

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Florida

K-12 enrollment — 2,606,337

The raw data used to develop these state profiles, including data for additional grade levels and years before 2002, can be found on the CEP Web site at www.cep-dc.org. Click on the link on the left for State Testing Data. Below the name of the report, click on the link for View State Profiles and Worksheets. Scroll down the page, and click on the Worksheet links for any state.

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary

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

There were upward trends in Florida in terms of achievement and progress on narrowing of achievement gaps.

Subgroup trends by achievement level at grade 4

- **Main trend:** In both reading and math, all subgroups showed gains in the percentage of students scoring at three achievement levels—basic-and-above, proficient-and-above, and advanced.

Gap trends at three grade levels

- **Main trend:** Overall, there was improvement in the closing of gaps in the percentages of students scoring at the proficient level between the African American, Latino and Native American subgroups and the white subgroup, and between low-income and non-low-income students, at grades 4, 8 and the high school grade analyzed. Most trend lines showed gaps closing in reading and math, with just a few instances of gaps getting wider or staying the same.

Data notes

- **Subgroups analyzed:** Trends were analyzed for white, African American, Latino, Asian American, Native American, and low-income students. Trends for students with disabilities, English language learners, and male and female students have not been summarized because they will be discussed in separate reports.

- Grades analyzed: Analyses of subgroup trends by three achievement levels are limited to one elementary grade because of the massive amounts of data involved and because this is the pilot year of a process that CEP hopes to extend to the middle and high school levels in future years. Analyses of achievement gap trends cover three grade levels: grade 4, grade 8, and the high school grade tested for NCLB.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	1999 through 2008 for reading at grades 4, 8, and 10 and for math at grades 5, 8, and 10 2001 through 2008 for all other grades in reading and math
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2002 through 2008 for reading at grades 4, 8, and 10 and for math at grade 8 2001 through 2008 for math at grade 4 2004 through 2008 for grade 10 math
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	2002 through 2008 Percentages proficient and mean scale score data not available for the comparison group of students who are <i>not</i> ELLs, so the ELL subgroup is compared with all students in the state

Test Characteristics

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

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	Florida Comprehensive Accountability Test (FCAT) High School Competency Test (HSCT) Florida Writes
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–10
State labels for achievement levels	FL uses five achievement levels: Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, and Level 5. For our analyses we treated Level 2 as Basic, Level 3 as Proficient, and Level 4 + Level 5 as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	Yes
First year test used	1998 for reading at grades 4, 8, and 10 and for math at grades 5, 8, and 10 2001 for all other grades in reading and math

Time of test administration

Spring

Major changes in testing system (2002–present)

None

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the Elementary Level

Note: The tables in this profile of subgroup achievement and gap trends begin with table 7. Tables 1 through 6 can be found in the companion state profile of general achievement trends.

Table FL-7. Percentages of Grade 4 Students by Racial or Ethnic Subgroup Scoring at the Advanced, Proficient and Above, and Basic and Above Levels in Reading

Subgroup	Reporting Year							Average Yearly Percentage Point Gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
All tested students								
Advanced	27%	29%	34%	37%	33%	35%	38%	1.8
Proficient and Above	55%	60%	70%	71%	66%	68%	70%	2.5
Basic and Above	70%	75%	83%	85%	83%	82%	83%	2.2
White								
Advanced	36%	40%	45%	47%	41%	46%	50%	2.3
Proficient and Above	67%	73%	79%	81%	74%	79%	81%	2.3
Basic and Above	81%	85%	90%	91%	86%	89%	90%	1.5
African American								
Advanced	12%	14%	16%	18%	16%	17%	20%	1.3
Proficient and Above	36%	41%	52%	56%	49%	51%	53%	2.8
Basic and Above	54%	60%	75%	74%	71%	71%	72%	3.0
Latino								
Advanced	20%	22%	26%	29%	25%	27%	31%	1.8
Proficient and Above	46%	51%	63%	65%	60%	60%	64%	3.0
Basic and Above	61%	67%	79%	80%	77%	76%	79%	3.0
Asian								
Advanced	42%	43%	47%	51%	51%	52%	53%	1.8
Proficient and Above	70%	73%	81%	82%	81%	81%	82%	2.0
Basic and Above	82%	85%	92%	92%	91%	90%	90%	1.3
Native American								
Advanced	29%	26%	36%	38%	34%	37%	38%	1.5
Proficient and Above	60%	62%	73%	77%	71%	71%	75%	2.5
Basic and Above	76%	80%	88%	87%	84%	85%	86%	1.7

