



GEORGIA GRADE 5
WRITING ASSESSMENT

2011

Interpretive Guide



Dr. John D. Barge, State School Superintendent
"Making Education Work for All Georgians"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
INTRODUCTION	5
SCORING PROCEDURES AND TYPES OF SCORES	5
Nature of the Scoring System	5
Analytic and Holistic Scoring	6
Domain Score Scale	6
How Scores are Derived	6
Scale Scores	7
Non-Scorable Responses	8
Conditional Administrations	8
Invalidations	8
Performance Level Descriptions	8
Domain Scores	10
Domain Descriptions and Components	10
INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORTS	11
SUMMARY REPORTS	12
SAMPLE REPORT FORMS	13
Student Label	13
Student Score Report	14
Domain Descriptive Statement	16
Achievement Roster	20
Does Not Meet Roster	21
Conditional Administration Roster	22
School/System Content Summary	23
School/System Population Summary	24

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 5 Writing Assessment consists of an evaluation of the student’s response to an assigned prompt. The prompt may be persuasive, informational, or narrative. 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

Student compositions are scored by trained raters who rate the compositions 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. Please note: 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 16-19).

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 across the various components.

The Domain 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.

How Scores Are Derived

Each student composition is scored in four domains (Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions). 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).

Weighting simply means that the sum of the scores assigned by the raters is multiplied by the weight (or importance) assigned to a domain by the Grade 5 Writing Advisory Committee. The table below shows the weight of each domain or the contribution of each domain to the student’s total score.

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

Because the development of ideas is considered most critical to effective writing, the *Ideas* domain is weighted twice the other domains. To illustrate the effect of the domain weighting process, the following table (page 7) provides sample domain ratings and raw scores.

	Domain Ratings				Raw Score
	Ideas (x 2)	Org. (x 1)	Style (x 1)	Conv. (x 1)	
Ratings	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	10
Ratings	2 2	2 3	3 3	3 3	25
Ratings	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	30
Ratings	5 4	4 4	4 4	3 4	41
Ratings	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	50

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. *Please note: scale scores, not raw scores, are reported.*

Scale Scores

The scale score range for the Georgia Grade 5 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, or have the same meaning as, scores from other editions 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 5 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.**

Non-Scorable Responses

Occasionally a student paper cannot be rated. In such cases, the reason for not rating the paper is noted on the Student Score Report/Achievement Rosters, 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.).

Conditional Administrations

Any accommodation not listed in the Student Assessment Handbook should not be used without permission from the Georgia Department of Education. Requests for any accommodations not in the Student Assessment Handbook must be made six weeks in advance of the administration. If an approved accommodation results in a conditional administration, it will be so noted on the Student Score Report, the Student Label, and the Achievement Roster by displaying a scale score with “CA” to indicate conditional administration. Students who received accommodations that resulted in a conditional administration will appear on the Conditional Administration Roster as well.

A test score resulting from a conditional administration must be interpreted in light of the specific accommodation(s) provided to the student during testing, because conditional accommodations are more expansive than standard accommodations and may encroach on the knowledge and skills targeted by the assessment. Discussions with parents and students should focus on the fact that the student obtained his or her Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment score with conditional accommodation(s), and that it is not clear how his or her performance would be affected if such conditional accommodation(s) were removed.

Invalidations

A testing irregularity, such as the use of an accommodation not prescribed by the student’s Individual Education Program (IEP) or the use of an unapproved accommodation, may result in a student’s paper being invalidated. Invalidated responses are so noted on the Student Score Report, the Student Label, and the Achievement Rosters. The number of invalidated responses is also reported on the School/System Content Summary and the School/System Student Population Summary.

Performance Levels and Performance Level Descriptions

Performance levels and descriptors provide meaning to the scale scores and are also reported. A performance level is a range of scores that defines a specific level of performance, as articulated in the Performance Level Descriptors. There are three performance levels for the Grade 5 Writing Assessment: Does Not Meet the Standard, Meets the Standard, and Exceeds the Standard.

A performance level descriptor is a verbal statement describing each performance level in terms of what the student has learned and can do. In addition to the test performance descriptors for the overall test performance, the student reports also provide statements

about the student's score range for each domain. (See pages 16-19 for those domain score statements.)

