

## Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Mississippi

*K-12 enrollment — 491,194*

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.** Mississippi made changes to its state testing program in the 2007-08 school year. Therefore, we could not calculate subgroup and achievement gap trends because fewer than three consecutive years of data were available, too short a period to constitute a trend. However, student subgroup achievement data for 2008 and 2009 is presented in the tables below.

## Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2008 through 2009, grades 3–8 and high school
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2008 through 2009, grades 3–8 and high school
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Percentage proficient data and high school scale score data are not available until 2009 for the comparison group of students who are <i>not</i> English language learners (ELLs), so the subgroup of ELLs is compared with all tested students in the state for these analyses.

## 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	Mississippi Curriculum Test (MCT), grades 3–8 MCT2 (first administered in 2007-08) Subject Area Testing Program (SATP) in English II & Algebra (high school end-of-course exams) SATP2 (first administered in 2007-08) Mississippi Alternate Assessment of the Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8 Grades vary for high school tests, depending on when students complete the course content being tested
State labels for achievement levels	MS uses four achievement levels: Minimal, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated 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	2008 (MCT2, SATP2)
Time of test administration	Spring (grades 3–8) Various times for end-of-course exams
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	July 2001: SATP cut scores set for English II November 2002: SATP cut scores set for Algebra I

November 2004: SATP cut scores set for Biology I and U.S. History

2005–06: Scores for some students displaced by Hurricane Katrina excluded from test results

2006–07: First year that MCT and SATP *only* were administered and previous tests were totally phased out (including Functional Literacy Exam, grades 4 and 7, Writing Assessments, and TerraNova Norm-Referenced Tests)

2006–07: Grade 2 no longer assessed

2006: Language Arts frameworks revised

2007: Math frameworks revised

2007–08: MCT2 first administered to grades 3-8; SATP2 first administered in Algebra I and English II. New cut scores set.

## 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 MS-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							3%	4%	NA
Proficient-and-above							44%	48%	NA
Basic-and-above							82%	83%	NA
White									
Advanced							5%	6%	NA
Proficient-and-above							61%	63%	NA
Basic-and-above							90%	90%	NA
African American									
Advanced							1%	1%	NA
Proficient-and-above							29%	34%	NA
Basic-and-above							75%	76%	NA
Latino									
Advanced							3%	3%	NA
Proficient-and-above							45%	44%	NA
Basic-and-above							80%	77%	NA
Asian <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced							11%	16%	NA
Proficient-and-above							72%	73%	NA
Basic-and-above							92%	92%	NA
Native American <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced							0%	4%	NA
Proficient-and-above							43%	56%	NA
Basic-and-above							77%	82%	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 5% in 2008 to 6% in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

<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 MS-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							3%	4%	NA
Proficient-and-above							44%	48%	NA
Basic-and-above							82%	83%	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced							1%	1%	NA
Proficient-and-above							31%	36%	NA
Basic-and-above							75%	77%	NA
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced							0%	0%	NA
Proficient-and-above							7%	7%	NA
Basic-and-above							39%	36%	NA
English language learners <sup>2,3</sup>									
Advanced							1%	1%	NA
Proficient-and-above							26%	22%	NA
Basic-and-above							68%	60%	NA
Female									
Advanced							3%	4%	NA
Proficient-and-above							48%	53%	NA
Basic-and-above							86%	86%	NA
Male									
Advanced							2%	3%	NA
Proficient-and-above							41%	43%	NA
Basic-and-above							79%	79%	NA

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test remained the same at 1% in 2008 and in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

<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 MS-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							7%	9%	NA
Proficient-and-above							49%	54%	NA
Basic-and-above							73%	80%	NA
White									
Advanced							12%	14%	NA
Proficient-and-above							64%	67%	NA
Basic-and-above							84%	87%	NA
African American									
Advanced							3%	3%	NA
Proficient-and-above							35%	41%	NA
Basic-and-above							64%	72%	NA
Latino									
Advanced							9%	9%	NA
Proficient-and-above							60%	58%	NA
Basic-and-above							79%	83%	NA
Asian <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced							34%	36%	NA
Proficient-and-above							87%	88%	NA
Basic-and-above							95%	96%	NA
Native American <sup>2</sup>									
Advanced							10%	19%	NA
Proficient-and-above							51%	65%	NA
Basic-and-above							69%	84%	NA

