Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Utah

K-12 enrollment — 930,525

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. Utah implemented new standards and cut scores in math so trend data that include 2009 are not available. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Utah showed across-the-board gains in reading at the *basic, proficient,* and *advanced* levels for all racial/ethnic subgroups, low-income students, and boys and girls. Progress was made in narrowing achievement gaps between most subgroups. Comparable data in reading were available for 2004-2009.

- ***Exceptions.*** Gaps in the percentage proficient widened between African American, Asian, and Native American students and white students in reading at grade 4. These gaps also widened between boys and girls at grade 8 and between Asian and white students at grade 10.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	Reading: 2004 through 2009 Math: 2004 through 2008 (new standards and cut scores implemented in 2009)
Years of comparable mean scale score data	Reading: 2004 through 2009 Math: 2004 through 2008 (new standards and cut scores implemented in 2009)

Test Characteristics

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

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	Utah Core CRTs (math, English language arts, science) Utah's Alternate Assessment (UAA) Utah's Academic Language Proficiency Assessment (UALPA) Utah Basic Skills Competency Test (UBSCT) Direct Writing Assessment (DWA)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	English language arts: 3–8, 10 Math: 3–7, and end-of-course tests for grade 8 and high school, taken when students complete the appropriate courses
State labels for achievement levels	UT uses four achievement levels: Minimal, Partial, Sufficient, and Substantial. For our analyses we treated Partial as Basic, Sufficient as Proficient, and Substantial as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2004 (new Math standards and cut scores implemented in 2009)
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	Spring 2003: Four new performance levels established (minimal, partial, sufficient, and substantial), replacing prior levels of mastery and non-mastery 2003–04: Standards reset for all assessments 2007: First administration of UALPA for English language learners 2008: Utah offered the assessment in both online and paper/pencil formats, and districts/schools were free to choose which format they wanted to use.

	Spring 2008: IOWA (NRT) reading test began and administered to all 3rd grade students. 2007/2008: 1st grade English Language Arts and Math CRT were not required and not administered. 2009: New standards and cut scores implemented for Math
Comments	Utah state education department staff identified pre-algebra for middle school and geometry for high school as the most appropriate CRT end-of-course exams to use to represent math achievement.

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 UT-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			48%	52%	51%	58%	58%	61%	2.5
Proficient-and-above			77%	77%	78%	80%	82%	83%	1.1
Basic-and-above			88%	88%	89%	90%	91%	92%	0.7
White									
Advanced			53%	57%	56%	64%	64%	67%	2.7
Proficient-and-above			82%	81%	83%	85%	87%	87%	1.1
Basic-and-above			91%	91%	92%	93%	94%	94%	0.7
African American									
Advanced			25%	28%	33%	38%	34%	39%	2.9
Proficient-and-above			55%	55%	62%	65%	64%	66%	2.3
Basic-and-above			76%	74%	77%	81%	77%	81%	0.9
Latino									
Advanced			20%	23%	24%	29%	31%	34%	2.8
Proficient-and-above			51%	51%	53%	57%	61%	62%	2.3
Basic-and-above			70%	73%	72%	76%	79%	80%	2.0
Asian									
Advanced			48%	56%	55%	61%	63%	68%	3.8
Proficient-and-above			78%	81%	80%	82%	87%	84%	1.2
Basic-and-above			89%	90%	89%	92%	93%	90%	0.1
Native American									
Advanced			19%	20%	23%	28%	27%	34%	3.0
Proficient-and-above			52%	50%	52%	54%	57%	63%	2.3
Basic-and-above			71%	74%	71%	73%	76%	83%	2.3

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 53% in 2004 to 67% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 2.7 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.

