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## Cobb Fifth Graders Top State on Writing Test

Cobb County fifth graders continued to outperform their peers across the state on the 2010 Georgia Fifth Grade Writing Assessment. The average scale score for CCSD students was 215, five points higher than the state score of 210. Cobb's scale score dropped three points from 2009, reflecting a statewide trend. Seventy-eight percent of Cobb students met or exceeded expectations on the writing assessment.

Thirty-seven Cobb elementary schools had mean scale scores higher than the state average, and 31 schools had scale scores above the district average of 215. A total of 27 schools saw an increase in their scale scores from last year, with Kennesaw Charter, Fair Oaks, Norton Park and King Springs showing the biggest gains in scale scores. Schools with the greatest increase in students meeting or exceeding expectations (a scale score of 200 or better) were Powers Ferry, Kennesaw Charter, Fair Oaks and Nicholson.

Overall, the highest scale scores were posted by Tritt (243), Mount Bethel (237), Shallowford Falls (235) and Sope Creek (235). Schools with the highest percent of students meeting or exceeding expectations were Tritt ( 97 percent), Mount Bethel ( 97 percent), Kincaid ( 96 percent), and Addison ( 96 percent).

Fifty-two percent of Cobb students with disabilities met or exceeded expectations, compared to just 38 percent across the state. Fifty percent of English Language Learners (ELL) in Cobb met expectations, which was slightly lower than the state average of 53 percent.

As a part of the statewide testing program, the Fifth Grade Writing Assessment was administered in March and requires students to write a composition on an assigned topic. The 2010 results will be the last for the Fifth Grade Writing Assessment. Due to state budget reductions, the test has been eliminated. The assessment provides fifth graders with a measurement of their writing performance and includes different aspects of writing domains. These domains include Ideas, Organization, Style, and Conventions. Domains are rated on a scale of 1 to 5. Performance of Cobb fifth graders as a whole was similar across all domains, ranging from 2.9 in Conventions to 3.1 in Style. This information can help students, parents, and teachers understand areas where students may need to focus their efforts to improve writing skills before taking the Eighth Grade Writing Assessment.

Each student paper is scored by professionals who have been trained to evaluate writing. Evaluators score student compositions on four qualities of effective writing. These qualities, or domains (Ideas, Organization,

Style, and Conventions), of effective writing should be present in a composition regardless of the topic.
The scale score range for the Fifth Grade Writing Assessment is 100 to 350, and scores are reported in the following performance levels: Does Not Meet (100-199), Meets (200-249), and Exceeds (250-350).

Summary data for the Fifth Grade Writing Assessment by school may be found in Tables I and II. More information about the Cobb County School District is available on the District Web site at www.cobbk12.org.
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# COBB COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT TESTING BRIEF <br> Fifth Grade Writing Assessment Spring 2010 

Georgia law (O.C.G.A. §20-2-281) states "writing assessments shall be administered to students in grades three, five, eight, and eleven." The purpose of the Grade 5 Writing Assessment is to assess student achievement in the Georgia Performance Standards in writing and writing instruction. The Grade 5 Writing Assessment provides predictive information to fifth graders about their future writing performance in advance of taking the Grade 8 Writing Assessment.

The percentage of Cobb County School District students achieving the Meets and Exceeds standards in 2010 ranged from 50 percent for English Language Learners (ELL) to 92 percent for Asian students. The mean scaled scores for Cobb students ranged from a 194 for ELL students to 230 for Asian students.

The scale score range for the Grade 5 Writing Assessment is 100 to 350 . Writing scores are also reported in the following performance levels: Does Not Meet (100-199), Meets (200-249), and Exceeds (250-350).

## Key Findings

o A total of 7,975 Cobb students were assessed in the 2010 Grade 5 Writing Assessment. Seventy-eight (78) percent of all students achieved the Meets or Exceeds standards set for writing with a mean scaled score of $\mathbf{2 1 5}$. This group includes all students with scorable papers.
o A total of 1,103 Special Education students were assessed in writing. Fifty-two (52) percent of students achieved the Meets or Exceeds standards set for writing with a mean scaled score of 195.
o A total of 452 English Language Learner (ELL) students were assessed in writing. Fifty (50) percent of students achieved the Meets or Exceeds standards set for writing with a mean scaled score of 194.

