Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Texas

K-12 enrollment — 4,728,204

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), Texas showed across-the-board gains—improvements in reading and math 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 in math but was mixed in reading. Comparable data were available for 2005-2009.

- ***Mixed gap trends.*** In math across three grade levels, the majority of gaps narrowed using percentages proficient and mean (average) test scores. In reading gaps mostly narrowed using percentages proficient but widened between Native American and whites students as well as between low-income and non-low-income students in the 4th and 10th grades using average (mean) test scores

- ***Gaps widen between boys and girls in reading.*** The gap in the percentage proficient widened between boys and girls in reading at grades 4 and 8. The same trends were apparent according to average (mean) test scores.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2005 through 2009
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2005 through 2009
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	In 2007, students who were not English language learners (ELLs) were further categorized as non-ELL monitored first year; non-ELL monitored second year; and other non-ELL. Because of the lack of a single non-ELL comparison group, the ELL subgroup is compared with all 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	Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), English and Spanish versions Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (Accommodated) for students with disabilities who meet criteria for being tested with accommodations Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills–Modified (TAKS-M) for certain students with disabilities Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills–Alternate (TAKS-Alt) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities Linguistically Accommodated Testing for Mathematics (LAT) for recent immigrant English language learners (ELLs) Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) to measure growth in reading for certain ELLs
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 10
State labels for achievement levels	TX uses three achievement levels: Did Not Meet Standard, Met Standard, and Commended Performance. For our analyses we treated Met Standard as Proficient and Commended Performance as Advanced. No TX achievement level was treated as our Basic.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	2003 for TAKS; Baseline year for comparable data 2005
Time of test administration	Spring

Major changes in testing system (2002–present)

2002 through 2005: State phased in higher passing standards for TAKS grades 3–11. In 2003, the passing standard was 2 standard errors of measurement (SEM) below the panel-recommended standard; in 2004, it was 1 SEM below the panel-recommended standard; and in 2005, it was fully phased in.
2004: Added following alternative assessments and English proficiency tests to AYP determinations: SDAA II, LDAA, RPTE, and LAT
2008: SDAA II, LDAA, and RPTE no longer administered; Implemented TAKS-Modified, TAKS-Alternate, TELPAS.

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 TX-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				37%	36%	42%	51%	48%	2.8
Proficient-and-above				83%	83%	89%	92%	93%	2.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White									
Advanced				53%	51%	57%	65%	60%	1.8
Proficient-and-above				92%	93%	95%	96%	96%	1.0
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
African American									
Advanced				25%	23%	31%	37%	39%	3.5
Proficient-and-above				78%	76%	84%	87%	90%	3.0
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced				24%	24%	31%	41%	39%	3.8
Proficient-and-above				75%	76%	84%	89%	90%	3.8
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced				50%	54%	61%	71%	69%	4.8
Proficient-and-above				91%	93%	96%	97%	98%	1.8
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American									
Advanced				42%	38%	46%	52%	49%	1.8
Proficient-and-above				86%	86%	90%	94%	94%	2.0
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 53% in 2005 to 60% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 1.8 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 TX-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic 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				37%	36%	42%	51%	48%	2.8
Proficient-and-above				83%	83%	89%	92%	93%	2.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced				23%	23%	29%	37%	36%	3.3
Proficient-and-above				75%	75%	83%	88%	89%	3.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				14%	12%	17%	12%	13%	0.3
Proficient-and-above				61%	63%	73%	60%	67%	1.3
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced				3%	2%	5%	8%	9%	2.3
Proficient-and-above				30%	32%	49%	58%	63%	10.3
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced				38%	38%	45%	54%	52%	3.5
Proficient-and-above				84%	85%	90%	93%	94%	2.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced				36%	33%	39%	48%	44%	2.0
Proficient-and-above				82%	82%	87%	90%	91%	2.3
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 23% in 2005 to 36% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 3.3 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

