Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Georgia

K-12 enrollment — 1,615,066

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. Georgia has made some changes in its testing program in recent years. As a result, trend data were only available for reading in grades 4 and 8 from 2006 through 2009, and only at the proficient and advanced levels. In math, data were only available for the high school level from 2004 through 2009. Achievement data for low income students were also unavailable. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Georgia students showed gains in reading at the proficient and advanced levels for racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls. The limited data show that progress has been made in narrowing achievement gaps in reading between the African American and Latino subgroups and the white subgroup at grades 4 and 8. Gaps also narrowed in high school math.

- ***Exception.*** The gap between boys and girls in reading (girls usually outperform boys in reading) widened in grade 4.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	Reading: 2006–2009, grades 3-8 (prior years not comparable due to change in scoring scale) 2008–2009, grade 11 (new test implemented in 2008) Math: 2008–2009, grades 3-5, 8 (new test implemented in 2008) 2006–2009, grade 6 2007–2009, grade 7 2004–2009, grade 11
Years of comparable mean scale score data	Reading: 2007–2009, grades 3-8 (prior years not comparable due to change in scoring scale) 2008–2009, grade 11 Math: 2008–2009, grades 3-5, 8 (new test implemented in 2008) 2005–2009, grade 11
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Subgroup mean scale score data are not available until 2005 for grade 11, and mean scale score data are not available for English language learners (ELLs) for grade 11 until 2007 Standard deviations are not available by subgroup until 2007 Data are not available for the comparison group of students who are *not* English language learners, so the ELL subgroup is compared with all tested students in the state For low-income and *not* low-income students, percentage proficient data are only available for grade 11 math from 2004 through 2007 and grades 3-8 reading from 2006 through 2007. Mean scale score data for these subgroups are not available for any year.
Other data limitations	Georgia reports results separately for reading and English language arts (ELA); to be consistent with other states, the results reported here are for reading, except in grade 11, where ELA results are reported.

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	Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) in reading and English language arts combined and in mathematics (grades 3-8) Georgia High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) in English language

	arts and mathematics (grade 11) Georgia Alternate Assessment (GAA) (standards-based portfolio assessment) For small schools without typical grade configurations tests above may not apply; in these instances, the CRCT in grades 1 and 2 and/or End-of-Course Tests (EOCT) may be used to measure adequate yearly progress (AYP). All schools are included in the accountability system with some evidence of academic achievement on a state-mandated assessment.
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 11 primarily. Schools that do not use these grade configurations have an alternate determination using other assessments for AYP.
State labels for achievement levels	GA uses three achievement levels: Does Not Meet (GHSGT: Fail), Meets (GHSGT: Pass), and Exceeds (GHSGT: Pass Plus). A fourth level, GHSGT Honors, is used for Grade 11 Language. For our analyses we did not have a category to treat as Basic; we treated Meets (GHSGT: Pass) as Proficient, and Exceeds (GHSGT: Pass Plus + GHSGT Honors) as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	Reading: 2006, grades 3-8; 2008, grade 11 Math: 2008, grades 3-5, 8 2006, grade 6 2007, grade 7 2004, grade 11
Time of test administration	Spring for CRCT and GHSGT for AYP purposes. For grade 11 only, first-time test-takers are considered in AYP determinations. Summer retest opportunity for CRCT for grade promotion purposes Summer, fall, and winter retest opportunities for GHSGT for graduation purposes EOCTs are offered at various times throughout the year depending on when specific course is offered
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2004: GHSGT was enhanced to meet U.S. Department of Education criteria for peer review approval. New annual measurable objectives were set for schools, based on new standards; scale range of 400 to 600 remained unchanged. 2004: EOCTs became requirement for course grades. 2006: Reading scores on the CRCT and English language arts scores on the GHSGT were linked to the national Lexile scale. 2008: The Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) were phased in to

replace Georgia's Quality Core Curriculum (QCC); scores are changing accordingly as tests are phased in.

2008: Students in grade 11 who took the GHSGT in English language arts for the first time took a new version of the test based solely on the GPS. The GHSGT math test was still based on the QCC.

2008: New tests administered in math in grades 3-5 and 8.

