

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — California

K-12 enrollment — 6,252,031

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 Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), California students made gains across the board in reading at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels for racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls. In math, there were some declines at the basic achievement level. In terms of percentages proficient, achievement gaps between racial/ethnic subgroups, low income and non-low income students, and boys and girls (in reading) narrowed almost across the board. However, this was not confirmed by the mean (average) score measure. Comparable data were available from 2004 through 2009.

- **Some exceptions.** At the basic achievement level for grade 8, there were slight declines shown in math for most subgroups, reflecting a decline for students overall. The achievement gap between boys and girls in reading at grade 4 widened.
- **Mixed picture using means.** Using mean (average) scores, there was a mixed picture of progress in closing achievement gaps. Many gaps widened, particularly at grades 4 and 8.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2004 through 2009
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2004 through 2009
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	<p>Data not available for students who are <i>not</i> low-income until 2006 for grades 4 and 8</p> <p>Percentage proficient data for students who are <i>not</i> English language learners (ELLs) not available until 2008, so the subgroup of ELLs is compared with all tested students in the state</p> <p>Mean scale score data for comparison groups of students who are <i>not</i> disabled and students who are <i>not</i> ELLs not available until 2008 for grade 10, so the subgroups of students with disabilities and ELLs are compared with all tested students in the state</p> <p>Numbers of tested students not available for subgroup of students with disabilities until 2007 for grade 4 math and Algebra I</p>

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	<p>California Standards Tests (CSTs):</p> <p>California English-Language Arts Standard Test, grades 2-8, including writing assessment at grades 4 and 7</p> <p>California Mathematics Standard Test, grades 2-7</p> <p>Grade 8 course-specific tests: General Mathematics, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, and Integrated Mathematics 1, 2, or 3</p> <p>California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)</p> <p>California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)</p>
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	CST grades 2-8, CAHSEE grade 10
State labels for achievement levels	CA uses five achievement levels: Far Below Basic (CST only), Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Below Basic + Basic as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	2004

Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	2003: CST revised to target <i>only</i> CA content standards 2006: New science tests added for grades 8 and 10 2008: CSTs: expanded to include testing in ELA in grades 2-11; math in grades 2-9; science in grades 5, 8, and 10; and history/social science in grades 8 and 11
Comments	Although the Algebra I end-of-course tests are used to determine achievement trends in grade 8 math, as the state recommended, students may take various math tests in grade 8. Approximately half of these students take the Algebra I test.

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 CA-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			11%	15%	18%	16%	18%	22%	2.2
Proficient-and-above			33%	39%	41%	41%	45%	48%	3.0
Basic-and-above			88%	90%	90%	88%	89%	91%	0.6
White									
Advanced			20%	26%	32%	29%	30%	36%	3.2
Proficient-and-above			51%	58%	62%	62%	63%	66%	3.0
Basic-and-above			95%	95%	96%	95%	94%	95%	0.0
African American									
Advanced			4%	6%	8%	7%	9%	12%	1.6
Proficient-and-above			19%	24%	27%	27%	32%	34%	3.0
Basic-and-above			80%	84%	86%	83%	84%	86%	1.2
Latino									
Advanced			4%	5%	7%	7%	8%	11%	1.4
Proficient-and-above			18%	23%	25%	26%	31%	34%	3.2
Basic-and-above			83%	85%	86%	84%	86%	88%	1.0
Asian									
Advanced			25%	29%	35%	34%	39%	45%	4.0
Proficient-and-above			53%	58%	62%	64%	69%	72%	3.8
Basic-and-above			94%	94%	95%	96%	96%	97%	0.6
Native American									
Advanced			7%	11%	15%	13%	13%	17%	2.0
Proficient-and-above			27%	35%	37%	37%	39%	42%	3.0
Basic-and-above			86%	89%	89%	87%	88%	89%	0.6

