

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New York

K-12 enrollment — 2,654,786

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.

In grade 4 math, a clear trend of rising performance was apparent for subgroups at three achievement levels, but in reading, trends were mixed. Progress in narrowing gaps was more evident in math than in reading.

Subgroup trends by achievement level at grade 4

- **Reading:** In reading, trends were mixed across three achievement levels—basic-and-above, proficient-and-above, and advanced. There were somewhat more gains than declines and several instances of subgroups showing no net change. Of the 18 trend lines analyzed across the three achievement levels in reading, 8 showed gains, 5 showed declines, and 5 showed no net change. Most of the flat or declining trends occurred at the advanced level.
- **Math:** In math, all but one of the 18 trend lines analyzed across the three achievement levels showed gains (nearly all of them moderate-to-large). The exception occurred for Asian students in math, where performance at the basic-and-above level showed no net change.
- **Notable subgroups:** In reading, trends for low-income students were flat or declining at all three achievement levels. In math, African American and Latino students made notable large gains at the proficient-and-above level.

Gap trends at two grade levels

- **General:** Progress in narrowing gaps was more evident in math than in reading for African American, Latino, Native American, and low-income students. In math, a majority of the trend lines analyzed showed evidence of gaps narrowing at grades 4 and 8, according to both

the percentage of student scoring proficient and average (mean) test scores. (High school trends were not available.) In reading, gap trends were mixed; there were several instances of gaps narrowing but a roughly equal number of instances where gaps widened or stayed the same.

- Performance of specific subgroups: Gaps between Native American and white students narrowed in reading and math at grades 4 and 8, according to both percentages proficient and average test scores. The low-income subgroup showed no evidence of gaps narrowing on either measure.
- Asian subgroup performance: Asian students had higher percentages proficient than white students in both subjects and grade levels. However, white students progressed at a faster rate in all cases, so the white-Asian gap narrowed.

Data notes

- Limited data: Trends are limited to 2006–2008 for grades 4 and 8. High school trends were not analyzed because data from New York's end-of-course high school tests are not report for a single class of students in a particular year.
- Subgroups analyzed: Trends were analyzed for white, African American, Latino, Native American, Asian American, and low-income students. 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 grades 4 and 8.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data

2006 through 2008, grades 3 through 8
High school data have not been reported for reasons explained in the test characteristics section below.

Years of comparable mean scale score data

2006-2008; grades 3 through 8
High school data have not been reported for reasons explained in the test characteristics section below.
no standard deviations available

Test Characteristics

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

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics (grades 3–8) NYS Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) Regents Examinations (RE) in English and mathematics (high school end-of-course exams, grades tested vary)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	Reading: 3–8, 10–12 Math: 3–8, 9–12
State labels for achievement levels	NY uses four achievement levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. For our analyses we treated Level 2 as Basic, Level 3 as Proficient, and Level 4 as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	1998–99: Regents Examination in English 2003–04: Regents Examination in math 2005–06: NYSTP for grades 3–8
Time of test administration	Once per year in grades 3–8: January for ELA and March for mathematics Three times per year for Regents Examinations: January, June, and August
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2005–06: New NYSTP tests introduced 2006: Students in grades 3–8 were assessed in ELA and mathematics. Prior to that, grades 4 and 8 were assessed, but NYSED advised that 2006 tests were not comparable to previous years.
Comments	New York reports its high school end-of-course results by cohort, defined as a group of entering 9 th graders. These high school data are not suitable for this study. The data include scores from students in a cohort who have taken the tests at different points during high school and may include multiple scores from students who have taken the tests more than once. The state does not use a student identification system so the data cannot be reported for a single class in a single year.

