

Subgroup Achievement and Gap Trends — Florida

K-12 enrollment — 2,628,754

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 labeled State Testing Data. In the list of results that appears, look for the most recent report on student achievement since 2002. Below the name of the report, click on the link for State Profiles and Worksheets. Scroll down the page until you reach the list of states. Click on the Worksheet link for proficiency data or scale score data for a particular state.

Subgroup Achievement Trends and Gap Trends — Key Findings

Summary. In grade 8 (the only grade in which subgroup trends were analyzed by achievement level), Florida students showed gains almost across the board in both reading and math at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels for racial/ethnic subgroups, low income students, and boys and girls. Progress has been made in narrowing achievement gaps in both reading and math between racial/ethnic subgroups, and between low income and non-low income students, with a few exceptions. Comparable data were available from 2002 through 2009.

- **Exception.** At the advanced achievement level for grade 8, there was a slight decline shown in reading for the Native American subgroup.
- **Reading gap between boys and girls.** The gap between boys and girls in reading (girls usually outperform boys in reading) narrowed in grade 4, but widened at grades 8 and 10.
- **Some gaps widen.** The achievement gap between Native American and white students widened in grade 10 reading and grade 8 math. The gap also widened between low income and non-low income students in Grade 8 reading.

Data Limitations

Years of comparable percentage proficient data	1999 through 2009 for reading at grades 4, 8, and 10 and for math at grades 5, 8, and 10 2001 through 2009 for all other grades in reading and math
Years of comparable mean scale score data	2002 through 2009
Disaggregated data for all subgroups and comparison groups	Data are not available until 2009 for the comparison group of students who are <i>not</i> English language learners, 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 Assessment Test (FCAT) Reading and Mathematics FCAT Writing (used as other indicators in AYP)
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, but students can substitute ACT or SAT score if they fail FCAT three times.
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 mathematics
Time of test administration	Spring
Major changes in testing system (2002–present)	None

Achievement by Subgroup — Trends at the Middle School Level

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

Table FL-7. Percentages of grade 8 students by racial or ethnic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced	17%	19%	18%	14%	15%	16%	19%	21%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	45%	49%	45%	44%	46%	49%	53%	54%	1.3
Basic-and-above	71%	75%	70%	74%	77%	78%	82%	82%	1.6
White									
Advanced	24%	26%	25%	20%	20%	22%	26%	28%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	58%	62%	57%	56%	58%	61%	65%	66%	1.1
Basic-and-above	83%	85%	81%	84%	85%	87%	90%	90%	1.0
African American									
Advanced	6%	7%	7%	4%	5%	6%	8%	8%	0.3
Proficient-and-above	24%	27%	25%	24%	27%	29%	34%	34%	1.4
Basic-and-above	53%	57%	53%	56%	61%	64%	71%	70%	2.4
Latino									
Advanced	11%	12%	12%	9%	11%	11%	14%	15%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	35%	38%	35%	34%	39%	40%	45%	47%	1.7
Basic-and-above	61%	65%	62%	64%	70%	71%	76%	77%	2.3
Asian									
Advanced	28%	31%	29%	26%	25%	29%	32%	37%	1.3
Proficient-and-above	61%	64%	59%	62%	62%	66%	69%	71%	1.4
Basic-and-above	82%	85%	83%	86%	85%	89%	89%	92%	1.4
Native American									
Advanced	20%	23%	16%	15%	17%	16%	18%	18%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above	51%	55%	47%	50%	50%	53%	58%	59%	1.1
Basic-and-above	77%	81%	73%	79%	81%	83%	87%	87%	1.4

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 24% in 2002 to 28% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for white 8th graders was 0.6 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 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table FL-8. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in reading