Table reads: The percentage of white 8<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 12% in 2008 to 14% in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

<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 MS-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							7%	9%	NA
Proficient-and-above							49%	54%	NA
Basic-and-above							73%	80%	NA
Low-income students									
Advanced							3%	4%	NA
Proficient-and-above							37%	43%	NA
Basic-and-above							66%	73%	NA
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>									
Advanced							0%	1%	NA
Proficient-and-above							10%	14%	NA
Basic-and-above							29%	37%	NA
English language learners <sup>2,3</sup>									
Advanced							8%	5%	NA
Proficient-and-above							50%	43%	NA
Basic-and-above							71%	73%	NA
Female									
Advanced							8%	9%	NA
Proficient-and-above							52%	57%	NA
Basic-and-above							78%	83%	NA
Male									
Advanced							7%	9%	NA
Proficient-and-above							46%	51%	NA
Basic-and-above							70%	77%	NA

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 3% in 2008 to 4% in 2009. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

<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 MS-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					EOC				
	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	08-09	50%	52%	NA		08-09	44%	48%	NA		08-09	49%	47%	NA	
White	08-09	63%	66%	NA		08-09	61%	63%	NA		08-09	68%	67%	NA	
African American	08-09	36%	39%	NA	NA	08-09	29%	34%	NA	NA	08-09	32%	31%	NA	NA
Latino	08-09	47%	52%	NA	NA	08-09	45%	44%	NA	NA	08-09	53%	45%	NA	NA
Asian	08-09	73%	71%	NA	NA	08-09	72%	73%	NA	NA	08-09	71%	70%	NA	NA
Native American	08-09	45%	53%	NA	NA	08-09	43%	56%	NA	NA	08-09	49%	37%	NA	NA
Not low-income	08-09	68%	68%	NA		08-09	62%	65%	NA		08-09	65%	64%	NA	
Low-income	08-09	37%	41%	NA	NA	08-09	31%	36%	NA	NA	08-09	34%	32%	NA	NA
Not disabled	08-09	53%	55%	NA		08-09	48%	52%	NA		08-09	53%	50%	NA	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	08-09	21%	23%	NA	NA	08-09	7%	7%	NA	NA	08-09	10%	7%	NA	NA
All tested students	08-09	50%	52%	NA		08-09	44%	48%	NA		08-09	49%	47%	NA	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	08-09	36%	37%	NA	NA	08-09	26%	22%	NA	NA	08-09	23%	23%	NA	NA
Female	08-09	54%	57%	NA		08-09	48%	53%	NA		08-09	53%	52%	NA	
Male	08-09	46%	47%	NA	NA	08-09	41%	43%	NA	NA	08-09	45%	43%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2008, 63% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 36% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2009, 66% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 39% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

<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 MS-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					EOC				
	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	08-09	55%	57%	NA		08-09	49%	54%	NA		08-09	57%	62%	NA	
White	08-09	68%	70%	NA		08-09	64%	67%	NA		08-09	71%	75%	NA	
African American	08-09	42%	45%	NA	NA	08-09	35%	41%	NA	NA	08-09	44%	50%	NA	NA
Latino	08-09	59%	62%	NA	NA	08-09	60%	58%	NA	NA	08-09	66%	77%	NA	NA
Asian	08-09	84%	84%	NA	NA	08-09	87%	88%	NA	NA	08-09	87%	89%	NA	NA
Native American	08-09	61%	66%	NA	NA	08-09	51%	65%	NA	NA	08-09	68%	67%	NA	NA
Not low-income	08-09	72%	72%	NA		08-09	65%	68%	NA		08-09	68%	74%	NA	
Low-income	08-09	44%	47%	NA	NA	08-09	37%	43%	NA	NA	08-09	47%	51%	NA	NA
Not disabled	08-09	58%	60%	NA		08-09	53%	58%	NA		08-09	59%	65%	NA	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	08-09	30%	30%	NA	NA	08-09	10%	14%	NA	NA	08-09	23%	25%	NA	NA
All tested students	08-09	55%	57%	NA		08-09	49%	54%	NA		08-09	57%	62%	NA	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	08-09	55%	56%	NA	NA	08-09	50%	43%	NA	NA	08-09	63%	72%	NA	NA
Female	08-09	56%	59%	NA		08-09	52%	57%	NA		08-09	59%	65%	NA	
Male	08-09	54%	56%	NA	NA	08-09	46%	51%	NA	NA	08-09	56%	59%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2008, 68% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 42% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2009, 70% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 45% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in math. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