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 20% in 2004 to 36% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 3.2 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 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table CA-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year							Average yearly percentage point gain ¹	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008		2009
All tested students									
Advanced			11%	15%	18%	16%	18%	22%	2.2
Proficient-and-above			33%	39%	41%	41%	45%	48%	3.0
Basic-and-above			88%	90%	90%	88%	89%	91%	0.6
Low-income students									
Advanced			4%	5%	7%	7%	8%	11%	1.4
Proficient-and-above			18%	22%	25%	26%	30%	33%	3.0
Basic-and-above			82%	85%	86%	84%	84%	86%	0.8
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced			2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	5%	0.7
Proficient-and-above			6%	8%	9%	10%	11%	15%	2.0
Basic-and-above			54%	61%	63%	60%	60%	66%	1.0
English language learners ³									
Advanced			0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0.0
Proficient-and-above			3%	6%	6%	6%	8%	8%	0.7
Basic-and-above			70%	75%	75%	71%	73%	74%	-0.3
Female									
Advanced			13%	16%	20%	19%	21%	25%	2.4
Proficient-and-above			37%	42%	45%	46%	50%	52%	3.0
Basic-and-above			91%	92%	93%	92%	93%	94%	0.6
Male									
Advanced			10%	13%	16%	14%	16%	20%	2.0
Proficient-and-above			29%	34%	37%	37%	41%	44%	3.0
Basic-and-above			84%	86%	88%	85%	87%	89%	1.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 4% in 2004 to 11% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 1.4 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2009 results.

Table CA-9. Percentages of Algebra I students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced			8%	8%	12%	9%	13%	15%	1.4
Proficient-and-above			35%	34%	40%	38%	42%	44%	1.8
Basic-and-above			92%	90%	89%	90%	93%	91%	-0.2
White									
Advanced			10%	11%	17%	13%	18%	20%	2.0
Proficient-and-above			47%	49%	55%	52%	54%	56%	1.8
Basic-and-above			97%	96%	95%	95%	97%	95%	-0.4
African American									
Advanced			1%	2%	4%	3%	5%	6%	1.0
Proficient-and-above			14%	14%	21%	20%	24%	26%	2.4
Basic-and-above			83%	81%	81%	83%	85%	82%	-0.2
Latino									
Advanced			2%	2%	5%	4%	6%	8%	1.2
Proficient-and-above			17%	18%	25%	25%	29%	33%	3.2
Basic-and-above			86%	84%	84%	87%	90%	89%	0.6
Asian									
Advanced			23%	26%	34%	28%	36%	40%	3.4
Proficient-and-above			64%	67%	72%	69%	72%	74%	2.0
Basic-and-above			98%	99%	98%	98%	98%	97%	-0.2
Native American									
Advanced			3%	4%	7%	6%	7%	8%	1.0
Proficient-and-above			26%	27%	30%	31%	30%	34%	1.6
Basic-and-above			91%	90%	86%	88%	90%	88%	-0.6

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 10% in 2004 to 20% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th 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 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table CA-10. Percentage of Algebra I 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			8%	8%	12%	9%	13%	15%	1.4
Proficient-and-above			35%	34%	40%	38%	42%	44%	1.8
Basic-and-above			92%	90%	89%	90%	93%	91%	-0.2
Low-income students									
Advanced			3%	3%	6%	4%	7%	9%	1.2
Proficient-and-above			19%	19%	26%	25%	30%	33%	2.8
Basic-and-above			87%	84%	84%	87%	90%	87%	0.0
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced			2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	0.3
Proficient-and-above			12%	10%	13%	14%	16%	16%	1.0
Basic-and-above			70%	67%	62%	70%	73%	68%	2.0
English language learners ³									
Advanced			2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	0.3
Proficient-and-above			10%	9%	13%	13%	15%	18%	1.7
Basic-and-above			79%	75%	72%	77%	80%	77%	1.7
Female									
Advanced			7%	7%	12%	9%	13%	15%	1.6
Proficient-and-above			34%	33%	41%	39%	42%	45%	2.2
Basic-and-above			92%	90%	91%	92%	94%	91%	-0.2
Male									
Advanced			8%	9%	13%	10%	14%	15%	1.4
Proficient-and-above			35%	35%	41%	39%	42%	43%	1.6
Basic-and-above			91%	89%	89%	91%	92%	90%	-0.2