## Key Findings (Continued)

Table 1
Comparison of 2009 and 2010 Percentages of $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade Students Meeting and Exceeding Writing Standards

| Cobb <br> Student <br> Groups | Percentage of Students by Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  | Differences from 2009 to 2010 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 |  |  | 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Does Not Meet | Meets | Exceeds | Does Not Meet | Meets | Exceeds | Does Not Meet | Meets | Exceeds |
| All Students | 17 | 72 | 11 | 22 | 68 | 10 | 5 | -4 | -1 |
| Regular Program | 13 | 75 | 12 | 18 | 72 | 10 | 5 | -3 | -2 |
| Students with Disabilities | 41 | 53 | 6 | 48 | 48 | 4 | 7 | -5 | -2 |
| English <br> Language <br> Learners | 44 | 55 | 1 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 6 | -5 | -1 |
| Females | 12 | 74 | 14 | 15 | 73 | 12 | 3 | -1 | -2 |
| Males | 23 | 69 | 8 | 28 | 64 | 8 | 5 | -5 | 0 |
| Asian | 7 | 75 | 18 | 8 | 70 | 22 | 1 | -5 | 4 |
| Black | 24 | 71 | 5 | 30 | 66 | 4 | 6 | -5 | -1 |
| Hispanic | 28 | 68 | 4 | 31 | 65 | 4 | 3 | -3 | 0 |
| White | 10 | 73 | 17 | 14 | 72 | 14 | 4 | -1 | -3 |

Table 2
Comparison of Mean Scale Scores for $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade Writing Assessment

| Cobb Student Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Difference from <br> 2009 to 2010 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Students | 218 | 215 | -3 |
| Regular Program | 221 | 218 | -3 |
| Students with Disabilities | 197 | 195 | -2 |
| English Language Learners | 194 | 194 | 0 |
| Females | 225 | 220 | -5 |
| Males | 211 | 209 | -2 |
| Asian | 231 | 230 | -1 |
| Black | 209 | 207 | -2 |
| Hispanic | 206 | 205 | -1 |
| White | 226 | 222 | -4 |

o Powers Ferry had the greatest gain in students meeting and exceeding expectations over last year, an increase of $15 \%$.
o Kennesaw Charter had the highest increase in scale score across the district, increasing ten (10) points over last year.
o Four (4) schools increased the overall percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards by 10 percentage points or more.

Fair Oaks Kennesaw Charter Nicholson Powers Ferry
o Four (4) schools increased their mean scale scores by 5 points or more:
Fair Oaks Kennesaw Charter King Springs Norton Park
o Thirty-seven (37) of Cobb's elementary schools had overall mean scale scores equal to or higher than the state mean scale score (210):

| Tritt | Mount Bethel | Sope Creek | Shallowford Falls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garrison Mill | Kincaid | East Side | Murdock |
| Timber Ridge | Rocky Mount | King Springs | Addison |
| Mableton | Kemp | Davis | Kennesaw Charter |
| Frey | Sedalia Park | Mountain View | Pickett's Mill |
| Chalker | Keheley | Ford | Nicholson |
| Harmony Leland | Cheatham Hill | Due West | Bullard |
| Eastvalley | Big Shanty | Pitner | Still |
| Vaughan | Smyrna Imagine Int'l | Bells Ferry | Nickajack |
| Acworth |  |  |  |

o Thirty-one (31) of these elementary schools had overall mean scale scores equal to or higher than the mean scale score for Metro RESA and the District average (215).

