# Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Idaho

*K-12 enrollment — 275,075*

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***. Idaho showed improvement in reading and math in grade 8 at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels for Latino and white students, low income students, and boys and girls. The state has also made progress in narrowing achievement gaps between Latino and white students and between low income and non-low income students. Comparable data were available from 2007 through 2009.

- ***Notable gains.*** Idaho had very large gains in the percentage of students reading at the advanced level.

## Data Limitations

| | |
|---|---|
| Years of comparable percentage proficient data | 2007 through 2009 |
| Years of comparable mean scale score data | 2007 through 2009; standard deviations not available for any year |
| Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups | Percent proficient data not available until 2009 and mean scale score data not available for any year for comparison groups of students who are *not* low-income, *not* disabled, or *not* English language learners (ELLs), so these subgroups are compared with all tested students in the state |

## 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 | Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT)<br>Idaho Alternate Assessment |
| Grades tested for NCLB accountability | 3-8, 10 |
| State labels for achievement levels | ID uses four achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Basic as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced. |
| High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam? | Yes |
| First year test used | 2007 |
| Time of test administration | Spring only for 3-8 & 10<br>Summer, Fall, Winter and Spring for retesting 10$^{th}$ graders for graduation requirement. Due to lack of use, Summer and Winter retests will not be used in 2010. Results reported here include Fall and Spring administrations. |
| Major changes in testing system (2002–present) | 2006: Switched test vendors; new vendor designed an adaptive version of the ISAT<br>2006: Piloted ISAT science test for grades 5, 7, 10<br>2007: Standard Scores were set and will remain until substantive changes are made to the standards, which will require changes to the test. |

## 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 ID-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 | | | | | | 38% | 49% | 54% | 8.0 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 86% | 88% | 91% | 2.8 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 97% | 97% | 98% | 0.6 |
| White | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 42% | 53% | 59% | 8.3 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 89% | 91% | 93% | 2.3 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 98% | 98% | 98% | 0.4 |
| African American[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 28% | 36% | 46% | 8.8 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 80% | 84% | 82% | 0.8 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 92% | 95% | 92% | -0.1 |
| Latino | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 16% | 24% | 28% | 6.1 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 69% | 74% | 81% | 6.4 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 91% | 92% | 95% | 2.2 |
| Asian[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 42% | 55% | 67% | 12.3 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 88% | 88% | 94% | 3.3 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 98% | 96% | 97% | -0.2 |
| Native American[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 23% | 24% | 36% | 6.6 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 73% | 74% | 82% | 4.6 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 93% | 93% | 95% | 1.1 |

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 42% in 2007 to 59% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 8.3 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 ID-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 | | | | | | 38% | 49% | 54% | 8.0 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 86% | 88% | 91% | 2.8 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 97% | 97% | 98% | 0.6 |
| Low-income students | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 26% | 34% | 41% | 7.6 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 77% | 81% | 87% | 4.7 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 94% | 94% | 96% | 1.1 |
| Students with disabilities[3] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 6% | 10% | 11% | 2.8 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 47% | 47% | 55% | 4.3 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 82% | 80% | 84% | 0.9 |
| English language learners[3] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 7% | 12% | 12% | 2.7 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 57% | 61% | 68% | 5.6 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 86% | 86% | 90% | 2.2 |
| Female | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 42% | 51% | 57% | 7.4 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 89% | 91% | 93% | 2.5 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 97% | 98% | 98% | 0.5 |
| Male | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 34% | 47% | 51% | 8.5 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 83% | 86% | 90% | 3.2 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 96% | 96% | 97% | 0.7 |

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 26% in 2007 to 41% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 7.6 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

**Table ID-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 | | | | | | 29% | 33% | 38% | 4.5 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 72% | 79% | 78% | 3.4 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 92% | 94% | 94% | 0.8 |
| White | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 33% | 37% | 42% | 4.7 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 76% | 82% | 82% | 3.3 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 94% | 95% | 95% | 0.6 |
| African American[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 18% | 20% | 24% | 3.3 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 56% | 62% | 61% | 2.5 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 82% | 81% | 83% | 0.4 |
| Latino | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 11% | 15% | 18% | 3.2 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 51% | 62% | 59% | 4.3 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 84% | 89% | 87% | 1.6 |
| Asian[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 39% | 44% | 54% | 7.1 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 82% | 83% | 84% | 1.0 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 95% | 95% | 95% | -0.3 |
| Native American[2] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 10% | 11% | 21% | 5.5 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 52% | 57% | 66% | 7.2 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 85% | 85% | 89% | 1.7 |

