Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Rhode Island

K-12 enrollment — 143,009

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 and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Rhode Island showed gains—improvements in reading and math at the *basic, proficient,* and *advanced* levels for most racial/ethnic subgroups, low-income students, and boys and girls. Achievement gaps between students narrowed in most cases at grades 4 and 8. Comparable data were available for 2006-2009 at grades 4 and 8, however, there were not enough years of data to discern trends at grade 11.

- ***Some exceptions in 8th grade math.*** In grade 8 math, the percentage of African American students scoring at the advanced level showed no net improvement. Further, achievement gaps between African American, Latino and white students, as well as low-income and non-low-income students remained the same in math at this grade level according to percentages proficient.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009, grades 3-8 2008 through 2009, grade 11 Grade 11 (the state switched to a new high school test in Fall 2007)
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009, grades 3-8 2008 through 2009, grade 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 England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) Rhode Island Alternate Assessment
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 11
State labels for achievement levels	RI uses four achievement levels: Substantially Below Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Proficient with Distinction. For our analyses we treated Partially Proficient as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Proficient with Distinction as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2005–06: NECAP grades 3–8 2007–08: NECAP grade 11
Time of test administration	Fall
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2005–06: Implemented NECAP, a new assessment system developed in collaboration with Vermont and New Hampshire, in grades 3–8 (Maine joined in Fall 2009); replaced New Standards Reference Exam (NSRE) tests at elementary and middle school levels Fall 2006: Piloted NECAP grade 11 assessment Fall 2007: Administered NECAP grade 11 assessment, replaced NSRE for grade 11

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 RI-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					10%	10%	13%	14%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					55%	59%	61%	65%	3.3
Basic-and-above					82%	85%	85%	88%	2.0
White									
Advanced					13%	12%	16%	18%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					66%	67%	70%	74%	2.7
Basic-and-above					90%	90%	91%	93%	1.0
African American									
Advanced					2%	2%	5%	5%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					30%	35%	41%	45%	5.0
Basic-and-above					66%	71%	73%	80%	4.7
Latino									
Advanced					1%	2%	3%	4%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					24%	34%	38%	40%	5.3
Basic-and-above					60%	68%	70%	75%	5.0
Asian[2]									
Advanced					10%	15%	16%	18%	2.7
Proficient-and-above					49%	57%	62%	73%	8.0
Basic-and-above					80%	82%	85%	91%	3.7
Native American[2]									
Advanced					4%	4%	8%	5%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					46%	47%	56%	46%	0.0
Basic-and-above					81%	75%	82%	74%	-2.3

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 13% in 2006 to 18% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 1.7 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 RI-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					10%	10%	13%	14%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					55%	59%	61%	65%	3.3
Basic-and-above					82%	85%	85%	88%	2.0
Low-income students									
Advanced					2%	3%	5%	5%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					33%	40%	43%	46%	4.3
Basic-and-above					69%	74%	75%	79%	3.3
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					1%	1%	1%	1%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					21%	19%	23%	25%	1.3
Basic-and-above					54%	52%	55%	62%	2.7
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced					0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					6%	7%	8%	7%	0.3
Basic-and-above					26%	31%	33%	41%	5.0
Female									
Advanced					14%	13%	18%	19%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					61%	65%	69%	70%	3.0
Basic-and-above					87%	89%	89%	92%	1.7
Male									
Advanced					7%	7%	9%	10%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					51%	53%	55%	60%	3.0
Basic-and-above					80%	81%	82%	85%	1.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 2% in 2006 to 5% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 1.0 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table RI-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%	11%	11%	13%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					48%	48%	48%	53%	1.7
Basic-and-above					69%	67%	73%	75%	2.0
White									
Advanced					13%	14%	15%	17%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					56%	57%	57%	63%	2.3
Basic-and-above					77%	76%	80%	83%	2.0
African American									
Advanced					2%	2%	2%	2%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					20%	24%	25%	27%	2.3
Basic-and-above					42%	43%	52%	53%	3.7
Latino									
Advanced					2%	2%	1%	3%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					19%	22%	24%	26%	2.3
Basic-and-above					40%	43%	53%	54%	4.7
Asian[2]									
Advanced					15%	14%	14%	19%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					49%	51%	52%	64%	5.0
Basic-and-above					70%	70%	75%	84%	4.7
Native American[2]									
Advanced					4%	4%	12%	1%	-1.0
Proficient-and-above					32%	31%	44%	28%	-1.3
Basic-and-above					56%	53%	69%	58%	0.7

