

## Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New Hampshire

*K-12 enrollment — 195,100*

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](http://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.** New Hampshire's demographic profile is such that, with the exception of Latino students at the elementary level, there are fewer than 500 students in the racial/ethnic subgroups at the various grade levels, and therefore these groups are too small to count for this study. The white, low income subgroup, and males and females made progress in grade 8 at the basic, proficient and advanced levels in both reading and math. Achievement gaps narrowed between the subgroups analyzed. Comparable data were available from 2006 through 2009 for grades 4, and 8; there were not enough years of data to discern trends at the high school level.

- **Gaps narrowed.** Gaps between low-income and non-low income students narrowed at all grade levels and in both subjects. Gaps narrowed between Latino and white students in grade 4 in both reading and math. Boys also narrowed achievement gaps with girls in reading in grade 4 and 8.

## Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009, grades 3 through 8 2008 through 2009, grade 11 (NH implemented a new high school assessment for grade 11 in Fall 2007)
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009, grades 3 through 8 2008 through 2009, grade 11
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	No standard deviations available for subgroups. Mean scale scores available for grades 3 through 8 for 2006 through 2009 and for grade 11 for 2008 through 2009.

## Test Characteristics

The characteristics highlighted below are for the state reading and mathematics tests used for accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), a collaborative assessment with Maine, Rhode Island and Vermont New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP); grade 10 only, last administered in May 2006 NHEIAP–Alt, assessment for students with disabilities
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8 (NECAP since fall 2005) 11 (NECAP since 2007-08)
State labels for achievement levels	NH 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: NECAP (grades 3–8) 2007-08: NECAP (grade 11)
Time of test administration	Fall for NECAP reading, math, and writing
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	May 2004: Last administration of NHEIAP at grades 3 and 6 2004–05: AYP reports did not include an assessment at elementary and middle school levels; attendance rates only used during transition to new assessment

2005–06: New assessment system (NECAP) administered at grades  
3–8

May 2006: Last administration of NHEIAP at grade 10

2006–07: AYP reports did not include a high school assessment;  
graduation rates only used during transition to new assessment

Fall 2007: New NECAP assessment administered in grade 11

Comments

## 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 NH-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**

Subgroup	Reporting year							Average yearly percentage point gain <sup>1</sup>	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008		2009
All tested students									
Advanced					11%	10%	13%	14%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					62%	66%	67%	71%	3.0
Basic-and-above					88%	90%	90%	93%	1.7
White									
Advanced					11%	10%	13%	14%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					63%	67%	68%	71%	2.7
Basic-and-above					89%	90%	91%	93%	1.3
African American <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced					4%	5%	5%	6%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					45%	40%	49%	56%	3.7
Basic-and-above					76%	75%	79%	83%	2.3
Latino <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced					3%	2%	5%	6%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					38%	35%	44%	44%	2.0
Basic-and-above					68%	70%	73%	76%	2.7
Asian <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced					21%	16%	29%	27%	2.0
Proficient-and-above					70%	74%	81%	83%	4.3
Basic-and-above					92%	93%	93%	96%	1.3
Native American <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced					2%	3%	8%	19%	5.7
Proficient-and-above					37%	50%	54%	62%	8.3
Basic-and-above					72%	80%	89%	88%	5.3

Table reads: The percentage of white 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 11% in 2006 to 14% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 1.0 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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 NH-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 <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					11%	10%	13%	14%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					62%	66%	67%	71%	3.0
Basic-and-above					88%	90%	90%	93%	1.7
Low-income students									
Advanced					3%	3%	5%	5%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					38%	42%	45%	50%	4.0
Basic-and-above					73%	76%	78%	82%	3.0
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced					0%	1%	1%	1%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					20%	21%	24%	30%	3.3
Basic-and-above					57%	59%	62%	70%	4.3
English language learners <sup>2,3</sup>									
Advanced					2%	2%	0%	1%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above					21%	15%	13%	24%	1.0
Basic-and-above					56%	52%	49%	57%	0.3
Female									
Advanced					15%	14%	18%	19%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					69%	73%	75%	76%	2.3
Basic-and-above					92%	93%	93%	95%	1.0
Male									
Advanced					7%	6%	9%	9%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					56%	59%	60%	65%	3.0
Basic-and-above					86%	86%	87%	90%	1.3

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 3% in 2006 to 5% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.7 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 NH-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**

