Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — District of Columbia

K-12 enrollment — 70,618

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. The District's demographics are such that achievement trends could only be determined for African American, male and female, and low income subgroups. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Washington, DC students showed gains in both reading and math at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels for all of these subgroups. Comparable data were available from 2006 through 2009.

- ***Improvement for low-income students.*** Achievement gaps narrowed between low-income and non-low income students across the board—both reading and math at all grade spans analyzed.

- ***Gender gap widened.*** Girls outperformed boys in both math and reading, and the gap in percentage proficient between boys and girls tended to widen, with the exception of high school reading, where the gender gap narrowed.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Native American data not reported due to small N-count

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	DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) DC CAS Alternate Assessment Portfolios
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3-8, 10
State labels for achievement levels	DC uses four achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Basic as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2006
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	Spring 2006: Changed test to DC CAS Spring 2008: Science tests administered

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 DC-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					6%	5%	6%	8%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					32%	31%	40%	45%	4.3
Basic-and-above					80%	75%	83%	85%	1.6
White[2]									
Advanced					67%	56%	46%	49%	-5.9
Proficient-and-above					90%	85%	85%	87%	-1.0
Basic-and-above					99%	92%	94%	95%	-1.3
African American									
Advanced					4%	4%	4%	6%	0.6
Proficient-and-above					29%	29%	38%	43%	4.5
Basic-and-above					80%	75%	82%	84%	1.5
Latino[2]									
Advanced					7%	5%	5%	8%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					38%	35%	37%	50%	3.7
Basic-and-above					74%	75%	79%	86%	4.2
Asian[2]									
Advanced					17%	4%	15%	23%	2.0
Proficient-and-above					53%	57%	66%	67%	4.5
Basic-and-above					86%	75%	89%	93%	2.5
Native American									
Advanced					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 67% in 2006 to 49% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 5.9 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 DC-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					6%	5%	6%	8%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					32%	31%	40%	45%	4.3
Basic-and-above					80%	75%	83%	85%	1.6
Low-income students									
Advanced					3%	3%	3%	5%	0.6
Proficient-and-above					26%	27%	35%	40%	4.7
Basic-and-above					78%	75%	82%	84%	2.2
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					1%	2%	2%	5%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					10%	12%	14%	16%	2.1
Basic-and-above					53%	49%	57%	57%	1.4
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced					1%	0%	1%	3%	0.9
Proficient-and-above					11%	14%	21%	33%	7.1
Basic-and-above					54%	55%	70%	83%	9.7
Female									
Advanced					8%	6%	8%	10%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					38%	36%	47%	52%	5.0
Basic-and-above					85%	80%	88%	90%	1.7
Male									
Advanced					5%	5%	4%	6%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					27%	27%	33%	38%	3.5
Basic-and-above					75%	71%	78%	79%	1.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 3% in 2006 to 5% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 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.

[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 DC-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					3%	5%	5%	6%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					27%	33%	39%	42%	5.2
Basic-and-above					67%	69%	75%	77%	3.1
White[2]									
Advanced					46%	49%	40%	43%	-0.7
Proficient-and-above					87%	85%	85%	87%	0.0
Basic-and-above					95%	94%	91%	93%	-0.5
African American									
Advanced					1%	3%	3%	4%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					24%	30%	36%	39%	5.0
Basic-and-above					66%	67%	74%	75%	3.0
Latino[2]									
Advanced					2%	4%	4%	6%	1.5
Proficient-and-above					30%	38%	46%	56%	8.4
Basic-and-above					69%	72%	80%	85%	5.3
Asian[2]									
Advanced					23%	22%	28%	38%	5.0
Proficient-and-above					75%	76%	70%	88%	4.4
Basic-and-above					97%	94%	87%	98%	0.5
Native American									
Advanced					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test decreased from 46% in 2006 to 43% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 0.7 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 DC-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					3%	5%	5%	6%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					27%	33%	39%	42%	5.2
Basic-and-above					67%	69%	75%	77%	3.1
Low-income students									
Advanced					1%	3%	3%	4%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					22%	28%	35%	39%	5.7
Basic-and-above					65%	67%	73%	76%	3.5
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					0%	2%	2%	4%	1.2
Proficient-and-above					6%	12%	15%	13%	2.2
Basic-and-above					35%	40%	47%	47%	4.0
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced					2%	1%	2%	7%	1.8
Proficient-and-above					17%	23%	33%	46%	9.9
Basic-and-above					51%	63%	69%	81%	10.0
Female									
Advanced					3%	4%	5%	7%	1.2
Proficient-and-above					29%	34%	42%	45%	5.3
Basic-and-above					71%	73%	80%	81%	3.4
Male									
Advanced					3%	5%	5%	6%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					24%	31%	36%	40%	5.1
Basic-and-above					64%	64%	70%	72%	2.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 1% in 2006 to 4% 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 DC-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	36%	45%	2.9		06-09	32%	45%	4.3		06-09	32%	39%	2.5	
White	06-09	88%	87%	-0.4[2]		06-09	90%	87%	-1.0[2]		06-09	87%	79%	-2.6[2]	
African American	06-09	32%	41%	3.0	L	06-09	29%	43%	4.5	L	06-09	28%	36%	2.7	L
Latino	06-09	42%	48%	2.0[2]	L	06-09	38%	50%	3.7[2]	L	06-09	38%	50%	3.9[2]	L
Asian	06-09	70%	76%	1.8[2]	L	06-09	53%	67%	4.5[2]	L	06-09	48%	73%	8.4[2]	L
Native American	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	52%	61%	2.8		06-09	43%	56%	4.4		06-09	39%	46%	2.3	
Low-income	06-09	29%	39%	3.2	L	06-09	26%	40%	4.7	L	06-09	24%	35%	3.7	L
Not disabled	06-09	41%	50%	3.1		06-09	38%	53%	4.9		06-09	38%	47%	3.0	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	14%	20%	1.9	S	06-09	10%	16%	2.1	S	06-09	5%	11%	1.7	S
Not ELLs	06-09	37%	45%	2.5		06-09	33%	46%	4.3		06-09	33%	39%	2.2	
English language learners[3]	06-09	21%	45%	8.0[2]	L	06-09	11%	33%	7.1[2]	L	06-09	16%	38%	7.6[2]	L
Female	06-09	40%	51%	3.8		06-09	38%	52%	5.0		06-09	38%	44%	2.2	
Male	06-09	32%	39%	2.1	S	06-09	27%	38%	3.5	S	06-09	26%	34%	2.6	L

