Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Louisiana

K-12 enrollment — 650,675

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), Louisiana showed mostly gains in reading at the basic and proficient levels for racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls. There were slight declines at the advanced level in reading for some subgroups. In math, there were gains across the board – all subgroups at all three achievement levels. Achievement gaps tended to narrow in both reading and math. Comparable data were available from 1999 through 2009 for grades 4 and 8, and 2001 through 2009 for grade 10.

- ***Slight declines at advanced.*** There were slight declines in grade 8 reading at the advanced level for white, Latino, and male students.

- ***Notable gap trends.*** African American students narrowed the achievement gap with their white counterparts at all three grade levels in both reading and math. The Asian subgroup narrowed gaps with the white subgroup in reading.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	1999 through 2009: Grades 4 and 8 2001 through 2009: Grade 10 2006 through 2009: Grades 3, 5, 6, 7
Years of data needed to compute effect sizes	1999 through 2009: Grades 4 and 8, 2001 through 2009: Grade 10 Until 2008, statewide standard deviations could not be obtained, so they were imputed using the male and female standard deviations.
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Percentage proficient data are not available for comparison group of students who are *not* English language learners, so ELLs are compared with all tested students in the state. Scale scores for subgroups and comparison groups available for 1999 through 2009 for grades 4 and 8 and for 2001 through 2009 for 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	Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP), grades 4 and 8 Integrated LEAP (*i*LEAP), grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 Graduation Exit Examination (GEE), grades 10 and 11 LEAP Alternate Assessment, Levels 1 and 2 (LAA 1, LAA 2)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3-11
State labels for achievement levels	LA uses five achievement levels: Unsatisfactory, Approaching Basic, Basic, Mastery, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Approaching Basic as Basic, Basic as Proficient, and Mastery + Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	1999: LEAP 2001: GEE 2006: *i*LEAP
Time of test administration	Spring (LEAP retest opportunities in summer; GEE retest opportunities in summer and fall)

Major changes in testing system (2002–present)

2003: “Proficient” level of achievement on performance level descriptors changed to “mastery” level (meaning remained the same)
2004: Students have to score at or above basic on either ELA or Math (and approaching basic on the other) to be promoted to 5th grade.
2006: Students have to score at or above basic on either ELA or Math (and approaching basic on the other) to be promoted to 9th grade.
2005–06: School AYP calculations adjusted based on impact of Hurricane Katrina; AYP calculations were performed with and without displaced students, and schools received the higher score.
2005–06: *i*LEAP implemented to assess students in grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 (replacing Iowa Tests of Basic Skills)

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 LA-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	17%	15%	10%	13%	15%	13%	14%	15%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above	48%	52%	47%	50%	55%	57%	57%	62%	2.0
Basic-and-above	87%	85%	83%	82%	90%	89%	89%	92%	0.7
White									
Advanced	26%	24%	15%	21%	21%	20%	21%	24%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above	65%	70%	62%	68%	68%	72%	71%	77%	1.7
Basic-and-above	95%	94%	93%	93%	94%	95%	94%	97%	0.3
African American									
Advanced	7%	5%	4%	5%	7%	6%	7%	7%	0.0
Proficient-and-above	30%	32%	31%	33%	39%	42%	42%	48%	2.6
Basic-and-above	78%	75%	73%	74%	84%	84%	83%	88%	1.4
Latino									
Advanced	18%	15%	10%	13%	14%	12%	14%	15%	-0.4
Proficient-and-above	52%	53%	49%	51%	54%	54%	58%	60%	1.1
Basic-and-above	87%	85%	81%	81%	85%	84%	84%	87%	0.0
Asian									
Advanced	31%	25%	23%	29%	33%	28%	29%	35%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	62%	62%	59%	68%	71%	69%	76%	76%	2.0
Basic-and-above	89%	87%	88%	91%	94%	94%	93%	94%	0.7
Native American[2]									
Advanced	12%	14%	6%	10%	10%	12%	13%	17%	0.7
Proficient-and-above	43%	54%	48%	52%	51%	58%	61%	68%	3.6
Basic-and-above	88%	86%	84%	84%	90%	90%	94%	94%	0.9

