


Wilson County, TN



Math Performance, Grades 3–8, 2016–2023




Average Math Scores and Trends in Scores

in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

| | |
|------------------|---------|
| 2019 Average | 1.09 |
| 2022 Average | 1.04 |
| 2023 Average | 1.44 |
| 2019-2022 Change | ↓ -0.05 |
| 2022-2023 Change | ↑ +0.40 |
| Since 2019 | ↑ +0.35 |

Reading Performance, Grades 3–8, 2016–2023



Average Reading Scores and Trends in Scores

in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average


| | |
|------------------|---------|
| 2019 Average | 1.14 |
| 2022 Average | 0.86 |
| 2023 Average | 1.03 |
| 2019-2022 Change | ↓ -0.28 |
| 2022-2023 Change | ↑ +0.18 |
| Since 2019 | ↓ -0.10 |



Wilson County, TN



Math Performance in Wilson County vs. Tennessee and Similar Districts, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023




Average Math Scores and Trends in Scores

in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

| | Wilson County, TN | Tennessee | Similar Districts* in Tennessee |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| 2019 Average | 1.09 | -0.07 | 0.89 |
| 2022 Average | 1.04 | -0.57 | 0.46 |
| 2023 Average | 1.44 | -0.21 | 0.78 |
| 2019-2022 Change | ▼ -0.05 | ▼ -0.50 | ▼ -0.42 |
| 2022-2023 Change | ▲ +0.40 | ▲ +0.36 | ▲ +0.32 |
| 2019-2023 Change | ▲ +0.35 | ▼ -0.14 | ▼ -0.11 |

*Comparison districts are the nearest matches within the same state based on socioeconomic status, demographics, and size.

Reading Performance in Wilson County vs. Tennessee and Similar Districts, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023



Average Reading Scores and Trends in Scores

in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

| | Wilson County, TN | Tennessee | Similar Districts* in Tennessee |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| 2019 Average | 1.14 | -0.05 | 0.76 |
| 2022 Average | 0.86 | -0.44 | 0.39 |
| 2023 Average | 1.03 | -0.18 | 0.56 |
| 2019-2022 Change | ▼ -0.28 | ▼ -0.39 | ▼ -0.37 |
| 2022-2023 Change | ▲ +0.18 | ▲ +0.26 | ▲ +0.17 |
| 2019-2023 Change | ▼ -0.10 | ▼ -0.13 | ▼ -0.20 |


*Comparison districts are the nearest matches within the same state based on socioeconomic status, demographics, and size.



Wilson County, TN



Math Performance by Subgroup, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023




Average Math Scores and Trends in Scores

in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

| | Black | Hispanic | White | Poor | Non-Poor |
|------------------|---------|----------|---------|---------|----------|
| 2019 Average | 0.05 | 0.11 | 1.19 | -0.64 | 1.33 |
| 2022 Average | -0.26 | 0.09 | 1.19 | -0.69 | 1.28 |
| 2023 Average | 0.17 | 0.41 | 1.60 | -0.34 | 1.69 |
| 2019-2022 Change | ↓ -0.31 | ↓ -0.02 | ↑ +0.00 | ↓ -0.04 | ↓ -0.05 |
| 2022-2023 Change | ↑ +0.43 | ↑ +0.32 | ↑ +0.41 | ↑ +0.34 | ↑ +0.41 |
| 2019-2023 Change | ↑ +0.12 | ↑ +0.30 | ↑ +0.41 | ↑ +0.30 | ↑ +0.36 |

Reading Performance by Subgroup, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023



Average Reading Scores and Trends in Scores


in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

| | Black | Hispanic | White | Poor | Non-Poor |
|------------------|---------|----------|---------|---------|----------|
| 2019 Average | 0.12 | 0.18 | 1.25 | -0.49 | 1.36 |
| 2022 Average | -0.36 | -0.23 | 1.02 | -0.90 | 1.10 |
| 2023 Average | -0.11 | -0.05 | 1.21 | -0.73 | 1.27 |
| 2019-2022 Change | ↓ -0.47 | ↓ -0.41 | ↓ -0.23 | ↓ -0.41 | ↓ -0.26 |
| 2022-2023 Change | ↑ +0.25 | ↑ +0.18 | ↑ +0.19 | ↑ +0.17 | ↑ +0.18 |
| 2019-2023 Change | ↓ -0.22 | ↓ -0.23 | ↓ -0.04 | ↓ -0.24 | ↓ -0.08 |




Tennessee Report on Covid Recovery

Change in Math Achievement 2019-2022
by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts




Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Change in Reading Achievement 2019-2022
by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts




Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Change in Math Achievement 2022-2023 by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts




Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDTA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Change in Reading Achievement 2022-2023 by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts




Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDTA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Change in Math Achievement 2019-2023 by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts



Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.


Change in Reading Achievement 2019-2023 by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts



Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Change in Math Achievement


by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts



Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Blue points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Change in Reading Achievement


by proportion FRPL in Tennessee districts



Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Orange points represent districts with at least 900 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state. For details on the methodology see <https://edopportunity.org/methods>.

Tennessee Math Achievement


By Race and Economic Status



Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress.
For details on the methodology, see <https://edopportunity.org/methods/>.

Tennessee Reading Achievement

By Race and Economic Status



Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress.
For details on the methodology, see <https://edopportunity.org/methods/>.