Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Connecticut

K-12 enrollment — 551,522

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. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Connecticut students showed gains across the board in math--at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels for racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls. In reading, there were gains at the basic and proficient levels, but a slight decline at the advanced level for all students, and each subgroup as well. Achievement gaps between racial/ethnic subgroups, between low income and non-low income students, and between boys and girls (in reading) narrowed almost across the board. Comparable data were available from 2006 through 2009 for grades 4 and 8 and from 2007 through 2009 for grade 10.

- ***Exception.*** The achievement gap between Latino and white students in grade 4 reading remained unchanged.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009, grades 3–8 2007 through 2009, grade 10
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009, grades 3–8 2007 through 2009, grade 10

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	Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), grades 3–8 CMT Skills Checklist (for special education students) Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), grade 10 CAPT Skills Checklist (for special education students)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 10
State labels for achievement levels	CT uses five achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Goal, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Basic as Basic, Proficient + Goal as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2006: CMT 2007: CAPT
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2005–06: Added grades 3, 5, 7 2006: Introduced new generation of CMT, switched to spring testing 2007: Introduced new generation of CAPT

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 CT-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					24%	23%	21%	22%	-0.5
Proficient-and-above					77%	76%	77%	81%	1.3
Basic-and-above					84%	84%	85%	88%	1.3
White									
Advanced					31%	29%	27%	29%	-0.6
Proficient-and-above					87%	86%	87%	90%	1.1
Basic-and-above					92%	92%	92%	95%	0.9
African American									
Advanced					6%	5%	4%	5%	-0.2
Proficient-and-above					53%	53%	54%	60%	2.3
Basic-and-above					67%	67%	68%	74%	2.3
Latino									
Advanced					5%	5%	4%	5%	-0.2
Proficient-and-above					50%	50%	50%	55%	1.6
Basic-and-above					62%	62%	64%	70%	2.5
Asian									
Advanced					38%	35%	35%	36%	-0.7
Proficient-and-above					87%	87%	89%	89%	1.0
Basic-and-above					92%	92%	93%	94%	0.8
Native American[2]									
Advanced					16%	18%	14%	15%	-0.1
Proficient-and-above					71%	70%	71%	76%	1.8
Basic-and-above					80%	75%	82%	88%	2.7

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 31% in 2006 to 29% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 0.6 percentage points per year.

[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 CT-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					24%	23%	21%	22%	-0.5
Proficient-and-above					77%	76%	77%	81%	1.3
Basic-and-above					84%	84%	85%	88%	1.3
Low-income students									
Advanced					6%	5%	4%	5%	-0.2
Proficient-and-above					52%	52%	52%	58%	1.9
Basic-and-above					65%	65%	65%	72%	2.4
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					3%	3%	3%	3%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					35%	34%	35%	48%	4.2
Basic-and-above					46%	45%	47%	61%	4.9
English language learners[3]									
Advanced					1%	1%	0%	0%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above					24%	18%	19%	19%	-1.7
Basic-and-above					37%	31%	34%	38%	0.6
Female									
Advanced					26%	26%	23%	24%	-0.8
Proficient-and-above					79%	79%	80%	83%	1.2
Basic-and-above					87%	86%	87%	90%	1.2
Male									
Advanced					21%	20%	19%	21%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above					74%	74%	74%	78%	1.4
Basic-and-above					82%	82%	82%	86%	1.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 6% in 2006 to 5% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.2 percentage points per year.

[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 CT-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

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					24%	27%	26%	30%	2.0
Proficient-and-above					79%	81%	81%	85%	1.9
Basic-and-above					90%	91%	91%	94%	1.3
White									
Advanced					31%	34%	34%	38%	2.4
Proficient-and-above					89%	90%	91%	93%	1.3
Basic-and-above					96%	96%	97%	98%	0.8
African American									
Advanced					4%	5%	6%	7%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					53%	57%	58%	64%	3.8
Basic-and-above					75%	78%	80%	84%	3.0
Latino									
Advanced					5%	6%	7%	8%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					54%	57%	59%	63%	3.2
Basic-and-above					76%	78%	78%	83%	2.5
Asian									
Advanced					44%	47%	48%	50%	1.9
Proficient-and-above					92%	92%	93%	94%	0.5
Basic-and-above					97%	98%	97%	98%	0.2
Native American[2]									
Advanced					16%	12%	15%	18%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					76%	72%	71%	83%	2.3
Basic-and-above					90%	81%	88%	91%	0.4

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 31% in 2006 to 38% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 2.4 percentage points per year.