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 33% in 2007 to 42% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 4.7 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

**Table ID-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 | | | | | | 29% | 33% | 38% | 4.5 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 72% | 79% | 78% | 3.4 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 92% | 94% | 94% | 0.8 |
| Low-income students | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 18% | 21% | 26% | 3.8 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 60% | 67% | 69% | 4.6 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 87% | 89% | 90% | 1.3 |
| Students with disabilities[3] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 5% | 5% | 6% | 0.4 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 27% | 30% | 29% | 1.0 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 66% | 63% | 63% | -1.4 |
| English language learners[3] | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 6% | 8% | 8% | 1.0 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 39% | 48% | 44% | 2.4 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 77% | 82% | 79% | 1.1 |
| Female | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 27% | 33% | 36% | 4.7 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 72% | 80% | 78% | 3.3 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 92% | 94% | 94% | 1.1 |
| Male | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | | 31% | 33% | 40% | 4.4 |
| Proficient-and-above | | | | | | 72% | 78% | 78% | 3.4 |
| Basic-and-above | | | | | | 92% | 93% | 93% | 0.5 |

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 18% in 2007 to 26% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 3.8 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 ID-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 | 07-09 | 81% | 86% | 2.9 | | 07-09 | 86% | 91% | 2.8 | | 07-09 | 79% | 89% | 5.0 | |
| White | 07-09 | 84% | 89% | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 89% | 93% | 2.3 | | 07-09 | 82% | 92% | 4.8 | |
| African American | 07-09 | 74% | 71% | -1.6[2] | S | 07-09 | 80% | 82% | 0.8[2] | S | 07-09 | 73% | 67% | -2.6[2] | S |
| Latino | 07-09 | 61% | 72% | 5.5 | L | 07-09 | 69% | 81% | 6.4 | L | 07-09 | 55% | 74% | 9.7 | L |
| Asian | 07-09 | 84% | 96% | 5.8[2] | L | 07-09 | 88% | 94% | 3.3[2] | L | 07-09 | 84% | 78% | -3.3[2] | S |
| Native American | 07-09 | 65% | 70% | 2.4[2] | S | 07-09 | 73% | 82% | 4.6[2] | L | 07-09 | 58% | 81% | 11.6[2] | L |
| All tested students | 07-09 | 81% | 86% | 2.9 | | 07-09 | 86% | 91% | 2.8 | | 07-09 | 79% | 89% | 5.0 | |
| Low-income | 07-09 | 71% | 80% | 4.2 | L | 07-09 | 77% | 87% | 4.7 | L | 07-09 | 67% | 81% | 7.1 | L |
| All tested students | 07-09 | 81% | 86% | 2.9 | | 07-09 | 86% | 91% | 2.8 | | 07-09 | 79% | 89% | 5.0 | |
| Students with disabilities[3] | 07-09 | 47% | 54% | 3.3 | L | 07-09 | 47% | 55% | 4.3 | L | 07-09 | 33% | 49% | 8.1 | L |
| All tested students | 07-09 | 81% | 86% | 2.9 | | 07-09 | 86% | 91% | 2.8 | | 07-09 | 79% | 89% | 5.0 | |
| English language learners[3] | 07-09 | 51% | 60% | 4.6 | L | 07-09 | 57% | 68% | 5.6 | L | 07-09 | 39% | 50% | 5.7 | L |
| Female | 07-09 | 82% | 88% | 3.0 | | 07-09 | 89% | 93% | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 82% | 90% | 4.2 | |
| Male | 07-09 | 79% | 84% | 2.8 | S | 07-09 | 83% | 90% | 3.2 | L | 07-09 | 76% | 88% | 5.9 | L |

