



E&R Report #04.34

November 2004

## NORTH CAROLINA WRITING ASSESSMENT RESULTS 2003-04

Author: Chuck Dulaney

### ABSTRACT

*The North Carolina Writing Assessment was administered in March 2004 to all students in grades 4, 7, and 10. Administration and scoring procedures were identical to those used in pilot testing conducted statewide in 2003. The new procedures make comparisons inappropriate for years prior to 2003. Results in 2004 showed that a higher percentage of students in WCPSS scored in Levels III or IV at all three grade levels than did students statewide. Disaggregation showed large gaps between demographic groups, with many more female students than male students scoring in Levels III or IV and much larger proportions of White and Asian students scoring in Level III or IV than Black or Hispanic/Latino students. Overall, 47.7% of students in grade 4, 62.0% of students in grade 7, and 66.2% of students in grade 10 scored in Levels III or IV. In both WCPSS and statewide, less than 2% of grade 4 students and less than 1% of grade 7 and grade 10 students scored in Level IV.*

### N.C. WRITING ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW AND RESULTS SUMMARY

North Carolina began its statewide writing assessment in the 1983-84 school year with tests administered to students in grades 6 and 9. From the beginning, the North Carolina Writing Assessment emphasized student composition skills, and scoring rubrics were designed to holistically assess students' abilities to create good written compositions in standardized single session testing environments. In 1995-96, testing shifted to grades 4, 7, and 10. In 2001 the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) staff began a process that resulted in new writing assessments and scoring procedures for grades 4, 7, and 10. The new procedures were approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) on January 9, 2003, and statewide pilot testing occurred in March 2003.

On March 2, 2004, students were instructed to write an essay in response to a standardized prompt. They were given 75 minutes to complete the essay in grades 4 and 7 and 100 minutes in grade 10. Essays were submitted to NCDPI for scoring, and results were transmitted to local school districts several months later.

#### Key Topics

New Scoring Procedures-----	p. 2
Types of Writing-----	p. 4-5
Ways To Interpret Results-----	p. 6
Disaggregated Results -----	p. 7-8
Individual School Results -----	p. 12-16

Prompts printed on standardized response booklets were given to students and then read aloud twice. The following prompts were used for the 2004 North Carolina Writing Assessment:

- Grade 4: Students were told “Think about a time you tried something new. Write a story about what happened.”
- Grade 7: Students were told “Tardies to class are disrupting instruction, leaving unfinished classwork to be completed at home. Although rules and consequences were set at the beginning of the year, students are still arriving late. Write an essay for your teacher in which you suggest a solution to the problem of tardies to class.”
- Grade 10: Students were given several quotations about integrity and then instructed to “Write a speech for your high school graduating class on the meaning of integrity.” Students were told they could use the ideas from the quotations, their own experiences, observations, and/or readings.

A new scoring system was implemented statewide in 2003-04. Possible scores ranged from 4-20, and scores were organized into Levels I, II, III, and IV. (See the next section for a more detailed description of the scoring process.)

Figure 1 shows the percentage of all students in the Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) who scored in Levels III or IV in 2004 and the average total score for the 2004 writing tests:

**Figure 1**  
**Overall WCPSS Writing Test Results For 2004**

Grade Level	Percentage in Levels III or IV	Average Total Score
4	47.7	11.4
7	62.0	11.8
10	66.2	11.9

As described in the following section, the new scoring model is significantly different from the model used prior to 2003 and comparisons to previous years are inappropriate. Results from the pilot testing conducted in the 2002-03 school year are shown when they are available.

### NEW N.C. WRITING ASSESSMENT SCORING PROCEDURES

New administration and scoring procedures for the writing assessment went into effect during the 2002-2003 school year. As in previous years, the essays were scored by two individual readers who evaluated both content and conventions (sentence formation, usage, and mechanics). Each reader gave a content score from 1 to 4 or a no score (NS) for essays that were off topic and could not be evaluated. Content scores were based on specified characteristics including focus, organization, support and elaboration, and style. A conventions score ranging from 0 to 2 was also given by each reader. Appendix A and Appendix B show the detailed rubrics used for scoring content and conventions published by NCDPI in July 2003.

The major change in scoring procedures incorporated the conventions score into the total writing score for each student. The total writing score is computed by combining the content scores and the conventions scores from both scorers using the following equation: The Total Writing

Assessment Score equals the sum of the content scores from the two independent readers multiplied by 2 plus the sum of the conventions scores from the two readers. For example, the first reader might give an essay a content score of 3 and a conventions score of 1. The second reader might give the same essay a content score of 2 and a conventions score of 1. Using the formula, add the content scores together and multiply the sum by 2, resulting in 10 points for content. Adding the conventions scores generates a final total score of 12. The new scoring method results in student scores ranging from a low of 4 (in a case where both readers gave content scores of 1 and conventions scores of 0) to a high of 20 (where both content scores are 4 and both conventions scores are 2).