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 13% in 2006 to 17% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 1.3 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 RI-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					11%	11%	11%	13%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					48%	48%	48%	53%	1.7
Basic-and-above					69%	67%	73%	75%	2.0
Low-income students									
Advanced					3%	3%	3%	4%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					26%	28%	29%	33%	2.3
Basic-and-above					49%	51%	57%	60%	3.7
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					1%	1%	1%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					14%	12%	13%	16%	0.7
Basic-and-above					32%	27%	34%	36%	1.3
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced					0%	0%	0%	1%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					5%	5%	6%	8%	1.0
Basic-and-above					15%	14%	24%	21%	2.0
Female									
Advanced					10%	10%	10%	13%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					47%	48%	48%	53%	2.0
Basic-and-above					69%	68%	73%	76%	2.3
Male									
Advanced					11%	12%	12%	13%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					48%	48%	48%	53%	1.7
Basic-and-above					69%	67%	72%	74%	1.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 3% in 2006 to 4% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 0.3 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

[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 RI-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	60%	68%	2.7		06-09	55%	65%	3.3		08-09	61%	69%	NA	
White	06-09	70%	76%	2.0		06-09	66%	74%	2.7		08-09	68%	75%	NA	
African American	06-09	36%	54%	6.0	L	06-09	30%	45%	5.0	L	08-09	41%	50%	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	32%	48%	5.3	L	06-09	24%	40%	5.3	L	08-09	40%	50%	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	59%	70%	3.7[2]	L	06-09	49%	73%	8.0[2]	L	08-09	67%	72%	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	56%	44%	-4.0[2]	S	06-09	46%	46%	0.0[2]	S	08-09	38%	59%	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	74%	80%	2.0		06-09	67%	77%	3.3		08-09	69%	76%	NA	
Low-income	06-09	40%	52%	4.0	L	06-09	33%	46%	4.3	L	08-09	44%	53%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	68%	76%	2.7		06-09	63%	74%	3.7		08-09	69%	77%	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	26%	32%	2.0	S	06-09	21%	25%	1.3	S	08-09	24%	29%	NA	NA
Not ELLs	06-09	64%	71%	2.3		06-09	58%	67%	3.0		08-09	64%	71%	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-09	9%	26%	5.7	L	06-09	6%	7%	0.3[2]	S	08-09	6%	7%	NA	NA
Female	06-09	66%	73%	2.3		06-09	61%	70%	3.0		08-09	68%	74%	NA	
Male	06-09	55%	64%	3.0	L	06-09	51%	60%	3.0	E	08-09	55%	65%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 70% of white 4th graders and 36% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 76% of white 4th graders and 54% 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 2.0 percentage points per year for white students and 6.0 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.

