Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New Mexico

K-12 enrollment — 323,882

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

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), New Mexico showed across-the-board gains—improvements in reading and math at the *basic-and-above, proficient-and-above,* and *advanced* levels for all major racial/ethnic subgroups and low-income students. Progress in narrowing achievement gaps at grades 4, 8, and 11 was mixed. Comparable data were available for 2005-2009 at grades 4 and 8 and for 2007-2009 at grade 11.

- ***Notable gains.*** In grade 8 reading, the largest gains occurred among *African American, Native American,* and male students at the proficient-and-above level. In grade 8 math, several subgroups made notable gains at the proficient-and-above and advanced levels.

- ***Mixed gap trends.*** In reading across three grade levels, the majority of gaps narrowed using percentages proficient, but gaps widened more often than they narrowed using average (mean) test scores. In math, the number of gaps that widened was equal to the number that narrowed when percentages proficient were used, but according to average test scores, gaps narrowed more often than they widened.

- ***Notable narrowing in grade 11 reading.*** Grade 11 reading showed a clear trend of gaps narrowing according to both percentages proficient and average test scores. The one exception was for low-income students, for whom the gap with non-low-income students stayed the same.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2005 through 2009, grade 3-8 2007 through 2009, grade 11
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2005 through 2009, grade 3-8 2007 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 Mexico Standards Based Assessment (SBA) New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 11
State labels for achievement levels	New Mexico uses four achievement levels: Beginning Step, Nearing Proficiency, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Nearing Proficiency 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	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2002–03: Administered the Terra Nova from CTB at all grades and the Standards Based Assessment in the spring of grades 4 and 8. Spring 2005: New tests administered in grades 3–9 and grade 11. These changes required new standard setting at all grade levels. For this reason, the state has been careful to not make direct comparisons between 2004 and 2005. New test was used for NCLB. In addition, grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 were tested for the first time. 2006–07: Science assessment administered. 2007: Changed test vendor and set new standards for high school test. 2007–08: Discontinued testing 9th grade and stopped counting 9th grade in high school AYP consideration

Comments

As a result of the 2007 changes in test vendor and test standards for the high school test, test results from 2007 and beyond were determined not to be comparable to results from previous years, so trends for high school are limited to 2007 through 2009.

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the Middle School Level

Note: The tables in this profile of subgroup achievement and gap trends begin with table 7. Tables 1 through 6 can be found in the companion state profile of general achievement trends.

Table NM-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				3%	3%	3%	5%	8%	1.2
Proficient-and-above				52%	51%	56%	63%	62%	2.6
Basic-and-above				88%	89%	89%	92%	91%	0.8
White									
Advanced				6%	6%	6%	9%	15%	2.1
Proficient-and-above				67%	68%	72%	77%	79%	3.0
Basic-and-above				93%	95%	94%	96%	95%	0.6
African American									
Advanced				2%	4%	3%	5%	7%	1.4
Proficient-and-above				46%	45%	51%	63%	59%	3.4
Basic-and-above				85%	85%	87%	91%	87%	0.5
Latino									
Advanced				2%	2%	2%	4%	5%	0.8
Proficient-and-above				46%	45%	50%	58%	55%	2.4
Basic-and-above				86%	87%	88%	91%	89%	0.8
Asian[2]									
Advanced				11%	9%	9%	15%	22%	2.7
Proficient-and-above				71%	66%	73%	77%	80%	2.2
Basic-and-above				93%	95%	95%	94%	97%	1.0
Native American									
Advanced				1%	1%	1%	3%	4%	0.9
Proficient-and-above				35%	32%	39%	54%	49%	3.5
Basic-and-above				82%	83%	85%	90%	89%	1.7

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 6% in 2005 to 15% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 2.1 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.

Table NM-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				3%	3%	3%	5%	8%	1.2
Proficient-and-above				52%	51%	56%	63%	62%	2.6
Basic-and-above				88%	89%	89%	92%	91%	0.8
Low-income students									
Advanced				2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	0.7
Proficient-and-above				43%	41%	47%	56%	52%	2.4
Basic-and-above				85%	86%	86%	90%	88%	0.8
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				2%	3%	3%	5%	4%	0.5
Proficient-and-above				16%	17%	17%	22%	22%	1.9
Basic-and-above				58%	59%	59%	66%	61%	0.6
English language learners[3]									
Advanced				1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	0.2
Proficient-and-above				32%	34%	36%	45%	35%	0.3
Basic-and-above				80%	83%	81%	87%	81%	-0.6
Female									
Advanced				5%	4%	4%	7%	10%	1.4
Proficient-and-above				60%	58%	61%	69%	67%	1.7
Basic-and-above				92%	93%	93%	95%	94%	0.3
Male									
Advanced				2%	2%	3%	4%	6%	1.0
Proficient-and-above				44%	44%	51%	58%	58%	3.4
Basic-and-above				83%	85%	86%	90%	88%	1.2

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 2% in 2005 to 4% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.7 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.