Scores are organized into four achievement levels (I, II, III, and IV), as are other North Carolina tests. The level definitions are similar to those used for End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) testing. Level I scores are considered far below grade level, Level II slightly below grade level, Level III at grade level, and Level IV well above grade level.

Prior to 2003, conventions ratings were not part of the total writing score, and the content scores of two readers were averaged, resulting in final scores ranging from 1.0 to 4.0.

## WRITING ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

Based upon recommendations of NCDPI Accountability Services and Instructional Services staff, and after careful examination of several standard-setting methods, the following achievement levels were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2003 for the new writing assessments at grades 4, 7, and 10:

Writing Test Total Score Ranges By Level

	Total Score Range
Level I	4-7
Level II	8-11
Level III	12-16
Level IV	17-20

*Statewide* data for the 2003 pilot administration and the 2004 regular administration are shown in Figure 2, and are compared to the last two years of statewide administration of the Writing test utilized prior to 2003. As shown, the new administration and scoring procedures used in 2003 and 2004 resulted in a much lower percentage of students in Levels III and IV at all three of the tested grade levels when compared to years when the previous scoring system was utilized. Comparisons of results from NC Writing Tests administered prior to 2003 to those administered in 2004 are clearly inappropriate because of the change in scoring systems, and therefore this report does not contain comparisons to tests administered prior to 2003.

**Figure 2**  
**Percentage of North Carolina Students By Level on NC Writing Tests**  
**Before and After Adoption of New Administration Procedures and Scoring Criteria**

Year	Grade Level	Number Tested	Achievement Levels			
			Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV
2001 (old test)	4	100,930	2.3%	28.9%	64.0%	4.8%
	7	98,178	2.4%	24.3%	66.0%	7.2%
	10	86,034	7.5%	38.6%	43.6%	10.3%
2002 (old test)	4	101,554	2.1%	51.0%	43.8%	3.0%
	7	101,425	1.9%	35.2%	60.1%	2.9%
	10	Test Not Given*	*	*	*	*
2003 (new test)	4	99,382	11.3%	50.2%	35.7%	2.8%
	7	103,074	12.5%	46.5%	40.9%	<0.1%
	10	84,093	18.8%	41.3%	38.9%	1.0%
2004 (new test)	4	102,121	9.6%	51.7%	37.0%	1.8%
	7	105,231	6.5%	47.9%	45.5%	0.0%
	10	88,633	9.4%	38.1%	51.9%	0.6%

## TYPES OF WRITING

Writing scores fluctuate based upon the type of writing and subject matter of the prompt. Figure 3 shows examples of prompts utilized by NCDPI for the 2003 and 2004 writing assessments.

In 2001 and 2002, the type of writing tested in fourth grade was personal narrative. In 2000, the type of writing was imaginative narrative. Based upon the recommendations of the NC Writing Assessment Task Force and the State Board of Education Ad Hoc Writing Committee, the fourth grade prompt will continue to be personal narrative or imaginative narrative. For the 2003 pilot test, the Grade 4 prompt was imaginative narrative. The 2004 prompt was personal narrative. In years prior to 2003, results showed that students were more successful on personal narrative compositions than on imaginative narrative. This may be one factor to consider when comparing 2003 to 2004 results at grade 4.

In prior years the type of writing tested in seventh grade was expository clarification. Beginning with the 2003 pilot test, the prompt was changed to argumentative. Future tests will call for an extended argumentative response that is either in the form of a problem/solution essay or an evaluative essay. The 2004 prompt called for a problem/solution essay. This type of prompt was also used in the 2003 pilot testing.

In prior years the type of writing tested in tenth grade was expository. Beginning with the 2003 pilot test, the prompt was changed to call for an extended informational response that is either in the form of a definition (as required in the 2004 prompt) or a cause/effect or problem/solution essay. In 2003, the grade 10 prompt was cause and effect. The change in type of prompt may again be a factor to consider when comparing results in grade 10 from 2003 to 2004.