Table RI-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	52%	63%	3.7		06-09	48%	53%	1.7		08-09	22%	27%	NA	
White	06-09	62%	71%	3.0		06-09	56%	63%	2.3		08-09	27%	33%	NA	
African American	06-09	25%	43%	6.0	L	06-09	20%	27%	2.3	E	08-09	6%	7%	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	26%	42%	5.3	L	06-09	19%	26%	2.3	E	08-09	6%	9%	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	53%	67%	4.7[2]	L	06-09	49%	64%	5.0[2]	L	08-09	32%	32%	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	34%	40%	2.0[2]	S	06-09	32%	28%	-1.3[2]	S	08-09	14%	11%	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	65%	76%	3.7		06-09	59%	66%	2.3		08-09	27%	34%	NA	
Low-income	06-09	32%	46%	4.7	L	06-09	26%	33%	2.3	E	08-09	9%	12%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	58%	69%	3.7		06-09	55%	62%	2.3		08-09	25%	31%	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	25%	32%	2.3	S	06-09	14%	16%	0.7	S	08-09	3%	5%	NA	NA
Not ELLS	06-09	56%	66%	3.3		06-09	49%	55%	2.0		08-09	23%	27%	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-09	11%	27%	5.3	L	06-09	5%	8%	1.0[2]	S	08-09	3%	2%	NA	NA
Female	06-09	52%	62%	3.3		06-09	47%	53%	2.0		08-09	20%	25%	NA	
Male	06-09	53%	64%	3.7	L	06-09	48%	53%	1.7	S	08-09	23%	30%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 62% of white 4th graders and 25% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 71% of white 4th graders and 43% 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 3.0 percentage points per year for white students and 6.0 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 RI-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	442	445	1.0		06-09	842	845	1.0		08-09	1143	1145	NA	
	SD	06-09	13.6	NA			06-09	14.0	NA			08-09	11.8	NA		
White	MSS	06-09	445	447	0.7		06-09	845	848	1.0		08-09	1145	1147	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	06-09	435	440	1.7	L	06-09	834	838	1.3	L	08-09	1137	1139	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	06-09	433	438	1.7	L	06-09	831	837	2.0	L	08-09	1137	1139	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	06-09	442	446	1.3[2]	L	06-09	840	848	2.7[2]	L	08-09	1143	1146	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	438	438	0.0[2]	S	06-09	839	838	-0.3[2]	S	08-09	1136	1142	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	446	449	1.0		06-09	846	849	1.0		08-09	1145	1147	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	436	439	1.0	E	06-09	834	839	1.7	L	08-09	1138	1140	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	445	447	0.7		06-09	844	848	1.3		08-09	1145	1147	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	430	433	1.0	L	06-09	830	832	0.7	S	08-09	1132	1133	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	443	446	1.0		06-09	842	845	1.0		08-09	1143	1145	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	426	432	2.0	L	06-09	823	825	0.7[2]	S	08-09	1128	1126	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	06-09	444	447	1.0		06-09	844	847	1.0		08-09	1145	1146	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	06-09	440	443	1.0	E	06-09	840	843	1.0	E	08-09	1141	1143	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 445 for white students and 435 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 447 for white students and 440 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 1.7 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The NECAP is scored on a scale of 00-80 (expressed as a 3-digit number with 1st digit representing grade level)

[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 RI-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	440	443	1.0		06-09	838	840	0.7		08-09	1132	1134	NA	
	SD	06-09	13.3	NA			06-09	12.4	NA			08-09	10.8	NA		
White	MSS	06-09	443	446	1.0		06-09	841	842	0.3		08-09	1134	1136	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	06-09	432	437	1.7	L	06-09	830	834	1.3	L	08-09	1126	1127	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	06-09	432	436	1.3	L	06-09	830	834	1.3	L	08-09	1126	1128	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	06-09	441	445	1.3[2]	L	06-09	839	842	1.0[2]	L	08-09	1135	1136	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	436	437	0.3[2]	S	06-09	835	834	-0.3[2]	S	08-09	1128	1130	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	444	447	1.0		06-09	841	843	0.7		08-09	1134	1136	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	434	437	1.0	E	06-09	832	835	1.0	L	08-09	1128	1129	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	442	445	1.0		06-09	840	842	0.7		08-09	1134	1135	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	430	432	0.7	S	06-09	827	830	1.0	L	08-09	1123	1125	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	441	444	1.0		06-09	839	840	0.3		08-09	1133	1134	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	426	431	1.7	L	06-09	822	826	1.3[2]	L	08-09	1120	1121	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	06-09	440	443	1.0		06-09	838	840	0.7		08-09	1132	1133	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	06-09	440	443	1.0	E	06-09	838	840	0.7	E	08-09	1132	1134	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 443 for white students and 432 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 446 for white students and 437 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an

average yearly rate of 1.0 points for white students and 1.7 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The NECAP is scored on a scale of 00-80 (expressed as a 3-digit number with 1st digit representing grade level)