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 36% in 2002 to 50% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 4th graders was 2.3 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table FL-8. Percentage of Grade 4 Students by Demographic Subgroup Scoring at the Advanced, Proficient and Above, and Basic and Above Levels in Reading

Subgroup	Reporting Year							Average Yearly Percentage Point Gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
All tested students								
Advanced	27%	29%	34%	37%	33%	35%	38%	1.8
Proficient and Above	55%	60%	70%	71%	66%	68%	70%	2.5
Basic and Above	70%	75%	83%	85%	83%	82%	83%	2.2
Low-income students								
Advanced	17%	19%	22%	24%	19%	22%	25%	1.3
Proficient and Above	43%	48%	60%	61%	53%	57%	59%	2.7
Basic and Above	60%	66%	78%	78%	73%	75%	76%	2.7
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced	8%	9%	15%	15%	12%	14%	15%	1.5
Proficient and Above	24%	28%	42%	43%	36%	39%	39%	1.5
Basic and Above	36%	42%	59%	60%	54%	55%	55%	0.5
English language learners ³								
Advanced	3%	6%	8%	10%	8%	9%	10%	1.0
Proficient and Above	12%	22%	34%	39%	33%	35%	36%	1.5
Basic and Above	20%	38%	54%	58%	54%	54%	55%	0.5
Female								
Advanced	30%	32%	36%	38%	36%	37%	39%	1.5
Proficient and Above	58%	63%	72%	74%	70%	71%	71%	2.2
Basic and Above	73%	78%	86%	87%	85%	85%	84%	1.8
Male								
Advanced	24%	27%	33%	35%	28%	33%	37%	2.2
Proficient and Above	51%	57%	68%	69%	61%	66%	69%	3.0
Basic and Above	66%	72%	83%	82%	78%	80%	82%	2.7

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 17% in 2002 to 25% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 4th graders was 1.3 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2008 results.

Table FL-9. Percentages of Grade 4 Students by Racial or Ethnic Subgroup Scoring at the Advanced, Proficient and Above, and Basic and Above Levels in Mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting Year							Average Yearly Percentage Point Gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
All tested students								
Advanced	19%	20%	26%	27%	31%	31%	34%	2.5
Proficient and Above	51%	54%	64%	64%	67%	69%	71%	3.3
Basic and Above	75%	77%	84%	86%	86%	86%	88%	2.2
White								
Advanced	26%	28%	33%	35%	39%	40%	44%	3.0
Proficient and Above	63%	67%	73%	74%	77%	78%	80%	2.8
Basic and Above	84%	87%	91%	92%	92%	92%	93%	1.5
African American								
Advanced	6%	7%	12%	10%	15%	15%	17%	1.8
Proficient and Above	28%	33%	43%	44%	50%	51%	54%	4.3
Basic and Above	56%	63%	74%	72%	76%	78%	79%	3.8
Latino								
Advanced	14%	15%	21%	21%	27%	27%	29%	2.5
Proficient and Above	44%	48%	59%	59%	63%	65%	66%	3.7
Basic and Above	69%	73%	81%	82%	83%	85%	86%	2.8
Asian								
Advanced	36%	38%	48%	50%	57%	56%	58%	3.7
Proficient and Above	71%	74%	82%	83%	85%	86%	87%	2.7
Basic and Above	88%	90%	94%	93%	94%	95%	95%	1.2
Native American								
Advanced	19%	20%	28%	26%	32%	33%	37%	3.0
Proficient and Above	56%	60%	67%	69%	70%	72%	76%	3.3
Basic and Above	80%	82%	87%	89%	88%	88%	91%	1.8