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the 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 NY-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					9%	8%	8%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					69%	68%	71%	1.0
Basic and Above					91%	92%	92%	0.5
White								
Advanced					11%	12%	11%	0.0
Proficient and Above					77%	79%	80%	1.5
Basic and Above					94%	96%	95%	0.5
African American								
Advanced					4%	3%	3%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					52%	51%	56%	2.0
Basic and Above					85%	87%	88%	1.5
Latino								
Advanced					4%	3%	3%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					55%	51%	57%	1.0
Basic and Above					86%	86%	88%	1.0
Asian								
Advanced					16%	14%	15%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					83%	80%	83%	0.0
Basic and Above					98%	96%	96%	-1.0
Native American								
Advanced					4%	4%	4%	0.0
Proficient and Above					55%	54%	61%	3.0
Basic and Above					83%	88%	88%	2.5

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test was 11% in 2006 and 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 4th graders was 0.0 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 NY-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					9%	8%	8%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					69%	68%	71%	1.0
Basic and Above					91%	92%	92%	0.5
Low-income students								
Advanced					4%	3%	4%	0.0
Proficient and Above					59%	55%	59%	0.0
Basic and Above					90%	88%	89%	-0.5
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced					1%	1%	1%	0.0
Proficient and Above					26%	28%	31%	2.5
Basic and Above					62%	67%	70%	4.0
English language learners ³								
Advanced					1%	0%	0%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					27%	23%	31%	2.0
Basic and Above					66%	69%	76%	5.0
Female								
Advanced					11%	10%	11%	0.0
Proficient and Above					72%	71%	75%	1.5
Basic and Above					93%	94%	94%	0.5
Male								
Advanced					7%	6%	6%	-0.5
Proficient and Above					65%	65%	67%	1.0
Basic and Above					90%	90%	90%	0.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test was 4% in 2006 and 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 4th graders was 0.0 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.

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 NY-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					26%	28%	29%	1.5
Proficient and Above					78%	80%	83%	2.5
Basic and Above					93%	95%	94%	0.5
White								
Advanced					32%	34%	36%	2.0
Proficient and Above					86%	88%	90%	2.0
Basic and Above					96%	97%	97%	0.5
African American								
Advanced					12%	13%	15%	1.5
Proficient and Above					62%	65%	72%	5.0
Basic and Above					86%	89%	91%	2.5
Latino								
Advanced					15%	17%	18%	1.5
Proficient and Above					67%	70%	77%	5.0
Basic and Above					88%	91%	93%	2.5
Asian								
Advanced					49%	52%	55%	3.0
Proficient and Above					92%	93%	94%	1.0
Basic and Above					98%	97%	98%	0.0
Native American								
Advanced					14%	15%	19%	2.5
Proficient and Above					69%	70%	78%	4.5
Basic and Above					88%	91%	93%	2.5

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 32% in 2006 to 36% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 4th graders was 2.0 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 NY-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					26%	28%	29%	1.5
Proficient and Above					78%	80%	83%	2.5
Basic and Above					93%	95%	94%	0.5
Low-income students								
Advanced					18%	17%	20%	1.0
Proficient and Above					71%	69%	77%	3.0
Basic and Above					91%	91%	93%	1.0
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced					6%	6%	7%	0.5
Proficient and Above					45%	47%	54%	4.5
Basic and Above					72%	75%	80%	4.0
English language learners ³								
Advanced					7%	8%	9%	1.0
Proficient and Above					50%	54%	64%	7.0
Basic and Above					78%	82%	88%	5.0
Female								
Advanced					25%	26%	28%	1.5
Proficient and Above					78%	80%	84%	3.0
Basic and Above					94%	95%	96%	1.0
Male								
Advanced					27%	29%	30%	1.5
Proficient and Above					78%	80%	83%	2.5
Basic and Above					92%	93%	94%	1.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 18% in 2006 to 20% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 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.

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 NY-11. Subgroup Achievement Trends in Reading by Percentages Proficient

NOTE: L = Larger gain than comparison group. S = Smaller gain than comparison group. E = Equal gain to comparison group.

