URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

States' Demographically Adjusted Performance on the 2022 Nation's Report Card

An Essay for the Learning Curve by Matthew Chingos

December 2024

Two years ago, the US government released the first comprehensive look at student achievement in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. The results are well summarized by the *Washington Post* headline "Scores Fall Coast to Coast, Especially in Math, under Pandemic's Toll."[1] The declines were the largest ever reported, and scores fell in nearly every state.[2]

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), known as the "nation's report card," is the only nationally comparable measure of student achievement administered in every state. Every two years, NAEP provides a state-by-state picture of student achievement in math and reading in fourth and eighth grades.[3] The most recent scores, from early 2022, were released in fall 2022; the 2024 scores are expected in early 2025.

Education policymakers and analysts frequently use NAEP scores as indicators of how well state education systems are doing, both compared with each other and with themselves over time. To facilitate more useful cross-state comparisons, the Urban Institute has published state scores since 2015 that adjust for differences across states in student demographics (e.g., income and race or ethnicity).[4] These adjusted scores capture how well students in each state score on NAEP compared with demographically similar students around the country.

Adjusting for state demographics is important when considering NAEP results. The average socioeconomic status of Massachusetts students, for example, is substantially different than that of Mississippi students. And demographics might have shifted in important ways in the wake of the pandemic. The median public elementary school experienced a 5 percent enrollment decline between

---

[1] Laura Meckler, "Scores Fall Coast to Coast, Especially in Math, under Pandemic's Toll," *Washington Post*, October 24, 2022, https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2022/10/24/pandemic-learning-loss-naep-tests/.

[2] Sarah Mervosh and Ashley Wu, "Math Scores Fell in Nearly Every State, and Reading Dipped on National Exam," *New York Times*, October 24, 2022, https://nytimes.com/2022/10/24/us/math-reading-scores-pandemic.html.

[3] NAEP is also administered in 12th grade and in other subjects, but state-by-state data are not available for these tests.

[4] Matthew Chingos, *Breaking the Curve: Promises and Pitfalls of Using NAEP Data to Assess the State Role in Student Achievement* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2015); and Kristin Blagg, Matthew Chingos, Grace Luetmer, Victoria Rosenboom, and Alexandra Tilsley, "America's Gradebook: How Does Your State Stack Up?" Urban Institute, last updated March 2, 2020, https://apps.urban.org/features/naep/.

2019–20 and 2021–22, with schools serving higher shares of children in poverty experiencing larger declines.[5]

This essay reports demographically adjusted scores from the 2022 NAEP and documents how adjusted state performance changed between 2019 and 2022. The top-ranking states across the four tests, adjusted for demographics, are Massachusetts, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas. These states largely ranked well before the pandemic, but the analysis identifies several states where relative performance has substantially changed since 2019. Delaware, Oregon, Minnesota, Maryland, and Maine declined the most relative to the national average, while Louisiana, Nevada, Texas, Hawaii, and Alabama improved the most.

States have implemented various strategies, backed by significant federal investments, to reverse the large declines in student achievement reflected on the 2022 NAEP. The 2024 results, which are due out in early 2025, will reveal how much each state has succeeded in reversing the declines. Understanding the interplay between NAEP performance and student demographics will continue to be critical to making sense of state grades on the nation's report card.

Demographically Adjusted NAEP Scores

I use student-level data available under a restricted-use license from the National Center for Education Statistics to calculate demographically adjusted NAEP scores for each of the four tests in 2019 and 2022. For each test in each year, I measure the relationship nationwide between test scores and student demographics, including gender, age, race or ethnicity, receipt of free and reduced-price lunch, special education status, and English language learner status.[6]

I follow past Urban Institute practice of imputing the likelihood of free and reduced-price lunch participation for students attending schools that offer free meals to all students.[7] This imputation, while imperfect, is especially important in the 2022 data, as free school meals were provided to all students during the school year under a US Department of Agriculture waiver for the pandemic. As a result of this policy, and previous adoption of school-wide free meals under the Community Eligibility Provision, data on students' free lunch eligibility were reported differently by state. For example, Oregon reported that 99 percent of students receive a free or reduced-price lunch, while Tennessee reported 29 percent

[5] Eloise Burtis and Sofoklis Goulas, "Declining School Enrollment since the Pandemic" (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2023).

