

# Interpretive Guide





## INTRODUCTION

Georgia’s performance-based writing assessments are administered to students in grades three, five, eight, and eleven. Student writing samples are evaluated on an analytic scoring system in all grades to provide diagnostic feedback to teachers, students, and parents about individual performance. The writing assessments provide information to students about their writing performance and areas of strength and challenge. This information is useful for instruction and preparation for future writing assessments.

Georgia law (O.C.G.A., Section 20-2-281) requires that writing assessments be administered to students in grades three, five, eight, and eleven. The State Writing Assessment Core Development and Advisory Committees assisted the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) in developing the writing component of the student assessment program. The committees were composed of educators with expertise in the instruction of writing skills and writing assessments. There were eight committees—a Core Development and Advisory Committee for each grade level (3, 5, 8, and 11). The goal of the Writing Assessment Core Development and Advisory Committees and GaDOE is to create developmentally appropriate assessment procedures to enhance statewide instruction in the language arts. Statewide writing assessments serve the purpose of improving writing and writing instruction.

## SCORING PROCEDURES AND TYPES OF SCORES

The Grade 8 Writing Assessment consists of an evaluation of the student’s response to an assigned prompt. The prompt may be persuasive or expository. Prompts are spiraled at the classroom level. Students do not have a choice of topics. Topic development, support, and organizational strategies are determined by the genre of writing. The type of writing determines the tone that is appropriate for the paper.

An individual writing report is prepared for each student, and results are summarized for each school and system. The results are designed to inform students, parents, teachers, and school administrators of the extent to which students are able to demonstrate effective writing skills and to suggest areas of instruction where improvement could be made. The various reports are described in this [Interpretive Guide](#).

### *Nature of the Scoring System*

Each student composition is scored by multiple raters who independently rate the composition on four qualities of effective writing. These qualities or domains of effective writing should be present in a composition regardless of the topic on which it is written. The domains are Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions. A component is a feature of writing within a particular domain. For example, “controlling idea” is a component of the Ideas domain (See descriptive statements for each domain on pages 13-16).

### ***Analytic and Holistic Scoring:***

The scoring system is analytic. Analytic scoring simply means that more than one feature (domain) of a paper is evaluated. Each domain itself is scored holistically. The score assigned indicates the test rater's overall impression of the writer's command of the components, using predetermined scoring criteria contained in the Scoring Guidelines for each domain. Holistic scoring requires balancing a writer's strengths and areas of challenge in the various components.

### ***The Score Scale:***

The score scale is a five-point scale. Each one of the domains of effective writing is evaluated separately and assigned a score of "1" (lowest), "2," "3," "4," or "5" (highest). The scale is a continuum representing a range of quality. Each score point on the continuum is defined by domain-specific scoring guidelines.

Occasionally a student paper cannot be rated. In such cases, the reason for not rating the paper is noted on the Student Score Report, and the numbers of such papers are shown on the School and System Content Summary Reports. The categories of non-scorable papers are shown below:

- **Blank:** The paper contains no student writing.
- **Copied:** Copied from a published source or another student's writing.
- **Illegible:** Not enough words in the paper are recognizable to be used as a basis for determining what other words are.
- **Incomprehensible:** The paper contains few recognizable English words or it may contain recognizable English words arranged in such a way that no meaning is conveyed.
- **Text Too Limited To Score:** Lack of enough text to score the student's writing.
- **Non-English:** The paper is written in a language other than English.
- **Nonparticipation:** Student did not attempt to write.
- **Off-Task:** Complete or major portion of the response consists of poetry, rap, and/or musical lyrics.
- **Off-Topic:** Student did not follow directives for the assigned task.
- **Offensive:** Language was inappropriate.
- **Invalidated:** Student's writing paper was not scored due to extenuating circumstances (i.e., cheating, etc.).

### ***How Scores Are Derived***

Each student composition is scored in four domains (Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions) by two raters. Scores in each domain range from 1 to 5 (5 being the highest score). The total weighted scores range from 10 (1s in all four domains) to 50 (5s in all four domains).

| Scoring Domain | Domain Weight                 |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Ideas          | 2 x the sum of raters' scores |
| Organization   | 1 x the sum of raters' scores |
| Style          | 1 x the sum of raters' scores |
| Conventions    | 1 x the sum of raters' scores |

Weighting simply means that the sum of the scores assigned by the two raters is multiplied by the weight (or importance) assigned to a domain by the Grade 8 Writing Advisory Committee. The following table provides sample domain ratings and raw scores.