Table reads: In 2007, 84% of white 4th graders and 74% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 89% of white 4th graders and 71% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2007 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.5 percentage points per year for white students and declined at an average rate of 1.6 percentage points per year for African American

students, indicating a widening 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 ID-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 | 07-09 | 82% | 86% | 1.8 | | 07-09 | 72% | 78% | 3.4 | | 07-09 | 73% | 78% | 2.9 | |
| White | 07-09 | 85% | 88% | 1.5 | | 07-09 | 76% | 82% | 3.3 | | 07-09 | 76% | 82% | 2.9 | |
| African American | 07-09 | 74% | 66% | -3.9[2] | S | 07-09 | 56% | 61% | 2.5[2] | S | 07-09 | 58% | 53% | -2.6[2] | S |
| Latino | 07-09 | 65% | 75% | 4.7 | L | 07-09 | 51% | 59% | 4.3 | L | 07-09 | 50% | 61% | 5.8 | L |
| Asian | 07-09 | 86% | 93% | 3.5[2] | L | 07-09 | 82% | 84% | 1.0[2] | S | 07-09 | 85% | 80% | -2.5[2] | S |
| Native American | 07-09 | 68% | 67% | -0.4[2] | S | 07-09 | 52% | 66% | 7.2[2] | L | 07-09 | 56% | 63% | 3.5[2] | L |
| All tested students | 07-09 | 82% | 86% | 1.8 | | 07-09 | 72% | 78% | 3.4 | | 07-09 | 73% | 78% | 2.9 | |
| Low-income | 07-09 | 74% | 80% | 2.6 | L | 07-09 | 60% | 69% | 4.6 | L | 07-09 | 61% | 68% | 3.7 | L |
| All tested students | 07-09 | 82% | 86% | 1.8 | | 07-09 | 72% | 78% | 3.4 | | 07-09 | 73% | 78% | 2.9 | |
| Students with disabilities[3] | 07-09 | 56% | 54% | -1.0 | S | 07-09 | 27% | 29% | 1.0 | S | 07-09 | 29% | 33% | 2.3 | S |
| All tested students | 07-09 | 82% | 86% | 1.8 | | 07-09 | 72% | 78% | 3.4 | | 07-09 | 73% | 78% | 2.9 | |
| English language learners[3] | 07-09 | 61% | 64% | 1.7 | S | 07-09 | 39% | 44% | 2.4 | S | 07-09 | 41% | 38% | -1.9 | S |
| Female | 07-09 | 82% | 86% | 2.3 | | 07-09 | 72% | 78% | 3.3 | | 07-09 | 73% | 78% | 2.6 | |
| Male | 07-09 | 82% | 85% | 1.4 | S | 07-09 | 72% | 78% | 3.4 | L | 07-09 | 73% | 79% | 3.2 | L |

Table reads: In 2007, 85% of white 4th graders and 74% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 88% of white 4th graders and 66% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2007 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.5 percentage points per year for white students and declined at an average rate of 3.9 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a widening 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 ID-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 | 07-09 | 208 | 210 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 225 | 230 | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 229 | 229 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | MSS | 07-09 | 209 | 211 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 226 | 231 | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 230 | 230 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| African American | MSS | 07-09 | 205 | 205 | 0.0[2] | S | 07-09 | 222 | 226 | 2.0[2] | S | 07-09 | 225 | 224 | -0.5[2] | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Latino | MSS | 07-09 | 201 | 204 | 1.5 | L | 07-09 | 219 | 223 | 2.0 | S | 07-09 | 221 | 223 | 1.0 | L |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Asian | MSS | 07-09 | 210 | 214 | 2.0[2] | L | 07-09 | 227 | 234 | 3.5[2] | L | 07-09 | 231 | 230 | -0.5[2] | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Native American | MSS | 07-09 | 202 | 204 | 1.0[2] | E | 07-09 | 221 | 225 | 2.0[2] | S | 07-09 | 222 | 224 | 1.0[2] | L |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All tested students | MSS | 07-09 | 208 | 210 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 225 | 230 | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 229 | 229 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Low-income | MSS | 07-09 | 204 | 207 | 1.5 | L | 07-09 | 222 | 226 | 2.0 | S | 07-09 | 225 | 226 | 0.5 | L |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All tested students | MSS | 07-09 | 208 | 210 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 225 | 230 | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 229 | 229 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Students with disabilities[3] | MSS | 07-09 | 199 | 200 | 0.5 | S | 07-09 | 214 | 216 | 1.0 | S | 07-09 | 216 | 217 | 0.5 | L |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All tested students | MSS | 07-09 | 208 | 210 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 225 | 230 | 2.5 | | 07-09 | 229 | 229 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| English language learners[3] | MSS | 07-09 | 199 | 201 | 1.0 | E | 07-09 | 216 | 218 | 1.0 | S | 07-09 | 218 | 218 | 0.0 | E |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | MSS | 07-09 | 209 | 211 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 227 | 231 | 2.0 | | 07-09 | 229 | 230 | 0.5 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Male | MSS | 07-09 | 207 | 209 | 1.0 | E | 07-09 | 224 | 229 | 2.5 | L | 07-09 | 228 | 228 | 0.0 | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |