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 3% in 2004 to 9% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 1.2 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 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2009 results.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

Table CA-11. Subgroup achievement trends in reading by percentages proficient

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

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

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	04-09	39%	61%	4.4		04-09	33%	48%	3.0		04-09	49%	52%	0.5	
White	04-09	59%	78%	3.8		04-09	51%	66%	3.0		04-09	68%	71%	0.6	
African American	04-09	27%	50%	4.6	L	04-09	19%	34%	3.0	E	04-09	32%	37%	0.9	L
Latino	04-09	25%	49%	4.8	L	04-09	18%	34%	3.2	L	04-09	31%	37%	1.2	L
Asian	04-09	63%	82%	3.8	E	04-09	53%	72%	3.8	L	04-09	64%	70%	1.3	L
Native American	04-09	35%	54%	3.8	E	04-09	27%	42%	3.0	E	04-09	44%	48%	0.9	L
Not low-income	06-09	70%	80%	3.3		06-09	58%	65%	2.3		04-09	62%	69%	1.4	
Low-income	06-09	35%	48%	4.3	L	06-09	25%	33%	2.7	L	04-09	29%	36%	1.4	E
Not disabled	06-09	53%	63%	3.3		06-09	45%	51%	2.0		06-09	54%	55%	0.3	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	20%	37%	5.7	L	06-09	9%	15%	2.0	E	06-09	11%	13%	0.5	L
All tested students	06-09	49%	61%	4.0		06-09	41%	48%	2.3		06-09	50%	52%	0.5	
English language learners ³	06-09	24%	34%	3.3	S	06-09	6%	8%	0.7	S	06-09	9%	9%	-0.2	S
Female	04-09	43%	65%	4.4		04-09	37%	52%	3.0		04-09	54%	57%	0.5	
Male	04-09	36%	57%	4.2	S	04-09	29%	44%	3.0	E	04-09	44%	47%	0.6	L

Table reads: In 2004, 59% of white 4th graders and 27% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 78% of white 4th graders and 50% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2004 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 3.8 percentage points per year for white students and 4.6 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table CA-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					Algebra I					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	04-09	45%	66%	4.2		04-09	35%	44%	1.8		04-09	45%	54%	1.7	
White	04-09	61%	78%	3.4		04-09	47%	56%	1.8		04-09	62%	69%	1.4	
African American	04-09	28%	51%	4.6	L	04-09	14%	26%	2.4	L	04-09	23%	33%	1.9	L
Latino	04-09	33%	56%	4.6	L	04-09	17%	33%	3.2	L	04-09	27%	40%	2.6	L
Asian	04-09	74%	88%	2.8	S	04-09	64%	74%	2.0	L	04-09	71%	83%	2.3	L
Native American	04-09	38%	58%	4.0	L	04-09	26%	34%	1.6	S	04-09	39%	46%	1.4	E
Not low-income	06-09	71%	80%	3.0		06-09	53%	54%	0.3		04-09	57%	68%	2.3	
Low-income	06-09	42%	56%	4.7	L	06-09	26%	33%	2.3	L	04-09	28%	41%	2.5	L
Not disabled	06-09	58%	67%	3.0		06-09	42%	46%	1.3		06-09	50%	57%	2.2	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	25%	43%	6.0	L	06-09	13%	16%	1.0	S	06-09	11%	15%	1.3	S
All tested students	06-09	54%	66%	4.0		06-09	40%	44%	1.3		06-09	47%	54%	2.2	
English language learners ³	06-09	36%	47%	3.7	S	06-09	13%	18%	1.7	L	06-09	16%	20%	1.4	S
Female	04-09	45%	66%	4.2		04-09	34%	45%	2.2		04-09	44%	52%	1.6	
Male	04-09	45%	66%	4.2	E	04-09	35%	43%	1.6	S	04-09	46%	55%	1.8	L