Comments

The test data in this profile were obtained from the state's testing files rather than from the AYP and accountability information posted on the state Web site, so they may not always match the data on the Web site.

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 GA-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					13%	18%	22%	31%	6.0
Proficient-and-above					89%	88%	91%	93%	1.3
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White									
Advanced					20%	26%	32%	42%	7.3
Proficient-and-above					95%	94%	95%	96%	0.3
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
African American									
Advanced					6%	9%	11%	18%	4.0
Proficient-and-above					85%	83%	86%	89%	1.3
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced					6%	11%	14%	20%	4.7
Proficient-and-above					79%	81%	83%	89%	3.3
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced					23%	33%	39%	49%	8.7
Proficient-and-above					93%	94%	95%	96%	1.0
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American[2]									
Advanced					14%	22%	22%	35%	7.0
Proficient-and-above					93%	91%	95%	92%	-0.3
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 increased from 20% in 2006 to 42% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 7.3 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 GA-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					13%	18%	22%	31%	6.0
Proficient-and-above					89%	88%	91%	93%	1.3
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced					5%	9%	NA	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above					83%	83%	NA	NA	NA
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					3%	3%	NA	8%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					66%	61%	64%	69%	1.0
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced					1%	3%	2%	3%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					58%	59%	53%	66%	2.7
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced					16%	20%	25%	34%	6.0
Proficient-and-above					92%	91%	93%	95%	1.0
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced					10%	16%	19%	27%	5.7
Proficient-and-above					87%	86%	88%	91%	1.3
Basic-and-above					NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 5% in 2006 to 9% in 2007. The average yearly gain in the percentage advanced was not calculated because there were fewer than three years of comparable data, too few years to constitute a trend.

[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 GA-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							15%	23%	NA
Proficient-and-above							62%	70%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
White									
Advanced							22%	32%	NA
Proficient-and-above							73%	79%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
African American									
Advanced							7%	11%	NA
Proficient-and-above							49%	58%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced							10%	11%	NA
Proficient-and-above							55%	65%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced							48%	57%	NA
Proficient-and-above							87%	92%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Native American[2]									
Advanced							13%	24%	NA
Proficient-and-above							61%	72%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 22% in 2008 to 32% in 2009. The average yearly gain in the percentage advanced was not calculated because there were fewer than three years of comparable data, too few years to constitute a trend.

[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 GA-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							15%	23%	NA
Proficient-and-above							62%	70%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced							NA	NA	NA
Proficient-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced							3%	5%	NA
Proficient-and-above							27%	34%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced							8%	10%	NA
Proficient-and-above							37%	45%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced							15%	24%	NA
Proficient-and-above							64%	73%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced							16%	22%	NA
Proficient-and-above							60%	67%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of female 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 15% in 2008 to 24% in 2009. The average yearly gain in the percentage advanced was not calculated because there were fewer than three years of comparable data, too few years to constitute a trend.