|         | Domain Ratings |            |             |             | Raw Score |
|---------|----------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
|         | Ideas (x 2)    | Org. (x 1) | Style (x 1) | Conv. (x 1) |           |
| Rater 1 | 1              | 1          | 1           | 1           | <b>10</b> |
| Rater 2 | 1              | 1          | 1           | 1           |           |
| Rater 1 | 2              | 2          | 3           | 3           | <b>25</b> |
| Rater 2 | 2              | 3          | 3           | 3           |           |
| Rater 1 | 3              | 3          | 3           | 3           | <b>30</b> |
| Rater 2 | 3              | 3          | 3           | 3           |           |
| Rater 1 | 5              | 4          | 4           | 3           | <b>41</b> |
| Rater 2 | 4              | 4          | 4           | 4           |           |
| Rater 1 | 5              | 5          | 5           | 5           | <b>50</b> |
| Rater 2 | 5              | 5          | 5           | 5           |           |

A paper can receive any raw score from 10 to 50. The raw score is then converted to a scale score between 100 and 350. *Note: Scale scores, not raw scores, are reported.*

### **Scale Scores**

The scale score range for the Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment is 100 to 350. Scale scores are used so that the scores from one edition of the writing assessment may be equated to, and mean the same thing as, scores from other versions of the assessment. By converting raw scores to scale scores, adjustments may be made for any small differences between the various assessment editions of the Grade 8 Writing Assessment. A scale score of 200 or higher is required to meet the standard, and a scale score of 250 or higher is required to exceed the standard.

## *Performance Level Descriptions*

### Does Not Meet the Standard

Writing samples that “**Do Not Meet**” the standard demonstrate limited focus on the assigned topic or genre and may lack an introduction or conclusion. A controlling idea may be unclear, or the controlling idea may not address the assigned genre. Development of the topic is minimal, and supporting ideas are listed rather than developed. Ideas may not be grouped or sequenced appropriately, and transitions may be lacking. The writing shows little awareness of audience or reader concerns. Word choice and sentences are simple and/or repetitive. The writer’s voice is inconsistent or not apparent. Frequent errors in sentence formation, usage, and mechanics may interfere with or obscure meaning. Demonstration of competence may be limited by the brevity of the response. **The scale score range is 100-199 for “Does Not Meet the Standard.”**

### Meets the Standard

Writing samples that “**Meet**” the standard are generally focused on the assigned topic and genre and contain a clear introduction, body and conclusion. Expository compositions have a controlling idea that explains or describes the assigned topic. Persuasive compositions have a clear position on the assigned topic. Supporting ideas are relevant and developed with some examples and details, but some parts of the paper may be more developed than others. Ideas are presented in a clear sequence. Related ideas are grouped together and connected with some transitions. Word choice is generally engaging, and there is some variation in sentence length and structure. The writer’s voice is clear, and the writing shows awareness of the audience. Sentence formation, usage, and mechanics are generally correct, and errors do not interfere with meaning. The text is of sufficient length to demonstrate effective writing skills. **The scale score range is 200-249 for “Meets the Standard.”**

### Exceeds the Standard

Writing samples that “**Exceed**” the standard are consistently focused on the assigned topic, genre, and audience and have an effective introduction, body, and conclusion. Expository compositions have a clear controlling idea that fully explains or describes the assigned topic. Persuasive compositions have a well-developed controlling idea that establishes the validity of the writer’s position. Supporting ideas are relevant and fully elaborated with specific examples and details that address reader concerns. Ideas are logically grouped and sequenced within paragraphs and across parts of the paper. Varied transitional elements are used to connect ideas. Word choice is varied and precise throughout the response, and sentences are varied in length and structure. The writer’s voice is distinctive, and the writer demonstrates sustained attention to the audience in the introduction, body, and conclusion. Sentence formation, usage, and mechanics are consistently correct in a variety of contexts. Errors are minor and infrequent. The text is of sufficient length to demonstrate effective writing skills in a variety of contexts. **The scale score range is 250-350 for “Exceeds the Standard.”**

### ***Domain Scores***

The Writing Score Report also describes the student's performance in four domains or aspects of writing. Two independent raters score each student on a scale of 1-5 in the domains of Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions. The final domain score is the average of the two ratings.

### ***Domain Descriptions and Components***

**Domain 1: IDEAS.** The degree to which the writer establishes a controlling idea and elaborates the main points with examples, illustrations, facts, or details that are appropriate to the persuasive genre.

#### Components

- Controlling Idea/Focus
- Supporting Ideas
- Relevance of Detail
- Depth of Development
- Awareness of the Persuasive Purpose
- Sense of Completeness

**Domain 2: ORGANIZATION.** The degree to which the writer's ideas are arranged in a clear order and the overall structure of the response is consistent with the persuasive genre.