| Tritt | Mount Bethel | Sope Creek | Shallowford Falls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garrison Mill | Kincaid | East Side | Murdock |
| Timber Ridge | Rocky Mount | King Springs | Addison |
| Mableton | Kemp | Davis | Kennesaw Charter |
| Frey | Sedalia Park | Mountain View | Pickett's Mill |
| Chalker | Keheley | Ford | Nicholson |
| Harmony Leland | Cheatham Hill | Due West | Bullard |
| Eastvalley | Big Shanty | Pitner |  |

o Forty-two (42) of Cobb's elementary schools had percentages higher than or equal to that of the state for students meeting or exceeding standards (73\%):

| Tritt | Mount Bethel | Kincaid | Addison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mableton | Timber Ridge | Mountain View | Sope Creek |
| East Side | Shallowford Falls | Pickett's Mill | Davis |
| Garrison Mill | Rocky Mount | Chalker | Ford |
| Harmony Leland | Kennesaw Charter | Murdock | Cheatham Hill |
| Frey | Nicholson | Due West | King Springs |
| Smyrna Imagine Int'l | Sedalia Park | Bullard | Kemp |
| Eastvalley | Keheley | Bells Ferry | Vaughan |
| Big Shanty | Blackwell | Pitner | Still |
| Nickajack | Powers Ferry | Clarkdale | Birney |
| Acworth | Norton Park |  |  |

o Thirty-six (36) of of these elementary schools had percentages higher than or equal to that of the district for students meeting or exceeding standards (78\%).

| Tritt | Mount Bethel | Kincaid | Addison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mableton | Timber Ridge | Mountain View | Sope Creek |
| East Side | Shallowford Falls | Pickett's Mill | Davis |
| Garrison Mill | Rocky Mount | Chalker | Ford |
| Harmony Leland | Kennesaw Charter | Murdock | Cheatham Hill |
| Frey | Nicholson | Due West | King Springs |
| Smyrna Imagine Int'l | Sedalia Park | Bullard | Kemp |
| Eastvalley | Keheley | Bells Ferry | Vaughan |
| Big Shanty | Blackwell | Pitner | Still |

## Successful Local School Practices

o Teachers at Fair Oaks met weekly with student small groups to discuss writing strategies and held one-on-one "writing conferences" with students to review strengths and weaknesses with specific writing assignments. This gave students more confidence in their writing as well as helping them set goals for further improvement.
o Norton Park made writing a school-wide goal by incorporating essential questions with reading and writing assignments to stimulate student thinking. Monthly writing assignments were evaluated by teachers following the state rubric to guide instruction and remediation.
o King Springs prepared students using sample writing tests. Staff reviewed the writing rubric and planned instruction to ensure the standards were being taught and the students mastered them.

Fifth Grade Writing Assessment: 2010

## All Students



|  | \# Tested | Mean Scale Score | \% DNM | \% M | \% E | \% M+E | WRITING DOMAINS** |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ideas | Organization | Style | Conventions |
| Kincaid | 100 | 230 | 4 | 72 | 24 | 96 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.3 |
| King Springs | 92 | 225 | 13 | 70 | 17 | 87 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| LaBelle | 65 | 198 | 40 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| Lewis | 165 | 204 | 35 | 61 | 5 | 66 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Mableton | 54 | 223 | 6 | 81 | 13 | 94 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Mableton Imagine Charter | 39 | 206 | 31 | 67 | 3 | 70 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Milford | 99 | 198 | 38 | 60 | 2 | 62 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Mount Bethel | 178 | 237 | 3 | 70 | 27 | 97 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Mountain View | 124 | 221 | 6 | 85 | 8 | 93 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Murdock | 160 | 228 | 12 | 71 | 18 | 89 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Nicholson | 85 | 220 | 11 | 80 | 9 | 89 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.1 |
| Nickajack | 112 | 212 | 23 | 70 | 7 | 77 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| Norton Park | 77 | 208 | 27 | 69 | 4 | 73 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Pickett's Mill | 133 | 221 | 9 | 79 | 12 | 91 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.1 |
| Pitner | 160 | 216 | 22 | 69 | 9 | 78 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| Powder Springs | 181 | 209 | 28 | 68 | 4 | 72 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| Powers Ferry | 70 | 205 | 24 | 73 | 3 | 76 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.6 |
| Riverside | 171 | 199 | 47 | 50 | 2 | 52 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| Rocky Mount | 91 | 227 | 10 | 76 | 14 | 90 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Russell | 103 | 204 | 34 | 64 | 2 | 66 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| Sanders | 149 | 198 | 50 | 48 | 2 | 50 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| Sedalia Park | 99 | 222 | 15 | 67 | 18 | 85 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| Shallowford Falls | 121 | 235 | 8 | 64 | 27 | 91 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| Sky View | 62 | 196 | 56 | 42 | 2 | 44 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Smyrna Imagine Int | 37 | 212 | 14 | 81 | 5 | 86 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| Sope Creek | 193 | 235 | 7 | 67 | 25 | 92 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Still | 119 | 215 | 22 | 71 | 7 | 78 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
| Teasley | 64 | 208 | 38 | 56 | 6 | 62 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 |
| Timber Ridge | 105 | 227 | 7 | 74 | 19 | 93 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Tritt | 181 | 243 | 3 | 62 | 35 | 97 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| Varner | 122 | 209 | 29 | 66 | 5 | 71 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| Vaughan | 166 | 214 | 19 | 73 | 7 | 80 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 |