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

	Grade 4					Grade 8					High School				
Subgroup	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group
All tested students	06-08	69%	71%	1.0		06-08	49%	56%	3.5		NA	NA	NA	NA	
White	06-08	77%	80%	1.5		06-08	61%	68%	3.5		NA	NA	NA	NA	
African American	06-08	52%	56%	2.0	L	06-08	28%	38%	5.0	L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino	06-08	55%	57%	1.0	S	06-08	31%	38%	3.5	E	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	06-08	83%	83%	0.0	S	06-08	67%	70%	1.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American	06-08	55%	61%	3.0	L	06-08	34%	42%	4.0	L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-08	75%	84%	4.5		06-08	59%	71%	6.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Low-income	06-08	59%	59%	0.0	S	06-08	36%	39%	1.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	76%	79%	1.5		06-08	56%	64%	4.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	26%	31%	2.5	L	06-08	11%	13%	1.0	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not ELL	06-08	69%	74%	2.5		06-08	50%	58%	4.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
English language learners ³	06-08	27%	31%	2.0	S	06-08	5%	6%	0.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	06-08	72%	75%	1.5		06-08	55%	63%	4.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Male	06-08	65%	67%	1.0	S	06-08	44%	50%	3.0	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 77% of white 4th graders and 52% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 80% of white 4th graders and 56% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.5 percentage point per year for white students and 2.0 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 NY-12. Subgroup Achievement Trends in Mathematics by Percentages Proficient

NOTE: L = Larger gain than comparison group. S = Smaller gain than comparison group. E = Equal gain to comparison group.

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

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					High School				
	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group
All tested students	06-08	78%	83%	2.5		06-08	54%	70%	8.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
White	06-08	86%	90%	2.0		06-08	68%	80%	6.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
African American	06-08	62%	72%	5.0	L	06-08	28%	49%	10.5	L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino	06-08	67%	77%	5.0	L	06-08	33%	55%	11.0	L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	06-08	92%	94%	1.0	S	06-08	77%	88%	5.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American	06-08	69%	78%	4.5	L	06-08	41%	61%	10.0	L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not low-income	06-08	83%	92%	4.5		06-08	64%	81%	8.5		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Low-income	06-08	71%	77%	3.0	S	06-08	39%	56%	8.5	E	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	84%	90%	3.0		06-08	60%	77%	8.5		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	45%	54%	4.5	L	06-08	17%	32%	7.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Not ELL	06-08	80%	85%	2.5		06-08	56%	72%	8.0		NA	NA	NA	NA	
English language learners ³	06-08	50%	64%	7.0	L	06-08	23%	28%	2.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	06-08	78%	84%	3.0		06-08	55%	72%	8.5		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Male	06-08	78%	83%	2.5	S	06-08	53%	68%	7.5	S	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 86% of white 4th graders and 62% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 90% of white 4th graders and 72% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2006 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.0 percentage point per year for white students and 5.0 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.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

Table NY-13. Achievement Gap Trends in Reading by Mean Scale Scores

NOTE: L = Larger gain than comparison group. S = Smaller gain than comparison group. E = Equal gain to comparison group.

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					High School				
		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	06-08	666.0	666	0.0		06-08	650.0	657	3.5		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
White	Mean SS	06-08	674.0	676	1.0		06-08	661.0	667	3.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
African American	Mean SS	06-08	649.0	651	1.0	E	06-08	631.0	642	5.5	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Latino	Mean SS	06-08	653.0	651	-1.0	S	06-08	634.0	641	3.5	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Asian	Mean SS	06-08	682.0	680	-1.0	S	06-08	666.0	668	1.0	S	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Native American	Mean SS	06-08	651.0	655	2.0	L	06-08	636.0	644	4.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	672.0	677.0	2.5		06-08	658.0	666.0	4.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	656.0	653	-1.5	S	06-08	639.0	643	2.0	S	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	673.0	674.0	0.5		06-08	657.0	663.0	3.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	622.0	626	2.0	L	06-08	609.0	621	6.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	666.0	670.0	2.0		06-08	651.0	660.0	4.5		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	625.0	630	2.5	L	06-08	602.0	609	3.5	S	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Female	Mean SS	06-08	670.0	673.0	1.5		06-08	656.0	664.0	4.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		

		Grade 4					Grade 8					High School				
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	06-08	661.0	662.0	0.5	S	06-08	645.0	652.0	3.5	S	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 674.0 for white students and 649.0 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 676 for white students and 651 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 1.0 points for white students and for African American students, indicating no change in the achievement gap for African Americans.