Table reads: In 2004, 61% of white 4th graders and 28% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 78% of white 4th graders and 51% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2004 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 3.4 percentage points per year for white students and 4.6 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

Table CA-13. Achievement gap trends in reading by mean scale scores

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

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain, MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain, MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain, MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	04-09	338.5	366.7	5.6		04-09	328.1	348.4	4.1		04-09	376	380	0.8	
	SD	04-09	52	59.5			04-09	52	60.9			04-09	39	37.6		
White	MSS	04-09	362.3	391.9	5.9		04-09	349.5	373.6	4.8		04-09	393	396	0.6	
	SD	04-09	51	56.8			04-09	50	59.7			04-09	NA	34.4		
African American	MSS	04-09	323.6	349.4	5.2	S	04-09	308.8	328.4	3.9	S	04-09	361	367	1.2	L
	SD	04-09	47	55.1			04-09	46	54.5			04-09	NA	35.8		
Latino	MSS	04-09	320.2	347.7	5.5	S	04-09	309.3	328.4	3.8	S	04-09	360	368	1.6	L
	SD	04-09	45	52.9			04-09	44	52.7			04-09	NA	34.5		
Asian	MSS	04-09	369.1	403.1	6.8	L	04-09	354.8	385.5	6.1	L	04-09	392	398	1.2	L
	SD	04-09	55	61.6			04-09	55	64.0			04-09	NA	37.5		
Native American	MSS	04-09	333.3	354.3	4.2	S	04-09	322.2	339.1	3.4	S	04-09	372	377	1.0	L
	SD	04-09	48	55.3			04-09	48	57.1			04-09	NA	36.9		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	378.7	394.8	5.4		06-09	360.6	373.0	4.1		06-09	392	395	1.0	
	SD	06-09	NA	56.8			06-09	NA	60.4			06-09	NA	34.7		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	330.2	346.8	5.5	L	06-09	318.3	327.8	3.2	S	06-09	362	367	1.7	L
	SD	06-09	51	53.0			06-09	48	53.1			06-09	NA	34.7		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	350.9	366.7	5.3		06-09	339.2	348.4	3.1		06-09	378	380	0.7	
	SD	06-09	59	59.5			06-09	56	60.9			06-09	39	37.6		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	309.4	332.0	7.5	L	06-09	287.5	296.6	3.0	S	06-09	336	340	1.3	L
	SD	06-09	57	61.5			06-09	44	52.0			06-09	NA	33.8		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	350.9	366.7	5.3		06-09	339.2	348.4	3.1		06-09	378	380	0.7	
	SD	06-09	59	59.5			06-09	56	60.9			06-09	39	37.6		
English language learners ³	MSS	06-09	316.4	329.4	4.3	S	06-09	290.6	292.7	0.7	S	06-09	339	342	1.0	L
	SD	06-09	46	47.1			06-09	36	38.8			06-09	NA	27.7		
Female	MSS	04-09	343.5	372.1	5.7		04-09	335.3	355.8	4.1		04-09	382	385	0.6	
	SD	04-09	52	58.8			04-09	50	59.6			04-09	NA	36.6		
Male	MSS	04-09	333.8	361.5	5.5	S	04-09	321.3	341.3	4.0	S	04-09	371	375	0.8	L
	SD	04-09	52	59.8			04-09	52	61.3			04-09	NA	37.9		

Table reads: In 2004, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 362.3 for white students and 323.6 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 391.9 for white students and 349.4 for African American students. Between 2004 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 5.9 points for white students and 5.2 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The CST (grades 4 and 8) is scored on a scale of 150-600; the CAHSEE (grade 10) is scored on a scale of 275-450.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table CA-14. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