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced	17%	19%	18%	14%	15%	16%	19%	21%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	45%	49%	45%	44%	46%	49%	53%	54%	1.3
Basic-and-above	71%	75%	70%	74%	77%	78%	82%	82%	1.6
Low-income students									
Advanced	8%	9%	9%	7%	7%	8%	9%	11%	0.4
Proficient-and-above	30%	33%	30%	29%	31%	34%	38%	40%	1.4
Basic-and-above	58%	62%	58%	61%	64%	68%	73%	74%	2.3
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	0.7
Proficient-and-above	13%	15%	13%	13%	13%	15%	19%	21%	2.7
Basic-and-above	32%	36%	31%	36%	38%	42%	49%	52%	4.7
English language learners ³									
Advanced	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0.0
Proficient-and-above	6%	9%	9%	7%	9%	10%	10%	10%	0.3
Basic-and-above	18%	30%	28%	26%	32%	36%	38%	39%	2.3
Female									
Advanced	19%	20%	19%	14%	18%	19%	20%	23%	0.6
Proficient-and-above	49%	51%	47%	46%	51%	53%	55%	58%	1.3
Basic-and-above	76%	78%	74%	76%	80%	83%	84%	85%	1.3
Male									
Advanced	16%	17%	17%	14%	12%	14%	17%	18%	0.3
Proficient-and-above	43%	46%	42%	42%	42%	45%	51%	50%	1.0
Basic-and-above	68%	71%	67%	70%	72%	74%	80%	79%	1.6

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state reading test increased from 8% in 2002 to 11% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in reading for low-income 8th graders was 0.4 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 2009 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 2006-2009 results.

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

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced	22%	24%	26%	26%	27%	29%	32%	29%	1.0
Proficient-and-above	53%	56%	56%	59%	60%	63%	67%	66%	1.9
Basic-and-above	75%	78%	78%	78%	80%	82%	86%	86%	1.6
White									
Advanced	31%	33%	35%	35%	36%	39%	42%	40%	1.3
Proficient-and-above	67%	70%	69%	71%	72%	76%	78%	78%	1.6
Basic-and-above	86%	89%	87%	87%	89%	92%	92%	93%	1.0
African American									
Advanced	7%	8%	10%	10%	11%	12%	14%	12%	0.7
Proficient-and-above	28%	31%	33%	36%	39%	42%	46%	45%	2.4
Basic-and-above	53%	58%	60%	60%	66%	68%	74%	74%	3.0
Latino									
Advanced	13%	17%	20%	21%	20%	22%	26%	24%	1.6
Proficient-and-above	42%	47%	49%	52%	53%	56%	61%	61%	2.7
Basic-and-above	67%	73%	74%	75%	76%	78%	82%	84%	2.4
Asian									
Advanced	44%	48%	51%	53%	53%	55%	59%	55%	1.6
Proficient-and-above	76%	80%	80%	81%	83%	83%	86%	85%	1.3
Basic-and-above	91%	92%	92%	92%	94%	93%	96%	95%	0.6
Native American									
Advanced	26%	28%	29%	25%	32%	36%	33%	31%	0.7
Proficient-and-above	60%	63%	59%	63%	64%	71%	71%	70%	1.4
Basic-and-above	82%	83%	80%	85%	85%	88%	88%	90%	1.1

Table reads: The percentage of white 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 31% in 2002 to 40% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for white 8th 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 2009 or the most recent year with available data, so changes for this subgroup should be interpreted with caution.

Table FL-10. Percentage of grade 8 students by demographic subgroup scoring at the advanced, proficient-and-above, and basic-and-above levels in mathematics

