

## Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New Mexico

*K-12 enrollment — 323,881*

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 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.

Grade 4 achievement trends at the proficient level showed a mixed picture for New Mexico's major student groups. Declines were more prevalent than gains in reading, while gains were more common than declines in math. Trends in achievement gaps were also mixed. In reading, gaps narrowed in nearly all cases, but in math the two indicators of achievement used in this study showed contradictory trends.

#### ***Subgroup trends by achievement level at grade 4***

- **General:** In grade 4 reading, declines in achievement were more common than gains across the five subgroups studied at three achievement levels—basic-and-above, proficient-and-above, and advanced. In grade 4 math, gains were somewhat more common than declines across the three achievement levels.
- **Reading:** Of the 15 trend lines analyzed across the three achievement levels in grade 4 reading, 11 showed declines (most of them slight), while 4 trend lines showed gains of various sizes. The white, Latino, and low-income subgroups showed declines in reading at all three achievement levels. The African American and Native American subgroups had mixed results at different achievement levels.
- **Math:** Of the 15 trend lines analyzed across three achievement levels in grade 4 math, 9 trend lines showed gains (most of them slight), 3 showed slight declines, and 3 showed no net change in performance. Only African American students made gains at all three achievement levels; results for other subgroups were mixed.

### **Gap trends at two grade levels**

- **General:** In reading, progress in narrowing achievement gaps was apparent on both measures of achievement used in this study—percentages of students scoring proficient and average (mean) test scores. In nearly all cases, gaps in reading narrowed at grades 4 and 8 on both measures; the exception related to the gap in average test scores between low-income and non-low-income students, which widened at grade 4. In math, the two indicators gave different very pictures. According to percentages proficient, gaps in math widened in the majority of cases, but according to average test scores, gaps narrowed for all groups across the board.

### **Data notes**

- **Limited data:** Trends are limited to 2005–2008 for grades 4 and 8. (Too few years of data were available to determine trends at the high school level.)
- **Subgroups analyzed:** Trends were analyzed for white, African American, Latino, Native American, and low-income students. The Asian American subgroup is too small in New Mexico to yield reliable trend data. 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 two grade levels, 4 and 8.

### **Data Limitations**

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	2005 through 2008, grade 3-8 2007 through 2008, grade 11
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2005 through 2008, grade 3-8 2007 through 2008, grade 11

### **Test Characteristics**

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

Test(s) used for NCLB accountability	New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (SBA) New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA)
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8, 11 (dropped 9 <sup>th</sup> grade in HS AYP consideration in 2008)

State labels for achievement levels	NM uses four achievement levels: Beginning Step, Nearing Proficiency, Proficient, and Advanced. For our analyses we treated Nearing Proficiency as Basic, Proficient as Proficient, and Advanced as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2005
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	<p>2002–03: Administered the Terra Nova from CTB at all grades and the Standards Based Assessment in the spring of grades 4 and 8.</p> <p>Spring 2005: New tests administered in grades 3–9 and grade 11. These changes required new standard setting at all grade levels. For this reason, the state has been careful to not make direct comparisons between 2004 and 2005. New test was used for NCLB. In addition, grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 were tested for the first time</p> <p>2006–07: Science assessment administered</p> <p>2007–08: Discontinued testing 9<sup>th</sup> grade and no longer counting 9<sup>th</sup> grade in high school AYP consideration</p>
Comments	As a result of the 2007 changes in test vendor and test standards for the high school test, test results from 2007 and beyond were determined not to be comparable to results from previous years, so trends for high school are limited to 2007 and 2008.

## 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 NM-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 <sup>1</sup>		
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		2007	2008
<b>All tested students</b>								
Advanced				10%	11%	11%	8%	-0.5
Proficient and Above				52%	54%	55%	51%	-0.3
Basic and Above				87%	89%	88%	85%	-0.7
<b>White</b>								
Advanced				17%	19%	18%	15%	-0.8
Proficient and Above				70%	72%	71%	69%	-0.5
Basic and Above				93%	94%	93%	92%	-0.5
<b>African American</b>								
Advanced				8%	7%	8%	7%	-0.3
Proficient and Above				45%	51%	48%	48%	1.0
Basic and Above				83%	86%	85%	84%	0.2
<b>Latino</b>								
Advanced				7%	7%	7%	5%	-0.4
Proficient and Above				45%	47%	49%	44%	-0.2
Basic and Above				85%	87%	86%	83%	-0.9
<b>Asian<sup>2</sup></b>								
Advanced				23%	25%	23%	18%	-1.6
Proficient and Above				72%	75%	75%	67%	-1.7
Basic and Above				95%	96%	96%	92%	-1.2
<b>Native American</b>								
Advanced				3%	4%	5%	4%	0.1
Proficient and Above				33%	35%	39%	36%	1.0
Basic and Above				78%	81%	80%	77%	-0.3