[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 NM-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				4%	4%	5%	7%	7%	0.9
Proficient-and-above				24%	26%	30%	37%	42%	4.6
Basic-and-above				75%	74%	80%	86%	92%	4.2
White									
Advanced				8%	9%	10%	13%	13%	1.4
Proficient-and-above				40%	43%	48%	55%	61%	5.2
Basic-and-above				86%	85%	90%	93%	96%	2.3
African American									
Advanced				2%	2%	4%	5%	4%	0.6
Proficient-and-above				17%	20%	23%	31%	37%	5.0
Basic-and-above				68%	64%	74%	83%	90%	5.6
Latino									
Advanced				2%	2%	2%	4%	5%	0.8
Proficient-and-above				17%	19%	22%	29%	35%	4.6
Basic-and-above				70%	69%	76%	83%	90%	5.0
Asian[2]									
Advanced				18%	19%	23%	24%	25%	1.8
Proficient-and-above				54%	54%	59%	67%	67%	3.3
Basic-and-above				87%	85%	91%	93%	98%	2.7
Native American									
Advanced				1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above				11%	14%	18%	23%	28%	4.3
Basic-and-above				64%	66%	73%	79%	88%	5.9

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 8% in 2005 to 13% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 1.4 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 NM-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				4%	4%	5%	7%	7%	0.9
Proficient-and-above				24%	26%	30%	37%	42%	4.6
Basic-and-above				75%	74%	80%	86%	92%	4.2
Low-income students									
Advanced				1%	2%	2%	3%	4%	0.6
Proficient-and-above				15%	18%	20%	27%	32%	4.4
Basic-and-above				68%	68%	75%	81%	89%	5.3
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				1%	1%	3%	3%	4%	0.8
Proficient-and-above				5%	6%	7%	10%	12%	2.0
Basic-and-above				35%	35%	44%	53%	68%	10.8
English language learners[3]									
Advanced				1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	0.2
Proficient-and-above				9%	13%	14%	17%	19%	2.3
Basic-and-above				60%	63%	68%	75%	85%	7.2
Female									
Advanced				4%	4%	5%	7%	7%	0.8
Proficient-and-above				24%	27%	31%	36%	43%	5.0
Basic-and-above				77%	76%	82%	86%	93%	4.0
Male									
Advanced				4%	4%	5%	7%	8%	1.0
Proficient-and-above				24%	26%	29%	37%	41%	4.3
Basic-and-above				73%	72%	79%	85%	90%	4.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 1% in 2005 to 4% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 0.6 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 NM-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	52%	52%	0.0		05-09	52%	62%	2.6		07-09	47%	51%	1.6	
White	05-09	70%	69%	-0.3		05-09	67%	79%	3.0		07-09	65%	67%	1.1	
African American	05-09	45%	45%	0.2	L	05-09	46%	59%	3.4	L	07-09	39%	49%	5.2[2]	L
Latino	05-09	45%	46%	0.3	L	05-09	46%	55%	2.4	S	07-09	38%	43%	2.1	L
Asian	05-09	72%	67%	-1.4[2]	S	05-09	71%	80%	2.2[2]	S	07-09	59%	62%	1.7[2]	L
Native American	05-09	33%	36%	0.8	L	05-09	35%	49%	3.5	L	07-09	32%	37%	2.7	L
Not low-income	05-09	71%	70%	-0.2		05-09	67%	79%	3.0		07-09	58%	61%	1.9	
Low-income	05-09	43%	44%	0.3	L	05-09	43%	52%	2.4	S	07-09	36%	40%	1.9	E
Not disabled	06-09	59%	57%	-0.9		06-09	57%	68%	3.7		07-09	53%	56%	1.5	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	21%	20%	-0.1	L	06-09	17%	22%	1.9	S	07-09	13%	17%	2.3	L
Not ELLs	06-09	61%	59%	-0.7		06-09	56%	69%	4.2		07-09	52%	55%	1.5	
English language learners[3]	06-09	37%	34%	-1.1	S	06-09	34%	35%	0.3	S	07-09	23%	23%	-0.1	S
Female	05-09	56%	57%	0.1		05-09	60%	67%	1.7		07-09	51%	54%	1.5	
Male	05-09	48%	47%	-0.1	S	05-09	44%	58%	3.4	L	07-09	44%	47%	1.6	L

