

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Louisiana

K-12 enrollment — 674,134

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 for State Testing Data. Below the name of the report, click on the link for View State Profiles and Worksheets. Scroll down the page, and click on the Worksheet links for any state.

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary

This year the Center on Education Policy analyzed data on the achievement of different groups of students in two distinct ways. First, we looked at grade 4 test results to determine whether the performance of various groups improved at three achievement levels—basic and above, proficient and above, and advanced. Second, we looked at gaps between these groups at the proficient level across three grades (grade 4, grade 8 in most cases, and a high school grade). These two types of analyses show whether elementary school achievement has generally gone up for different groups of students and whether achievement gaps at different grade levels have narrowed, widened, or stayed the same.

Louisiana test scores show a clear upward trend at all achievement levels. Most achievement gaps are narrowing, with some instances of gaps widening.

Subgroup trends by achievement level at grade 4

- Main trend: In reading, almost all subgroups showed gains in the percentage of students scoring at the basic-and-above, proficient-and-above, and advanced achievement levels. In math, gains were shown across the board—all subgroups and all achievement levels.

Gap trends at three grade levels

- Main trend: Overall, there was improvement in the closing of gaps in the percentages of students scoring at the proficient level between the African American and Latino subgroups and the white subgroup, and between low-income and non-low-income students, at grades 4, 8 and the high school grade analyzed. The majority of percentage proficient and mean scale score (the second achievement measure used for this study) trend lines showed gaps closing in reading and math; Latino-white gaps tended to widen using the mean score measure.

Data notes

- Subgroups analyzed: Trends were analyzed for white, African American, Latino, Asian American and low-income students. The Native American subgroup is too small in Louisiana to yield reliable trend data. Trends for students with disabilities, English language learners, and male and female students have not been summarized because they will be discussed in separate reports.
- Grades analyzed: Analyses of subgroup trends by three achievement levels are limited to one elementary grade because of the massive amounts of data involved and because this is the pilot year of a process that CEP hopes to extend to the middle and high school levels in future years. Analyses of achievement gap trends cover three grade levels: grade 4, grade 8, and the high school grade tested for NCLB.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	1999 through 2008: Grades 4 and 8 2001 through 2008: Grade 10
Years of comparable mean scale score data	1999 through 2008: Grades 4 and 8, 2001 through 2008: Grade 10 Until 2008, statewide standard deviations could not be obtained, so they were imputed using the male and female standard deviations
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	2002 through 2008 Percentage proficient data not available for comparison group of students who are <i>not</i> English language learners, so 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	Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP), grades 4 and 8 Integrated LEAP (ILEAP), grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 Graduation Exit Examination (GEE), grades 10 and 11 LEAP Alternate Assessment, Levels 1 and 2 (LAA 1, LAA 2)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3-11
State labels for achievement levels	LA uses five achievement levels: Unsatisfactory, Approaching Basic, Basic, Mastery, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated

	Approaching Basic as Basic, Basic as Proficient, and Mastery + Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	1999: LEAP 2001: GEE 2006: LEAP
Time of test administration	Spring (LEAP retest opportunities in summer; GEE retest opportunities in summer and fall)
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2003: “Proficient” level of achievement on performance level descriptors changed to “mastery” level (meaning remained the same) 2005–06: School AYP calculations adjusted based on impact of Hurricane Katrina; AYP calculations were performed with and without displaced students, and schools received the higher score. 2005–06: LEAP implemented to assess students in grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 (replacing Iowa Tests of Basic Skills) 2008: Instituted requirement that students must score at or above basic on either the ELA or math test (and at approaching basic on the other test) to be promoted to 5 th and 9 th grades

