

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Washington

K-12 enrollment — 1,040,750

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

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Washington showed across-the-board gains in math—improvements at the *basic*, *proficient*, and *advanced* levels for all racial/ethnic subgroups, low-income students, and boys and girls. Achievement was mixed, however, for this grade level in reading. Conversely, progress in narrowing achievement gaps was made in reading at grades 4, 8, and 10, however, it was mixed in math. Comparable data were available for 2002-2009 at grades 4 and 10 and for 2006-2009 at grade 8.

- **Mixed achievement gains in grade 8 reading.** Students made gains in reading at the advanced achievement level across all subgroups, however, they simultaneously showed declines at the *basic-and-above* and *proficient-and-above* achievement levels
- **Mixed gap trends.** In reading across three grade levels, the majority of gaps narrowed using percentages proficient. In math, trends were less positive: gaps widened across subgroups at grade 4 and were mixed at grades 8 and 10.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	1999 through 2009, grades 4, 7, and 10 2006 through 2009, grades 3, 5, 6, and 8
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2002 through 2009, grades 4 and 10 2006 through 2009, grade 8
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Percentage proficient data not available until 2003 and mean scale score data not available until 2007 for low-income subgroup. Data are not available until 2008 for comparison groups of students who are <i>not</i> low-income, disabled, or English language learners (ELLs), so the subgroups of low-income students, students with disabilities, and ELLs are compared with all tested students in the state.

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	Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3-8, 10
State labels for achievement levels	WA 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	1997: Grade 4 1998: Grade 7 1999: Grade 10 2006 :Grades 3, 5, 6, and 8
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2005-06: Testing expanded to include grades 3-8, 10 2008: Passing the High School WASL became a requirement for graduation.

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 WA-7. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year					Average yearly percentage point gain ¹			
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		2007	2008	2009
All tested students									
Advanced					32%	33%	32%	34%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					70%	64%	66%	67%	-1.0
Basic-and-above					91%	89%	90%	89%	-0.9
White									
Advanced					35%	36%	35%	37%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					74%	69%	69%	71%	-1.0
Basic-and-above					93%	91%	92%	91%	-0.6
African American									
Advanced					20%	19%	21%	23%	1.1
Proficient-and-above					54%	47%	52%	54%	0.3
Basic-and-above					84%	80%	83%	83%	-0.3
Latino									
Advanced					20%	19%	22%	23%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					55%	49%	52%	52%	-0.9
Basic-and-above					85%	81%	82%	81%	-1.3
Asian									
Advanced					42%	42%	44%	46%	1.4
Proficient-and-above					78%	72%	76%	76%	-0.5
Basic-and-above					94%	92%	93%	92%	-0.5
Native American									
Advanced					20%	17%	19%	21%	0.2
Proficient-and-above					56%	46%	49%	49%	-2.4
Basic-and-above					85%	79%	80%	79%	-2.2

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 35% in 2006 to 37% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 0.7 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The 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 WA-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					32%	33%	32%	34%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					70%	64%	66%	67%	-1.0
Basic-and-above					91%	89%	90%	89%	-0.9
Low-income students									
Advanced					21%	20%	21%	23%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					57%	50%	52%	53%	-1.1
Basic-and-above					85%	82%	83%	82%	-1.3
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced					5%	4%	4%	4%	-0.2
Proficient-and-above					21%	15%	17%	17%	-1.4
Basic-and-above					57%	46%	52%	48%	-3.0
English language learners ³									
Advanced					5%	5%	5%	5%	-0.2
Proficient-and-above					27%	22%	22%	20%	-2.5
Basic-and-above					68%	64%	60%	52%	-5.1
Female									
Advanced					38%	39%	39%	41%	1.0
Proficient-and-above					75%	71%	72%	73%	-0.7
Basic-and-above					94%	92%	93%	92%	-0.6
Male									
Advanced					26%	27%	26%	28%	0.5
Proficient-and-above					65%	58%	60%	61%	-1.3
Basic-and-above					89%	85%	87%	86%	-0.9

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 21% in 2006 to 23% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.8 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The 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.