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

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					24%	27%	26%	30%	2.0
Proficient-and-above					79%	81%	81%	85%	1.9
Basic-and-above					90%	91%	91%	94%	1.3
Low-income students									
Advanced					5%	6%	6%	8%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					55%	59%	58%	65%	3.3
Basic-and-above					76%	79%	79%	84%	2.6
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					3%	4%	4%	5%	0.5
Proficient-and-above					38%	40%	40%	54%	5.3
Basic-and-above					58%	59%	62%	75%	5.5
English language learners[3]									
Advanced					3%	3%	2%	2%	-0.4
Proficient-and-above					40%	35%	34%	36%	-1.6
Basic-and-above					65%	62%	60%	65%	0.3
Female									
Advanced					22%	26%	26%	29%	2.3
Proficient-and-above					80%	81%	82%	85%	1.9
Basic-and-above					91%	92%	92%	95%	1.2
Male									
Advanced					25%	28%	27%	30%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					78%	81%	80%	84%	1.9
Basic-and-above					89%	90%	91%	93%	1.4

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 5% in 2006 to 8% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 1.0 percentage points per year.

[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 CT-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	06-09	72%	74%	0.9		06-09	77%	81%	1.3		07-09	80%	82%	1.1	
White	06-09	82%	85%	1.0		06-09	87%	90%	1.1		07-09	89%	90%	0.7	
African American	06-09	48%	53%	1.6	L	06-09	53%	60%	2.3	L	07-09	54%	60%	2.8	L
Latino	06-09	44%	47%	1.0	E	06-09	50%	55%	1.6	L	07-09	57%	61%	2.1	L
Asian	06-09	83%	85%	1.0	E	06-09	87%	89%	1.0	S	07-09	86%	88%	1.2	L
Native American	06-09	63%	70%	2.2[2]	L	06-09	71%	76%	1.8[2]	L	07-09	65%	70%	2.7[2]	L
Not low-income	06-09	83%	86%	1.0		06-09	86%	90%	1.3		07-09	87%	89%	1.0	
Low-income	06-09	45%	50%	1.5	L	06-09	52%	58%	1.9	L	07-09	55%	60%	2.5	L
Not disabled	06-09	77%	77%	0.0		06-09	82%	84%	0.5		07-09	84%	85%	0.3	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	29%	40%	3.6	L	06-09	35%	48%	4.2	L	07-09	40%	49%	4.3	L
Not ELLs	06-09	74%	77%	0.9		06-09	79%	83%	1.4		07-09	81%	83%	1.1	
English language learners[3]	06-09	30%	23%	-2.5	S	06-09	24%	19%	-1.7	S	07-09	38%	35%	-1.3	S
Female	06-09	74%	76%	0.6		06-09	79%	83%	1.2		07-09	84%	86%	1.0	
Male	06-09	69%	73%	1.1	L	06-09	74%	78%	1.4	L	07-09	75%	77%	1.1	L