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the Elementary 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 LA-7. Percentages of Grade 4 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	
All tested students								
Advanced	19%	14%	21%	21%	20%	24%	25%	1.0
Proficient and Above	57%	59%	60%	64%	64%	69%	69%	2.0
Basic and Above	86%	85%	82%	86%	84%	88%	88%	0.3
White								
Advanced	29%	23%	30%	32%	29%	32%	35%	1.0
Proficient and Above	73%	74%	73%	78%	77%	78%	80%	1.2
Basic and Above	93%	93%	89%	94%	92%	92%	94%	0.2
African American								
Advanced	9%	6%	11%	12%	9%	13%	16%	1.2
Proficient and Above	42%	45%	46%	52%	50%	57%	60%	3.0
Basic and Above	79%	77%	73%	79%	76%	82%	84%	0.8
Latino								
Advanced	19%	17%	26%	24%	18%	22%	22%	0.5
Proficient and Above	64%	66%	66%	67%	62%	67%	65%	0.2
Basic and Above	92%	88%	86%	86%	82%	85%	84%	-1.3
Asian								
Advanced	29%	23%	36%	37%	36%	39%	48%	3.2
Proficient and Above	71%	72%	75%	76%	78%	81%	83%	2.0
Basic and Above	93%	91%	91%	90%	93%	94%	95%	0.3
Native American ²								
Advanced	14%	13%	20%	19%	20%	21%	26%	2.0
Proficient and Above	56%	56%	61%	61%	68%	69%	72%	2.7
Basic and Above	87%	86%	64%	86%	86%	90%	91%	0.7

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 29% in 2002 to 35% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 4th graders was 1.0 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

**Table LA-8. Percentage of Grade 4 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	
All tested students								
Advanced	19%	14%	21%	21%	20%	24%	25%	1.0
Proficient and Above	57%	59%	60%	64%	64%	69%	69%	2.0
Basic and Above	86%	85%	82%	86%	84%	88%	88%	0.3
Low-income students								
Advanced	9%	7%	13%	14%	13%	16%	18%	1.5
Proficient and Above	44%	48%	51%	56%	57%	62%	63%	3.2
Basic and Above	80%	80%	77%	82%	81%	85%	85%	0.8
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced	3%	4%	6%	7%	5%	7%	8%	1.5
Proficient and Above	20%	29%	27%	32%	30%	34%	37%	3.5
Basic and Above	54%	59%	51%	59%	55%	62%	64%	4.5
English language learners ³								
Advanced	15%	11%	18%	19%	13%	18%	20%	3.5
Proficient and Above	55%	53%	56%	58%	52%	61%	58%	3.0
Basic and Above	87%	81%	79%	80%	77%	79%	79%	1.0
Female								
Advanced	22%	16%	24%	24%	24%	27%	30%	1.3
Proficient and Above	63%	64%	65%	68%	70%	74%	75%	2.0
Basic and Above	90%	89%	86%	89%	89%	92%	92%	0.3
Male								
Advanced	16%	12%	17%	18%	16%	20%	21%	0.8
Proficient and Above	52%	54%	54%	60%	59%	64%	64%	2.0
Basic and Above	82%	81%	77%	83%	80%	85%	85%	0.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 9% in 2002 to 18% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 4th graders was 1.5 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 2008 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 2006-2008 results.

Table LA-9. Percentages of Grade 4 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	
All tested students								
Advanced	12%	16%	15%	18%	22%	17%	23%	1.8
Proficient and Above	50%	58%	53%	61%	62%	64%	67%	2.8
Basic and Above	75%	81%	76%	82%	83%	84%	85%	1.7
White								
Advanced	21%	27%	26%	28%	33%	26%	34%	2.2
Proficient and Above	69%	76%	73%	77%	77%	79%	81%	2.0
Basic and Above	89%	93%	90%	92%	92%	94%	94%	0.8
African American								
Advanced	5%	5%	5%	8%	10%	7%	11%	1.0
Proficient and Above	34%	40%	36%	47%	47%	47%	53%	3.2
Basic and Above	63%	69%	64%	73%	73%	74%	78%	2.5
Latino								
Advanced	12%	18%	17%	20%	20%	15%	22%	1.7
Proficient and Above	59%	65%	60%	67%	60%	63%	69%	1.7
Basic and Above	82%	86%	83%	85%	80%	83%	86%	0.7
Asian								
Advanced	33%	34%	34%	38%	46%	36%	51%	3.0
Proficient and Above	75%	78%	76%	81%	84%	85%	88%	2.2
Basic and Above	91%	93%	91%	92%	95%	95%	95%	0.7
Native American ²								
Advanced	10%	15%	17%	16%	20%	15%	23%	2.2
Proficient and Above	48%	56%	61%	59%	62%	64%	66%	3.0
Basic and Above	76%	78%	82%	83%	82%	86%	87%	1.8

