Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Maine

K-12 enrollment — 189,436

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), Maine students had across-the-board gains. There were improvements in both reading and math at the basic, proficient and advanced levels for the subgroups large enough to count, which were white students, low income students, and boys and girls. Results on achievement gaps were mixed. Comparable data were available from 2006 through 2009.

- ***Mixed picture on gaps.*** The achievement gap between low income and non-low income students widened at grade 8 and 11 in reading, and grade 4 and 8 in math. The gender gap in reading (in favor of girls) narrowed at grades 4 and 8, but widened at grade 11.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009, grades 3 through 8 and grade 11 reading 2007 through 2009, grade 11 mathematics
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009, grades 3 through 8 2007 through 2009, grade 11
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Percentage proficient data not available until 2007 for English language learners (ELLs). Percentage of advanced students not available for disaggregated groups until 2007.

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	Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) Maine's Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio (PAAP) Maine High School Assessment (MHSA)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 11
State labels for achievement levels	ME uses four achievement levels: Not Meeting Standards, Partially Meeting Standards, Meeting Standards, and Exceeding Standards. For our analyses we treated Partially Meeting Standards as Basic, Meeting Standards as Proficient, and Exceeding Standards as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2005–06 for MEA and new version of MHSA 2006–07 for rescaled MHSA
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2005–06: Began testing grades 3, 5–7 to meet NCLB requirements 2005–06: Began basing assessments on revised standards; made online testing available 2005–06: Replaced high school assessment with the SAT 2006–07: Augmented the SAT mathematics test with state-specific items

2006–07: Rescaled the MHSA tests in both reading and math to use an 80-point scale

2009–10: Replaced MEA with the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) in a consortium with New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

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 ME-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%	16%	23%	19%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					59%	65%	71%	70%	3.7
Basic-and-above					82%	89%	89%	91%	2.8
White									
Advanced					NA	16%	23%	20%	1.9
Proficient-and-above					59%	65%	72%	71%	4.0
Basic-and-above					82%	88%	90%	91%	3.0
African American[2]									
Advanced					NA	6%	11%	8%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					42%	48%	49%	50%	2.7
Basic-and-above					68%	75%	71%	79%	3.7
Latino[2]									
Advanced					NA	9%	18%	17%	4.0
Proficient-and-above					47%	54%	56%	65%	6.0
Basic-and-above					66%	82%	83%	87%	7.1
Asian[2]									
Advanced					NA	17%	32%	28%	5.3
Proficient-and-above					65%	64%	71%	71%	1.9
Basic-and-above					84%	88%	89%	89%	1.7
Native American[2]									
Advanced					NA	7%	9%	10%	1.6
Proficient-and-above					38%	42%	52%	56%	5.9
Basic-and-above					68%	80%	81%	81%	4.4

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 16% in 2007 to 20% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 1.9 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

Table ME-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					17%	16%	23%	19%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					59%	65%	71%	70%	3.7
Basic-and-above					82%	89%	89%	91%	2.8
Low-income students									
Advanced					NA	7%	12%	9%	1.2
Proficient-and-above					43%	48%	56%	55%	3.9
Basic-and-above					70%	79%	81%	83%	4.5
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					NA	1%	3%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					16%	19%	27%	24%	2.8
Basic-and-above					43%	56%	59%	61%	6.0
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced						2%	8%	5%	1.3
Proficient-and-above						32%	38%	38%	2.9
Basic-and-above						64%	65%	73%	4.4
Female									
Advanced					NA	21%	30%	25%	2.1
Proficient-and-above					66%	71%	78%	76%	3.4
Basic-and-above					87%	91%	93%	93%	2.1
Male									
Advanced					NA	10%	17%	14%	2.0
Proficient-and-above					52%	57%	66%	65%	4.2
Basic-and-above					77%	84%	87%	88%	3.6