³Gap 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 WA-9. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced					18%	19%	21%	20%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					49%	50%	52%	51%	0.6
Basic-and-above					72%	71%	75%	74%	0.5
White									
Advanced					20%	21%	25%	23%	0.9
Proficient-and-above					55%	56%	57%	57%	0.7
Basic-and-above					77%	77%	80%	79%	0.5
African American									
Advanced					5%	5%	7%	6%	0.6
Proficient-and-above					22%	25%	28%	27%	1.4
Basic-and-above					47%	47%	54%	54%	2.3
Latino									
Advanced					6%	6%	7%	7%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					26%	27%	30%	29%	0.9
Basic-and-above					53%	52%	57%	56%	1.2
Asian									
Advanced					28%	28%	33%	32%	1.6
Proficient-and-above					60%	59%	65%	63%	1.0
Basic-and-above					80%	78%	83%	82%	0.5
Native American									
Advanced					7%	6%	8%	8%	0.4
Proficient-and-above					30%	28%	32%	31%	0.2
Basic-and-above					55%	54%	59%	56%	0.2

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 20% in 2006 to 23% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 0.9 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The 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 WA-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%	21%	20%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					49%	50%	52%	51%	0.6
Basic-and-above					72%	71%	75%	74%	0.5
Low-income students									
Advanced					7%	8%	9%	9%	0.5
Proficient-and-above					31%	31%	33%	33%	0.7
Basic-and-above					57%	55%	60%	60%	1.0
Students with disabilities³									
Advanced					1%	2%	2%	2%	0.1
Proficient-and-above					8%	8%	8%	8%	0.0
Basic-and-above					21%	18%	23%	21%	0.3
English language learners³									
Advanced					2%	2%	2%	3%	0.3
Proficient-and-above					10%	9%	10%	11%	0.3
Basic-and-above					29%	26%	27%	28%	-0.4
Female									
Advanced					17%	18%	21%	20%	0.7
Proficient-and-above					49%	51%	53%	51%	0.6
Basic-and-above					73%	73%	77%	75%	0.5
Male									
Advanced					18%	19%	22%	21%	0.8
Proficient-and-above					48%	49%	51%	50%	0.6
Basic-and-above					71%	69%	73%	72%	0.6

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 7% in 2006 to 9% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 0.5 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The 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.

³Gap 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 WA-11. Subgroup achievement trends in reading by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.

If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
	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	02-09	66%	72%	0.9		06-09	70%	67%	-1.0		02-09	59%	80%	3.0	
White	02-09	71%	78%	0.9		06-09	74%	71%	-1.0		02-09	65%	84%	2.8	
African American	02-09	49%	57%	1.1	L	06-09	54%	54%	0.3	L	02-09	36%	68%	4.6	L
Latino	02-09	42%	54%	1.7	L	06-09	55%	52%	-0.9	L	02-09	35%	70%	5.0	L
Asian	02-09	71%	78%	1.1	L	06-09	78%	76%	-0.5	L	02-09	62%	85%	3.3	L
Native American	02-09	51%	58%	1.0	L	06-09	56%	49%	-2.4	S	02-09	44%	65%	3.1	L
All tested students	03-09	67%	72%	0.9		06-09	70%	67%	-1.0		03-09	60%	80%	3.3	
Low-income	03-09	52%	59%	1.2	L	06-09	57%	53%	-1.1	S	03-09	43%	69%	4.4	L
All tested students	06-09	81%	72%	-3.0		06-09	70%	67%	-1.0		06-09	82%	80%	-0.5	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	47%	32%	-5.1	S	06-09	21%	17%	-1.4	S	06-09	36%	34%	-0.9	S
All tested students	06-09	81%	72%	-3.0		06-09	70%	67%	-1.0		06-09	82%	80%	-0.5	
English language learners ³	06-09	50%	29%	-6.8	S	06-09	27%	20%	-2.5	S	06-09	35%	35%	0.0	L
Female	02-09	69%	76%	1.0		06-09	75%	73%	-0.7		02-09	67%	84%	2.4	
Male	02-09	63%	68%	0.7	S	06-09	65%	61%	-1.3	S	02-09	53%	76%	3.4	L

Table reads: In 2002, 71% of white 4th graders and 49% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 78% of white 4th graders and 57% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2002 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.9 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.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The 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.

³Gap 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 WA-12. Subgroup achievement trends in mathematics by percentages proficient

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group.