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 26% in 2002 to 44% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 4th graders was 3.0 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table FL-10. Percentage of Grade 4 Students by Demographic Subgroup Scoring at the Advanced, Proficient and Above, and Basic and Above Levels in Mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting Year							Average Yearly Percentage Point Gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
All tested students								
Advanced	19%	20%	26%	27%	31%	31%	34%	2.5
Proficient and Above	51%	54%	64%	64%	67%	69%	71%	3.3
Basic and Above	75%	77%	84%	86%	86%	86%	88%	2.2
Low-income students								
Advanced	9%	10%	17%	15%	19%	20%	23%	2.3
Proficient and Above	36%	41%	53%	52%	56%	58%	61%	4.2
Basic and Above	63%	68%	79%	78%	80%	82%	83%	3.3
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced	6%	7%	11%	11%	12%	14%	16%	2.0
Proficient and Above	24%	27%	38%	39%	40%	44%	46%	3.0
Basic and Above	46%	50%	63%	64%	65%	68%	70%	2.5
English language learners ³								
Advanced	6%	6%	9%	9%	12%	12%	13%	0.5
Proficient and Above	21%	27%	35%	37%	40%	44%	46%	3.0
Basic and Above	40%	53%	61%	63%	65%	70%	73%	4.0
Female								
Advanced	17%	18%	24%	25%	29%	30%	33%	2.7
Proficient and Above	49%	53%	61%	63%	66%	68%	71%	3.7
Basic and Above	74%	78%	84%	85%	86%	87%	89%	2.5
Male								
Advanced	20%	22%	29%	27%	33%	33%	36%	2.7
Proficient and Above	52%	56%	66%	65%	69%	69%	71%	3.2
Basic and Above	74%	78%	87%	84%	86%	87%	88%	2.3

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 9% in 2002 to 23% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 4th graders was 2.3 percentage points per year.

¹Averages are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

³Gap trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because state and federal policy changes may have affected the year-to-year comparability of test results for these subgroups. Average yearly percentage point gains are based on 2006-2008 results.

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)

Table FL-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	02-08	55%	70%	2.5		02-08	45%	53%	1.3		02-08	36%	38%	0.3	
White	02-08	67%	81%	2.3		02-08	58%	65%	1.2		02-08	47%	50%	0.5	
African American	02-08	36%	53%	2.8	L	02-08	24%	34%	1.7	L	02-08	14%	17%	0.5	E
Latino	02-08	46%	64%	3.0	L	02-08	35%	45%	1.7	L	02-08	24%	30%	1.0	L
Asian	02-08	70%	82%	2.0	S	02-08	61%	69%	1.3	L	02-08	44%	53%	1.5	L
Native American	02-08	60%	75%	2.5	L	02-08	51%	58%	1.2	E	02-08	39%	41%	0.3	S
Not low-income	02-08	72%	83%	1.8		02-08	58%	66%	1.3		02-08	42%	48%	1.0	
Low-income	02-08	43%	59%	2.7	L	02-08	30%	38%	1.3	E	02-08	17%	22%	0.8	S
Not disabled	06-08	71%	75%	2.0		06-08	51%	58%	3.5		06-08	35%	41%	3.0	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	36%	39%	1.5	S	06-08	11%	19%	4.0	L	06-08	45%	11%	-17.0	S
All tested students	06-08	66%	70%	2.0		06-08	46%	53%	3.5		06-08	32%	38%	3.0	
English language learners ³	06-08	33%	36%	1.5	S	06-08	9%	10%	0.5	S	06-08	4%	6%	1.0	S
Female	02-08	58%	71%	2.2		02-08	49%	55%	1.0		02-08	35%	39%	0.7	
Male	02-08	51%	69%	3.0	L	02-08	43%	51%	1.3	L	02-08	36%	38%	0.3	S

Table reads: In 2002, 67% of white 4th graders and 36% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 81% of white 4th graders and 53% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2002 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at

an average rate of 2.3 percentage point per year for white students and 2.8 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

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

Table FL-12. Subgroup Achievement Trends in Mathematics by Percentages Proficient