[6] I use the national reporting sample (RPTSAMP = 1) for all 50 states and the District of Columbia (i.e., I exclude the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Department of Defense Educational Activity). Because no student takes the entire test, I follow the recommended NAEP guidance on combining the 20 plausible test score values and 62 replicate weights. For details, see Matthew Chingos, Kristin Blagg, and Grace Luetmer, "America's Gradebook: How Does Your State Stack Up? Appendix" (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 2019). I estimate the relationship between NAEP scores and demographics separately for 2019 and 2022 but obtain similar results if I use the 2019 estimated relationship to calculate the 2022 adjusted scores.

[7] I am grateful to Kristin Blagg, who originally developed this methodology, for implementing it for the 2019 and 2022 results reported in this essay. The methodology is described in detail in Chingos, Blagg, and Luetmer, "America's Gradebook."

of students as eligible. In 2022, the imputation improves the correlation between the state average free and reduced-price lunch rates and an income measure from (more accurate) Census Bureau data from 0.59 to 0.71 (appendix table A.1).[8]

I use the estimated relationship between test scores and student demographics to calculate a predicted score for each student who took the NAEP, which is simply an estimate of the average performance of students with the same demographic characteristics nationwide. Finally, I calculate the difference between each student's actual score and their predicted score (which tells us how well they scored relative to students nationwide with similar characteristics) and average it to the state level.

For ease of interpretation, I scale the adjusted scores so that they have the same average score as the unadjusted national average score. The full set of adjusted scores is reported in appendix table A.2. Table 1 summarizes state rankings across the four NAEP tests in 2022. The top five states are Massachusetts, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas.

TABLE 1

2022 State Rankings on NAEP, Demographically Adjusted

	4th Grade		8th Grade		
State	**Math**	**Reading**	**Math**	**Reading**	**Average rank**
Massachusetts	6	3	1	1	2.8
Mississippi	3	2	3	6	3.5
Florida	1	1	7	5	3.5
Louisiana	5	4	5	2	4.0
Texas	2	5	2	10	4.8
Georgia	8	11	6	3	7.0
Indiana	4	9	4	11	7.0
Illinois	11	14	10	7	10.5
Nevada	10	10	18	8	11.5
South Carolina	7	6	16	23	13.0
New Jersey	16	18	17	4	13.8
Utah	22	21	13	13	17.3
Connecticut	20	19	20	12	17.8
New York	39	17	9	9	18.5
California	26	12	24	14	19.0
Kentucky	15	7	37	19	19.5
Pennsylvania	14	15	26	27	20.5
Nebraska	9	25	15	34	20.8
Wisconsin	13	31	14	26	21.0
Ohio	24	26	19	16	21.3
Idaho	21	39	8	21	22.3
Colorado	29	8	34	20	22.8
Virginia	19	30	11	32	23.0
South Dakota	28	28	12	28	24.0
Wyoming	12	13	30	44	24.8
Arkansas	33	20	28	18	24.8
Washington	32	24	21	22	24.8
Rhode Island	25	16	35	24	25.0

[8] The free and reduced-price lunch data for Washington, DC, are highly inconsistent across the unadjusted, imputed, and Census Bureau measures, so I do not report adjusted NAEP scores for DC.

State	4th Grade		8th Grade		Average rank
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	
North Carolina	18	27	22	37	26.0
Iowa	17	37	31	35	30.0
New Mexico	38	34	27	25	31.0
Montana	36	36	25	29	31.5
Minnesota	23	43	23	38	31.8
Maryland	44	35	38	17	33.5
Vermont	46	41	32	15	33.5
New Hampshire	41	23	39	33	34.0
Arizona	42	38	29	30	34.8
Oklahoma	27	29	44	39	34.8
Kansas	30	32	41	40	35.8
Alabama	37	22	45	41	36.3
Michigan	40	40	40	31	37.8
North Dakota	35	44	33	49	40.3
Hawaii	31	33	49	48	40.3
Missouri	43	42	42	36	40.8
Tennessee	34	45	46	45	42.5
Alaska	48	48	36	42	43.5
Maine	45	46	43	43	44.3
Delaware	49	47	47	46	47.3
Oregon	50	50	48	47	48.8
West Virginia	47	49	50	50	49.0

Source: Author's calculations from restricted-use NAEP data.
Note: NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Three of these states were also in the top five in 2019 (appendix table A.3). Texas ranked 8th in 2019, and Louisiana was 20th that year. New Jersey and Indiana were in the top five in 2019, but in 2022, they ranked 11th and 9th, respectively.

