#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 405 TM 003 009

TITLE Georgia Statewide Testing Program Results 1972-73:

Systems Category Report.

INSTITUTION Georgia State Dept. of Education, Atlanta. Div. of

Program and Staff Development.

PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS \*Achievement Tests; Comparative Analysis; Grade 4;

Grade 8; Grade 11; Performance Factors; Program Evaluation; \*Public School Systems; Standardized Tests; \*State Programs; Statistical Data; \*Test

Results

IDENTIFIERS \*Georgia

#### **ABSTRACT**

This report, one of six volumes presenting the results of Georgia's statewide testing program, provides test results for grades 4, 8 and 11 by school system category and, within categories, by school system. The categories, totaling 43 for individual schools and 48 for systems, were devised in an effort to make comparisons between schools and systems more meaningful. Each category is defined by three factors which have been shown to influence achievement test scores: (1) system or school size--average daily attendance; (2) mental abilities scores of students--Cognitive Abilities Test verbal scores; and (3) income level--percent of students above a minimal income subsistence level. No in-depth analysis of results is given in this report, which should be read in conjunction with the other reports. The following information is provided: (1) average daily attendance, (2) average teachers salaries, (3) Cooperative Educational Services Agencies districts, (4) scores for the Cognitive Abilities Test, (5) scores for the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, (6) mean, (7) number of students tested, (8) non-failure rate, (9) percentile rank, (10) percentage above the minimal subsistence income level, (11) retention rate, (12) standard deviation, (13) scores for the Tests of Academic Progress, and (14) total instructional co - per child. (For related documents, see TM 003 007-008, 010.) (KM)

# Statewick Testing Program Results 1972-73

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATEP DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# GEORGIA STATEWIDE TESTING PROGRAM REPORT 1972-73 SCHOOL YEAR

Presented to the State Board of Education
by
Office of Instructional Services
Division of Program and Staff Development
Statewide Testing Program
Georgia Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
May 1973

Jack P. Nix, State Superintendent of Schools



For further information contact — Dr. J. W. Waites or Mr. P. C. Thomas, Statewide Testing Program, Program and Staff Development, Office of Instructional Services, State Department of Education, 258 State Office Building, A lanta, Georgia 30334, Phone: 404-656-2688.



#### INTRODUCTION

When the State Legislature funded the Statewide Testing Program in 1971, Georgia took its first step toward a comprehensive educational assessment program. The tests presently being administered, however, are directly concerned with certain basic skills and abilities, and are not intended to measure total achievement in any given subject or grade. While most of these skills and abilities appear basic or essential to nearly all types of academic achievement, it is obvious that they are not inclusive of all of the desired outcomes of instruction at the levels tested. The results obtained from these tests, therefore, will not constitute in themselves an adequate basis for, and should not be unduly emphasized in, the total evaluation of instruction. It is conceivable, although very unlikely, that some schools or classes may do well on these tests and yet be relatively deficient in relation to other important responsibilities — as in music, literature, health or character education — and that other schools or classes obtaining below-average test results may, nevertheless, be providing an educational environment that in other respects is quite satisfactory.

These tests are concerned with only those outcomes of instruction that happen to be particularly amenable to objective measurement. The measures provided can be used to distinct advantage, but their wisest use involves a full recognition of their restrictions. One should measure and treat as objectively as possible those aspects of instruction that are susceptible to such treatment. In the meantime, one should not neglect the other less tangible but perhaps equally important aspects.

To draw conclusions from a single measurement or test result is extremely difficult and can be misleading. There are often many factors which must be considered in analyzing test scores. It was for this reason that the original advisory committee for the Statewide Testing Program stated that "test results cannot be used as a basis of comparison of teachers, schools, or systems." However, the decision by the Attorney General's office that failure to release group data of the Statewide Testing Program violated the State Open Records Law mandated that the State Board of Education make public these test scores for individual schools and school systems. Consequently, the Board of Education, in compliance with State law, in May of 1972 released an alphabetical listing of systems and schools within systems with obtained scores for each major subtest at each grade level tested. Report 1 of the 1973 reports contains the same alphabetical listing of school systems and schools within systems.