Table UT-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			48%	52%	51%	58%	58%	61%	2.5
Proficient-and-above			77%	77%	78%	80%	82%	83%	1.1
Basic-and-above			88%	88%	89%	90%	91%	92%	0.7
Low-income students									
Advanced			31%	36%	34%	41%	40%	44%	2.5
Proficient-and-above			62%	63%	64%	67%	69%	71%	1.7
Basic-and-above			78%	80%	80%	83%	83%	85%	1.4
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced			11%	13%	14%	17%	18%	19%	1.6
Proficient-and-above			33%	33%	35%	32%	44%	44%	2.8
Basic-and-above			54%	57%	57%	63%	66%	67%	3.5
English language learners[3]									
Advanced			19%	23%	24%	27%	47%	9%	-4.8
Proficient-and-above			48%	50%	52%	54%	42%	34%	-5.8
Basic-and-above			68%	71%	71%	73%	84%	62%	-3.1
Female									
Advanced			52%	56%	55%	63%	64%	67%	2.9
Proficient-and-above			81%	80%	82%	84%	86%	87%	1.2
Basic-and-above			90%	91%	92%	93%	93%	94%	0.8
Male									
Advanced			45%	49%	47%	53%	53%	55%	2.1
Proficient-and-above			74%	73%	75%	76%	78%	78%	0.9
Basic-and-above			85%	86%	86%	88%	89%	89%	0.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 31% in 2004 to 44% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 2.5 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 UT-9. Percentages of pre-algebra 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			40%	43%	46%	46%	53%		NA
Proficient-and-above			63%	67%	69%	70%	73%		NA
Basic-and-above			74%	77%	79%	79%	82%		NA
White									
Advanced			45%	48%	52%	51%	59%		NA
Proficient-and-above			68%	71%	74%	75%	78%		NA
Basic-and-above			78%	81%	82%	83%	86%		NA
African American									
Advanced			18%	22%	22%	25%	32%		NA
Proficient-and-above			41%	42%	46%	53%	53%		NA
Basic-and-above			51%	61%	61%	69%	66%		NA
Latino									
Advanced			18%	22%	23%	24%	28%		NA
Proficient-and-above			40%	46%	46%	51%	51%		NA
Basic-and-above			54%	61%	61%	67%	68%		NA
Asian									
Advanced			48%	48%	56%	56%	60%		NA
Proficient-and-above			70%	74%	78%	79%	79%		NA
Basic-and-above			80%	84%	87%	87%	88%		NA
Native American									
Advanced			17%	17%	22%	23%	24%		NA
Proficient-and-above			37%	43%	44%	45%	47%		NA
Basic-and-above			51%	59%	59%	58%	63%		NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 45% in 2004 to 59% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[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 UT-10. Percentage of pre-algebra students by demographic 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			40%	43%	46%	46%	53%		NA
Proficient-and-above			63%	67%	69%	70%	73%		NA
Basic-and-above			74%	77%	79%	79%	82%		NA
Low-income students									
Advanced			27%	30%	33%	34%	37%		NA
Proficient-and-above			50%	54%	56%	60%	59%		NA
Basic-and-above			62%	67%	69%	72%	73%		NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced			7%	8%	9%	10%	14%		NA
Proficient-and-above			17%	20%	21%	24%	28%		NA
Basic-and-above			28%	33%	32%	36%	41%		NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced			19%	21%	24%	24%	39%		NA
Proficient-and-above			40%	45%	48%	51%	61%		NA
Basic-and-above			54%	62%	63%	67%	74%		NA
Female									
Advanced			40%	43%	47%	48%	53%		NA
Proficient-and-above			66%	69%	71%	73%	75%		NA
Basic-and-above			77%	80%	81%	82%	85%		NA
Male									
Advanced			40%	43%	46%	45%	53%		NA
Proficient-and-above			61%	65%	67%	67%	71%		NA
Basic-and-above			71%	75%	76%	77%	80%		NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 27% in 2004 to 37% in 2008. The average annual percentage point gain was not calculated because the trend line ended before 2009.

[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 UT-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 10				
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	04-09	76%	78%	0.5		04-09	77%	83%	1.1		04-09	77%	85%	1.5	
White	04-09	80%	83%	0.5		04-09	82%	87%	1.1		04-09	81%	89%	1.5	
African American	04-09	66%	61%	-0.9	S	04-09	55%	66%	2.3	L	04-09	60%	68%	1.6	L
Latino	04-09	52%	58%	1.2	L	04-09	51%	62%	2.3	L	04-09	47%	66%	3.7	L
Asian	04-09	78%	78%	0.1	S	04-09	78%	84%	1.2	L	04-09	79%	85%	1.2	S
Native American	04-09	53%	55%	0.3	S	04-09	52%	63%	2.3	L	04-09	49%	68%	3.7	L
Not low-income	04-09	84%	85%	0.4		04-09	85%	88%	0.8		04-09	83%	90%	1.3	
Low-income	04-09	64%	67%	0.6	L	04-09	62%	71%	1.7	L	04-09	61%	73%	2.5	L
Not disabled	06-09	85%	83%	-0.7		06-09	84%	87%	1.3		06-09	82%	89%	2.5	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	50%	52%	0.7	L	06-09	35%	44%	2.8	L	06-09	32%	45%	4.3	L
Not ELLs	06-09	83%	82%	-0.4		06-09	82%	86%	1.3		06-09	80%	88%	2.5	
English language learners[3]	06-09	56%	39%	-5.5	S	06-09	52%	34%	-5.8	S	06-09	47%	31%	-5.3	S
Female	04-09	80%	81%	0.3		04-09	81%	87%	1.2		04-09	82%	88%	1.3	
Male	04-09	72%	75%	0.6	L	04-09	74%	78%	0.9	S	04-09	73%	82%	1.8	L