**Figure 3**  
**Prompts Used For 2003 Pilot and 2004 Regular Writing Assessments**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Type of Writing</b>	<b>Prompt</b>
4	2003	Imaginative Narrative	One morning you look out the window and discover that a huge castle has appeared. You rush outside to the castle and hear sounds inside it. Someone is living in the castle! The castle door creaks open. Write a story about what happens next.
4	2004	Personal Narrative	Think about a time you tried something new. Write a story about what happened.
7	2003	Argumentative (Problem/Solution)	Your local government has awarded your school \$500,000 to spend on school improvements. Your principal is concerned about how to use this money in a way that will benefit the most students. Write a letter to your principal on how to best use this money for your school.
7	2004	Argumentative (Problem/Solution)	Tardies to class are disrupting instruction, leaving unfinished classwork to be completed at home. Although rules and consequences were set at the beginning of the year, students are still arriving late. Write an essay for your teacher in which you suggest a solution to the problem of tardies to class.
10	2003	Informational (Cause and Effect)	Students were instructed to read a synopsis of an article titled "Television's Effects on Kids: It Can Be Harmful". The prompt then gave the following instructions: Using the information presented, your own experiences, observations, and/or readings, write a speech to present to your community's elementary and middle school Parent/Guardian Associations in which you examine the harmful effects of children watching too much television.
10	2004	Informational (Definition)	Students were instructed to read a set of quotations about integrity. The prompt then gave the following instructions: Using the information presented, your own experiences, observations, and/or readings, write a speech for your high school graduating class on the meaning of integrity."

## INTERPRETING WRITING ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Writing Assessment results should be interpreted carefully. Each year, the modes of writing and/or the specific prompts change. With the implementation of a new administration and scoring procedure, results for the 2003-04 school year should be interpreted even more cautiously. While comparisons of the percentages of students at each achievement level can be made to previous years, it must be remembered that the scores associated with each achievement level were generated through a different process than in previous years.

### WCPSS Versus the State

One way to examine WCPSS scores is to determine whether WCPSS students score above the state average, and, if so, by how much from year to year. Another question is whether *changes* in WCPSS performance from year to year were greater than those seen in the state. A third approach is to compare changes within the type of writing relative to changes seen in the state. Since the types of writing tested changed from 2003 to 2004, the third approach is not possible for current results. Figure 4 shows two years of results for WCPSS and NC.

### Individual Schools versus WCPSS or the State

School performance can best be interpreted in light of WCPSS performance overall (as well as the state's performance). Just as in comparisons of WCPSS to the state, schools should ask whether their performance, relative to these larger populations, is similar and showing the same trends. If the percentage of students in the district scoring at Level III or higher improved between 2003 and 2004, a WCPSS school will want to see similar gains. Individual school scores are not available for the 2003 pilot testing. Appendix D shows all WCPSS schools as well as composite scores for all schools by level—elementary, middle, high, and alternative.

### Scores For Disaggregated Groups

Scores are reported for groups of students disaggregated by gender, race, and participation in programs for exceptional children, and limited English proficiency. When additional data becomes available, performance changes can be compared across time for various groups. Figure 5 shows disaggregated 2004 results for WCPSS and North Carolina.

### Individual Student Scores

Individual student scores are difficult to interpret. Both the WCPSS E&R Department and the state Department of Public Instruction discourage overuse of the individual scores. A single test score should not be used to judge a student's overall ability in writing or any other skill area. This score should be considered as only one example of a student's work and be balanced against other samples of writing generated through classroom activities. Student performance on different prompts may vary quite a bit. Students' writing scores measure their performance on a specific set of standards and criteria. If students do not follow directions in the prompt exactly, or write a different type of essay than was requested, it will have a major impact on their score. If a student's score is lower than expected on an essay, teachers and parents should look over the response to the prompt prior to deciding whether further action is needed. A careful examination of a collection of an individual student's writing samples may reveal that the student needs practice in responding to different kinds of writing style prompts or that one particular kind of prompt needs to be the focus of additional classroom instruction.

## 2004 WRITING TEST RESULTS

Writing assessments conducted in 2003 were considered pilot test administrations, but all students were required to participate. Results were not used in the state ABCs accountability program. Statewide results for 2004 were official, but were still not included in the ABCs results. Results showing the percentage of scores at or above Level III were reported for the state and school districts. As discussed above, changes in prompts may be one source of variation in scores from year to year. As shown in Figure 4, grade 4 showed almost no change from 2003 to 2004 in the percentage of students scoring in the “proficient” range of Levels III or IV. In grade 7, the statewide percentage improved 4.5 points and the WCPSS percentage improved 2.9 points. In grade 10, the statewide improvement was 12.6 points while the WCPSS percentage rose 16.4 points.