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 7% in 2007 to 9% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 1.2 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 ME-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%	13%	11%	14%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					45%	51%	51%	52%	2.2
Basic-and-above					74%	77%	76%	76%	0.6
White									
Advanced					NA	13%	11%	15%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					45%	52%	52%	52%	2.4
Basic-and-above					75%	78%	77%	77%	0.5
African American[2]									
Advanced					NA	4%	2%	6%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					24%	29%	25%	30%	2.0
Basic-and-above					51%	56%	48%	56%	1.6
Latino[2]									
Advanced					NA	6%	7%	8%	1.2
Proficient-and-above					38%	40%	41%	39%	0.4
Basic-and-above					66%	72%	67%	65%	-0.2
Asian[2]									
Advanced					NA	14%	24%	26%	6.2
Proficient-and-above					60%	61%	66%	59%	-0.2
Basic-and-above					77%	83%	86%	79%	0.7
Native American[2]									
Advanced					NA	4%	5%	5%	0.6
Proficient-and-above					30%	29%	27%	36%	1.9
Basic-and-above					63%	62%	60%	67%	1.3

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 13% in 2007 to 15% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 0.8 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.

Table ME-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%	13%	11%	14%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					45%	51%	51%	52%	2.2
Basic-and-above					74%	77%	76%	76%	0.6
Low-income students									
Advanced					NA	5%	5%	6%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					30%	34%	35%	35%	1.6
Basic-and-above					61%	63%	64%	63%	0.6
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					NA	1%	1%	2%	0.5
Proficient-and-above					12%	16%	15%	13%	0.4
Basic-and-above					37%	39%	37%	34%	-1.0
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced						3%	5%	6%	1.4
Proficient-and-above						26%	29%	23%	-1.5
Basic-and-above						55%	49%	49%	-3.2
Female									
Advanced					NA	12%	11%	15%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					45%	51%	51%	54%	2.9
Basic-and-above					76%	78%	77%	78%	0.6
Male									
Advanced					NA	14%	11%	14%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					44%	52%	51%	50%	1.9
Basic-and-above					72%	77%	75%	74%	0.6

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 5% in 2007 to 6% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 0.4 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 ME-11. Subgroup achievement trends in reading by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.
If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
Subgroup	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	61%	70%	2.9		06-09	59%	70%	3.7		06-09	45%	49%	1.3	
White	06-09	62%	70%	2.8		06-09	59%	71%	4.0		06-09	45%	50%	1.7	
African American	06-09	42%	53%	3.6[2]	L	06-09	42%	50%	2.7[2]	S	06-09	28%	26%	-0.7[2]	S
Latino	06-09	41%	65%	8.0[2]	L	06-09	47%	65%	6.0[2]	L	06-09	37%	37%	0.0[2]	S
Asian	06-09	62%	70%	2.8[2]	E	06-09	65%	71%	1.9[2]	S	06-09	37%	45%	2.7[2]	L
Native American	06-09	46%	59%	4.3[2]	L	06-09	38%	56%	5.9[2]	L	06-09	36%	32%	-1.3[2]	S
Not low-income	06-09	70%	78%	2.8		06-09	66%	79%	4.4		06-09	49%	55%	2.0	
Low-income	06-09	47%	58%	3.7	L	06-09	43%	55%	3.9	S	06-09	30%	33%	1.0	S
Not disabled	06-09	67%	77%	3.2		06-09	66%	79%	4.4		06-09	49%	55%	2.0	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	31%	37%	2.1	S	06-09	16%	24%	2.8	S	06-09	11%	12%	0.3	S
Not ELLs	07-09	67%	70%	1.7		07-09	65%	71%	3.0		07-09	46%	50%	2.0	
English language learners[3]	07-09	31%	44%	6.6[2]	L	07-09	32%	38%	2.9[2]	S	07-09	11%	9%	-1.0[2]	S
Female	06-09	66%	74%	2.7		06-09	66%	76%	3.4		06-09	47%	53%	2.0	
Male	06-09	57%	66%	2.9	L	06-09	52%	65%	4.2	L	06-09	43%	46%	1.0	S