The bottom of the ranking list was similarly stable, with Alaska, Oregon, and West Virginia scoring among the bottom five states in both years. In 2022, the bottom five also included Maine and Delaware.

How Did Relative State Performance Change?

Adjusted state performance on the NAEP is strongly but not perfectly correlated between 2019 and 2022 (correlation coefficients of 0.74 to 0.79, depending on the test). I find that several states saw significant change in their relative performance.

It is important not to focus on changes in rankings across years because small changes in states' scores can lead to large changes in their rankings, especially among states with rankings toward the middle of the pack. A more meaningful measure of changes in states' relative performance is changes in their adjusted scores compared with the national average. Because most states saw declines over this period, a state could improve its performance relative to the national average simply by having a smaller decline than other states.

Sorting states by their total decline in demographically adjusted relative performance across the four tests shows that many states experienced large changes in their relative performance (table 2). Nine states experienced a decline of more than 10 points, though Oregon's inclusion on that list might reflect challenges with imputing free lunch eligibility in a state where all students participate in the program (appendix table A.1). Some of the largest declines were posted by Delaware, Minnesota, and Maryland.

TABLE 2

2019–22 Change in Demographically Adjusted NAEP Scores, Relative to the Average State

	4th Grade		8th Grade		
State	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Total
Delaware	-11.8	-4.7	-8.7	-3.8	-29.1
Oregon	-5.5	-4.6	-6.0	-5.6	-21.6
Minnesota	-5.7	-5.7	-5.6	-2.2	-19.2
Maryland	-6.8	-4.0	-5.8	-1.3	-17.9
Maine	-4.5	-1.7	-5.5	-4.8	-16.4
North Carolina	-2.7	-3.6	-5.0	-4.2	-15.5
Virginia	-6.3	-1.4	-5.7	-0.3	-13.7
Oklahoma	-1.8	-3.7	-3.1	-3.4	-12.0
New Jersey	-2.8	-5.2	-3.8	0.4	-11.4
Missouri	-2.9	-1.3	-3.3	-1.6	-9.2
Kansas	0.6	-3.7	-0.2	-4.7	-8.0
North Dakota	-0.2	-2.0	-2.2	-3.5	-8.0
Connecticut	-1.5	-0.9	-1.2	-2.4	-6.0
Washington	-0.6	-2.4	-0.4	-1.8	-5.3
Pennsylvania	-0.3	-3.1	-0.4	-1.4	-5.3
Tennessee	0.5	-1.3	-2.3	-2.1	-5.2
Ohio	0.0	-1.5	-2.2	-1.2	-5.0
Nebraska	0.4	1.0	-2.8	-1.7	-3.2
Colorado	-0.8	-2.8	1.5	-1.0	-3.0
Vermont	-1.1	-0.8	-1.6	1.3	-2.3
Arizona	-1.6	-2.4	1.6	1.1	-1.3
Wyoming	1.2	-0.6	1.1	-2.5	-0.9
New Hampshire	-1.3	-0.4	1.3	-0.1	-0.5
Michigan	1.8	0.0	-1.8	-0.3	-0.3
West Virginia	2.6	-2.0	-1.0	0.5	0.1
Massachusetts	-0.5	-0.8	0.1	1.4	0.2
Wisconsin	3.5	-0.5	1.6	-1.8	2.8
Montana	0.7	1.7	0.1	0.9	3.4
Florida	0.9	0.0	4.1	-1.5	3.5
Indiana	1.5	2.0	1.4	-1.2	3.7
Alaska	-1.8	1.0	3.0	2.0	4.3
Rhode Island	0.3	2.4	1.7	0.7	5.2
Georgia	1.4	1.8	-0.3	2.8	5.7
Iowa	3.6	1.3	0.5	0.5	6.0
Arkansas	1.3	1.9	1.6	1.4	6.2
New Mexico	-0.4	1.9	2.1	3.0	6.6
Illinois	3.1	1.2	1.6	0.9	6.8
Idaho	2.0	4.7	-1.1	1.2	6.9
Utah	0.8	4.2	0.3	1.8	7.0
New York	-0.6	3.2	0.7	4.0	7.3
South Carolina	3.5	0.5	5.3	-1.0	8.3