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 21% in 2002 to 34% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 4th graders was 2.2 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

**Table LA-10. Percentage of Grade 4 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	
All tested students								
Advanced	12%	16%	15%	18%	22%	17%	23%	1.8
Proficient and Above	50%	58%	53%	61%	62%	64%	67%	2.8
Basic and Above	75%	81%	76%	82%	83%	84%	85%	1.7
Low-income students								
Advanced	6%	8%	9%	11%	15%	10%	15%	1.5
Proficient and Above	38%	46%	45%	53%	55%	54%	59%	3.5
Basic and Above	67%	74%	71%	77%	79%	78%	81%	2.3
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced	2%	6%	5%	7%	7%	6%	9%	1.0
Proficient and Above	21%	34%	27%	36%	35%	36%	42%	3.5
Basic and Above	44%	59%	50%	58%	60%	61%	66%	3.0
English language learners ³								
Advanced	16%	17%	15%	21%	20%	17%	23%	1.5
Proficient and Above	60%	58%	55%	64%	59%	62%	67%	4.0
Basic and Above	81%	82%	78%	82%	79%	81%	84%	2.5
Female								
Advanced	12%	16%	15%	16%	22%	17%	23%	1.8
Proficient and Above	51%	58%	54%	60%	63%	64%	68%	2.8
Basic and Above	76%	82%	78%	81%	84%	85%	87%	1.8
Male								
Advanced	13%	16%	16%	18%	22%	17%	23%	1.7
Proficient and Above	51%	57%	53%	61%	61%	63%	67%	2.7
Basic and Above	75%	80%	75%	81%	81%	83%	85%	1.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 6% in 2002 to 15% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 4th graders was 1.5 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 2008 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 2006-2008 results.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)**Table LA-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	02-08	57%	69%	2.0		02-08	48%	57%	1.5		02-08	52%	58%	1.0	
White	02-08	73%	80%	1.2		02-08	65%	71%	1.0		02-08	70%	70%	0.0	
African American	02-08	42%	60%	3.0	L	02-08	30%	42%	2.0	L	02-08	34%	45%	1.8	L
Latino	02-08	64%	65%	0.2	S	02-08	52%	58%	1.0	E	02-08	49%	52%	0.5	L
Asian	02-08	71%	83%	2.0	L	02-08	62%	76%	2.3	L	02-08	58%	69%	1.8	L
Native American	02-08	56%	72%	2.7 ²	L	02-08	43%	61%	3.0 ²	L	02-08	52%	54%	0.3 ²	L
Not low-income	02-08	74%	86%	2.0		02-08	61%	75%	2.3		02-08	62%	71%	1.5	
Low-income	02-08	44%	63%	3.2	L	02-08	34%	46%	2.0	S	02-08	36%	48%	2.0	L
Not disabled	06-08	70%	77%	3.5		06-08	60%	63%	1.5		06-08	67%	62%	-2.5	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	30%	37%	3.5	E	06-08	11%	15%	2.0	L	06-08	15%	15%	0.0	L
All tested students	06-08	64%	69%	2.5		06-08	55%	57%	1.0		06-08	64%	58%	-3.0	
English language learners ³	06-08	52%	58%	3.0	L	06-08	33%	43%	5.0	L	06-08	33%	31%	-1.0	L
Female	02-08	63%	75%	2.0		02-08	54%	62%	1.3		02-08	58%	64%	1.0	
Male	02-08	52%	64%	2.0	E	02-08	42%	52%	1.7	L	02-08	47%	54%	1.2	L