#### Components

- Overall Plan
- Introduction/Body/Conclusion
- Sequence of Ideas
- Grouping of Ideas within Paragraphs
- Organizing Strategies Appropriate to Persuasion
- Transitions

**Domain 3: STYLE.** The degree to which the writer controls language to engage the reader.

#### Components

- Word Choice
- Audience Awareness
- Voice
- Sentence Variety

**Domain 4: CONVENTIONS.** The degree to which the writer demonstrates control of sentence formation, usage, and mechanics. *Note: In general, sentence formation and usage are weighted more heavily than mechanics in determining the overall conventions score.*

| Components: | <b>Sentence Formation</b>   | <b>Usage</b>   | <b>Mechanics</b>  |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| Elements:   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• correctness</li><li>• clarity of meaning</li><li>• complexity</li><li>• end punctuation</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• subject-verb agreement</li><li>• standard word forms</li><li>• verb tenses</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• internal punctuation</li><li>• spelling</li><li>• paragraph breaks</li><li>• capitalization</li></ul> |

## INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORTS

### **Student Label**

One label is provided for each student tested. The label is to be placed in the student's cumulative school record. It contains the performance level, total scale score, and domain scores. Domain scores are reported as the mean (or average) of two raters' scores. A sample label and interpretive key are on page 10.

### **Writing Student Score Report**

Two originals of the Writing Student Score Report are provided (see sample on page 11): one is a student/parent copy which must be provided to the student's parent(s) or guardian, preferably after the results are reviewed with the student in a counselor or teacher conference; one copy is for instructional use by the student's teacher(s).

The Writing Student Score Report describes the student's total test performance and performance level. It also describes the domain scores with written narrative. The domain score is reported as the mean (or average) of two raters' scores. A complete list of descriptive statements for score points 1-5 in each domain appears on pages 12-15. If a student's paper cannot be rated (e.g., because of illegible handwriting or not being written on the assigned topic), no scores are reported. In this case, there is a statement in the top box signifying the reason the paper cannot be scored.

The back page of the Student Score Report contains detailed information about the score report and the four domains of writing (see sample on page 16).

### **Writing Test Achievement Roster**

Two copies of the Writing Test Achievement Rosters are provided (see sample on page 17). Rosters contain the names of all students tested, including students with disabilities and ELL students. For each student, the roster displays the total writing score, the performance level, and domain performance. Student ID numbers and state required codes (SRC) are shown as coded on the student's Answer Document.

### **Writing Test Does Not Meet Roster**

This roster lists students who did not meet the standard for the Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment (see sample on page 18). Students who had non-scorable papers are also listed. This roster may be used to determine which students need remedial instruction in writing. In addition to student names, the roster contains student ID numbers and scale scores. If a student's paper was non-scorable, "NS" appears in the scale score column. Students who took the Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment under conditional administrations are not listed on this roster.

### **Writing Test Conditional Administration Roster**

This roster lists students who took the Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment with accommodations that resulted in a conditional administration of the test (see sample on page 19). For each student, the roster displays a scale score with the letters "CA" to indicate a conditional administration. The roster also indicates domain performance.



Student ID numbers and state required codes (SRC) are shown as coded on the student's Answer Document.

## **SUMMARY REPORTS**

### **Writing Test School Content Summary**

A summary of student scores is provided for each school where testing was conducted (see sample on page 20). Three copies of this report are provided (two for the school and one for the system). The School Content Summary contains four sections displaying the following information.

1. Mean scale scores for the school, system, RESA, and state are shown. These data are based on the scores for all students.
2. A Performance Summary describes the performance of all examinees with scorable papers. The percentages of students for each performance level for the school, system, RESA, and state are shown. An N-count (number) is also provided for the school.
3. A Domain Rating Summary provides mean domain scores for all students with scorable papers, and mean domain scores for each genre assessed: persuasive and expository. In each domain (Ideas, Organization, Style, Conventions), a student may receive a score of 1-5.
4. The number and percent of non-scorable papers in each of 10 categories are shown. The number of invalidated papers is also shown. The total number of non-scorable and invalidated papers is indicated in the bottom row of this section.

### **Writing Test System Content Summary**

For each system a summary report is provided which is identical in format to the school report (see sample on page 20). Two copies are provided.

### **School Student Population Summary**


The population summary (see sample on page 21) indicates performance for various groups of students. For each group, the number of students tested, (under standard and conditional administrations) and mean scale scores are reported. Performance level percentages are also included for the school and system.

### **System Student Population Summary**

The population summary indicates performance for various groups of students. For each group, the number of students tested, (under standard and conditional administrations), mean scale scores are reported. Performance level percentages are also included for the system and state.

