Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Indiana

K-12 enrollment — 1,046,263

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. Indiana made changes to its state testing program in 2009, so comparisons to earlier years could not be made for the sake of discerning trends in student achievement. Data on student achievement from earlier years are presented in the tables below.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2002 through 2008 for grades 3, 6, and 8 2004 through 2008 for grades 4, 5, 7 and 10 New ISTEP+ test administered to grades 3-8 in 2009; grade 10 not assessed in 2009
Years of data needed to compute effect sizes	2002 through 2008 for grade 8 2004 through 2008 for grades 4 and 10 New ISTEP+ test administered to grades 3-8 in 2009; grade 10 not assessed in 2009
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Proficiency and effect size subgroup data for 2002 through 2008 for grade 8 and 2004 through 2008 for grades 4 and 10 (3-8 baseline reset and grade 10 not assessed in 2009)

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	Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) ISTEP+ Graduation Qualifying Exam (GQE) Core 40 End-of-Course Assessments Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 10
State labels for achievement levels	IN uses three achievement levels: Below, Pass, and Pass+. For our analyses we treated Pass as Proficient and Pass+ as Advanced. No IN achievement level was treated as our Basic.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	2002, grades 3, 6, and 8; 2004, grades 4, 5, 7, and 10. (New ISTEP+ test will have baseline 2009 for grades 3-8)
Time of test administration	Fall (New ISTEP+ transitioned to Spring in 2009)
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2002: Grades 3, 6, and 8 ISTEP+ tests modified to reflect new Indiana standards; vertical scale developed; cut scores/performance level

descriptors introduced
2003: Standards incorporated into new tests for grades 4, 5, 7, and 9
2004: New tests administered in grades 4, 5, 7, and 9
2004: Grade 10 GQE revised to reflect new standards; first year of full administration of ISTEP+ to grades 3–10
2008-09: For this year only, students took the ISTEP+ twice as the test moved from a fall testing window to a spring testing window. IN also made the transition to End-of-Course tests in Algebra I and English 10.
2009: First Spring administration of new ISTEP+. Administered in two sessions (open-ended portion in March, multiple choice in April-May). New cut scores established. Class of 2011 will be last group of students to take the current GQE. Class of 2012 will take End-of-Course assessments in Algebra 1 and English 10. Cut scores will be established summer of 2010.

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 IN-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	7%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%	5%		NA
Proficient-and-above	64%	65%	68%	68%	67%	69%	67%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
White									
Advanced	8%	8%	9%	9%	9%	9%	6%		NA
Proficient-and-above	68%	69%	72%	72%	73%	75%	73%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
African American									
Advanced	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%		NA
Proficient-and-above	36%	38%	42%	45%	42%	45%	46%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Latino									
Advanced	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%		NA
Proficient-and-above	45%	47%	52%	53%	46%	51%	51%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Asian									
Advanced	17%	21%	22%	20%	16%	17%	14%		NA
Proficient-and-above	77%	78%	79%	82%	75%	77%	74%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Native American[2]									
Advanced	5%	4%	7%	5%	4%	4%	2%		NA
Proficient-and-above	49%	51%	59%	66%	65%	56%	61%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	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 8% in 2002 to 6% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

Table IN-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic 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	7%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%	5%		NA
Proficient-and-above	64%	65%	68%	68%	67%	69%	67%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Low-income students									
Advanced	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%		NA
Proficient-and-above	43%	45%	50%	52%	50%	53%	52%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%		NA
Proficient-and-above	16%	20%	23%	24%	24%	26%	23%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced	2%	3%	2%	NA	1%	1%	0%		NA
Proficient-and-above	25%	40%	41%	NA	28%	31%	30%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Female									
Advanced	9%	9%	10%	11%	10%	10%	7%		NA
Proficient-and-above	68%	69%	72%	74%	72%	76%	74%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Male									
Advanced	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	3%		NA
Proficient-and-above	60%	60%	63%	63%	63%	63%	61%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	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 remained the same at 2% from 2002 to 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table IN-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	11%	14%	16%	16%	16%	18%	18%		NA
Proficient-and-above	66%	71%	72%	72%	71%	74%	74%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
White									
Advanced	12%	16%	18%	18%	18%	21%	21%		NA
Proficient-and-above	71%	76%	77%	77%	76%	80%	80%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
African American									
Advanced	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%		NA
Proficient-and-above	32%	40%	42%	43%	42%	46%	49%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Latino									
Advanced	4%	4%	7%	7%	6%	8%	9%		NA
Proficient-and-above	51%	55%	55%	58%	54%	59%	61%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Asian									
Advanced	35%	41%	45%	44%	41%	44%	44%		NA
Proficient-and-above	85%	87%	87%	90%	86%	84%	84%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Native American[2]									
Advanced	4%	10%	10%	8%	10%	13%	12%		NA
Proficient-and-above	57%	59%	60%	66%	69%	60%	70%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 12% in 2002 to 21% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

