Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New Jersey

K-12 enrollment — 1,377,728

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 New Jersey, achievement gaps narrowed in grade 11 reading and math for all major subgroups, with one exception. Comparable data for grade 11 by subgroup were available for 2002-2009, with a few exceptions. Because the state changed its tests at grades 4 and 8 in recent years, there were too few years of comparable data to determine trends at these grades.

- ***Grade 11 math gap trends.*** In math, achievement gaps narrowed for African American, Latino, and low-income 11th graders according to both percentages proficient and average (mean) scores.

- ***Grade 11 reading gap trends.*** In reading, gaps narrowed for *Latino* and *low-income* 11th graders according to both percentages scoring proficient and average (mean) scores. For *African American* students, the gap in grade 11 reading widened using percentages proficient but narrowed using average scores.

- ***Narrowing male-female reading gap.*** Girls outperformed boys in grade 11 reading, but the gap between these groups narrowed.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2001– 2008: Grade 4 reading 1999 – 2008: Grade 4 math 2004 – 2008: Grade 3 2008 – 2009: Grades 5-8 2002 – 2009: Grade 11
Years of comparable mean scale score data	Effect sizes not calculated; complete standard deviations not available beyond 2005 (and not available in 2003) Comparable mean scale score data for subgroups available 2003 through 2008 for grade 4; 2008 through 2009 for grade 8; and 2003 through 2009 for grade 11
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Data are not available until 2007 for comparison group of students who are *not* disabled; not available for any year for students who are *not* English language learners (ELL), so the ELL subgroup is compared with all tested students in the state. Percentage proficient data for comparison group of students who are *not* low-income not available until 2003 for grades 4 and 11.

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	New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge, grades 3–8 High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA), grade 11 Alternate Proficiency Assessment
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 11
State labels for achievement levels	NJ uses three achievement levels: Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced Proficient. For our analyses we treated Proficient as Proficient and Advanced Proficient as Advanced. No NJ achievement level was treated as our Basic.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	1999: NJ ASK 4 math (new NJ ASK 4 administered in 2009) 2001: NJ ASK 4 language arts (new NJ ASK 4 administered in 2009) 2002: HSPA

	2004: NJ ASK 3 (new NJ ASK 3 administered in 2009) 2008: NJ ASK 5-8
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	1999: Standards set for the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) and NJASK 4 in math 2001: Standards set for the ESPA and NJ ASK 4 in language arts March 2004: NJ ASK 4 replaced ESPA for accountability purposes (name changed but test content and structure remained the same) March 2005: NJ ASK 3 first used for accountability purposes 2005–06: Grades 5, 6, and 7 added to testing Spring 2007: HSPA science assessments began 2008: New NJ ASK grade 5-8 programs were implemented, new standards were set 2009: New grade 3-4 testing programs established in 2009, with standards set in July 2009.

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 NJ-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							11%	11%	NA
Proficient-and-above							81%	82%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
White									
Advanced							15%	14%	NA
Proficient-and-above							90%	91%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
African American									
Advanced							3%	2%	NA
Proficient-and-above							62%	62%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced							4%	3%	NA
Proficient-and-above							68%	69%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced							26%	27%	NA
Proficient-and-above							92%	93%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Native American[2]									
Advanced							9%	9%	NA
Proficient-and-above							78%	83%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 15% in 2008 to 14% in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

Table NJ-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced							11%	11%	NA
Proficient-and-above							81%	82%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced							3%	3%	NA
Proficient-and-above							63%	64%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced							1%	1%	NA
Proficient-and-above							44%	47%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced							1%	0%	NA
Proficient-and-above							38%	32%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced							16%	15%	NA
Proficient-and-above							86%	86%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced							8%	8%	NA
Proficient-and-above							76%	78%	NA
Basic-and-above							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 3% in 2008 and in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table NJ-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							25%	30%	NA
Proficient-and-above							67%	71%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
White									
Advanced							31%	36%	NA
Proficient-and-above							79%	82%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
African American									
Advanced							6%	10%	NA
Proficient-and-above							38%	45%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced							11%	15%	NA
Proficient-and-above							50%	56%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced							52%	58%	NA
Proficient-and-above							88%	90%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Native American[2]									
Advanced							20%	25%	NA
Proficient-and-above							63%	63%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 31% in 2008 to 36% in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

