Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — North Dakota

K-12 enrollment — 93,396

The raw data used to develop these state profiles, including data for additional grade levels and years before 2002, can be found on the CEP Web site at www.cep-dc.org. Click on the link on the left labeled State Testing Data. In the list of results that appears, look for the most recent report on student achievement since 2002. Below the name of the report, click on the link for State Profiles and Worksheets. Scroll down the page until you reach the list of states. Click on the Worksheet link for proficiency data or scale score data for a particular state.

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 reading and math (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), North Dakota showed across-the-board gains at the *basic-and-above, proficient-and-above,* and *advanced* levels for the state's major racial/ethnic subgroups and low-income students. Achievement gaps generally narrowed at grades 4, 8, and 11, although average (mean) scores revealed exceptions to this pattern. Comparable data were available for 2005-2009 at all three grades analyzed.

- ***Subgroups counted.*** North Dakota showed gains in the percentages of white, Native American, and low-income 8th graders reaching all three achievement levels in both reading and math. Gains were also evident for 8th grade boys and girls at all three achievement levels in both subjects. (In North Dakota, the African American, Latino, and Asian subgroups are too small to yield reliable trend data.)

- ***Gap trends and exceptions.*** Gaps between *Native American* and white students narrowed in reading and math across grades 4, 8, and 11, according to both percentages proficient and average (mean) test scores. Gaps for *low-income* students narrowed at all three grades according to percentages proficient, but according to average test scores, low-income gaps narrowed in reading and math at grade 4 and widened in both subjects at grades 8 and 11.

- ***Reading gap between boys and girls.*** Girls outperformed boys in reading at the three grades analyzed, but this gap narrowed at grades 4 and 8 according to both percentages proficient and average scores. At grade 11, the two indicators showed different trends in the boy-girl gap: a narrowing using percentages proficient but a widening using average scores.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2005 through 2009
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2005 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	North Dakota State Assessment (NDSA) North Dakota Alternate Assessment (NDAA)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3-8, 11
State labels for achievement levels	ND uses four achievement levels: Novice, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Partially Proficient as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2005
Time of test administration	Fall
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2001–02: The NDSA replaced the TerraNova as the state assessment, with the goal of eventually assessing grades 3–8 and 11. From 2001–02 through 2003–04, grades 4, 8, and 12 were tested. 2004–05: Tests administered in grades 3–8 and 11. Spring 2005: New standards set, new cut scores established

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 ND-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				16%	12%	17%	17%	18%	0.4
Proficient-and-above				72%	72%	76%	74%	76%	1.1
Basic-and-above				92%	92%	93%	92%	93%	0.3
White									
Advanced				17%	13%	19%	18%	19%	0.4
Proficient-and-above				75%	76%	79%	77%	79%	1.0
Basic-and-above				93%	94%	95%	94%	95%	0.4
African American[2]									
Advanced				11%	6%	10%	7%	11%	0.0
Proficient-and-above				59%	54%	53%	48%	58%	-0.3
Basic-and-above				88%	84%	76%	72%	76%	-3.0
Latino[2]									
Advanced				9%	7%	8%	7%	9%	0.0
Proficient-and-above				55%	57%	60%	66%	63%	1.8
Basic-and-above				92%	90%	87%	87%	88%	-1.0
Asian[2]									
Advanced				22%	19%	21%	33%	32%	2.5
Proficient-and-above				67%	76%	84%	82%	86%	5.0
Basic-and-above				90%	91%	95%	98%	92%	0.7
Native American									
Advanced				4%	3%	6%	9%	5%	0.4
Proficient-and-above				44%	47%	52%	52%	53%	2.2
Basic-and-above				76%	76%	81%	82%	79%	0.7

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 17% in 2005 to 19% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 0.4 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

Table ND-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				16%	12%	17%	17%	18%	0.4
Proficient-and-above				72%	72%	76%	74%	76%	1.1
Basic-and-above				92%	92%	93%	92%	93%	0.3
Low-income students									
Advanced				10%	7%	11%	11%	10%	0.1
Proficient-and-above				58%	61%	64%	63%	65%	1.7
Basic-and-above				85%	86%	88%	87%	86%	0.3
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				4%	4%	9%	10%	8%	1.3
Proficient-and-above				40%	48%	53%	49%	58%	3.3
Basic-and-above				75%	79%	81%	80%	85%	1.9
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced				1%	3%	6%	8%	3%	0.0
Proficient-and-above				28%	40%	47%	41%	33%	-2.3
Basic-and-above				65%	72%	75%	72%	60%	-4.0
Female									
Advanced				19%	15%	20%	19%	20%	0.4
Proficient-and-above				77%	77%	80%	77%	81%	0.9
Basic-and-above				94%	94%	94%	94%	95%	0.1
Male									
Advanced				13%	9%	15%	16%	15%	0.5
Proficient-and-above				67%	68%	72%	71%	72%	1.2
Basic-and-above				89%	90%	91%	91%	91%	0.6