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 a beginning or ending. A controlling idea may be unclear, or the controlling idea may not address the assigned genre. Development is minimal, and supporting ideas are listed rather than developed. Ideas may not be grouped 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 have a clear beginning, middle, and ending. Narrative compositions have a clear plot and some development of characters. Informational 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. Supporting ideas are presented in a generally 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. Narrative compositions have a well developed plot and well developed characters. Informational 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 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 appropriate, and the writer demonstrates sustained attention to the audience in the beginning, middle, and ending. 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. Raters score student papers on a scale of 1-5 in the domains of Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions

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 assigned genre.

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 assigned genre.

Components

- Overall Plan
- Introduction/Body/Conclusion
- Sequence of Ideas
- Grouping of Ideas
- 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">• correctness• clarity of meaning• simple, complex, and compound sentences• end punctuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• subject-verb agreement• standard word forms• possessives• contractions• pronoun-antecedent agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• internal punctuation• spelling• paragraph breaks• capitalization

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. A sample label and interpretive key are on page 13.

Student Score Report

Two originals of the Student Score Report are provided (see sample on page 14): 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 Student Score Report describes the student's total test performance and performance level. It also describes the domain scores with written narrative. A complete list of descriptive statements for score points 1-5 in each domain appears on pages 16-19. 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 15).

Achievement Roster

Two copies of the Writing Test Achievement Rosters are provided (see sample on page 20). Rosters contain the names of all students tested, including students who participated in a conditional administration. 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.

Does Not Meet Roster

This roster lists students who did not meet the standard for the Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment (see sample on page 21). 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, scale scores, and domain performance. If a student's paper was non-scorable, "NS" appears in the scale score column. **Students who took the Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment with accommodations that resulted in a conditional administration are not listed on this roster.**

Conditional Administration Roster

This roster lists students who took the Georgia Grade 5 Writing Assessment with accommodations that resulted in a conditional administration of the test (see sample on page 22). 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

System Content Summary

A summary of student scores is provided (two copies) for each system where testing was conducted (see sample on page 23). The System Content Summary contains four sections displaying the following information.

1. Mean scale scores for the 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 at each performance level for the system, RESA, and state are shown. An N-count (number) in each performance level is also provided for the system.
3. A Domain Rating Summary provides mean domain scores for all students with scorable papers, and mean domain scores for each genre assessed: persuasive, informational, and narrative. 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.

School Content Summary

For each school, a summary report is provided which is identical in format to the system report (see sample on page 23). Three copies of this report are provided (two for the school and one for the system).

System Student Population Summary

The population summary (see sample on page 24) 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 system and state.

School Student Population Summary

For each school, a population summary is provided which is identical in format to the system report (see sample on page 24). The population summary 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.

SAMPLE REPORT FORMS

Student Label

NAME: John J Jefferson
GTID: 2009000508 TEST DATE: MAR09

SCALE SCORE	IDE	ORG	STY	CNV
243	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

Perf. Level: Meets Standard

GEORGIA GRADE 5 WRITING ASSESSMENT

Callouts: A (Name/GTID), B (Test Date), C (Assessment Name), D (Scale Score), E (Performance Level), F (Domain Scores)

Student Label (Conditional Administration)

NAME: Georgia G Grant
GTID: 2009000506 TEST DATE: MAR09

SCALE SCORE	IDE	ORG	STY	CNV
202CA	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0

Perf. Level: Meets Standard

GEORGIA GRADE 5 WRITING ASSESSMENT

Callout: G (CA indicator in Scale Score)

Key:

- A. Student's name and GTID as they appear on the Answer Document
- B. Date of testing
- C. Name of Assessment
- D. Scale Score
- E. Performance Level
- F. Domain Scores
- G. CA indicates a Conditional Administration

Student Score Report (Front)



Writing Student Score Report

Name: Jefferson, John J
 DOB: 05/14/1998
 Test Date: Spring, 2009
 System: Friendly County
 School: Friendly County Elem
 Teacher: Fifth G Teacher

GTID: 2009000508
 Document No: 509008
 Code: 123-0509
 Date Printed: 3/16/2009

Total Test Performance and Performance Level

Scale Score

On a scale of 100 to 350, your writing score is **243**, which indicates that your performance level **meets** the standard for Grade 5 writing skills.