Table reads: In 2004, 80% of white 4th graders and 66% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 83% of white 4th graders and 61% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2004 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.5 percentage points per year for white students and declined at an average rate of 0.9 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

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

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

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

Table UT-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					Pre-Algebra					Geometry				
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	04-08	74%	75%	NA		04-08	63%	73%	NA		04-08	63%	68%	NA	
White	04-08	78%	80%	NA		04-08	68%	78%	NA		04-08	66%	73%	NA	
African American	04-08	57%	51%	NA	NA	04-08	41%	53%	NA	NA	04-08	34%	48%	NA	NA
Latino	04-08	53%	53%	NA	NA	04-08	40%	51%	NA	NA	04-08	36%	41%	NA	NA
Asian	04-08	81%	81%	NA	NA	04-08	70%	79%	NA	NA	04-08	67%	74%	NA	NA
Native American	04-08	52%	53%	NA	NA	04-08	37%	47%	NA	NA	04-08	33%	41%	NA	NA
Not low-income	04-08	81%	82%	NA		04-08	72%	79%	NA		04-08	67%	72%	NA	
Low-income	04-08	62%	63%	NA	NA	04-08	50%	59%	NA	NA	04-08	50%	55%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	81%	79%	NA		06-08	77%	79%	NA		06-08	69%	69%	NA	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-08	50%	49%	NA	NA	06-08	21%	28%	NA	NA	06-08	56%	59%	NA	NA
Not ELLS	06-08	79%	78%	NA		06-08	72%	76%	NA		06-08	71%	71%	NA	
English language learners[3]	06-08	56%	45%	NA	NA	06-08	48%	61%	NA	NA	06-08	41%	58%	NA	NA
Female	04-08	74%	75%	NA		04-08	66%	75%	NA		04-08	60%	66%	NA	
Male	04-08	73%	75%	NA	NA	04-08	61%	71%	NA	NA	04-08	66%	70%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2004, 78% of white 4th graders and 57% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 80% of white 4th graders and 51% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Average annual percentage point gains were not calculated because the trend lines ended before 2009.

[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 UT-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 10				
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	04-09	166	167	0.2		04-09	167	169	0.4		04-09	166	169	0.6	
	SD	04-09	11.2	NA			04-09	11.1	NA			04-09	11.7	NA		
White	MSS	04-09	167	168	0.2		04-09	168	170	0.4		04-09	167	170	0.6	
	SD	04-09	10.8	NA			04-09	10.7	NA			04-09	11.2	NA		
African American	MSS	04-09	162	162	0.0	S	04-09	161	163	0.4	E	04-09	159	163	0.8	L
	SD	04-09	11.0	NA			04-09	10.5	NA			04-09	12.0	NA		
Latino	MSS	04-09	159	161	0.4	L	04-09	159	162	0.6	L	04-09	157	162	1.0	L
	SD	04-09	11.0	NA			04-09	10.6	NA			04-09	11.9	NA		
Asian	MSS	04-09	167	168	0.2	E	04-09	168	171	0.6	L	04-09	167	169	0.4	S
	SD	04-09	11.3	NA			04-09	11.7	NA			04-09	11.7	NA		
Native American	MSS	04-09	160	160	0.0	S	04-09	160	162	0.4	E	04-09	158	163	1.0	L
	SD	04-09	11.0	NA			04-09	10.9	NA			04-09	11.8	NA		
Not low-income	MSS	04-09	168	169	0.2		04-09	169	171	0.4		04-09	168	171	0.6	
	SD	04-09	10.5	NA			04-09	10.4	NA			04-09	10.9	NA		
Low-income	MSS	04-09	162	163	0.2	E	04-09	162	165	0.6	L	04-09	161	164	0.6	E
	SD	04-09	11.3	NA			04-09	11.1	NA			04-09	10.3	NA		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	169	168	-0.3		06-09	169	170	0.3		06-09	169	170	0.3	
	SD	06-09	9.6	NA			06-09	9.7	NA			06-09	9.8	NA		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	159	159	0.0	L	06-09	155	157	0.7	L	06-09	155	157	0.7	L
	SD	06-09	10.8	NA			06-09	9.5	NA			06-09	9.1	NA		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-09	168	168	0.0		06-09	168	170	0.7		06-09	169	170	0.3	
	SD	06-09	10.0	NA			06-09	10.0	NA			06-09	10.2	NA		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	161	157	-1.3	S	06-09	160	156	-1.3	S	06-09	160	154	-2.0	S
	SD	06-09	10.5	NA			06-09	10.6	NA			06-09	10.6	NA		
Female	MSS	04-09	167	168	0.2		04-09	168	170	0.4		04-09	168	170	0.4	
	SD	04-09	11.1	NA			04-09	10.7	NA			04-09	11.4	NA		
Male	MSS	04-09	165	166	0.2	E	04-09	166	167	0.2	S	04-09	165	168	0.6	L
	SD	04-09	11.2	NA			04-09	11.4	NA			04-09	11.9	NA		