[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 TX-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				15%	15%	17%	21%	24%	2.3
Proficient-and-above				61%	67%	71%	75%	79%	4.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White									
Advanced				22%	23%	26%	31%	33%	2.8
Proficient-and-above				75%	80%	83%	85%	88%	3.3
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
African American									
Advanced				6%	6%	7%	9%	12%	1.5
Proficient-and-above				44%	50%	58%	61%	66%	5.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino									
Advanced				9%	9%	11%	14%	18%	2.3
Proficient-and-above				50%	58%	64%	69%	74%	6.0
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian									
Advanced				40%	42%	47%	52%	57%	4.3
Proficient-and-above				86%	90%	92%	93%	94%	2.0
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American									
Advanced				15%	15%	16%	19%	24%	2.3
Proficient-and-above				61%	69%	74%	78%	79%	4.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 22% in 2005 to 33% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th graders was 2.8 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 TX-10. Percentage of grade 8 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				15%	15%	17%	21%	24%	2.3
Proficient-and-above				61%	67%	71%	75%	79%	4.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced				7%	8%	9%	12%	16%	2.3
Proficient-and-above				48%	56%	62%	66%	71%	5.8
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with disabilities[3]									
Advanced				3%	3%	4%	3%	5%	0.7
Proficient-and-above				31%	40%	46%	30%	44%	1.3
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English language learners[3]									
Advanced				2%	2%	2%	5%	6%	1.3
Proficient-and-above				22%	29%	36%	41%	50%	7.0
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female									
Advanced				14%	14%	16%	20%	24%	2.5
Proficient-and-above				61%	67%	71%	75%	79%	4.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male									
Advanced				15%	16%	18%	22%	25%	2.5
Proficient-and-above				61%	67%	72%	75%	79%	4.5
Basic-and-above				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 7% in 2005 to 16% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 2.3 percentage points per year.

[1]Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

[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 TX-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	05-09	79%	84%	1.3		05-09	83%	93%	2.5		05-09	67%	88%	5.3	
White	05-09	88%	92%	1.0		05-09	92%	96%	1.0		05-09	76%	93%	4.3	
African American	05-09	69%	76%	1.8	L	05-09	78%	90%	3.0	L	05-09	58%	83%	6.3	L
Latino	05-09	73%	80%	1.8	L	05-09	75%	90%	3.8	L	05-09	59%	84%	6.3	L
Asian	05-09	91%	95%	1.0	E	05-09	91%	98%	1.8	L	05-09	80%	95%	3.8	S
Native American	05-09	83%	86%	0.8	S	05-09	86%	94%	2.0	L	05-09	71%	91%	5.0	L
Not low-income	05-09	89%	92%	0.8		05-09	91%	97%	1.5		05-09	74%	92%	4.5	
Low-income	05-09	71%	78%	1.8	L	05-09	75%	89%	3.5	L	05-09	57%	82%	6.3	L
Not disabled	06-09	83%	86%	1.0		06-09	84%	94%	3.3		06-09	86%	90%	1.3	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	74%	61%	-4.3	S	06-09	63%	67%	1.3	S	06-09	55%	48%	-2.3	S
All tested students	06-09	82%	84%	0.7		06-09	83%	93%	3.3		06-09	85%	88%	1.0	
English language learners[3]	06-09	63%	73%	3.3	L	06-09	32%	63%	10.3	L	06-09	32%	45%	4.3	L
Female	05-09	81%	87%	1.5		05-09	84%	94%	2.5		05-09	74%	91%	4.3	
Male	05-09	78%	82%	1.0	S	05-09	82%	91%	2.3	S	05-09	60%	84%	6.0	L

Table reads: In 2005, 88% of white 4th graders and 69% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 92% of white 4th graders and 76% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.0 percentage points per year for white students and 1.8 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 TX-12. Subgroup achievement trends in mathematics by percentages proficient

