

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assesses mathematics on a 0-500 point scale. In 2005, Los Angeles Unified School District was one of ten urban districts that voluntarily participated in the NAEP mathematics assessment on a trial basis.

| Overall Mathematics Results for Los Angeles | | Student Percentages at NAEP Achievement Levels | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2005, the average scale score for eighth-grade students in Los Angeles was 250. This was higher than their average score in 2003 (245).¹ Los Angeles' average score (250) in 2005 was lower than that of public schools in large central cities² (265). The percentage of students in Los Angeles who performed at or above the NAEP <i>Proficient</i> level was 11 percent in 2005. This percentage was greater than that in 2003 (7 percent). The percentage of students in Los Angeles who performed at or above the NAEP <i>Basic</i> level was 38 percent in 2005. This percentage was greater than that in 2003 (32 percent). | | <p>Los Angeles (public) 2003: 68% Below Basic, 25% Basic, 6% Proficient, 1% Advanced 2005: 62% Below Basic, 27% Basic, 9% Proficient, 2% Advanced Large central city (public) 2005: 50% Below Basic, 34% Basic, 14% Proficient, 3% Advanced Nation (public) 2005: 32% Below Basic, 39% Basic, 23% Proficient, 6% Advanced</p> <p>Percent below <i>Basic</i> Percent at <i>Basic</i>, <i>Proficient</i>, and <i>Advanced</i></p> <p>■ Below <i>Basic</i> □ <i>Basic</i> ■ <i>Proficient</i> ■ <i>Advanced</i></p> <p>NOTE: The NAEP grade 8 mathematics achievement levels correspond to the following scale points: Below <i>Basic</i>, 261 or lower; <i>Basic</i>, 262–298; <i>Proficient</i>, 299–332; <i>Advanced</i>, 333 or above.</p> | |

| Performance of NAEP Reporting Groups in Los Angeles: 2005 | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| Reporting groups | Percent of students ³ | Average score | Percent below <i>Basic</i> | Percent of students at or above <i>Basic</i> | Percent of students at or above <i>Proficient</i> | Percent <i>Advanced</i> |
| Male | 49 | 252 ↑ | 61 ↓ | 39 ↑ | 12 ↑ | 3 |
| Female | 51 | 249 | 64 | 36 | 9 | 1 |
| White | 9 | 280 | 32 | 68 | 32 | 7 |
| Black | 13 | 239 | 71 | 29 | 7 | 1 |
| Hispanic | 72 | 245 ↑ | 68 | 32 | 6 | 1 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 6 | 291 ↑ | 18 | 82 | 43 ↑ | 8 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | # | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ | ‡ |
| Eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch | 77 ↑ | 245 ↑ | 68 | 32 | 6 | 1 |
| Not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch | 23 ↑ | 270 ↑ | 41 ↓ | 59 ↑ | 25 ↑ | 5 |

| Average Score Gaps Between Selected Groups | | Mathematics Scale Scores at Selected Percentiles | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2005, male students in Los Angeles had an average score that was not significantly different from that of female students. In 2003, there was no significant difference between the average score of male and female students. In 2005, Black students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 41 points. In 2003, the average score for Black students was lower than that of White students by 43 points. In 2005, Hispanic students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 35 points. In 2003, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 37 points. In 2005, students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch, an indicator of poverty, had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 25 points. This performance gap was wider than that of 2003 (5 points). In 2005, the score gap between students at the 75th percentile and students at the 25th percentile was 51 points. In 2003, the score gap between students at the 75th percentile and students at the 25th percentile was 50 points. | | <p>Score 500 280 270 260 250 240 230 220 210 0</p> <p>Percentiles 75th 50th 25th</p> <p>Year '03 '05</p> <p>Scores at selected percentiles on the NAEP mathematics scale indicate how well students at lower, middle, and higher levels performed.</p> | |

The estimate rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

* Significantly different from 2005.

↑ Significantly higher than 2003. ↓ Significantly lower than 2003.

¹ Comparisons (higher/lower/not different) are based on statistical tests. The .05 level was used for testing statistical significance. Comparisons across jurisdictions and comparisons with the nation or within a jurisdiction across years may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (ELL). The exclusion rates for SD and ELL in Los Angeles were 2 percent and 2 percent in 2005, respectively. Statistical comparisons are calculated on the basis of unrounded scale scores or percentages.

² "Large central city" includes public schools located in large central cities (population 250,000 or more) within metropolitan statistical areas as defined by the federal Office of Management and Budget. It is not synonymous with "inner city."

³ For comparison, non-White students comprised 77 percent of students in large central city public schools and 40 percent in public schools nationally. Also, students eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch comprised 62 percent of students in large central city public schools and 39 percent in public schools nationally.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding and because the "Information not available" category for free/reduced-price school lunch and the "Unclassified" category for race/ethnicity are not displayed. Visit <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/mathematics/tuda.asp> for additional results and detailed information.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2003 and 2005 Trial Urban District Mathematics Assessments.