Table reads: In 2004, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 167 for white students and 162 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 162.7 for white students and 161.1 for African American students. Between 2004 and 2009, the mean scale score declined at an average yearly rate of 0.9 points for white students and 0.2 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Utah Core CRTs are scored on a scale of 100-200.

[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 UT-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					Pre-Algebra					Geometry				
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	04-08	165	166	NA		04-08	163	166	NA		04-08	162	163	NA	
	SD	04-08	11.3	12.9			04-08	11.6	12.6			04-08	11.7	13.4		
White	MSS	04-08	167	168	NA		04-08	164	167	NA		04-08	163	164	NA	
	SD	04-08	11.0	12.3			04-08	11.3	12.2			04-08	11.3	12.8		
African American	MSS	04-08	160	157	NA	NA	04-08	156	159	NA	NA	04-08	153	155	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	11.0	14.0			04-08	11.2	13.0			04-08	11.9	12.6		
Latino	MSS	04-08	159	159	NA	NA	04-08	157	159	NA	NA	04-08	154	154	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	10.8	12.5			04-08	11.1	11.9			04-08	11.9	13.4		
Asian	MSS	04-08	168	169	NA	NA	04-08	164	167	NA	NA	04-08	164	165	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	11.4	13.6			04-08	11.1	11.5			04-08	12.6	14.4		
Native American	MSS	04-08	160	158	NA	NA	04-08	157	158	NA	NA	04-08	156	154	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	11.4	12.6			04-08	11.7	12.4			04-08	12.2	12.5		
Not low-income	MSS	04-08	167	168	NA		04-08	165	168	NA		04-08	163	164	NA	
	SD	04-08	10.8	12.1			04-08	10.9	11.9			04-08	11.2	12.9		
Low-income	MSS	04-08	162	162	NA	NA	04-08	159	161	NA	NA	04-08	158	158	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	11.4	13.0			04-08	11.7	12.8			04-08	12.7	13.7		
Not disabled	MSS	06-08	169	167	NA		06-08	167	167	NA		06-08	165	163	NA	
	SD	06-08	11.1	12.2			06-08	9.5	11.6			06-08	10.7	13.2		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-08	160	157	NA	NA	06-08	156	154	NA	NA	06-08	156	153	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	12.0	13.6			06-08	9.3	12.6			06-08	10.5	13.0		
Not ELLs	MSS	06-08	169	167	NA		06-08	166	166	NA		06-08	165	163	NA	
	SD	06-08	11.5	12.5			06-08	10.0	12.4			06-08	10.5	13.1		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-08	162	157	NA	NA	06-08	160	157	NA	NA	06-08	158	152	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	11.3	12.2			06-08	10.0	11.3			06-08	11.6	13.3		
Female	MSS	04-08	165	166	NA		04-08	163	166	NA		04-08	161	162	NA	
	SD	04-08	11.2	12.5			04-08	11.0	12.0			04-08	11.4	13.1		
Male	MSS	04-08	165	166	NA	NA	04-08	163	165	NA	NA	04-08	163	163	NA	NA
	SD	04-08	11.5	13.1			04-08	12.1	13.1			04-08	12.0	13.6		

Table reads: In 2004, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 167 for white students and 160 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 168 for white students and 157 for African American students. Average annual mean scale score gains were not calculated

because the trend lines ended before 2009.