Table IN-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	11%	14%	16%	16%	16%	18%	18%		NA
Proficient-and-above	66%	71%	72%	72%	71%	74%	74%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Low-income students									
Advanced	3%	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%	8%		NA
Proficient-and-above	45%	52%	55%	55%	54%	59%	61%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced	1%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%		NA
Proficient-and-above	22%	29%	31%	31%	33%	36%	35%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced	3%	7%	8%	NA	6%	5%	5%		NA
Proficient-and-above	33%	51%	51%	NA	44%	44%	47%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Female									
Advanced	9%	12%	14%	14%	14%	16%	17%		NA
Proficient-and-above	66%	71%	72%	72%	71%	74%	75%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA
Male									
Advanced	12%	16%	17%	17%	17%	20%	20%		NA
Proficient-and-above	66%	70%	70%	71%	70%	74%	75%		NA
Basic-and-above	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 3% in 2002 to 8% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

Table IN-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	04-08	73%	73%	NA		02-08	64%	67%	NA		04-08	68%	67%	NA	
White	04-08	77%	78%	NA		02-08	68%	73%	NA		04-08	73%	73%	NA	
African American	04-08	52%	55%	NA	NA	02-08	36%	46%	NA	NA	04-08	40%	41%	NA	NA
Latino	04-08	55%	58%	NA	NA	02-08	45%	51%	NA	NA	04-08	44%	47%	NA	NA
Asian	04-08	87%	78%	NA	NA	02-08	77%	74%	NA	NA	04-08	74%	67%	NA	NA
Native American	04-08	71%	72%	NA	NA	02-08	49%	61%	NA	NA	04-08	55%	64%	NA	NA
Not low-income	04-08	82%	83%	NA		02-08	72%	78%	NA		04-08	77%	77%	NA	
Low-income	04-08	59%	61%	NA	NA	02-08	43%	52%	NA	NA	04-08	48%	49%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	80%	79%	NA		06-08	74%	75%	NA		06-08	73%	74%	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-08	44%	43%	NA	NA	06-08	24%	23%	NA	NA	06-08	21%	23%	NA	NA
Not ELLs	06-08	76%	74%	NA		06-08	68%	69%	NA		06-08	68%	68%	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-08	45%	49%	NA	NA	06-08	28%	30%	NA	NA	06-08	22%	20%	NA	NA
Female	04-08	78%	78%	NA		02-08	68%	74%	NA		04-08	73%	72%	NA	
Male	04-08	68%	69%	NA	NA	02-08	60%	61%	NA	NA	04-08	64%	62%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2004, 77% of white 4th graders and 52% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 78% of white 4th graders and 55% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Average annual percentage point gains were not calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