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test remained the same at 10% in 2005 and in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.1 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 ND-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				18%	19%	23%	27%	23%	1.3
Proficient-and-above				65%	67%	67%	70%	71%	1.4
Basic-and-above				91%	92%	91%	92%	94%	0.6
White									
Advanced				20%	21%	25%	29%	25%	1.3
Proficient-and-above				69%	72%	71%	74%	74%	1.3
Basic-and-above				93%	94%	94%	94%	96%	0.6
African American[2]									
Advanced				7%	7%	10%	9%	11%	0.9
Proficient-and-above				38%	36%	38%	39%	42%	0.9
Basic-and-above				75%	78%	68%	71%	71%	-1.0
Latino[2]									
Advanced				4%	13%	11%	7%	9%	1.3
Proficient-and-above				49%	52%	50%	52%	50%	0.3
Basic-and-above				91%	88%	80%	83%	88%	-1.0
Asian[2]									
Advanced				30%	25%	34%	36%	38%	2.0
Proficient-and-above				56%	67%	77%	89%	78%	5.5
Basic-and-above				78%	91%	92%	95%	94%	4.0
Native American									
Advanced				5%	4%	10%	14%	11%	1.6
Proficient-and-above				35%	36%	39%	45%	48%	3.3
Basic-and-above				72%	75%	75%	76%	81%	2.2

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 20% in 2005 to 25% 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 ND-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				18%	19%	23%	27%	23%	1.3
Proficient-and-above				65%	67%	67%	70%	71%	1.4
Basic-and-above				91%	92%	91%	92%	94%	0.6
Low-income students									
Advanced				11%	11%	15%	18%	15%	1.1
Proficient-and-above				51%	53%	53%	57%	59%	2.1
Basic-and-above				84%	85%	84%	85%	88%	1.0
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				6%	6%	12%	11%	11%	1.6
Proficient-and-above				33%	40%	44%	44%	51%	3.8
Basic-and-above				73%	76%	76%	76%	84%	2.6
English language learners[2,3]									
Advanced				4%	4%	12%	15%	5%	0.2
Proficient-and-above				19%	31%	35%	42%	32%	0.2
Basic-and-above				60%	73%	70%	71%	64%	-2.9
Female									
Advanced				17%	17%	22%	26%	22%	1.2
Proficient-and-above				65%	66%	66%	71%	71%	1.6
Basic-and-above				91%	92%	92%	92%	94%	0.7
Male									
Advanced				19%	21%	24%	28%	25%	1.5
Proficient-and-above				66%	69%	68%	70%	71%	1.2
Basic-and-above				91%	92%	91%	91%	93%	0.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 11% in 2005 to 15% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 1.1 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 ND-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	05-09	76%	80%	1.1		05-09	72%	76%	1.1		05-09	70%	68%	-0.5	
White	05-09	79%	83%	1.1		05-09	75%	79%	1.0		05-09	73%	71%	-0.5	
African American	05-09	64%	64%	0.1[2]	S	05-09	59%	58%	-0.3[2]	S	05-09	52%	41%	-2.7[2]	S
Latino	05-09	66%	64%	-0.6[2]	S	05-09	55%	63%	1.8[2]	L	05-09	54%	62%	2.0[2]	L
Asian	05-09	77%	75%	-0.6[2]	S	05-09	67%	86%	5.0[2]	L	05-09	65%	69%	1.0[2]	L
Native American	05-09	50%	62%	3.0	L	05-09	44%	53%	2.2	L	05-09	37%	44%	1.9	L
Not low-income	05-09	81%	85%	0.9		05-09	78%	81%	0.8		05-09	75%	73%	-0.4	
Low-income	05-09	65%	72%	1.9	L	05-09	58%	65%	1.7	L	05-09	55%	56%	0.3	L
Not disabled	06-09	80%	83%	0.8		06-09	76%	79%	0.8		06-09	76%	71%	-1.8	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	61%	66%	1.6	L	06-09	48%	58%	3.3	L	06-09	45%	49%	1.2	L
Not ELLs	06-09	79%	81%	0.9		06-09	74%	78%	1.3		06-09	74%	70%	-1.4	
English language learners[3]	06-09	48%	50%	0.5[2]	S	06-09	40%	33%	-2.3[2]	S	06-09	30%	25%	-1.4[2]	E
Female	05-09	78%	82%	1.0		05-09	77%	81%	0.9		05-09	75%	72%	-0.8	
Male	05-09	73%	78%	1.3	L	05-09	67%	72%	1.2	L	05-09	66%	65%	-0.1	L

