Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Alaska

K-12 enrollment — 128,762

The raw data used to develop these state profiles, including data for additional grade levels and years before 2002, can be found on the CEP Web site at www.cep-dc.org. Click on the link on the left labeled State Testing Data. In the list of results that appears, look for the most recent report on student achievement since 2002. Below the name of the report, click on the link for State Profiles and Worksheets. Scroll down the page until you reach the list of states. Click on the Worksheet link for proficiency data or scale score data for a particular state.

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. Alaska showed improvement in reading and math in grade 8 at the proficient level for almost all racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls (subgroup trends were not available at the basic or advanced levels). Most student subgroups had upward trends in percentages proficient, with a few exceptions. Gains in math tended to be larger than in reading. Trends in closing achievement gaps were mixed. Comparable data were available from 2005 through 2009 for grades 3 and 8, and from 2006 through 2009 for grade 10.

- ***Notable gains.*** In both reading and math at grade 8, the largest gains in the percentage proficient were made by the low-income subgroup.

- ***Exceptions.*** The percentage of Native American students scoring at the proficient level declined slightly in reading. Asian students showed no gains in math or reading.

- ***Mixed gap trends.*** In reading, gaps tended to widen at the elementary grade but narrow in high school; this was true to a lesser extent in math. Gaps between Asian and white students widened in all grades/subjects except high school reading; gaps widened because the white subgroup showed larger gains than the Asian subgroup.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2005 through 2009, grades 3 through 8 2006 through 2009, grade 10
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2008
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Proficiency data available only in 2008 for comparison group of students who are *not* English language learners, so the ELL subgroup is compared with all tested students in the state Achievement-level data (i.e., Far Below Proficient, Below Proficient, Proficient, Advanced) not available for subgroups in 2009 Subgroup scale scores available in 2009 only Subgroup of Native American students was redefined by Alaska in 2006 to include Alaska Natives, so baseline year for this subgroup is 2006 in analyses.

Test Characteristics

The characteristics highlighted below are for the state reading and mathematics tests used for accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	Alaska Standards Based Assessment (ASBA) Grade 10 Standards Based Assessment (SBA) Alaska Alternate Assessment
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–10
State labels for achievement levels	AK uses four achievement levels: Far Below Proficient, Below Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Below Proficient as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Although the Grade 10 Standards-Based Assessment—High School Graduation Qualifying Exam is packaged and administered as a single test, students receive separate scores for the SBA segment of the exam, which is used for NCLB accountability, and for the HSGQE segment, which is used as an exit exam.
First year test used	2005, grades 3–9 2006, grade 10
Time of test administration	Spring

Major changes in testing system (2002–present)

2005: Switched from using the Alaska Benchmark Exams (ABE) to the ASBA and expanded testing to all of the grades 3–9
2006: Switched to ASBA in grade 10

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the Middle School Level

Note: The tables in this profile of subgroup achievement and gap trends begin with table 7. Tables 1 through 6 can be found in the companion state profile of general achievement trends.

Table AK-7. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
Subgroup	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced				31%	33%	37%	37%	32%	0.1
Proficient-and-above				80%	82%	86%	85%	82%	0.4
Basic-and-above				95%	96%	97%	97%	96%	0.1
White									
Advanced				42%	44%	48%	48%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				90%	91%	93%	92%	90%	0.2
Basic-and-above				97%	98%	100%	98%	NA	NA
African American[2]									
Advanced				15%	17%	25%	23%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				69%	75%	82%	82%	73%	0.8
Basic-and-above				91%	94%	97%	97%	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced				23%	22%	33%	33%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				76%	77%	88%	87%	76%	0.2
Basic-and-above				94%	95%	98%	98%	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced				24%	26%	34%	30%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				76%	81%	87%	83%	76%	0.0
Basic-and-above				94%	96%	97%	97%	NA	NA
Native American									
Advanced					14%	17%	16%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above					67%	70%	71%	65%	-0.6
Basic-and-above					91%	92%	93%	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 42% in 2005 to 48% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table AK-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced				31%	33%	37%	37%	32%	0.1
Proficient-and-above				80%	82%	86%	85%	82%	0.4
Basic-and-above				95%	96%	97%	97%	96%	0.1
Low-income students									
Advanced				15%	17%	22%	22%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				66%	70%	77%	75%	71%	1.2
Basic-and-above				91%	93%	94%	95%	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				4%	4%	6%	6%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				42%	44%	49%	47%	45%	0.4
Basic-and-above				78%	80%	82%	82%	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced				4%	7%	12%	5%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				52%	58%	68%	55%	40%	-5.8
Basic-and-above				88%	90%	92%	90%	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced				36%	36%	42%	41%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				85%	87%	90%	89%	86%	0.3
Basic-and-above				96%	98%	98%	98%	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced				27%	29%	33%	34%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				76%	78%	82%	82%	78%	0.5
Basic-and-above				94%	94%	96%	96%	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 15% in 2005 to 22% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2009 results.