**Figure 4**  
**A Comparison of NC and WCPSS Percentages At Level III or IV**

	North Carolina		WCPSS	
	2003	2004	2003	2004
Grade 4	38.6	38.7	47.7	47.7
Grade 7	40.9	45.6	59.1	62.0
Grade 10	39.9	52.5	49.8	66.2

## SCORES FOR DISAGGREGATED GROUPS

Scores are reported for groups of students, disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, and participation in programs for exceptional children, and students with limited English proficiency. As shown in Figure 5, significant gaps between groups are evident in the percentage of students scoring in Levels III or IV. The gender gap, which is typically small on End-of-Grade and End-of-Course tests, was large at all three grade levels. WCPSS gaps were similar to statewide gaps. However, WCPSS students consistently scored higher than their demographic counterparts across the state.

**Figure 5**  
**Percentage of Students In Levels III or IV In 2004 By Demographic Group**

	Grade 4		Grade 7		Grade 10	
	WCPSS	NC	WCPSS	NC	WCPSS	NC
All Students	47.7	38.7	62.0	45.6	66.2	52.5
Female	55.3	45.4	71.4	55.6	72.3	59.7
Male	40.6	32.3	53.1	36.0	60.0	45.1
American Indian	32.6	27.3	53.5	28.4	63.6	36.5
Asian	67.4	50.8	84.2	57.2	74.0	59.4
Black	28.1	23.9	39.2	30.2	48.1	38.9
Hispanic/Latino	28.5	24.8	36.7	30.9	43.1	31.9
Multiracial	47.0	40.3	62.7	47.3	66.4	51.7
White	58.6	47.8	74.5	54.8	74.3	60.0
All Students with Disabilities	19.5	14.3	27.5	12.5	32.3	18.3
Limited English Proficiency	47.7	14.8	18.9	13.8	21.3	12.6

## TOTAL SCORE FREQUENCIES

As discussed earlier, total scores using the new scoring system can range from 4 to 20. Figure 6 shows the percentage of each possible total score awarded to students in 2004 in both WCPSS and statewide. As shown, the most frequently obtained score statewide was a 10 in grades 4 and 7 and a 12 in grade 10. In WCPSS the pattern was slightly different, with a 12 being the most common score in grade 7. Since a 12 is the bottom of the Level III range and a large percentage of students received total scores of 12, the percentage of scores in Levels III or IV reported in tables shown above could easily be lower with a slightly different prompt or some other change in testing conditions.

**Figure 6**  
**Percentage of Students By Total Writing Score In 2004**

Total Score		Grade 4		Grade 7		Grade 10	
		WCPSS	NC	WCPSS	NC	WCPSS	NC
Level IV	20	0.27	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.09
	19	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	18	1.36	1.27	0.05	0.02	0.40	0.47
	17	0.12	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.02
Level III	16	9.17	6.82	7.25	4.26	8.77	6.95
	15	3.87	3.76	0.30	0.39	2.39	2.07
	14	11.33	8.88	15.30	10.28	14.97	11.93
	13	4.83	3.13	3.16	2.47	5.54	3.83
	12	16.75	14.36	35.92	28.12	33.99	27.12
Level II	11	2.63	2.09	7.39	7.01	1.85	3.40
	10	33.22	31.40	24.80	34.18	21.92	24.44
	9	4.63	8.98	1.20	2.66	2.58	4.07
	8	6.16	9.21	1.76	4.08	3.10	6.22
Level I	7	0.90	1.17	0.74	1.45	1.13	1.96
	6	2.02	3.77	0.60	1.63	1.21	3.28
	5	0.59	0.97	0.27	0.80	0.53	1.26
	4	1.80	3.46	0.97	2.36	0.74	1.57
	NS	0.34	0.26	0.28	0.27	0.72	1.30
Total N		8,432	102,121	8,535	105,231	7,182	88,633

The fact that almost no writing scores fell into the Level IV range is very different from outcomes on other North Carolina standardized tests. For example, on End-of-Grade tests given in grades 3-8 in WCPSS in 2004, 54.8% of all reading scores and 66.0% of all math scores were in Level IV. Similarly, 44.9% of all End-of-Course tests given in WCPSS during the 2003-04 school year resulted in a Level IV score. The discrepancy between Level IV performance on EOG and EOC multiple-choice tests and Level IV performance on the writing assessments is an issue for further study and discussion.

