Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New York

K-12 enrollment — 2,691,267

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 York showed a clear trend of gains in reading and math at the *basic-and-above, proficient-and-above,* and *advanced* levels for all major subgroups with just a few exceptions. Achievement gaps in reading and math also narrowed at grades 4 and 8 for most subgroups according to both percentages proficient and average (mean) scores. Comparable data were available for 2006-2009 at grades 4 and 8. Trends could not be determined for grade 11 because New York administers end-of-course exams that students take at different points in high school, depending on when they have completed the appropriate courses.

- ***Grade 8 trends at the proficient and basic levels.*** The percentages of 8th grade students scoring at the *proficient-and-above* and *basic-and-above* achievement levels increased in reading and math for all major racial/ethnic subgroups, low-income students, and boys and girls.

- ***Exceptions at advanced level in reading.*** At the advanced level of achievement in grade 8, most subgroups made gains in reading and math. However, *white* students, *low-income* students, and *boys* showed slight declines in reading.

- ***Notable gains.*** Nearly all subgroups made notable gains at the proficient level in reading and math. Gains at the proficient level were particularly strong in math for African American, Latino, Native American, and low-income students.

- ***Exceptions to narrowing gaps.*** For *low-income* students, the gap in reading widened at grades 4 and 8 according to percentages proficient, and widened at grade 4 and showed no change at grade 8 according to average scores. In math, the gap for *low-income* students narrowed according to percentages proficient but widened according to average scores. For *Latino* students, the gap in grade 4 reading narrowed according to percentages proficient but showed no change according to average scores.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2006 through 2009, grades 3 through 8 High school data have not been reported for reasons explained in the test characteristics section below.
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009, grades 4 and 8 No scale score data available for HS
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	State policy for testing ELL students in ELA was revised in 2006-07, so trends for this subgroup do not begin until 2007.

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 York State Testing Program (NYSTP) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics (grades 3–8) NYS Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) Regents Examinations (RE) in English and mathematics (high school end-of-course exams, grades tested vary)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	Reading: 3–8, 10–12 Math: 3–8, 9–12
State labels for achievement levels	NY uses four achievement levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. For our analyses we treated Level 2 as Basic, Level 3 as Proficient, and Level 4 as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	1998–99: Regents Examination in English 2003–04: Regents Examination in math 2005–06: NYSTP for grades 3–8
Time of test administration	Once per year in grades 3–8: January for ELA and March for mathematics Three times per year for Regents Examinations: January, June, and August
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2005–06: New NYSTP tests introduced 2006: Students in grades 3–8 were assessed in ELA and

mathematics. Prior to that, grades 4 and 8 were assessed, but NYSED advised that 2006 tests were not comparable to previous years.

Comments

New York reports its high school end-of-course results by cohort, defined as a group of entering 9th graders. These high school data are not suitable for this study. The data include scores from students in a cohort who have taken the tests at different points during high school and may include multiple scores from students who have taken the tests more than once. The state does not use a student identification system so the data cannot be reported for a single class in a single year.

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 NY-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					5%	6%	6%	5%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					49%	57%	56%	69%	6.5
Basic-and-above					91%	94%	95%	98%	2.4
White									
Advanced					7%	8%	8%	7%	-0.1
Proficient-and-above					61%	70%	68%	79%	6.1
Basic-and-above					95%	97%	97%	99%	1.4
African American									
Advanced					1%	2%	2%	1%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					28%	37%	38%	52%	7.9
Basic-and-above					82%	90%	93%	98%	5.2
Latino									
Advanced					1%	2%	2%	2%	0.2
Proficient-and-above					31%	38%	38%	53%	7.2
Basic-and-above					85%	88%	91%	97%	3.9
Asian									
Advanced					9%	10%	9%	9%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					67%	69%	70%	80%	4.2
Basic-and-above					95%	96%	96%	98%	1.1
Native American									
Advanced					1%	4%	2%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					34%	45%	42%	56%	7.2
Basic-and-above					86%	92%	92%	98%	4.0

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test remained the same at 7% in 2006 and in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for white 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.

Table NY-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					5%	6%	6%	5%	0.0
Proficient-and-above					49%	57%	56%	69%	6.5
Basic-and-above					91%	94%	95%	98%	2.4
Low-income students									
Advanced					2%	2%	2%	2%	-0.1
Proficient-and-above					36%	42%	39%	55%	6.2
Basic-and-above					88%	91%	91%	97%	3.1
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					0%	0%	0%	0%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					11%	16%	13%	25%	4.6
Basic-and-above					62%	75%	77%	92%	10.1
English language learners[3]									
Advanced						0%	0%	0%	0.0
Proficient-and-above						6%	6%	13%	3.3
Basic-and-above						61%	65%	86%	12.6
Female									
Advanced					6%	7%	8%	6%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					55%	63%	63%	74%	6.2
Basic-and-above					93%	96%	97%	99%	2.0
Male									
Advanced					4%	4%	4%	4%	-0.2
Proficient-and-above					44%	52%	50%	64%	6.6
Basic-and-above					88%	92%	93%	98%	3.2