Table reads: In 2006, 82% of white 4th graders and 48% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 85% of white 4th graders and 53% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.0 percentage points per year for white students and 1.6 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing 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 CT-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	06-09	80%	85%	1.4		06-09	79%	85%	1.9		07-09	77%	78%	0.6	
White	06-09	89%	92%	1.2		06-09	89%	93%	1.3		07-09	88%	89%	0.5	
African American	06-09	57%	65%	2.8	L	06-09	53%	64%	3.8	L	07-09	43%	46%	1.5	L
Latino	06-09	60%	67%	2.2	L	06-09	54%	63%	3.2	L	07-09	51%	54%	1.9	L
Asian	06-09	92%	95%	0.8	S	06-09	92%	94%	0.5	S	07-09	87%	89%	1.1	L
Native American	06-09	70%	81%	3.6[2]	L	06-09	76%	83%	2.3[2]	L	07-09	63%	78%	7.4[2]	L
Not low-income	06-09	89%	93%	1.3		06-09	88%	93%	1.6		07-09	86%	87%	0.8	
Low-income	06-09	60%	67%	2.4	L	06-09	55%	65%	3.3	L	07-09	49%	52%	1.6	L
Not disabled	06-09	85%	87%	0.6		06-09	84%	88%	1.1		07-09	82%	82%	0.1	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	46%	63%	5.5	L	06-09	38%	54%	5.3	L	07-09	39%	43%	1.9	L
Not ELLS	06-09	82%	86%	1.4		06-09	80%	86%	2.0		07-09	79%	80%	0.6	
English language learners[3]	06-09	54%	54%	0.1	S	06-09	40%	36%	-1.6	S	07-09	34%	36%	0.9	L
Female	06-09	80%	85%	1.5		06-09	80%	85%	1.9		07-09	77%	77%	0.3	
Male	06-09	80%	84%	1.4	S	06-09	78%	84%	1.9	E	07-09	78%	80%	1.0	L

Table reads: In 2006, 89% of white 4th graders and 57% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 92% of white 4th graders and 65% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.2 percentage points per year for white students and 2.8 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing 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 CT-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	06-09	249.9	254.8	1.6		06-09	249.7	251.3	0.5		07-09	242.9	245.1	1.1	
	SD	06-09	44.9	43.3			06-09	44.9	40.2			07-09	47.4	46.8		
White	MSS	06-09	261.5	266.5	1.7		06-09	261.5	262.0	0.2		07-09	254.8	257.1	1.2	
	SD	06-09	41.1	38.9			06-09	41.2	37.1			07-09	43.4	42.9		
African American	MSS	06-09	222.5	229.3	2.3	L	06-09	221.2	225.7	1.5	L	07-09	209.0	213.2	2.1	L
	SD	06-09	39.1	39.5			06-09	37.2	32.4			07-09	40.6	40.0		
Latino	MSS	06-09	219.0	225.7	2.2	L	06-09	217.9	222.7	1.6	L	07-09	211.9	214.7	1.4	L
	SD	06-09	40.8	39.8			06-09	39.6	34.6			07-09	42.9	42.0		
Asian	MSS	06-09	264.0	271.0	2.3	L	06-09	267.1	267.6	0.2	E	07-09	256.2	260.4	2.1	L
	SD	06-09	42.6	42.4			06-09	46.6	40.8			07-09	48.9	49.3		
Native American	MSS	06-09	237.9	246.0	2.7[2]	L	06-09	239.0	241.4	0.8[2]	L	07-09	220.6	226.8	3.1[2]	L
	SD	06-09	45.3	39.4			06-09	40.5	35.7			07-09	40.7	44.4		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	262.4	267.6	1.7		06-09	261.0	262.2	0.4		07-09	253.1	256.0	1.5	
	SD	06-09	40.8	38.8			06-09	41.8	37.5			07-09	44.1	43.4		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	219.9	227.4	2.5	L	06-09	219.5	224.3	1.6	L	07-09	209.5	213.3	1.9	L
	SD	06-09	39.7	39.3			06-09	38.2	33.4			07-09	42.2	41.6		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	256.1	257.8	0.6		06-09	255.7	254.7	-0.3		07-09	248.5	249.0	0.3	
	SD	06-09	41.1	42.0			06-09	41.7	38.9			07-09	44.4	45.2		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	201.9	217.6	5.2	L	06-09	203.3	214.1	3.6	L	07-09	193.8	202.0	4.1	L
	SD	06-09	43.9	41.7			06-09	40.9	34.9			07-09	45.0	43.1		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	252.5	257.4	1.6		06-09	251.6	253.3	0.6		07-09	244.5	246.9	1.2	
	SD	06-09	43.9	42.0			06-09	44.0	39.2			07-09	46.7	45.9		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	205.1	201.6	-1.2	S	06-09	196.2	196.0	-0.1	S	07-09	191.4	188.6	-1.4	S
	SD	06-09	38.0	34.1			06-09	34.2	26.4			07-09	41.9	39.7		
Female	MSS	06-09	253.5	257.5	1.3		06-09	253.9	254.3	0.1		07-09	251.4	253.0	0.8	
	SD	06-09	43.7	42.8			06-09	44.1	39.4			07-09	46.3	45.9		
Male	MSS	06-09	246.5	252.2	1.9	L	06-09	245.8	248.4	0.9	L	07-09	234.7	237.4	1.4	L
	SD	06-09	45.7	43.5			06-09	45.2	40.8			07-09	47.1	46.4		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 261.5 for white students and 222.5 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 266.5 for white students and 229.3 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 1.7 points for white students and 2.3 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) for grades 4 and 8 and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) for grade 10 are scored on a scale of 100-400.