*RESA: Atlanta, Buford, Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Douglas, Fulton, Forsyth, Gwinnett and Rockdale Counties, Decatur, and Marietta City systems

DNM = Did Not Meet Standards (Score of 100-199)
M = Met Standards (Score of 200-249)
**Scoring Information for Domains
E = Exceeded Standards (Score of 250-350)
$\% \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{E}=$ Percentage of students meeting and exceeding standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GEORGIA |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 123,929 | 210 | 27 | 66 | 7 |
| Regular Program Students |  |  | 23 | 69 | 8 |
| Limited English Proficient |  |  | 47 | 52 | 1 |
| Special Education |  |  | 62 | 36 | 2 |
| COBB COUNTY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 7975 | 215 | 22 | 68 | 10 |
| Regular Program Students | 6872 | 218 | 18 | 72 | 10 |
| Limited English Proficient | 452 | 194 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| Special Education | 1103 | 195 | 48 | 48 | 4 |
| ACWORTH |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 196 | 211 | 27 | 68 | 6 |
| Regular Program Students | 158 | 215 | 17 | 76 | 7 |
| Limited English Proficient | 12 | 200 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| Special Education | 38 | 192 | 66 | 34 | 0 |
| ADDISON |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 74 | 224 | 4 | 80 | 16 |
| Regular Program Students | 61 | 227 | 0 | 84 | 16 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 13 | 208 | 23 | 62 | 15 |
| ARGYLE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 118 | 203 | 29 | 69 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 106 | 207 | 24 | 75 | 2 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 12 | 165 | 75 | 25 | 0 |
| AUSTELL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 146 | 203 | 32 | 65 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 121 | 208 | 23 | 74 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 25 | 184 | 76 | 24 | 0 |
| BAKER |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 148 | 208 | 28 | 69 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 132 | 209 | 26 | 71 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 16 | 196 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| BELLS FERRY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 88 | 212 | 18 | 78 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 78 | 218 | 12 | 85 | 4 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 10 | 164 | 70 | 30 | 0 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010 Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BELMONT HILLS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 80 | 196 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| Regular Program Students | 68 | 200 | 41 | 59 | 0 |
| Limited English Proficient | 20 | 183 | 70 | 30 | 0 |
| Special Education | 12 | 176 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| BIG SHANTY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 256 | 216 | 21 | 65 | 14 |
| Regular Program Students | 218 | 223 | 12 | 72 | 16 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 38 | 179 | 71 | 26 | 3 |
| BIRNEY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 111 | 207 | 25 | 72 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 99 | 210 | 20 | 77 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | 13 | 207 | 8 | 92 | 0 |
| Special Education | 12 | 184 | 67 | 33 | 0 |
| BLACKWELL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 123 | 209 | 21 | 79 | 0 |
| Regular Program Students | 101 | 214 | 14 | 86 | 0 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 22 | 190 | 55 | 45 | 0 |
| BROWN |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 39 | 201 | 36 | 56 | 8 |
| Regular Program Students | 33 | 211 | 24 | 67 | 9 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| BRUMBY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 153 | 194 | 48 | 52 | 0 |
| Regular Program Students | 138 | 198 | 45 | 55 | 0 |
| Limited English Proficient | 14 | 193 | 57 | 43 | 0 |
| Special Education | 15 | 159 | 80 | 20 | 0 |
| BRYANT |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 137 | 204 | 31 | 68 | 1 |
| Regular Program Students | 123 | 206 | 28 | 71 | 1 |
| Limited English Proficient | 14 | 200 | 43 | 57 | 0 |
| Special Education | 14 | 192 | 57 | 43 | 0 |
| BULLARD |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 185 | 217 | 15 | 76 | 9 |
| Regular Program Students | 160 | 219 | 13 | 78 | 10 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 25 | 206 | 32 | 64 | 4 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHALKER |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 151 | 221 | 10 | 79 | 11 |
| Regular Program Students | 137 | 225 | 6 | 82 | 12 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 14 | 187 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| CHEATHAM HILL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 147 | 218 | 11 | 74 | 15 |
| Regular Program Students | 134 | 222 | 7 | 78 | 16 |
| Limited English Proficient | 11 | 197 | 18 | 82 | 0 |
| Special Education | 13 | 184 | 54 | 38 | 8 |
| CLARKDALE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 76 | 209 | 24 | 75 | 1 |
