

## Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Oregon

*K-12 enrollment — 564,064*

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](http://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), Oregon showed a clear trend of gains in reading and math at the *basic-and-above*, *proficient-and-above*, and *advanced* levels for all major racial/ethnic subgroups, low-income students, and boys and girls, with a few exceptions. Progress in narrowing achievement gaps at grades 4, 8, and 10 was mixed. Comparable data were available for 2007-2009 at all three grades analyzed.

- **Exceptions to grade 8 achievement gains for subgroups.** Oregon showed declines in the percentages of Asian students scoring at the proficient level in reading. In math, declines were evident for African American and Native American students at the proficient-and-above level and for girls at the advanced level.
- **Trends in percentage proficient gaps.** In both reading and math, progress in narrowing gaps varied by grade and subgroup when the percentage proficient indicator was used. No subgroup had a clear pattern of narrowing gaps across all three grade levels in either subject according to this indicator. In reading, gaps in percentages proficient narrowed as often as they widened, and in two instances gaps showed no net change. In math, narrowing gaps slightly outnumbered widening gaps.
- **Trends in average (mean) score gaps.** Average scores showed a somewhat more positive picture of narrowing gaps than percentages proficient. Gaps in average scores narrowed more often than they widened in both reading and math. For most subgroups, progress in narrowing gaps in mean scores varied by grade level; however, gaps in reading for low-income students narrowed across all three grade levels.
- **Reading gap for boys.** Boys made progress in narrowing the gap in reading with girls, who generally performed higher, at all grades according to average scores and at grades 4 and 10 according to percentages proficient.

## Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2007 through 2009 (cut scores changed in 2006-07)
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2009, grade 4 2005 through 2009, grades 8 and 10
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Scale score data not available until 2007 for students who are <i>not</i> low-income, disabled, or English language learners (ELLs)

## 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	Oregon Statewide Assessment
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	Reading and math: Grades 3–8 and 10 as of 2005–06 Writing: Grades 4, 7, and 10
State labels for achievement levels	OR uses five achievement levels: Very Low, Low, Nearly Meets Standard, Meets Standard, and Exceeds Standard. For our analyses we treated Nearly Meets Standard as Basic, Meets Standard as Proficient, and Exceeds Standard as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	1991; cut scores reset in 2006–07
Time of test administration	Available September–May (peak in April and May)
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	September 2005: Performance standards set for grades 4, 6, and 7 in reading and math; these standards were not used to determine AYP until 2006–07. 2006–07: Cut scores changed for all previously tested grades, so data for 2006–07 and beyond are not comparable to those from previous years

## 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 OR-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**

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced						20%	21%	22%	1.1
Proficient-and-above						68%	65%	70%	0.7
Basic-and-above						85%	86%	89%	2.0
White									
Advanced						24%	25%	26%	1.2
Proficient-and-above						74%	71%	75%	0.6
Basic-and-above						88%	89%	92%	1.7
African American									
Advanced						9%	9%	11%	1.0
Proficient-and-above						53%	50%	54%	0.4
Basic-and-above						74%	76%	80%	3.2
Latino									
Advanced						6%	7%	8%	0.7
Proficient-and-above						44%	40%	48%	2.0
Basic-and-above						69%	71%	78%	4.6
Asian									
Advanced						25%	28%	28%	1.9
Proficient-and-above						75%	72%	74%	-0.5
Basic-and-above						89%	89%	91%	0.7
Native American									
Advanced						11%	13%	13%	1.1
Proficient-and-above						56%	54%	60%	2.0
Basic-and-above						80%	79%	83%	1.3

Table reads: The percentage of white 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 24% in 2007 to 26% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 1.2 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

**Table OR-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 <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced						20%	21%	22%	1.1
Proficient-and-above						68%	65%	70%	0.7
Basic-and-above						85%	86%	89%	2.0
Low-income students									
Advanced						10%	10%	12%	0.8
Proficient-and-above						54%	50%	56%	1.1
Basic-and-above						76%	77%	83%	3.3
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced						4%	5%	4%	0.2
Proficient-and-above						28%	25%	27%	-0.5
Basic-and-above						54%	55%	61%	3.3
English language learners <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced						1%	1%	1%	-0.1
Proficient-and-above						24%	17%	18%	-3.1
Basic-and-above						51%	50%	54%	1.9
Female									
Advanced						22%	23%	25%	1.5
Proficient-and-above						71%	69%	74%	1.1
Basic-and-above						87%	88%	91%	2.0
Male									
Advanced						19%	19%	20%	0.6
Proficient-and-above						65%	62%	66%	0.3
Basic-and-above						82%	83%	86%	2.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 10% in 2007 to 12% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.8 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