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

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

Subgroup	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting PP	Ending PP	Average Annual Gain ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller Than Comparison Group
All tested students	02-08	51%	71%	3.3		02-08	53%	67%	2.3		02-08	60%	69%	1.5	
White	02-08	63%	80%	2.8		02-08	67%	78%	1.8		02-08	73%	80%	1.2	
African American	02-08	28%	54%	4.3	L	02-08	28%	46%	3.0	L	02-08	32%	46%	2.3	L
Latino	02-08	44%	66%	3.7	L	02-08	42%	61%	3.2	L	02-08	48%	64%	2.7	L
Asian	02-08	71%	87%	2.7	S	02-08	76%	86%	1.7	S	02-08	79%	86%	1.2	E
Native American	02-08	56%	76%	3.3	L	02-08	60%	71%	1.8	E	02-08	64%	73%	1.5	L
Not low-income	02-08	66%	83%	2.8		02-08	67%	79%	2.0		02-08	67%	77%	1.7	
Low-income	02-08	36%	61%	4.2	L	02-08	36%	54%	3.0	L	02-08	41%	56%	2.5	L
Not disabled	06-08	72%	74%	1.0		06-08	66%	71%	2.5		06-08	70%	73%	1.5	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	40%	46%	3.0	L	06-08	23%	30%	3.5	L	06-08	26%	30%	2.0	L
All tested students	06-08	67%	71%	2.0		06-08	60%	67%	3.5		06-08	65%	69%	2.0	
English language learners ³	06-08	40%	46%	3.0	L	06-08	27%	30%	1.5	S	06-08	32%	33%	0.5	S
Female	02-08	49%	71%	3.7		02-08	54%	66%	2.0		02-08	58%	67%	1.5	
Male	02-08	52%	71%	3.2	S	02-08	52%	67%	2.5	L	02-08	63%	70%	1.2	S

Table reads: In 2002, 63% of white 4th graders and 28% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 80% of white 4th graders and 54% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2002 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.8 percentage point per year for white students and declined 4.3 percentage points per year for African American students, indicating a larger rate of gain and a narrowing of the achievement gap for African American 4th graders.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

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

Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Mean Scale Scores)

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

NOTE: L = Larger gain than comparison group. S = Smaller gain than comparison group. E = Equal gain to comparison group. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
All tested students	Mean SS	02-08	299	319	3.3		02-08	295	310	2.5		02-08	303	306	0.5	
	SD	02-08	63.3	56.2			02-08	63.3	47.6			02-08	55.1	62.6		
White	Mean SS	02-08	316	334	3.0		02-08	313	322	1.5		02-08	320	325	0.8	
	SD	02-08	57.9	51.2			02-08	55.8	44.2			02-08	46.4	57.3		
African American	Mean SS	02-08	274	295	3.5	L	02-08	264	290	4.3	L	02-08	272	274	0.3	S
	SD	02-08	60.3	54.6			02-08	62.1	44.7			02-08	55.7	58.1		
Latino	Mean SS	02-08	285	309	4.0	L	02-08	278	300	3.7	L	02-08	286	293	1.2	L
	SD	02-08	66.6	57.7			02-08	66.3	48.6			02-08	57.6	61.5		
Asian	Mean SS	02-08	323	339	2.7	S	02-08	318	330	2.0	L	02-08	316	326	1.7	L
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Native American	Mean SS	02-08	307	324	2.8	S	02-08	304	313	1.5	E	02-08	309	311	0.3	S
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	323	338	2.5		02-08	313	325	2.0		02-08	312	321	1.5	
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	281	302	3.5	L	02-08	272	294	3.7	L	02-08	278	282	0.7	S
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	322	327	2.5		06-08	307	316	4.5		06-08	306	313	3.5	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	271	274	1.5	S	06-08	245	267	11.0	L	06-08	237	249	6.0	L
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
All tested students	Mean SS	06-08	314	319	2.5		06-08	299	310	5.5		06-08	298	306	4.0	
	SD	06-08	53.5	56.2			06-08	54.2	47.6			06-08	59.3	62.6		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	268	271	1.5	S	06-08	239	254	7.5	L	06-08	236	235	-0.5	S
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Female	Mean SS	02-08	306	322	2.7		02-08	301	314	2.2		02-08	305	308	0.5	
	SD	02-08	60.7	53.0			02-08	58.9	45.5			02-08	52.0	61.4		