Table AK-9. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
Subgroup	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced				23%	26%	29%	28%	27%	0.9
Proficient-and-above				62%	65%	69%	68%	67%	1.1
Basic-and-above				81%	82%	85%	86%	84%	0.6
White									
Advanced				30%	34%	37%	36%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				72%	74%	78%	77%	76%	1.0
Basic-and-above				88%	89%	92%	91%	NA	NA
African American[2]									
Advanced				11%	12%	13%	14%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				40%	48%	59%	53%	45%	1.2
Basic-and-above				64%	72%	81%	77%	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced				16%	15%	20%	21%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				54%	59%	67%	64%	58%	1.0
Basic-and-above				75%	76%	84%	86%	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced				24%	29%	33%	27%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				62%	69%	76%	68%	62%	0.0
Basic-and-above				82%	85%	90%	85%	NA	NA
Native American									
Advanced					12%	14%	14%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above					46%	51%	51%	49%	0.9
Basic-and-above					69%	72%	74%	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 30% in 2005 to 36% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table AK-10. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
Subgroup	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced				23%	26%	29%	28%	27%	0.9
Proficient-and-above				62%	65%	69%	68%	67%	1.1
Basic-and-above				81%	82%	85%	86%	84%	0.6
Low-income students									
Advanced				11%	13%	16%	16%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				44%	49%	56%	56%	51%	1.8
Basic-and-above				69%	71%	77%	77%	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				3%	4%	5%	5%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				20%	20%	28%	26%	26%	2.2
Basic-and-above				42%	42%	49%	49%	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced				6%	8%	12%	5%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				34%	40%	48%	36%	24%	-5.2
Basic-and-above				61%	63%	71%	63%	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced				23%	25%	28%	27%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				63%	65%	70%	69%	67%	1.1
Basic-and-above				83%	83%	86%	87%	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced				23%	27%	29%	29%	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above				61%	65%	69%	68%	66%	1.1
Basic-and-above				79%	81%	85%	85%	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 11% in 2005 to 16% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2009 results.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

Table AK-11. Subgroup achievement trends in reading by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.
If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	05-09	78%	78%	0.0		05-09	80%	82%	0.4		06-09	81%	83%	0.6	
White	05-09	87%	88%	0.2		05-09	90%	90%	0.2		06-09	91%	92%	0.3	
African American	05-09	74%	72%	-0.6[2]	S	05-09	69%	73%	0.8[2]	L	06-09	69%	80%	3.7[2]	L
Latino	05-09	77%	77%	-0.2	S	05-09	76%	76%	0.2	E	06-09	77%	81%	1.4	L
Asian	05-09	78%	71%	-1.7	S	05-09	76%	76%	0.0	S	06-09	73%	75%	0.8	L
Native American	06-09	75%	57%	-0.7	S	06-09	80%	65%	-0.6	S	06-09	62%	63%	0.4	L
Not low-income	05-09	87%	88%	0.3		05-09	87%	89%	0.4		06-09	88%	90%	0.9	
Low-income	05-09	65%	66%	0.4	L	05-09	66%	71%	1.2	L	06-09	66%	69%	0.9	E
Not disabled	06-09	85%	84%	-0.2		06-09	87%	87%	-0.2		06-09	86%	87%	0.5	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	49%	45%	-1.1	S	06-09	44%	45%	0.4	L	06-09	41%	45%	1.2	L
All tested students	06-09	79%	78%	-0.4		06-09	82%	82%	-0.1		06-09	81%	83%	0.6	
English language learners[3]	06-09	54%	33%	-7.2	S	06-09	58%	40%	-5.8	S	06-09	49%	38%	-3.6	S
Female	05-09	81%	81%	-0.1		05-09	85%	86%	0.3		06-09	84%	86%	0.6	
Male	05-09	75%	75%	0.0	L	05-09	76%	78%	0.5	L	06-09	79%	80%	0.5	S

Table reads: In 2005, 87% of white 4th graders and 74% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 88% of white 4th graders and 72% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.2 percentage points per year for white students and decreased at an average rate of 0.6 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