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

	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 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	05-09	81%	86%	1.3		05-09	61%	79%	4.5		05-09	58%	65%	1.8	
White	05-09	90%	92%	0.5		05-09	75%	88%	3.3		05-09	73%	77%	1.0	
African American	05-09	67%	77%	2.5	L	05-09	44%	66%	5.5	L	05-09	38%	49%	2.8	L
Latino	05-09	76%	84%	2.0	L	05-09	50%	74%	6.0	L	05-09	45%	58%	3.3	L
Asian	05-09	95%	97%	0.5	E	05-09	86%	94%	2.0	S	05-09	83%	89%	1.5	L
Native American	05-09	84%	86%	0.5	E	05-09	61%	79%	4.5	L	05-09	64%	70%	1.5	L
Not low-income	05-09	90%	93%	0.8		05-09	73%	87%	3.5		05-09	68%	74%	1.5	
Low-income	05-09	74%	81%	1.8	L	05-09	48%	71%	5.8	L	05-09	43%	55%	3.0	L
Not disabled	06-09	84%	87%	1.0		06-09	68%	81%	4.3		06-09	62%	68%	2.0	
Students with disabilities[3]	06-09	78%	65%	-4.3	S	06-09	40%	44%	1.3	S	06-09	28%	21%	-2.3	S
All tested students	06-09	83%	86%	1.0		06-09	67%	79%	4.0		06-09	60%	65%	1.7	
English language learners[3]	06-09	72%	81%	3.0	L	06-09	29%	50%	7.0	L	06-09	23%	31%	2.7	L
Female	05-09	80%	86%	1.5		05-09	61%	79%	4.5		05-09	57%	66%	2.3	
Male	05-09	82%	86%	1.0	S	05-09	61%	79%	4.5	E	05-09	60%	65%	1.3	S

Table reads: In 2005, 90% of white 4th graders and 67% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 92% of white 4th graders and 77% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2005 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 0.5 percentage points per year for white students and 2.5 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 TX-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	05-09	2235	2264	7.3		05-09	2288	2368	20.0		05-09	2187	2246	14.8	
	SD	05-09	177.2	182.5			05-09	216.6	205.1			05-09	118.7	137.9		
White	MSS	05-09	2289	2322	8.3		05-09	2369	2425	14.0		05-09	2225	2286	15.3	
	SD	05-09	170.9	175.6			05-09	200.4	191.6			05-09	115.2	132.2		
African American	MSS	05-09	2176	2204	7.0	S	05-09	2232	2328	24.0	L	05-09	2149	2210	15.3	E
	SD	05-09	169.1	173.8			05-09	202.1	200.3			05-09	103.8	130.2		
Latino	MSS	05-09	2196	2227	7.8	S	05-09	2221	2327	26.5	L	05-09	2152	2215	15.8	L
	SD	05-09	168.5	174.4			05-09	209.2	204.1			05-09	112.2	131.5		
Asian	MSS	05-09	2324	2366	10.5	L	05-09	2358	2474	29.0	L	05-09	2244	2329	21.3	L
	SD	05-09	171.0	176.3			05-09	202.2	192.4			05-09	130.4	151.9		
Native American	MSS	05-09	2244	2275	7.8	S	05-09	2310	2376	16.5	L	05-09	2203	2258	13.8	S
	SD	05-09	171.3	177.0			05-09	209.8	199.7			05-09	116.1	128.6		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	2293	2329	9.0		05-09	2357	2427	17.5		05-09	2215	2281	16.5	
	SD	05-09	170.5	174.7			05-09	202.8	191.4			05-09	118.1	135.5		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	2184	2212	7.0	S	05-09	2216	2314	24.5	L	05-09	2145	2205	15.0	S
	SD	05-09	167.0	171.8			05-09	206.9	202.0			05-09	108.3	129.2		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	2229	2271	14.0		06-09	2298	2383	28.3		06-09	2235	2257	7.3	
	SD	06-09	153.4	179.8			06-09	215.2	197.5			06-09	132.0	132.7		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	2187	2145	-14.0	S	06-09	2147	2160	4.3	S	06-09	2116	2091	-8.3	S
	SD	06-09	155.4	185.6			06-09	200.2	198.6			06-09	113.2	121.9		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	2227	2264	12.3		06-09	2292	2368	25.3		06-09	2229	2246	5.7	
	SD	06-09	154.1	182.5			06-09	216.8	205.1			06-09	133.6	137.9		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	2136	2178	14.0	L	06-09	2020	2132	37.3	L	06-09	2052	2079	9.0	L
	SD	06-09	140.3	162.8			06-09	163.0	183.9			06-09	102.1	109.8		
Female	MSS	05-09	2244	2280	9.0		05-09	2296	2391	23.8		05-09	2206	2265	14.8	
	SD	05-09	174.8	181.1			05-09	214.2	201.4			05-09	118.8	135.4		
Male	MSS	05-09	2226	2247	5.3	S	05-09	2280	2346	16.5	S	05-09	2168	2228	15.0	L
	SD	05-09	179.1	182.4			05-09	218.8	206.1			05-09	116.8	137.6		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 2289 for white students and 2176 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 2322 for white students and 2204 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 8.3 points for white students and 7.0 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The TAKS is scored using linear transformations of the Rasch Partial Credit Model with proficiency estimates. Scales vary from grade to grade such that cutoffs are aligned: Met – 2100 and Commended – 2400. Standard scale scores range from approximately 1000-3200.

