

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — New Hampshire

K-12 enrollment — 198,117

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.

The three subgroups that were large enough to analyze in New Hampshire (white, Latino, and low-income students) showed a clear trend of gains in grade 4 reading and math at all three achievement levels—basic-and-above, proficient-and-above, and advanced. Achievement gaps narrowed for the Latino and low-income subgroups.

Subgroup trends by achievement level at grade 4

- Notable progress: Gains at grade 4 were notably large for Latino students at the proficient-and-above level in reading and for Latino and low-income students at the basic-and-above level in math.

Gap trends at two grade levels

- Gaps in percentages proficient and average test scores: According to percentages proficient, achievement gaps in both reading and math narrowed for the low-income subgroup at grades 4 and 8 and for the Latino subgroup at grade 4 (at grade 8, the Latino group was too small to discern trends).

Data notes

- Limited data: Trends are limited to 2006–2008 for grades 4 and 8. New Hampshire implemented a new high school test in 2007, so trends are not available at the high school level.

- Subgroups analyzed: Trends were analyzed for white, Latino, and low-income students at grade 4 and for white and low-income students at grade 8. The African American, Asian, and Native American subgroups in New Hampshire were too small to yield reliable trend data at either grade, and the Latino subgroup was too small at grade 8. 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	2006 through 2008, grades 3 through 8 2008, grade 11 (NH implemented a new high school assessment for grade 11 in Fall 2007)
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2006 through 2008, grades 3 through 8 Standard deviations for grade 11 are available in 2008 only
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	2006 through 2008, grades 3 through 8 2008, grade 11 (NH implemented a new high school assessment for grade 11 in Fall 2007)
Numbers of test-takers by subgroup	Available for 2008 only for 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 England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), a collaborative assessment with Rhode Island and Vermont NHEIAP–Alt, assessment for students with disabilities
Grades tested for NCLB accountability	3–8 (NECAP since fall 2005) 11 (NECAP administered in 2007-08)
State labels for achievement levels	NH uses four achievement levels: Substantially Below Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Proficient with Distinction. For our analyses we treated Partially Proficient as Basic, Proficient as

	Proficient, and Proficient with Distinction as Advanced.
High school NCLB test also used as an exit exam?	No
First year test used	2005: NECAP (grades 3–8) 2007-08: NECAP (grade 11)
Time of test administration	Fall for NECAP reading, math, and writing
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	May 2004: Last administration of NHEIAP at grades 3 and 6 2004–05: AYP reports did not include an assessment at elementary and middle school levels; attendance rates only used during transition to new assessment 2005–06: New assessment system (NECAP) administered at grades 3–8 May 2006: Last administration of NHEIAP at grade 10 2006–07: AYP reports did not include a high school assessment; graduation rates only used during transition to new assessment Fall 2007: New NECAP assessment administered in grade 11 2008: Science test administered in May to grades 4, 8, and 11
Comments	Under NECAP, student proficiency was defined from the beginning consistent with the levels in NCLB.

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 NH-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					13%	17%	19%	3.0
Proficient and Above					69%	72%	74%	2.5
Basic and Above					89%	91%	91%	1.0
White								
Advanced					13%	17%	19%	3.0
Proficient and Above					71%	73%	75%	2.0
Basic and Above					90%	91%	92%	1.0
African American ²								
Advanced					7%	6%	8%	0.5
Proficient and Above					45%	54%	57%	6.0
Basic and Above					78%	81%	78%	0.0
Latino								
Advanced					5%	6%	11%	3.0
Proficient and Above					42%	50%	54%	6.0
Basic and Above					72%	78%	80%	4.0
Asian ²								
Advanced					18%	31%	28%	5.0
Proficient and Above					68%	81%	84%	8.0
Basic and Above					89%	96%	95%	3.0
Native American ²								
Advanced					4%	11%	24%	10.0
Proficient and Above					63%	68%	76%	6.5
Basic and Above					84%	88%	93%	4.5

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 13% in 2006 to 19% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading 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 NH-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					13%	17%	19%	3.0
Proficient and Above					69%	72%	74%	2.5
Basic and Above					89%	91%	91%	1.0
Low-income students								
Advanced					5%	7%	8%	1.5
Proficient and Above					49%	53%	55%	3.0
Basic and Above					77%	80%	80%	1.5
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced					1%	3%	3%	1.0
Proficient and Above					26%	29%	33%	3.5
Basic and Above					58%	63%	63%	2.5
English language learners ^{2,3}								
Advanced					2%	3%	2%	0.0
Proficient and Above					28%	35%	30%	1.0
Basic and Above					60%	65%	60%	0.0
Female								
Advanced					17%	22%	24%	3.5
Proficient and Above					75%	77%	78%	1.5
Basic and Above					92%	93%	93%	0.5
Male								
Advanced					9%	12%	14%	2.5
Proficient and Above					64%	68%	70%	3.0
Basic and Above					87%	89%	89%	1.0