[1]Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Table AK-12. Subgroup achievement trends in mathematics by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.
If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	05-09	69%	74%	1.3		05-09	62%	67%	1.1		06-09	62%	68%	1.9	
White	05-09	78%	83%	1.4		05-09	72%	76%	1.0		06-09	72%	77%	1.7	
African American	05-09	57%	62%	1.2[2]	S	05-09	40%	45%	1.2[2]	L	06-09	38%	57%	6.4[2]	L
Latino	05-09	62%	73%	2.8	L	05-09	54%	58%	1.0	E	06-09	54%	62%	2.5	L
Asian	05-09	70%	71%	0.2	S	05-09	62%	62%	0.0	S	06-09	61%	63%	0.5	S
Native American	06-09	69%	56%	-0.2	S	06-09	59%	49%	0.9	S	06-09	42%	47%	1.7	E
Not low-income	05-09	77%	83%	1.5		05-09	71%	76%	1.3		06-09	69%	77%	2.4	
Low-income	05-09	56%	63%	1.7	L	05-09	44%	51%	1.8	L	06-09	45%	51%	2.0	S
Not disabled	06-09	78%	79%	0.3		06-09	70%	72%	0.4		06-09	67%	73%	1.8	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	45%	45%	0.1	S	06-09	20%	26%	2.2	L	06-09	16%	25%	3.0	L
All tested students	06-09	73%	74%	0.3		06-09	65%	67%	0.6		06-09	62%	68%	1.9	
English language learners[3]	06-09	53%	38%	-4.7	S	06-09	40%	24%	-5.2	S	06-09	33%	26%	-2.6	S
Female	05-09	70%	75%	1.3		05-09	63%	67%	1.1		06-09	62%	68%	1.9	
Male	05-09	68%	73%	1.3	E	05-09	61%	66%	1.1	E	06-09	62%	68%	1.9	E

Table reads: In 2005, 78% of white 4th graders and 57% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 83% of white 4th graders and 62% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.4 percentage points per year for white students and 1.2 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

[1]Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

Table AK-13. Achievement gap trends in reading by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation.
If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	05-09	NA	366	NA		05-09	NA	368	NA		05-09	NA	369	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
White	MSS	05-09	NA	390	NA		05-09	NA	389	NA		05-09	NA	392	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	05-09	NA	349	NA	NA	05-09	NA	334	NA	NA	05-09	NA	352	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	05-09	NA	359	NA	NA	05-09	NA	353	NA	NA	05-09	NA	353	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	05-09	NA	345	NA	NA	05-09	NA	351	NA	NA	05-09	NA	346	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	NA	321	NA	NA	06-09	NA	328	NA	NA	06-09	NA	324	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	NA	390	NA		05-09	NA	386	NA		05-09	NA	386	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	NA	337	NA	NA	05-09	NA	340	NA	NA	05-09	NA	334	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	NA	377	NA		06-09	NA	377	NA		06-09	NA	377	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	NA	304	NA	NA	06-09	NA	298	NA	NA	06-09	NA	297	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	NA	376	NA		06-09	NA	377	NA		06-09	NA	379	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	NA	284	NA	NA	06-09	NA	290	NA	NA	06-09	NA	285	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	05-09	NA	374	NA		05-09	NA	378	NA		05-09	NA	377	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	05-09	NA	358	NA	NA	05-09	NA	358	NA	NA	05-09	NA	361	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 390 for white students and 349 for African American students. The average annual gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

Note: The Alaska Standards Based Assessment (ASBA) is scored on a scale of 100-600.

[1]Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Table AK-14. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation.
If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	05-09	NA	351	NA		05-09	NA	333	NA		05-09	NA	331	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
White	MSS	05-09	NA	371	NA		05-09	NA	351	NA		05-09	NA	350	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	05-09	NA	324	NA	NA	05-09	NA	291	NA	NA	05-09	NA	308	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	05-09	NA	343	NA	NA	05-09	NA	316	NA	NA	05-09	NA	315	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	05-09	NA	340	NA	NA	05-09	NA	325	NA	NA	05-09	NA	322	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	NA	314	NA	NA	06-09	NA	302	NA	NA	06-09	NA	295	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	NA	372	NA		05-09	NA	351	NA		05-09	NA	347	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	NA	326	NA	NA	05-09	NA	306	NA	NA	05-09	NA	301	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	NA	361	NA		06-09	NA	342	NA		06-09	NA	339	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	NA	296	NA	NA	06-09	NA	265	NA	NA	06-09	NA	263	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	NA	359	NA		06-09	NA	341	NA		06-09	NA	339	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	NA	284	NA	NA	06-09	NA	265	NA	NA	06-09	NA	267	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	05-09	NA	351	NA		05-09	NA	334	NA		05-09	NA	330	NA	
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	05-09	NA	350	NA	NA	05-09	NA	332	NA	NA	05-09	NA	332	NA	NA
	SD	05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA			05-09	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 371 for white students and 324 for African American students. The average annual gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

Note: The Alaska Standards Based Assessment (ASBA) is scored on a scale of 100-600.