Table reads: In 2005, 79% of white 4th graders and 64% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 83% of white 4th graders and 64% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.1 percentage points per year for white students and 0.1 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

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

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

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

Table ND-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	05-09	79%	81%	0.4		05-09	65%	71%	1.4		05-09	55%	57%	0.5	
White	05-09	82%	84%	0.6		05-09	69%	74%	1.3		05-09	58%	60%	0.6	
African American	05-09	55%	60%	1.1[2]	L	05-09	38%	42%	0.9[2]	S	05-09	31%	32%	0.1[2]	S
Latino	05-09	69%	64%	-1.2[2]	S	05-09	49%	50%	0.3[2]	S	05-09	31%	48%	4.3[2]	L
Asian	05-09	82%	76%	-1.5[2]	S	05-09	56%	78%	5.5[2]	L	05-09	64%	71%	1.7[2]	L
Native American	05-09	57%	62%	1.3	L	05-09	35%	48%	3.3	L	05-09	21%	26%	1.0	L
Not low-income	05-09	84%	86%	0.4		05-09	72%	76%	1.1		05-09	60%	63%	0.7	
Low-income	05-09	70%	73%	0.7	L	05-09	51%	59%	2.1	L	05-09	37%	41%	1.0	L
Not disabled	06-09	83%	83%	0.1		06-09	72%	74%	0.6		06-09	60%	59%	-0.3	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	63%	70%	2.2	L	06-09	40%	51%	3.8	L	06-09	30%	38%	2.7	L
Not ELLS	06-09	81%	82%	0.4		06-09	69%	72%	1.0		06-09	58%	58%	0.1	
English language learners[3]	06-09	53%	49%	-1.1[2]	S	06-09	31%	32%	0.2[2]	S	06-09	18%	21%	0.9[2]	L
Female	05-09	79%	81%	0.4		05-09	65%	71%	1.6		05-09	52%	56%	0.8	
Male	05-09	80%	82%	0.5	L	05-09	66%	71%	1.2	S	05-09	57%	58%	0.3	S

Table reads: In 2005, 82% of white 4th graders and 55% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 84% of white 4th graders and 60% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.6 percentage points per year for white students and 1.1 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 ND-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	05-09	647.9	650.6	0.7		05-09	685.3	688.3	0.8		05-09	712.8	708.6	-1.1	
	SD	05-09	27.8	30.0			05-09	28.6	28.7			05-09	28.5	28.2		
White	MSS	05-09	650.1	653.1	0.8		05-09	687.5	690.7	0.8		05-09	714.7	711.0	-0.9	
	SD	05-09	26.9	28.4			05-09	27.7	27.5			05-09	27.7	26.1		
African American	MSS	05-09	639.1	634.7	-1.1[2]	S	05-09	676.7	667.8	-2.2[2]	S	05-09	696.2	677.0	-4.8[2]	S
	SD	05-09	28.2	42.8			05-09	28.2	39.7			05-09	33.1	51.3		
Latino	MSS	05-09	638.6	637.0	-0.4[2]	S	05-09	676.4	678.2	0.5[2]	S	05-09	703.7	702.5	-0.3[2]	L
	SD	05-09	26.7	29.6			05-09	25.1	29.1			05-09	25.2	31.1		
Asian	MSS	05-09	649.1	648.1	-0.3[2]	S	05-09	685.6	696.5	2.7[2]	L	05-09	711.6	712.9	0.3[2]	L
	SD	05-09	30.6	35.8			05-09	33.4	32.3			05-09	26.1	33.2		
Native American	MSS	05-09	629.1	634.3	1.3	L	05-09	665.1	670.0	1.2	L	05-09	690.5	689.8	-0.2	L
	SD	05-09	28.4	31.7			05-09	29.1	28.1			05-09	28.9	31.3		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	652.3	654.8	0.6		05-09	689.7	692.7	0.8		05-09	715.7	712.4	-0.8	
	SD	05-09	26.8	28.4			05-09	27.2	27.3			05-09	27.5	25.8		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	638.7	642.5	1.0	L	05-09	675.1	677.8	0.7	S	05-09	702.3	697.6	-1.2	S
	SD	05-09	27.5	31.3			05-09	29.0	29.3			05-09	28.9	31.9		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	651.6	652.5	0.3		06-09	687.4	690.5	1.0		06-09	715.0	710.7	-1.4	
	SD	06-09	28.6	29.4			06-09	27.4	28.0			06-09	24.2	27.1		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	637.1	634.1	-1.0	S	06-09	664.3	665.8	0.5	S	06-09	690.7	684.6	-2.0	S
	SD	06-09	30.4	29.7			06-09	26.4	26.2			06-09	24.7	30.1		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	650.7	651.5	0.3		06-09	685.7	689.5	1.3		06-09	713.5	709.9	-1.2	
	SD	06-09	28.8	29.0			06-09	27.7	27.8			06-09	24.7	26.6		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	625.0	622.7	-0.8[2]	S	06-09	661.1	652.0	-3.0[2]	S	06-09	683.8	667.5	-5.4[2]	S
	SD	06-09	28.3	40.9			06-09	31.6	35.0			06-09	30.3	43.7		
Female	MSS	05-09	650.7	653.2	0.6		05-09	689.2	692.1	0.7		05-09	715.6	712.1	-0.9	
	SD	05-09	27.5	30.1			05-09	27.3	28.1			05-09	26.3	26.6		
Male	MSS	05-09	645.2	648.0	0.7	L	05-09	681.6	684.9	0.8	L	05-09	710.3	705.6	-1.2	S
	SD	05-09	27.8	29.5			05-09	29.3	28.6			05-09	29.9	29.0		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 650.1 for white students and 639.1 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 653.1 for white students and 634.7 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.8 points for white students and declined at an average yearly rate of 1.1 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The North Dakota State Assessment (NDSA) scoring scale varies for different grade levels within a range of 470-870.