Table NJ-10. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain[1]
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced							25%	30%	NA
Proficient-and-above							67%	71%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced							9%	13%	NA
Proficient-and-above							44%	51%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced							5%	5%	NA
Proficient-and-above							27%	30%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced							7%	8%	NA
Proficient-and-above							31%	31%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced							22%	27%	NA
Proficient-and-above							67%	72%	NA
Basic-and-above							NA	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced							27%	32%	NA
Proficient-and-above							68%	71%	NA
Basic-and-above							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 9% in 2008 to 13% in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

Table NJ-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	02-08	79%	83%	NA		08-09	81%	82%	NA		02-09	81%	84%	0.4	
White	02-08	87%	89%	NA		08-09	90%	91%	NA		02-09	88%	91%	0.4	
African American	02-08	61%	67%	NA	NA	08-09	62%	62%	NA	NA	02-09	63%	63%	0.1	S
Latino	02-08	67%	73%	NA	NA	08-09	68%	69%	NA	NA	02-09	64%	72%	1.1	L
Asian	02-08	90%	93%	NA	NA	08-09	92%	93%	NA	NA	02-09	87%	91%	0.6	L
Native American	02-08	74%	72%	NA	NA	08-09	78%	83%	NA	NA	02-09	63%	84%	3.0[2]	L
Not low-income	03-08	86%	89%	NA		08-09	88%	89%	NA		03-09	84%	88%	0.6	
Low-income	03-08	58%	69%	NA	NA	08-09	63%	64%	NA	NA	03-09	57%	67%	1.6	L
Not disabled	07-08	88%	89%	NA		08-09	90%	90%	NA		07-09	94%	92%	-1.0	
Students with disabilities[3]	07-08	50%	55%	NA	NA	08-09	44%	47%	NA	NA	07-09	48%	47%	-0.9	L
All tested students	06-08	80%	83%	NA		08-09	81%	82%	NA		06-09	84%	84%	0.0	
English language learners[3]	06-08	44%	61%	NA	NA	08-09	38%	32%	NA	NA	06-09	22%	25%	0.8	L
Female	02-08	85%	86%	NA		08-09	86%	86%	NA		02-09	86%	87%	0.1	
Male	02-08	74%	79%	NA		08-09	76%	78%	NA		02-09	77%	81%	0.6	L

Table reads: In 2002, 87% of white 4th graders and 61% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 89% of white 4th graders and 67% 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 NJ-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	02-08	69%	85%	NA		08-09	67%	71%	NA		02-09	69%	73%	0.6	
White	02-08	80%	92%	NA		08-09	79%	82%	NA		02-09	79%	83%	0.5	
African American	02-08	39%	68%	NA	NA	08-09	38%	45%	NA	NA	02-09	36%	43%	1.0	L
Latino	02-08	53%	76%	NA	NA	08-09	50%	56%	NA	NA	02-09	45%	56%	1.6	L
Asian	02-08	86%	95%	NA	NA	08-09	88%	90%	NA	NA	02-09	84%	90%	0.9	L
Native American	02-08	67%	83%	NA	NA	08-09	63%	63%	NA	NA	02-09	57%	72%	2.1[2]	L
Not low-income	03-08	77%	91%	NA		08-09	76%	80%	NA		03-09	71%	79%	1.3	
Low-income	03-08	47%	72%	NA	NA	08-09	44%	51%	NA	NA	03-09	36%	51%	2.6	L
Not disabled	07-08	90%	90%	NA		08-09	77%	80%	NA		07-09	82%	82%	-0.3	
Students with disabilities[3]	07-08	64%	65%	NA	NA	08-09	27%	30%	NA	NA	07-09	30%	29%	-0.2	L
All tested students	06-08	82%	85%	NA		08-09	67%	71%	NA		06-09	76%	73%	-1.1	
English language learners[3]	06-08	55%	65%	NA	NA	08-09	31%	31%	NA	NA	06-09	33%	26%	-2.1	S
Female	02-08	67%	85%	NA		08-09	67%	72%	NA		02-09	68%	73%	0.6	
Male	02-08	70%	85%	NA	NA	08-09	68%	71%	NA	NA	02-09	69%	73%	0.6	E