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

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Algebra I					Grade 10				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	04-09	343.2	382.5	7.9		04-09	330.8	347.3	3.3		04-09	377	384	1.4	
	SD	04-09	64	77.4			04-09	65	76.9			04-09	38	38.4		
White	MSS	04-09	365.4	404.9	7.9		04-09	350.7	366.5	3.2		04-09	390	397	1.4	
	SD	04-09	64	76.0			04-09	NA	74.9			04-09	NA	35.7		
African American	MSS	04-09	316.9	354.4	7.5	S	04-09	297.6	313.7	3.2	E	04-09	356	364	1.6	L
	SD	04-09	56	71.1			04-09	NA	64.7			04-09	NA	34.7		
Latino	MSS	04-09	325.0	363.2	7.6	S	04-09	303.3	325.2	4.4	L	04-09	361	372	2.2	L
	SD	04-09	56	69.7			04-09	NA	65.8			04-09	NA	34.8		
Asian	MSS	04-09	391.7	439.2	9.5	L	04-09	381.9	410.3	5.7	L	04-09	405	414	1.8	L
	SD	04-09	70	80.7			04-09	NA	86.8			04-09	NA	35.0		
Native American	MSS	04-09	331.7	364.9	6.6	S	04-09	320.2	328.5	1.7	S	04-09	370	376	1.2	S
	SD	04-09	59	71.2			04-09	NA	65.5			04-09	NA	37.1		
Not low-income	MSS	06-09	389.5	411.2	7.2		06-09	361.2	369.6	2.8		06-09	391	397	2.0	
	SD	06-09	NA	77.5			06-09	NA	79.3			06-09	NA	36.6		
Low-income	MSS	06-09	340.7	362.3	7.2	E	06-09	313.5	326.5	4.3	L	06-09	365	372	2.3	L
	SD	06-09	67	70.5			06-09	NA	68.3			06-09	NA	35.8		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	361.4	382.5	7.0		06-09	338.5	347.3	2.9		06-09	378	384	2.0	
	SD	06-09	74	77.4			06-09	74	76.9			06-09	38	38.4		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	309.0	341.4	10.8	L	06-09	282.7	290.6	2.6	S	06-09	340	345	1.7	S
	SD	06-09	71	77.4			06-09	NA	63.4			06-09	NA	32.8		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	361.4	382.5	7.0		06-09	338.5	347.3	2.9		06-09	378	384	2.0	
	SD	06-09	74	77.4			06-09	74	76.9			06-09	38	38.4		
English language learners ³	MSS	06-09	331.0	348.4	5.8	S	06-09	288.3	299.7	3.8	L	06-09	351	355	1.3	S
	SD	06-09	63	65.5			06-09	NA	61.7			06-09	NA	31.2		
Female	MSS	04-09	343.8	382.4	7.7		04-09	330.5	349.5	3.8		04-09	376	383	1.4	
	SD	04-09	63	74.8			04-09	NA	75.6			04-09	NA	37.2		
Male	MSS	04-09	342.7	382.7	8.0	L	04-09	331.2	345.0	2.8	S	04-09	377	385	1.6	L
	SD	04-09	66	79.8			04-09	NA	78.2			04-09	NA	39.5		

Table reads: In 2004, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 365.4 for white students and 316.9 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 404.9 for white students and 354.4 for African American students. Between 2004 and 2009, the mean scale score