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 5% in 2006 to 8% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 4th graders was 1.5 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 NH-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					16%	15%	18%	1.0
Proficient and Above					65%	66%	68%	1.5
Basic and Above					86%	87%	89%	1.5
White								
Advanced					16%	15%	18%	1.0
Proficient and Above					66%	67%	69%	1.5
Basic and Above					87%	88%	90%	1.5
African American ²								
Advanced					6%	3%	8%	1.0
Proficient and Above					42%	38%	41%	-0.5
Basic and Above					66%	70%	71%	2.5
Latino								
Advanced					5%	5%	6%	0.5
Proficient and Above					38%	44%	44%	3.0
Basic and Above					66%	70%	76%	5.0
Asian ²								
Advanced					25%	32%	32%	3.5
Proficient and Above					72%	80%	78%	3.0
Basic and Above					90%	92%	93%	1.5
Native American ²								
Advanced					5%	2%	19%	7.0
Proficient and Above					51%	61%	71%	10.0
Basic and Above					76%	88%	95%	9.5

Table reads: The percentage of white 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 16% in 2006 to 18% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 4th graders was 1.0 percentage point 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 NH-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					16%	15%	18%	1.0
Proficient and Above					65%	66%	68%	1.5
Basic and Above					86%	87%	89%	1.5
Low-income students								
Advanced					5%	6%	7%	1.0
Proficient and Above					43%	47%	47%	2.0
Basic and Above					71%	74%	76%	2.5
Students with disabilities ³								
Advanced					3%	4%	4%	0.5
Proficient and Above					30%	33%	34%	2.0
Basic and Above					57%	61%	64%	3.5
English language learners ^{2,3}								
Advanced					4%	4%	7%	1.5
Proficient and Above					31%	34%	30%	-0.5
Basic and Above					57%	61%	58%	0.5
Female								
Advanced					15%	14%	16%	0.5
Proficient and Above					64%	64%	66%	1.0
Basic and Above					85%	86%	88%	1.5
Male								
Advanced					17%	16%	20%	1.5
Proficient and Above					65%	68%	69%	2.0
Basic and Above					86%	88%	89%	1.5

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 4th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 5% in 2006 to 7% in 2008. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 4th graders was 1.0 percentage point 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 NH-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 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	06-08	69%	74%	2.5		06-08	62%	67%	2.5		08	67%		NA	
White	06-08	71%	75%	2.0		06-08	63%	68%	2.5		08	67%		NA	
African American	06-08	45%	57%	6.0 ²	L	06-08	45%	49%	2.0 ²	S	08	46%		NA	NA
Latino	06-08	42%	54%	6.0	L	06-08	38%	44%	3.0 ²	L	08	46%		NA	NA
Asian	06-08	68%	84%	8.0 ²	L	06-08	70%	81%	5.5 ²	L	08	74%		NA	NA
Native American	06-08	63%	76%	6.5 ²	L	06-08	37%	54%	8.5 ²	L	08	49%		NA	NA
Not low-income	06-08	75%	79%	2.0		06-08	67%	72%	2.5		08	70%		NA	
Low-income	06-08	49%	55%	3.0	L	06-08	38%	45%	3.5	L	08	46%		NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	76%	81%	2.5		06-08	70%	75%	2.5		08	74%		NA	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	26%	33%	3.5	L	06-08	20%	24%	2.0	S	08	25%		NA	NA
Not ELL	06-08	70%	74%	2.0		06-08	63%	68%	2.5		08	67%		NA	
English language learners ³	06-08	28%	30%	1.0 ²	S	06-08	21%	13%	-4.0 ²	S	08	25%		NA	NA
Female	06-08	75%	78%	1.5		06-08	69%	75%	3.0		08	74%		NA	
Male	06-08	64%	70%	3.0	L	06-08	56%	60%	2.0	S	08	60%		NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 71% of white 4th graders and 45% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state reading test. In 2008, 75% of white 4th graders and 57% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2006 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.0 percentage point per year for white students and 6.0 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 NH-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 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	06-08	65%	68%	1.5		06-08	56%	58%	1.0		08	28%		NA	
White	06-08	66%	69%	1.5		06-08	56%	59%	1.5		08	14%		NA	
African American	06-08	42%	41%	-0.5 ²	S	06-08	43%	30%	-6.5 ²	S	08	12%		NA	NA
Latino	06-08	38%	44%	3.0	L	06-08	29%	34%	2.5 ²	L	08	11%		NA	NA
Asian	06-08	72%	78%	3.0 ²	L	06-08	70%	76%	3.0 ²	L	08	47%		NA	NA
Native American	06-08	51%	71%	10.0 ²	L	06-08	37%	48%	5.5 ²	L	08	17%		NA	NA
Not low-income	06-08	71%	73%	1.0		06-08	61%	64%	1.5		08	30%		NA	
Low-income	06-08	43%	47%	2.0	L	06-08	32%	36%	2.0	L	08	12%		NA	NA
Not disabled	06-08	70%	73%	1.5		06-08	63%	66%	1.5		08	31%		NA	
Students with disabilities ³	06-08	30%	34%	2.0	L	06-08	14%	17%	1.5	E	08	4%		NA	NA
Not ELL	06-08	65%	68%	1.5		06-08	56%	58%	1.0		08	28%		NA	
English language learners ³	06-08	31%	30%	-0.5 ²	S	06-08	20%	19%	-0.5 ²	S	08	10%		NA	NA
Female	06-08	64%	66%	1.0		06-08	57%	58%	0.5		08	25%		NA	
Male	06-08	65%	69%	2.0	L	06-08	54%	59%	2.5	L	08	29%		NA	NA