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
<b>All tested students</b>									
Advanced					13%	14%	15%	18%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					56%	57%	58%	65%	3.0
Basic-and-above					78%	76%	80%	84%	2.0
<b>White</b>									
Advanced					13%	14%	15%	18%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					56%	58%	59%	65%	3.0
Basic-and-above					78%	77%	81%	84%	2.0
<b>African American<sup>2</sup></b>									
Advanced					6%	5%	6%	6%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					43%	30%	30%	40%	-1.0
Basic-and-above					63%	51%	59%	67%	1.3
<b>Latino<sup>2</sup></b>									
Advanced					5%	3%	7%	7%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					29%	28%	34%	41%	4.0
Basic-and-above					54%	50%	59%	66%	4.0
<b>Asian<sup>2</sup></b>									
Advanced					31%	27%	35%	38%	2.3
Proficient-and-above					70%	71%	76%	79%	3.0
Basic-and-above					86%	84%	89%	93%	2.3
<b>Native American<sup>2</sup></b>									
Advanced					6%	9%	13%	10%	1.3
Proficient-and-above					37%	40%	48%	55%	6.0
Basic-and-above					56%	60%	75%	77%	7.0

Table reads: The percentage of white 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 13% in 2006 to 18% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 1.7 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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 NH-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 <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
<b>All tested students</b>									
Advanced					13%	14%	15%	18%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					56%	57%	58%	65%	3.0
Basic-and-above					78%	76%	80%	84%	2.0
<b>Low-income students</b>									
Advanced					3%	4%	5%	6%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					32%	33%	36%	44%	4.0
Basic-and-above					57%	56%	64%	69%	4.0
<b>Students with disabilities<sup>3</sup></b>									
Advanced					1%	2%	2%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					14%	17%	17%	22%	2.7
Basic-and-above					35%	36%	42%	48%	4.3
<b>English language learners<sup>2,3</sup></b>									
Advanced					3%	4%	2%	2%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above					20%	15%	19%	23%	1.0
Basic-and-above					44%	28%	41%	46%	0.7
<b>Female</b>									
Advanced					12%	14%	13%	18%	2.0
Proficient-and-above					57%	58%	58%	65%	2.7
Basic-and-above					79%	78%	81%	84%	1.7
<b>Male</b>									
Advanced					13%	14%	17%	18%	1.7
Proficient-and-above					54%	57%	59%	64%	3.3
Basic-and-above					76%	76%	81%	84%	2.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 3% in 2006 to 6% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 1.0 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 NH-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.

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	69%	75%	2.0		06-09	62%	71%	3.0		08-09	67%	72%	NA	
White	06-09	71%	76%	1.7		06-09	63%	71%	2.7		08-09	67%	74%	NA	
African American	06-09	45%	58%	4.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	45%	56%	3.7 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	46%	60%	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	42%	57%	5.0	L	06-09	38%	44%	2.0 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	46%	53%	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	68%	83%	5.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	70%	83%	4.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	74%	78%	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	63%	56%	-2.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	06-09	37%	62%	8.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	49%	69%	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	75%	79%	1.3		06-09	67%	75%	2.7		08-09	70%	75%	NA	
Low-income	06-09	49%	58%	3.0	L	06-09	38%	50%	4.0	L	08-09	46%	54%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	76%	82%	2.0		06-09	70%	78%	2.7		08-09	74%	80%	NA	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	06-09	26%	35%	3.0	L	06-09	20%	30%	3.3	L	08-09	25%	30%	NA	NA
Not ELLs	06-09	70%	76%	2.0		06-09	63%	71%	2.7		08-09	67%	73%	NA	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	06-09	28%	37%	3.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	21%	24%	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	25%	21%	NA	NA
Female	06-09	75%	80%	1.7		06-09	69%	76%	2.3		08-09	74%	80%	NA	
Male	06-09	64%	71%	2.3	L	06-09	56%	65%	3.0	L	08-09	60%	66%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 71% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 45% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 76% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 58% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.7 percentage points per year for white students and 4.3 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 NH-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.