[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 IN-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	04-08	73%	73%	NA		02-08	66%	74%	NA		04-08	64%	65%	NA	
White	04-08	77%	78%	NA		02-08	71%	80%	NA		04-08	70%	70%	NA	
African American	04-08	52%	55%	NA	NA	02-08	32%	49%	NA	NA	04-08	30%	36%	NA	NA
Latino	04-08	61%	63%	NA	NA	02-08	51%	61%	NA	NA	04-08	44%	49%	NA	NA
Asian	04-08	87%	84%	NA	NA	02-08	85%	84%	NA	NA	04-08	83%	74%	NA	NA
Native American	04-08	71%	68%	NA	NA	02-08	57%	70%	NA	NA	04-08	54%	58%	NA	NA
Not low-income	04-08	81%	81%	NA		02-08	75%	84%	NA		04-08	73%	75%	NA	
Low-income	04-08	60%	63%	NA	NA	02-08	45%	61%	NA	NA	04-08	43%	46%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	78%	77%	NA		06-08	77%	81%	NA		06-08	71%	71%	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-08	53%	51%	NA	NA	06-08	33%	35%	NA	NA	06-08	25%	27%	NA	NA
Not ELLS	06-08	75%	74%	NA		06-08	71%	76%	NA		06-08	65%	65%	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-08	53%	59%	NA	NA	06-08	44%	47%	NA	NA	06-06	35%	34%	NA	NA
Female	04-08	73%	72%	NA		02-08	66%	75%	NA		04-08	63%	65%	NA	
Male	04-08	74%	73%	NA	NA	02-08	66%	75%	NA	NA	04-08	66%	65%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2004, 77% of white 4th graders and 52% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 78% of white 4th graders and 55% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Average annual percentage point gains were not calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

[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 IN-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	Mean SS	04-08	461.0	461.1	NA		02-08	533.6	535.3	NA		04-08	572.2	571.6	NA	
	SD	04-08	60.7	59.5			02-08	57.1	50.0			04-08	51.0	50.3		
White	Mean SS	04-08	467.8	468.2	NA		02-08	539.4	541.1	NA		04-08	578.1	578.1	NA	
	SD	04-08	59.4	58.3			02-08	55.5	48.6			04-08	48.6	48.1		
African American	Mean SS	04-08	429.5	433.0	NA	NA	02-08	497.8	509.7	NA	NA	04-08	538.9	540.7	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	56.8	57.5			02-08	53.2	45.8			04-08	48.8	47.2		
Latino	Mean SS	04-08	433.8	436.4	NA	NA	02-08	508.9	514.4	NA	NA	04-08	539.7	546.5	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	57.5	56.8			02-08	55.1	50.0			04-08	55.0	49.9		
Asian	Mean SS	04-08	487.8	484.1	NA	NA	02-08	558.4	552.7	NA	NA	04-08	587.8	577.3	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	59.7	70.0			02-08	59.2	61.8			04-08	58.8	71.9		
Native American	Mean SS	04-08	453.1	455.8	NA	NA	02-08	514.6	526.6	NA	NA	04-08	561.6	561.3	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	57.0	57.5			02-08	59.4	47.9			04-08	50.1	46.9		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	04-08	476.2	477.6	NA		02-08	545.1	548.0	NA		04-08	581.8	583.3	NA	
	SD	04-08	56.9	56.3			02-08	53.7	46.6			04-08	47.6	46.7		
Low-income	Mean SS	04-08	437.4	440.7	NA	NA	02-08	506.1	515.6	NA	NA	04-08	546.7	549.5	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	58.9	57.0			02-08	55.2	48.5			04-08	50.7	49.2		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	471.2	469.7	NA		06-08	546.6	544.1	NA		06-08	579.9	580.2	NA	
	SD	06-08	51.5	53.8			06-08	48.4	44.0			06-08	45.9	44.5		
Students with disabilities[3]	Mean SS	06-08	418.9	416.6	NA	NA	06-08	478.1	480.4	NA	NA	06-08	512.6	516.6	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	65.5	67.4			06-08	53.8	50.1			06-08	49.0	50.1		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	464.4	463.0	NA		06-08	538.1	536.7	NA		06-08	572.5	573.0	NA	
	SD	06-08	56.8	59.0			06-08	54.0	49.3			06-08	50.6	49.5		
English language learners[3]	Mean SS	06-08	421.1	424.7	NA	NA	06-08	486.3	492.6	NA	NA	06-08	513.6	515.3	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	56.4	57.0			06-08	59.1	51.3			06-08	58.5	51.1		
Female	Mean SS	04-08	470.4	471.1	NA		02-08	540.6	544.4	NA		04-08	579.5	579.3	NA	
	SD	04-08	59.0	58.9			02-08	54.7	47.8			04-08	48.8	48.1		
Male	Mean SS	04-08	452.1	451.5	NA	NA	02-08	526.9	526.6	NA	NA	04-08	565.1	564.2	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	60.9	58.5			02-08	58.5	50.5			04-08	52.1	51.2		