Domain Scores

<p>Ideas</p>	<p>Domain Score = 4.0 The paper contained a well developed controlling idea that was consistently focused on the assigned topic, genre, and purpose and addressed the assigned task. Supporting ideas were relevant to the topic and genre. The response contained specific examples and details that addressed reader concerns and perspectives.</p>
<p>Organization</p>	<p>Domain Score = 4.0 The overall organizational plan was appropriate to the writer's ideas and assigned 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 together. Varied transitional elements were used to link parts of the paper.</p>
<p>Style</p>	<p>Domain Score = 4.0 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. Sentences varied in length and structure. Some genre appropriate strategies were used to engage the reader.</p>
<p>Conventions</p>	<p>Domain Score = 4.0 Simple, complex and/or compound sentences were correct with correct end punctuation. Usage and mechanics were consistently correct with few errors in any component.</p>

A

B

C

D

E

F

Key:

- A.** Name of Assessment
- B.** Student Demographic Information
- C.** Scale Score and Performance Level
- D.** Description of Performance (if the paper was non-scorable, it will be so noted here)

- E.** Domain Scores
- F.** Description of Domain Performance

Student Score Report (Back)

Georgia law requires that writing assessments be administered to students in Grade Five. Student writing samples are evaluated on an analytic scoring system to provide diagnostic feedback to teachers, students, and parents about individual performance.

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. Raters score each student on a scale of 1-5 in the domains of Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions.

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.

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 assigned genre.

Components

- Overall Plan
- Introduction/Body/Conclusion
- Sequence of Ideas
- Grouping of Ideas
- 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">• correctness• clarity of meaning• simple, complex, and compound sentences• end punctuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• subject-verb agreement• standard word forms• possessives• contractions• pronoun-antecedent agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• internal punctuation• spelling• paragraph breaks• capitalization

Georgia Grade 5 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 was consistently focused on the assigned topic, genre, and purpose and addressed all aspects of the assigned task. Supporting ideas were relevant to the topic, genre, and audience and were fully elaborated throughout the response. The response contained specific examples and details that fully addressed reader concerns and perspectives.

I = 3.5 or 4

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

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, genre, and purpose. 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 and address some reader concerns and perspectives.

I = 1.5 or 2

The paper contained a minimally developed controlling idea with a limited focus on the assigned topic, genre, and purpose and addressed some aspect of the assigned task. Supporting ideas were general, and/or undeveloped. Some ideas were partially developed while others were listed. The response lacked sufficient information (due to brevity or repetition) to provide a sense of completeness. Some details were irrelevant or inappropriate to the assigned topic, audience, and genre.

I = 1

A controlling idea was not established although the writer may have announced a topic. There was little or no focus on the assigned topic, genre, or purpose. The majority of details were irrelevant. Development was lacking due to the brevity of the response or unclear supporting ideas.

Georgia Grade 5 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 writer's ideas and assigned genre. Ideas were logically and appropriately sequenced within paragraphs and across parts of the paper. The introduction set the stage, and the conclusion provided a sense of closure. Ideas were grouped logically. 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 writer's ideas and assigned 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 together. Varied transitional elements were used to link parts of the paper.

O = 2.5 or 3

The overall organizational plan was generally appropriate to the writer's ideas and assigned genre. There was a generally clear sequence of ideas. The introduction was appropriate, and the conclusion was clear. Related ideas were generally grouped together. 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. Unrelated ideas were grouped together. Transitions were formulaic, repetitive, 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. Ideas were not arranged in a meaningful order. Transitions were lacking or inappropriate. There was insufficient writing (due to brevity or copying the prompt) to determine competence in Organization.

Georgia Grade 5 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 throughout the paper. A consistent and appropriate voice was used throughout the response. A variety of sentence lengths, structures, and beginnings 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. 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 demonstrated in the introduction, body, or conclusion. The writer's voice was clear and discernible. There was some variation in sentence length and structure. The demonstration of the writer's competence was limited by the brevity of the response.

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 5 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. Usage and mechanics were correct in a variety of contexts. Errors were infrequent in all components and did not interfere with meaning.

C = 3.5 or 4

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

C = 2.5 or 3

Simple sentences were generally correct with generally correct end punctuation. There were some errors in complex and compound sentences. Usage and mechanics were generally correct with some errors. Few errors interfered with meaning.