Table reads: In 2002, 73% of white 4th graders and 42% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 80% of white 4th graders and 60% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2002 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at

an average rate of 1.2 percentage point per year for white students and 3.0 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

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 2008 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 LA-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	02-08	50%	67%	2.8		02-08	41%	58%	2.8		02-08	47%	65%	3.0	
White	02-08	69%	81%	2.0		02-08	62%	73%	1.8		02-08	66%	79%	2.2	
African American	02-08	34%	53%	3.2	L	02-08	21%	39%	3.0	L	02-08	26%	48%	3.7	L
Latino	02-08	59%	69%	1.7	S	02-08	46%	56%	1.7	S	02-08	43%	60%	2.8	L
Asian	02-08	75%	88%	2.2	L	02-08	70%	83%	2.2	L	02-08	71%	87%	2.7	L
Native American	02-08	48%	66%	3.0 ²	L	02-08	38%	56%	3.0 ²	L	02-08	50%	64%	2.3 ²	L
Not low-income	02-08	67%	85%	3.0		02-08	53%	75%	3.7		02-08	56%	75%	3.2	
Low-income	02-08	38%	59%	3.5	L	02-08	26%	47%	3.5	S	02-08	31%	55%	4.0	L
Not disabled	06-08	67%	73%	3.0		06-08	57%	62%	2.5		06-08	70%	67%	-1.5	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	35%	42%	3.5	L	06-08	15%	25%	5.0	L	06-08	23%	25%	1.0	L
All tested students	06-08	62%	67%	2.5		06-08	53%	58%	2.5		06-08	66%	65%	-0.5	
English language learners ³	06-08	59%	67%	4.0	L	06-08	43%	48%	2.5	E	06-08	51%	54%	1.5	L
Female	02-08	51%	68%	2.8		02-08	40%	55%	2.5		02-08	45%	64%	3.2	
Male	02-08	51%	67%	2.7	S	02-08	43%	59%	2.7	L	02-08	49%	67%	3.0	S

Table reads: In 2002, 69% of white 4th graders and 34% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 81% of white 4th graders and 53% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2002 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.0 percentage point per year for white students and 3.2 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller 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 2008 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 LA-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.

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	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
All tested students	Mean SS	02-08	307	320	2.2		02-08	309	315	1.0		02-08	298	303	0.8	
	SD	02-08	59	53			02-08	51	46			02-08	46	43		
White	Mean SS	02-08	330	334	0.7		02-08	329	330	0.2		02-08	319	314	-0.8	
	SD	02-08	53	50			02-08	45	39			02-08	40	38		
African American	Mean SS	02-08	286	307	3.5	L	02-08	290	301	1.8	L	02-08	286	289	0.6	L
	SD	02-08	58	51			02-08	52	47			02-08	47	44		
Latino	Mean SS	02-08	316	313	-0.5	S	02-08	314	307	-1.2	S	02-08	300	290	-1.7	S
	SD	02-08	52	60			02-08	51	53			02-08	47	56		
Asian	Mean SS	02-08	328	347	3.2	L	02-08	328	335	1.1	L	02-08	316	317	0.2	L
	SD	02-08	59	57			02-08	55	47			02-08	50	52		
Native American	Mean SS	02-08	302	324	3.8 ²	L	02-08	307	320	2.2 ²	L	02-08	301	302	0.2 ²	L
	SD	02-08	55	46			02-08	49	40			02-08	43	39		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	329	346	2.8		02-08	322	334	2.0		02-08	307	314	1.2	
	SD	02-08	NA	48			02-08	NA	39			02-08	NA	40		
Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	289	310	3.5	L	02-08	294	305	1.8	S	02-08	279	292	2.2	L
	SD	02-08	NA	51			02-08	NA	47			02-08	NA	44		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	320	330	5.0		06-08	322	322	0.0		06-08	313	307	-3.0	
	SD	06-08	52	48			06-08	41	41			06-08	38	40		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	258	277	9.5	L	06-08	251	262	5.5	L	06-08	245	245	0.0	L
	SD	06-08	71	60			06-08	64	58			06-08	62	57		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	311	321	5.0		06-08	314	316	1.0		06-08	309	304	-2.5	
	SD	06-08	60	52			06-08	49	45			06-08	43	43		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	291	303	6.0	L	06-08	280	285	2.5	L	06-08	263	265	1.0	L
	SD	06-08	72	65			06-08	73	67			06-08	70	66		
Female	Mean SS	02-08	315	329	2.4		02-08	319	322	0.5		02-08	311	308	-0.5	
	SD	02-08	57	50			02-08	48	43			02-08	43	42		