[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 CT-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	06-09	252.6	262.8	3.4		06-09	251.8	260.3	2.8		07-09	250.0	251.8	0.9	
	SD	06-09	46.4	48.8			06-09	45.7	43.6			07-09	47.5	47.2		
White	MSS	06-09	263.9	275.1	3.7		06-09	264.5	272.5	2.7		07-09	263.5	265.9	1.2	
	SD	06-09	42.4	44.5			06-09	40.7	38.5			07-09	40.4	39.1		
African American	MSS	06-09	221.2	230.7	3.2	S	06-09	217.7	228.0	3.4	L	07-09	208.7	211.3	1.3	L
	SD	06-09	41.0	43.6			06-09	38.5	36.8			07-09	43.2	45.0		
Latino	MSS	06-09	224.8	234.2	3.1	S	06-09	218.7	228.8	3.4	L	07-09	215.1	218.5	1.7	L
	SD	06-09	43.0	44.2			06-09	39.8	38.8			07-09	44.1	46.0		
Asian	MSS	06-09	276.0	289.3	4.4	L	06-09	279.0	284.3	1.8	S	07-09	269.6	270.7	0.6	S
	SD	06-09	45.6	47.9			06-09	44.5	43.6			07-09	47.9	44.6		
Native American	MSS	06-09	239.0	256.4	5.8[2]	L	06-09	240.4	248.7	2.8[2]	L	07-09	231.6	241.4	4.9[2]	L
	SD	06-09	43.6	45.1			06-09	42.0	42.0			07-09	46.8	43.2		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	264.6	276.5	4.0		06-09	263.9	272.7	2.9		07-09	260.9	263.8	1.5	
	SD	06-09	42.8	44.9			06-09	41.8	39.3			07-09	42.6	41.1		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	224.0	233.7	3.2	S	06-09	219.2	229.4	3.4	L	07-09	213.9	216.7	1.4	S
	SD	06-09	42.0	44.0			06-09	39.4	38.1			07-09	45.0	46.4		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	258.3	266.2	2.6		06-09	258.1	264.3	2.1		07-09	255.5	255.9	0.2	
	SD	06-09	43.3	47.8			06-09	42.2	41.8			07-09	43.8	44.5		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	209.4	227.2	5.9	L	06-09	203.0	218.7	5.2	L	07-09	201.1	205.7	2.3	L
	SD	06-09	46.6	45.2			06-09	42.0	39.6			07-09	51.4	51.3		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	254.6	265.0	3.5		06-09	253.4	262.3	3.0		07-09	251.6	253.5	1.0	
	SD	06-09	45.9	48.1			06-09	45.1	42.6			07-09	46.5	46.1		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	218.8	218.2	-0.2	S	06-09	206.7	204.9	-0.6	S	07-09	197.9	198.5	0.3	S
	SD	06-09	42.1	41.5			06-09	38.5	32.4			07-09	48.6	48.3		
Female	MSS	06-09	251.5	261.0	3.2		06-09	251.5	260.5	3.0		07-09	248.5	249.2	0.4	
	SD	06-09	44.6	47.0			06-09	44.2	42.6			07-09	46.1	45.8		
Male	MSS	06-09	253.7	264.5	3.6	L	06-09	252.1	260.0	2.6	S	07-09	251.3	254.5	1.6	L
	SD	06-09	48.1	50.5			06-09	47.1	44.6			07-09	48.9	48.4		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 263.9 for white students and 221.2 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 275.1 for white students and 230.7 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score

improved at an average yearly rate of 3.7 points for white students and 3.2 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) for grades 4 and 8 and the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) for grade 10 are scored on a scale of 100-400.