Table reads: In 2006, 62% of white 4th graders and 42% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 70% of white 4th graders and 53% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.8 percentage points per year for white students and 3.6 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 ME-12. Subgroup achievement trends in mathematics by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.
If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
Subgroup	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	59%	65%	2.1		06-09	45%	52%	2.2		07-09	40%	42%	1.0	
White	06-09	60%	66%	2.0		06-09	45%	52%	2.4		07-09	40%	43%	1.5	
African American	06-09	37%	46%	3.0[2]	L	06-09	24%	30%	2.0[2]	S	07-09	14%	16%	1.0[2]	S
Latino	06-09	46%	60%	4.7[2]	L	06-09	38%	39%	0.4[2]	S	07-09	32%	28%	-2.0[2]	S
Asian	06-09	66%	67%	0.3[2]	S	06-09	60%	59%	-0.2[2]	S	07-09	46%	52%	3.0[2]	L
Native American	06-09	41%	58%	5.7[2]	L	06-09	30%	36%	1.9[2]	S	07-09	18%	21%	1.5[2]	E
Not low-income	06-09	67%	74%	2.5		06-09	52%	61%	3.1		07-09	45%	48%	1.5	
Low-income	06-09	47%	53%	2.0	S	06-09	30%	35%	1.6	S	07-09	21%	25%	2.0	L
Not disabled	06-09	64%	72%	2.5		06-09	50%	59%	3.1		07-09	44%	47%	1.5	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	35%	35%	0.1	S	06-09	12%	13%	0.4	S	07-09	6%	7%	0.5	S
Not ELLS	07-09	61%	66%	2.5		07-09	51%	52%	0.6		07-09	39%	42%	1.5	
English language learners[3]	07-09	36%	42%	2.9[2]	L	07-09	26%	23%	-1.5[2]	S	07-09	16%	14%	-1.0[2]	S
Female	06-09	58%	65%	2.4		06-09	45%	54%	2.9		07-09	38%	41%	1.5	
Male	06-09	61%	66%	1.5	S	06-09	44%	50%	1.9	S	07-09	41%	43%	1.0	S

Table reads: In 2006, 60% of white 4th graders and 37% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 66% of white 4th graders and 46% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.0 percentage points per year for white students and 3.0 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

[1]Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

[3]Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

Table ME-13. Achievement gap trends in reading by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation.
If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	845	850	1.7		07-09	1141	1141	0.0	
	SD	06-09	10.2	9.3			06-09	17.4	14.6			07-09	14.3	11.0		
White	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	845	850	1.7		07-09	1141	1141	0.0	
	SD	06-09	10.1	9.2			06-09	17.4	14.5			07-09	14.2	14.5		
African American	MSS	06-09	439	441	0.7[2]	E	06-09	836	843	2.3[2]	L	07-09	1131	1133	1.0[2]	L
	SD	06-09	11.1	10.5			06-09	17.5	15.0			07-09	13.8	14.0		
Latino	MSS	06-09	441	445	1.3[2]	L	06-09	839	847	2.7[2]	L	07-09	1137	1137	0.0[2]	E
	SD	06-09	10.8	8.0			06-09	18.6	15.1			07-09	14.4	14.3		
Asian	MSS	06-09	445	447	0.7[2]	E	06-09	847	851	1.3[2]	S	07-09	1139	1141	1.0[2]	L
	SD	06-09	11.1	11.0			06-09	18.1	16.2			07-09	14.0	16.5		
Native American	MSS	06-09	440	444	1.3[2]	L	06-09	836	843	2.3[2]	L	07-09	1135	1135	0.0[2]	E
	SD	06-09	9.7	9.0			06-09	16.4	15.2			07-09	13.8	14.3		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	446	448	0.7		06-09	848	853	1.7		07-09	1142	1143	0.5	
	SD	06-09	9.9	9.0			06-09	16.7	13.7			07-09	14.0	14.4		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	441	443	0.7	E	06-09	838	844	2.0	L	07-09	1134	1136	1.0	L
	SD	06-09	9.7	9.0			06-09	17.1	14.3			07-09	13.5	13.5		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	449	448	-0.3		06-09	848	853	1.7		07-09	1142	1143	0.5	
	SD	06-09	9.6	8.7			06-09	15.8	13.0			07-09	13.6	13.7		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	437	439	0.7	L	06-09	827	834	2.3	L	07-09	1127	1127	0.0	S
	SD	06-09	10.1	9.0			06-09	15.1	13.2			07-09	11.8	12.1		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	845	850	1.7		07-09	1141	1141	0.0	
	SD	06-09	10.1	9.2			06-09	17.3	14.5			07-09	14.2	14.5		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	436	440	1.3[2]	L	06-09	828	838	3.3[2]	L	07-09	1127	1126	-0.5[2]	S
	SD	06-09	11.1	10.8			06-09	17.7	13.7			07-09	11.6	11.1		
Female	MSS	06-09	446	448	0.7		06-09	848	852	1.3		07-09	1142	1140	-1.0	
	SD	06-09	10.2	9.5			06-09	16.8	14.5			07-09	13.5	14.0		
Male	MSS	06-09	443	445	0.7	E	06-09	842	847	1.7	L	07-09	1140	1142	1.0	L
	SD	06-09	10.0	8.9			06-09	17.4	14.3			07-09	14.9	15.0		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 444 for white students and 439 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 446 for white students and 441 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.7 points for white students and for African American students, indicating no change in the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Maine Educational Assessment (grades 3-8) and Maine High School Assessment (grade 11) are scored on a scale of 00-80, expressed as a 3-digit number with 1st digit representing grade level at grades 3-8 (e.g., a score of 33 in 4th grade = 433) and as a 4-digit number with the first two digits representing grade level for high school (e.g., a score of 33 in high school = 1133).