Realistically speaking, the results of the Statewide Testing Program were used (and no doubt will continue to be used) to compare schools and systems as to the quality of their instructional programs. Many of the conclusions drawn by the nicdia, the general public and some educators concerning the quality of Georgia

schools were either misleading or errone influencing achievement test scores (suo making their judgments

Bearing this fact in mind, it is the purpo more meaningful and valid by holding which research indicates influence achiev

The factors which are held constant are -

- a) The Average Daily Attendance (A
- b) The Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT
- c) The percent of ADA students in tence level (MSL).

By holding these three factors constant income level, it should be possible to disystem in such a manner that it can be similar enough for meaningful comparison questions regarding reasons for a school how it differs from those in the same or displayed.

There are 48 categories for systems, as grade level tested (four, eight and elevel school size, mental abilities scores of status, Category, 1 for tystems includes the verbal scores over 100, and between 81 minimal subsistence income level. Categor below 2,000, CAT verbal scores below 8 above a minimal subsistence income level.

It should be obvious that inter-category of i.e., Category 1 systems cannot be compinappropriate to assume that Category Category 48 systems. It might very will doing as well as or better than some Category the school system has little or not family income level.

While comparisons cannot be made ac compare schools or systems within a give in Category 1 are all large systems with and family income, it is reasonable to expenditure of the comparison of th

the State thensive however intended to find the comes of the reform the reformation in the reforma

those ve meas r wisest treat a uch trea

neasure

enviro

ten mai reason ed that or syst te to rele Records cores fo tion, in ig of sy test at e phabetic

f the Stand (d) to contraints. Moreon rams. Moreon ferences



the Statewide Testing Program in 1971, Georgia ehensive educational assessment program. The however, are directly concerned with certain trintended to measure total achievement in any it of these skills and abilities appear basic or mic achievement, it is obvious that they are not comes of instruction at the levels tested. The therefore, will not constitute in themselves and be unduly emphasized in, the total evaluation of ugh very unlikely, that some schools or classes yet be relatively deficient in relation to other nusic, literature, health or character education—taining below-average test results may, nevertheenvironment that in other respects is quite

those outcomes of instruction that happen to be measurement. The measures provided can be revisest use involves a full recognition of their treat as objectively as possible those aspects of with the treatment. In the meantime, one should not exhaps equally important aspects.

neasurement or test result is extremely difficult ten many factors which must be considered in reason that the original advisory committee for ed that "test results cannot be used as a basis of or systems." However, the decision by the e to release group data of the Statewide Testing Records Law mandated that the State Board of cores for individual schools and school systems. Ition, in compliance with State law, in May of gof systems and schools within systems with test at each grade level tested. Report 1 of the phabetical listing of school systems and schools

f the Statewide Testing Program were used (and id) to compare schools and systems as to the rams. Many of the conclusions drawn by the educators concerning the quality of Georgia

schools were either misleading or erroneous because they failed to consider factors influencing achievement test scores (such as socioeconomic status and abilities) in making their judgments.

Bearing this fact in mind, it is the purpose of this report to make such comparisons more meaningful and valid by holding constant a number of quantifiable factors which research indicates influence achievement test scores.

The factors which are held constant are -

- a) The Average Daily Attendance (ADA).
- b) The Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT) verbal scores.
- The percent of ADA students in a school above a minimal income subsistence level (MSL).

By holding these three factors constant, i.e., size of school, mental ability and income level, it should be possible to categorize (see Figure 1) each school and system in such a manner that it can be determined which schools or systems are similar enough for meaningful comparisons. This technique should help raise many questions regarding reasons for a school falling in a particular category, why and/or how it differs from those in the same or different categories.

There are 48 categories for systems, as well as 48 categories for schools at each grade level tested (four, eight and eleven). Each category is defined by system or school size, mental abilities scores of students and income level (see Figure 1). Thus, Category 1 for systems includes those systems with an ADA over 9,000, CAT verbal scores over 100, and between 81 percent to 99 percent of students above a minimal subsistence income level. Category 48 includes those systems with an ADA below 2,000, CAT verbal scores below 84, and only 41 percent or fewer students above a minimal subsistence income level.

It should be obvious that inter-category comparisons cannot be meaningfully made, i.e., Category 1 systems cannot be compared with Category 48 systems. Thus it is inappropriate to assume that Category 1 systems are doing a superior job to Category 48 systems. It might very well be that some Category 48 systems are doing as well as or better than some Category 1 systems considering factors over which the school system has little or no control, i.e., students' academic ability and family income level.