Table reads: In 2005, 70% of white 4th graders and 45% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 69% of white 4th graders and 45% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient declined at an average rate of 0.3 percentage points per year for white students and improved at an average rate of 0.2 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 NM-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	39%	42%	0.7		05-09	24%	42%	4.6		07-09	31%	34%	1.4	
White	05-09	56%	59%	0.9		05-09	40%	61%	5.2		07-09	50%	52%	1.0	
African American	05-09	29%	33%	1.0	L	05-09	17%	37%	5.0	S	07-09	21%	29%	4.4[2]	L
Latino	05-09	32%	36%	0.9	E	05-09	17%	35%	4.6	S	07-09	21%	25%	2.0	L
Asian	05-09	69%	66%	-0.8[2]	S	05-09	54%	67%	3.3[2]	S	07-09	58%	62%	2.2[2]	L
Native American	05-09	25%	28%	0.8	S	05-09	11%	28%	4.3	S	07-09	16%	19%	1.4	L
Not low-income	05-09	57%	60%	0.7		05-09	40%	60%	5.0		07-09	42%	45%	1.5	
Low-income	05-09	31%	35%	0.9	L	05-09	15%	32%	4.4	S	07-09	19%	23%	2.1	L
Not disabled	06-09	45%	46%	0.2		06-09	30%	47%	5.7		07-09	35%	38%	1.3	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	16%	19%	0.8	L	06-09	6%	12%	2.0	S	07-09	6%	10%	2.0	L
Not ELLS	06-09	46%	47%	0.4		06-09	30%	48%	5.8		07-09	35%	37%	1.2	
English language learners[3]	06-09	28%	28%	-0.2	S	06-09	13%	19%	2.3	S	07-09	10%	12%	0.7	S
Female	05-09	39%	43%	0.9		05-09	24%	43%	5.0		07-09	30%	32%	1.2	
Male	05-09	39%	41%	0.5	S	05-09	24%	41%	4.3	S	07-09	32%	35%	1.6	L

Table reads: In 2005, 56% of white 4th graders and 29% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 59% of white 4th graders and 33% 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 0.9 percentage points per year for white students and 1.0 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 NM-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	638.7	639.0	0.1		05-09	682.6	692.9	2.6		07-09	616.3	620.4	2.1	
	SD	05-09	33.9	37.7			05-09	31.8	33.5			07-09	37.6	33.4		
White	MSS	05-09	653.4	653.7	0.1		05-09	694.8	707.3	3.1		07-09	631.3	632.7	0.7	
	SD	05-09	31.6	35.9			05-09	30.2	31.3			07-09	35.8	32.2		
African American	MSS	05-09	634.3	632.6	-0.4	S	05-09	679.0	689.1	2.5	S	07-09	608.6	617.2	4.3[2]	L
	SD	05-09	33.8	36.3			05-09	31.3	34.9			07-09	38.9	34.6		
Latino	MSS	05-09	632.6	634.0	0.4	L	05-09	677.3	686.7	2.4	S	07-09	608.5	614.1	2.8	L
	SD	05-09	32.8	36.5			05-09	30.9	32.4			07-09	36.1	32.4		
Asian	MSS	05-09	657.9	653.8	-1.0[2]	S	05-09	699.4	711.0	2.9[2]	S	07-09	627.1	632.5	2.7[2]	L
	SD	05-09	31.3	37.3			05-09	30.8	33.1			07-09	38.5	32.9		
Native American	MSS	05-09	625.4	624.4	-0.2	S	05-09	671.6	682.9	2.8	S	07-09	603.8	610.9	3.5	L
	SD	05-09	30.7	36.3			05-09	29.2	31.2			07-09	33.6	30.3		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	654.7	655.5	0.2		05-09	694.7	707.3	3.2		07-09	624.9	628.8	1.9	
	SD	05-09	31.0	34.7			05-09	30.2	30.8			07-09	37.0	32.3		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	631.2	631.9	0.2	E	05-09	675.2	684.3	2.3	S	07-09	606.4	611.9	2.7	L
	SD	05-09	32.6	36.7			05-09	30.5	32.1			07-09	35.8	32.4		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	644.8	644.4	-0.2		06-09	689.8	697.9	2.7		07-09	622.0	625.1	1.6	
	SD	06-09	31.8	34.2			06-09	27.2	30.3			07-09	34.3	30.6		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	606.9	601.4	-1.8	S	06-09	651.9	655.0	1.1	S	07-09	575.4	581.1	2.9	L
	SD	06-09	35.5	39.5			06-09	30.6	32.0			07-09	34.8	29.8		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	646.2	644.7	-0.5		06-09	688.9	698.1	3.1		07-09	620.3	623.7	1.7	
	SD	06-09	33.7	36.5			06-09	29.8	32.2			07-09	36.8	32.6		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	624.9	621.9	-1.0	S	06-09	670.5	669.8	-0.2	S	07-09	595.1	597.5	1.2	S
	SD	06-09	32.6	36.1			06-09	29.1	29.5			07-09	34.5	29.6		
Female	MSS	05-09	642.5	643.8	0.3		05-09	689.1	697.5	2.1		07-09	620.6	624.1	1.7	
	SD	05-09	33.6	36.6			05-09	29.9	32.3			07-09	36.5	32.5		
Male	MSS	05-09	635.1	634.4	-0.2	S	05-09	676.3	688.5	3.0	L	07-09	611.8	616.5	2.4	L
	SD	05-09	33.8	38.2			05-09	32.3	34.1			07-09	38.2	33.9		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 653.4 for white students and 634.3 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 653.7 for white students and 632.6 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.1 points for white students and declined at an average yearly rate of 0.4 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (SBA) is scored using a linear transformation with a mean of 600 and standard deviation of 35.