**Appendix A**  
**North Carolina Writing Assessment Scoring Model**  
**Grades 4, 7, and 10 Content Rubric**

Points	Description
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic/subject is clear, though it may or may not be explicitly stated</li> <li>• Maintains focus on topic/subject throughout the response</li> <li>• Organizational structure establishes relationships between and among ideas and/or events</li> <li>• Consists of a logical progression of ideas and/or events and is unified and complete</li> <li>• Support and elaboration are related to and supportive of the topic/subject</li> <li>• Consists of specific, developed details</li> <li>• Exhibits skillful use of vocabulary that is precise and purposeful</li> <li>• Demonstrates skillful use of sentence fluency</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic/subject is generally clear, though it may or may not be explicitly stated</li> <li>• May exhibit minor lapses in focus on topic/subject</li> <li>• Organizational structure establishes relationships between and among ideas and/or events, although minor lapses may be present</li> <li>• Consists of a logical progression of ideas and/or events and is reasonably complete, although minor lapses may be present</li> <li>• Support and elaboration may have minor weaknesses in relatedness to and support of the topic/subject</li> <li>• Consists of some specific details</li> <li>• Exhibits reasonable use of vocabulary that is precise and purposeful</li> <li>• Demonstrates reasonable use of sentence fluency</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic/subject may be vague</li> <li>• May lose or may exhibit major lapses in focus on topic/subject</li> <li>• Organizational structure may establish little relationship between and among ideas and/or events</li> <li>• May have major lapses in the logical progression of ideas and/or events and is minimally complete</li> <li>• Support and elaboration may have major weaknesses in relatedness to and support of the topic/subject</li> <li>• Consists of general and/or undeveloped details, which may be presented in a list-like fashion</li> <li>• Exhibits minimal use of vocabulary that is precise and purposeful</li> <li>• Demonstrates minimal use of sentence fluency</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topic/subject is unclear or confusing</li> <li>• May fail to establish focus on topic/subject</li> <li>• Organizational structure may not establish connection between and among ideas and/or events</li> <li>• May consist of ideas and/or events that are presented in a random fashion and is incomplete or confusing</li> <li>• Support and elaboration attempts to support the topic/subject but may be unrelated or confusing</li> <li>• Consists of sparse details</li> <li>• Lacks use of vocabulary that is precise and purposeful</li> <li>• May not demonstrate sentence fluency</li> </ul>
NS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This code may be used for compositions that are entirely illegible or otherwise unscorable: blank responses, responses written in a foreign language, restatements of the prompt, and responses that are off-topic or incoherent.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B**  
**North Carolina Writing Assessment Scoring Model**  
**Grades 4, 7, and 10 Conventions Rubric**

Points	Description
2	<b>Exhibits reasonable control of grammatical conventions appropriate to the writing task</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exhibits reasonable control of sentence formation</li> <li>• Exhibits reasonable control of standard usage including agreement, tense, and case</li> <li>• Exhibits reasonable control of mechanics including use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling</li> </ul>
1	<b>Exhibits minimal control of grammatical conventions appropriate to the writing task</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exhibits minimal control of sentence formation</li> <li>• Exhibits minimal control of standard usage including agreement, tense, and case</li> <li>• Exhibits minimal control of mechanics including use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling</li> </ul>
NS	<b>Lacks control of grammatical conventions appropriate to the writing task</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks control of sentence formation</li> <li>• Lacks control of standard usage including agreement, tense, and case</li> <li>• Lacks control of mechanics including use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling</li> </ul>

---

NCDPI Division of Accountability Services/North Carolina Testing Section July 2003

**Appendix C**  
**Cross Tabulation of Content Scores With Conventions Scores**

Grade 4 Content Scores		Grade 4 Conventions Scores					Total
		0	1	2	3	4	
0	Count	29					29
4	Count	152	50	48	6	1	257
6	Count	122	70	228	36	14	470
8	Count	290	354	2735	221	724	4324
10	Count	52	1	665	403	643	1764
12	Count	23	4	310	326	767	1430
14	Count	2		6	10	115	133
16	Count				2	23	25
Total Count		670	479	3992	1004	2287	8432

Grade 7 Content Scores		Grade 7 Conventions Scores					Total
		0	1	2	3	4	
0	Count	24					24
4	Count	83	23	22	4	1	133
6	Count	29	59	85	24	9	206
8	Count	64	78	2102	631	2972	5847
10	Count	6		93	270	1297	1666
12	Count	1		9	26	619	655
14	Count					4	4
16	Count						
Total Count		207	160	2311	955	4902	8535

Grade 10 Content Scores		Grade 10 Conventions Scores					Total
		0	1	2	3	4	
0	Count	52					52
4	Count	53	38	67	32	18	208
6	Count	20	49	180	109	104	462
8	Count	25	76	1467	133	2162	3863
10	Count	3		277	396	944	1620
12	Count	2	2	131	172	630	937
14	Count				3	29	32
16	Count					8	8
Total Count		155	165	2122	845	3895	7182