While comparisons cannot be made across categories, it should be possible to compare schools or systems within a given category. For example, since the systems in Category 1 are all large systems with students who are high in academic abilities and family income, it is reasonable to expect their achievement test scores to also



be quite similar. When wide discrepancies exist within a category, we should then begin to examine the school input factors (such as average teachers' salaries, instructional cost per pupil, etc.), as well as other factors, in attempting to determine why some schools or systems that are similar in some ways score differently in achievement level.

It should also be possible to make some assumptions when comparing a system in relationship to its category. For example, assume that system X has achievement test scores that fall at the State Norm (average). If system X is found in Category 48 where both students' abilities and family incomes are low it can probably be assumed that system X is doing an above average job of instructing its students. If system X had fallen into Category 1 where both students' abilities and family incomes are high, it is reasonable to assume that its students would be functioning in the superior range. Since, however, these students on the average are only obtaining scores at the State Norm, the system may well be functioning at a level which is below average. Bear in mind that inter-category comparisons have not been made.

here, it is the system's relationship to its catego

It should also be remembered that the score four are mean composite scores. The mean so school or system. Consequently, any school of students who score as high as or as low as system. In other words, while Elementary School of 69, some students in School X may score as low as 45.

This report is one of six volumes in which the found. This particular report contains categorany in-depth analyzation of the results, nor shiften this report alone. It should be read in cooperticular emphasis given to report six. That with the analyzation of the Statewide Testing

iscrepar put fact well as o at are

nake son or exar te Norm ties and ng an ab tegory ble to a bwever, the syste that inte



put factors (such as average teachers' salaries, instructed as other factors, in attempting to determine why are similar in some ways score differently in

nake some assumptions when comparing a system in or example, assume that system X has achievement to Norm (average). If system X is found in Category ties and family incomes are low it can probably being an above average job of instructing its students. If tegory, 1 where both students' abilities and family ble to assume that its students would be functioning owever, these students on the average are only obtain the system may well be functioning at a level which is that inter-category comparisons have not been made

here, it is the system's relationship to its category which has been examined.

It should also be remembered that the scores reported in Reports two, three and four are mean composite scores. The mean score represents the average score for a school or system. Consequently, any school or system would likely have individual students who score as high as or as low as some students in any other school or system. In other words, while Elementary School X may have a mean composite score of 69, some students in School X may score as high as 83 while others may score as low as 45.

This report is one of sillumes in which the Statewide Testing Program results are found. This particular report contains categories for systems. It does not present any in-depth analyzation of the results, nor should too many conclusions be drawn from this report alone. It should be read in conjunction with the other reports, with particular emphasis given to report six. That report will be concerned primarily with the analyzation of the Statewide Testing Program results.



FIGURE 1
THE DESCRIPTIVE MATRIX OF CATEGORIZATION OF SCHOOLS AND SYSTE

	Α Ι	O A		CAT	ORES	ABO		DΑ	
System	4th Grade	8th Grade	11th Grade	Above 100	99-84	83-Below			ئ.
Above	Above	Above	Above	1	2	3			
9001	150	300	400	4	5	6			
			•	7	8	9			
				10	11	12			
9000	149	299	399	13	14	15			
to	to	to	to	16	17	18			
4001	100	200	200	19	20	21			
				22	23	24			
4000	99	199	199	25	26	27			
to	to	to	to	28	29	30			
2001	50	100	100	31	32	33			
				34	35	36		`	
Below	Below	Below	Below	37	38	39			1
2000	49	99	99	40	41	42			
] [				43	44	45		7	
				46	47	48	τ'		



THE DESCRIPTIVE MATRIX OF CATE 3 ORIZATION OF SCHOOLS AND SYSTEMS

D A		CAT	VERBAL SC	ORES	PERCENT OF STUDENTS ABOVE A MINIMAL SUBSISTENCE INCOME LEVEL
∩th Grade	11th Grade	Above 100	99-84	83-Below	
Above	Above	1	2	3	99% - 81%
300	400	4	5	6	80% - 61%
		7	8	9	60% - 41%
		10	11	12	Below 41%
299	399	13	14	15	99% - 81%
to	to	16	17	18	80% - 61%
200	200	19	20	21	60% - 41%
		22	23	24	Below 41%
199	199	25	26	27	99% - 81%
to	to	28	29	30	80% - 61%
100	100	31	32	33	60% - 41%
		34	35	36	Below 41%
Below	Below	37	38	39	99% - 81%
99	99	40	41	42	80% - 61%
		43	44	45	60% - 41%
		46	47	48	Below 41%



#### SYSTEMS GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The following are definitions of the terms and the types of results that will be found in this report.