**Table OR-9. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics**

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced						28%	27%	28%	0.1
Proficient-and-above						70%	69%	71%	0.3
Basic-and-above						82%	83%	85%	1.8
White									
Advanced						31%	30%	32%	0.2
Proficient-and-above						75%	74%	75%	0.3
Basic-and-above						85%	86%	88%	1.5
African American									
Advanced						12%	11%	13%	0.2
Proficient-and-above						51%	48%	50%	-0.6
Basic-and-above						68%	69%	71%	1.6
Latino									
Advanced						11%	11%	12%	0.4
Proficient-and-above						50%	49%	54%	1.8
Basic-and-above						66%	69%	74%	4.2
Asian									
Advanced						48%	48%	49%	0.6
Proficient-and-above						82%	81%	82%	0.1
Basic-and-above						90%	89%	90%	0.4
Native American									
Advanced						14%	14%	16%	0.7
Proficient-and-above						60%	57%	59%	-0.7
Basic-and-above						74%	75%	77%	1.5

Table reads: The percentage of white 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 31% in 2007 to 32% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.2 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

**Table OR-10. Percentage of grade 8 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 <sup>1</sup>
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced						28%	27%	28%	0.1
Proficient-and-above						70%	69%	71%	0.3
Basic-and-above						82%	83%	85%	1.8
Low-income students									
Advanced						15%	14%	16%	0.3
Proficient-and-above						57%	55%	58%	0.6
Basic-and-above						73%	74%	78%	2.8
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced						6%	6%	7%	0.3
Proficient-and-above						31%	28%	31%	-0.1
Basic-and-above						47%	50%	55%	3.9
English language learners <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced						6%	6%	5%	-0.7
Proficient-and-above						36%	33%	33%	-1.9
Basic-and-above						54%	54%	57%	1.8
Female									
Advanced						27%	25%	27%	-0.1
Proficient-and-above						69%	69%	71%	0.5
Basic-and-above						82%	83%	86%	2.1
Male									
Advanced						29%	28%	30%	0.4
Proficient-and-above						70%	69%	71%	0.1
Basic-and-above						82%	83%	85%	1.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 15% in 2007 to 16% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.3 percentage points per year.

<sup>1</sup>Averages are subject to rounding error.

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

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

## Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

**Table OR-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 <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	07-09	79%	84%	2.6		07-09	68%	70%	0.7		07-09	65%	66%	0.5	
White	07-09	84%	88%	2.3		07-09	74%	75%	0.6		07-09	71%	73%	1.0	
African American	07-09	69%	74%	2.4	L	07-09	53%	54%	0.4	S	07-09	41%	42%	0.4	S
Latino	07-09	60%	69%	4.3	L	07-09	44%	48%	2.0	L	07-09	39%	41%	0.7	S
Asian	07-09	84%	88%	1.8	S	07-09	75%	74%	-0.5	S	07-09	68%	68%	-0.3	S
Native American	07-09	74%	78%	2.0	S	07-09	56%	60%	2.0	L	07-09	53%	54%	0.5	S
Not low-income	07-09	88%	92%	2.1		07-09	79%	81%	1.1		07-09	74%	76%	1.1	
Low-income	07-09	69%	77%	3.7	L	07-09	54%	56%	1.1	E	07-09	48%	51%	1.1	E
Not disabled	07-09	85%	90%	2.5		07-09	74%	76%	0.9		07-09	71%	72%	0.6	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	07-09	47%	54%	3.3	L	07-09	28%	27%	-0.5	S	07-09	24%	23%	-0.3	S
Not ELLs	07-09	83%	88%	2.4		07-09	72%	73%	0.8		07-09	68%	70%	0.7	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	07-09	50%	59%	4.5	L	07-09	24%	18%	-3.1	S	07-09	15%	12%	-1.6	S
Female	07-09	82%	86%	2.2		07-09	71%	74%	1.1		07-09	69%	70%	0.4	
Male	07-09	76%	82%	2.9	L	07-09	65%	66%	0.3	S	07-09	62%	63%	0.6	L

Table reads: In 2007, 84% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 69% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 88% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 74% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2007 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.3 percentage points per year for white students and 2.4 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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