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 26% in 2002 to 24% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 0.3 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 LA-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	17%	15%	10%	13%	15%	13%	14%	15%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above	48%	52%	47%	50%	55%	57%	57%	62%	2.0
Basic-and-above	87%	85%	83%	82%	90%	89%	89%	92%	0.7
Low-income students									
Advanced	8%	6%	5%	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%	0.0
Proficient-and-above	34%	36%	36%	40%	44%	47%	46%	52%	2.6
Basic-and-above	82%	77%	77%	78%	85%	86%	84%	88%	0.9
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above	9%	13%	8%	10%	11%	15%	15%	19%	2.7
Basic-and-above	50%	49%	37%	39%	50%	55%	55%	65%	5.0
English language learners[3]									
Advanced	13%	8%	6%	8%	8%	7%	9%	7%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above	35%	31%	30%	34%	33%	36%	43%	34%	0.3
Basic-and-above	76%	68%	66%	64%	69%	71%	71%	72%	1.0
Female									
Advanced	20%	18%	13%	17%	19%	18%	17%	20%	0.0
Proficient-and-above	54%	57%	55%	57%	61%	66%	62%	69%	2.1
Basic-and-above	91%	89%	88%	88%	94%	95%	92%	95%	0.6
Male									
Advanced	13%	12%	6%	10%	11%	10%	11%	12%	-0.1
Proficient-and-above	42%	47%	38%	45%	49%	51%	52%	57%	2.1
Basic-and-above	83%	81%	77%	79%	86%	87%	86%	90%	1.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test remained the same at 8% from 2002 to 2009. During this period, the average yearly change in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.0 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.

Table LA-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	4%	8%	7%	7%	7%	10%	7%	12%	1.1
Proficient-and-above	41%	47%	53%	51%	53%	55%	58%	59%	2.6
Basic-and-above	69%	70%	75%	73%	77%	80%	84%	82%	1.9
White									
Advanced	8%	14%	12%	11%	10%	16%	11%	19%	1.6
Proficient-and-above	62%	68%	73%	69%	69%	71%	73%	75%	1.9
Basic-and-above	87%	87%	89%	87%	88%	90%	92%	92%	0.7
African American									
Advanced	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	5%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	21%	27%	33%	32%	34%	36%	39%	42%	3.0
Basic-and-above	53%	53%	60%	59%	64%	66%	72%	71%	2.6
Latino									
Advanced	4%	8%	7%	6%	5%	10%	7%	13%	1.3
Proficient-and-above	46%	51%	54%	51%	52%	52%	56%	62%	2.3
Basic-and-above	75%	74%	79%	72%	74%	76%	81%	81%	0.9
Asian									
Advanced	16%	24%	25%	24%	23%	29%	21%	40%	3.4
Proficient-and-above	70%	69%	76%	79%	79%	80%	83%	83%	1.9
Basic-and-above	88%	85%	90%	91%	92%	92%	95%	94%	0.9
Native American[2]									
Advanced	3%	5%	6%	5%	6%	7%	5%	10%	1.0
Proficient-and-above	38%	47%	53%	50%	47%	50%	56%	61%	3.3
Basic-and-above	72%	70%	76%	78%	76%	78%	85%	86%	2.0

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 8% in 2002 to 19% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 1.6 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 LA-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	4%	8%	7%	7%	7%	10%	7%	12%	1.1
Proficient-and-above	41%	47%	53%	51%	53%	55%	58%	59%	2.6
Basic-and-above	69%	70%	75%	73%	77%	80%	84%	82%	1.9
Low-income students									
Advanced	1%	3%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%	7%	0.9
Proficient-and-above	26%	32%	44%	41%	43%	45%	47%	49%	3.3
Basic-and-above	58%	58%	70%	67%	70%	73%	78%	76%	2.6
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	2%	0.7
Proficient-and-above	10%	16%	16%	15%	15%	21%	25%	25%	3.3
Basic-and-above	32%	35%	35%	33%	36%	44%	53%	52%	5.3
English language learners[3]									
Advanced	5%	9%	6%	8%	7%	9%	6%	12%	1.7
Proficient-and-above	44%	43%	49%	44%	43%	42%	48%	48%	1.7
Basic-and-above	70%	64%	67%	64%	66%	65%	72%	70%	1.3
Female									
Advanced	4%	6%	7%	7%	5%	10%	6%	12%	1.1
Proficient-and-above	40%	45%	54%	51%	50%	54%	55%	58%	2.6
Basic-and-above	70%	69%	77%	75%	76%	79%	82%	82%	1.7
Male									
Advanced	5%	8%	8%	7%	7%	10%	7%	13%	1.1
Proficient-and-above	43%	47%	53%	51%	54%	55%	59%	60%	2.4
Basic-and-above	70%	69%	74%	72%	76%	79%	83%	82%	1.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 1% in 2002 to 7% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 0.9 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.