# SAMPLE REPORT FORMS

## Student Label



## Key:

- A. Student's name and GTID as they appear on the Answer Document
- B. Date of testing
- C. Name of test
- D. Scale Score
- E. Performance Level
- F. Domain Scores (average of the scores assigned by two raters)

# Writing Student Score Report (Front)



## Writing Student Score Report

Name: Harrison, Heather H  
 DOB: 02/24/1994  
 Test Date: Winter, 2009  
 System: Friendly County  
 School: Friendly Middle Sch  
 Teacher: Eighth G Teacher


GTID: 2009000807  
 Document No: 809007  
 Code: 123-0809  
 Date Printed: 1/29/2009

**A**

**B**

**C**

**D**



**Key:**

- A.** Student Demographic Information
- B.** Scale Score and Performance Level
- C.** Performance Level
- D.** Domain Scores (average of two raters' scores) and Descriptions of Domain Performance

## Student Score Report (Back)

Georgia law requires that writing assessments be administered to students in Grade Eight. Student writing samples are evaluated on an analytic scoring system to provide diagnostic feedback to teachers, students, and parents about individual performance. This feedback may help students to prepare for the Georgia High School Graduation Test in Grade 11, which must be passed to earn a regular education diploma.

### Understanding the Student Score Report

The Student Score Report provides two types of information. Overall performance is reported as a scale score ranging from approximately 100 to 350 and as a performance level. Scale scores are related to performance levels as follows: below 200–Does Not Meet the Standard, 200-249–Meets the Standard, 250 and above–Exceeds the Standard. This information appears in the top section of the report, which is labeled “Total Test Performance and Performance Level.” If the paper is not scorable, an explanation is printed instead of a scaled score and performance level. The Student Score Report also describes the student’s performance in four domains or aspects of writing. Two independent raters score each student on a scale of 1-5 in the domains of Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions. The final domain score is the average of the two ratings.

### Four Domains of Writing

**Domain 1: IDEAS.** The degree to which the writer establishes a controlling idea and elaborates the main points with examples, illustrations, facts, or details that are appropriate to the assigned genre. The Ideas Domain is weighted twice as heavily as the others when computing total scale scores.

#### Components

- Controlling Idea/Focus
- Supporting Ideas
- Relevance of Detail
- Depth of Development
- Sense of Completeness
- Awareness of Genre

**Domain 2: ORGANIZATION.** The degree to which the writer’s ideas are arranged in a clear order and the overall structure of the response is consistent with the persuasive genre.

#### Components

- Overall Plan
- Introduction/Body/Conclusion
- Sequence of Ideas
- Grouping of Ideas within Paragraphs
- Genre-Specific Strategies
- Transitions

**Domain 3: STYLE.** The degree to which the writer controls language to engage the reader.

#### Components

- Word Choice
- Audience Awareness
- Voice
- Sentence Variety
- Strategies Appropriate to the Genre

**Domain 4: CONVENTIONS.** The degree to which the writer demonstrates control of sentence formation, usage, and mechanics. *Note: In general, sentence formation and usage are weighted more heavily than mechanics in determining the overall conventions score.*

| Components: | Sentence Formation  | Usage  | Mechanics   |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| Elements:   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• correctness</li><li>• clarity of meaning</li><li>• complexity</li><li>• end punctuation</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• subject-verb agreement</li><li>• standard word forms</li><li>• verb tenses</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• internal punctuation</li><li>• spelling</li><li>• paragraph breaks</li><li>• capitalization</li></ul> |

## Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment - Domain Descriptive Statements

One of the following domain statements will appear on the Student Score Report below the domain score for Ideas.

### **Ideas**

#### **I = 4.5 or 5**

The paper contained a fully developed controlling idea that consistently focused on the assigned topic and purpose and addressed all aspects of the assigned task. Supporting ideas were relevant to the topic, genre, and audience and were fully elaborated with logical examples and details. The response fully addressed reader concerns and perspectives. Genre appropriate strategies were used to develop the ideas.

#### **I = 3.5 or 4**

The paper contained a well developed controlling idea that consistently focused on the assigned topic and purpose and addressed the assigned task. Supporting ideas were relevant to the topic and genre and were developed with specific examples and details. The response addressed reader concerns and perspectives. The response was appropriate to the assigned genre.

#### **I = 2.5 or 3**

The paper contained a developed controlling idea with a generally consistent focus on the assigned topic and purpose and addressed the assigned task. Supporting ideas were relevant to the topic and genre and were developed with some examples and details. Some parts of the paper were well developed, but other parts were only partially developed. There was sufficient information to provide a sense of completeness. The response addressed some reader concerns and perspectives. The response was appropriate to the assigned genre.

#### **I = 1.5 or 2**

The paper contained a minimally developed controlling idea with a limited focus on the assigned topic and purpose and addressed some aspect of the assigned task. Supporting ideas were vague, general, and/or undeveloped. The response lacked sufficient information (due to brevity or repetition) to provide a sense of completeness and address reader concerns. The response did not demonstrate genre awareness.

#### **I = 1**

The paper lacked a controlling idea and focus on the assigned topic and purpose. Supporting ideas were irrelevant, unclear or lacking altogether. The response lacked sufficient information (due to brevity or repetition) to provide a sense of completeness and failed to address reader concerns. The response did not demonstrate genre awareness.

## Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment - Domain Descriptive Statements

One of the following domain statements will appear on the Student Score Report below the domain score for Organization.

### **Organization**

#### **O = 4.5 or 5**

The overall organizational plan was appropriate to the assigned topic and genre. Ideas were logically and appropriately sequenced within paragraphs and across parts of the paper. The introduction set the stage for the writer's ideas and purpose of the genre, and the conclusion provided a sense of closure. Related ideas were grouped logically within paragraphs. Varied and effective transitional elements were used to link all elements of the response.

#### **O = 3.5 or 4**

The overall organizational plan was appropriate to the assigned topic and genre. Ideas were logically sequenced across parts of the paper. The introduction set the stage, and the conclusion ended the piece of writing without repetition. Related ideas were grouped logically within paragraphs. Varied transitional elements were used to link parts of the paper and ideas within paragraphs.

#### **O = 2.5 or 3**

The overall organizational plan was generally appropriate to the assigned topic and genre. There was a generally clear sequence of ideas. The introduction was clear, and the conclusion provided closure. Related ideas were generally grouped together within paragraphs. Transitions were used to link parts of the paper.

#### **O = 1.5 or 2**

The organizational plan was formulaic and/or inappropriate to the assigned genre. There was minimal evidence of sequencing. The paper had an ineffective introduction or conclusion. Ideas within paragraphs were not arranged in a meaningful order. Transitions were formulaic or ineffective. Demonstration of the writer's competence was limited by the brevity of the response.

#### **O = 1**

There was no evidence of an organizational plan. The sequence of ideas was unclear. The paper lacked an introduction and/or conclusion. Unrelated ideas were included within paragraphs. Transitions were lacking or inappropriate. There was insufficient writing (due to brevity or copying the prompt) to determine competence in Organization.

## Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment - Domain Descriptive Statements

One of the following domain statements will appear on the Student Score Report below the domain score for Style.

### Style

#### **S = 4.5 or 5**

Carefully crafted phrases and sentences created a sustained tone. Varied, precise, and engaging language was used throughout the response. Figurative or technical language was used for rhetorical effect. Sustained attention to the audience was demonstrated. An evocative or authoritative voice was used throughout the response. An extensive variety of sentence structures, beginnings and endings were used. A variety of genre appropriate strategies engaged the reader.

#### **S = 3.5 or 4**

Language and tone were consistent with the writer's purpose and assigned genre. Word choice was precise and engaging. Attention to the audience was demonstrated in the introduction, body, and conclusion. The writer's voice was consistent and distinctive. Sentences varied in length and structure. Some genre appropriate strategies were used to engage the reader.

#### **S = 2.5 or 3**

Language and tone were generally consistent with the writer's purpose and assigned genre. Word choice was generally engaging with lapses into simple and ordinary language. Awareness of audience was generally limited to the introduction and/or conclusion. The writer's voice was clear and appropriate. There was some variation in sentence length and structure.

#### **S = 1.5 or 2**

Language and tone were uneven (appropriate in some parts but not in others). Word choice was simple, ordinary and/or repetitive. Awareness of audience was limited. The writer's voice was minimal, inconsistent, or indistinct. There was little variation in sentence length and structure. Demonstration of competence was limited by the brevity of the response.

#### **S = 1**

Language and tone were flat or inappropriate to the assigned task. Word choice was inaccurate, imprecise, and/or confusing. There was little or no attention to the audience. The writer's voice was not apparent. Sentences were not varied. There was insufficient writing to determine competence in Style.

## Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment - Domain Descriptive Statements

One of the following domain statements will appear on the Student Score Report below the domain score for Conventions.

### **Conventions**

#### **C = 4.5 or 5**

Simple, compound, and complex sentences were clear and correct with correct end punctuation. A variety of coordination and subordination strategies were used. Usage and mechanics were correct in a variety of contexts. Errors were infrequent in all components.

#### **C = 3.5 or 4**

Simple, compound, and complex sentences were correct with correct end punctuation. Usage and mechanics were consistently correct with few errors in any component.

#### **C = 2.5 or 3**

Sentences were generally correct with generally correct end punctuation. There were some errors in complex and compound sentences, but few errors in simple sentences. There were occasional fragments, run-ons, or awkward sentences. Usage and mechanics were generally correct, and few errors interfered with meaning.

#### **C = 1.5 or 2**

Minimal control was demonstrated in sentence formation, usage, and mechanics. Simple sentences were correct, but other sentences were incomplete, awkward, or overloaded. End punctuation was missing or incorrect. There were frequent errors in usage and mechanics which interfered with meaning. Demonstration of competence was limited by the brevity of the response.

#### **C = 1**

There were frequent sentence fragments, run-ons, and/or incorrect sentences. End punctuation was incorrect or lacking. There were frequent and severe errors in usage and/or mechanics. Errors interfered with or obscured meaning. There was insufficient writing (due to brevity or copying the prompt) to determine competence in Conventions.