Table reads: The percentage of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 17% in 2005 to 15% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for white 4<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.8 percentage point 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

**Table NM-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 <sup>1</sup>		
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		2007	2008
All tested students								
Advanced				10%	11%	11%	8%	-0.5
Proficient and Above				52%	54%	55%	51%	-0.3
Basic and Above				87%	89%	88%	85%	-0.7
Low-income students								
Advanced				6%	6%	7%	5%	-0.2
Proficient and Above				43%	45%	46%	42%	-0.1
Basic and Above				84%	86%	84%	81%	-0.9
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>								
Advanced				3%	3%	5%	3%	-0.1
Proficient and Above				20%	21%	23%	19%	-1.0
Basic and Above				65%	60%	59%	52%	-3.9
English language learners <sup>3</sup>								
Advanced				4%	4%	5%	4%	-0.3
Proficient and Above				33%	37%	39%	34%	-1.4
Basic and Above				80%	83%	81%	77%	-3.1
Female								
Advanced				12%	13%	13%	10%	-0.5
Proficient and Above				56%	59%	60%	56%	-0.2
Basic and Above				90%	91%	91%	88%	-0.6
Male								
Advanced				8%	8%	8%	6%	-0.5
Proficient and Above				48%	49%	50%	46%	-0.5
Basic and Above				85%	86%	85%	82%	-0.9

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test decreased from 6% in 2005 to 5% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly decline in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 4<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 2008 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 2006-2008 results.

**Table NM-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 <sup>1</sup>		
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		2007	2008
<b>All tested students</b>								
Advanced				7%	9%	11%	7%	-0.1
Proficient and Above				39%	41%	46%	39%	-0.1
Basic and Above				89%	89%	91%	91%	0.6
<b>White</b>								
Advanced				13%	15%	19%	13%	0.0
Proficient and Above				56%	57%	62%	55%	-0.1
Basic and Above				95%	95%	95%	95%	0.1
<b>African American</b>								
Advanced				4%	5%	8%	6%	0.6
Proficient and Above				29%	32%	38%	32%	1.0
Basic and Above				85%	83%	86%	86%	0.4
<b>Latino</b>								
Advanced				5%	6%	7%	4%	-0.1
Proficient and Above				32%	35%	40%	33%	0.3
Basic and Above				88%	88%	89%	90%	0.8
<b>Asian<sup>2</sup></b>								
Advanced				24%	26%	29%	19%	-1.7
Proficient and Above				69%	68%	73%	64%	-1.7
Basic and Above				95%	98%	97%	98%	1.0
<b>Native American</b>								
Advanced				3%	3%	5%	3%	0.1
Proficient and Above				25%	26%	31%	25%	-0.2
Basic and Above				84%	84%	86%	87%	1.1

Table reads: The percentage of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test was 13% in 2002 and in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 4<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.0 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

**Table NM-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 <sup>1</sup>		
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006		2007	2008
<b>All tested students</b>								
Advanced				7%	9%	11%	7%	-0.1
Proficient and Above				39%	41%	46%	39%	-0.1
Basic and Above				89%	89%	91%	91%	0.6
<b>Low-income students</b>								
Advanced				4%	5%	6%	4%	0.0
Proficient and Above				31%	33%	38%	31%	0.0
Basic and Above				87%	87%	88%	89%	0.8
<b>Students with disabilities<sup>3</sup></b>								
Advanced				2%	3%	4%	3%	0.0
Proficient and Above				16%	16%	22%	17%	0.2
Basic and Above				68%	71%	76%	77%	2.8
<b>English language learners<sup>3</sup></b>								
Advanced				3%	4%	6%	3%	-0.4
Proficient and Above				25%	28%	33%	26%	-1.3
Basic and Above				84%	85%	86%	87%	1.1
<b>Female</b>								
Advanced				7%	9%	11%	7%	0.1
Proficient and Above				39%	42%	46%	40%	0.2
Basic and Above				90%	90%	92%	92%	0.6
<b>Male</b>								
Advanced				8%	8%	10%	7%	-0.3
Proficient and Above				39%	40%	45%	38%	-0.3
Basic and Above				89%	89%	90%	90%	0.6

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4<sup>th</sup> graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test was 4% in 2005 and 2008. During this period, the average yearly change in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 4<sup>th</sup> graders was 0.0 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 2008 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 2006-2008 results.