Table reads: In 2007, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 209 for white students and 205 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 211 for white students and 205 for African American students. Between 2007 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 1.0 points for white students and remained the same for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The ISAT (Idaho Standards Achievement Test) scores are obtained using Rasch Unit scaled scores (typical range 140-300).

[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 ID-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 | 07-09 | 211 | 213 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 236 | 239 | 1.5 | | 07-09 | 244 | 244 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| White | MSS | 07-09 | 212 | 214 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 238 | 240 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 245 | 245 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| African American | MSS | 07-09 | 208 | 206 | -1.0[2] | S | 07-09 | 231 | 233 | 1.0[2] | E | 07-09 | 239 | 237 | -1.0[2] | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Latino | MSS | 07-09 | 205 | 208 | 1.5 | L | 07-09 | 230 | 232 | 1.0 | E | 07-09 | 237 | 238 | 0.5 | L |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Asian | MSS | 07-09 | 215 | 218 | 1.5[2] | L | 07-09 | 241 | 243 | 1.0[2] | E | 07-09 | 249 | 248 | -0.5[2] | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Native American | MSS | 07-09 | 206 | 206 | 0.0[2] | S | 07-09 | 230 | 233 | 1.5[2] | L | 07-09 | 238 | 238 | 0.0[2] | E |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| All tested students | MSS | 07-09 | 211 | 213 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 236 | 239 | 1.5 | | 07-09 | 244 | 244 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Low-income | MSS | 07-09 | 208 | 210 | 1.0 | E | 07-09 | 232 | 235 | 1.5 | E | 07-09 | 241 | 240 | -0.5 | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| All tested students | MSS | 07-09 | 211 | 213 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 236 | 239 | 1.5 | | 07-09 | 244 | 244 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Students with disabilities[3] | MSS | 07-09 | 203 | 203 | 0.0 | S | 07-09 | 225 | 224 | -0.5 | S | 07-09 | 232 | 231 | -0.5 | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| All tested students | MSS | 07-09 | 211 | 213 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 236 | 239 | 1.5 | | 07-09 | 244 | 244 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| English language learners[3] | MSS | 07-09 | 204 | 205 | 0.5 | S | 07-09 | 227 | 228 | 0.5 | S | 07-09 | 236 | 233 | -1.5 | S |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Female | MSS | 07-09 | 211 | 213 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 236 | 238 | 1.0 | | 07-09 | 244 | 244 | 0.0 | |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |
| Male | MSS | 07-09 | 211 | 213 | 1.0 | E | 07-09 | 237 | 239 | 1.0 | E | 07-09 | 245 | 245 | 0.0 | E |
| | SD | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | | 07-09 | NA | NA | | |

Table reads: In 2007, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 212 for white students and 208 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 214 for white students and 206 for African American students. Between 2007 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an

average yearly rate of 1.0 points for white students and declined at an average yearly rate of 1.0 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The ISAT (Idaho Standards Achievement Test) scores are obtained using Rasch Unit scaled scores (typical range 140-300).