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test remained the same at 2% in 2006 and in 2009. During this period, the average yearly decline 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 NY-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					10%	12%	17%	19%	3.1
Proficient-and-above					54%	59%	70%	80%	8.7
Basic-and-above					85%	88%	93%	96%	3.8
White									
Advanced					13%	15%	21%	24%	3.8
Proficient-and-above					68%	72%	80%	89%	7.1
Basic-and-above					93%	94%	95%	98%	1.6
African American									
Advanced					2%	3%	6%	7%	1.6
Proficient-and-above					28%	34%	49%	63%	11.6
Basic-and-above					70%	75%	86%	93%	7.8
Latino									
Advanced					3%	4%	7%	9%	2.1
Proficient-and-above					33%	40%	55%	69%	12.1
Basic-and-above					74%	79%	88%	95%	6.9
Asian									
Advanced					30%	33%	41%	43%	4.3
Proficient-and-above					77%	81%	88%	92%	5.0
Basic-and-above					94%	96%	97%	99%	1.5
Native American									
Advanced					5%	5%	7%	11%	1.9
Proficient-and-above					41%	46%	61%	74%	11.0
Basic-and-above					79%	85%	91%	96%	5.6

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 13% in 2006 to 24% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 3.8 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 NY-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					10%	12%	17%	19%	3.1
Proficient-and-above					54%	59%	70%	80%	8.7
Basic-and-above					85%	88%	93%	96%	3.8
Low-income students									
Advanced					5%	6%	9%	12%	2.2
Proficient-and-above					39%	43%	56%	70%	10.5
Basic-and-above					80%	81%	88%	95%	4.9
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced					1%	1%	2%	2%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					17%	21%	32%	46%	9.7
Basic-and-above					56%	60%	72%	84%	9.3
English language learners[3]									
Advanced					2%	3%	3%	5%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					23%	26%	28%	53%	9.9
Basic-and-above					61%	65%	68%	89%	9.2
Female									
Advanced					10%	12%	18%	21%	3.6
Proficient-and-above					55%	60%	72%	82%	9.0
Basic-and-above					86%	89%	94%	97%	3.7
Male									
Advanced					10%	11%	16%	18%	2.6
Proficient-and-above					53%	57%	68%	79%	8.5
Basic-and-above					84%	87%	91%	96%	4.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 5% in 2006 to 12% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 2.2 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 NY-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					High School				
Subgroup	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	69%	77%	2.6		06-09	49%	69%	6.5		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
White	06-09	77%	85%	2.7		06-09	61%	79%	6.1		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
African American	06-09	52%	65%	4.3	L	06-09	28%	52%	7.9	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	55%	65%	3.3	L	06-09	31%	53%	7.2	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	83%	87%	1.2	S	06-09	67%	80%	4.2	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	55%	69%	4.7	L	06-09	34%	56%	7.2	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	75%	88%	4.4		06-09	59%	81%	7.3		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
Low-income	06-09	59%	67%	2.5	S	06-09	36%	55%	6.2	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	76%	84%	2.8		06-09	56%	77%	6.8		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	26%	37%	3.8	L	06-09	11%	25%	4.6	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not ELLs	07-09	71%	80%	4.5		07-09	60%	71%	5.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
English language learners[3]	07-09	23%	41%	8.9	L	07-09	6%	13%	3.3	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	06-09	72%	80%	2.7		06-09	55%	74%	6.2		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
Male	06-09	65%	74%	2.9	L	06-09	44%	64%	6.6	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 77% of white 4th graders and 52% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 85% of white 4th graders and 65% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.7 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 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 NY-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					High School				
Subgroup	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	06-09	78%	87%	3.1		06-09	54%	80%	8.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
White	06-09	86%	92%	1.9		06-09	68%	89%	7.1		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
African American	06-09	62%	78%	5.2	L	06-09	28%	63%	11.6	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino	06-09	67%	82%	5.0	L	06-09	33%	69%	12.1	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	06-09	92%	96%	1.3	S	06-09	77%	92%	5.0	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American	06-09	69%	83%	4.6	L	06-09	41%	74%	11.0	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-09	83%	93%	3.4		06-09	64%	89%	8.4		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
Low-income	06-09	71%	82%	3.6	L	06-09	39%	70%	10.5	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-09	84%	92%	2.7		06-09	60%	86%	8.8		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	45%	61%	5.2	L	06-09	17%	46%	9.7	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not ELLS	06-09	80%	89%	2.9		06-09	56%	82%	8.6		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-09	50%	71%	7.1	L	06-09	23%	53%	9.9	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	06-09	78%	88%	3.2		06-09	55%	82%	9.0		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
Male	06-09	78%	87%	2.9	S	06-09	53%	79%	8.5	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 86% of white 4th graders and 62% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 92% of white 4th graders and 78% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2006 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.9 percentage points per year for white students and 5.2 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.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