improved at an average yearly rate of 7.9 points for white students and 7.5 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The CST (grades 4 and Algebra I) is scored on a scale of 150-600; the CAHSEE (grade 10) is scored on a scale of 275-450.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table CA-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8/Algebra I					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	04-09	490,486	437,972	-10.7%	100.0%	04-09	494,184	463,894	-6.1%	100.0%	04-09	448,005	476,768	6.4%	100.0%
	Math	04-09	490,189	440,456	-10.1%	100.0%	04-09	190,179	261,931	37.7%	100.0%	04-09	446,264	474,221	6.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	04-09	148,618	121,889	-18.0%	27.8%	04-09	170,133	136,324	-19.9%	29.4%	04-09	162,818	145,693	-10.5%	30.6%
	Math	04-09	148,519	122,558	-17.5%	27.8%	04-09	70,282	78,731	12.0%	30.1%	04-09	161,699	144,715	-10.5%	30.5%
African American	Reading	04-09	40,220	31,701	-21.2%	7.2%	04-09	41,693	35,037	-16.0%	7.6%	04-09	35,805	37,285	4.1%	7.8%
	Math	04-09	40,137	31,802	-20.8%	7.2%	04-09	13,502	18,309	35.6%	7.0%	04-09	35,507	37,088	4.5%	7.8%
Latino	Reading	04-09	240,653	222,151	-7.7%	50.7%	04-09	217,467	226,297	4.1%	48.8%	04-09	183,260	224,478	22.5%	47.1%
	Math	04-09	240,545	223,641	-7.0%	50.8%	04-09	75,741	123,502	63.1%	47.2%	04-09	183,037	223,358	22.0%	47.1%
Asian	Reading	04-09	38,622	37,481	-3.0%	8.6%	04-09	40,284	41,133	2.1%	8.9%	04-09	42,302	43,658	3.2%	9.2%
	Math	04-09	38,637	37,613	-2.7%	8.5%	04-09	20,898	26,294	25.8%	10.0%	04-09	42,237	43,508	3.0%	9.2%
Native American	Reading	04-09	3,981	3,679	-7.6%	0.8%	04-09	4,389	4,018	-8.5%	0.9%	04-09	4,082	3,927	-3.8%	0.8%
	Math	04-09	3,972	3,693	-7.0%	0.8%	04-09	1,190	1,971	65.6%	0.8%	04-09	4,017	3,896	-3.0%	0.8%
Low-income	Reading	06-09	271,573	255,755	-5.8%	58.4%	06-09	244,524	251,296	2.8%	54.2%	06-09	207,271	235,589	13.7%	49.4%
	Math	06-09	271,323	257,397	-5.1%	58.4%	06-09	109,326	135,091	23.6%	51.6%	06-09	206,502	234,291	13.5%	49.4%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	48,498	28,488	-41.3%	6.5%	06-09	43,847	31,199	-28.8%	6.7%	06-09	40,463	38,317	-5.3%	8.0%
	Math	07-09	45,756	31,158	-31.9%	7.1%	07-09	8,930	11,412	27.8%	4.4%	06-09	38,159	35,372	-7.3%	7.5%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	152,171	125,979	-17.2%	28.8%	06-09	93,006	78,157	-16.0%	16.8%	06-09	79,035	76,676	-3.0%	16.1%
	Math	06-09	152,114	127,069	-16.5%	28.8%	06-09	32,669	32,691	0.1%	12.5%	06-09	78,390	75,631	-3.5%	15.9%
Female	Reading	04-09	239,243	216,845	-9.4%	49.5%	04-09	241,329	228,828	-5.2%	49.3%	04-09	220,499	233,302	5.8%	48.9%
	Math	04-09	239,113	217,305	-9.1%	49.3%	04-09	99,297	133,415	34.4%	50.9%	04-09	220,162	232,840	5.8%	49.1%
Male	Reading	04-09	251,177	221,019	-12.0%	50.5%	04-09	252,766	234,910	-7.1%	50.6%	04-09	227,999	243,401	6.8%	51.1%
	Math	04-09	251,011	223,036	-11.1%	50.6%	04-09	90,859	128,454	41.4%	49.0%	04-09	226,569	241,304	6.5%	50.9%

Table reads: In 2004, 148,618 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 121,889 students, a decrease of 18.0%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 27.8% of the 437,972 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.