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	65%	73%	2.7		06-09	56%	65%	3.0		08-09	28%	32%	NA	
White	06-09	66%	75%	3.0		06-09	56%	65%	3.0		08-09	14%	33%	NA	
African American	06-09	42%	49%	2.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	06-09	43%	40%	-1.0 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	12%	15%	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	38%	51%	4.3	L	06-09	29%	41%	4.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	11%	14%	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	72%	82%	3.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	70%	79%	3.0 <sup>2</sup>	E	08-09	47%	49%	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	51%	60%	3.0 <sup>2</sup>	E	06-09	37%	55%	6.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	17%	13%	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	71%	78%	2.3		06-09	61%	70%	3.0		08-09	30%	35%	NA	
Low-income	06-09	43%	57%	4.7	L	06-09	32%	44%	4.0	L	08-09	12%	15%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	70%	79%	3.0		06-09	63%	73%	3.3		08-09	31%	37%	NA	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	06-09	30%	39%	3.0	E	06-09	14%	22%	2.7	S	08-09	4%	4%	NA	NA
Not ELLS	06-09	65%	74%	3.0		06-09	56%	65%	3.0		08-09	28%	33%	NA	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	06-09	31%	43%	4.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	20%	23%	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	10%	5%	NA	NA
Female	06-09	64%	73%	3.0		06-09	57%	65%	2.7		08-09	25%	30%	NA	
Male	06-09	65%	74%	3.0	E	06-09	54%	64%	3.3	L	08-09	29%	34%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 66% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 42% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 75% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 49% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> 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 2.3 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 NH-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.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	444	447	1.0		06-09	844	846	0.7		08-09	1144	1145	NA	
	SD	06-09	11.9	12.4			06-09	12.9	12.5			08-09	11.3	11.3		
White	MSS	06-09	444	447	1.0		06-09	844	846	0.7		08-09	1144	1145	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	06-09	437	440	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	E	06-09	838	841	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	1138	1141	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	06-09	436	441	1.7	L	06-09	835	838	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	1138	1140	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	06-09	444	450	2.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	847	852	1.7 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	1146	1148	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	441	440	-0.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	06-09	837	845	2.7 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	1140	1142	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	446	448	0.7		06-09	845	848	1.0		08-09	1144	1146	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	438	441	1.0	L	06-09	836	840	1.3	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	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		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	MSS	06-09	431	434	1.0	E	06-09	830	834	1.3	L	08-09	1133	1134	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	444	447	1.0		06-09	844	846	0.7		08-09	1144	1145	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	MSS	06-09	431	434	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	E	06-09	831	830	-0.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	1133	1131	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	06-09	446	449	1.0		06-09	846	849	1.0		08-09	1146	1148	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	06-09	442	445	1.0	E	06-09	841	844	1.0	E	08-09	1142	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 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test was 444 for white students and 437 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> 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 1.0 points for white students and African American students, indicating no change in the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) is scored on a scale of 0-80 (expressed as a 3-digit number with 1<sup>st</sup> digit representing grade level; e.g. a score of 33 in 6<sup>th</sup> grade = 633).

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 NH-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.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	840	843	1.0		08-09	1134	1135	NA	
	SD	06-09	12.0	11.8			06-09	11.0	9.9			08-09	10.5	9.5		
White	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	841	843	0.7		08-09	1134	1135	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	06-09	435	438	1.0 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	836	837	0.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	1127	1130	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	06-09	436	440	1.3	L	06-09	834	836	0.7 <sup>2</sup>	E	08-09	1127	1129	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	06-09	447	451	1.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	846	847	0.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	1138	1139	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	439	440	0.3 <sup>2</sup>	S	06-09	836	840	1.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	08-09	1130	1131	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	445	448	1.0		06-09	842	844	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	437	441	1.3	L	06-09	834	837	1.0	L	08-09	1129	1130	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	445	448	1.0		06-09	843	845	0.7		08-09	1135	1137	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	MSS	06-09	433	436	1.0	E	06-09	828	833	1.7	L	08-09	1124	1126	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7		06-09	841	843	0.7		08-09	1134	1135	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	MSS	06-09	432	436	1.3 <sup>2</sup>	L	06-09	831	831	0.0 <sup>2</sup>	S	08-09	1123	1126	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	06-09	443	446	1.0		06-09	841	843	0.7		08-09	1134	1135	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			08-09	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	06-09	444	446	0.7	S	06-09	840	842	0.7	E	08-09	1134	1135	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 4<sup>th</sup> grade math test was 444 for white students and 435 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade math was 446 for white students and 438 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 New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) is scored on a scale of 0-80 (expressed as a 3-digit number with 1<sup>st</sup> digit representing grade level; e.g. a score of 33 in 6<sup>th</sup> grade = 633).