Table NY-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					High School				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	666	670	1.3		06-09	650	661	3.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
White	MSS	06-09	674	678	1.3		06-09	661	668	2.3		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	06-09	649	658	3.0	L	06-09	631	650	6.3	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	06-09	653	657	1.3	E	06-09	634	649	5.0	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	06-09	682	682	0.0	S	06-09	666	671	1.7	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	651	661	3.3	L	06-09	636	652	5.3	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	672	681	3.0		06-09	658	670	4.0		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	656	659	1.0	S	06-09	639	651	4.0	E	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	673	676	1.0		06-09	657	666	3.0		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	622	635	4.3	L	06-09	609	633	8.0	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	07-09	668	672	2.0		07-09	658	663	2.5		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	07-09	NA	NA			07-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	07-09	624	639	7.5	L	07-09	605	623	9.0	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	07-09	NA	NA			07-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	06-09	670	674	1.3		06-09	656	665	3.0		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	06-09	661	666	1.7	L	06-09	645	657	4.0	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 674 for white students and 649 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 678 for white students and 658 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 1.3 points for white students and 3.0 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) is scored on a scale that varies by subject and grade (typically from about 500-800 for 3-8 tests).

[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 NY-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					High School				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS[1]	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	677	689	4.0		06-09	652	675	7.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
White	MSS	06-09	685	695	3.3		06-09	663	683	6.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
African American	MSS	06-09	659	675	5.3	L	06-09	629	658	9.7	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Latino	MSS	06-09	663	680	5.7	L	06-09	634	663	9.7	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Asian	MSS	06-09	700	714	4.7	L	06-09	678	696	6.0	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Native American	MSS	06-09	664	679	5.0	L	06-09	640	666	8.7	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	683	699	5.3		06-09	659	684	8.3		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	668	681	4.3	S	06-09	641	665	8.0	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	683	696	4.3		06-09	658	681	7.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	640	657	5.7	L	06-09	614	643	9.7	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	679	692	4.3		06-09	653	676	7.7		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	647	667	6.7	L	06-09	621	650	9.7	L	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Female	MSS	06-09	676	690	4.7		06-09	653	677	8.0		NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		
Male	MSS	06-09	677	689	4.0	S	06-09	650	673	7.7	S	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-09	NA	NA			06-09	NA	NA			NA-NA	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 685 for white students and 659 for African American students. In 2009, the mean

scale score in 4th grade math was 695 for white students and 675 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 3.3 points for white students and 5.3 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) is scored on a scale that varies by subject and grade (typically from about 500-800 for 3-8 tests).

[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 NY-15. Numbers of test-takers

		Grade 4					Grade 8					High School				
Subgroup	Subject	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	190,822	195,827	2.6%	100.0%	06-09	212,196	207,409	-2.3%	100.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	202,393	197,561	-2.4%	100.0%	06-09	219,025	209,215	-4.5%	100.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	Reading	06-09	105,960	100,714	-5.0%	51.4%	06-09	118,069	109,366	-7.4%	52.7%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	106,883	100,789	-5.7%	51.0%	06-09	118,550	109,352	-7.8%	52.3%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
African American	Reading	06-09	37,758	37,519	-0.6%	19.2%	06-09	42,996	39,678	-7.7%	19.1%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	38,472	37,707	-2.0%	19.1%	06-09	43,283	39,816	-8.0%	19.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino	Reading	06-09	33,495	41,491	23.9%	21.2%	06-09	37,605	41,991	11.7%	20.2%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	41,536	42,461	2.2%	21.5%	06-09	42,082	43,014	2.2%	20.6%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	Reading	06-09	12,710	14,663	15.4%	7.5%	06-09	12,481	15,051	20.6%	7.3%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	14,585	15,150	3.9%	7.7%	06-09	14,032	15,686	11.8%	7.5%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American	Reading	06-09	894	893	-0.1%	0.5%	06-09	1,043	992	-4.9%	0.5%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	913	892	-2.3%	0.5%	06-09	1,076	999	-7.2%	0.5%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Low-income	Reading	06-09	79,465	102,017	28.4%	52.1%	06-09	85,565	98,632	15.3%	47.6%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	87,726	103,393	17.9%	52.3%	06-09	91,206	100,169	9.8%	47.9%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	27,841	31,103	11.7%	15.9%	06-09	30,066	31,950	6.3%	15.4%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	29,618	31,155	5.2%	15.8%	06-09	30,033	31,902	6.2%	15.2%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English language learners	Reading	07-09	14,200	14,874	4.7%	7.6%	07-09	10,076	10,043	-0.3%	4.8%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	14,579	16,685	14.4%	8.4%	06-09	11,971	12,078	0.9%	5.8%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	Reading	06-09	93,335	95,273	2.1%	48.7%	06-09	103,717	101,566	-2.1%	49.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	98,544	96,042	-2.5%	48.6%	06-09	107,013	102,437	-4.3%	49.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	Reading	06-09	97,487	100,554	3.1%	51.3%	06-09	108,479	105,843	-2.4%	51.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-09	103,849	101,519	-2.2%	51.4%	06-09	112,012	106,778	-4.7%	51.0%	NA-NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 105,960 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 100,714 students, a decrease of 5.0%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 51.4% of the 195,827 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.