# Writing Test Achievement Roster



## Writing Test Achievement Roster

System: Friendly County  
 School: Friendly Middle Sch Code: 123-0809  
 Teacher: Eighth G Teacher  
 Test Date: Winter, 2009 Date Printed: 29JAN09

Page: 1

| Student Name         | GTID       | Primary SRC | DOB      | Perf. Level  | Scale Score | Domain IDE | Performance ORG | STY | CNV |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|----------|--------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|-----|-----|
| Adams, Ashley A      | 2009000801 | 8           | 1/14/95  | DNM          | 100         | 1.0        | 1.0             | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Buchanan, Benjamin B | 2009000802 |             | 10/14/94 | DNM          | 152         | 1.5        | 1.0             | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Cleveland, Charles C | 2009000803 |             | 3/10/95  | DNM          | 195         | 2.5        | 2.5             | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Eisenhower, Emily E  | 2009000804 | 4           | 7/04/94  | CA           | 196CA       | 2.5        | 2.0             | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Fillmore, Frank F    | 2009000805 |             | 5/03/95  | M            | 200         | 2.5        | 2.5             | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Grant, Georgia G     | 2009000806 | 4           | 6/17/94  | CA           | 202CA       | 2.5        | 3.0             | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Harrison, Heather H  | 2009000807 |             | 2/24/94  | M            | 224         | 3.5        | 3.5             | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Jefferson, John J    | 2009000808 |             | 5/14/95  | M            | 243         | 4.0        | 4.0             | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Kennedy, Kathy K     | 2009000809 |             | 4/08/95  | EXC          | 250         | 4.5        | 4.0             | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| Lincoln, Luke L      | 2009000810 |             | 8/06/95  | EXC          | 303         | 5.0        | 4.0             | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Madison, Mary M      | 2009000811 |             | 5/05/95  | EXC          | 350         | 5.0        | 5.0             | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Nixon, Noah N        | 2009000812 | 8           | 12/21/93 | Not Scorable | Blank       |            |                 |     |     |
| Polk, Paul P         | 2009000813 | 4           | 12/08/94 | Not Scorable | Off Topic   |            |                 |     |     |
| Roosevelt, Rachel R  | 2009000814 |             | 10/24/94 | Not Scorable | Invalidated |            |                 |     |     |

**B**

**A**

**F**

**G**

**C**

**D**

**E**

**Key:**

- A.** School and System Information
- B.** Date Tested
- C.** Student Names
- D.** SRC as coded on answer document
- E.** Performance Levels and Scale Scores
  - DNM = Does Not Meet the Standard (100-199)
  - M = Meets the Standard (200-249)
  - EXC = Exceeds the Standard (250-350)
  - CA = Conditional Assessment
- F.** Domain Scores
  - IDE = Ideas
  - ORG = Organization
  - STY = Style
  - CNV = Conventions
- G.** Non-Scorable category

## Writing Test Does Not Meet the Standard Roster



### Writing Test Does Not Meet Roster

System: Friendly County  
School: Friendly Middle Sch Code: 123-0809  
Test Date: Winter, 2009 Date Printed: 29JAN09

Page: 1

| Student Name         | GTID       | DOB      | Scale Score |
|----------------------|------------|----------|-------------|
| Adams, Ashley A      | 2009000801 | 1/14/95  | 100         |
| Buchanan, Benjamin B | 2009000802 | 10/14/94 | 152         |
| Cleveland, Charles C | 2009000803 | 3/10/95  | 195         |
| Nixson, Noah N       | 2009000812 | 12/21/93 | NS          |
| Polk, Paul P         | 2009000813 | 12/08/94 | NS          |
| Roosevelt, Rachel R  | 2009000814 | 10/24/94 | NS          |

**B**

**A**

**C**

### Key:

- A. School/System Information and date tested
- B. Student names (in alphabetical order)
- C. Scale Scores (or NS reported if non-scorable)

# Writing Test Conditional Administration Roster



## Writing Test Conditional Administration Roster

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| System: Friendly County                            | ← (A) |
| School: Friendly Middle Sch      Code: 123-0809    |       |
| Test Date: Winter, 2009      Date Printed: 29JAN09 |       |

Page: 1

| Student Name        | GTID       | Primary SRC | DOB     | Scale Score | Domain Performance |     |     |     |
|---------------------|------------|-------------|---------|-------------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|
|                     |            |             |         |             | IDE                | ORG | STY | CNV |
| Eisenhower, Emily E | 2009000804 | 4           | 7/04/94 | 196CA       | 2.5                | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 |
| Grant, Georgia G    | 2009000806 | 4           | 6/17/94 | 202CA       | 2.5                | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 |

(B)

(C)

(D)

(E)