[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 ID-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 | 07-09 | 19,624 | 21,098 | 7.5% | 100.0% | 07-09 | 19,840 | 20,180 | 1.7% | 100.0% | 07-09 | 19,092 | 18,614 | -2.5% | 100.0% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 19,680 | 21,151 | 7.5% | 100.0% | 07-09 | 19,864 | 20,224 | 1.8% | 100.0% | 07-09 | 19,131 | 18,651 | -2.5% | 100.0% |
| White | Reading | 07-09 | 15,651 | 16,955 | 8.3% | 80.4% | 07-09 | 16,093 | 16,398 | 1.9% | 81.3% | 07-09 | 15,883 | 15,264 | -3.9% | 82.0% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 15,662 | 16,966 | 8.3% | 80.2% | 07-09 | 16,092 | 16,398 | 1.9% | 81.1% | 07-09 | 15,881 | 15,262 | -3.9% | 81.8% |
| African American | Reading | 07-09 | 217 | **231** | 6.5% | 1.1% | 07-09 | 179 | **233** | 30.2% | 1.2% | 07-09 | 178 | **187** | 5.1% | 1.0% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 220 | **237** | 7.7% | 1.1% | 07-09 | 179 | **238** | 33.0% | 1.2% | 07-09 | 178 | **199** | 11.8% | 1.1% |
| Latino | Reading | 07-09 | 2,782 | 3,056 | 9.8% | 14.5% | 07-09 | 2,629 | 2,766 | 5.2% | 13.7% | 07-09 | 2,141 | 2,495 | 16.5% | 13.4% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 2,819 | 3,075 | 9.1% | 14.5% | 07-09 | 2,651 | 2,782 | 4.9% | 13.8% | 07-09 | 2,175 | 2,499 | 14.9% | 13.4% |
| Asian | Reading | 07-09 | 234 | **257** | 9.8% | 1.2% | 07-09 | 238 | **251** | 5.5% | 1.2% | 07-09 | 219 | **222** | 1.4% | 1.2% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 239 | **268** | 12.1% | 1.3% | 07-09 | 239 | **273** | 14.2% | 1.3% | 07-09 | 227 | **239** | 5.3% | 1.3% |
| Native American | Reading | 07-09 | 298 | **354** | 18.8% | 1.7% | 07-09 | 310 | **338** | 9.0% | 1.7% | 07-09 | 249 | **339** | 36.1% | 1.8% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 298 | **352** | 18.1% | 1.7% | 07-09 | 310 | **338** | 9.0% | 1.7% | 07-09 | 246 | **342** | 39.0% | 1.8% |
| Low-income | Reading | 07-09 | 8,884 | 9,915 | 11.6% | 47.0% | 07-09 | 7,817 | 8,284 | 6.0% | 41.1% | 07-09 | 6,133 | 5,058 | -17.5% | 27.2% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 8,919 | 9,953 | 11.6% | 47.1% | 07-09 | 7,832 | 8,324 | 6.3% | 41.2% | 07-09 | 6,161 | 5,086 | -17.4% | 27.3% |
| Students w/ disabilities | Reading | 07-09 | 2,226 | 2,184 | -1.9% | 10.4% | 07-09 | 1,888 | 1,792 | -5.1% | 8.9% | 07-09 | 1,649 | 1,196 | -27.5% | 6.4% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 2,229 | 2,191 | -1.7% | 10.4% | 07-09 | 1,884 | 1,788 | -5.1% | 8.8% | 07-09 | 1,652 | 1,191 | -27.9% | 6.4% |
| English language learners | Reading | 07-09 | 1,788 | 1,630 | -8.8% | 7.7% | 07-09 | 1,302 | 1,197 | -8.1% | 5.9% | 07-09 | 997 | 769 | -22.9% | 4.1% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 1,830 | 1,688 | -7.8% | 8.0% | 07-09 | 1,339 | 1,248 | -6.8% | 6.2% | 07-09 | 1,031 | 814 | -21.0% | 4.4% |
| Female | Reading | 07-09 | 9,552 | 10,381 | 8.7% | 49.2% | 07-09 | 9,594 | 9,921 | 3.4% | 49.2% | 07-09 | 9,293 | 9,063 | -2.5% | 48.7% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 9,578 | 10,406 | 8.6% | 49.2% | 07-09 | 9,602 | 9,948 | 3.6% | 49.2% | 07-09 | 9,315 | 9,088 | -2.4% | 48.7% |
| Male | Reading | 07-09 | 10,072 | 10,717 | 6.4% | 50.8% | 07-09 | 10,246 | 10,259 | 0.1% | 50.8% | 07-09 | 9,799 | 9,551 | -2.5% | 51.3% |
| | Math | 07-09 | 10,102 | 10,745 | 6.4% | 50.8% | 07-09 | 10,262 | 10,276 | 0.1% | 50.8% | 07-09 | 9,816 | 9,563 | -2.6% | 51.3% |

Table reads: In 2007, 15,651 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had risen to 16,955 students, an increase of 8.3%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 80.4% of the 21,098 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.