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 NY-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					High School				
		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	06-08	677.0	683	3.0		06-08	652.0	666	7.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
White	Mean SS	06-08	685.0	690	2.5		06-08	663.0	675	6.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
African American	Mean SS	06-08	659.0	667	4.0	L	06-08	629.0	647	9.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Latino	Mean SS	06-08	663.0	672	4.5	L	06-08	634.0	652	9.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Asian	Mean SS	06-08	700.0	707	3.5	L	06-08	678.0	692	7.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Native American	Mean SS	06-08	664.0	672	4.0	L	06-08	640.0	654	7.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	683.0	690.0	3.5		06-08	659.0	674.0	7.5		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	668.0	673	2.5	S	06-08	641.0	654	6.5	S	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	683.0	688.0	2.5		06-08	658.0	672.0	7.0		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	640.0	650	5.0	L	06-08	614.0	630	8.0	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	679.0	685.0	3.0		06-08	653.0	668.0	7.5		06-08	NA	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	647.0	658	5.5	L	06-08	621.0	640	9.5	L	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Female	Mean SS	06-08	676.0	683.0	3.5		06-08	653.0	668.0	7.5		06-08	NA	NA	NA	

		Grade 4					Grade 8					High School				
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	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Male	Mean SS	06-08	677.0	683.0	3.0	S	06-08	650.0	664.0	7.0	S	06-08	NA	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 685.0 for white students and 659.0 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 690 for white students and 667 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 2.5 points for white students and 4.0 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

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 NY-15. Numbers of Test-Takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					High School				
		Year Span	# of Test-Takers Start Year	# of Test-Takers End Year	Change in # of Test-Takers Over Time	% of Test-Takers in Subgroup in End Year	Year Span	# of Test-Takers Start Year	# of Test-Takers End Year	Change in # of Test-Takers Over Time	% of Test-Takers in Subgroup in End Year	Year Span	# of Test-Takers Start Year	# of Test-Takers End Year	Change in # of Test-Takers Over Time	% of Test-Takers in Subgroup in End Year
All tested students	Reading	06-08	190,822	196,834	3.2%	100.0%	06-08	212,196	209,146	-1.4%	100.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	202,393	198,505	-1.9%	100.0%	06-08	219,025	210,589	-3.9%	100.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	Reading	06-08	105,960	102,219	-3.5%	51.9%	06-08	118,069	112,143	-5.0%	53.6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	106,883	102,268	-4.3%	51.5%	06-08	118,550	111,953	-5.6%	53.2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
African American	Reading	06-08	37,758	37,961	0.5%	19.3%	06-08	42,996	40,479	-5.9%	19.4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	38,472	38,156	-0.8%	19.2%	06-08	43,283	40,529	-6.4%	19.2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latino	Reading	06-08	33,495	41,193	23.0%	20.9%	06-08	37,605	41,020	9.1%	19.6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	41,536	42,154	1.5%	21.2%	06-08	42,082	42,026	-0.1%	20.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian	Reading	06-08	12,710	14,294	12.5%	7.3%	06-08	12,481	14,335	14.9%	6.9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	14,585	14,749	1.1%	7.4%	06-08	14,032	14,910	6.3%	7.1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Native American	Reading	06-08	894	931	4.1%	0.5%	06-08	1,043	1,043	0.0%	0.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	913	929	1.8%	0.5%	06-08	1,076	1,044	-3.0%	0.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Low-income	Reading	06-08	79,465	99,515	25.2%	50.6%	06-08	85,565	96,120	12.3%	46.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	87,726	100,968	15.1%	50.9%	06-08	91,206	97,541	6.9%	46.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-08	27,841	31,917	14.6%	16.2%	06-08	30,066	32,329	7.5%	15.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	29,618	31,964	7.9%	16.1%	06-08	30,033	32,124	7.0%	15.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English language learners	Reading	06-08	3,597	14,628	306.7%	7.4%	06-08	5,015	9,081	81.1%	4.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	14,579	16,383	12.4%	8.3%	06-08	11,971	11,028	-7.9%	5.2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	Reading	06-08	93,335	107,069	14.7%	54.4%	06-08	103,717	112,375	8.3%	53.7%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	98,544	107,898	9.5%	54.4%	06-08	107,013	112,814	5.4%	53.6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	Reading	06-08	97,487	109,809	12.6%	55.8%	06-08	108,479	116,091	7.0%	55.5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Math	06-08	103,849	110,681	6.6%	55.8%	06-08	112,012	116,706	4.2%	55.4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 105,960 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 102,219 students, a decrease of 3.5%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 51.9% of the 196,834 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.