**Key:**

- A. School/System Information and date tested
- B. Student names
- C. SRC as coded on answer document
- D. Scale Score (CA indicates a conditional administration)
- E. Domain Scores (average of two raters' scores in each domain)

## Writing Test School/System Content Summary

The School Content Summary and the System Content Summary are identical in format; therefore, only the System Content Summary is reproduced below.

| G8WA                              |  | System |      |        | RESA | State |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------|------|--------|------|-------|
| All Students with Scorable Papers |  | 798    | 5187 | 119716 |      |       |
| Number of Test Takers             |  |        |      |        |      |       |
| Mean Scale Score                  |  | 207    | 212  | 212    |      |       |

| Performance Summary | Does Not Meet Standard            | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Total  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------|
|                     | All Students with Scorable Papers |                |                  |        |
| System N            | 243                               | 502            | 53               | 798    |
| System %            | 30%                               | 63%            | 7%               |        |
| RESA N              | 1079                              | 3788           | 320              | 5187   |
| RESA %              | 21%                               | 73%            | 6%               |        |
| State N             | 26525                             | 85553          | 7638             | 119716 |
| State %             | 22%                               | 71%            | 6%               |        |

| Nonscorable Papers                       |  | Number | Percent |
|--|--|--------|---------|
| Blank                                    |  | 2      | 17%     |
| Copied                                   |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Illegible                                |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Incomprehensible                         |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Text Too Limited To Score                |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Non English                              |  | 2      | 17%     |
| Nonparticipation                         |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Off Task                                 |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Off Topic                                |  | 8      | 67%     |
| Offensive                                |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Invalidated                              |  | 0      | 0%      |
| Total Nonscorable and Invalidated Papers |  | 12     | 100%    |

| Writing Test Content Summary       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| System Report for: Friendly County |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| System Code: 123                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Tested: Winter, 2009          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number Processed: 810              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number Reported: 798               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Printed: 1/29/2009            |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Domain Rating Summary |                                   |       |            |       |            |       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|
| Mean Domain Score     | All Students with Scorable Papers |       | Genres     |       |            |       |
|                       | N                                 | Score | Persuasive |       | Expository |       |
|                       |                                   |       | N          | Score | N          | Score |
| Ideas (2)             |                                   |       |            |       |            |       |
| System                | 798                               | 2.9   | 389        | 2.8   | 409        | 2.9   |
| RESA                  | 5187                              | 3.0   | 2666       | 3.0   | 2521       | 3.0   |
| State                 | 119716                            | 3.0   | 61012      | 2.9   | 58704      | 3.0   |
| Organization (1)      |                                   |       |            |       |            |       |
| System                | 798                               | 2.8   | 389        | 2.7   | 409        | 2.8   |
| RESA                  | 5187                              | 2.9   | 2666       | 2.9   | 2521       | 2.9   |
| State                 | 119716                            | 2.9   | 61012      | 2.9   | 58704      | 2.9   |
| Style (1)             |                                   |       |            |       |            |       |
| System                | 798                               | 2.8   | 389        | 2.8   | 409        | 2.8   |
| RESA                  | 5187                              | 3.0   | 2666       | 3.0   | 2521       | 2.9   |
| State                 | 119716                            | 3.0   | 61012      | 3.0   | 58704      | 2.9   |
| Conventions (1)       |                                   |       |            |       |            |       |
| System                | 798                               | 2.7   | 389        | 2.7   | 409        | 2.7   |
| RESA                  | 5187                              | 2.9   | 2666       | 2.9   | 2521       | 2.9   |
| State                 | 119716                            | 2.9   | 61012      | 2.9   | 58704      | 2.9   |

Compositions were scored by independent raters on a scale of 1 to 5 for each domain. Domains are weighted in computing a total score. The weight for each domain is shown in ( ) beside the domain label above.

See Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment Interpretive Guide for an explanation of the categories of nonscorable papers.

### Key:

- A.** Name of system reported, system code, and date of testing
- B.** Number of student documents processed and number reported.
- C.** Mean scale scores for system, RESA, and state
- D.** Number and percentage of students at each performance level for system, RESA, and state.
- E.** Domain rating summary includes mean domain scores for all students with scorable papers. Mean domain scores are reported for the system, RESA, and state.
- F.** Number and percentage of nonscorable papers in each category, number of invalidated responses, and total number of nonscorable and invalidated papers

# Writing Test School/System Student Population Summary

The School Student Population Summary and the System Student Population Summary are identical in format; therefore, only the System Report is reproduced below.