- 1. Average Daily Attendance (ADA). The Average Daily Attendance indicates the average number of students who daily attend a school or system. The average daily attendance of a school grade is presumed for the purposes of this report to be the number of students who participate in the Statewide Testing Program. The ADA of systems was compiled by the Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Georgia Department of Education, and should present an accurate ADA for systems for the 1971.72 school year. The number of students daily attending a school or system is an indicator of its size.
- 2. Average Teachers' Salaries (ATS). The Average Teachers' Salaries are derived by taking the total expenditures for teachers' salaries for the system and dividing it by the total number of teachers (i.e., regular teachers, as well as teaching principals, assistant principals, librarians, counselors, exceptional teachers, vocational teachers and part-time teachers) in the system. The factors of experience, certification of the teachers and difference in salary bases of the various counties are not taken separately. ATS were compiled by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Georgia Department of Education, for the 1971-72 school year.
- 3. Cooperative Educational Services Agei. sies (CESA) Districts. The State Board of Education was given authority by Senate Bill 538 to establish Cooperative Educational Services Agencies for the purpose of local school systems sharing services designed to improve the effectiveness of the educational programs of those school systems. At this time not all of the CESA districts are operable, and there are a number of school systems cooperating with districts outside of their designated districts. We are, however, identifying school systems by the CESA districts under which they will eventually be operating. There are 18 Educational Planning districts.
- 4. Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT). The Cognitive Abilities Test provides a set of measures of the individual's ability to use and manipulate abstract and symbolic relationships (i.e., symbols representing words, and symbols representing spatial, geometric or figural patterns). Verbal and non-verbal abilities of the students are reported as Standard Age Scores (SAS). An average SAS will fa!! above and below a score of 100, i.e., approximately 84 to 116. CAT verbal scores theoretically provide a more meaningful measure of the individual's academic ability. This is because academic skills and tasks rely heavily upon the individual's verbal abilities. It was for this reason the CAT verbal scores were

used as one variable in the Descriptive C.

 lowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). If cerned with the basic skills essential to the elementary and junior high school i tested are +

Test V · Vocabulary

Test R - Reading Comprehension

Test L. Language Skills (Spelling, Capital

Test W - Work-Study Skills (Map Readicedge and Use of Reference Mas

Test M - Mathematics Skills (Mathemating).

In the test situation the pupil is required regular schoolwork. The results are an est developmental continuum, not of where he zation of the school. The results are report fourth grader would be expected to receivaverage eighth grader would be expected to the purposes of this report a composite scores.

- Mean. Each category is defined by its or average TAP score. This is computed: all the schools in a particular category.
- N. In each category for the fourth heading "N". The numbers which fall number of fourth, eighth and eleventh gr
- 8. Non-Failure Rate. The Non-Failure Rate promoted to the next grade in a give compiled by the Division of Planning Department of Education, for the 1971
- Percentile Rank (Labeled 75 percent, 50 is defined by the percentile ranks of its percentile ranks can be thought of as c example, a score of 60.1 on the compose (eleventh grade) is the cut off point for

and the

he Avera

daily at de is properties of the compiled of the 19 yetem is

Average teachers chers (r ls, libra me teach ers and c y ATS Georgia

enate Bi ourpose of aveness of all of the ms coopevel, ide eventual

cognitive
to use
epresenti
terns). Ve
Age Scor
... approx
neaningfi
nic skills

this reaso



and the types of results that will be

he Average Daily Attendance indicates daily attend a school or system. The de is presumed for the purposes of this no participate in the Statewide Testing impiled by the Division of Planning, partment of Education, and should the 1971-72 school year. The number, stem is an indicator of its size.