[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 RI-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	11,311	9,623	-14.9%	100.0%	06-09	12,305	11,239	-8.7%	100.0%	08-09	11,661	10,684	-8.4%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	11,384	9,661	-15.1%	100.0%	06-09	12,351	11,303	-8.5%	100.0%	08-09	11,661	10,699	-8.2%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	7,970	6,659	-16.4%	69.2%	06-09	8,870	7,896	-11.0%	70.3%	08-09	8,464	7,739	-8.6%	72.4%
	Math	06-09	7,971	6,659	-16.5%	68.9%	06-09	8,860	7,894	-10.9%	69.8%	08-09	8,464	7,742	-8.5%	72.4%
African American	Reading	06-09	953	864	-9.3%	9.0%	06-09	994	965	-2.9%	8.6%	08-09	994	932	-6.2%	8.7%
	Math	06-09	959	866	-9.7%	9.0%	06-09	1,002	973	-2.9%	8.6%	08-09	994	928	-6.6%	8.7%
Latino	Reading	06-09	1,978	1,723	-12.9%	17.9%	06-09	1,968	1,977	0.5%	17.6%	08-09	1,800	1,617	-10.2%	15.1%
	Math	06-09	2,036	1,749	-14.1%	18.1%	06-09	2,015	2,023	0.4%	17.9%	08-09	1,800	1,631	-9.4%	15.2%
Asian	Reading	06-09	354	**303**	-14.4%	3.1%	06-09	393	**325**	-17.3%	2.9%	08-09	324	**358**	10.5%	3.4%
	Math	06-09	362	**313**	-13.5%	3.2%	06-09	396	**337**	-14.9%	3.0%	08-09	324	**330**	1.9%	3.1%
Native American	Reading	06-09	48	**71**	47.9%	0.7%	06-09	69	**74**	7.2%	0.7%	08-09	73	**63**	-13.7%	0.6%
	Math	06-09	48	**71**	47.9%	0.7%	06-09	68	**74**	8.8%	0.7%	08-09	73	**62**	-15.1%	0.6%
Low-income	Reading	06-09	4,501	4,007	-11.0%	41.6%	06-09	4,272	4,284	0.3%	38.1%	08-09	3,367	3,225	-4.2%	30.2%
	Math	06-09	4,555	4,024	-11.7%	41.7%	06-09	4,320	4,331	0.3%	38.3%	08-09	3,367	3,237	-3.9%	30.3%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	2,133	1,632	-23.5%	17.0%	06-09	2,294	2,042	-11.0%	18.2%	08-09	2,040	1,609	-21.1%	15.1%
	Math	06-09	2,132	1,627	-23.7%	16.8%	06-09	2,287	2,037	-10.9%	18.0%	08-09	2,040	1,607	-21.2%	15.0%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	679	527	-22.4%	5.5%	06-09	355	**279**	-21.4%	2.5%	08-09	308	**214**	-30.5%	2.0%
	Math	06-09	761	580	-23.8%	6.0%	06-09	429	**349**	-18.6%	3.1%	08-09	308	**237**	-23.1%	2.2%
Female	Reading	06-09	5,410	4,629	-14.4%	48.1%	06-09	5,917	5,429	-8.2%	48.3%	08-09	5,788	5,336	-7.8%	49.9%
	Math	06-09	5,438	4,641	-14.7%	48.0%	06-09	5,943	5,449	-8.3%	48.2%	08-09	5,788	5,341	-7.7%	49.9%
Male	Reading	06-09	5,822	4,994	-14.2%	51.9%	06-09	6,287	5,810	-7.6%	51.7%	08-09	5,870	5,347	-8.9%	50.0%
	Math	06-09	5,858	5,020	-14.3%	52.0%	06-09	6,305	5,854	-7.2%	51.8%	08-09	5,870	5,357	-8.7%	50.1%

Table reads: In 2006, 7,970 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 6,659 students, a decrease of 16.4%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 69.2% of the 9,623 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.