[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 ND-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	05-09	633.4	633.8	0.1		05-09	697.7	703.9	1.6		05-09	740.7	743.4	0.7	
	SD	05-09	31.5	31.1			05-09	34.0	35.8			05-09	40.3	39.8		
White	MSS	05-09	635.7	636.5	0.2		05-09	700.8	707.0	1.6		05-09	744.1	747.4	0.8	
	SD	05-09	30.5	29.4			05-09	32.7	33.7			05-09	38.0	37.5		
African American	MSS	05-09	611.3	611.5	0.1[2]	S	05-09	675.7	670.5	-1.3[2]	S	05-09	710.3	701.7	-2.2[2]	S
	SD	05-09	49.7	45.4			05-09	35.9	50.8			05-09	46.5	51.3		
Latino	MSS	05-09	623.4	622.0	-0.4[2]	S	05-09	685.0	686.5	0.4[2]	S	05-09	718.6	731.2	3.2[2]	L
	SD	05-09	29.7	30.5			05-09	25.3	32.9			05-09	41.4	41.1		
Asian	MSS	05-09	639.5	638.4	-0.3[2]	S	05-09	693.1	716.5	5.9[2]	L	05-09	748.7	756.0	1.8[2]	L
	SD	05-09	33.7	40.5			05-09	45.3	43.9			05-09	42.1	44.2		
Native American	MSS	05-09	615.5	617.5	0.5	L	05-09	671.6	681.4	2.4	L	05-09	701.5	708.3	1.7	L
	SD	05-09	30.0	30.7			05-09	34.3	38.8			05-09	44.8	39.7		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	638.1	638.5	0.1		05-09	702.8	709.2	1.6		05-09	745.7	749.5	0.9	
	SD	05-09	30.6	29.4			05-09	32.3	33.9			05-09	37.9	37.2		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	623.6	625.0	0.3	L	05-09	685.8	691.2	1.4	S	05-09	722.2	725.1	0.7	S
	SD	05-09	31.0	32.1			05-09	34.8	36.8			05-09	43.1	41.9		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	636.6	635.7	-0.3		06-09	702.4	706.7	1.4		06-09	747.8	746.6	-0.4	
	SD	06-09	30.4	30.6			06-09	32.3	34.9			06-09	37.5	38.2		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	619.6	619.5	0.0	L	06-09	670.1	675.8	1.9	L	06-09	702.6	703.1	0.2	L
	SD	06-09	30.0	31.0			06-09	34.2	31.8			06-09	38.4	37.7		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	635.3	634.9	-0.1		06-09	700.0	705.3	1.8		06-09	744.9	745.1	0.1	
	SD	06-09	30.5	29.8			06-09	33.4	34.4			06-09	39.1	38.4		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	610.9	605.7	-1.7[2]	S	06-09	668.8	659.6	-3.1[2]	S	06-09	700.6	688.3	-4.1[2]	S
	SD	06-09	28.7	46.1			06-09	35.0	47.6			06-09	41.8	48.0		
Female	MSS	05-09	632.9	633.1	0.1		05-09	697.4	703.4	1.5		05-09	738.6	741.9	0.8	
	SD	05-09	30.8	30.7			05-09	32.5	33.5			05-09	38.3	38.0		
Male	MSS	05-09	633.8	634.7	0.2	L	05-09	698.1	704.5	1.6	L	05-09	742.7	745.2	0.6	S
	SD	05-09	32.1	31.1			05-09	35.4	37.6			05-09	41.9	41.3		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 635.7 for white students and 611.3 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 636.5 for white students and 611.5 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2009, the mean scale score