**Appendix D**  
**2004 Writing Scores By School And Level**

Code	School Name	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Pct Lev1	Pct Lev2	Pct Lev3	Pct Lev4
304	Adams Elementary	15	52	83	3	9.8%	34.0%	54.2%	2.0%
308	Apex Elementary	4	45	60	3	3.6%	40.2%	53.6%	2.7%
320	Aversboro Elementary	10	54	34	0	10.2%	55.1%	34.7%	0.0%
326	Bailewick Elementary	7	26	45	6	8.3%	31.0%	53.6%	7.1%
327	Ballentine Elementary	5	35	35	0	6.7%	46.7%	46.7%	0.0%
328	Baucom Elementary	1	50	86	4	0.7%	35.5%	61.0%	2.8%
334	Brassfield Elementary	1	41	55	6	1.0%	39.8%	53.4%	5.8%
336	Brentwood Elementary	8	56	18	1	9.6%	67.5%	21.7%	1.2%
340	Briarcliff Elementary	7	36	40	5	8.0%	40.9%	45.5%	5.7%
344	Brooks Elementary	11	45	26	0	13.4%	54.9%	31.7%	0.0%
352	Bugg Elementary	4	32	18	2	7.1%	57.1%	32.1%	3.6%
362	Carver Elementary	10	46	32	2	11.1%	51.1%	35.6%	2.2%
364	Cary Elementary	7	59	41	3	6.4%	53.6%	37.3%	2.7%
376	Combs Elementary	5	40	46	3	5.3%	42.6%	48.9%	3.2%
380	Conn Elementary	9	29	43	2	10.8%	34.9%	51.8%	2.4%
384	Creech Road Elementary	12	73	24	1	10.9%	66.4%	21.8%	0.9%
390	Davis Drive Elementary	0	28	141	3	0.0%	16.3%	82.0%	1.7%
393	Dillard Dr. Elementary	2	33	34	0	2.9%	47.8%	49.3%	0.0%
396	Douglas Elementary	8	44	30	1	9.6%	53.0%	36.1%	1.2%
398	Durant Road Elementary	7	82	113	3	3.4%	40.0%	55.1%	1.5%
414	Farmington Woods Elementary	1	43	65	4	0.9%	38.1%	57.5%	3.5%
415	Fox Road Elementary	26	109	59	0	13.4%	56.2%	30.4%	0.0%
416	Fuller Elementary	10	36	31	1	12.8%	46.2%	39.7%	1.3%
420	Fuquay-Varina Elementary	7	56	34	2	7.1%	56.6%	34.3%	2.0%
439	Green Hope Elementary	3	37	90	2	2.3%	28.0%	68.2%	1.5%
440	Green Elementary	11	66	48	3	8.6%	51.6%	37.5%	2.3%
442	Hilburn Drive Elementary	4	52	58	2	3.4%	44.8%	50.0%	1.7%
446	Hodge Road Elementary	6	68	29	0	5.8%	66.0%	28.2%	0.0%
447	Holly Springs Elementary	1	37	41	1	1.3%	46.3%	51.3%	1.3%
448	Hunter Elementary	4	52	59	0	3.5%	45.2%	51.3%	0.0%
449	Holly Ridge Elementary	5	29	37	3	6.8%	39.2%	50.0%	4.1%
452	Jeffreys Grove Elementary	3	33	40	2	3.8%	42.3%	51.3%	2.6%
454	Heritage Elementary	2	91	75	1	1.2%	53.8%	44.4%	0.6%
456	Joyner Elementary	3	38	22	0	4.8%	60.3%	34.9%	0.0%
460	Kingswood Elementary	1	21	23	0	2.2%	46.7%	51.1%	0.0%
464	Knightdale Elementary	6	75	35	0	5.2%	64.7%	30.2%	0.0%
468	Lacy Elementary	3	26	39	2	4.3%	37.1%	55.7%	2.9%
469	Leesville Road Elementary	6	44	63	2	5.2%	38.3%	54.8%	1.7%
470	Lead Mine Elementary	6	54	31	0	6.6%	59.3%	34.1%	0.0%
476	Lincoln Heights Elementary	2	45	44	0	2.2%	49.5%	48.4%	0.0%
480	Lockhart Elementary	4	37	71	5	3.4%	31.6%	60.7%	4.3%
488	Lynn Road Elementary	8	38	33	2	9.9%	46.9%	40.7%	2.5%
494	Middle Creek Elementary	4	47	44	1	4.2%	49.0%	45.8%	1.0%
496	Millbrook Elementary	15	69	30	0	13.2%	60.5%	26.3%	0.0%
504	Morrisville Elementary	1	50	108	9	0.6%	29.8%	64.3%	5.4%
516	North Ridge Elementary	1	61	41	1	1.0%	58.7%	39.4%	1.0%
520	Northwoods Elementary	6	63	64	4	4.4%	46.0%	46.7%	2.9%
522	Oak Grove Elementary	5	73	86	5	3.0%	43.2%	50.9%	3.0%
523	Olive Chapel Elementary	0	66	68	0	0.0%	49.3%	50.7%	0.0%
524	Olds Elementary	1	21	23	0	2.2%	46.7%	51.1%	0.0%