**Achievement by Subgroup — Gap Trends (Percentages Proficient)****Table NM-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 11				
	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	05-08	52%	51%	-0.3		05-08	52%	63%	4.0		07-08	47%	50%	NA	
White	05-08	70%	69%	-0.5		05-08	67%	77%	3.1		07-08	65%	65%	NA	
African American	05-08	45%	48%	1.0	L	05-08	46%	63%	5.7	L	07-08	39%	45%	NA	NA
Latino	05-08	45%	44%	-0.2	L	05-08	46%	58%	4.2	L	07-08	38%	43%	NA	NA
Asian	05-08	72%	67%	-1.7 <sup>2</sup>	S	05-08	71%	77%	2.1 <sup>2</sup>	S	07-08	59%	61%	NA	NA
Native American	05-08	33%	36%	1.0	L	05-08	35%	54%	6.2	L	07-08	32%	35%	NA	NA
Not low-income	05-08	71%	70%	-0.3		05-08	67%	77%	3.3		07-08	58%	60%	NA	
Low-income	05-08	43%	42%	-0.1	L	05-08	43%	56%	4.3	L	07-08	36%	39%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	59%	56%	-1.8		06-08	57%	70%	6.5		07-08	53%	55%	NA	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	06-08	21%	19%	-1.0	L	06-08	17%	22%	2.6	S	07-08	13%	13%	NA	NA
Not ELL	06-08	61%	57%	-1.9		06-08	56%	69%	6.3		07-08	52%	55%	NA	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	06-08	37%	34%	-1.4	L	06-08	34%	45%	5.4	S	07-08	23%	25%	NA	NA
Female	05-08	56%	56%	-0.2		05-08	60%	69%	3.2		07-08	51%	55%	NA	
Male	05-08	48%	46%	-0.5	S	05-08	44%	58%	4.7	L	07-08	44%	44%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2005, 70% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 45% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 69% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 48% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2005 and 2008, the percentage proficient declined at an average rate of 0.5 percentage point per year for white students and increased at an average rate of 1.0 percentage point 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

<sup>3</sup>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 NM-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 11				
	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	05-08	39%	39%	-0.1		05-08	24%	37%	4.2		07-08	31%	34%	NA	
White	05-08	56%	55%	-0.1		05-08	40%	55%	5.0		07-08	50%	52%	NA	
African American	05-08	29%	32%	1.0	L	05-08	17%	31%	4.9	S	07-08	21%	25%	NA	NA
Latino	05-08	32%	33%	0.3	L	05-08	17%	29%	4.1	S	07-08	21%	25%	NA	NA
Asian	05-08	69%	64%	-1.7 <sup>2</sup>	S	05-08	54%	67%	4.5 <sup>2</sup>	S	07-08	58%	60%	NA	NA
Native American	05-08	25%	25%	-0.2	S	05-08	11%	23%	4.1	S	07-08	16%	17%	NA	NA
Not low-income	05-08	57%	58%	0.2		05-08	40%	53%	4.5		07-08	42%	45%	NA	
Low-income	05-08	31%	31%	0.0	S	05-08	15%	27%	4.0	S	07-08	19%	21%	NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	45%	42%	-1.4		06-08	30%	41%	5.4		07-08	35%	37%	NA	
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	06-08	16%	17%	0.2	L	06-08	6%	10%	1.8	S	07-08	6%	8%	NA	NA
Not ELL	06-08	46%	44%	-1.2		06-08	30%	42%	5.7		07-08	35%	38%	NA	
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	06-08	28%	26%	-1.3	S	06-08	13%	17%	2.3	S	07-08	10%	12%	NA	NA
Female	05-08	39%	40%	0.2		05-08	24%	36%	4.3		07-08	30%	32%	NA	
Male	05-08	39%	38%	-0.3	S	05-08	24%	37%	4.1	S	07-08	32%	35%	NA	NA

Table reads: In 2005, 56% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 29% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 55% of white 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 32% of African American 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2005 and 2008, the percentage proficient declined at an average rate of 0.1 percentage point per year for white students and increased at an average rate of 1.0 percentage point 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 2008 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