C = 1.5 or 2

Minimal control was demonstrated in sentence formation, usage, and mechanics. Sentence structure was awkward, and 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.

Achievement Roster



Writing Test Achievement Roster

System: Friendly County
 School: Friendly County Elem Code: 123-0509
 Teacher: Fifth G Teacher
 Test Date: Spring, 2009 Date Printed: 16MAR09

Page: 1

Student Name	GTID	Primary SRC	DOB	Perf. Level	Scale Score	Domain IDE	Performance ORG	STY	CNV
Adams, Ashley A	2009000501	8	1/14/98	DNM	100	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Buchanan, Benjamin B	2009000502	0	10/14/97	DNM	152	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5
Cleveland, Charles C	2009000503	0	3/10/98	DNM	195	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0
Eisenhower, Emily E	2009000504	4	7/04/97	CA	196CA	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0
Fillmore, Frank F	2009000505	0	5/03/98	M	200	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0
Grant, Georgia G	2009000506	15	6/17/97	CA	202CA	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0
Harrison, Heather H	2009000507	0	2/24/97	M	224	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0
Jefferson, John J	2009000508	0	5/14/98	M	243	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Kennedy, Kathy K	2009000509	0	4/08/98	EXC	250	4.5	4.0	4.5	3.5
Lincoln, Luke L	2009000510	0	8/06/98	EXC	303	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Madison, Mary M	2009000511	0	5/05/98	EXC	350	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Nixson, Noah N	2009000512	8	12/21/96	Not Scorable	Blank				
Polk, Paul P	2009000513	4	12/08/97	Not Scorable	Off Topic				
Roosevelt, Rachel R	2009000514	0	10/24/97	Not Scorable	Invalidated				

B

C

A

F

G

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 Administration
- F.** Domain Scores
 - IDE = Ideas
 - ORG = Organization
 - STY = Style
 - CNV = Conventions
- G.** Non-Scorable category

Does Not Meet Roster



Writing Test Does Not Meet Roster

System: Friendly County
School: Friendly County Elem Code: 123-0509
Test Date: Spring, 2009 Date Printed: 16MAR09

Page: 1

Student Name	GTID	Primary SRC	DOB	Scale Score	Domain Performance			
					IDE	ORG	STY	CNV
Adams, Ashley A	2009000501	8	1/14/98	100	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Buchanan, Benjamin B	2009000502	0	10/14/97	152	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5
Cleveland, Charles C	2009000503	0	3/10/98	195	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0
Nixson, Noah N	2009000512	8	12/21/96	NS - Blank				
Polk, Paul P	2009000513	4	12/08/97	NS - Off Topic				
Roosevelt, Rachel R	2009000514	0	10/24/97	NS - Invalidated				

A

E

B

C

D

Key:

- A. School/System Information and date tested
- B. Student names
- C. SRC as coded on answer document
- D. Scale Score (or NS to indicate a non-scorable response)
- E. Domain Scores

Conditional Administration Roster



Writing Test Conditional Administration Roster

System: Friendly County
School: Friendly County Elem Code: 123-0509
Test Date: Spring, 2009 Date Printed: 16MAR09

Page: 1

Student Name	GTID	Primary SRC	DOB	Scale Score	Domain IDE	Performance ORG	STY	CNV
Eisenhower, Emily E	2009000504	4	7/04/97	196CA	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0
Grant, Georgia G	2009000506	15	6/17/97	202CA	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0

B

C

D

A

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

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.



Writing Test Content Summary

System Report for: Friendly County
 System Code: 123
 Date Tested: Spring, 2009
 Number Processed: 481
 Number Reported: 476

Date Printed: 3/16/2009

C

G5WA			
All Students with Scorable Papers	System	RESA	State
Number of Test Takers	476	5195	119140
Mean Scale Score	229	216	214

D

Performance Summary	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total
All Students with Scorable Papers				
System N	52	331	93	476
System %	11%	70%	20%	
RESA N	1115	3460	620	5195
RESA %	21%	67%	12%	
State N	27574	78795	12771	119140
State %	23%	66%	11%	