improved at an average yearly rate of 0.2 points for white students and 0.1 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The North Dakota State Assessment (NDSA) scoring scale varies for different grade levels within a range of 470-870.

[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 ND-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	05-09	6,933	6,804	-1.9%	100.0%	05-09	7,858	7,274	-7.4%	100.0%	05-09	7,700	7,383	-4.1%	100.0%
	Math	05-09	6,947	6,820	-1.8%	100.0%	05-09	7,839	7,287	-7.0%	100.0%	05-09	7,687	7,366	-4.2%	100.0%
White	Reading	05-09	6,059	5,761	-4.9%	84.7%	05-09	6,912	6,302	-8.8%	86.6%	05-09	6,937	6,484	-6.5%	87.8%
	Math	05-09	6,064	5,768	-4.9%	84.6%	05-09	6,893	6,307	-8.5%	86.6%	05-09	6,924	6,474	-6.5%	87.9%
African American	Reading	05-09	92	**162**	76.1%	2.4%	05-09	93	**114**	22.6%	1.6%	05-09	63	**104**	65.1%	1.4%
	Math	05-09	98	**167**	70.4%	2.4%	05-09	98	**121**	23.5%	1.7%	05-09	67	**104**	55.2%	1.4%
Latino	Reading	05-09	96	**146**	52.1%	2.1%	05-09	100	**136**	36.0%	1.9%	05-09	97	**97**	0.0%	1.3%
	Math	05-09	98	**146**	49.0%	2.1%	05-09	99	**136**	37.4%	1.9%	05-09	98	**96**	-2.0%	1.3%
Asian	Reading	05-09	60	**71**	18.3%	1.0%	05-09	68	**66**	-2.9%	0.9%	05-09	76	**71**	-6.6%	1.0%
	Math	05-09	60	**75**	25.0%	1.1%	05-09	72	**68**	-5.6%	0.9%	05-09	77	**72**	-6.5%	1.0%
Native American	Reading	05-09	611	640	4.7%	9.4%	05-09	659	630	-4.4%	8.7%	05-09	473	601	27.1%	8.1%
	Math	05-09	610	641	5.1%	9.4%	05-09	651	630	-3.2%	8.6%	05-09	469	596	27.1%	8.1%
Low-income	Reading	05-09	2,255	2,454	8.8%	36.1%	05-09	2,333	2,225	-4.6%	30.6%	05-09	1,509	1,921	27.3%	26.0%
	Math	05-09	2,267	2,468	8.9%	36.2%	05-09	2,326	2,234	-4.0%	30.7%	05-09	1,508	1,909	26.6%	25.9%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	985	1,033	4.9%	15.2%	06-09	898	935	4.1%	12.9%	06-09	658	816	24.0%	11.1%
	Math	06-09	986	1,043	5.8%	15.3%	06-09	871	941	8.0%	12.9%	06-09	641	815	27.1%	11.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	312	**244**	-21.8%	3.6%	06-09	310	**234**	-24.5%	3.2%	06-09	154	**234**	51.9%	3.2%
	Math	06-09	319	**256**	-19.7%	3.8%	06-09	321	**243**	-24.3%	3.3%	06-09	162	**233**	43.8%	3.2%
Female	Reading	05-09	3,377	3,293	-2.5%	48.4%	05-09	3,858	3,526	-8.6%	48.5%	05-09	3,702	3,558	-3.9%	48.2%
	Math	05-09	3,383	3,302	-2.4%	48.4%	05-09	3,851	3,530	-8.3%	48.4%	05-09	3,696	3,551	-3.9%	48.2%
Male	Reading	05-09	3,548	3,474	-2.1%	51.1%	05-09	3,981	3,718	-6.6%	51.1%	05-09	3,991	3,797	-4.9%	51.4%
	Math	05-09	3,556	3,482	-2.1%	51.1%	05-09	3,969	3,727	-6.1%	51.1%	05-09	3,984	3,789	-4.9%	51.4%

Table reads: In 2005, 6,059 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 5,761 students, a decrease of 4.9%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 84.7% of the 6,804 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.