[1]Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

[2]The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Table AK-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year	Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year	Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year
All tested students	Reading	05-09	9,342	9,529	2.0%	100.0%	05-09	10,272	9,337	-9.1%	100.0%	06-09	9,626	9,081	-5.7%	100.0%
	Math	05-09	9,378	9,532	1.6%	100.0%	05-09	10,316	9,334	-9.5%	100.0%	06-09	9,596	9,124	-4.9%	100.0%
White	Reading	05-09	5,442	4,936	-9.3%	51.8%	05-09	6,057	5,164	-14.7%	55.3%	06-09	5,735	5,089	-11.3%	56.0%
	Math	05-09	5,446	4,930	-9.5%	51.7%	05-09	6,083	5,154	-15.3%	55.2%	06-09	5,731	5,110	-10.8%	56.0%
African American	Reading	05-09	477	**344**	-27.9%	3.6%	05-09	483	**340**	-29.6%	3.6%	06-09	409	**313**	-23.5%	3.4%
	Math	05-09	481	**347**	-27.9%	3.6%	05-09	485	**337**	-30.5%	3.6%	06-09	414	**312**	-24.6%	3.4%
Latino	Reading	05-09	407	646	58.7%	6.8%	05-09	373	534	43.2%	5.7%	06-09	364	500	37.4%	5.5%
	Math	05-09	410	653	59.3%	6.9%	05-09	379	534	40.9%	5.7%	06-09	365	508	39.2%	5.6%
Asian	Reading	05-09	655	739	12.8%	7.8%	05-09	683	732	7.2%	7.8%	06-09	700	714	2.0%	7.9%
	Math	05-09	671	750	11.8%	7.9%	05-09	689	740	7.4%	7.9%	06-09	693	722	4.2%	7.9%
Native American	Reading	06-09	2,401	2,154	-10.3%	22.6%	06-09	2,626	1,960	-25.4%	21.0%	06-09	2,244	1,972	-12.1%	21.7%
	Math	06-09	2,398	2,144	-10.6%	22.5%	06-09	2,627	1,957	-25.5%	21.0%	06-09	2,215	1,983	-10.5%	21.7%
Low-income	Reading	05-09	3,732	4,396	17.8%	46.1%	05-09	3,418	3,676	7.5%	39.4%	06-09	2,823	3,085	9.3%	34.0%
	Math	05-09	3,752	4,400	17.3%	46.2%	05-09	3,427	3,677	7.3%	39.4%	06-09	2,800	3,125	11.6%	34.3%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	1,382	1,477	6.9%	15.5%	06-09	1,150	1,067	-7.2%	11.4%	06-09	954	927	-2.8%	10.2%
	Math	06-09	1,381	1,480	7.2%	15.5%	06-09	1,151	1,066	-7.4%	11.4%	06-09	961	933	-2.9%	10.2%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	1,558	1,048	-32.7%	11.0%	06-09	1,551	996	-35.8%	10.7%	06-09	1,164	960	-17.5%	10.6%
	Math	06-09	1,573	1,067	-32.2%	11.2%	06-09	1,563	1,004	-35.8%	10.8%	06-09	1,150	974	-15.3%	10.7%
Female	Reading	05-09	4,610	4,575	-0.8%	48.0%	05-09	4,949	4,534	-8.4%	48.6%	06-09	4,708	4,398	-6.6%	48.4%
	Math	05-09	4,637	4,580	-1.2%	48.0%	05-09	4,960	4,536	-8.5%	48.6%	06-09	4,678	4,423	-5.5%	48.5%
Male	Reading	05-09	4,732	4,954	4.7%	52.0%	05-09	5,323	4,803	-9.8%	51.4%	06-09	4,918	4,683	-4.8%	51.6%
	Math	05-09	4,741	4,952	4.5%	52.0%	05-09	5,356	4,798	-10.4%	51.4%	06-09	4,918	4,701	-4.4%	51.5%

Table reads: In 2005, 5,442 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 4,936 students, a decrease of 9.3%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 51.8% of the 9,529 4th graders taking the reading test that year.