<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 MS-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					EOC				
		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	Mean SS	08-09	149	149.1	NA		08-09	146	147.6	NA		08-09	649.5	649.2	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.6	11.9			08-09	11.9	12.0			08-09	8.8	8.9		
White	Mean SS	08-09	152	152.6	NA		08-09	151	151.6	NA		08-09	653.3	653.0	NA	
	SD	08-09	10.9	11.0			08-09	10.9	11.1			08-09	8.4	8.7		
African American	Mean SS	08-09	145	145.7	NA	NA	08-09	143	144.2	NA	NA	08-09	646.1	645.9	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	11.1	11.7			08-09	11.3	11.5			08-09	7.6	7.6		
Latino	Mean SS	08-09	147	148.3	NA	NA	08-09	146	145.9	NA	NA	08-09	649.7	648.5	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	12.2	10.9			08-09	12.1	13.3			08-09	8.7	8.0		
Asian	Mean SS	08-09	154	155.3	NA	NA	08-09	153	155.5	NA	NA	08-09	654.9	654.3	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	12.1	12.0			08-09	11.5	12.4			08-09	10.0	10.0		
Native American	Mean SS	08-09	148	149.2	NA	NA	08-09	144	149.4	NA	NA	08-09	649.7	647.1	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	11.2	11.6			08-09	13.3	12.8			08-09	7.9	8.1		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	08-09	153	153.4	NA		08-09	151.0	151.9	NA		08-09	652.9	652.5	NA	
	SD	08-09	10.9	10.9			08-09	10.9	11.2			08-09	NA	8.8		
Low-income	Mean SS	08-09	146	146.2	NA	NA	08-09	143	144.5	NA	NA	08-09	646.4	646.1	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	11.1	11.6			08-09	11.4	11.6			08-09	7.8	7.8		
Not disabled	Mean SS	08-09	150	150.1	NA		08-09	148	149.2	NA		08-09	650.4	649.9	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.0	11.1			08-09	10.8	10.9			08-09	NA	11.6		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	Mean SS	08-09	140	140.0	NA	NA	08-09	133	133.3	NA	NA	08-09	640.0	638.8	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	13.3	13.6			08-09	12.2	12.0			08-09	NA	19.0		
All tested students	Mean SS	08-09	149	149.1	NA		08-09	146	147.6	NA		08-09	649.5	649.2	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.6	11.9			08-09	11.9	12.0			08-09	8.8	8.9		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	Mean SS	08-09	143	145.5	NA	NA	08-09	141	139.5	NA	NA	08-09	643.9	644.3	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	12.2	11.4			08-09	12.3	12.7			08-09	7.8	7.0		
Female	Mean SS	08-09	150	150.4	NA		08-09	148	149.1	NA		08-09	650.3	650.1	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.0	11.3			08-09	11.4	11.5			08-09	8.7	8.8		
Male	Mean SS	08-09	148	147.9	NA	NA	08-09	145	146.3	NA	NA	08-09	648.6	648.2	NA	NA

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4				Grade 8				EOC							
		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	
	SD	08-09	12.0	12.2							08-09	8.8	8.9				

Table reads: In 2008, the mean scale score on the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test was 152 for white students and 145 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading was 152.6 for white students and 145.7 for African American students. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

Note: In 2009, the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2) (Grades 3-8) is scored on a scale of 88 to 194 and the Subject Area Testing Program, Second Edition (SATP2) (English II) is scored on a scale of 642 to above 661.