State	4th Grade		8th Grade		Total
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	
Kentucky	2.8	1.3	4.7	1.5	10.3
California	2.4	2.8	2.2	3.1	10.5
South Dakota	2.4	2.9	1.3	4.4	11.0
Mississippi	1.5	3.8	5.0	2.9	13.1
Alabama	4.0	4.2	3.9	2.5	14.7
Hawaii	3.5	3.7	4.1	3.4	14.7
Texas	3.9	2.4	5.4	4.2	15.8
Nevada	4.6	5.7	3.5	5.4	19.2
Louisiana	6.5	5.6	10.2	4.5	26.7

Source: Author's calculations from restricted-use NAEP data.
Notes: NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress. Dark blue indicates large declines, light blue indicates small declines, dark yellow indicates large increases, and light yellow indicates small increases.

Nine states saw their relative performance increase by more than 10 points, with the largest increases occurring in Louisiana, Nevada, and Texas.

These changes in relative performance are closely related to changes in overall NAEP performance. States that declined in relative performance tended to be those that posted above-average declines in unadjusted NAEP scores and vice versa.

Implications

The declines in student performance captured by the NAEP were large by historical standards and in the context of how much students learn in a typical school year. Depending on the test, the declines of 3 to 8 points represent roughly 48 to 87 lost days of learning, or 27 to 48 percent of a school year.[9] In a state like Virginia, which had especially large declines, the learning loss was more than a full year of learning in one of the tested grades and subjects (8th-grade math).

The upcoming release of the 2024 scores will show how much of the decline has been reversed for students who were fourth and eighth graders last school year. This is likely to vary significantly across states, just as the declines from 2019 to 2022 did, and raise questions about why some states were able to catch up more than others.

Three lessons from this analysis that policymakers, analysts, and others who follow the NAEP data should bear in mind as they interpret the forthcoming 2024 data include the following:

- The demographic adjustments from the 2022 scores, reported here, can be applied to the 2024 scores to make better comparisons across states (compared with the raw scores published by

[9] This calculation uses the student-level standard deviation of the 2022 NAEP tests and the average annual gains in test scores from grade 4 to 5 and from grade 8 to 9, as reported by Bloom and coauthors, assuming a 180-day school year. See Howard S. Bloom, Carolyn J. Hill, Alison Rebeck Black, and Mark W. Lipsey, "Performance Trajectories and Performance Gaps as Achievement Effect Size Benchmarks for Educational Interventions," *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* 1, no. 4 (2008): 289, https://doi.org/10.1080/19345740802400072.

NAEP). This adjustment can also answer questions such as whether initially higher-performing states were able to recover more of the lost learning than lower-performing states.
- Demographic changes from 2022 to 2024 are unlikely to predict large changes in test scores nationwide, but in light of the wide variation by state found in this analysis, it will be important to monitor demographic trends at the state level.
- Users of the NAEP data should be especially careful when calculating and interpreting socioeconomic gaps as captured by the NAEP, given the challenges with measuring socioeconomic status in a way that is consistent across states and over time. Results that initially appear to be unusual might be explained by anomalies in the data, such as Oregon reporting that 99 percent of its were students were eligible for free and reduced-price lunch in 2022.

The demographic adjustments in this analysis are an imperfect solution to the challenges of comparing student performance across states and over time. They do not capture every characteristic that matters, and those that are included have limitations, especially the use of free and reduced-price lunch receipt as the only proxy for family income. But for many purposes, looking at demographically adjusted performance is a better starting point than working from unadjusted NAEP scores.