If the average annual gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average annual gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
	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	02-09	52%	52%	0.0		06-09	49%	51%	0.6		02-09	37%	45%	1.1	
White	02-09	57%	59%	0.3		06-09	55%	57%	0.7		02-09	42%	51%	1.3	
African American	02-09	29%	30%	0.2	S	06-09	22%	27%	1.4	L	02-09	13%	21%	1.1	S
Latino	02-09	29%	29%	0.0	S	06-09	26%	29%	0.9	L	02-09	14%	23%	1.3	E
Asian	02-09	59%	63%	0.6	L	06-09	60%	63%	1.0	L	02-09	45%	57%	1.8	L
Native American	02-09	36%	33%	-0.4	S	06-09	30%	31%	0.2	S	02-09	21%	25%	0.5	S
All tested students	03-09	55%	52%	-0.5		06-09	49%	51%	0.6		03-09	39%	45%	1.0	
Low-income	03-09	40%	36%	-0.8	S	06-09	31%	33%	0.7	L	03-09	24%	27%	0.5	S
All tested students	06-09	59%	52%	-2.3		06-09	49%	51%	0.6		06-09	51%	45%	-1.9	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	27%	20%	-2.3	E	06-09	8%	8%	0.0	S	06-09	9%	5%	-1.3	L
All tested students	06-09	59%	52%	-2.3		06-09	49%	51%	0.6		06-09	51%	45%	-1.9	
English language learners ³	06-09	24%	14%	-3.3	S	06-09	10%	11%	0.3	S	06-09	13%	8%	-1.6	L
Female	02-09	52%	53%	0.1		06-09	49%	51%	0.6		02-09	38%	45%	0.9	
Male	02-09	52%	51%	-0.1	S	06-09	48%	50%	0.6	E	02-09	37%	46%	1.2	L

Table reads: In 2002, 57% 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 30% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2002 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.3 percentage points per year for white students and 0.2 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.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The 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.

³Gap 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 WA-13. Achievement gap trends in reading by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		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	02-09	407.3	411.5	0.6		06-09	408.8	406.4	-0.8		02-09	407.7	419.0	1.6	
	SD	02-09	20.2	22.6			06-09	24.7	26.4			02-09	31.6	29.9		
White	MSS	02-09	409.8	414.9	0.7		06-09	411.7	408.9	-1.0		02-09	411.0	422.1	1.6	
	SD	02-09	19.5	22.0			06-09	23.4	25.2			02-09	30.5	28.8		
African American	MSS	02-09	399.5	402.5	0.4	S	06-09	400.1	398.2	-0.6	L	02-09	390.3	406.0	2.2	L
	SD	02-09	19.6	21.1			06-09	24.6	26.6			02-09	31.5	32.1		
Latino	MSS	02-09	395.9	400.9	0.7	E	06-09	400.1	396.7	-1.1	S	02-09	389.1	408.7	2.8	L
	SD	02-09	20.3	20.7			06-09	24.2	27.6			02-09	31.4	29.7		
Asian	MSS	02-09	409.5	416.1	0.9	L	06-09	415.0	412.9	-0.7	L	02-09	409.5	423.6	2.0	L
	SD	02-09	19.7	22.7			06-09	25.2	26.8			02-09	31.4	30.0		
Native American	MSS	02-09	400.3	402.4	0.3	S	06-09	401.5	395.1	-2.1	S	02-09	397.2	407.3	1.4	S
	SD	02-09	19.2	21.4			06-09	24.3	27.8			02-09	31.5	30.0		
All tested students	MSS	07-09	410.1	411.5	0.7		07-09	406.8	406.4	-0.2		07-09	424.7	419.0	-2.8	
	SD	07-09	20.7	22.6			07-09	25.8	26.4			07-09	29.8	29.9		
Low-income	MSS	07-09	402.5	403.3	0.4	S	07-09	397.5	397.5	0.0	L	07-09	412.5	408.5	-2.0	L
	SD	07-09	20.5	21.1			07-09	25.9	27.3			07-09	29.8	30.5		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	413.8	411.5	-0.8		06-09	408.8	406.4	-0.8		06-09	431.7	419.0	-4.2	
	SD	06-09	21.3	22.6			06-09	24.7	26.4			06-09	34.4	29.9		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	396.4	390.1	-2.1	S	06-09	380.6	372.0	-2.9	S	06-09	394.0	383.4	-3.5	L
	SD	06-09	23.5	22.3			06-09	24.7	27.6			06-09	30.4	30.9		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	413.8	411.5	-0.8		06-09	408.8	406.4	-0.8		06-09	431.7	419.0	-4.2	
	SD	06-09	21.3	22.6			06-09	24.7	26.4			06-09	34.4	29.9		
English language learners ³	MSS	06-09	396.2	389.6	-2.2	S	06-09	384.6	374.2	-3.5	S	06-09	389.4	385.5	-1.3	L
	SD	06-09	21.0	16.7			06-09	23.1	26.2			06-09	29.9	27.1		
Female	MSS	02-09	409.6	414.4	0.7		06-09	413.5	411.0	-0.8		02-09	413.8	423.7	1.4	
	SD	02-09	20.3	25.0			06-09	23.9	25.6			02-09	29.9	29.1		
Male	MSS	02-09	405.2	408.8	0.5	S	06-09	405.7	402.0	-1.2	S	02-09	401.8	414.8	1.9	L
	SD	02-09	19.9	22.5			06-09	24.0	26.4			02-09	32.1	30.0		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 409.8 for white students and 399.5 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 414.9 for white students and 402.5 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.7 points for white students and 0.4 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The WASL-Reading is scored on a scale of 225-525.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The 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.