<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 MS-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					EOC				
		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	Mean SS	08-09	150	151.0	NA		08-09	148	149.4	NA		08-09	652.2	653.2	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.6	11.2			08-09	11.8	12.3			08-09	10.4	11.1		
White	Mean SS	08-09	154	154.2	NA		08-09	152	153.2	NA		08-09	655.7	656.9	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.1	10.7			08-09	10.8	11.4			08-09	10.4	11.2		
African American	Mean SS	08-09	147	147.7	NA	NA	08-09	145	146.0	NA	NA	08-09	648.7	649.8	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	11.0	10.7			08-09	11.3	11.9			08-09	9.0	9.8		
Latino	Mean SS	08-09	150	152.2	NA	NA	08-09	150	150.3	NA	NA	08-09	654.7	656.8	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	11.7	10.7			08-09	11.6	12.5			08-09	10.5	10.5		
Asian	Mean SS	08-09	159	159.9	NA	NA	08-09	159	160.5	NA	NA	08-09	663.4	664.7	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	12.5	10.6			08-09	10.2	11.5			08-09	13.3	13.6		
Native American	Mean SS	08-09	153	151.9	NA	NA	08-09	148	152.3	NA	NA	08-09	656.4	654.2	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	9.8	10.4			08-09	14.0	13.7			08-09	10.6	9.9		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	08-09	155	155.0	NA		08-09	152	153.6	NA		08-09	654.9	656.6	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.0	10.6			08-09	10.9	11.3			08-09	NA	11.3		
Low-income	Mean SS	08-09	148	148.4	NA	NA	08-09	145	146.4	NA	NA	08-09	649.4	650.3	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	11.1	10.8			08-09	11.4	12.0			08-09	9.4	10.0		
Not disabled	Mean SS	08-09	151	151.9	NA		08-09	150	151.0	NA		08-09	652.7	654.0	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.0	10.5			08-09	10.9	10.9			08-09	NA	13.7		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	Mean SS	08-09	143	142.6	NA	NA	08-09	136	136.0	NA	NA	08-09	643.3	643.1	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	13.4	12.7			08-09	12.2	14.2			08-09	NA	15.6		
All tested students	Mean SS	08-09	150	151.0	NA		08-09	148	149.4	NA		08-09	652.2	653.2	NA	
	SD	08-09	11.6	11.2			08-09	11.8	12.3			08-09	10.4	11.1		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	Mean SS	08-09	148	150.6	NA	NA	08-09	147	146.7	NA	NA	08-09	654.0	656.3	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	12.2	10.9			08-09	12.6	13.2			08-09	11.5	11.5		
Female	Mean SS	08-09	151	151.6	NA		08-09	149	150.5	NA		08-09	652.4	653.8	NA	
	SD	08-09	10.9	10.7			08-09	11.0	11.4			08-09	10.1	10.8		
Male	Mean SS	08-09	150	150.4	NA	NA	08-09	147	148.5	NA	NA	08-09	651.9	652.7	NA	NA
	SD	08-09	12.1	11.6			08-09	12.4	13.0			08-09	10.8	11.4		

Table reads: In 2008, the mean scale score on the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade math test was 154 for white students and 147 for African American students. In 2009, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade math was 154.2 for white students and 147.7 for African American students. Average yearly gains have not been calculated because fewer

than three consecutive years of data are available, too short a period to constitute a trend.

Note: In 2009, the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2) (Grades 3-8) is scored on a scale of 88 to 194 and the Subject Area Testing Program, Second Edition (SATP2) (Algebra I) is scored on a scale of 642 to above 661.