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
Male	Mean SS	02-08	294	315	3.5	L	02-08	288	306	3.0	L	02-08	301	304	0.5	E
	SD	02-08	65.0	58.9			02-08	66.6	49.1			02-08	NA	63.5		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 316 for white students and 274 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 334 for white students and 295 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 3.0 points for white students and 3.5 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The FCAT is scored on a scale of 100-500.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

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

Table FL-14. Subgroup Achievement Trends in Mathematics by Mean Scale Scores

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

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

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
All tested students	Mean SS	02-08	294	324	5.0		02-08	305	324	3.2		02-08	319	327	1.3	
	SD	02-08	63.4	60.8			02-08	58.1	46.1			02-08	47.9	42.0		
White	Mean SS	02-08	311	339	4.7		02-08	323	336	2.2		02-08	333	338	0.8	
	SD	02-08	57.2	57.6			02-08	48.7	41.4			02-08	40.1	35.4		
African American	Mean SS	02-08	262	298	6.0	L	02-08	273	302	4.8	L	02-08	289	306	2.8	L
	SD	02-08	61.6	57.7			02-08	61.7	45.3			02-08	50.6	44.5		
Latino	Mean SS	02-08	283	317	5.7	L	02-08	294	317	3.8	L	02-08	307	321	2.3	L
	SD	02-08	64.0	59.2			02-08	57.7	45.5			02-08	46.6	40.9		
Asian	Mean SS	02-08	325	360	5.8	L	02-08	337	353	2.7	L	02-08	342	349	1.2	L
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Native American	Mean SS	02-08	301	332	5.2	L	02-08	316	329	2.2	E	02-08	324	331	1.2	L
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	317	345	4.7		02-08	323	338	2.5		02-08	326	336	1.7	
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	02-08	274	307	5.5	L	02-08	285	309	4.0	L	02-08	299	313	2.3	L
	SD	02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA			02-08	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	326	331	2.5		06-08	323	330	3.5		06-08	330	332	1.0	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	276	286	5.0	L	06-08	259	280	10.5	L	06-08	275	285	5.0	L
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
All tested students	Mean SS	06-08	318	324	3.0		06-08	314	324	5.0		06-08	324	327	1.5	
	SD	06-08	60.8	60.8			06-08	52.0	46.1			06-08	45.4	42.0		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	275	286	5.5	L	06-08	273	283	5.0	E	06-08	289	292	1.5	E
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA		
Female	Mean SS	02-08	293	323	5.0		02-08	307	324	2.8		02-08	317	326	1.5	

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) ¹	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
	SD	02-08	61.1	58.9			02-08	54.0	43.4			02-08	45.5	39.0		
Male	Mean SS	02-08	294	326	5.3	L	02-08	304	324	3.3	L	02-08	321	328	1.2	S
	SD	02-08	65.5	62.5			02-08	61.7	48.5			02-08	50.0	44.6		

Table reads: In 2002, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 311 for white students and 262 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 339 for white students and 298 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 4.7 points for white students and 6.0 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The FCAT is scored on a scale of 100-500.

¹Numbers in these columns are subject to rounding error.