[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 LA-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	02-09	57%	72%	2.1		02-09	48%	62%	2.0		02-09	52%	62%	1.4	
White	02-09	73%	82%	1.3		02-09	65%	77%	1.7		02-09	70%	72%	0.3	
African American	02-09	42%	62%	2.9	L	02-09	30%	48%	2.6	L	02-09	34%	48%	2.0	L
Latino	02-09	64%	67%	0.4	S	02-09	52%	60%	1.1	S	02-09	49%	53%	0.6	L
Asian	02-09	71%	81%	1.4	L	02-09	62%	76%	2.0	L	02-09	58%	71%	1.9	L
Native American	02-09	56%	75%	2.7[2]	L	02-09	43%	68%	3.6[2]	L	02-09	52%	63%	1.6[2]	L
Not low-income	02-09	74%	87%	1.9		02-09	61%	79%	2.6		02-09	62%	72%	1.4	
Low-income	02-09	44%	66%	3.1	L	02-09	34%	52%	2.6	E	02-09	36%	52%	2.3	L
Not disabled	06-09	70%	78%	2.7		06-09	60%	68%	2.7		06-09	67%	65%	-0.7	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	30%	41%	3.7	L	06-09	11%	19%	2.7	E	06-09	15%	24%	3.0	L
All tested students	06-09	64%	72%	2.7		06-09	55%	62%	2.3		06-09	64%	62%	-0.7	
English language learners[3]	06-09	52%	55%	1.0	S	06-09	33%	34%	0.3	S	06-09	33%	27%	-2.0[2]	S
Female	02-09	63%	77%	2.0		02-09	54%	69%	2.1		02-09	58%	68%	1.4	
Male	02-09	52%	68%	2.3	L	02-09	42%	57%	2.1	E	02-09	47%	55%	1.1	S

Table reads: In 2002, 73% of white 4th graders and 42% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 82% of white 4th graders and 62% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2002 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.3 percentage points per year for white students and 2.9 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 LA-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	02-09	50%	65%	2.1		02-09	41%	59%	2.6		02-09	47%	73%	3.7	
White	02-09	69%	80%	1.6		02-09	62%	75%	1.9		02-09	66%	84%	2.6	
African American	02-09	34%	50%	2.3	L	02-09	21%	42%	3.0	L	02-09	26%	60%	4.9	L
Latino	02-09	59%	64%	0.7	S	02-09	46%	62%	2.3	L	02-09	43%	66%	3.3	L
Asian	02-09	75%	83%	1.1	S	02-09	70%	83%	1.9	E	02-09	71%	87%	2.3	S
Native American	02-09	48%	66%	2.6[2]	L	02-09	38%	61%	3.3[2]	L	02-09	50%	70%	2.9[2]	L
Not low-income	02-09	67%	84%	2.4		02-09	53%	77%	3.4		02-09	56%	82%	3.7	
Low-income	02-09	38%	56%	2.6	L	02-09	26%	49%	3.3	S	02-09	31%	64%	4.7	L
Not disabled	06-09	67%	71%	1.3		06-09	57%	64%	2.3		06-09	70%	75%	1.7	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	35%	39%	1.3	E	06-09	15%	25%	3.3	L	06-09	23%	38%	5.0	L
All tested students	06-09	62%	65%	1.0		06-09	53%	59%	2.0		06-09	66%	73%	2.3	
English language learners[3]	06-09	59%	56%	-1.0	S	06-09	43%	48%	1.7	S	06-09	51%	52%	0.3[2]	S
Female	02-09	51%	64%	1.9		02-09	40%	58%	2.6		02-09	45%	71%	3.7	
Male	02-09	51%	65%	2.0	L	02-09	43%	60%	2.4	S	02-09	49%	75%	3.7	E