[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 ME-14. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation.
If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	840	843	1.0		07-09	1140	1141	0.5	
	SD	06-09	13.9	13.3			06-09	17.6	18.2			07-09	10.4	11.0		
White	MSS	06-09	445	447	0.7		06-09	840	843	1.0		07-09	1141	1141	0.0	
	SD	06-09	13.7	13.1			06-09	17.5	18.0			07-09	10.4	10.9		
African American	MSS	06-09	436	439	1.0[2]	L	06-09	830	831	0.3[2]	S	07-09	1133	1134	0.5[2]	L
	SD	06-09	15.4	14.5			06-09	16.9	19.6			07-09	9.1	9.6		
Latino	MSS	06-09	441	443	0.7[2]	E	06-09	835	836	0.3[2]	S	07-09	1138	1136	-1.0[2]	S
	SD	06-09	15.2	11.1			06-09	17.5	18.6			07-09	10.5	10.8		
Asian	MSS	06-09	446	448	0.7[2]	E	06-09	845	847	0.7[2]	S	07-09	1142	1144	1.0[2]	L
	SD	06-09	13.4	15.0			06-09	18.9	20.4			07-09	11.7	13.1		
Native American	MSS	06-09	439	445	2.0[2]	L	06-09	833	836	1.0[2]	E	07-09	1137	1134	-1.5[2]	S
	SD	06-09	13.5	14.7			06-09	15.7	17.1			07-09	9.2	12.2		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	447	450	1.0		06-09	843	847	1.3		07-09	1142	1142	0.0	
	SD	06-09	13.4	12.7			06-09	17.1	17.3			07-09	10.5	11.0		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	440	442	0.7	S	06-09	833	835	0.7	S	07-09	1136	1136	0.0	E
	SD	06-09	13.5	12.9			06-09	17.0	17.5			07-09	8.7	9.8		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	446	448	0.7		06-09	842	846	1.3		07-09	1142	1142	0.0	
	SD	06-09	13.2	12.4			06-09	16.4	16.4			07-09	10.2	10.3		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	436	437	0.3	S	06-09	824	824	0.0	S	07-09	1131	1130	-0.5	S
	SD	06-09	14.1	13.6			06-09	15.7	16.9			07-09	6.7	9.6		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	445	447	0.7		06-09	840	843	1.0		07-09	1141	1141	0.0	
	SD	06-09	13.8	13.2			06-09	17.6	18.1			07-09	10.4	11.0		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	436	439	1.0[2]	L	06-09	827	829	0.7[2]	S	07-09	1133	1132	-0.5[2]	S
	SD	06-09	15.8	15.2			06-09	17.3	19.9			07-09	9.9	10.8		
Female	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	840	843	1.0		07-09	1140	1141	0.5	
	SD	06-09	13.8	13.1			06-09	16.8	17.8			07-09	9.7	10.1		
Male	MSS	06-09	445	447	0.7	E	06-09	839	842	1.0	E	07-09	1141	1140	-0.5	S
	SD	06-09	14.0	13.4			06-09	18.3	18.6			07-09	11.1	11.8		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 445 for white students and 436 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 447 for white students and 439 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an

average yearly rate of 0.7 points for white students and 1.0 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Maine Educational Assessment (grades 3-8) and Maine High School Assessment (grade 11) are scored on a scale of 00-80, expressed as a 3-digit number with 1st digit representing grade level at grades 3-8 (e.g., a score of 33 in 4th grade = 433) and as a 4-digit number with the first two digits representing grade level for high school (e.g., a score of 33 in high school = 1133).