[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 GA-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 11				
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	81%	87%	2.0		06-09	89%	93%	1.3		08-09	90%	90%	NA	
White	06-09	90%	93%	1.0		06-09	95%	96%	0.3		08-09	94%	94%	NA	
African American	06-09	71%	80%	3.0	L	06-09	85%	89%	1.3	L	08-09	85%	85%	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	71%	84%	4.3	L	06-09	79%	89%	3.3	L	08-09	83%	86%	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	90%	94%	1.3	L	06-09	93%	96%	1.0	L	08-09	92%	94%	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	92%	90%	-0.7[2]	S	06-09	93%	92%	-0.3[2]	S	08-09	90%	89%	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	91%	NA	NA		06-09	95%	NA	NA		08-09	NA	NA	NA	
Low-income	06-09	72%	NA	NA	NA	06-09	83%	NA	NA	NA	08-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	84%	90%	2.0		06-09	93%	95%	0.7		08-09	93%	93%	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	61%	64%	1.0	S	06-09	66%	69%	1.0	L	08-09	56%	56%	NA	NA
All tested students	06-09	81%	87%	2.0		06-09	89%	93%	1.3		08-09	90%	90%	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-09	56%	71%	5.0	L	06-09	58%	66%	2.7	L	08-09	54%	59%	NA	NA
Female	06-09	83%	90%	2.3		06-09	92%	95%	1.0		08-09	92%	92%	NA	
Male	06-09	79%	84%	1.7	S	06-09	87%	91%	1.3	L	08-09	88%	88%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 90% of white 4th graders and 71% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 93% of white 4th graders and 80% 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 point per year for white students and 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 GA-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 11				
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	08-09	70%	74%	NA		08-09	62%	70%	NA		04-09	92%	94%	0.4	
White	08-09	80%	84%	NA		08-09	73%	79%	NA		04-09	96%	97%	0.2	
African American	08-09	57%	61%	NA	NA	08-09	49%	58%	NA	NA	04-09	85%	89%	0.8	L
Latino	08-09	67%	71%	NA	NA	08-09	55%	65%	NA	NA	04-09	85%	93%	1.6	L
Asian	08-09	90%	92%	NA	NA	08-09	87%	92%	NA	NA	04-09	98%	98%	0.0	S
Native American	08-09	74%	76%	NA	NA	08-09	61%	72%	NA	NA	04-09	94%	97%	0.6[2]	L
Not low-income	08-09	NA	NA	NA		08-09	NA	NA	NA		04-09	95%	NA	NA	
Low-income	08-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	08-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	04-09	85%	NA	NA	NA
Not disabled	08-09	74%	78%	NA		08-09	66%	74%	NA		06-09	95%	96%	0.3	
Students with disabilities[3]	08-09	41%	45%	NA	NA	08-09	27%	34%	NA	NA	06-09	56%	63%	2.3	L
All tested students	08-09	70%	74%	NA		08-09	62%	70%	NA		06-09	92%	94%	0.7	
English language learners[3]	08-09	48%	53%	NA	NA	08-09	37%	45%	NA	NA	06-09	79%	83%	1.3	L
Female	08-09	71%	75%	NA		08-09	64%	73%	NA		04-09	93%	94%	0.2	
Male	08-09	69%	73%	NA	NA	08-09	60%	67%	NA	NA	04-09	91%	93%	0.4	L

Table reads: In 2008, 80% of white 4th graders and 57% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 84% of white 4th graders and 61% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. The average annual gains were not calculated because there were fewer than three years of comparable data, too few years to constitute a trend.

[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 GA-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 11				
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	Mean SS	07-09	830.0	830.8	0.4		07-09	827.0	833.5	3.3		08-09	235.0	237.1	NA	
	SD	07-09	31.0	29.3			07-09	24.0	25.1			08-09	30.3	32.7		
White	Mean SS	07-09	840.4	839	-0.7		07-09	834.0	841	3.5		08-09	243.1	246	NA	
	SD	07-09	29.9	29			07-09	23.4	25			08-09	29.2	32		
African American	Mean SS	07-09	818.7	821	1.2	L	07-09	819.1	825	3.0	S	08-09	224.4	225	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	27.7	28			07-09	21.8	22			08-09	27.7	29		
Latino	Mean SS	07-09	818.4	823	2.3	L	07-09	819.4	827	3.8	L	08-09	225.3	229	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	28.5	26			07-09	23.8	24			08-09	30.3	30		
Asian	Mean SS	07-09	843.2	843	-0.1	L	07-09	837.7	845	3.6	L	08-09	244.9	250	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	30.6	29			07-09	25.6	27			08-09	33.4	35		
Native American	Mean SS	07-09	833.8	833	-0.4[2]	L	07-09	827.8	835	3.6[2]	L	08-09	235.8	237	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	31.1	28			07-09	24.9	24			08-09	33.3	31		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	07-09	832.6	833	0.2		07-09	829.3	836	3.3		08-09	237.9	240	NA	
	SD	07-09	30.2	29			07-09	23.1	24			08-09	28.2	31		
Students with disabilities[3]	Mean SS	07-09	811.8	810	-0.9	S	07-09	805.9	811	2.6	S	08-09	207.8	202	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	30.2	29			07-09	21.8	22			08-09	33.7	33		
All tested students	Mean SS	07-09	830.0	830.8	0.4		07-09	827.0	833.5	3.3		08-09	235.0	237.1	NA	
	SD	07-09	31.0	29.3			07-09	24.0	25.1			08-09	30.3	32.7		
English language learners[3]	Mean SS	07-09	802.3	809	3.4	L	07-09	799.6	807	3.7	L	08-09	200.2	203	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	23.5	23			07-09	20.1	20			08-09	26.2	25		
Female	Mean SS	07-09	831.8	834	1.1		07-09	829.1	836	3.5		08-09	237.1	240	NA	
	SD	07-09	30.6	29			07-09	23.7	25			08-09	29.2	32		
Male	Mean SS	07-09	828.3	827	-0.6	S	07-09	824.6	831	3.2	S	08-09	232.8	235	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	31.2	29			07-09	24.2	25			08-09	31.3	34		