Note: The Utah Core CRTs are scored on a scale of 100-200.

[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 UT-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8 Reading/Pre-Algebra					Grade 10 Reading/Geometry				
		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	04-09	35,043	43,478	24.1%	100.0%	04-09	35,660	38,961	9.3%	100.0%	04-09	34,773	35,970	3.4%	100.0%
	Math	04-08	34,426	42,766	24.2%	100.0%	04-08	38,173	42,276	10.7%	100.0%	04-08	29,463	34,146	15.9%	100.0%
White	Reading	04-09	28,618	34,023	18.9%	78.3%	04-09	29,839	30,874	3.5%	79.2%	04-09	29,603	28,850	-2.5%	80.2%
	Math	04-08	28,131	33,564	19.3%	78.5%	04-08	30,924	32,996	6.7%	78.0%	04-08	25,595	28,111	9.8%	82.3%
African American	Reading	04-09	498	677	35.9%	1.6%	04-09	373	585	56.8%	1.5%	04-09	347	500	44.1%	1.4%
	Math	04-08	490	605	23.5%	1.4%	04-08	509	627	23.2%	1.5%	04-08	262	412	57.3%	1.2%
Latino	Reading	04-09	4,392	6,483	47.6%	14.9%	04-09	3,798	5,457	43.7%	14.0%	04-09	3,147	4,592	45.9%	12.8%
	Math	04-08	4,301	6,376	48.2%	14.9%	04-08	4,916	6,528	32.8%	15.4%	04-08	2,236	3,789	69.5%	11.1%
Asian	Reading	04-09	551	740	34.3%	1.7%	04-09	609	672	10.3%	1.7%	04-09	648	760	17.3%	2.1%
	Math	04-08	535	741	38.5%	1.7%	04-08	548	582	6.2%	1.4%	04-08	557	673	20.8%	2.0%
Native American	Reading	04-09	427	598	40.0%	1.4%	04-09	460	589	28.0%	1.5%	04-09	468	562	20.1%	1.6%
	Math	04-08	422	596	41.2%	1.4%	04-08	595	735	23.5%	1.7%	04-08	276	531	92.4%	1.6%
Low-income	Reading	04-09	13,215	16,516	25.0%	38.0%	04-09	11,465	12,762	11.3%	32.8%	04-09	9,102	9,932	9.1%	27.6%
	Math	04-08	12,981	15,891	22.4%	37.2%	04-08	14,196	14,032	-1.2%	33.2%	04-08	6,666	8,062	20.9%	23.6%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	5,324	6,346	19.2%	14.6%	06-09	3,535	4,278	21.0%	11.0%	06-09	2,819	3,379	19.9%	9.4%
	Math	06-08	5,269	5,770	9.5%	13.5%	06-08	5,208	5,568	6.9%	13.2%	06-08	901	1,397	55.0%	4.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	4,608	3,673	-20.3%	8.4%	06-09	3,888	2,244	-42.3%	5.8%	06-09	3,015	1,582	-47.5%	4.4%
	Math	06-08	4,644	3,972	-14.5%	9.3%	06-08	4,885	3,304	-32.4%	7.8%	06-08	2,446	1,543	-36.9%	4.5%
Female	Reading	04-09	17,115	21,156	23.6%	48.7%	04-09	17,232	19,069	10.7%	48.9%	04-09	17,004	17,404	2.4%	48.4%
	Math	04-08	16,834	20,940	24.4%	49.0%	04-08	18,400	20,393	10.8%	48.2%	04-08	14,641	16,829	14.9%	49.3%
Male	Reading	04-09	17,928	22,322	24.5%	51.3%	04-09	18,428	19,892	7.9%	51.1%	04-09	17,769	18,566	4.5%	51.6%
	Math	04-08	17,592	21,826	24.1%	51.0%	04-08	19,773	21,883	10.7%	51.8%	04-08	14,822	17,317	16.8%	50.7%

Table reads: In 2004, 28,618 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had risen to 34,023 students, an increase of 18.9%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 78.3% of the 43,478 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.