Average Teachers' Salaries are derived teachers' salaries for the system and chers (i.e., regular teachers, as well as is, librarians, comiselors, exceptional me teachers) in the system. The factors is and difference in salary bases of the ATS were compiled by the Division Jeorgia Department of Education, for

res (CESA) Districts. The State Board chate Bill 538 to establish Cooperative surpose of local school systems sharing iveness of the educational programs of all of the CESA districts are operable, ms cooperating with districts outside of every identifying school systems by the eventually be operating. There are 18

Cognitive Abilities Test provides a set of to use and manipulate abstract and epresenting words, and symbols represents. Verbal and non-verbal abilities of Age Scores (SAS). An average SAS will approximately 84 to 116. CAT verbal neaningful measure of the individual's not skills and tasks rely heavily upon the this reason the CAT verbal scores were

used as one variable in the Descriptive Categories Matrix,

5. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills are concerned with the basic skills essential to success in any type of school work at the elementary and junior high school level (grade four and eight). Major areas tested are ~

Test V · Vocapulary

Test R - Reading Comprehension

Test L. Language Skills (Spelling, Capitalization, Punctuation, Usage)

Test W Work Study Skills (Map Reading, Reading Graphs and Tables, Knowl edge and Use of Reference Materials)

Test M. Mathematics Skills (Mathematic Concepts, Mathematic Problem Solving).

In the test situation the pupil is required to use his skills just as he does in his regular schoolwork. The results are an estimate of where the pupil is along a developmental continuum, not of where he should be placed in the graded organization of the school. The results are reported in standard score form. An average fourth grader would be expected to receive a score between 68 to 71, and an average eighth grader would be expected to receive a score between 99 to 102. For the purposes of this report a composite score was computed from the subtest scores,

- 6. Mean. Each category is defined by its mean or average composite ITBS scare or average TAP score. This is computed by adding the scores of each student in all the schools in a particular category and dividing this sum by the total number of students in that category.
- 7. N. In each category for the fourth, eighth and eleverith grade there is a heading "N". The numbers which fall under this heading correspond to the number of fourth, eighth and eleventh grade students who were tested.
- 8. Non-Failure Rate. The Non-Failure Rate is the percent of students who were promoted to the next grade in a given system. The Non-Failure Rate was compiled by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Georgia Department of Education, for the 1971-72 school ye
- 9. Percentile Rank (Labeled 75 percent, 50 percent, 25 percent). Each category is defined by the percentile ranks of its achievement scores, in this report the percentile ranks can be thought of as cut off points for obtained scores. For example, a score of 60.1 on the composite TAP score 1 as seen in Category 1 (eleventh grade) is the cut off point for the 75th percentile rank. This means



that in this category all schools which obtained a composite TAP score 1 score at or above 60.1 were in the top 25 percent of that category. Similarly, in Category 1 all schools obtaining a score of 54.2 or better were in the top 50 percent of Category 1 and all schools receiving a score at or below 48.2 were in the bottom 25 percent of Category 1. In the system categories percentile ranks for each category are given for fourth, eighth and eleventh grade scores. Keep in mind that category percentile ranks are being utilized here, and one would expect to find that most of the schools fall around the 50th percentile point. This is because the 50th percentile point represents the average or midpoint score of the category.

10. Percentage of ADA Students Above the Minimal Subsistence Income Level. This data is collected from the State Free Lunch Program. It is computed by dividing the number of ADA students not receiving free or reduced price lunches by the number of ADA students in the school or system. Eligibility for free or reduced price lunches is determined by family income and the number of children in the family. At the present time this data is the most accurate index of the socioeconomic status of a school or system that is available. It is important to note that not only is the income of families used as a determining factor but also the size of the family. Thus we have a more accurate indicator of the economic status of the family unit. The reader should also be cautioned that this data may not be entirely accurate when evaluating the eleventh grade. This is due to the fact that a number of the eleventh graders who are eligible for the free lunch program decline to participate in it. However, there is little reason to believe that the data will not be representative of the groups being tested.