Appendix

TABLE A.1

Estimates of the Share of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch

	From NAEP Data (Unadjusted)			From NAEP data (with Imputation)			From Census Bureau Data		
State	2019	2022	Change	2019	2022	Change	2019	2022	Change
Alabama	53%	47%	-6%	56%	50%	-6%	41%	40%	-1%
Alaska	48%	44%	-4%	47%	43%	-4%	22%	27%	5%
Arizona	54%	45%	-9%	50%	45%	-5%	38%	34%	-4%
Arkansas	65%	64%	0%	59%	59%	0%	45%	41%	-5%
California	61%	59%	-2%	57%	60%	2%	35%	33%	-2%
Colorado	39%	37%	-2%	39%	36%	-2%	25%	23%	-1%
Connecticut	42%	39%	-2%	41%	38%	-2%	28%	25%	-3%
Delaware	30%	23%	-6%	30%	22%	-8%	39%	34%	-5%
DC	72%	78%	7%	58%	74%	16%	33%	25%	-9%
Florida	59%	57%	-2%	59%	57%	-2%	39%	36%	-3%
Georgia	61%	55%	-6%	54%	51%	-3%	39%	35%	-4%
Hawaii	44%	44%	0%	43%	43%	0%	26%	32%	6%
Idaho	47%	43%	-4%	42%	45%	3%	32%	29%	-3%
Illinois	50%	45%	-6%	48%	44%	-4%	32%	31%	-1%
Indiana	50%	50%	0%	49%	50%	2%	34%	31%	-3%
Iowa	43%	40%	-4%	42%	37%	-4%	29%	26%	-3%
Kansas	48%	45%	-3%	48%	43%	-5%	34%	29%	-6%
Kentucky	59%	58%	-1%	54%	60%	6%	37%	40%	2%
Louisiana	67%	71%	4%	69%	75%	6%	47%	48%	1%
Maine	44%	39%	-5%	43%	38%	-5%	28%	21%	-7%
Maryland	44%	42%	-2%	45%	38%	-7%	26%	25%	-1%
Massachusetts	31%	42%	12%	32%	42%	10%	23%	24%	1%
Michigan	49%	52%	3%	47%	44%	-2%	34%	33%	-1%
Minnesota	36%	31%	-6%	36%	30%	-7%	22%	23%	1%
Mississippi	77%	78%	1%	71%	76%	5%	50%	49%	-1%
Missouri	54%	44%	-11%	50%	41%	-9%	34%	32%	-2%

State	From NAEP Data (Unadjusted) 2019	2022	Change	From NAEP data (with Imputation) 2019	2022	Change	From Census Bureau Data 2019	2022	Change
Montana	44%	39%	-6%	40%	37%	-2%	32%	31%	-1%
Nebraska	45%	41%	-3%	45%	39%	-6%	27%	28%	1%
Nevada	62%	78%	17%	53%	71%	18%	38%	37%	-1%
New Hampshire	23%	23%	0%	22%	25%	2%	18%	14%	-4%
New Jersey	38%	33%	-5%	36%	30%	-6%	26%	26%	0%
New Mexico	76%	77%	1%	63%	72%	9%	40%	43%	3%
New York	53%	59%	6%	51%	59%	7%	33%	34%	2%
North Carolina	46%	36%	-9%	47%	37%	-10%	39%	37%	-2%
North Dakota	33%	26%	-7%	32%	25%	-7%	24%	21%	-3%
Ohio	49%	45%	-5%	43%	41%	-1%	34%	33%	-1%
Oklahoma	61%	61%	0%	57%	54%	-3%	39%	39%	0%
Oregon	59%	99%	40%	41%	31%	-10%	28%	30%	2%
Pennsylvania	45%	45%	0%	42%	44%	2%	32%	30%	-2%
Rhode Island	48%	46%	-2%	47%	46%	-1%	26%	28%	2%
South Carolina	60%	59%	-1%	58%	60%	1%	40%	38%	-2%
South Dakota	31%	26%	-5%	29%	34%	5%	30%	28%	-2%
Tennessee	31%	29%	-2%	32%	29%	-2%	39%	36%	-3%
Texas	60%	59%	0%	57%	61%	4%	39%	37%	-2%
Utah	34%	29%	-5%	33%	30%	-2%	23%	22%	-1%
Vermont	34%	38%	3%	33%	35%	2%	25%	26%	1%
Virginia	39%	38%	-1%	40%	41%	1%	27%	26%	-1%
Washington	50%	48%	-2%	49%	44%	-5%	26%	25%	-1%
West Virginia	50%	51%	1%	48%	56%	8%	39%	40%	1%
Wisconsin	41%	41%	-1%	41%	39%	-2%	25%	24%	-1%
Wyoming	36%	27%	-8%	35%	27%	-8%	23%	22%	-1%
National average (unweighted)	49%	48%	-1%	46%	45%	-1%	32%	31%	-1%
Correlation with Census Bureau data	0.71	0.59	0.23	0.75	0.71	0.04			