Table reads: In 2002, 69% of white 4th graders and 34% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 80% of white 4th graders and 50% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2002 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.6 percentage points per year for white students and 2.3 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 LA-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	02-09	307	323	2.3		02-09	309	321	1.7		02-09	298	308	1.4	
	SD	02-09	59.3	51			02-09	51.4	42			02-09	46.0	40		
White	MSS	02-09	329.6	337	1.1		02-09	328.7	334	0.8		02-09	318.8	318	-0.1	
	SD	02-09	53.2	48			02-09	44.6	36			02-09	39.7	36		
African American	MSS	02-09	286.0	309	3.3	L	02-09	290.0	308	2.6	L	02-09	285.6	296	1.5	L
	SD	02-09	58.0	49			02-09	52.2	41			02-09	47.4	39		
Latino	MSS	02-09	315.8	314	-0.3	S	02-09	314.0	313	-0.1	S	02-09	300.2	296	-0.6	S
	SD	02-09	51.5	59			02-09	50.9	55			02-09	47.2	55		
Asian	MSS	02-09	327.6	341	1.9	L	02-09	328.4	337	1.2	L	02-09	315.6	319	0.5	L
	SD	02-09	58.8	59			02-09	54.9	48			02-09	50.4	51		
Native American	MSS	02-09	301.5	321	2.8[2]	L	02-09	306.9	326	2.7[2]	L	02-09	301.1	310	1.3[2]	L
	SD	02-09	54.6	50			02-09	48.9	40			02-09	43.3	33		
Not low-income	MSS	02-09	329	346	2.4		02-09	322	337	2.1		02-09	307	319	1.7	
	SD	02-09	NA	48			02-09	NA	36			02-09	NA	39		
Low-income	MSS	02-09	289	313	3.4	L	02-09	294	311	2.4	L	02-09	279	299	2.9	L
	SD	02-09	NA	49			02-09	NA	42			02-09	NA	39		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	320	328	2.7		06-09	322	325	1.0		06-09	313	310	-1.0	
	SD	06-09	52	47			06-09	41	37			06-09	38	38		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	258	282	8.0	L	06-09	251	273	7.3	L	06-09	245	266	7.0	L
	SD	06-09	71	58			06-09	64	53			06-09	62	51		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	311	323	4.0		06-09	314	321	2.3		06-09	309	309	0.0	
	SD	06-09	60	51			06-09	49	41			06-09	43	39		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	291	296	1.7	S	06-09	280	285	1.7	S	06-09	263	261	-0.7[2]	S
	SD	06-09	72	61			06-09	73.0	64			06-09	70	65		
Female	MSS	02-09	314.9	330	2.2		02-09	319.1	327	1.1		02-09	311.0	314	0.4	
	SD	02-09	56.5	48			02-09	48.0	38			02-09	43.4	38		
Male	MSS	02-09	299.2	316	2.4	L	02-09	301.9	314	1.7	L	02-09	298.2	302	0.6	L
	SD	02-09	62.0	53			02-09	54.7	44			02-09	48.3	40		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 329.6 for white students and 286.0 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 337 for white students and 309 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 1.1 points for white students and 3.3 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) for grades 4 and 8, and the Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) for grades 10 and 11 are scored on a scale of 100 - 500.

[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 LA-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	02-09	313	329	2.3		02-09	309	332	3.3		02-09	297	330	4.7	
	SD	02-09	53.0	52			02-09	48.0	50			02-09	52.8	47		
White	MSS	02-09	334.2	348	2.0		02-09	329.5	350	2.9		02-09	325.2	343	2.6	
	SD	02-09	47.6	48			02-09	38.8	48			02-09	45.1	49		
African American	MSS	02-09	292.8	311	2.6	L	02-09	289.5	314	3.5	L	02-09	281.7	312	4.3	L
	SD	02-09	49.8	48			02-09	47.9	43			02-09	51.7	37		
Latino	MSS	02-09	319.9	327	1.0	S	02-09	315.9	332	2.3	S	02-09	302.8	322	2.7	L
	SD	02-09	46.4	52			02-09	42.0	54			02-09	47.5	48		
Asian	MSS	02-09	347.7	361	1.9	S	02-09	338.9	377	5.5	L	02-09	339.7	363	3.3	L
	SD	02-09	56.4	57			02-09	45.9	66			02-09	53.2	64		
Native American	MSS	02-09	308.6	329	2.9[2]	L	02-09	308.9	332	3.3[2]	L	02-09	309.8	329	2.7[2]	L
	SD	02-09	50.0	47			02-09	43.0	45			02-09	46.0	44		
Not low-income	MSS	02-09	332	356	3.4		02-09	320	354	4.9		02-09	308	343	5.0	
	SD	02-09	NA	50			02-09	NA	50			02-09	NA	51		
Low-income	MSS	02-09	298	318	2.9	S	02-09	295	320	3.6	S	02-09	278	317	5.6	L
	SD	02-09	NA	48			02-09	NA	44			02-09	NA	38		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	336	334	-0.7		06-09	325	336	3.7		06-09	325	331	2.0	
	SD	06-09	55	50			06-09	39	48			06-09	44	47		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	292	298	2.0	L	06-09	273	294	7.0	L	06-09	270	293	7.7	L
	SD	06-09	59	54			06-09	55	48			06-09	52	42		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	330	330	0.0		06-09	319	333	4.7		06-09	322	330	2.7	
	SD	06-09	58	52			06-09	44	49			06-09	47	47		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	321	318	-1.0	S	06-09	308	320	4.0	S	06-09	304	304	0.0[2]	S
	SD	06-09	62	53			06-09	53	63			06-09	57	52		
Female	MSS	02-09	313.7	329	2.2		02-09	309.9	331	3.0		02-09	306.1	327	3.0	
	SD	02-09	50.8	51			02-09	45.2	48			02-09	49.9	44		
Male	MSS	02-09	312.0	329	2.4	L	02-09	309.9	334	3.5	L	02-09	308.2	333	3.6	L
	SD	02-09	55.0	52			02-09	50.7	51			02-09	55.5	50		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 334.2 for white students and 292.8 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 348 for white students and 311 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at

an average yearly rate of 2.0 points for white students and 2.6 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) for grades 4 and 8, and the Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) for grades 10 and 11 are scored on a scale of 100 - 500.