²The number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

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

Table FL-15. Numbers of Test-Takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year Span	# of Test-Takers Start Year	# of Test-Takers End Year	Change in # of Test-Takers Over Time	% of Test-Takers in Subgroup in End Year	Year Span	# of Test-Takers Start Year	# of Test-Takers End Year	Change in # of Test-Takers Over Time	% of Test-Takers in Subgroup in End Year	Year Span	# of Test-Takers Start Year	# of Test-Takers End Year	Change in # of Test-Takers Over Time	% of Test-Takers in Subgroup in End Year
All tested students	Reading	02-08	192,117	192,769	0.3%	100.0%	02-08	184,483	186,441	1.1%	100.0%	02-08	150,178	185,308	23.4%	100.0%
	Math	02-08	192,394	192,813	0.2%	100.0%	02-08	184,379	186,227	1.0%	100.0%	02-08	149,783	184,648	23.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	02-08	97,331	87,327	-10.3%	45.3%	02-08	98,135	89,914	-8.4%	48.2%	02-08	84,113	90,207	7.2%	48.7%
	Math	02-08	97,352	87,316	-10.3%	45.3%	02-08	98,087	89,833	-8.4%	48.2%	02-08	83,837	89,981	7.3%	48.7%
African American	Reading	02-08	46,962	42,716	-9.0%	22.2%	02-08	43,198	40,346	-6.6%	21.6%	02-08	32,115	41,665	29.7%	22.5%
	Math	02-08	47,055	42,750	-9.1%	22.2%	02-08	43,122	40,281	-6.6%	21.6%	02-08	32,000	41,422	29.4%	22.4%
Latino	Reading	02-08	39,399	49,137	24.7%	25.5%	02-08	36,918	45,033	22.0%	24.2%	02-08	28,410	43,104	51.7%	23.3%
	Math	02-08	39,496	49,147	24.4%	25.5%	02-08	36,930	44,970	21.8%	24.1%	02-08	28,301	42,926	51.7%	23.2%
Asian	Reading	02-08	3,468	4,606	32.8%	2.4%	02-08	3,810	4,472	17.4%	2.4%	02-08	3,645	4,784	31.2%	2.6%
	Math	02-08	3,475	4,606	32.5%	2.4%	02-08	3,813	4,473	17.3%	2.4%	02-08	3,621	4,782	32.1%	2.6%
Native American	Reading	02-08	561	591	5.3%	0.3%	02-08	506	576	13.8%	0.3%	02-08	375	526	40.3%	0.3%
	Math	02-08	558	594	6.5%	0.3%	02-08	507	579	14.2%	0.3%	02-08	376	531	41.2%	0.3%
Low-income	Reading	02-08	106,219	102,301	-3.7%	53.1%	02-08	83,081	85,651	3.1%	45.9%	02-08	40,173	69,044	71.9%	37.3%
	Math	02-08	105,949	102,307	-3.4%	53.1%	02-08	83,012	85,499	3.0%	45.9%	02-08	39,888	68,748	72.4%	37.2%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-08	30,452	28,912	-5.1%	15.0%	06-08	26,552	21,118	-20.5%	11.3%	06-08	20,060	20,147	0.4%	10.9%
	Math	06-08	30,463	28,940	-5.0%	15.0%	06-08	26,399	21,033	-20.3%	11.3%	06-08	19,815	19,940	0.6%	10.8%
English language learners	Reading	06-08	15,040	15,540	3.3%	8.1%	06-08	10,960	10,281	-6.2%	5.5%	06-08	10,116	10,011	-1.0%	5.4%
	Math	06-08	15,059	15,547	3.2%	8.1%	06-08	10,965	10,265	-6.4%	5.5%	06-08	10,034	9,954	-0.8%	5.4%
Female	Reading	02-08	93,931	94,170	0.3%	48.9%	02-08	91,112	91,660	0.6%	49.2%	02-08	76,906	93,139	21.1%	50.3%
	Math	02-08	94,005	94,193	0.2%	48.9%	02-08	91,069	91,569	0.5%	49.2%	02-08	76,791	92,895	21.0%	50.3%
Male	Reading	02-08	98,076	98,545	0.5%	51.1%	02-08	93,283	94,682	1.5%	50.8%	02-08	73,040	91,956	25.9%	49.6%
	Math	02-08	98,265	98,565	0.3%	51.1%	02-08	93,221	94,551	1.4%	50.8%	02-08	72,670	91,545	26.0%	49.6%

Table reads: In 2002, 97,331 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 87,327 students, a decrease of 10.3%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 45.3% of the 192,769 4th graders taking the reading test that year.

Note: **Bold** type indicates that the number of students tested in this subgroup at this grade level was fewer than 500 in 2008 or the most recent year with available data.

Key Terms

Percentage proficient (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at and above the cut score for “proficient” performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB. The Act requires states to report student test performance in terms of at least three achievement levels: basic, proficient, and advanced. Adequate yearly progress determinations are based on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient level and above.

Percentage basic (and above) — The percentage of students in a group who score at and above the cut score for “basic” performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB.

Percentage advanced — The percentage of students in a group who reach or exceed the cut score for “advanced” performance on the state test used to determine progress under NCLB.