Sources: Author's calculations from restricted-use NAEP data and Census Bureau data accessed via IPUMS.
Notes: NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress. Census Bureau data are the estimated share of public school students in grades 1 through 12 from families with incomes below 185 percent of the federal poverty level.

TABLE A.2

Demographically Adjusted NAEP Scores

State	4th-Grade Math 2019	2022	4th-Grade Reading 2019	2022	8th-Grade Math 2019	2022	8th-Grade Reading 2019	2022
Alabama	232.2	230.3	213.9	213.7	270.2	266.2	254.1	253.0
Alaska	233.0	225.5	206.1	205.0	275.8	268.7	254.2	252.6
Arizona	236.2	228.8	213.5	211.0	280.6	270.0	259.2	256.6
Arkansas	235.3	230.8	217.2	214.7	277.0	270.7	261.0	258.8
California	235.8	232.3	218.6	216.8	276.9	271.5	260.1	259.5
Colorado	238.4	231.8	220.8	218.3	279.9	268.9	263.2	258.6
Connecticut	240.2	232.9	220.7	215.3	281.8	272.7	265.9	259.9
Delaware	239.3	221.7	218.2	205.3	275.7	262.7	258.9	251.5
Florida	249.8	244.9	229.0	229.0	284.2	276.0	267.9	262.8
Georgia	241.1	236.7	221.8	217.4	283.3	276.9	265.0	264.1
Hawaii	233.7	231.4	211.7	211.8	266.3	261.7	251.3	251.1

State	4th-Grade Math		4th-Grade Reading		8th-Grade Math		8th-Grade Reading	
	2019	2022	2019	2022	2019	2022	2019	2022
Idaho	236.7	232.9	215.8	210.6	279.3	275.8	260.8	258.4
Illinois	238.3	235.6	219.0	216.5	282.2	275.2	264.8	262.1
Indiana	243.8	239.5	220.8	218.2	283.9	277.6	264.9	260.0
Iowa	236.0	233.8	214.8	211.2	276.9	270.0	258.0	254.9
Kansas	237.0	231.8	216.2	211.9	280.2	268.3	261.4	253.0
Kentucky	237.3	234.3	218.1	218.7	275.5	268.6	260.9	258.8
Louisiana	238.5	239.2	216.9	222.9	279.6	277.0	264.3	265.2
Maine	237.3	227.1	217.0	207.3	277.3	267.4	260.9	252.5
Maryland	240.3	227.7	221.3	211.4	280.7	268.4	264.2	259.3
Massachusetts	244.9	238.6	228.3	224.3	289.2	280.1	268.9	266.7
Michigan	233.8	229.8	215.5	209.5	276.5	268.4	259.8	255.8
Minnesota	244.1	232.6	218.1	208.4	285.6	271.7	259.8	254.0
Mississippi	247.3	243.0	226.3	227.2	282.2	277.8	263.5	262.7
Missouri	237.2	228.5	216.1	208.7	277.3	267.8	260.0	254.8
Montana	235.6	230.6	215.5	211.4	278.0	271.5	259.7	256.9
Nebraska	242.0	236.5	219.9	213.0	281.0	273.8	260.6	255.3
Nevada	237.1	236.0	218.7	218.1	276.1	273.5	260.3	262.1
New Hampshire	236.7	229.6	216.0	213.3	277.0	268.4	259.3	255.6
New Jersey	242.7	234.1	223.4	215.5	286.9	273.5	266.4	263.2
New Mexico	236.5	230.3	213.7	211.7	277.2	270.9	258.1	257.5
New York	236.4	229.9	219.0	215.6	280.5	275.6	261.7	262.0
North Carolina	242.2	233.7	221.8	212.8	284.0	272.2	262.6	254.8
North Dakota	236.7	230.7	214.5	208.2	279.6	269.4	257.7	250.5
Ohio	238.4	232.5	219.2	212.9	282.6	272.9	264.2	259.3
Oklahoma	239.9	232.2	219.6	212.4	279.0	267.1	260.8	253.8
Oregon	232.0	220.6	212.8	202.7	275.4	262.6	260.4	251.2
Pennsylvania	240.9	234.7	220.5	216.0	282.7	271.3	262.2	257.2
Rhode Island	238.0	232.5	218.1	215.6	274.6	268.8	261.0	258.1
South Carolina	240.2	238.0	219.2	220.4	281.4	273.7	262.9	258.2
South Dakota	235.6	232.2	215.3	212.5	279.7	274.4	256.4	257.1
Tennessee	236.1	230.7	214.5	208.1	274.9	265.5	257.4	251.7
Texas	246.8	244.9	219.8	221.0	285.4	279.6	261.1	261.7
Utah	237.8	232.8	218.5	214.6	278.2	274.2	261.6	259.7
Vermont	233.1	226.2	214.9	209.2	278.6	269.5	261.7	259.4
Virginia	245.5	233.4	221.8	212.0	284.2	274.5	259.6	255.7
Washington	237.6	231.2	217.5	213.0	282.8	272.2	263.7	258.3
West Virginia	228.8	225.6	209.6	204.5	267.1	256.9	251.0	247.8
Wisconsin	237.3	235.0	214.5	211.9	282.7	274.0	262.6	257.2
Wyoming	239.7	235.1	219.7	216.7	278.9	270.0	258.1	252.0