[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 LA-15. Numbers of test-takers

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Subject	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	02-09	60,655	55,823	-8.0%	100.0%	02-09	53,485	49,611	-7.2%	100.0%	02-09	48,666	38,046	-21.8%	100.0%
	Math	02-09	60,640	55,823	-7.9%	100.0%	02-09	57,074	49,562	-13.2%	100.0%	02-09	52,798	38,090	-27.9%	100.0%
White	Reading	02-09	27,589	26,033	-5.6%	46.6%	02-09	26,293	23,841	-9.3%	48.1%	02-09	22,964	20,559	-10.5%	54.0%
	Math	02-09	27,580	26,034	-5.6%	46.6%	02-09	26,769	23,826	-11.0%	48.1%	02-09	23,051	20,539	-10.9%	53.9%
African American	Reading	02-09	30,980	26,889	-13.2%	48.2%	02-09	25,227	23,330	-7.5%	47.0%	02-09	16,876	15,524	-8.0%	40.8%
	Math	02-09	30,976	26,887	-13.2%	48.2%	02-09	28,265	23,298	-17.6%	47.0%	02-09	17,167	15,587	-9.2%	40.9%
Latino	Reading	02-09	943	1,660	76.0%	3.0%	02-09	787	1,311	66.6%	2.6%	02-09	622	967	55.5%	2.5%
	Math	02-09	943	1,660	76.0%	3.0%	02-09	805	1,311	62.9%	2.6%	02-09	631	965	52.9%	2.5%
Asian	Reading	02-09	658	728	10.6%	1.3%	02-09	721	687	-4.7%	1.4%	02-09	684	721	5.4%	1.9%
	Math	02-09	656	728	11.0%	1.3%	02-09	725	687	-5.2%	1.4%	02-09	687	723	5.2%	1.9%
Native American	Reading	02-09	389	**473**	21.6%	0.8%	02-09	371	**362**	-2.4%	0.7%	02-09	259	**275**	6.2%	0.7%
	Math	02-09	389	**473**	21.6%	0.8%	02-09	378	**361**	-4.5%	0.7%	02-09	260	**276**	6.2%	0.7%
Low-income	Reading	02-09	34,342	39,280	14.4%	70.4%	02-09	23,830	31,358	31.6%	63.2%	02-09	16,541	19,333	16.9%	50.8%
	Math	02-09	34,333	39,281	14.4%	70.4%	02-09	25,848	31,318	21.2%	63.2%	02-09	18,506	19,372	4.7%	50.9%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	8,093	6,826	-15.7%	12.2%	06-09	5,553	4,292	-22.7%	8.7%	06-09	2,418	1,668	-31.0%	4.4%
	Math	06-09	8,091	6,827	-15.6%	12.2%	06-09	5,816	4,274	-26.5%	8.6%	06-09	2,410	1,661	-31.1%	4.4%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	759	1,196	57.6%	2.1%	06-09	429	725	69.0%	1.5%	06-09	298	**425**	42.6%	1.1%
	Math	06-09	758	1,196	57.8%	2.1%	06-09	434	725	67.1%	1.5%	06-09	295	**424**	43.7%	1.1%
Female	Reading	02-09	29,242	26,876	-8.1%	48.1%	02-09	26,582	24,638	-7.3%	49.7%	02-09	21,582	19,957	-7.5%	52.5%
	Math	02-09	29,236	26,875	-8.1%	48.1%	02-09	28,768	24,623	-14.4%	49.7%	02-09	21,802	20,020	-8.2%	52.6%
Male	Reading	02-09	31,329	28,872	-7.8%	51.7%	02-09	26,783	24,852	-7.2%	50.1%	02-09	19,823	18,089	-8.7%	47.5%
	Math	02-09	31,320	28,872	-7.8%	51.7%	02-09	28,166	24,818	-11.9%	50.1%	02-09	19,994	18,070	-9.6%	47.4%

Table reads: In 2002, 27,589 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 26,033 students, a decrease of 5.6%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 46.6% of the 55,823 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.