Moderate-to-large gain — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average gain of 1 or more percentage points per year. For effect size, an average gain of 0.02 or greater per year.

Slight gain — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average gain of less than 1 percentage point per year. For effect size, an average gain of less than 0.02 per year.

Moderate-to-large decline — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average decline of 1 or more percentage points per year. For effect size, an average decline of 0.02 or greater per year.

Slight decline — For the percentage basic, proficient, or advanced, an average decline of less than 1 percentage points per year. For effect size, an average decline of less than 0.02 per year.

Effect size — A statistical tool that conveys the amount of difference between test results using a common unit of measurement which does not depend on the scoring scale for a particular test.

Accumulated annual effect size — The cumulative gain in effect size over a range of years.

Mean scale score — The arithmetical average of a group of test scores, expressed on a common scale for a particular state’s test. The mean is calculated by adding the scores and dividing the sum by the number of scores.

Standard deviation — A measure of how much test scores tend to deviate from the mean—in other words, how spread out or bunched together test scores are. If students’ scores are bunched together, with many scores close to the mean, then the standard deviation will be small. If scores are spread out, with many students scoring at the high or low ends of the scale, then the standard deviation will be large.

Cautions and Explanations

Different labels for achievement levels — For consistency, all of the state profiles developed for this report use a common set of labels (basic, proficient, and advanced) for the main achievement levels required by NCLB. In practice, however, some states may use different labels, such as “meets standard” instead of proficient, and some states have established additional achievement levels beyond those required by NCLB.

Different names for subgroups — For the sake of consistency and ease of data tabulation, all of the state profiles developed for this report use a common set of names for the major student subgroups. In practice, however, states use various names for subgroups that may differ from those used here (such as using “Hispanic” instead of “Latino,” or “special education students” instead of “students with disabilities”). Moreover, a few states separately track the performance of subgroups not included in the analyses for this report.

Special caution for students with disabilities and English language learners — Trends for students with disabilities and English language learners should be interpreted with caution because changes in federal guidance and state accountability plans may have altered which students in these subgroups are tested for accountability purposes, how they are tested, and when their test scores are counted as proficient under NCLB. These factors could affect the year-to-year comparability of test results.

Inclusion of former English language learners — In many states, the subgroup of English language learners (also known as limited English proficient students) includes students who were formerly English language learners but who have achieved English language proficiency or fluency in the last two years. Federal NCLB regulations permit states to include these formerly ELL students (sometimes referred to as “redesignated fluent English proficient” students) in the ELL subgroup for up to two years for purposes of NCLB accountability.

Limitations of percentage proficient measure — The percentage proficient, the main gauge of student performance under NCLB, can be easily understood and gives a snapshot of how many students have met their state’s performance expectations. But it also has several limitations as a measure of student achievement. Users of percentage proficient data should keep in mind these limitations, particularly the following:

- * “Proficient” means different things across different states. States vary widely in curriculum, learning expectations, and tests, and state tests differ considerably in their difficulty and cut scores for proficient performance.
- * Although this study has taken steps to avoid comparing test data where there have been “breaks” in comparability resulting from new tests, changes in content standards, revised cut scores, or other major changes in testing programs, the year-to-year comparability of test results in the same state may still be affected by less obvious policy and demographic changes.
- * Changes in student performance may occur that are not reflected in percentage proficient data, such as an increase in the number of students reaching performance levels below and above proficient (such as the basic or advanced levels).
- * The size of the achievement gaps between various subgroups depends in part on where a state sets its cut score for proficiency. For example, if a proficiency cut score is set so high that almost nobody reaches it or so low that almost everyone reaches it, there will be little apparent achievement gap. By contrast, if the cut score is closer to the mean test score, the gaps between subgroups will be more apparent.

Difficulty of attributing causes — Although the tables above show trends in test scores since the enactment of NCLB, one cannot assume that these trends have occurred *because* of NCLB. It is always difficult to determine a cause-and-effect relationship between test score trends and any specific education policy or program due to the many federal, state, and local reforms undertaken in recent years and due to the lack of an appropriate “control” group of students not affected by NCLB.