| Regular Program Students | 67 | 212 | 16 | 82 | 1 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| CLAY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 85 | 203 | 29 | 66 | 5 |
| Regular Program Students | 79 | 205 | 25 | 70 | 5 |
| Limited English Proficient | 22 | 189 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| COMPTON |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 93 | 197 | 46 | 53 | 1 |
| Regular Program Students | 79 | 201 | 38 | 61 | 1 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 14 | 172 | 93 | 7 | 0 |
| DAVIS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 99 | 222 | 9 | 80 | 11 |
| Regular Program Students | 81 | 224 | 6 | 83 | 11 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 18 | 216 | 22 | 67 | 11 |
| DOWELL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 178 | 203 | 35 | 62 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 155 | 205 | 32 | 65 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 23 | 184 | 61 | 39 | 0 |
| DUE WEST |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 78 | 218 | 12 | 85 | 4 |
| Regular Program Students | 72 | 219 | 10 | 88 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EAST SIDE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 163 | 229 | 8 | 71 | 21 |
| Regular Program Students | 139 | 230 | 8 | 71 | 22 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 24 | 222 | 8 | 75 | 17 |
| EASTVALLEY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 89 | 216 | 16 | 75 | 9 |
| Regular Program Students | 84 | 217 | 14 | 77 | 8 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| FAIR OAKS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 113 | 201 | 36 | 63 | 1 |
| Regular Program Students | 103 | 203 | 34 | 65 | 1 |
| Limited English Proficient | 41 | 192 | 49 | 51 | 0 |
| Special Education | 10 | 176 | 60 | 40 | 0 |
| FORD |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 152 | 220 | 10 | 79 | 11 |
| Regular Program Students | 128 | 223 | 5 | 83 | 12 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 24 | 203 | 33 | 58 | 8 |
| FREY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 110 | 222 | 11 | 77 | 12 |
| Regular Program Students | 101 | 225 | 8 | 79 | 13 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| GARRISON MILL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 130 | 231 | 10 | 71 | 19 |
| Regular Program Students | 103 | 232 | 9 | 72 | 19 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 27 | 226 | 15 | 67 | 19 |
| GREEN ACRES |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 114 | 201 | 32 | 67 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 102 | 206 | 25 | 73 | 2 |
| Limited English Proficient | 35 | 192 | 43 | 57 | 0 |
| Special Education | 12 | 160 | 83 | 17 | 0 |
| HARMONY-LELAND |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 69 | 219 | 10 | 80 | 10 |
| Regular Program Students | 59 | 221 | 7 | 81 | 12 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 10 | 205 | 30 | 70 | 0 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HAYES |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 193 | 207 | 28 | 68 | 4 |
| Regular Program Students | 169 | 211 | 23 | 73 | 4 |
| Limited English Proficient | 14 | 199 | 43 | 57 | 0 |
| Special Education | 24 | 176 | 67 | 33 | 0 |
| HOLLYDALE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 132 | 206 | 33 | 61 | 6 |
| Regular Program Students | 111 | 211 | 25 | 68 | 7 |
| Limited English Proficient | 11 | 196 | 64 | 36 | 0 |
| Special Education | 21 | 181 | 71 | 29 | 0 |
| KEHELEY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 70 | 221 | 19 | 71 | 10 |
| Regular Program Students | 56 | 225 | 13 | 75 | 13 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 14 | 204 | 43 | 57 | 0 |
| KEMP |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 152 | 223 | 16 | 67 | 17 |
| Regular Program Students | 126 | 226 | 10 | 71 | 19 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 26 | 210 | 46 | 46 | 8 |
| KENNESAW CHARTER |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 49 | 222 | 10 | 82 | 8 |
| Regular Program Students | 47 | 222 | 11 | 81 | 9 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| KINCAID |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 100 | 230 | 4 | 72 | 24 |
| Regular Program Students | 86 | 232 | 2 | 71 | 27 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 14 | 220 | 14 | 79 | 7 |
| KING SPRINGS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 92 | 225 | 13 | 70 | 17 |
| Regular Program Students | 82 | 227 | 10 | 72 | 18 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 10 | 212 | 40 | 50 | 10 |
| LABELLE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 65 | 198 | 40 | 60 | 0 |
| Regular Program Students | 50 | 201 | 34 | 66 | 0 |
| Limited English Proficient | 15 | 198 | 33 | 67 | 0 |
| Special Education | 15 | 185 | 60 | 40 | 0 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEWIS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 165 | 204 | 35 | 61 | 5 |
| Regular Program Students | 144 | 209 | 31 | 63 | 6 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 21 | 176 | 57 | 43 | 0 |
| MABLETON |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 54 | 223 | 6 | 81 | 13 |
