau, Office of the Governor of Indiana  
 Ken Griffin, Office of the Governor of Wyoming  
 Thomas Houlihan, North Carolina Partnership for Excellence  
 David Ice, Office of the Governor of West Virginia  
 Scott Jenkins, Office of the Governor of Michigan  
 Debbie Marshall, Office of the Governor of Michigan  
 Jim McClousky, Office of the Governor of North Carolina  
 Lynda McCulloch, Office of the Governor of North Carolina  
 Rita Meyer, Office of the Governor of Wyoming  
 Donna Moloney, Office of the Governor of Kentucky  
 William Steiger, Office of the Governor of Wisconsin  
 Jeff Viohl, Office of the Governor of Indiana

### Administration Representatives

Mary Cassell, Office of Management and Budget  
 Michael Cohen, U.S. Department of Education  
 Laura Lippman, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics  
 Maggie McNeely, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
 Cheryl Parker Rose, U.S. Department of Education

### Congressional Representatives

Sherry Kaiman, U.S. Senate, Office of Senator Jeffords  
 Jim Hudson, U.S. House of Representatives, Office of Representative Martínez  
 Vic Klatt, U.S. House of Representatives, Office of Representative Goodling  
 Carmel Martin, U.S. Senate, Office of Senator Bingaman  
 Bob Sweet, U.S. House of Representatives, Office of Representative Goodling

## State Legislators' Representatives

Representative G. Spencer Coggs, Wisconsin State  
Legislature

Representative Mary Lou Cowlshaw, Illinois State  
Legislature

Representative Douglas Jones, Idaho State Legislature

Jana Jones, Idaho State Legislature, Office of  
Representative Douglas Jones

Senator Stephen Stoll, Missouri State Legislature

Sherry Weinstein, Illinois State Legislature, Office of  
Representative Cowlshaw

## Other Working Group Contributors

Julie Bell, National Conference of State Legislatures

Dane Linn, National Governors' Association

David Shreve, National Conference of State  
Legislatures

Patty Sullivan, National Governors' Association

## Data Acquisition

Steve Agbayani, Pinkerton Computer Consultants, Inc.

Sam Barbett, U.S. Department of Education

Loretta Bass, U.S. Department of Commerce

Mike Battaglia, Abt Associates

Michael Brick, Westat

Steven Broghman, U.S. Department of Education

Janis Brown, U.S. Department of Education

Susan Broyles, U.S. Department of Education

Joyce Buchanon, University of Michigan

Peggy Carr, U.S. Department of Education

Kathryn Chandler, U.S. Department of Education

Christopher Chapman, U.S. Department of Education

Wade Curry, College Board

Sally Curtin, U.S. Department of Health and  
Human Services

Patricia Dabbs, U.S. Department of Education

Arnold Goldstein, U.S. Department of Education

Patrick Gonzales, U.S. Department of Education

Steve Gorman, U.S. Department of Education

Frances Gragg, Westat

Margaret Daly Hunker, Westat

Lloyd Johnston, University of Michigan

Phillip Kaufman, MPR Associates, Inc.

Kwang Kim, Westat

Steve Klein, MPR Associates, Inc.

Laura Lippman, U.S. Department of Education

Ginger Maggio, University of Michigan

Frank Morgan, U.S. Department of Education

Christine Winqvist Nord, Westat

Martin O'Connell, U.S. Department of Commerce

Patrick O'Malley, University of Michigan

Isabelle Puskas, Educational Testing Service

John Seitsema, U.S. Department of Education

Tom Snyder, U.S. Department of Education

Stephanie Ventura, U.S. Department of Health and  
Human Services

Ray Wiles, Westat

Bob Wright, U.S. Department of Health and  
Human Services

Beth Young, U.S. Department of Education

Nicholas Zill, Westat

# 1999 National Education Goals Report

## Response Card

The National Education Goals Panel values your feedback on the *1999 National Education Goals Report*. Please take a few moments to complete and return this questionnaire so that we can improve future reports. Mail or fax to:

### National Education Goals Panel

1255 22nd Street, NW, Suite 502

Washington, DC 20037

PHONE (202) 724-0015

FAX (202) 632-0957

E-MAIL: [NEGP@ed.gov](mailto:NEGP@ed.gov)