[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 NM-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	625.4	629.6	1.1		05-09	681.2	700.7	4.9		07-09	583.0	584.0	0.5	
	SD	05-09	34.3	33.3			05-09	35.5	32.1			07-09	31.2	33.5		
White	MSS	05-09	639.6	642.9	0.8		05-09	697.8	714.3	4.1		07-09	596.7	598.6	1.0	
	SD	05-09	33.7	33.7			05-09	35.7	32.4			07-09	33.2	35.2		
African American	MSS	05-09	617.0	621.5	1.1	L	05-09	674.0	694.2	5.1	L	07-09	572.3	577.5	2.6[2]	L
	SD	05-09	32.9	32.0			05-09	32.8	30.2			07-09	30.6	30.4		
Latino	MSS	05-09	619.1	624.7	1.4	L	05-09	673.4	695.3	5.5	L	07-09	575.4	576.7	0.6	S
	SD	05-09	32.3	31.3			05-09	32.6	30.0			07-09	27.0	29.5		
Asian	MSS	05-09	650.9	650.5	-0.1[2]	S	05-09	710.3	724.8	3.6[2]	S	07-09	605.9	610.9	2.5[2]	L
	SD	05-09	38.9	37.5			05-09	42.4	37.4			07-09	38.4	39.6		
Native American	MSS	05-09	614.6	618.1	0.9	L	05-09	669.2	689.3	5.0	L	07-09	572.9	570.9	-1.0	S
	SD	05-09	30.6	29.0			05-09	29.0	27.5			07-09	24.0	26.6		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	641.0	644.1	0.8		05-09	697.0	713.9	4.2		07-09	591.4	593.7	1.1	
	SD	05-09	34.0	33.6			05-09	36.1	32.4			07-09	33.0	34.6		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	618.0	623.3	1.3	L	05-09	671.7	692.9	5.3	L	07-09	573.5	574.1	0.3	S
	SD	05-09	31.8	31.0			05-09	31.5	29.2			07-09	26.1	29.2		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	630.5	632.8	0.8		06-09	688.6	704.9	5.5		07-09	587.1	587.8	0.4	
	SD	06-09	34.3	32.5			06-09	33.9	30.6			07-09	30.2	32.7		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	601.7	607.4	1.9	L	06-09	651.7	669.5	6.0	L	07-09	554.0	552.6	-0.7	S
	SD	06-09	32.0	29.9			06-09	25.9	25.2			07-09	21.3	20.8		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	632.1	633.5	0.5		06-09	688.6	704.8	5.4		07-09	586.2	587.0	0.4	
	SD	06-09	35.1	33.4			06-09	35.1	32.0			07-09	31.6	33.4		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	613.9	618.0	1.4	L	06-09	667.1	682.8	5.2	S	07-09	566.5	563.2	-1.7	S
	SD	06-09	32.6	29.8			06-09	30.7	26.0			07-09	23.2	25.1		
Female	MSS	05-09	625.3	630.5	1.3		05-09	681.8	701.5	4.9		07-09	582.7	582.7	0.0	
	SD	05-09	33.6	32.7			05-09	34.3	31.0			07-09	29.2	31.8		
Male	MSS	05-09	625.4	628.7	0.8	S	05-09	680.6	700.0	4.9	E	07-09	583.4	585.2	0.9	L
	SD	05-09	34.9	33.8			05-09	36.6	33.1			07-09	33.2	35.1		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 639.6 for white students and 617.0 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 642.9 for white students and 621.5 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 1.1 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (SBA) is scored using a linear transformation with a mean of 600 and standard deviation of 35.