| Regular Program Students | 45 | 228 | 2 | 82 | 16 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| MABLETON IMAGINE INT |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 39 | 206 | 31 | 67 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 35 | 210 | 26 | 71 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| MILFORD |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 99 | 198 | 38 | 60 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 85 | 207 | 29 | 68 | 2 |
| Limited English Proficient | 17 | 188 | 59 | 41 | 0 |
| Special Education | 14 | 147 | 93 | 7 | 0 |
| MOUNT BETHEL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 178 | 237 | 3 | 70 | 27 |
| Regular Program Students | 150 | 238 | 1 | 70 | 29 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 28 | 228 | 14 | 68 | 18 |
| MOUNTAIN VIEW |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 124 | 221 | 6 | 85 | 8 |
| Regular Program Students | 99 | 225 | 3 | 87 | 10 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 25 | 207 | 20 | 80 | 0 |
| MURDOCK |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 160 | 228 | 12 | 71 | 18 |
| Regular Program Students | 126 | 232 | 8 | 72 | 20 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 34 | 212 | 26 | 65 | 9 |
| NICHOLSON |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 85 | 220 | 11 | 80 | 9 |
| Regular Program Students | 71 | 224 | 4 | 85 | 11 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 14 | 198 | 43 | 57 | 0 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NICKAJACK |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 112 | 212 | 23 | 70 | 7 |
| Regular Program Students | 102 | 215 | 20 | 73 | 8 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 10 | 184 | 60 | 40 | 0 |
| NORTON PARK |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 77 | 208 | 27 | 69 | 4 |
| Regular Program Students | 74 | 209 | 26 | 70 | 4 |
| Limited English Proficient | 11 | 191 | 82 | 18 | 0 |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| PICKETT'S MILL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 133 | 221 | 9 | 79 | 12 |
| Regular Program Students | 111 | 225 | 6 | 79 | 14 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 22 | 201 | 23 | 77 | 0 |
| PITNER |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 160 | 216 | 22 | 69 | 9 |
| Regular Program Students | 141 | 219 | 18 | 72 | 10 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 19 | 194 | 47 | 53 | 0 |
| POWDER SPRINGS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 181 | 209 | 28 | 68 | 4 |
| Regular Program Students | 161 | 212 | 23 | 73 | 4 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 20 | 189 | 70 | 30 | 0 |
| POWERS FERRY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 70 | 205 | 24 | 73 | 3 |
| Regular Program Students | 62 | 206 | 21 | 76 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | 10 | 192 | 30 | 70 | 0 |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| RIVERSIDE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 171 | 199 | 47 | 50 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 157 | 201 | 45 | 53 | 3 |
| Limited English Proficient | 26 | 190 | 65 | 35 | 0 |
| Special Education | 14 | 179 | 79 | 21 | 0 |
| ROCKY MOUNT |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 91 | 227 | 10 | 76 | 14 |
| Regular Program Students | 77 | 228 | 8 | 77 | 16 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 14 | 218 | 21 | 71 | 7 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RUSSELL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 103 | 204 | 34 | 64 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 90 | 206 | 32 | 66 | 2 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 13 | 190 | 46 | 54 | 0 |
| SANDERS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 149 | 198 | 50 | 48 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 138 | 199 | 49 | 49 | 2 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 11 | 195 | 55 | 45 | 0 |
| SEDALIA PARK |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 99 | 222 | 15 | 67 | 18 |
| Regular Program Students | 85 | 226 | - | 71 | 20 |
| Limited English Proficient | 10 | 196 | 40 | 50 | 10 |
| Special Education | 14 | 199 | 50 | 43 | 7 |
| SHALLOWFORD FALLS |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 121 | 235 | 8 | 64 | 27 |
| Regular Program Students | 97 | 241 | 4 | 63 | 33 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 24 | 214 | 25 | 71 | 4 |
| SKY VIEW |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 62 | 196 | 56 | 42 | 2 |
| Regular Program Students | 50 | 202 | 50 | 48 | 2 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 12 | 173 | 83 | 17 | 0 |
| SMYRNA IMAGINE INT |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 37 | 212 | 14 | 81 | 5 |
| Regular Program Students | 33 | 214 | 12 | 82 | 6 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| SOPE CREEK |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 193 | 235 | 7 | 67 | 25 |
| Regular Program Students | 165 | 241 | 2 | 70 | 28 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 28 | 198 | 36 | 54 | 11 |
| STILL |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 119 | 215 | 22 | 71 | 7 |
| Regular Program Students | 91 | 221 | 13 | 78 | 9 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 28 | 195 | 50 | 50 | 0 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