Subgroup	Reporting year								Average yearly percentage point gain ¹
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
All tested students									
Advanced	22%	24%	26%	26%	27%	29%	32%	29%	1.0
Proficient-and-above	53%	56%	56%	59%	60%	63%	67%	66%	1.9
Basic-and-above	75%	78%	78%	78%	80%	82%	86%	86%	1.6
Low-income students									
Advanced	10%	12%	15%	15%	14%	16%	19%	17%	1.0
Proficient-and-above	36%	40%	43%	45%	45%	49%	54%	54%	2.6
Basic-and-above	61%	66%	68%	69%	70%	73%	78%	79%	2.6
Students with disabilities ³									
Advanced	4%	3%	5%	5%	5%	7%	8%	8%	1.0
Proficient-and-above	18%	17%	19%	72%	22%	26%	30%	32%	3.3
Basic-and-above	38%	39%	38%	40%	43%	48%	54%	58%	5.0
English language learners ³									
Advanced	5%	6%	8%	7%	7%	7%	8%	6%	-0.3
Proficient-and-above	22%	24%	27%	26%	27%	27%	30%	27%	0.0
Basic-and-above	44%	49%	51%	49%	52%	52%	57%	53%	0.3
Female									
Advanced	22%	23%	26%	26%	26%	28%	30%	29%	1.0
Proficient-and-above	54%	56%	57%	59%	61%	63%	66%	66%	1.7
Basic-and-above	76%	78%	80%	80%	82%	83%	86%	87%	1.6
Male									
Advanced	22%	24%	25%	28%	27%	30%	33%	31%	1.3
Proficient-and-above	52%	55%	56%	58%	59%	63%	67%	67%	2.1
Basic-and-above	73%	76%	75%	78%	79%	82%	85%	86%	1.9