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
Male	Mean SS	02-08	299	313	2.3	S	02-08	302	309	1.2	L	02-08	298	296	-0.4	L
	SD	02-08	62	54			02-08	55	48			02-08	48	44		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 330 for white students and 286 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 334 for white students and 307 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.7 points for white students and 3.5 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (grades 4 and 8) and Graduation Exit Examination (grade 10) is scored on a scale of 100-500.

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 2008 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 LA-14. Subgroup Achievement 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.

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	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
All tested students	Mean SS	02-08	313	334	3.5		02-08	309	325	2.7		02-08	297	322	4.2	
	SD	02-08	53	54			02-08	48	41			02-08	53	50		
White	Mean SS	02-08	334	352	3.0		02-08	330	339	1.6		02-08	325	337	2.0	
	SD	02-08	48	50			02-08	39	38			02-08	45	49		
African American	Mean SS	02-08	293	316	3.9	L	02-08	289	310	3.4	L	02-08	282	303	3.6	L
	SD	02-08	50	52			02-08	48	39			02-08	52	42		
Latino	Mean SS	02-08	320	334	2.4	S	02-08	316	322	1.0	S	02-08	303	315	2.0	E
	SD	02-08	46	55			02-08	42	46			02-08	47	49		
Asian	Mean SS	02-08	348	374	4.4	L	02-08	339	354	2.5	L	02-08	340	362	3.7	L
	SD	02-08	56	58			02-08	46	48			02-08	53	67		
Native American	Mean SS	02-08	309	334	4.2 ²	L	02-08	309	327	3.0 ²	L	02-08	310	321	1.9 ²	S
	SD	02-08	50	53			02-08	43	37			02-08	46	43		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	332	362	5.0		02-08	320	342	3.7		02-08	308	337	4.8	
	SD	02-08	NA	51			02-08	NA	40			02-08	NA	52		
Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	298	323	4.2	S	02-08	295	315	3.3	S	02-08	278	309	5.2	L
	SD	02-08	NA	52			02-08	NA	39			02-08	NA	43		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	336	342	3.0		06-08	325	330	2.5		06-08	325	326	0.5	
	SD	06-08	55	52			06-08	39	39			06-08	44	49		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	292	301	4.5	L	06-08	273	289	8.0	L	06-08	270	278	4.0	L
	SD	06-08	59	60			06-08	55	49			06-08	52	45		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	330	334	2.0		06-08	319	325	3.0		06-08	322	323	0.5	
	SD	06-08	58	54			06-08	44	41			06-08	47	50		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	321	331	5.0	L	06-08	308	313	2.5	S	06-08	304	311	3.5	L
	SD	06-08	62	62			06-08	53	53			06-08	57	61		
Female	Mean SS	02-08	314	335	3.6		02-08	310	324	2.4		02-08	306	320	2.3	

		Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
Subgroup	Statistic	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
	SD	02-08	51	53			02-08	45	39			02-08	50	48		
Male	Mean SS	02-08	312	333	3.5	S	02-08	310	326	2.7	L	02-08	308	325	2.8	L
	SD	02-08	55	56			02-08	51	43			02-08	55	51		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 334 for white students and 293 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 352 for white students and 316 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 3.0 points for white students and 3.9 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (grades 4 and 8) and Graduation Exit Examination (grade 10) is scored on a scale of 100-500.