[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 ME-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year	Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year	Year span	# of test-takers start year	# of test-takers end year	Change in # of test-takers over time	% of test-takers in subgroup in end year
All tested students	Reading	06-09	13,946	13,581	-2.6%	100.0%	06-09	16,254	14,481	-10.9%	100.0%	07-09	15,054	14,660	-2.6%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	14,016	13,609	-2.9%	100.0%	06-09	16,247	14,471	-10.9%	100.0%	07-09	15,420	15,008	-2.7%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	13,127	12,684	-3.4%	93.4%	06-09	15,515	13,586	-12.4%	93.8%	07-09	14,370	13,887	-3.4%	94.7%
	Math	06-09	13,174	12,699	-3.6%	93.3%	06-09	15,508	13,567	-12.5%	93.8%	07-09	14,702	14,203	-3.4%	94.6%
African American	Reading	06-09	327	408	24.8%	3.0%	06-09	284	362	27.5%	2.5%	07-09	290	303	4.5%	2.1%
	Math	06-09	337	415	23.1%	3.0%	06-09	284	367	29.2%	2.5%	07-09	304	315	3.6%	2.1%
Latino	Reading	06-09	139	146	5.0%	1.1%	06-09	133	186	39.8%	1.3%	07-09	123	151	22.8%	1.0%
	Math	06-09	142	147	3.5%	1.1%	06-09	134	190	41.8%	1.3%	07-09	129	157	21.7%	1.0%
Asian	Reading	06-09	245	221	-9.8%	1.6%	06-09	208	231	11.1%	1.6%	07-09	193	219	13.5%	1.5%
	Math	06-09	254	225	-11.4%	1.7%	06-09	209	233	11.5%	1.6%	07-09	204	227	11.3%	1.5%
Native American	Reading	06-09	96	122	27.1%	0.9%	06-09	101	116	14.9%	0.8%	07-09	78	100	28.2%	0.7%
	Math	06-09	97	123	26.8%	0.9%	06-09	100	114	14.0%	0.8%	07-09	81	106	30.9%	0.7%
Low-income	Reading	06-09	5,159	5,677	10.0%	41.8%	06-09	5,428	5,277	-2.8%	36.4%	07-09	3,464	4,120	18.9%	28.1%
	Math	06-09	5,205	5,704	9.6%	41.9%	06-09	5,423	5,270	-2.8%	36.4%	07-09	3,606	4,306	19.4%	28.7%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	2,259	2,211	-2.1%	16.3%	06-09	2,447	2,256	-7.8%	15.6%	07-09	1,870	1,865	-0.3%	12.7%
	Math	06-09	2,303	2,227	-3.3%	16.4%	06-09	2,437	2,242	-8.0%	15.5%	07-09	1,991	1,959	-1.6%	13.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	227	357	57.3%	2.6%	06-09	221	324	46.6%	2.2%	07-09	233	225	-3.4%	1.5%
	Math	06-09	301	370	22.9%	2.7%	06-09	228	336	47.4%	2.3%	07-09	250	239	-4.4%	1.6%
Female	Reading	06-09	6,919	6,580	-4.9%	48.5%	06-09	7,815	7,074	-9.5%	48.9%	07-09	7,401	7,562	2.2%	51.6%
	Math	06-09	6,935	6,591	-5.0%	48.4%	06-09	7,813	7,070	-9.5%	48.9%	07-09	7,566	7,760	2.6%	51.7%
Male	Reading	06-09	7,015	7,001	-0.2%	51.5%	06-09	8,426	7,407	-12.1%	51.1%	07-09	7,653	7,098	-7.3%	48.4%
	Math	06-09	7,069	7,018	-0.7%	51.6%	06-09	8,422	7,401	-12.1%	51.1%	07-09	7,854	7,248	-7.7%	48.3%

Table reads: In 2006, 13,127 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 12,684 students, a decrease of 3.4%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 93.4% of the 13,581 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.