**Table OR-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 <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group	Year span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average annual gain <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comparison group
All tested students	07-09	71%	77%	3.1		07-09	70%	71%	0.3		07-09	55%	54%	-0.7	
White	07-09	76%	82%	2.9		07-09	75%	75%	0.3		07-09	60%	58%	-0.6	
African American	07-09	56%	62%	2.8	S	07-09	51%	50%	-0.6	S	07-09	28%	28%	-0.3	L
Latino	07-09	52%	61%	4.6	L	07-09	50%	54%	1.8	L	07-09	33%	33%	0.2	L
Asian	07-09	79%	84%	2.6	S	07-09	82%	82%	0.1	S	07-09	70%	67%	-1.5	S
Native American	07-09	61%	68%	3.5	L	07-09	60%	59%	-0.7	S	07-09	39%	36%	-1.5	S
Not low-income	07-09	82%	87%	2.8		07-09	79%	81%	0.8		07-09	64%	64%	-0.2	
Low-income	07-09	60%	68%	4.1	L	07-09	57%	58%	0.6	S	07-09	38%	38%	0.1	L
Not disabled	07-09	77%	83%	3.2		07-09	76%	77%	0.5		07-09	60%	59%	-0.7	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	07-09	43%	49%	3.1	S	07-09	31%	31%	-0.1	S	07-09	17%	14%	-1.1	S
Not ELLS	07-09	75%	81%	3.0		07-09	73%	73%	0.3		07-09	57%	56%	-0.6	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	07-09	44%	52%	3.7	L	07-09	36%	33%	-1.9	S	07-09	18%	16%	-0.8	S
Female	07-09	70%	77%	3.4		07-09	69%	71%	0.5		07-09	54%	53%	-0.4	
Male	07-09	72%	78%	2.8	S	07-09	70%	71%	0.1	S	07-09	56%	54%	-1.1	S

Table reads: In 2007, 76% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 56% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 82% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 62% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2007 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.9 percentage points per year for white students and 2.8 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a smaller rate of gain and a widening of the achievement gap for African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

## Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

**Table OR-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 <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	218.8	220.5	0.6		05-09	232.5	234.4	0.5		05-09	238.3	238.7	0.1	
	SD	06-09	10.5	10.7			05-09	10.1	8.7			05-09	10.1	9.1		
White	MSS	06-09	220.3	222.1	0.6		05-09	233.7	235.6	0.5		05-09	239.4	240.1	0.2	
	SD	06-09	10.4	10.5			05-09	9.8	8.5			05-09	9.7	8.8		
African American	MSS	06-09	215.4	216.3	0.3	S	05-09	228.3	230.7	0.6	L	05-09	232.7	233.1	0.1	S
	SD	06-09	9.6	10.2			05-09	9.7	8.3			05-09	10.2	8.9		
Latino	MSS	06-09	212.6	214.4	0.6	E	05-09	226.3	229.5	0.8	L	05-09	231.6	233.1	0.4	L
	SD	06-09	9.1	9.3			05-09	9.8	8.0			05-09	10.1	8.0		
Asian	MSS	06-09	220.8	222.7	0.6	E	05-09	234.4	235.7	0.3	S	05-09	239.0	239.2	0.1	S
	SD	06-09	10.8	11.4			05-09	9.8	9.0			05-09	9.6	9.2		
Native American	MSS	06-09	216.7	217.1	0.1	S	05-09	229.0	231.8	0.7	L	05-09	234.6	236.4	0.4	L
	SD	06-09	9.5	9.4			05-09	9.9	8.2			05-09	10.0	8.1		
Not low-income	MSS	07-09	223.3	224.2	0.4		07-09	236.2	236.9	0.4		07-09	240.7	241.0	0.1	
	SD	07-09	10.9	10.5			07-09	9.0	8.3			07-09	9.3	8.8		
Low-income	MSS	07-09	216.0	216.9	0.5	L	07-09	230.0	231.3	0.6	L	07-09	234.7	235.2	0.3	L
	SD	07-09	10.6	9.7			07-09	9.4	8.2			07-09	9.5	8.4		
Not disabled	MSS	07-09	221.1	221.7	0.3		07-09	234.7	235.4	0.4		07-09	239.7	239.7	0.0	
	SD	07-09	10.8	10.2			07-09	9.1	8.2			07-09	9.3	8.7		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	MSS	07-09	212.2	213.5	0.6	L	07-09	224.9	226.3	0.7	L	07-09	229.6	230.4	0.4	L
	SD	07-09	11.6	11.1			07-09	9.4	8.3			07-09	9.2	8.2		
Not ELLs	MSS	07-09	221.2	221.8	0.3		07-09	234.5	235.1	0.3		07-09	239.4	239.5	0.0	
	SD	07-09	11.1	10.4			07-09	9.3	8.4			07-09	9.5	8.7		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	MSS	07-09	211.8	211.3	-0.2	S	07-09	225.1	224.1	-0.5	S	07-09	229.0	227.6	-0.7	S
	SD	07-09	9.6	8.3			07-09	8.6	6.8			07-09	8.3	6.8		
Female	MSS	06-09	219.7	220.9	0.4		05-09	233.6	235.2	0.4		05-09	239.4	239.5	0.0	
	SD	06-09	10.4	10.6			05-09	9.7	8.6			05-09	9.4	8.9		
Male	MSS	06-09	218.0	220.0	0.7	L	05-09	231.5	233.5	0.5	L	05-09	237.2	238.0	0.2	L
	SD	06-09	10.6	10.8			05-09	10.4	8.8			05-09	10.6	9.2		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test was 220.3 for white students and 215.4 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading was 222.1 for white students and 216.3 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.6 points for white students and 0.3 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Oregon Statewide Assessment is scored on a scale of 150 to 300.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