Web site: [www.negp.gov](http://www.negp.gov)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

### Please circle all that apply:

Student / Parent / Educator / Business or Community Leader / Federal, State, or Local Policymaker /  
Concerned Citizen

1. For what purpose do you use this report?

2. How well has the report served that purpose?

\_\_\_ Very Well    \_\_\_ Well    \_\_\_ Poorly    \_\_\_ Very Poorly

3. How could the report have served you better?

4. How do you rate the usefulness of the information included on the U.S. and state pages?

(1 = very useful and 5 = not very useful)

• U.S. Scorecard  
very useful                      not very useful  
1    2    3    4    5    N/A

• State Pages: Improvement over time  
very useful                      not very useful  
1    2    3    4    5    N/A

• State Pages: Highest-performing states  
very useful                      not very useful  
1    2    3    4    5    N/A

• State Pages: Most-improved states  
very useful                      not very useful  
1    2    3    4    5    N/A

5. Please check if you would like to receive free copies of the following:

**How many?**

- 1999 Data Volume for the National Education Goals Report
- Reading Achievement State by State, 1999
- Mathematics and Science Achievement State by State, 1998
- Implementing Academic Standards: Papers Commissioned by the National Education Goals Panel, 1997
- Publications list

**Previous annual Goals Reports:**

- 1998 National Education Goals Report
- 1998 Data Volume for the National Education Goals Report
- 1997 National Education Goals Report
- 1997 Summary: Mathematics and Science Achievement for the 21st Century
- 1996 National Education Goals Report
- 1996 Executive Summary: Commonly Asked Questions about Standards and Assessments
- 1995 National Education Goals Report
- 1995 Executive Summary: Improving Education through Family-School-Community Partnerships

**Lessons from the States series:**

- Exploring High and Improving Reading Achievement in Connecticut, 1999
- Promising Practices: Progress toward the Goals, 1998
- Exploring Rapid Achievement Gains in North Carolina and Texas, 1998
- Talking About Tests: An Idea Book for State Leaders, 1998
- The Reviews of State Content Standards, 1998

**Early childhood series:**

- Principles and Recommendations for Early Childhood Assessments, 1998
- Ready Schools, 1998
- Getting a Good Start in School, 1997
- Special Early Childhood Report, 1997

**Place First  
Class Postage  
Here or Fax to:  
(202) 632-0957**

**National Education Goals Panel**  
1255 22nd Street, NW, Suite 502  
Washington, DC 20037



NATIONAL  
EDUCATION  
**GOALS**  
P A N E L

Tape here

# National Education Goals Panel

## Governors

Paul E. Patton, Kentucky (Chair, 1999)

John Engler, Michigan

Jim Geringer, Wyoming

James B. Hunt, Jr., North Carolina

Frank Keating, Oklahoma

Frank O'Bannon, Indiana

Tommy G. Thompson, Wisconsin

Cecil H. Underwood, West Virginia

## Members of the Administration

Richard W. Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education

Michael Cohen, Senior Advisor to the U.S. Secretary of Education

## Members of Congress

U.S. Senator Jeff Bingaman, New Mexico

U.S. Senator Jim Jeffords, Vermont

U.S. Representative William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania

U.S. Representative Matthew G. Martínez, California

## State Legislators

Representative G. Spencer Coggs, Wisconsin

Representative Mary Lou Cowlshaw, Illinois

Representative Douglas R. Jones, Idaho

Senator Stephen M. Stoll, Missouri

## National Education Goals Panel Staff

Ken Nelson, Executive Director

John W. Barth, Senior Education Associate

Burt A. Glassman, Education Program Specialist

Christopher R. Harrington, Education Associate

Cynthia D. Prince, Associate Director for Analysis and Reporting

Emily O. Wurtz, Senior Education Associate

Cynthia M. Dixon, Program Assistant

John J. Masaitis, Executive Officer

Artesia L. Robinson, Secretary

**NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL**

1255 22ND STREET, N.W., SUITE 502

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037

(202) 724-0015 • FAX (202) 632-0957

[www.negp.gov](http://www.negp.gov)

E-MAIL: [NEGP@ed.gov](mailto:NEGP@ed.gov)