Table reads: In 2004, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 467.8 for white students and 429.5 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 468.2 for white students and 433.0 for African American students. Average annual mean scale score gains were not calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

Note: The Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) for reading is scored on a scale of 140 – 800 at grade 4, 230 – 890 at grade 8, and 220 – 820 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 IN-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	Mean SS	04-08	446.3	447.6	NA		02-08	543.7	560.1	NA		04-08	605.7	606.2	NA	
	SD	04-08	60.6	64.7			02-08	74.3	79.7			04-08	73.2	64.2		
White	Mean SS	04-08	452.7	454.6	NA		02-08	552.2	570.7	NA		04-08	614.9	614.6	NA	
	SD	04-08	58.4	61.9			02-08	71.0	75.7			04-08	67.6	59.7		
African American	Mean SS	04-08	413.7	417.0	NA	NA	02-08	487.7	509.1	NA	NA	04-08	547.1	562.0	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	61.2	66.5			02-08	69.9	78.5			04-08	77.2	66.9		
Latino	Mean SS	04-08	427.1	429.6	NA	NA	02-08	514.1	530.0	NA	NA	04-08	569.4	581.3	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	58.3	63.9			02-08	71.5	78.1			04-08	76.5	65.2		
Asian	Mean SS	04-08	485.6	475.3	NA	NA	02-08	599.6	605.9	NA	NA	04-08	657.7	631.4	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	62.3	83.6			02-08	79.5	99.9			04-08	82.5	97.9		
Native American	Mean SS	04-08	440.8	438.9	NA	NA	02-08	521.7	548.3	NA	NA	04-08	592.6	593.4	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	57.1	65.4			02-08	66.6	73.4			04-08	72.8	61.2		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	04-08	460.1	463.0	NA		02-08	559.3	580.7	NA		04-08	619.6	621.3	NA	
	SD	04-08	56.4	60.8			02-08	69.0	73.4			04-08	66.9	58.4		
Low-income	Mean SS	04-08	424.9	428.5	NA	NA	02-08	506.5	528.1	NA	NA	04-08	568.9	577.9	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	60.5	64.1			02-08	72.9	78.5			04-08	75.8	65.0		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	456.0	454.6	NA		06-08	566.5	573.1	NA		06-08	619.0	616.3	NA	
	SD	06-08	56.0	59.6			06-08	70.1	69.7			06-08	64.9	55.2		
Students with disabilities	Mean SS	06-08	410.8	411.1	NA	NA	06-08	475.4	479.0	NA	NA	06-08	527.3	542.0	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	76.2	76.6			06-08	86.5	89.8			06-08	90.6	78.6		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	450.0	449.1	NA		06-08	554.9	561.9	NA		06-08	608.6	607.5	NA	
	SD	06-08	61.5	64.1			06-08	78.7	79.0			06-08	74.3	63.4		
English language learners	Mean SS	06-08	413.3	420.8	NA	NA	06-08	501.8	506.9	NA	NA	06-08	554.8	556.4	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	65.5	68.4			06-08	84.1	81.1			06-08	90.1	76.5		
Female	Mean SS	04-08	444.5	446.7	NA		02-08	543.2	558.7	NA		04-08	602.8	606.1	NA	
	SD	04-08	59.0	62.5			02-08	69.7	76.5			04-08	70.9	60.7		
Male	Mean SS	04-08	447.9	448.5	NA	NA	02-08	544.2	561.4	NA	NA	04-08	608.7	606.3	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	62.0	66.6			02-08	78.5	82.6			04-08	75.2	67.4		