<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 MS-15. Numbers of test-takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					High School EOC				
		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	08-09	37,053	37,918	2.3%	100.0%	08-09	37,347	37,107	-0.6%	100.0%	08-09	28,054	29,590	5.5%	100.0%
	Math	08-09	37,053	37,918	2.3%	100.0%	08-09	37,347	37,107	-0.6%	100.0%	08-09	29,210	32,197	10.2%	100.0%
White	Reading	08-09	17,370	17,808	2.5%	47.0%	08-09	16,846	16,881	0.2%	45.5%	08-09	12,855	13,113	2.0%	44.3%
	Math	08-09	17,370	17,808	2.5%	47.0%	08-09	16,846	16,881	0.2%	45.5%	08-09	13,565	14,321	5.6%	44.5%
African American	Reading	08-09	18,365	18,773	2.2%	49.5%	08-09	19,250	18,994	-1.3%	51.2%	08-09	14,586	15,722	7.8%	53.1%
	Math	08-09	18,365	18,773	2.2%	49.5%	08-09	19,250	18,994	-1.3%	51.2%	08-09	14,966	17,011	13.7%	52.8%
Latino	Reading	08-09	806	881	9.3%	2.3%	08-09	631	649	2.9%	1.7%	08-09	347	<b>437</b>	25.9%	1.5%
	Math	08-09	806	881	9.3%	2.3%	08-09	631	649	2.9%	1.7%	08-09	383	533	39.2%	1.7%
Asian	Reading	08-09	330	<b>340</b>	3.0%	0.9%	08-09	298	<b>319</b>	7.0%	0.9%	08-09	221	<b>266</b>	20.4%	0.9%
	Math	08-09	330	<b>340</b>	3.0%	0.9%	08-09	298	<b>319</b>	7.0%	0.9%	08-09	246	<b>284</b>	15.4%	0.9%
Native American	Reading	08-09	69	<b>63</b>	-8.7%	0.2%	08-09	61	<b>69</b>	13.1%	0.2%	08-09	45	<b>52</b>	15.6%	0.2%
	Math	08-09	69	<b>63</b>	3.3%	0.2%	08-09	61	<b>69</b>	13.1%	0.2%	08-09	50	<b>48</b>	-4.0%	0.1%
Low-income	Reading	08-09	21,634	22,714	5.0%	59.9%	08-09	20,760	20,863	0.5%	56.2%	08-09	13,936	15,513	11.3%	52.4%
	Math	08-09	21,634	22,714	5.0%	59.9%	08-09	20,760	20,863	0.5%	56.2%	08-09	14,527	17,022	17.2%	52.9%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	08-09	3,441	3,423	-0.5%	9.0%	08-09	3,453	3,279	-5.0%	8.8%	08-09	NA	2,545	NA	8.6%
	Math	08-09	3,441	3,453	0.3%	9.1%	08-09	3,453	3,326	-3.7%	9.0%	08-09	NA	2,601	NA	8.1%
English language learners	Reading	08-09	481	567	17.9%	1.5%	08-09	285	<b>320</b>	12.3%	0.9%	08-09	130	<b>195</b>	50.0%	0.7%
	Math	08-09	481	567	17.9%	1.5%	08-09	285	<b>320</b>	12.3%	0.9%	08-09	165	<b>229</b>	38.8%	0.7%
Female	Reading	08-09	18,168	18,559	2.2%	48.9%	08-09	18,263	18,506	1.3%	49.9%	08-09	14,523	15,173	4.5%	51.3%
	Math	08-09	18,168	18,559	2.2%	48.9%	08-09	18,263	18,506	1.3%	49.9%	08-09	15,289	16,659	9.0%	51.7%
Male	Reading	08-09	18,772	19,306	2.8%	50.9%	08-09	18,823	18,406	-2.2%	49.6%	08-09	13,531	14,417	6.5%	48.7%
	Math	08-09	18,772	19,306	2.8%	50.9%	08-09	18,823	18,406	-2.2%	49.6%	08-09	13,921	15,538	11.6%	48.3%

Table reads: In 2008, 17,370 students in the white subgroup took the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had risen to 17,808 students, an increase of 2.5%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 47.0% of the 37,918 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.