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 2008 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 LA-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	02-08	60,655	54,896	-9.5%	100.0%	02-08	53,485	49,514	-7.4%	100.0%	02-08	48,666	41,891	-13.9%	100.0%
	Math	02-08	60,640	54,889	-9.5%	100.0%	02-08	57,074	49,492	-13.3%	100.0%	02-08	52,798	41,898	-20.6%	100.0%
White	Reading	02-08	27,589	25,785	-6.5%	47.0%	02-08	26,293	23,823	-9.4%	48.1%	02-08	22,964	21,940	-4.5%	52.4%
	Math	02-08	27,580	25,782	-6.5%	47.0%	02-08	26,769	23,818	-11.0%	48.1%	02-08	23,051	21,932	-4.9%	52.3%
African American	Reading	02-08	30,980	26,564	-14.3%	48.4%	02-08	25,227	23,362	-7.4%	47.2%	02-08	16,876	17,823	5.6%	42.5%
	Math	02-08	30,976	26,561	-14.3%	48.4%	02-08	28,265	23,345	-17.4%	47.2%	02-08	17,167	17,837	3.9%	42.6%
Latino	Reading	02-08	943	1,437	52.4%	2.6%	02-08	787	1,279	62.5%	2.6%	02-08	622	1,047	68.3%	2.5%
	Math	02-08	943	1,436	52.3%	2.6%	02-08	805	1,279	58.9%	2.6%	02-08	631	1,047	65.9%	2.5%
Asian	Reading	02-08	658	644	-2.1%	1.2%	02-08	721	652	-9.6%	1.3%	02-08	684	738	7.9%	1.8%
	Math	02-08	656	644	-1.8%	1.2%	02-08	725	652	-10.1%	1.3%	02-08	687	735	7.0%	1.8%
Native American	Reading	02-08	389	443	13.9%	0.8%	02-08	371	380	2.4%	0.8%	02-08	259	286	10.4%	0.7%
	Math	02-08	389	443	13.9%	0.8%	02-08	378	380	0.5%	0.8%	02-08	260	285	9.6%	0.7%
Low-income	Reading	02-08	34,342	38,747	12.8%	70.6%	02-08	23,830	31,253	31.1%	63.1%	02-08	16,541	21,503	30.0%	51.3%
	Math	02-08	34,333	38,741	12.8%	70.6%	02-08	25,848	31,236	20.8%	63.1%	02-08	18,506	21,497	16.2%	51.3%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-08	8,093	7,376	-8.9%	13.4%	06-08	5,553	4,378	-21.2%	8.8%	06-08	2,418	2,452	1.4%	5.9%
	Math	06-08	8,091	7,376	-8.8%	13.4%	06-08	5,816	4,371	-24.8%	8.8%	06-08	2,410	2,446	1.5%	5.8%
English language learners	Reading	06-08	759	1,119	47.4%	2.0%	06-08	429	754	75.8%	1.5%	06-08	298	535	79.5%	1.3%
	Math	06-08	758	1,119	47.6%	2.0%	06-08	434	754	73.7%	1.5%	06-08	295	537	82.0%	1.3%
Female	Reading	02-08	29,242	26,515	-9.3%	48.3%	02-08	26,582	24,665	-7.2%	49.8%	02-08	21,582	21,879	1.4%	52.2%
	Math	02-08	29,236	26,510	-9.3%	48.3%	02-08	28,768	24,665	-14.3%	49.8%	02-08	21,802	21,909	0.5%	52.3%
Male	Reading	02-08	31,329	28,336	-9.6%	51.6%	02-08	26,783	24,785	-7.5%	50.1%	02-08	19,823	19,860	0.2%	47.4%
	Math	02-08	31,320	28,334	-9.5%	51.6%	02-08	28,166	24,763	-12.1%	50.0%	02-08	19,994	19,832	-0.8%	47.3%

Table reads: In 2002, 27,589 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 25,785 students, a decrease of 6.5%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 47.0% of the 54,896 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data.

Key Terms

Percentage proficient (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at and 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 and 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 points 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 ends 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 above 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.