Table reads: In 2006, 66% of white 4th graders and 42% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level on the state math test. In 2008, 69% of white 4th graders and 41% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2006 and 2008, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 1.5 percentage point per year for white students and declined by an average rate of 0.5 percentage point per year for African American students, indicating a lower rate of gain and a widening 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 NH-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) 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	06-08	444	446	1.0		06-08	844	845	0.5		2008	1144	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	11.9	12.2			06-08	12.9	12.8			2008	11.3	NA		
White	Mean SS	06-08	444	446	1.0		06-08	844	846	1.0		2008	1144	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
African American	Mean SS	06-08	437	439	1.0 ²	E	06-08	838	839	0.5 ²	S	2008	1138	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Latino	Mean SS	06-08	436	440	2.0	L	06-08	835	837	1.0 ²	E	2008	1138	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Asian	Mean SS	06-08	444	450	3.0 ²	L	06-08	847	851	2.0 ²	L	2008	1146	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Native American	Mean SS	06-08	441	447	3.0 ²	L	06-08	837	842	2.5 ²	L	2008	1140	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	446	448	1.0		06-08	845	847	1.0		2008	1144	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	438	440	1.0	E	06-08	836	839	1.5	L	2008	1138	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	446	448	1.0		06-08	846	848	1.0		2008	1145	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	431.0	433.0	1.0	E	06-08	830.0	832.0	1.0	E	2008	1133.0	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	444	446	1.0		06-08	844	846	1.0		2008	1144	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	431	432	0.5 ²	S	06-08	831	828	-1.5 ²	S	2008	1133	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Female	Mean SS	06-08	446	448	1.0		06-08	846	848	1.0		2008	1146	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		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	06-08	442	444	1.0	E	06-08	841	843	1.0	E	2008	1142	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade reading test was 444 for white students and 437 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 446 for white students and 439 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 1.0 points for white students and for African American students, indicating no change in the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Nevada CRT and HSPE are 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 NH-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 11				
		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	06-08	444	445	0.5		06-08	840	841	0.5		2008	1134	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	12.0	11.6			06-08	11.0	10.8			2008	10.5	NA		
White	Mean SS	06-08	444	445	0.5		06-08	841	842	0.5		2008	1134	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
African American	Mean SS	06-08	435	437	1.0 ²	L	06-08	836	835	-0.5 ²	S	2008	1127	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Latino	Mean SS	06-08	436	438	1.0	L	06-08	834	835	0.5 ²	E	2008	1127	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Asian	Mean SS	06-08	447	449	1.0 ²	L	06-08	846	847	0.5 ²	E	2008	1138	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Native American	Mean SS	06-08	439	446	3.5 ²	L	06-08	836	840	2.0 ²	L	2008	1130	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Not Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	445	446	0.5		06-08	842	843	0.5		2008	1134	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Low-income	Mean SS	06-08	437	439	1.0	L	06-08	834	836	1.0	L	2008	1129	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Not disabled	Mean SS	06-08	445	446	0.5		06-08	843	843	0.0		2008	1135	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Students with disabilities ³	Mean SS	06-08	433	435	1.0	L	06-08	828	830	1.0	L	2008	1124	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Not ELLs	Mean SS	06-08	444	445	0.5		06-08	841	841	0.0		2008	1134	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
English language learners ³	Mean SS	06-08	432	434	1.0 ²	L	06-08	831	830	-0.5 ²	S	2008	1123	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Female	Mean SS	06-08	443	444	0.5		06-08	841	841	0.0		2008	1134	NA	NA	
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 11				
		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	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		
Male	Mean SS	06-08	444	445	0.5	E	06-08	840	841	0.5	L	2008	1134	NA	NA	NA
	SD	06-08	NA	NA			06-08	NA	NA			2008	NA	NA		