Cobb County School District
Table II
Fifth Grade Writing Assesment: 2010
Percentages of Students in Performance Levels by Program Type

| 2010 | \# Tested | Average Scale Score | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TEASLEY |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 64 | 208 | 38 | 56 | 6 |
| Regular Program Students | 61 | 209 | 34 | 59 | 7 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| TIMBER RIDGE |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 105 | 227 | 7 | 74 | 19 |
| Regular Program Students | 82 | 233 | 2 | 73 | 24 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 23 | 208 | 22 | 78 | 0 |
| TRITT |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 181 | 243 | 3 | 62 | 35 |
| Regular Program Students | 148 | 248 | 1 | 60 | 39 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 33 | 221 | 12 | 70 | 18 |
| VARNER |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 122 | 209 | 29 | 66 | 5 |
| Regular Program Students | 107 | 213 | 21 | 73 | 6 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 15 | 180 | 80 | 20 | 0 |
| VAUGHN |  |  | DNM | M | E |
| All Students | 166 | 214 | 19 | 73 | 7 |
| Regular Program Students | 139 | 217 | 12 | 80 | 8 |
| Limited English Proficient | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC | TFC |
| Special Education | 27 | 196 | 56 | 41 | 4 |

TFC = Too Few To Report (If a school had fewer than 10 students scores are not listed.)
DNM = Did Not Meet Standards
M = Met Standards
E = Exceeded Standards