Table reads: The percentage of low-income 8th graders who scored at the advanced level on the state math test increased from 10% in 2002 to 17% in 2009. During this period, the average yearly gain in the percentage advanced in math for low-income 8th graders was 1.0 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 2009 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 2006-2009 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	02-09	55%	74%	2.7		02-09	45%	54%	1.3		02-09	36%	37%	0.1	
White	02-09	67%	84%	2.4		02-09	58%	66%	1.1		02-09	47%	48%	0.1	
African American	02-09	36%	59%	3.3	L	02-09	24%	34%	1.4	L	02-09	14%	18%	0.6	L
Latino	02-09	46%	68%	3.1	L	02-09	35%	47%	1.7	L	02-09	24%	30%	0.9	L
Asian	02-09	70%	86%	2.3	S	02-09	61%	71%	1.4	L	02-09	44%	54%	1.4	L
Native American	02-09	60%	79%	2.7	L	02-09	51%	59%	1.1	E	02-09	39%	39%	0.0	S
Not low-income	02-09	72%	87%	2.1		02-09	58%	69%	1.6		02-09	42%	47%	0.7	
Low-income	02-09	43%	65%	3.1	L	02-09	30%	40%	1.4	S	02-09	17%	23%	0.9	L
Not disabled	06-09	71%	81%	3.3		06-09	51%	60%	3.0		06-09	35%	41%	2.0	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	36%	46%	3.3	E	06-09	13%	21%	2.7	S	06-09	7%	10%	1.0	S
All tested students	06-09	66%	74%	2.7		06-09	46%	54%	2.7		06-09	32%	37%	1.7	
English language learners ³	06-09	33%	42%	3.0	L	06-09	9%	10%	0.3	S	06-09	4%	4%	0.0	S
Female	02-09	58%	77%	2.7		02-09	49%	58%	1.3		02-09	35%	38%	0.4	
Male	02-09	51%	71%	2.9	L	02-09	43%	50%	1.0	S	02-09	36%	35%	-0.1	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 2009, 84% of white 4th graders and 59% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in reading. Between 2002 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.4 percentage points per year for white students and 3.3 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 2009 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	02-09	51%	75%	3.4		02-09	53%	66%	1.9		02-09	60%	69%	1.3	
White	02-09	63%	83%	2.9		02-09	67%	78%	1.6		02-09	73%	80%	1.0	
African American	02-09	28%	60%	4.6	L	02-09	28%	45%	2.4	L	02-09	32%	49%	2.4	L
Latino	02-09	44%	72%	4.0	L	02-09	42%	61%	2.7	L	02-09	48%	64%	2.3	L
Asian	02-09	71%	90%	2.7	S	02-09	76%	85%	1.3	S	02-09	79%	87%	1.1	L
Native American	02-09	56%	79%	3.3	L	02-09	60%	70%	1.4	S	02-09	64%	75%	1.6	L
Not low-income	02-09	66%	86%	2.9		02-09	67%	79%	1.7		02-09	67%	78%	1.6	
Low-income	02-09	36%	66%	4.3	L	02-09	36%	54%	2.6	L	02-09	41%	57%	2.3	L
Not disabled	06-09	72%	80%	2.7		06-09	66%	72%	2.0		06-09	70%	75%	1.7	
Students with disabilities ³	06-09	40%	50%	3.3	L	06-09	22%	32%	3.3	L	06-09	26%	31%	1.7	E
All tested students	06-09	67%	75%	2.7		06-09	60%	66%	2.0		06-09	65%	69%	1.3	
English language learners ³	06-09	40%	52%	4.0	L	06-09	27%	27%	0.0	S	06-09	32%	33%	0.3	S
Female	02-09	49%	75%	3.7		02-09	54%	66%	1.7		02-09	58%	68%	1.4	
Male	02-09	52%	75%	3.3	S	02-09	52%	67%	2.1	L	02-09	63%	70%	1.0	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 2009, 83% of white 4th graders and 60% of African American 4th graders scored at the proficient level in math. Between 2002 and 2009, the percentage proficient improved at an average rate of 2.9 percentage points per year for white students and 4.6 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 2009 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. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	02-09	299	324	3.6		02-09	295	312	2.4		02-09	303	305	0.3	
	SD	02-09	63.3	52			02-09	63.3	49			02-09	55.1	59		
White	MSS	02-09	316	338	3.1		02-09	313	325	1.7		02-09	320	321	0.1	
	SD	02-09	57.9	47			02-09	55.8	46			02-09	46.4	54		
African American	MSS	02-09	274	303	4.1	L	02-09	264	290	3.7	L	02-09	272	277	0.7	L
	SD	02-09	60.3	50			02-09	62.1	46			02-09	55.7	56		
Latino	MSS	02-09	285	314	4.1	L	02-09	278	303	3.6	L	02-09	286	295	1.3	L
	SD	02-09	66.6	54			02-09	66.3	49			02-09	57.6	59		
Asian	MSS	02-09	323	346	3.3	L	02-09	318	333	2.1	L	02-09	316	329	1.9	L
	SD	02-09	NA	52			02-09	NA	49			02-09	NA	58		
Native American	MSS	02-09	307	328	3.0	S	02-09	304	315	1.6	S	02-09	309	311	0.3	L
	SD	02-09	NA	49			02-09	NA	44			02-09	NA	54		
Not low-income	MSS	02-09	323	344	3.0		02-09	313	328	2.1		02-09	312	319	1.0	
	SD	02-09	NA	46			02-09	NA	45			02-09	NA	55		
Low-income	MSS	02-09	281	309	4.0	L	02-09	272	296	3.4	L	02-09	278	285	1.0	E
	SD	02-09	NA	52			02-09	NA	47			02-09	NA	57		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	322	331	3.0		06-09	307	318	3.7		06-09	306	312	2.0	
	SD	06-09	NA	47			06-09	NA	45			06-09	NA	54		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	271	285	4.7	L	06-09	245	270	8.3	L	06-09	237	250	4.3	L
	SD	06-09	NA	64			06-09	NA	51			06-09	NA	64		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	314	324	3.3		06-09	299	312	4.3		06-09	298	305	2.3	
	SD	06-09	53.5	52			06-09	54.2	49			06-09	59.3	59		
English language learners ³	MSS	06-09	268	278	3.3	E	06-09	239	257	6.0	L	06-09	236	242	2.0	S
	SD	06-09	NA	60			06-09	NA	46			06-09	NA	52		
Female	MSS	02-09	306	329	3.3		02-09	301	317	2.3		02-09	305	309	0.6	
	SD	02-09	60.7	50			02-09	58.9	47			02-09	52.0	56		
Male	MSS	02-09	294	319	3.6	L	02-09	288	307	2.7	L	02-09	301	301	0.0	S
	SD	02-09	65.0	54			02-09	66.6	50			02-09	NA	61		

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 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade reading was 338 for white students and 303 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an average yearly rate of 3.1 points for white students and 4.1 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (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 2009 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. Achievement gap trends in mathematics by mean scale scores

NOTE: L = larger gain than comparison group. S = smaller gain than comparison group. E = equal gain to comparison group. MSS = mean scale score. SD = standard deviation. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest, such as African American students, is larger than the average gain for the comparison group, such as white students, this indicates that the achievement gap has narrowed. If the average gain for the subgroup of interest is smaller, this means the gap has widened.