Table reads: In 2004, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 452.7 for white students and 413.7 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 454.6 for white students and 417.0 for African American students. Average annual mean scale score gains were not

calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

Note: The Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) for mathematics is scored on a scale of 185 – 750 at grade 4, 340 – 830 at grade 8, and 300 – 920 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 IN-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	04-08	76,828	78,094	1.6%	100.0%	02-08	77,713	79,855	2.8%	100.0%	04-08	76,531	79,565	4.0%	100.0%
	Math	04-08	76,828	78,094	1.6%	100.0%	02-08	77,713	79,855	2.8%	100.0%	04-08	76,531	79,565	4.0%	100.0%
White	Reading	04-08	59,271	57,514	-3.0%	73.6%	02-08	63,881	60,562	-5.2%	75.8%	04-08	62,076	61,650	-0.7%	77.5%
	Math	04-08	59,271	57,514	-3.0%	73.6%	02-08	63,881	60,562	-5.2%	75.8%	04-08	62,076	61,650	-0.7%	77.5%
African American	Reading	04-08	9,585	9,689	1.1%	12.4%	02-08	8,989	9,952	10.7%	12.5%	04-08	8,523	9,438	10.7%	11.9%
	Math	04-08	9,585	9,689	1.1%	12.4%	02-08	8,989	9,952	10.7%	12.5%	04-08	8,523	9,438	10.7%	11.9%
Latino	Reading	04-08	3,903	5,644	44.6%	7.2%	02-08	2,421	5,008	106.9%	6.3%	04-08	2,780	4,413	58.7%	5.5%
	Math	04-08	3,903	5,644	44.6%	7.2%	02-08	2,421	5,008	106.9%	6.3%	04-08	2,780	4,413	58.7%	5.5%
Asian	Reading	04-08	879	1,211	37.8%	1.6%	02-08	730	1,085	48.6%	1.4%	04-08	801	1,025	28.0%	1.3%
	Math	04-08	879	1,211	37.8%	1.6%	02-08	730	1,085	48.6%	1.4%	04-08	801	1,025	28.0%	1.3%
Native American	Reading	04-08	211	210	-0.5%	0.3%	02-08	195	223	14.4%	0.3%	04-08	172	222	29.1%	0.3%
	Math	04-08	211	210	-0.5%	0.3%	02-08	195	223	14.4%	0.3%	04-08	172	222	29.1%	0.3%
Low-income	Reading	04-08	29,688	34,768	17.1%	44.5%	02-08	22,614	31,121	37.6%	39.0%	04-08	20,080	27,700	37.9%	34.8%
	Math	04-08	29,688	34,768	17.1%	44.5%	02-08	22,614	31,121	37.6%	39.0%	04-08	20,080	27,700	37.9%	34.8%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-08	12,930	12,756	-1.3%	16.3%	06-08	11,726	11,163	-4.8%	14.0%	06-08	10,550	11,184	6.0%	14.1%
	Math	06-08	12,930	12,756	-1.3%	16.3%	06-08	11,726	11,163	-4.8%	14.0%	06-08	10,550	11,184	6.0%	14.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-08	3,364	4,158	23.6%	5.3%	06-08	2,225	2,745	23.4%	3.4%	06-08	1,833	2,032	10.9%	2.6%
	Math	06-08	3,364	4,158	23.6%	5.3%	06-08	2,225	2,745	23.4%	3.4%	06-08	1,833	2,032	10.9%	2.6%
Female	Reading	04-08	37,315	38,187	2.3%	48.9%	02-08	38,007	38,859	2.2%	48.7%	04-08	37,624	38,690	2.8%	48.6%
	Math	04-08	37,315	38,187	2.3%	48.9%	02-08	38,007	38,859	2.2%	48.7%	04-08	37,624	38,690	2.8%	48.6%
Male	Reading	04-08	39,362	39,793	1.1%	51.0%	02-08	39,566	40,922	3.4%	51.2%	04-08	38,833	40,758	5.0%	51.2%
	Math	04-08	39,362	39,793	1.1%	51.0%	02-08	39,566	40,922	3.4%	51.2%	04-08	38,833	40,758	5.0%	51.2%

Table reads: In 2004, 59,271 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 57,514 students, a decrease of 3.0%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 73.6% of the 78,094 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.