Table reads: In 2006, the mean scale score on the state 4th grade math test was 444.0 for white students and 435.0 for African American students. In 2008, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 445.0 for white students and 437.0 for African American students. Between 2006 and 2008, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 0.5 points for white students and 1.0 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Nevada CRT and HSPE are 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 NH-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
All tested students	Reading	06-08	15,041	14,853	-1.2%	100.0%	06-08	17,034	16,069	-5.7%	100.0%	08	15,611	NA	NA	97.1%
	Math	06-08	15,050	14,871	-1.2%	100.0%	06-08	17,029	16,080	-5.6%	100.0%	08	15,546	NA	NA	96.7%
White	Reading	06-08	13,912	13,464	-3.2%	90.6%	06-08	15,988	14,917	-6.7%	92.8%	08	14,654	NA	NA	91.2%
	Math	06-08	13,901	13,462	-3.2%	90.5%	06-08	15,969	14,915	-6.6%	92.8%	08	14,587	NA	NA	90.7%
African American	Reading	06-08	292	350	19.9%	2.4%	06-08	234	276	17.9%	1.7%	08	201	NA	NA	1.3%
	Math	06-08	303	356	17.5%	2.4%	06-08	235	278	18.3%	1.7%	08	201	NA	NA	1.3%
Latino	Reading	06-08	402	517	28.6%	3.5%	06-08	396	494	24.7%	3.1%	08	427	NA	NA	2.7%
	Math	06-08	407	523	28.5%	3.5%	06-08	405	278	-31.4%	1.7%	08	429	NA	NA	2.7%
Asian	Reading	06-08	325	342	5.2%	2.3%	06-08	250	295	18.0%	1.8%	08	271	NA	NA	1.7%
	Math	06-08	330	350	6.1%	2.4%	06-08	256	302	18.0%	1.9%	08	272	NA	NA	1.7%
Native American	Reading	06-08	56	147	162.5%	1.0%	06-08	48	48	0.0%	0.3%	08	43	NA	NA	0.3%
	Math	06-08	56	147	162.5%	1.0%	06-08	48	48	0.0%	0.3%	08	42	NA	NA	0.3%
Low-income	Reading	06-08	3,074	3,140	2.1%	21.1%	06-08	2,965	2,908	-1.9%	18.1%	08	2,127	NA	NA	13.2%
	Math	06-08	3,083	3,140	1.8%	21.1%	06-08	2,968	2,904	-2.2%	18.1%	08	2,106	NA	NA	13.1%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-08	1,977	2,144	8.4%	14.4%	06-08	2,612	2,531	-3.1%	15.8%	08	2,317	NA	NA	14.4%
	Math	06-08	1,975	2,142	8.5%	14.4%	06-08	2,605	2,526	-3.0%	15.7%	08	2,303	NA	NA	14.3%
English language learners	Reading	06-08	373	266	-28.7%	1.8%	06-08	219	174	-20.5%	1.1%	08	130	NA	NA	0.8%
	Math	06-08	400	292	-27.0%	2.0%	06-08	238	196	-17.6%	1.2%	08	135	NA	NA	0.8%
Female	Reading	06-08	7,275	7,291	0.2%	49.1%	06-08	8,396	7,776	-7.4%	48.4%	08	7,714	NA	NA	48.0%
	Math	06-08	7,277	7,210	-0.9%	48.5%	06-08	8,394	7,785	-7.3%	48.4%	08	7,687	NA	NA	47.8%
Male	Reading	06-08	7,765	7,649	-1.5%	51.5%	06-08	8,638	8,292	-4.0%	51.6%	08	7,897	NA	NA	49.1%
	Math	06-08	7,772	7,661	-1.4%	51.5%	06-08	8,635	8,294	-3.9%	51.6%	08	7,859	NA	NA	48.9%

Table reads: In 2006, 13,912 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2008, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 13,464 students, a decrease of 3.2%. In 2008, the white subgroup made up 90.6% of the 14,853 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.