**Table OR-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					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS <sup>1</sup>	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	06-09	218.8	218.4	-0.1		05-09	234.8	235.7	0.2		05-09	236.9	236.0	-0.2	
	SD	06-09	10.1	10.4			05-09	12.5	11.3			05-09	11.6	10.1		
White	MSS	06-09	219.9	219.7	-0.1		05-09	235.9	236.8	0.2		05-09	238.0	237.1	-0.2	
	SD	06-09	9.8	10.1			05-09	12.3	11.1			05-09	11.3	9.9		
African American	MSS	06-09	214.8	213.6	-0.4	S	05-09	228.2	230.0	0.4	L	05-09	230.0	229.7	-0.1	L
	SD	06-09	9.4	9.8			05-09	11.3	9.7			05-09	10.8	9.2		
Latino	MSS	06-09	213.9	213.5	-0.1	E	05-09	227.9	230.4	0.6	L	05-09	230.3	231.0	0.2	L
	SD	06-09	9.1	9.1			05-09	10.9	9.1			05-09	10.2	8.7		
Asian	MSS	06-09	222.5	222.5	0.0	L	05-09	240.4	242.0	0.4	L	05-09	240.9	240.2	-0.2	E
	SD	06-09	11.4	12.4			05-09	13.2	14.3			05-09	12.2	11.6		
Native American	MSS	06-09	216.4	215.2	-0.4	S	05-09	230.2	231.8	0.4	L	05-09	232.2	232.9	0.2	L
	SD	06-09	9.5	9.2			05-09	11.4	9.6			05-09	11.0	8.8		
Not low-income	MSS	07-09	221.3	221.8	0.3		07-09	238.6	238.9	0.2		07-09	237.6	238.4	0.4	
	SD	07-09	11.8	10.3			07-09	11.9	11.7			07-09	10.7	10.1		
Low-income	MSS	07-09	214.3	215.2	0.4	L	07-09	231.3	231.7	0.2	E	07-09	231.0	232.3	0.7	L
	SD	07-09	10.5	9.4			07-09	10.4	9.5			07-09	10.2	9.0		
Not disabled	MSS	07-09	219.1	219.5	0.2		07-09	236.8	236.9	0.0		07-09	236.4	237.0	0.3	
	SD	07-09	11.4	9.9			07-09	11.5	10.9			07-09	10.5	9.7		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	MSS	07-09	211.4	212.5	0.6	L	07-09	225.7	226.7	0.5	L	07-09	225.4	227.0	0.8	L
	SD	07-09	11.6	11.0			07-09	10.0	9.9			07-09	9.8	8.9		
Not ELLs	MSS	07-09	219.0	219.5	0.3		07-09	236.4	236.4	0.0		07-09	235.9	236.6	0.3	
	SD	07-09	11.6	10.2			07-09	11.7	11.2			07-09	10.8	9.9		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	MSS	07-09	211.6	211.4	-0.1	S	07-09	227.9	226.3	-0.8	S	07-09	227.6	227.1	-0.3	S
	SD	07-09	10.2	8.9			07-09	10.0	8.4			07-09	9.8	8.5		
Female	MSS	06-09	218.4	217.9	-0.2		05-09	234.5	235.1	0.2		05-09	236.6	235.7	-0.2	
	SD	06-09	9.8	9.9			05-09	12.0	10.7			05-09	11.0	9.6		
Male	MSS	06-09	219.2	219.0	-0.1	L	05-09	235.0	236.1	0.3	L	05-09	237.2	236.3	-0.2	E
	SD	06-09	10.3	10.8			05-09	12.9	11.8			05-09	12.1	10.6		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade math test was 219.9 for white students and 214.8 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade math was 219.7 for white students and 213.6 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2009, the mean scale score

declined at an average yearly rate of 0.1 points for white students and 0.4 points for African American students, indicating a widening of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Oregon Statewide Assessment is scored on a scale of 150 to 300.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