³Gap 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 WA-14. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		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	02-09	400.6	400.9	0.0		06-09	397.0	399.5	0.8		02-09	388.7	388.6	0.0	
	SD	02-09	34.0	42.3			06-09	40.8	41.7			02-09	38.5	38.7		
White	MSS	02-09	405.0	407.7	0.4		06-09	403.3	405.1	0.6		02-09	393.0	393.9	0.1	
	SD	02-09	32.6	40.4			06-09	38.7	40.0			02-09	37.1	37.8		
African American	MSS	02-09	381.4	378.9	-0.4	S	06-09	371.9	376.4	1.5	L	02-09	361.5	366.7	0.7	L
	SD	02-09	32.1	39.0			06-09	37.1	37.5			02-09	34.6	35.4		
Latino	MSS	02-09	382.0	379.0	-0.4	S	06-09	376.7	378.7	0.7	L	02-09	364.4	370.3	0.8	L
	SD	02-09	32.7	38.1			06-09	36.5	37.0			02-09	34.6	33.0		
Asian	MSS	02-09	406.2	413.5	1.1	L	06-09	409.7	413.0	1.1	L	02-09	395.1	397.6	0.4	L
	SD	02-09	34.4	44.9			06-09	42.5	45.5			02-09	40.4	40.9		
Native American	MSS	02-09	388.3	381.6	-1.0	S	06-09	380.6	379.6	-0.3	S	02-09	373.9	370.8	-0.4	S
	SD	02-09	32.5	39.6			06-09	37.0	38.8			02-09	36.2	34.4		
All tested students	MSS	07-09	405.0	400.9	-2.1		07-09	398.3	399.5	0.6		07-09	397.9	388.6	-4.6	
	SD	07-09	41.7	42.3			07-09	42.5	41.7			07-09	39.3	38.7		
Low-income	MSS	07-09	387.7	384.9	-1.4	L	07-09	379.6	382.2	1.3	L	07-09	379.7	372.8	-3.5	L
	SD	07-09	38.8	39.3			07-09	39.9	38.8			07-09	37.9	35.3		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	406.0	400.9	-1.7		06-09	397.0	399.5	0.8		06-09	401.2	388.6	-4.2	
	SD	06-09	37.2	42.3			06-09	40.8	41.7			06-09	37.5	38.7		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	379.0	364.9	-4.7	S	06-09	348.6	347.7	-0.3	S	06-09	357.3	342.8	-4.8	S
	SD	06-09	36.0	41.9			06-09	35.8	36.3			06-09	35.3	31.4		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	406.0	400.9	-1.7		06-09	397.0	399.5	0.8		06-09	401.2	388.6	-4.2	
	SD	06-09	37.2	42.3			06-09	40.8	41.7			06-09	37.5	38.7		
English language learners ³	MSS	06-09	375.8	362.5	-4.4	S	06-09	356.6	354.9	-0.6	S	06-09	361.8	349.9	-4.0	L
	SD	06-09	32.2	34.1			06-09	34.6	35.7			06-09	35.3	30.9		
Female	MSS	02-09	400.8	401.6	0.1		06-09	398.7	400.1	0.5		02-09	389.5	388.6	-0.1	
	SD	02-09	33.8	41.4			06-09	39.0	41.2			02-09	36.9	36.5		
Male	MSS	02-09	400.4	400.2	0.0	S	06-09	397.4	398.9	0.5	E	02-09	388.0	388.7	0.1	L
	SD	02-09	34.1	43.1			06-09	41.6	43.2			02-09	39.9	40.6		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 405.0 for white students and 381.4 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 407.7 for white students and 378.9 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2009, the mean scale score

improved at an average yearly rate of 0.4 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 WASL-Mathematics is scored on a scale of 125-575.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The 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.