<sup>3</sup>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 NM-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 11				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
All tested students	Mean SS	05-08	638.7	636.8	-0.7		05-08	682.6	692.5	3.3		07-08	616.3	620.0	NA	
	SD	05-08	33.9	35.7			05-08	31.8	31.0			07-08	37.6	34.9		
White	Mean SS	05-08	653.4	651.5	-0.7		05-08	694.8	703.7	3.0		07-08	631.3	631.5	NA	
	SD	05-08	31.6	33.7			05-08	30.2	29.0			07-08	35.8	34.0		
African American	Mean SS	05-08	634.3	635.0	0.2	L	05-08	679.0	691.1	4.0	L	07-08	608.6	616.3	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	33.8	35.9			05-08	31.3	31.5			07-08	38.9	34.5		
Latino	Mean SS	05-08	632.6	631.2	-0.5	L	05-08	677.3	687.6	3.4	L	07-08	608.5	614.3	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	32.8	34.6			05-08	30.9	30.3			07-08	36.1	34.3		
Asian	Mean SS	05-08	657.9	653.8	-1.4 <sup>2</sup>	S	05-08	699.4	706.8	2.5 <sup>2</sup>	S	07-08	627.1	629.8	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	31.3	33.8			05-08	30.8	33.6			07-08	38.5	38.0		
Native American	Mean SS	05-08	625.4	625.0	-0.1	L	05-08	671.6	685.9	4.8	L	07-08	603.8	610.5	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	30.7	33.9			05-08	29.2	30.5			07-08	33.6	30.8		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	05-08	654.7	653.5	-0.4		05-08	694.7	703.9	3.1		07-08	624.9	627.9	NA	
	SD	05-08	31.0	32.3			05-08	30.2	28.4			07-08	37.0	33.8		
Low-income	Mean SS	05-08	631.2	629.6	-0.6	S	05-08	675.2	685.7	3.5	L	07-08	606.4	611.3	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	32.6	34.6			05-08	30.5	30.4			07-08	35.8	34.1		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	644.8	641.6	-1.6		06-08	689.8	697.4	3.8		07-08	622.0	625.6	NA	
	SD	06-08	31.8	32.5			06-08	27.2	27.5			07-08	34.3	31.2		
Students with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	Mean SS	06-08	606.9	601.3	-2.8	S	06-08	651.9	656.8	2.5	S	07-08	575.4	579.5	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	35.5	37.8			06-08	30.6	31.2			07-08	34.8	33.9		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	646.2	642.5	-1.9		06-08	688.9	697.1	4.1		07-08	620.3	623.6	NA	
	SD	06-08	33.7	34.6			06-08	29.8	30.0			07-08	36.8	34.2		
English language learners <sup>3</sup>	Mean SS	06-08	624.9	621.3	-1.8	L	06-08	670.5	676.2	2.9	S	07-08	595.1	600.7	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	32.6	33.9			06-08	29.1	28.6			07-08	34.5	32.3		
Female	Mean SS	05-08	642.5	641.3	-0.4		05-08	689.1	697.7	2.9		07-08	620.6	625.2	NA	
	SD	05-08	33.6	35.0			05-08	29.9	29.6			07-08	36.5	33.5		

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
Male	Mean SS	05-08	635.1	632.3	-0.9	S	05-08	676.3	687.6	3.8	L	07-08	611.8	614.7	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	33.8	35.8			05-08	32.3	31.5			07-08	38.2	35.5		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test was 653.4 for white students and 634.3 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading was 651.5 for white students and 635.0 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2008, the mean scale score declined at an average yearly rate of 0.7 points for white students and improved at an average yearly rate of 0.2 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment is scored using a linear transformation such that scale scores (SS) = 35( $\theta$ ) + 600.

<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 2008 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.



Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group	Year Span	Starting Year	Ending Year	Average Gain (Mean Scale Score) <sup>1</sup>	Gain Larger or Smaller than Comparison Group
	SD	05-08	33.6	32.7			05-08	34.3	35.2			07-08	29.2	31.4		
Male	Mean SS	05-08	625.4	625.8	0.2	S	05-08	680.6	693.9	4.4	L	07-08	583.4	584.7	NA	NA
	SD	05-08	34.9	32.9			05-08	36.6	36.1			07-08	33.2	34.9		

Table reads: In 2005, the mean scale score on the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade math test was 639.6 for white students and 617.0 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4<sup>th</sup> grade math was 640.2 for white students and 621.0 for African American students. Between 2005 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.2 points for white students and 1.3 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment is scored using a linear transformation such that scale scores (SS) = 35(θ) + 600.