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

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

Table OR-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	06-09	41,278	41,328	0.1%	100.0%	05-09	43,716	41,663	-4.7%	100.0%	05-09	41,657	41,257	-1.0%	100.0%
	Math	06-09	41,290	41,440	0.4%	100.0%	05-09	43,698	41,674	-4.6%	100.0%	05-09	41,287	41,046	-0.6%	100.0%
White	Reading	06-09	29,005	27,828	-4.1%	67.3%	05-09	33,391	29,160	-12.7%	70.0%	05-09	32,422	29,750	-8.2%	72.1%
	Math	06-09	29,000	27,897	-3.8%	67.3%	05-09	33,196	29,167	-12.1%	70.0%	05-09	32,157	29,580	-8.0%	72.1%
African American	Reading	06-09	1,238	1,229	-0.7%	3.0%	05-09	1,261	1,228	-2.6%	2.9%	05-09	1,167	1,179	1.0%	2.9%
	Math	06-09	1,237	1,231	-0.5%	3.0%	05-09	1,248	1,228	-1.6%	2.9%	05-09	1,132	1,162	2.7%	2.8%
Latino	Reading	06-09	6,766	7,363	8.8%	17.8%	05-09	5,382	6,729	25.0%	16.2%	05-09	4,265	6,141	44.0%	14.9%
	Math	06-09	6,788	7,393	8.9%	17.8%	05-09	5,383	6,729	25.0%	16.1%	05-09	4,246	6,108	43.9%	14.9%
Asian	Reading	06-09	1,906	1,955	2.6%	4.7%	05-09	1,734	1,927	11.1%	4.6%	05-09	1,805	2,042	13.1%	4.9%
	Math	06-09	1,910	1,959	2.6%	4.7%	05-09	1,708	1,932	13.1%	4.6%	05-09	1,792	2,034	13.5%	5.0%
Native American	Reading	06-09	857	827	-3.5%	2.0%	05-09	1,051	846	-19.5%	2.0%	05-09	929	784	-15.6%	1.9%
	Math	06-09	856	829	-3.2%	2.0%	05-09	1,033	846	-18.1%	2.0%	05-09	916	771	-15.8%	1.9%
Low-income	Reading	07-09	18,983	21,095	11.1%	50.9%	07-09	17,392	18,936	8.9%	45.4%	07-09	14,380	16,216	12.8%	39.5%
	Math	07-09	19,118	21,185	10.8%	51.1%	07-09	17,395	18,949	8.9%	45.5%	07-09	14,239	16,112	13.2%	39.3%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	07-09	5,703	6,054	6.2%	14.6%	07-09	4,760	4,881	2.5%	11.7%	07-09	4,298	4,201	-2.3%	10.2%
	Math	07-09	5,888	6,171	4.8%	14.9%	07-09	4,756	4,908	3.2%	11.8%	07-09	4,227	4,147	-1.9%	10.1%
English language learners	Reading	07-09	5,933	5,396	-9.1%	13.0%	07-09	4,167	2,927	-29.8%	7.0%	07-09	3,099	2,526	-18.5%	6.2%
	Math	07-09	5,985	5,435	-9.2%	13.1%	07-09	4,180	2,924	-30.0%	7.0%	07-09	3,069	2,522	-17.8%	6.1%
Female	Reading	06-09	20,120	20,335	1.1%	49.2%	05-09	21,241	20,476	-3.6%	49.1%	05-09	20,347	20,210	-0.7%	49.0%
	Math	06-09	20,125	20,352	1.1%	49.1%	05-09	21,230	20,473	-3.6%	49.1%	05-09	20,177	20,102	-0.4%	49.0%
Male	Reading	06-09	21,158	20,993	-0.8%	50.8%	05-09	22,475	21,187	-5.7%	50.9%	05-09	21,310	21,047	-1.2%	51.0%
	Math	06-09	21,165	21,088	-0.4%	50.9%	05-09	22,468	21,201	-5.6%	50.9%	05-09	21,110	20,944	-0.8%	51.0%

Table reads: In 2006, 29,005 students in the white subgroup took the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 27,828 students, a decrease of 4.1%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 67.3% of the 41,328 4<sup>th</sup> 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.