³Gap 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 WA-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		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	02-09	75,074	76,516	1.9%	100.0%	06-09	78,175	76,887	-1.6%	100.0%	02-09	69,826	78,296	12.1%	100.0%
	Math	02-09	75,282	76,512	1.6%	100.0%	06-09	77,997	76,912	-1.4%	100.0%	02-09	69,987	77,924	11.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	02-09	53,615	48,365	-9.8%	63.2%	06-09	54,912	50,846	-7.4%	66.1%	02-09	52,261	52,718	0.9%	67.3%
	Math	02-09	53,768	48,349	-10.1%	63.2%	06-09	54,745	50,838	-7.1%	66.1%	02-09	52,401	52,555	0.3%	67.4%
African American	Reading	02-09	4,136	4,373	5.7%	5.7%	06-09	4,278	4,240	-0.9%	5.5%	02-09	3,164	4,242	34.1%	5.4%
	Math	02-09	4,143	4,368	5.4%	5.7%	06-09	4,265	4,235	-0.7%	5.5%	02-09	3,163	4,183	32.2%	5.4%
Latino	Reading	02-09	8,502	12,558	47.7%	16.4%	06-09	9,382	11,191	19.3%	14.6%	02-09	5,382	10,115	87.9%	12.9%
	Math	02-09	8,541	12,557	47.0%	16.4%	06-09	9,402	11,196	19.1%	14.6%	02-09	5,400	9,974	84.7%	12.8%
Asian	Reading	02-09	5,410	6,512	20.4%	8.5%	06-09	6,070	6,562	8.1%	8.5%	02-09	5,362	6,801	26.8%	8.7%
	Math	02-09	5,401	6,531	20.9%	8.5%	06-09	6,064	6,598	8.8%	8.6%	02-09	5,363	6,781	26.4%	8.7%
Native American	Reading	02-09	2,130	2,073	-2.7%	2.7%	06-09	2,245	1,977	-11.9%	2.6%	02-09	1,781	1,942	9.0%	2.5%
	Math	02-09	2,154	2,072	-3.8%	2.7%	06-09	2,236	1,977	-11.6%	2.6%	02-09	1,779	1,930	8.5%	2.5%
Low-income	Reading	07-09	31,603	34,402	8.9%	45.0%	07-09	29,271	29,925	2.2%	38.9%	07-09	25,072	26,191	4.5%	33.5%
	Math	07-09	31,603	34,390	8.8%	44.9%	07-09	29,271	29,923	2.2%	38.9%	07-09	25,072	25,847	3.1%	33.2%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	10,269	10,201	-0.7%	13.3%	06-09	8,925	7,945	-11.0%	10.3%	06-09	7,988	7,058	-11.6%	9.0%
	Math	06-09	10,269	10,198	-0.7%	13.3%	06-09	8,924	7,942	-11.0%	10.3%	06-09	7,988	7,060	-11.6%	9.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	6,555	6,563	0.1%	8.6%	06-09	3,811	3,172	-16.8%	4.1%	06-09	3,461	2,909	-15.9%	3.7%
	Math	06-09	6,555	6,591	0.5%	8.6%	06-09	3,810	3,211	-15.7%	4.2%	06-09	3,461	2,884	-16.7%	3.7%
Female	Reading	02-09	36,348	37,174	2.3%	48.6%	06-09	37,909	37,558	-0.9%	48.8%	02-09	34,579	38,274	10.7%	48.9%
	Math	02-09	36,398	37,169	2.1%	48.6%	06-09	37,779	37,566	-0.6%	48.8%	02-09	34,636	37,966	9.6%	48.7%
Male	Reading	02-09	38,660	39,337	1.8%	51.4%	06-09	40,244	39,319	-2.3%	51.1%	02-09	35,079	39,927	13.8%	51.0%
	Math	02-09	38,821	39,338	1.3%	51.4%	06-09	40,181	39,337	-2.1%	51.1%	02-09	35,180	39,864	13.3%	51.2%

Table reads: In 2002, 53,615 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 48,365 students, a decrease of 9.8%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 63.2% of the 76,516 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.