<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 2008 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 NM-15. Numbers of Test-Takers

Subgroup	Subject	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		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	05-08	23,367	24,086	3.1%	100.0%	05-08	25,263	24,131	-4.5%	100.0%	07-08	19,383	19,695	1.6%	100.0%
	Math	05-08	23,594	24,111	2.2%	100.0%	05-08	25,274	24,157	-4.4%	100.0%	07-08	19,291	19,737	2.3%	100.0%
White	Reading	05-08	7,271	6,860	-5.7%	28.5%	05-08	8,235	7,164	-13.0%	29.7%	07-08	6,888	6,702	-2.7%	34.0%
	Math	05-08	7,321	6,868	-6.2%	28.5%	05-08	8,224	7,169	-12.8%	29.7%	07-08	6,867	6,708	-2.3%	34.0%
African American	Reading	05-08	588	587	-0.2%	2.4%	05-08	637	646	1.4%	2.7%	07-08	472	503	6.6%	2.6%
	Math	05-08	595	588	-1.2%	2.4%	05-08	639	648	1.4%	2.7%	07-08	472	504	6.8%	2.6%
Latino	Reading	05-08	12,935	13,889	7.4%	57.7%	05-08	13,166	13,217	0.4%	54.8%	07-08	9,274	9,764	5.3%	49.6%
	Math	05-08	13,064	13,896	6.4%	57.6%	05-08	13,179	13,231	0.4%	54.8%	07-08	9,203	9,775	6.2%	49.5%
Asian	Reading	05-08	272	<b>349</b>	28.3%	1.4%	05-08	235	<b>284</b>	20.9%	1.2%	07-08	279	<b>285</b>	2.2%	1.4%
	Math	05-08	278	<b>353</b>	27.0%	1.5%	05-08	240	<b>285</b>	18.8%	1.2%	07-08	281	<b>284</b>	1.1%	1.4%
Native American	Reading	05-08	2,301	2,401	4.3%	10.0%	05-08	2,990	2,819	-5.7%	11.7%	07-08	2,469	2,441	-1.1%	12.4%
	Math	05-08	2,336	2,406	3.0%	10.0%	05-08	2,992	2,823	-5.6%	11.7%	07-08	2,467	2,466	0.0%	12.5%
Low-income	Reading	05-08	15,894	16,839	5.9%	69.9%	05-08	15,731	15,081	-4.1%	62.5%	07-08	9,091	9,392	3.3%	47.7%
	Math	05-08	16,058	16,861	5.0%	69.9%	05-08	15,738	15,098	-4.1%	62.5%	07-08	9,042	9,430	4.3%	47.8%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-08	3,052	2,876	-5.8%	11.9%	06-08	3,501	2,907	-17.0%	12.0%	07-08	2,379	2,389	0.4%	12.1%
	Math	06-08	3,058	2,894	-5.4%	12.0%	06-08	3,456	2,918	-15.6%	12.1%	07-08	2,348	2,389	1.7%	12.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-08	6,898	6,502	-5.7%	27.0%	06-08	5,970	5,291	-11.4%	21.9%	07-08	3,132	3,122	-0.3%	15.9%
	Math	06-08	6,912	6,509	-5.8%	27.0%	06-08	5,976	5,298	-11.3%	21.9%	07-08	3,122	3,134	0.4%	15.9%
Female	Reading	05-08	11,451	11,865	3.6%	49.3%	05-08	12,343	11,806	-4.4%	48.9%	07-08	9,805	9,896	0.9%	50.2%
	Math	05-08	11,534	11,871	2.9%	49.2%	05-08	12,343	11,818	-4.3%	48.9%	07-08	9,760	9,917	1.6%	50.2%
Male	Reading	05-08	11,916	12,221	2.6%	50.7%	05-08	12,920	12,325	-4.6%	51.1%	07-08	9,575	9,799	2.3%	49.8%
	Math	05-08	12,060	12,240	1.5%	50.8%	05-08	12,931	12,339	-4.6%	51.1%	07-08	9,528	9,820	3.1%	49.8%

Table reads: In 2005, 7,271 students in the white subgroup took the state 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 6,860 students, a decrease of 5.7%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 28.5% of the 24,086 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 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.