Subgroup	Statistic	Grade 4					Grade 8					Grade 10				
		Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group	Year span	Start year	End year	Avg. gain MSS ¹	Gain larger or smaller than comp. group
All tested students	MSS	02-09	294	330	5.1		02-09	305	322	2.4		02-09	319	327	1.1	
	SD	02-09	63.4	60			02-09	58.1	46			02-09	47.9	42		
White	MSS	02-09	311	343	4.6		02-09	323	335	1.7		02-09	333	338	0.7	
	SD	02-09	57.2	56			02-09	48.7	41			02-09	40.1	37		
African American	MSS	02-09	262	305	6.1	L	02-09	273	300	3.9	L	02-09	289	307	2.6	L
	SD	02-09	61.6	58			02-09	61.7	46			02-09	50.6	44		
Latino	MSS	02-09	283	323	5.7	L	02-09	294	316	3.1	L	02-09	307	321	2.0	L
	SD	02-09	64.0	60			02-09	57.7	46			02-09	46.6	43		
Asian	MSS	02-09	325	365	5.7	L	02-09	337	350	1.9	L	02-09	342	351	1.3	L
	SD	02-09	NA	59			02-09	NA	44			02-09	NA	38		
Native American	MSS	02-09	301	336	5.0	L	02-09	316	326	1.4	S	02-09	324	332	1.1	L
	SD	02-09	NA	61			02-09	NA	43			02-09	NA	39		
Not low-income	MSS	02-09	317	351	4.9		02-09	323	337	2.0		02-09	326	336	1.4	
	SD	02-09	NA	56			02-09	NA	41			02-09	NA	38		
Low-income	MSS	02-09	274	314	5.7	L	02-09	285	308	3.3	L	02-09	299	314	2.1	L
	SD	02-09	NA	58			02-09	NA	46			02-09	NA	43		
Not disabled	MSS	06-09	326	336	3.3		06-09	323	328	1.7		06-09	330	332	0.7	
	SD	06-09	NA	56			06-09	NA	41			06-09	NA	37		
Students with disabilities ³	MSS	06-09	276	292	5.3	L	06-09	259	281	7.3	L	06-09	275	285	3.3	L
	SD	06-09	NA	68			06-09	NA	56			06-09	NA	56		
All tested students	MSS	06-09	318	330	4.0		06-09	314	322	2.7		06-09	324	327	1.0	
	SD	06-09	60.8	60			06-09	52.0	46			06-09	45.4	42		
English language learners ³	MSS	06-09	275	291	5.3	L	06-09	273	277	1.3	S	06-09	289	290	0.3	S
	SD	06-09	NA	64			06-09	NA	55			06-09	NA	52		
Female	MSS	02-09	293	329	5.1		02-09	307	322	2.1		02-09	317	327	1.4	
	SD	02-09	61.1	58			02-09	54.0	44			02-09	45.5	39		
Male	MSS	02-09	294	330	5.1	E	02-09	304	322	2.6	L	02-09	321	327	0.9	S
	SD	02-09	65.5	62			02-09	61.7	48			02-09	50.0	45		

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 2009, the mean scale score in 4th grade math was 343 for white students and 305 for African American students. Between 2002 and 2009, the mean scale score improved at an

average yearly rate of 4.6 points for white students and 6.1 points for African American students, indicating a narrowing of the achievement gap for African Americans.