**Appendix D**  
**2004 Writing Scores By School And Level**

<b>Code</b>	<b>School Name</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Pct Lev1</b>	<b>Pct Lev2</b>	<b>Pct Lev3</b>	<b>Pct Lev4</b>
525	Partnership Elementary	1	20	29	0	2.0%	40.0%	58.0%	0.0%
530	Penny Road Elementary	2	46	49	4	2.0%	45.5%	48.5%	4.0%
531	Pleasant Union Elementary	2	40	55	2	2.0%	40.4%	55.6%	2.0%
532	Poe Elementary	2	39	21	1	3.2%	61.9%	33.3%	1.6%
536	Powell Elementary	5	44	49	2	5.0%	44.0%	49.0%	2.0%
540	Rand Road Elementary	5	45	30	0	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%	0.0%
542	Reedy Creek Elem.	8	63	40	1	7.1%	56.3%	35.7%	0.9%
544	Rolesville Elementary	2	44	58	1	1.9%	41.9%	55.2%	1.0%
548	Root Elementary	2	16	46	7	2.8%	22.5%	64.8%	9.9%
550	Salem Elementary	4	30	76	7	3.4%	25.6%	65.0%	6.0%
560	Smith Elementary	7	58	14	0	8.9%	73.4%	17.7%	0.0%
564	Stough Elementary	9	38	30	1	11.5%	48.7%	38.5%	1.3%
568	Swift Creek Elementary	3	37	27	0	4.5%	55.2%	40.3%	0.0%
570	Timber Drive Elementary	7	81	86	2	4.0%	46.0%	48.9%	1.1%
572	Underwood Elementary	6	26	23	0	10.9%	47.3%	41.8%	0.0%
576	Vance Elementary	3	37	24	2	4.5%	56.1%	36.4%	3.0%
580	Vandora Springs Elem.	1	34	33	1	1.4%	49.3%	47.8%	1.4%
584	Wake Forest Elementary	17	80	52	1	11.3%	53.3%	34.7%	0.7%
593	Wakefield Elem.	5	69	77	1	3.3%	45.4%	50.7%	0.7%
596	Washington Elementary	1	42	52	6	1.0%	41.6%	51.5%	5.9%
598	Weatherstone Elem.	9	52	91	2	5.8%	33.8%	59.1%	1.3%
600	Wendell Elementary	13	70	24	0	12.1%	65.4%	22.4%	0.0%
606	West Lake Elementary	6	84	107	2	3.0%	42.2%	53.8%	1.0%
616	Wilburn Elementary	11	106	51	0	6.5%	63.1%	30.4%	0.0%
618	Wildwood Forest Elem.	7	65	63	2	5.1%	47.4%	46.0%	1.5%
620	Wiley Elementary	7	25	32	0	10.9%	39.1%	50.0%	0.0%
624	Willow Springs Elem.	11	65	42	1	9.2%	54.6%	35.3%	0.8%
626	Yates Mill Pond Elementary	2	32	26	2	3.2%	51.6%	41.9%	3.2%
628	York Elementary	10	36	43	2	11.0%	39.6%	47.3%	2.2%
632	Zebulon Elementary	15	63	28	0	14.2%	59.4%	26.4%	0.0%
	<b>Elementary Subtotal</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>3930</b>	<b>3873</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>