Source: Author's calculations from restricted-use NAEP data.
Note: NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress.

TABLE A.3

2019 State Rankings on NAEP, Demographically Adjusted

State	4th Grade		8th Grade		Average rank
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	
Massachusetts	5	2	1	1	2.3
Florida	1	1	5	2	2.3
New Jersey	8	4	2	3	4.3
Indiana	7	9	8	6	7.5
Mississippi	2	3	14	12	7.8

State	4th Grade		8th Grade		Average rank
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	
Georgia	11	6	9	5	7.8
North Carolina	9	5	7	16	9.3
Texas	3	14	4	22	10.8
Connecticut	15	11	16	4	11.5
Maryland	13	8	19	10	12.5
Pennsylvania	12	12	12	17	13.3
Virginia	4	7	6	37	13.5
Ohio	21	18	13	9	15.3
South Carolina	14	17	17	14	15.5
Illinois	22	19	15	7	15.8
Colorado	20	10	23	13	16.5
Minnesota	6	26	3	34	17.3
Nebraska	10	13	18	29	17.5
Washington	25	28	10	11	18.5
Louisiana	19	31	25	8	20.8
Oklahoma	16	16	28	27	21.8
New York	36	20	21	19	24.0
Wisconsin	28	43	11	15	24.3
Utah	24	23	31	20	24.5
Wyoming	17	15	29	41	25.5
Kansas	31	32	22	21	26.5
Maine	26	30	34	26	29.0
Rhode Island	23	27	47	24	30.3
Kentucky	27	25	44	25	30.3
Nevada	30	21	41	31	30.8
Idaho	33	35	27	28	30.8
Delaware	18	24	43	40	31.3
Missouri	29	33	33	33	32.0
California	40	22	38	32	33.0
Arkansas	43	29	37	23	33.0
Vermont	46	39	30	18	33.3
New Hampshire	32	34	36	38	35.0
Arizona	37	46	20	39	35.5
North Dakota	34	41	26	44	36.3
Montana	41	36	32	36	36.3
South Dakota	42	38	24	46	37.5
Michigan	44	37	40	35	39.0
New Mexico	35	45	35	42	39.3
Iowa	39	40	39	43	40.3
Tennessee	38	42	46	45	42.8
Oregon	49	47	45	30	42.8
Alaska	47	50	42	47	46.5
Alabama	48	44	48	48	47.0
Hawaii	45	48	50	49	48.0
West Virginia	50	49	49	50	49.5

Source: Author's calculations from restricted-use NAEP data.

Note: NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Matthew Chingos is vice president for education data and policy at the Urban Institute.

Acknowledgments

This essay was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation as part of the Learning Curve essay series. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at www.urban.org/fundingprinciples.

500 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

www.urban.org