[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 TX-14. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

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

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 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	05-09	2256	2312	14.0		05-09	2156	2241	21.3		05-09	2139	2182	10.8	
	SD	05-09	194.1	211.2			05-09	192.5	198.5			05-09	176.7	193.8		
White	MSS	05-09	2316	2365	12.3		05-09	2221	2297	19.0		05-09	2199	2239	10.0	
	SD	05-09	186.5	202.5			05-09	188.3	193.5			05-09	173.4	192.7		
African American	MSS	05-09	2169	2232	15.8	L	05-09	2079	2163	21.0	L	05-09	2058	2103	11.3	L
	SD	05-09	180.0	203.6			05-09	166.5	177.2			05-09	144.3	163.9		
Latino	MSS	05-09	2218	2282	16.0	L	05-09	2106	2206	25.0	L	05-09	2085	2141	14.0	L
	SD	05-09	183.0	205.2			05-09	175.5	186.8			05-09	155.5	176.5		
Asian	MSS	05-09	2391	2462	17.8	L	05-09	2315	2416	25.3	L	05-09	2283	2355	18.0	L
	SD	05-09	190.0	191.4			05-09	210.8	216.6			05-09	203.3	217.5		
Native American	MSS	05-09	2273	2310	9.3	S	05-09	2160	2240	20.0	L	05-09	2152	2198	11.5	L
	SD	05-09	193.9	210.2			05-09	179.8	188.6			05-09	163.0	186.5		
Not low-income	MSS	05-09	2318	2376	14.5		05-09	2214	2297	20.8		05-09	2181	2227	11.5	
	SD	05-09	189.8	201.9			05-09	193.7	199.5			05-09	179.4	198.3		
Low-income	MSS	05-09	2202	2262	15.0	L	05-09	2096	2189	23.3	L	05-09	2076	2127	12.8	L
	SD	05-09	181.3	204.5			05-09	171.9	183.0			05-09	152.4	172.9		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	2271	2320	16.3		06-09	2190	2251	20.3		06-09	2165	2193	9.3	
	SD	06-09	191.8	208.0			06-09	192.7	195.9			06-09	182.7	191.0		
Students with disabilities[3]	MSS	06-09	2220	2176	-14.7	S	06-09	2068	2072	1.3	S	06-09	2032	1994	-12.7	S
	SD	06-09	187.1	214.5			06-09	162.1	159.7			06-09	139.0	138.8		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	2268	2312	14.7		06-09	2185	2241	18.7		06-09	2159	2182	7.7	
	SD	06-09	192.1	211.2			06-09	193.1	198.5			06-09	183.1	193.8		
English language learners[3]	MSS	06-09	2186	2255	23.0	L	06-09	2029	2096	22.3	L	06-09	2014	2036	7.3	S
	SD	06-09	175.5	202.0			06-09	149.6	164.6			06-09	130.7	148.9		
Female	MSS	05-09	2249	2311	15.5		05-09	2155	2239	21.0		05-09	2130	2181	12.8	
	SD	05-09	193.1	209.8			05-09	190.4	197.4			05-09	169.5	188.1		
Male	MSS	05-09	2262	2312	12.5	S	05-09	2157	2243	21.5	L	05-09	2148	2183	8.8	S
	SD	05-09	194.9	212.5			05-09	194.7	199.6			05-09	183.5	199.2		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 2316 for white students and 2169 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 2365 for white students and 2232 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2009, the mean scale score improved

at an average yearly rate of 12.3 points for white students and 15.8 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The TAKS is scored using linear transformations of the Rasch Partial Credit Model with proficiency estimates. Scales vary from grade to grade such that cutoffs are aligned: Met – 2100 and Commended – 2400. Standard scale scores range from approximately 1000-3200.