[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 NM-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	23,367	23,745	1.6%	100.0%	05-09	25,263	23,242	-8.0%	100.0%	07-09	19,383	19,256	-0.7%	100.0%
	Math	05-09	23,594	23,776	0.8%	100.0%	05-09	25,274	23,242	-8.0%	100.0%	07-09	19,291	19,228	-0.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	05-09	7,271	6,934	-4.6%	29.2%	05-09	8,235	6,954	-15.6%	29.9%	07-09	6,888	6,531	-5.2%	33.9%
	Math	05-09	7,321	6,937	-5.2%	29.2%	05-09	8,224	6,956	-15.4%	29.9%	07-09	6,867	6,519	-5.1%	33.9%
African American	Reading	05-09	588	668	13.6%	2.8%	05-09	637	662	3.9%	2.8%	07-09	472	484	2.5%	2.5%
	Math	05-09	595	670	12.6%	2.8%	05-09	639	666	4.2%	2.9%	07-09	472	484	2.5%	2.5%
Latino	Reading	05-09	12,935	13,293	2.8%	56.0%	05-09	13,166	12,841	-2.5%	55.2%	07-09	9,274	9,561	3.1%	49.7%
	Math	05-09	13,064	13,314	1.9%	56.0%	05-09	13,179	12,838	-2.6%	55.2%	07-09	9,203	9,563	3.9%	49.7%
Asian	Reading	05-09	272	369	35.7%	1.6%	05-09	235	311	32.3%	1.3%	07-09	279	289	3.6%	1.5%
	Math	05-09	278	369	32.7%	1.6%	05-09	240	311	29.6%	1.3%	07-09	281	289	2.8%	1.5%
Native American	Reading	05-09	2,301	2,481	7.8%	10.4%	05-09	2,990	2,472	-17.3%	10.6%	07-09	2,469	2,389	-3.2%	12.4%
	Math	05-09	2,336	2,486	6.4%	10.5%	05-09	2,992	2,469	-17.5%	10.6%	07-09	2,467	2,371	-3.9%	12.3%
Low-income	Reading	05-09	15,894	16,549	4.1%	69.7%	05-09	15,731	14,554	-7.5%	62.6%	07-09	9,091	9,572	5.3%	49.7%
	Math	05-09	16,058	16,572	3.2%	69.7%	05-09	15,738	14,555	-7.5%	62.6%	07-09	9,042	9,560	5.7%	49.7%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	3,052	2,947	-3.4%	12.4%	06-09	3,501	2,744	-21.6%	11.8%	07-09	2,379	2,090	-12.1%	10.9%
	Math	06-09	3,058	2,966	-3.0%	12.5%	06-09	3,456	2,743	-20.6%	11.8%	07-09	2,348	2,084	-11.2%	10.8%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	6,898	5,927	-14.1%	25.0%	06-09	5,970	4,263	-28.6%	18.3%	07-09	3,132	2,473	-21.0%	12.8%
	Math	06-09	6,912	5,941	-14.0%	25.0%	06-09	5,976	4,260	-28.7%	18.3%	07-09	3,122	2,472	-20.8%	12.9%
Female	Reading	05-09	11,451	11,628	1.5%	49.0%	05-09	12,343	11,366	-7.9%	48.9%	07-09	9,805	9,816	0.1%	51.0%
	Math	05-09	11,534	11,643	0.9%	49.0%	05-09	12,343	11,367	-7.9%	48.9%	07-09	9,760	9,805	0.5%	51.0%
Male	Reading	05-09	11,916	12,117	1.7%	51.0%	05-09	12,920	11,874	-8.1%	51.1%	07-09	9,575	9,438	-1.4%	49.0%
	Math	05-09	12,060	12,133	0.6%	51.0%	05-09	12,931	11,873	-8.2%	51.1%	07-09	9,528	9,421	-1.1%	49.0%

Table reads: In 2005, 7,271 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 6,934 students, a decrease of 4.6%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 29.2% of the 23,745 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.