Note: The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (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 2009 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	02-09	192,117	195,972	2.0%	100.0%	02-09	184,483	196,007	6.2%	100.0%	02-09	150,178	188,198	25.3%	100.0%
	Math	02-09	192,394	195,995	1.9%	100.0%	02-09	184,379	195,722	6.2%	100.0%	02-09	149,783	187,563	25.2%	100.0%
White	Reading	02-09	97,331	87,052	-10.6%	44.4%	02-09	98,135	90,396	-7.9%	46.1%	02-09	84,113	89,594	6.5%	47.6%
	Math	02-09	97,352	87,047	-10.6%	44.4%	02-09	98,087	90,231	-8.0%	46.1%	02-09	83,837	89,340	6.6%	47.6%
African American	Reading	02-09	46,962	43,907	-6.5%	22.4%	02-09	43,198	44,021	1.9%	22.5%	02-09	32,115	42,345	31.9%	22.5%
	Math	02-09	47,055	43,905	-6.7%	22.4%	02-09	43,122	43,959	1.9%	22.5%	02-09	32,000	42,114	31.6%	22.5%
Latino	Reading	02-09	39,399	50,594	28.4%	25.8%	02-09	36,918	48,879	32.4%	24.9%	02-09	28,410	44,877	58.0%	23.8%
	Math	02-09	39,496	50,610	28.1%	25.8%	02-09	36,930	48,846	32.3%	25.0%	02-09	28,301	44,741	58.1%	23.9%
Asian	Reading	02-09	3,468	4,738	36.6%	2.4%	02-09	3,810	4,803	26.1%	2.5%	02-09	3,645	4,754	30.4%	2.5%
	Math	02-09	3,475	4,736	36.3%	2.4%	02-09	3,813	4,800	25.9%	2.5%	02-09	3,621	4,740	30.9%	2.5%
Native American	Reading	02-09	561	558	-0.5%	0.3%	02-09	506	573	13.2%	0.3%	02-09	375	551	46.9%	0.3%
	Math	02-09	558	558	0.0%	0.3%	02-09	507	574	13.2%	0.3%	02-09	376	546	45.2%	0.3%
Low-income	Reading	02-09	106,219	110,656	4.2%	56.5%	02-09	83,081	98,639	18.7%	50.3%	02-09	40,173	77,506	92.9%	41.2%
	Math	02-09	105,949	110,647	4.4%	56.5%	02-09	83,012	98,448	18.6%	50.3%	02-09	39,888	77,187	93.5%	41.2%
Students w/ disabilities	Reading	06-09	30,452	30,096	-1.2%	15.4%	06-09	26,552	25,879	-2.5%	13.2%	06-09	20,060	21,050	4.9%	11.2%
	Math	06-09	30,463	30,091	-1.2%	15.4%	06-09	26,399	25,804	-2.3%	13.2%	06-09	19,815	20,873	5.3%	11.1%
English language learners	Reading	06-09	15,040	15,536	3.3%	7.9%	06-09	10,960	9,893	-9.7%	5.0%	06-09	10,116	9,780	-3.3%	5.2%
	Math	06-09	15,059	15,563	3.3%	7.9%	06-09	10,965	9,899	-9.7%	5.1%	06-09	10,034	9,735	-3.0%	5.2%
Female	Reading	02-09	93,931	95,496	1.7%	48.7%	02-09	91,112	95,728	5.1%	48.8%	02-09	76,906	93,722	21.9%	49.8%
	Math	02-09	94,005	95,499	1.6%	48.7%	02-09	91,069	95,612	5.0%	48.9%	02-09	76,791	93,497	21.8%	49.8%
Male	Reading	02-09	98,076	99,854	1.8%	51.0%	02-09	93,283	99,620	6.8%	50.8%	02-09	73,040	93,682	28.3%	49.8%
	Math	02-09	98,265	99,854	1.6%	50.9%	02-09	93,221	99,454	6.7%	50.8%	02-09	72,670	93,265	28.3%	49.7%

Table reads: In 2002, 97,331 students in the white subgroup took the state 4th grade reading test. By 2009, the number of white test-takers had fallen to 87,052 students, a decrease of 10.6%. In 2009, the white subgroup made up 44.4% of the 195,972 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 2009 or the most recent year with available data.

Key Terms

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cautions and Explanations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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