Table reads: In 2006, 88% of white 4th graders and 32% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 87% of white 4th graders and 41% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient declined at an average rate of 0.4 percentage points per year for white students and improved at an average rate of 3.0 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 DC-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	28%	50%	7.3		06-09	27%	42%	5.2		06-09	27%	39%	3.9	
White	06-09	86%	90%	1.3[2]		06-09	87%	87%	0.0[2]		06-09	88%	73%	-5.2[2]	
African American	06-09	22%	44%	7.5	L	06-09	24%	39%	5.0	L	06-09	23%	36%	4.4	L
Latino	06-09	38%	61%	7.8	L	06-09	30%	56%	8.4[2]	L	06-09	36%	55%	6.4[2]	L
Asian	06-09	69%	81%	4.2[2]	L	06-09	75%	88%	4.4[2]	L	06-09	75%	80%	1.6[2]	L
Native American	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	43%	64%	6.9		06-09	36%	51%	5.0		06-09	34%	46%	4.3	
Low-income	06-09	21%	44%	7.8	L	06-09	22%	39%	5.7	L	06-09	21%	35%	4.7	L
Not disabled	06-09	32%	55%	7.8		06-09	32%	50%	6.0		06-09	33%	47%	4.8	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	7%	22%	5.0	S	06-09	6%	13%	2.2	S	06-09	4%	9%	1.8	S
Not ELLS	06-09	28%	48%	6.8		06-09	27%	42%	5.0		06-09	28%	39%	3.7	
English language learners[3]	06-09	22%	59%	12.1[2]	L	06-09	17%	46%	9.9[2]	L	06-09	27%	48%	7.1[2]	L
Female	06-09	30%	52%	7.5		06-09	29%	45%	5.3		06-09	28%	42%	4.5	
Male	06-09	25%	47%	7.3	S	06-09	24%	40%	5.1	S	06-09	27%	37%	3.3	S