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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 NH-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	15,041	14,430	-4.1%	100.0%	06-09	17,034	15,640	-8.2%	100.0%	08-09	15,611	15,691	0.5%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	15,050	14,444	-4.0%	100.0%	06-09	17,029	15,655	-8.1%	100.0%	08-09	15,546	15,674	0.8%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	13,912	13,160	-5.4%	91.2%	06-09	15,988	14,459	-9.6%	92.4%	08-09	14,654	14,793	0.9%	93.4%
	Math	06-09	13,901	13,155	-5.4%	91.1%	06-09	15,969	14,456	-9.5%	92.3%	08-09	14,587	14,763	1.2%	93.1%
African American	Reading	06-09	292	<b>297</b>	1.7%	2.1%	06-09	234	<b>294</b>	25.6%	1.9%	08-09	201	<b>220</b>	9.5%	1.3%
	Math	06-09	303	<b>301</b>	-0.7%	2.1%	06-09	235	<b>299</b>	27.2%	1.9%	08-09	201	<b>221</b>	10.0%	1.3%
Latino	Reading	06-09	402	504	25.4%	3.5%	06-09	396	<b>471</b>	18.9%	3.0%	08-09	427	<b>369</b>	-13.6%	2.7%
	Math	06-09	407	512	25.8%	3.5%	06-09	405	<b>475</b>	17.3%	3.0%	08-09	429	<b>373</b>	-13.1%	2.7%
Asian	Reading	06-09	325	<b>382</b>	17.5%	2.6%	06-09	250	<b>322</b>	28.8%	2.1%	08-09	271	<b>240</b>	-11.4%	1.7%
	Math	06-09	330	<b>389</b>	17.9%	2.7%	06-09	256	<b>331</b>	29.3%	2.1%	08-09	272	<b>248</b>	-8.8%	1.7%
Native American	Reading	06-09	56	<b>47</b>	-16.1%	0.3%	06-09	48	<b>58</b>	20.8%	0.4%	08-09	43	<b>39</b>	-9.3%	0.3%
	Math	06-09	56	<b>47</b>	-16.1%	0.3%	06-09	48	<b>58</b>	20.8%	0.4%	08-09	42	<b>39</b>	-7.1%	0.3%
Low-income	Reading	06-09	3,074	3,154	2.6%	21.9%	06-09	2,965	3,033	2.3%	19.4%	08-09	2,127	2,136	0.4%	13.6%
	Math	06-09	3,083	3,150	2.2%	21.8%	06-09	2,968	3,031	2.1%	19.4%	08-09	2,106	2,136	1.4%	13.4%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	1,977	2,038	3.1%	14.1%	06-09	2,612	2,542	-2.7%	16.3%	08-09	2,317	2,392	3.2%	14.8%
	Math	06-09	1,975	2,034	3.0%	14.1%	06-09	2,605	2,539	-2.5%	16.2%	08-09	2,303	2,367	2.8%	14.7%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	373	<b>310</b>	-16.9%	2.1%	06-09	219	<b>166</b>	-24.2%	1.1%	08-09	130	<b>105</b>	-19.2%	0.8%
	Math	06-09	400	<b>336</b>	-16.0%	2.3%	06-09	238	<b>190</b>	-20.2%	1.2%	08-09	135	<b>120</b>	-11.1%	0.9%
Female	Reading	06-09	7,275	6,948	-4.5%	48.1%	06-09	8,396	7,601	-9.5%	48.6%	08-09	7,714	7,813	1.3%	49.2%
	Math	06-09	7,277	6,960	-4.4%	48.2%	06-09	8,394	7,611	-9.3%	48.6%	08-09	7,687	7,805	1.5%	49.0%
Male	Reading	06-09	7,765	7,482	-3.6%	51.9%	06-09	8,638	8,039	-6.9%	51.4%	08-09	7,897	7,876	-0.3%	50.3%
	Math	06-09	7,772	7,484	-3.7%	51.8%	06-09	8,635	8,044	-6.8%	51.4%	08-09	7,859	7,867	0.1%	50.1%

Table reads: In 2006, 13,912 students in the white subgroup took the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 13,160 students, a decrease of 5.4%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 91.2% of the 14,430 4<sup>th</sup> 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.