[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 TX-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	05-09	273,508	318,128	16.3%	100.0%	05-09	291,845	319,826	9.6%	100.0%	05-09	270,825	299,127	10.5%	100.0%
	Math	05-09	278,466	323,665	16.2%	100.0%	05-09	291,433	317,831	9.1%	100.0%	05-09	266,419	293,402	10.1%	100.0%
White	Reading	05-09	109,123	115,393	5.7%	36.3%	05-09	120,588	116,413	-3.5%	36.4%	05-09	118,940	115,772	-2.7%	38.7%
	Math	05-09	110,406	115,763	4.9%	35.8%	05-09	119,833	115,587	-3.5%	36.4%	05-09	117,385	113,904	-3.0%	38.8%
African American	Reading	05-09	38,833	45,359	16.8%	14.3%	05-09	40,754	45,087	10.6%	14.1%	05-09	37,090	43,334	16.8%	14.5%
	Math	05-09	39,340	45,424	15.5%	14.0%	05-09	40,572	44,563	9.8%	14.0%	05-09	36,347	42,127	15.9%	14.4%
Latino	Reading	05-09	114,902	144,032	25.4%	45.3%	05-09	120,378	145,802	21.1%	45.6%	05-09	104,090	127,555	22.5%	42.6%
	Math	05-09	117,929	149,071	26.4%	46.1%	05-09	120,883	145,087	20.0%	45.6%	05-09	101,952	124,846	22.5%	42.6%
Asian	Reading	05-09	9,217	11,954	29.7%	3.8%	05-09	8,854	11,234	26.9%	3.5%	05-09	9,471	11,214	18.4%	3.7%
	Math	05-09	9,327	12,011	28.8%	3.7%	05-09	8,893	11,281	26.9%	3.5%	05-09	9,469	11,241	18.7%	3.8%
Native American	Reading	05-09	1,038	1,163	12.0%	0.4%	05-09	955	1,209	26.6%	0.4%	05-09	886	1,113	25.6%	0.4%
	Math	05-09	1,054	1,175	11.5%	0.4%	05-09	939	1,196	27.4%	0.4%	05-09	859	1,086	26.4%	0.4%
Low-income	Reading	05-09	145,599	177,599	22.0%	55.8%	05-09	141,873	166,508	17.4%	52.1%	05-09	109,031	135,701	24.5%	45.4%
	Math	05-09	149,297	182,619	22.3%	56.4%	05-09	142,074	165,151	16.2%	52.0%	05-09	106,327	132,114	24.3%	45.0%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	11,452	18,087	57.9%	5.7%	06-09	11,998	20,768	73.1%	6.5%	06-09	12,771	18,276	43.1%	6.1%
	Math	06-09	12,203	18,877	54.7%	5.8%	06-09	10,408	18,703	79.7%	5.9%	06-09	10,191	15,471	51.8%	5.3%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	29,775	50,572	69.8%	15.9%	06-09	16,389	19,254	17.5%	6.0%	06-09	12,190	15,212	24.8%	5.1%
	Math	06-09	32,323	55,317	71.1%	17.1%	06-09	16,738	19,306	15.3%	6.1%	06-09	12,048	14,966	24.2%	5.1%
Female	Reading	05-09	137,265	157,924	15.1%	49.6%	05-09	146,774	158,613	8.1%	49.6%	05-09	136,529	148,932	9.1%	49.8%
	Math	05-09	138,670	160,227	15.5%	49.5%	05-09	146,272	157,457	7.6%	49.5%	05-09	134,371	146,302	8.9%	49.9%
Male	Reading	05-09	136,020	159,919	17.6%	50.3%	05-09	144,878	161,110	11.2%	50.4%	05-09	134,140	150,077	11.9%	50.2%
	Math	05-09	139,563	163,150	16.9%	50.4%	05-09	144,970	160,227	10.5%	50.4%	05-09	131,830	146,924	11.4%	50.1%

Table reads: In 2005, 109,123 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had risen to 115,393 students, an increase of 5.7%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 36.3% of the 318,128 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.