F

Nonscorable Papers	Number	Percent
Blank	1	20%
Copied	0	0%
Illegible	0	0%
Incomprehensible	0	0%
Text Too Limited To Score	2	40%
Non English	0	0%
Nonparticipation	0	0%
Off Task	0	0%
Off Topic	2	40%
Offensive	0	0%
Invalidated	0	0%
Total Nonscorable and Invalidated Papers	5	100%

A

B

Domain Rating Summary								
Mean Domain Score	All Students with Scorable Papers		Genres					
	N	Score	Persuasive		Informational		Narrative	
	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score
Ideas (2)								
System	476	3.4	150	3.2	166	3.3	160	3.5
RESA	5195	3.1	1676	3.0	1788	3.1	1731	3.1
State	119140	3.0	38700	2.9	41091	3.0	39349	3.1
Organization (1)								
System	476	3.3	150	3.2	166	3.3	160	3.5
RESA	5195	3.0	1676	3.0	1788	3.0	1731	3.1
State	119140	3.0	38700	2.9	41091	3.0	39349	3.1
Style (1)								
System	476	3.4	150	3.4	166	3.3	160	3.6
RESA	5195	3.1	1676	3.1	1788	3.0	1731	3.1
State	119140	3.0	38700	3.0	41091	3.0	39349	3.1
Conventions (1)								
System	476	3.3	150	3.4	166	3.3	160	3.4
RESA	5195	3.0	1676	3.0	1788	3.0	1731	2.9
State	119140	2.9	38700	2.9	41091	3.0	39349	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 5 Writing Assessment Interpretive Guide for an explanation of the categories of nonscorable papers.

E

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.** Percentage of students at each performance level for system, RESA, and state. N-count (number) in each performance level is provided for the system.
- 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.

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 5 Writing Assessment
Spring, 2009

System: Friendly County
Code: 123
Total Processed: 481

Date Printed: 16MAR09

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	476	461	15	229	11	70	20	23	66	11
Regular Program Students	422	422	0	232	8	71	21	19	70	12
SRC 13 English Language Learner	7	7	0	-	-	-	-	47	51	2
SRC 14 Section 504	3	3	0	-	-	-	-	40	54	6
SRC 18 Migrant Certified	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	43	53	5
SRC 19 ELL Monitored	5	4	1	-	-	-	-	24	71	5
Other Regular Program Students	411	411	0	232	7	71	22	17	70	12
All Special Education	54	39	15	206	37	57	6	57	40	3
SRC 01 Visually Impaired	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	24	65	11
SRC 02 Deafness/Hard of Hearing	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	63	34	2
SRC 03 Deaf/Blind	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	24	76	0
SRC 04 Spec Learning Disabilities	21	15	6	189	52	48	0	64	35	1
SRC 05 Mild Intellectual Disability	1	0	1	-	-	-	-	91	9	0
SRC 06 Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	61	39	0
SRC 07 Mod/Sev/Prof Intell. Dis.	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	95	5	0
SRC 08 Autism	2	0	2	-	-	-	-	63	32	4
SRC 09 Orthopedic Impairments	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	44	51	5
SRC 10 Speech/Language Disability	22	19	3	224	18	68	14	31	62	7
SRC 11 Emotional/Behavioral Disorder	3	3	0	-	-	-	-	67	32	1
SRC 12 Other Health Impairments	5	2	3	-	-	-	-	61	37	2
SRC 15 Significant Developmental Delay	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	95	5	0
Gender										
Female	243	236	7	234	7	68	25	17	70	14
Male	233	225	8	223	15	71	14	29	63	8
Ethnic Group										
Asian	18	17	1	236	11	61	28	10	63	27
Black	16	15	1	214	6	81	13	30	65	6
Hispanic	17	17	0	210	12	82	6	27	66	7
Native American	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	27	62	11
White	408	395	13	229	11	69	20	18	67	14
Multi Ethnic	17	17	0	240	6	65	29	19	68	13
All Accommodated	26	11	15	193	42	58	0	64	34	1
Special Education Accommodated	24	9	15	192	46	54	0	68	31	1
ELL Accommodated	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	55	44	1
ELL-Monitored Accommodated	1	0	1	-	-	-	-	47	51	1
Section 504 Accommodated	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	45	50	5
Nonscorable Papers	5	3	2							
Invalidated Papers	0	0	0							
ELL Deferred	0	0	0							

For privacy and reliability reasons, scores are reported only for groups with 10 or more students.

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