Table reads: In 2007, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 840.4 for white students and 818.7 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 839 for white students and 821 for African American students. Between 2007 and 2009, the mean scale score declined at an average yearly rate of 0.7 points for white students and improved at an average yearly rate of 1.2 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) (Grades 3-8) is scored on a scale of 650 – 950. The Georgia High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) (Grade 11) in English Language Arts is scored on a scale of 100-350.

[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 GA-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 11				
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	Mean SS	08-09	818.8	826.0	NA		08-09	812.9	820.1	NA		05-09	530	534.9	1.2	
	SD	08-09	36.0	40.5			08-09	36.0	38.1			05-09	NA	26.1		
White	Mean SS	08-09	829.0	838	NA		08-09	822.1	830	NA		05-09	537	543	1.5	
	SD	08-09	35.4	40			08-09	36.8	39			05-09	NA	25		
African American	Mean SS	08-09	805.4	811	NA	NA	08-09	801.0	807	NA	NA	05-09	518	523	1.3	S
	SD	08-09	32.0	36			08-09	29.4	32			05-09	NA	22		
Latino	Mean SS	08-09	813.1	819	NA	NA	08-09	805.6	813	NA	NA	05-09	523	530	1.8	L
	SD	08-09	32.3	36			08-09	31.8	34			05-09	NA	24		
Asian	Mean SS	08-09	845.8	857	NA	NA	08-09	849.8	856	NA	NA	05-09	544	552	2.0	L
	SD	08-09	38.3	45			08-09	46.5	46			05-09	NA	26		
Native American	Mean SS	08-09	823.6	828	NA	NA	08-09	811.8	821	NA	NA	05-09	531	536	1.3[2]	S
	SD	08-09	32.0	42			08-09	38.2	35			05-09	NA	25		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	08-09	822.1	829	NA		08-09	816.2	824	NA		06-09	536	537	0.3	
	SD	08-09	34.6	39			08-09	35.3	37			06-09	NA	25		
Students with disabilities[3]	Mean SS	08-09	794.1	798	NA	NA	08-09	785.3	790	NA	NA	06-09	504	507	1.0	L
	SD	08-09	36.5	41			08-09	28.5	31			06-09	NA	24		
All tested students	Mean SS	08-09	818.8	826.0	NA		08-09	812.9	820.1	NA		07-09	533.2	534.9	0.8	
	SD	08-09	36.0	40.5			08-09	36.0	38.1			07-09	26.5	26.1		
English language learners[3]	Mean SS	08-09	798.3	803	NA	NA	08-09	796.2	799	NA	NA	07-09	515.5	519	1.7	L
	SD	08-09	31.9	32			08-09	34.9	35			07-09	23.2	22		
Female	Mean SS	08-09	819.1	826	NA		08-09	814.2	822	NA		05-09	528	534	1.5	
	SD	08-09	34.65	39			08-09	34.2	37			05-09	NA	25		
Male	Mean SS	08-09	818.5	826	NA	NA	08-09	811.8	818	NA	NA	05-09	532	536	1.0	S
	SD	08-09	37.3	42			08-09	37.5	39			05-09	NA	27		

Table reads: In 2008, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 829.0 for white students and 805.4 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 838 for white students and 811 for African American students. The average annual gains were not calculated because

there were fewer than three years of comparable data, too few years to constitute a trend.