Table reads: In 2006, 86% of white 4th graders and 22% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 90% of white 4th graders and 44% 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 1.3 percentage points per year for white students and 7.5 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 DC-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	449.1	451.8	0.9		06-09	848.6	853.2	1.5		06-09	947.4	953.4	2.0	
	SD	06-09	14.2	15.2			06-09	15.8	13.2			06-09	16.9	13.0		
White	MSS	06-09	466.7	467.0	0.1[2]		06-09	871.4	869.4	-0.6[2]		06-09	969.7	969.5	-0.1[2]	
	SD	06-09	12.5	12.2			06-09	11.7	12.1			06-09	14.1	13.7		
African American	MSS	06-09	447.7	450.2	0.8	L	06-09	847.9	852.4	1.5	L	06-09	945.9	952.5	2.2	L
	SD	06-09	13.8	14.7			06-09	14.8	12.8			06-09	16.4	12.5		
Latino	MSS	06-09	449.6	452.3	0.9[2]	L	06-09	846.7	853.6	2.3[2]	L	06-09	949.7	955.1	1.8[2]	L
	SD	06-09	14.9	14.5			06-09	19.7	13.0			06-09	15.0	12.4		
Asian	MSS	06-09	458.3	462.8	1.5[2]	L	06-09	852.7	862.5	3.3[2]	L	06-09	954.1	958.2	1.4[2]	L
	SD	06-09	14.8	12.7			06-09	19.6	12.6			06-09	12.4	15.5		
Native American	MSS	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	454.3	457.7	1.1		06-09	852.4	857.2	1.6		06-09	949.9	956.3	2.1	
	SD	06-09	15.2	14.9			06-09	16.5	13.7			06-09	17.6	13.7		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	446.9	449.5	0.9	S	06-09	846.5	851.5	1.7	L	06-09	944.8	951.8	2.3	L
	SD	06-09	13.2	14.6			06-09	15.0	12.6			06-09	15.7	12.3		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	450.8	453.8	1.0		06-09	851.3	855.9	1.5		06-09	950.4	955.3	1.6	
	SD	06-09	13.6	14.1			06-09	14.5	11.6			06-09	15.7	11.9		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	440.8	440.7	0.0	S	06-09	837.6	840.9	1.1	S	06-09	934.1	942.3	2.7	L
	SD	06-09	14.4	16.2			06-09	16.2	13.1			06-09	15.7	13.2		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	449.6	452.0	0.8		06-09	849.2	853.5	1.5		06-09	947.6	953.6	2.0	
	SD	06-09	14.1	15.2			06-09	15.4	13.1			06-09	17.0	13.0		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	442.7	449.9	2.4[2]	L	06-09	835.2	847.7	4.2[2]	L	06-09	943.2	949.6	2.1[2]	L
	SD	06-09	14.9	14.7			06-09	19.0	12.6			06-09	13.3	12.4		
Female	MSS	06-09	450.8	454.2	1.1		06-09	850.7	855.8	1.7		06-09	949.8	954.9	1.7	
	SD	06-09	13.8	13.7			06-09	15.4	12.2			06-09	16.1	12.0		
Male	MSS	06-09	447.4	449.4	0.6	S	06-09	846.5	850.5	1.3	S	06-09	945.0	951.5	2.2	L
	SD	06-09	14.4	16.1			06-09	15.9	13.7			06-09	17.2	13.9		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 466.7 for white students and 447.7 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 467.0 for white students and 450.2 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.1 points for white students and 0.8 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The DC CAS is scored on a scale of 400-499 at grade 4, 800-899 at grade 8, and 900-999 at grade 10.

[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 DC-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	449.2	456.4	2.4		06-09	839.7	846.0	2.1		06-09	938.2	946.3	2.7	
	SD	06-09	16.0	16.7			06-09	16.9	16.1			06-09	21.1	18.9		
White	MSS	06-09	469.8	472.5	0.9[2]		06-09	863.8	864.8	0.3[2]		06-09	970.3	967.4	-1.0[2]	
	SD	06-09	14.8	13.8			06-09	14.4	13.3			06-09	16.5	17.7		
African American	MSS	06-09	447.0	454.2	2.4	L	06-09	838.4	844.7	2.1	L	06-09	935.7	944.6	3.0	L
	SD	06-09	15.1	16.1			06-09	16.2	15.7			06-09	19.9	18.3		
Latino	MSS	06-09	452.7	460.3	2.5	L	06-09	840.8	849.0	2.7[2]	L	06-09	942.8	951.4	2.9[2]	L
	SD	06-09	14.9	15.3			06-09	16.5	14.3			06-09	19.0	17.0		
Asian	MSS	06-09	463.3	470.2	2.3[2]	L	06-09	838.4	866.3	9.3[2]	L	06-09	935.7	965.4	9.9[2]	L
	SD	06-09	14.3	14.4			06-09	12.5	14.1			06-09	17.9	20.5		
Native American	MSS	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	454.6	462.0	2.5		06-09	843.0	849.7	2.2		06-09	941.1	950.0	3.0	
	SD	06-09	17.8	17.0			06-09	17.6	16.4			06-09	22.1	19.5		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	446.8	454.3	2.5	E	06-09	837.8	844.4	2.2	E	06-09	935.3	944.2	3.0	E
	SD	06-09	14.6	16.0			06-09	16.2	15.8			06-09	19.6	18.2		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	451.9	458.8	2.3		06-09	842.7	849.0	2.1		06-09	942.0	949.2	2.4	
	SD	06-09	14.2	15.4			06-09	15.7	14.5			06-09	20.1	17.6		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	435.4	443.0	2.5	L	06-09	827.3	832.2	1.6	S	06-09	921.3	929.2	2.6	L
	SD	06-09	17.5	16.9			06-09	16.1	16.0			06-09	17.0	16.7		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	449.3	456.2	2.3		06-09	839.9	846.1	2.1		06-09	938.1	946.3	2.8	
	SD	06-09	16.4	16.8			06-09	16.9	16.1			06-09	21.2	18.9		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	446.9	457.8	3.6[2]	L	06-09	835.6	845.5	3.3[2]	L	06-09	940.3	944.9	1.5[2]	S
	SD	06-09	14.3	15.8			06-09	16.6	17.0			06-09	19.4	18.3		
Female	MSS	06-09	450.2	457.8	2.5		06-09	841.1	847.3	2.1		06-09	939.5	947.2	2.6	
	SD	06-09	15.1	15.7			06-09	16.1	15.2			06-09	20.3	18.2		
Male	MSS	06-09	448.1	455.1	2.3	S	06-09	838.3	844.7	2.1	E	06-09	936.9	945.1	2.7	L
	SD	06-09	16.9	17.5			06-09	17.5	16.9			06-09	21.8	19.6		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 469.8 for white students and 447.0 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 472.5 for white students and 454.2 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score