Student Population Summary  
Georgia Grade 8 Writing Assessment  
Winter, 2009

System: Friendly County  
Code: 123  
Total Processed: 810

Date Printed: 29JAN09

| Student Group                        | N Tested |     |      | Mean Scale Score | Performance Level |    |     |         |    |     |
|--------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|------------------|-------------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|
|                                      | All      | Std | Cond |                  | % System          |    |     | % State |    |     |
|                                      |          |     |      |                  | DNM               | M  | Exc | DNM     | M  | Exc |
| All Students with Scorable Papers    | 798      | 775 | 23   | 207              | 30                | 63 | 7   | 22      | 71 | 6   |
| Regular Program Students             | 668      | 668 | 0    | 212              | 23                | 69 | 8   | 18      | 75 | 7   |
| SRC 13 English Language Learner      | 45       | 44  | 1    | 188              | 53                | 47 | 0   | 60      | 40 | 0   |
| SRC 14 Section 504                   | 5        | 5   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 33      | 64 | 4   |
| SRC 18 Migrant Certified             | 6        | 6   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 49      | 50 | 2   |
| SRC 19 ELL Monitored                 | 12       | 11  | 1    | 204              | 25                | 75 | 0   | 29      | 70 | 1   |
| Other Regular Program Students       | 610      | 610 | 0    | 214              | 21                | 70 | 9   | 17      | 76 | 7   |
| All Special Education                | 130      | 107 | 23   | 179              | 68                | 32 | 1   | 60      | 40 | 1   |
| SRC 01 Visually Impaired             | 1        | 1   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 33      | 65 | 2   |
| SRC 02 Deafness/Hard of Hearing      | 3        | 1   | 2    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 59      | 40 | 1   |
| SRC 03 Deaf/Blind                    | 0        | 0   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | -       | -  | -   |
| SRC 04 Spec Learning Disabilities    | 40       | 33  | 7    | 182              | 65                | 33 | 3   | 59      | 41 | 0   |
| SRC 05 Mild Intellectual Disability  | 13       | 9   | 4    | 153              | 92                | 8  | 0   | 93      | 7  | 0   |
| SRC 06 Traumatic Brain Injury        | 1        | 0   | 1    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 75      | 25 | 0   |
| SRC 07 Mod/Sev/Prof Intell. Dis.     | 0        | 0   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | -       | -  | -   |
| SRC 08 Autism                        | 2        | 2   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 47      | 48 | 6   |
| SRC 09 Orthopedic Impairments        | 3        | 2   | 1    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 41      | 53 | 6   |
| SRC 10 Speech/Language Disability    | 3        | 3   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 39      | 58 | 3   |
| SRC 11 Emotional/Behavioral Disorder | 43       | 39  | 4    | 176              | 74                | 26 | 0   | 64      | 36 | 1   |
| SRC 12 Other Health Impairments      | 21       | 17  | 4    | 197              | 48                | 52 | 0   | 55      | 44 | 1   |
| Gender                               |          |     |      |                  |                   |    |     |         |    |     |
| Female                               | 386      | 377 | 9    | 214              | 21                | 70 | 9   | 16      | 76 | 8   |
| Male                                 | 412      | 398 | 14   | 200              | 39                | 57 | 4   | 28      | 67 | 5   |
| Ethnic Group                         |          |     |      |                  |                   |    |     |         |    |     |
| Asian                                | 18       | 18  | 0    | 261              | 0                 | 56 | 44  | 11      | 71 | 18  |
| Black                                | 478      | 467 | 11   | 201              | 36                | 61 | 3   | 31      | 66 | 3   |
| Hispanic                             | 153      | 148 | 5    | 204              | 33                | 63 | 4   | 29      | 68 | 3   |
| Native American                      | 0        | 0   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 23      | 69 | 7   |
| White                                | 125      | 120 | 5    | 225              | 12                | 70 | 18  | 15      | 76 | 9   |
| Multi Ethnic                         | 23       | 21  | 2    | 216              | 17                | 70 | 13  | 17      | 76 | 7   |
| All Accommodated                     | 127      | 104 | 23   | 179              | 65                | 35 | 0   | 65      | 35 | 0   |
| Special Education Accommodated       | 98       | 75  | 23   | 176              | 68                | 32 | 0   | 66      | 34 | 0   |
| ELL Accommodated                     | 30       | 29  | 1    | 185              | 57                | 43 | 0   | 65      | 35 | 0   |
| ELL-Monitored Accommodated           | 3        | 2   | 1    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 50      | 49 | 1   |
| Section 504 Accommodated             | 1        | 1   | 0    | -                | -                 | -  | -   | 39      | 58 | 3   |
| Nonscorable Papers                   | 12       | 10  | 2    |                  |                   |    |     |         |    |     |
| Invalidated Papers                   | 0        | 0   | 0    |                  |                   |    |     |         |    |     |
| ELL Deferred                         | 9        | 9   | 0    |                  |                   |    |     |         |    |     |

Key:

- A. System Information
- B. Student groups
- C. Number of students tested (all, standard and conditional administrations)
- D. Mean scale scores
- E. Percentage at each performance level for system and state