[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 CT-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	06-09	42,179	39,245	-7.0%	100.0%	06-09	43,831	40,996	-6.5%	100.0%	07-09	42,056	41,119	-2.2%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	42,308	39,790	-6.0%	100.0%	06-09	43,944	41,156	-6.3%	100.0%	07-09	41,966	41,002	-2.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	28,446	25,602	-10.0%	65.2%	06-09	29,912	27,543	-7.9%	67.2%	07-09	29,391	28,183	-4.1%	68.5%
	Math	06-09	28,495	25,923	-9.0%	65.1%	06-09	29,957	27,656	-7.7%	67.2%	07-09	29,365	28,096	-4.3%	68.5%
African American	Reading	06-09	5,673	5,322	-6.2%	13.6%	06-09	6,044	5,347	-11.5%	13.0%	07-09	5,745	5,618	-2.2%	13.7%
	Math	06-09	5,704	5,392	-5.5%	13.6%	06-09	6,067	5,361	-11.6%	13.0%	07-09	5,680	5,570	-1.9%	13.6%
Latino	Reading	06-09	6,327	6,469	2.2%	16.5%	06-09	6,327	6,354	0.4%	15.5%	07-09	5,449	5,796	6.4%	14.1%
	Math	06-09	6,373	6,612	3.8%	16.6%	06-09	6,367	6,385	0.3%	15.5%	07-09	5,439	5,809	6.8%	14.2%
Asian	Reading	06-09	1,580	1,712	8.4%	4.4%	06-09	1,408	1,609	14.3%	3.9%	07-09	1,361	1,396	2.6%	3.4%
	Math	06-09	1,584	1,719	8.5%	4.3%	06-09	1,411	1,612	14.2%	3.9%	07-09	1,373	1,404	2.3%	3.4%
Native American	Reading	06-09	153	**140**	-8.5%	0.4%	06-09	140	**143**	2.1%	0.3%	07-09	110	**126**	14.5%	0.3%
	Math	06-09	152	**144**	-5.3%	0.4%	06-09	142	**142**	0.0%	0.3%	07-09	109	**123**	12.8%	0.3%
Low-income	Reading	06-09	12,406	12,464	0.5%	31.8%	06-09	11,868	11,771	-0.8%	28.7%	07-09	9,845	10,461	6.3%	25.4%
	Math	06-09	12,474	12,718	2.0%	32.0%	06-09	11,935	11,798	-1.1%	28.7%	07-09	9,793	10,419	6.4%	25.4%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	4,854	2,895	-40.4%	7.4%	06-09	4,977	3,453	-30.6%	8.4%	07-09	4,274	3,335	-22.0%	8.1%
	Math	06-09	4,924	3,414	-30.7%	8.6%	06-09	5,035	3,616	-28.2%	8.8%	07-09	4,254	3,344	-21.4%	8.2%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	2,319	1,789	-22.9%	4.6%	06-09	1,483	1,402	-5.5%	3.4%	07-09	1,242	1,207	-2.8%	2.9%
	Math	06-09	2,351	1,861	-20.8%	4.7%	06-09	1,504	1,413	-6.1%	3.4%	07-09	1,310	1,262	-3.7%	3.1%
Female	Reading	06-09	20,557	19,410	-5.6%	49.5%	06-09	21,416	20,190	-5.7%	49.2%	07-09	20,774	20,409	-1.8%	49.6%
	Math	06-09	20,593	19,538	-5.1%	49.1%	06-09	21,452	20,223	-5.7%	49.1%	07-09	20,746	20,327	-2.0%	49.6%
Male	Reading	06-09	21,622	19,835	-8.3%	50.5%	06-09	22,415	20,806	-7.2%	50.8%	07-09	21,282	20,710	-2.7%	50.4%
	Math	06-09	21,715	20,252	-6.7%	50.9%	06-09	22,492	20,933	-6.9%	50.9%	07-09	21,220	20,675	-2.6%	50.4%

Table reads: In 2006, 28,446 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 25,602 students, a decrease of 10.0%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 65.2% of the 39,245 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.