Note: The Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) (Grades 3-8) is scored on a scale of 650 – 950. The Georgia High School Graduation Tests (GHSGT) (Grade 11) in Mathematics is scored on a scale of 400-600.

[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 GA-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		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	07-09	120,309	126,046	4.8%	100.0%	07-09	124,313	121,229	-2.5%	100.0%	08-09	93,560	95,512	2.1%	100.0%
	Math	08-09	124,551	126,260	1.4%	100.0%	08-09	122,268	121,362	-0.7%	100.0%	04-09	80,678	95,566	18.5%	100.0%
White	Reading	07-09	56,117	57,396	2.3%	45.5%	07-09	57,545	55,786	-3.1%	46.0%	08-09	47,631	47,422	-0.4%	49.7%
	Math	08-09	56,886	57,400	0.9%	45.5%	08-09	56,054	55,780	-0.5%	46.0%	04-09	45,390	47,431	4.5%	49.6%
African American	Reading	07-09	44,811	46,583	4.0%	37.0%	07-09	50,172	47,229	-5.9%	39.0%	08-09	35,117	36,124	2.9%	37.8%
	Math	08-09	46,501	46,593	0.2%	36.9%	08-09	48,500	47,203	-2.7%	38.9%	04-09	28,333	36,159	27.6%	37.8%
Latino	Reading	07-09	11,786	13,215	12.1%	10.5%	07-09	10,009	10,728	7.2%	8.8%	08-09	5,272	5,939	12.7%	6.2%
	Math	08-09	12,732	13,319	4.6%	10.5%	08-09	10,480	10,848	3.5%	8.9%	04-09	3,367	5,956	76.9%	6.2%
Asian	Reading	07-09	3,581	3,825	6.8%	3.0%	07-09	3,365	3,783	12.4%	3.1%	08-09	3,150	3,431	8.9%	3.6%
	Math	08-09	3,871	3,918	1.2%	3.1%	08-09	3,721	3,832	3.0%	3.2%	04-09	2,537	3,433	35.3%	3.6%
Native American	Reading	07-09	155	**183**	18.1%	0.1%	07-09	171	**191**	11.7%	0.2%	08-09	146	**188**	28.8%	0.2%
	Math	08-09	209	**184**	-99.6%	0.1%	08-09	201	**191**	-5.0%	0.2%	04-09	92	**187**	103.3%	0.2%
Low-income	Reading	07-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	07-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	08-09	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	08-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	08-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	04-09	24,786	NA	NA	NA
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	07-09	14,806	13,937	-5.9%	11.1%	07-09	13,579	12,752	-6.1%	10.5%	08-09	7,565	7,695	1.7%	8.1%
	Math	08-09	14,700	13,926	-5.3%	11.0%	08-09	13,010	12,746	-2.0%	10.5%	06-09	7,031	7,711	9.7%	8.1%
English language learners	Reading	07-09	4,078	4,929	20.9%	3.9%	07-09	2,751	2,565	-6.8%	2.1%	08-09	1,438	1,360	-5.4%	1.4%
	Math	08-09	4,462	5,158	15.6%	4.1%	08-09	2,882	2,771	-3.9%	2.3%	07-09	1,462	1,388	-5.1%	1.5%
Female	Reading	07-09	58,954	61,673	4.6%	48.9%	07-09	60,944	59,484	-2.4%	49.1%	08-09	48,503	49,805	2.7%	52.1%
	Math	08-09	61,074	61,790	1.2%	48.9%	08-09	59,840	59,548	-0.5%	49.1%	04-09	42,047	49,832	18.5%	52.1%
Male	Reading	07-09	61,211	64,256	5.0%	51.0%	07-09	63,226	61,625	-2.5%	50.8%	08-09	45,005	45,665	1.5%	47.8%
	Math	08-09	63,321	64,354	1.6%	51.0%	08-09	62,303	61,698	-1.0%	50.8%	04-09	38,631	45,694	18.3%	47.8%

Table reads: In 2007, 56,117 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had risen to 57,396 students, an increase of 2.3%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 45.5% of the 126,046 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.