improved at an average yearly rate of 0.9 points for white students and 2.4 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The DC CAS is scored on a scale of 400-499 at grade 4, 800-899 at grade 8, and 900-999 at grade 10.

[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 DC-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	4,208	4,524	7.5%	100.0%	06-09	4,123	4,458	8.1%	100.0%	06-09	3,401	3,585	5.4%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	4,208	4,556	8.3%	100.0%	06-09	4,123	4,459	8.1%	100.0%	06-09	3,401	3,581	5.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	231	**304**	31.6%	6.7%	06-09	129	**141**	9.3%	3.2%	06-09	144	**120**	-16.7%	3.3%
	Math	06-09	231	**307**	32.9%	6.7%	06-09	129	**142**	10.1%	3.2%	06-09	144	**120**	-16.7%	3.4%
African American	Reading	06-09	3,449	3,653	5.9%	80.7%	06-09	3,624	3,840	6.0%	86.1%	06-09	2,887	3,100	7.4%	86.5%
	Math	06-09	3,449	3,660	6.1%	80.3%	06-09	3,624	3,832	5.7%	85.9%	06-09	2,887	3,098	7.3%	86.5%
Latino	Reading	06-09	461	**494**	7.2%	10.9%	06-09	300	**417**	39.0%	9.4%	06-09	307	**318**	3.6%	8.9%
	Math	06-09	461	511	10.8%	11.2%	06-09	300	**420**	40.0%	9.4%	06-09	307	**316**	2.9%	8.8%
Asian	Reading	06-09	64	**69**	7.8%	1.5%	06-09	64	**58**	-9.4%	1.3%	06-09	57	**44**	-22.8%	1.2%
	Math	06-09	64	**74**	15.6%	1.6%	06-09	64	**63**	-1.6%	1.4%	06-09	57	**44**	-22.8%	1.2%
Native American	Reading	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	06-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
Low-income	Reading	06-09	2,925	3,271	11.8%	72.3%	06-09	2,640	3,119	18.1%	70.0%	06-09	1,690	2,300	36.1%	64.2%
	Math	06-09	2,925	3,293	12.6%	72.3%	06-09	2,640	3,119	18.1%	69.9%	06-09	1,690	2,294	35.7%	64.1%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	703	696	-1.0%	15.4%	06-09	812	794	-2.2%	17.8%	06-09	624	531	-14.9%	14.8%
	Math	06-09	703	698	-0.7%	15.3%	06-09	812	789	-2.8%	17.7%	06-09	624	530	-15.1%	14.8%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	288	**432**	50.0%	9.5%	06-09	169	**255**	50.9%	5.7%	06-09	179	**199**	11.2%	5.6%
	Math	06-09	288	**461**	60.1%	10.1%	06-09	169	**265**	56.8%	5.9%	06-09	179	**198**	10.6%	5.5%
Female	Reading	06-09	2,125	2,233	5.1%	49.4%	06-09	2,073	2,271	9.6%	50.9%	06-09	1,709	1,958	14.6%	54.6%
	Math	06-09	2,125	2,246	5.7%	49.3%	06-09	2,073	2,272	9.6%	51.0%	06-09	1,709	1,961	14.7%	54.8%
Male	Reading	06-09	2,083	2,291	10.0%	50.6%	06-09	2,046	2,187	6.9%	49.1%	06-09	1,687	1,627	-3.6%	45.4%
	Math	06-09	2,083	2,310	10.9%	50.7%	06-09	2,046	2,187	6.9%	49.0%	06-09	1,687	1,620	-4.0%	45.2%

Table reads: In 2006, 231 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had risen to 304 students, an increase of 31.6%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 6.7% of the 4,524 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.