Note: **Bold** type indicates that the number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2009 or the most recent year with available data.

Key Terms

Percentage proficient (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at or above the cut score for "proficient" performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB. The Act requires states to report student test performance in terms of at least three achievement levels: basic, proficient, and advanced. Adequate yearly progress determinations are based on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient level and above.

Percentage basic (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at or above the cut score for "basic" performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB.

Percentage advanced — The percentage of students in a group who reach or exceed the cut score for "advanced" performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB.

Moderate-to-large gain — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average gain of 1 or more percentage points per year. For effect size, an average gain of 0.02 or greater per year.

Slight gain — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average gain of less than 1 percentage point per year. For effect size, an average gain of less than 0.02 per year.

Moderate-to-large decline — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average decline of 1 or more percentage points per year. For effect size, an average decline of 0.02 or greater per year.

Slight decline — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average decline of less than 1 percentage point per year. For effect size, an average decline of less than 0.02 per year.

Effect size — A statistical tool that conveys the amount of difference between test results using a common unit of measurement which does not depend on the scoring scale for a particular test.

Accumulated annual effect size — The cumulative gain in effect size over a range of years.

Mean scale score — The arithmetical average of a group of test scores, expressed on a common scale for a particular state's test. The mean is calculated by adding the scores and dividing the sum by the number of scores.

Standard deviation — A measure of how much test scores tend to deviate from the mean—in other words, how spread out or bunched together test scores are. If students' scores are bunched together, with many scores close to the mean, then the standard deviation will be small. If scores are spread out, with many students scoring at the high or low end of the scale, then the standard deviation will be large.

Cautions and Explanations

Different labels for achievement levels — For consistency, all of the state profiles developed for this report use a common set of labels (basic, proficient, and advanced) for the main achievement levels required by NCLB. In practice, however, some states may use different labels, such as "meets standard" instead of proficient, and some states have established additional achievement levels beyond those required by NCLB.

Different names for subgroups — For the sake of consistency and ease of data tabulation, all of the state profiles developed for this report use a common set of names for the major student subgroups. In practice, however, states use various names for subgroups that may differ from those used here (such as using "Hispanic" instead of "Latino," or "special education students" instead of "students with disabilities"). Moreover, a few states separately track the performance of subgroups not included in the analyses for this report.

Special caution for students with disabilities and English language learners — Trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because changes in federal guidance and state accountability plans may have altered which students in these subgroups are tested for accountability purposes, how they are tested, and when their test scores are counted as proficient under NCLB. These factors could affect the year-to-year comparability of test results.

Inclusion of former English language learners — In many states, the subgroup of English language learners (also known as limited English proficient students) includes students who were formerly English language learners but who have achieved English language proficiency or fluency in the last two years. Federal NCLB regulations permit states to include these formerly ELL students (sometimes referred to as "redesignated fluent English proficient" students) in the ELL subgroup for up to two years for purposes of NCLB accountability.

Limitations of percentage proficient measure — The percentage proficient, the main gauge of student performance under NCLB, can be easily understood and gives a snapshot of how many students have met their state's performance expectations. But it also has several limitations as a measure of student achievement. Users of percentage proficient data should keep in mind these limitations, particularly the following:

* "Proficient" means different things across different states. States vary widely in curriculum, learning expectations, and tests, and state tests differ considerably in their difficulty and cut scores for proficient performance.
* Although this study has taken steps to avoid comparing test data where there have been "breaks" in comparability resulting from new tests, changes in content standards, revised cut scores, or other major changes in testing programs, the year-to-year comparability of test results in the same state may still be affected by less obvious policy and demographic changes.
* Changes in student performance may occur that are not reflected in percentage proficient data, such as an increase in the number of students reaching performance levels below and above proficient (such as the basic or advanced levels).
* The size of the achievement gaps between various subgroups depends in part on where a state sets its cut score for proficiency. For example, if a proficiency cut score is set so high that almost nobody reaches it or so low that almost everyone reaches it, there will be little apparent achievement gap. By contrast, if the cut score is closer to the mean test score, the gaps between subgroups will be more apparent.

Difficulty of attributing causes — Although the tables in this profile show trends in test scores since the enactment of NCLB, one cannot assume that these trends have occurred *because* of NCLB. It is always difficult to determine a cause-and-effect relationship between test score trends and any specific education policy or program due to the many federal, state, and local reforms undertaken in recent years and due to the lack of an appropriate "control" group of students not affected by NCLB.