**Appendix D**  
**2004 Writing Scores By School And Level**

<b>Code</b>	<b>School Name</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Pct Lev1</b>	<b>Pct Lev2</b>	<b>Pct Lev3</b>	<b>Pct Lev4</b>
312	Apex Middle	5	85	235	0	1.5%	26.2%	72.3%	0.0%
356	Carnage Middle	8	142	158	0	2.6%	46.1%	51.3%	0.0%
360	Carroll Middle	13	94	157	0	4.9%	35.6%	59.5%	0.0%
370	Centennial Middle	1	53	117	0	0.6%	31.0%	68.4%	0.0%
388	Daniels Middle	15	126	175	1	4.7%	39.7%	55.2%	0.3%
391	Davis Drive Middle	5	75	349	0	1.2%	17.5%	81.4%	0.0%
394	Dillard Dr. Middle	4	99	252	0	1.1%	27.9%	71.0%	0.0%
399	Durant Road Middle	9	188	397	0	1.5%	31.6%	66.8%	0.0%
400	Reedy Creek Middle	17	111	183	0	5.5%	35.7%	58.8%	0.0%
404	East Garner Middle	16	159	105	0	5.7%	56.8%	37.5%	0.0%
408	East Millbrook Middle	18	139	172	0	5.5%	42.2%	52.3%	0.0%
410	East Wake Middle	23	150	99	0	8.5%	55.1%	36.4%	0.0%
424	Fuquay-Varina Middle	4	124	152	0	1.4%	44.3%	54.3%	0.0%
450	Holly Ridge Middle	9	86	189	0	3.2%	30.3%	66.5%	0.0%
471	Leesville Road Middle	9	108	228	0	2.6%	31.3%	66.1%	0.0%
472	Ligon Middle	6	47	266	3	1.9%	14.6%	82.6%	0.9%
484	Lufkin Rd. Middle	5	85	231	0	1.6%	26.5%	72.0%	0.0%
492	Martin Middle	6	88	215	0	1.9%	28.5%	69.6%	0.0%
506	Moore Square Museum Middle	4	64	135	0	2.0%	31.5%	66.5%	0.0%
512	North Garner Middle	14	153	106	0	5.1%	56.0%	38.8%	0.0%
592	Wake Forest-Rolesville Mid.	12	172	215	0	3.0%	43.1%	53.9%	0.0%
594	Wakefield Middle	2	110	243	0	0.6%	31.0%	68.5%	0.0%
604	West Cary Middle	4	67	267	0	1.2%	19.8%	79.0%	0.0%
607	West Lake Middle	6	129	353	0	1.2%	26.4%	72.3%	0.0%
608	West Millbrook Middle	11	154	159	0	3.4%	47.5%	49.1%	0.0%
636	Zebulon Middle	15	170	122	0	4.9%	55.4%	39.7%	0.0%
	<b>Middle School Subtotal</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>2978</b>	<b>5280</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>62.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Appendix D**  
**2004 Writing Scores By School And Level**

<b>Code</b>	<b>School Name</b>	<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Pct Lev1</b>	<b>Pct Lev2</b>	<b>Pct Lev3</b>	<b>Pct Lev4</b>
316	Apex High	15	118	354	2	3.1%	24.1%	72.4%	0.4%
318	Athens Drive High	13	83	261	4	3.6%	23.0%	72.3%	1.1%
348	Broughton High	21	148	368	2	3.9%	27.5%	68.3%	0.4%
368	Cary High	19	146	327	1	3.9%	29.6%	66.3%	0.2%
411	East Wake High	18	166	222	3	4.4%	40.6%	54.3%	0.7%
412	Enloe High	13	108	413	11	2.4%	19.8%	75.8%	2.0%
428	Fuquay-Varina High	17	99	233	1	4.9%	28.3%	66.6%	0.3%
436	Garner High	42	183	170	2	10.6%	46.1%	42.8%	0.5%
441	Green Hope High	17	94	370	4	3.5%	19.4%	76.3%	0.8%
473	Leesville Road High	21	132	324	6	4.3%	27.3%	67.1%	1.2%
495	Middle Creek High	9	132	246	1	2.3%	34.0%	63.4%	0.3%
500	Millbrook High	26	146	270	0	5.9%	33.0%	61.1%	0.0%
552	Sanderson High	26	90	279	1	6.6%	22.7%	70.5%	0.3%
562	Southeast Raleigh High	14	177	336	1	2.7%	33.5%	63.6%	0.2%
588	Wake Forest-Rolesville High	20	134	227	0	5.2%	35.2%	59.6%	0.0%
595	Wakefield High	16	148	305	1	3.4%	31.5%	64.9%	0.2%
	<b>High School Subtotal</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>2104</b>	<b>4705</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>65.7%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
324	Longview School	5	11	1	0	29.4%	64.7%	5.9%	0.0%
508	Mt. Vernon School	7	18	6	0	22.6%	58.1%	19.4%	0.0%
528	Mary E. Phillips High	1	6	11	0	5.6%	33.3%	61.1%	0.0%
	<b>Alternative Schools Subtotal</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
	<b>WCPS Total Grades 4, 7, 10</b>	<b>1032</b>	<b>9047</b>	<b>13876</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>