Table reads: In 2002, 80% of white 4th graders and 39% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 92% of white 4th graders and 68% 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 NJ-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	03-08	214.6	215.6	NA		08-09	220.0	220.4	NA		03-09	219.8	229.9	1.7	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
White	MSS	03-08	220.9	220.6	NA		08-09	226.8	226.9	NA		03-09	227.5	230.2	0.5	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	03-08	201.8	203.6	NA	NA	08-09	204.8	205.2	NA	NA	03-09	199.8	203.3	0.6	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	03-08	203.1	207.1	NA	NA	08-09	208.5	209.1	NA	NA	03-09	201.5	210.2	1.5	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	03-08	224.9	226.1	NA	NA	08-09	233.0	233.6	NA	NA	03-09	229.5	233.5	0.7	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	03-08	213.8	210.0	NA	NA	08-09	218.1	218.2	NA	NA	03-09	215.6	220.6	0.8[2]	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	03-08	220.3	220.5	NA		08-09	225.6	226.1	NA		03-09	223.9	227.4	0.6	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	03-08	201.1	204.3	NA	NA	08-09	205.3	206.4	NA	NA	03-09	196.2	206.2	1.7	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	07-08	220.4	220.0	NA		08-09	225.9	225.7	NA		07-09	233.1	230.2	-1.5	
	SD	07-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			07-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	07-08	194.1	195.6	NA	NA	08-09	194.8	197.3	NA	NA	07-09	191.0	190.0	-0.5	L
	SD	07-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			07-09	NA	NA		
All tested students	MSS	06-08	215.6	215.6	NA		08-09	220.0	220.4	NA		06-09	224.8	229.9	1.7	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-08	191.1	199.1	NA	NA	08-09	192.1	190.7	NA	NA	06-09	171.0	173.3	0.8	S
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	03-08	219.1	219.4	NA		08-09	225.1	224.5	NA		03-09	225.2	226.7	0.3	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	03-08	210.3	212.1	NA	NA	08-09	215.2	216.5	NA	NA	03-09	214.4	219.3	0.8	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2003, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 220.9 for white students and 201.8 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 220.6 for white students and 203.6 for African American students. Average annual mean scale score gains were not calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

Note: The New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK) for grades 4 and 8, and the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) for grade 11 is scored on a scale of 100-300.

[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 NJ-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	03-08	217.3	234.6	NA		08-09	217.2	221.2	NA		03-09	214.9	220.6	1.0	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
White	MSS	03-08	226.5	242.2	NA		08-09	228.8	231.6	NA		03-09	223.7	228.5	0.8	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	03-08	194.3	215.3	NA	NA	08-09	186.7	192.3	NA	NA	03-09	188.5	195.5	1.2	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	03-08	202.9	222.3	NA	NA	08-09	198.2	203.7	NA	NA	03-09	194.5	205.0	1.8	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	03-08	238.3	251.5	NA	NA	08-09	247.9	251.8	NA	NA	03-09	233.9	241.9	1.3	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	03-08	216.3	233.1	NA	NA	08-09	209.8	213.3	NA	NA	03-09	208.4	222.1	2.3[2]	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	03-08	225.3	241.5	NA		08-09	226.4	230.6	NA		03-09	219.2	225.8	1.1	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	03-08	198.3	218.9	NA	NA	08-09	193.1	198.4	NA	NA	03-09	190.2	201.1	1.8	L
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	07-08	239.3	239.6	NA		08-09	226.8	230.7	NA		07-09	228.0	227.7	-0.2	
	SD	07-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			07-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	07-08	212.2	213.9	NA	NA	08-09	175.3	170.0	NA	NA	07-09	184.3	185.9	0.8	L
	SD	07-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			07-09	NA	NA		
All tested students	MSS	06-08	232.8	234.6	NA		08-09	217.2	221.2	NA		06-09	223.7	220.6	-1.0	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-08	205.8	213.2	NA	NA	08-09	180.3	108.0	NA	NA	06-09	190.4	185.0	-1.8	S
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	03-08	215.8	234.6	NA		08-09	216.3	220.4	NA		03-09	212.9	219.7	1.1	
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	03-08	218.8	234.6	NA	NA	08-09	218.2	222.1	NA	NA	03-09	216.7	221.4	0.8	S
	SD	03-08	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA			03-09	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2003, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 226.5 for white students and 194.3 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 242.2 for white students and 215.3 for African American students. Average annual mean scale score gains were not

calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

Note: The New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK) for grades 4 and 8, and the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) for grade 11 is scored on a scale of 100-300.

[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 NJ-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	02-08	103,507	100,740	-2.7%	100.0%	08-09	104,423	104,439	0.0%	100.0%	02-09	84,509	97,300	15.1%	100.0%
	Math	02-08	103,870	101,526	-2.3%	100.0%	08-09	104,564	104,451	-0.1%	100.0%	02-09	84,030	97,030	15.5%	100.0%
White	Reading	03-08	60,327	55,408	-8.2%	55.0%	08-09	58,676	58,074	-1.0%	55.6%	03-09	54,778	57,793	5.5%	59.4%
	Math	03-08	60,205	55,527	-7.8%	54.7%	08-09	58,650	58,042	-1.0%	55.6%	03-09	54,713	57,683	5.4%	59.4%
African American	Reading	03-08	19,224	16,985	-11.6%	16.9%	08-09	18,166	17,658	-2.8%	16.9%	03-09	12,358	15,283	23.7%	15.7%
	Math	03-08	19,203	17,073	-11.1%	16.8%	08-09	18,138	17,595	-3.0%	16.8%	03-09	12,289	15,202	23.7%	15.7%
Latino	Reading	03-08	17,377	18,853	8.5%	18.7%	08-09	18,613	19,217	3.2%	18.4%	03-09	11,163	15,396	37.9%	15.8%
	Math	03-08	17,377	19,274	10.9%	19.0%	08-09	18,673	19,191	2.8%	18.4%	03-09	11,122	15,337	37.9%	15.8%
Asian	Reading	03-08	6,450	8,497	31.7%	8.4%	08-09	7,870	8,182	4.0%	7.8%	03-09	5,165	7,790	50.8%	8.0%
	Math	03-08	6,441	8,637	34.1%	8.5%	08-09	7,990	8,308	4.0%	8.0%	03-09	5,163	7,785	50.8%	8.0%
Native American	Reading	03-08	112	**81**	-27.7%	0.1%	08-09	104	**114**	9.6%	0.1%	03-09	359	**152**	-57.7%	0.2%
	Math	03-08	112	**83**	-25.9%	0.1%	08-09	102	**116**	13.7%	0.1%	03-09	360	**151**	-58.1%	0.2%
Low-income	Reading	03-08	31,458	30,537	-2.9%	30.3%	08-09	28,857	30,467	5.6%	29.2%	03-09	13,345	20,595	54.3%	21.2%
	Math	03-08	31,449	30,942	-1.6%	30.5%	08-09	28,904	30,447	5.3%	29.1%	03-09	13,287	20,504	54.3%	21.1%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	07-08	15,229	15,665	2.9%	15.5%	08-09	16,832	16,633	-1.2%	15.9%	07-09	14,321	14,458	1.0%	14.9%
	Math	07-08	15,286	15,749	3.0%	15.5%	08-09	16,738	16,573	-1.0%	15.9%	07-09	14,264	14,334	0.5%	14.8%
English language learners	Reading	06-08	3,017	4,593	52.2%	4.6%	08-09	3,440	2,530	-26.5%	2.4%	06-09	2,581	2,281	-11.6%	2.3%
	Math	06-08	3,725	5,260	41.2%	5.2%	08-09	3,792	2,724	-28.2%	2.6%	06-09	2,583	2,277	-11.8%	2.3%
Female	Reading	03-08	51,820	48,900	-5.6%	48.5%	08-09	50,776	50,751	0.0%	48.6%	03-09	43,598	47,957	10.0%	49.3%
	Math	03-08	51,747	49,205	-4.9%	48.5%	08-09	50,856	50,794	-0.1%	48.6%	03-09	43,509	47,844	10.0%	49.3%
Male	Reading	03-08	54,330	51,824	-4.6%	51.4%	08-09	53,460	53,612	0.3%	51.3%	03-09	44,646	49,324	10.5%	50.7%
	Math	03-08	54,253	52,299	-3.6%	51.5%	08-09	53,518	53,584	0.1%	51.3%	03-09	44,539	49,167	10.4%	50.7%

Table reads: In 2003, 60,327 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 55,408 students, a decrease of 8.2%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 55.0% of the 100,740 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.