- 11. Retention Rate. The Retention Rate is the retained in a given system, i.e., those-who did Rate was compiled by the Division of Plann: Georgia Department of Education, for the 1971.
- 12. Standard Deviation or S. D. Each category is defrom the mean (average) achievement score. I thought of as a measure of dispersion or varia compute the mean (average). The larger the S. scores around the average.
- 13. Tests of Academic Progress (TAP). The Tests of cerned with measuring the extent to which the high school instruction have been achieved, ne Statewide Testing Program are composition, read category report the subtests of composition correspond to composite TAP score 1, compositing P score 3 respectively. In a h of these subte would be expected to obtain a standard score of 5
- 14. Total Instructional Cost per ADA Child. This fithe funds spent on teachers' salaries, books, we ment used directly for instruction. This sum including used for instructional purposes. Statistics fitures per child are taken from the series of pub Statistics (1971-72)" published by the Georgia De

e in the sobtain and all to f Car given for percent of the percent

from the of AD of AD of AD of AD of AD of the of the of that a gram defined as the of the of the of that a gram defined as from the of of the of the

the da



ell schools which obtained a composite TAP score 1 score e in the top 25 percent of that category. Similarly, in sobtaining a score of 54.2 or better were in the top 50 and all schools receiving a score at or below 48.2 were in tof Category 1. In the system categories percentile ranks given for fourth, eighth and eleventh grade scores. Keep percentile ranks are being utilized here, and one would ost of the schools fall around the 50th percentile point. Oth percentile point represents the average or midpoint

from the State Free Lunch Program. It is computed by of ADA students not receiving free or reduced price of ADA students in the school or system. Elig.Dility for funches is determined by family income and the number nully. At the present time this data is the most accurate nomic status of a school or system that is available. It is too only is the income of families used as a determining e of the family. Thus we have a more accurate indicator sof the family unit. The reader should also be cautioned be entirely accurate when evaluating the eleventh grade, that a number of the eleventh graders who are a ligible gram decline to participate in it. However, there is little the data will not be representative of the groups being

- 11. Retention Rate. The Retention Rate is the percent of students who are retained in a given system, i.e., those who did not drop out. The Retention Rate was compiled by the Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Georgia Department of Education, for the 1971-72 school year.
- 12. Standard Deviation or S. D. Each category is defined by its standard deviation from the mean (average) achievement score. The standard deviation can be thought of as a measure of dispersion or variability of all the scores used to compute the mean (average). The larger the S. D. the greater the spread of scores around the average.
- 13. Tests of Academic Progress (TAP). The Tests of Academic Progress are concerned with measuring the extent to which the objectives of a basic area of nich school instruction have been achieved. The areas included in the Georgia Statewide Testing Program are composition, reading and mathematics. On the category report the subtests of composition, reading and mathematics correspond to composite TAP score 1, composite TAP score 2 and composite TAP score 3 respectively. In each of these subtests an average eleventh grader would be expected to obtain a standard score of 50.
- 14. Total Instructional Cost per ADA Child. This figure is derived by computing the funds spent on teachers' salaries, books, workbooks, supplies and equipment used directly for instruction. This sum includes all local, state and federal funds used for instructional purposes. Statistics for total instructional expenditures per child are taken from the series of publications, "Georgia Education Statistics (1971-72)" published by the Georgia Department of Education.



# CATEGORY 1 SYSTEMS

# AJA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

	1POSITE GRADE 4	COMPOSIT ITUS GRADE		TAP SCORE 1 GRADE 11	TAP SCOR GRAJL	
MEAN 5.0. 75TH 50TH 25TH SYSTEM NAME	10.3 % 70.0 % 70.9 % 62.0	3.5. 1 75TH % 11 5uTH % 10 25TH % 9	11.4 50 11.7 25 11.8 IT.		S.O. 75TH % 5 50TH % 5 25TH % 4	UB P±⊃ GRA
COSS CEKALS COSS	4 105.6	99.2 102.0 103.3 106.7 93.8 103.0 95.8 97.2	68.6 99.6 72.0 103.7 69.1 100.7 68.2 97.7	52.6 53.1 51.2 51.8	50.2 96 53.5 94 51.6 93 48.1 95	41896 449 101. 79520 537 105. 31478 653 100. 17341 453 100.

## CATEGORY 1 SYSTEMS

## AJA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

<u>ئ</u> 4		MPOSITE GRADE			P SCOS GRADE			P SCORE GRAJL 11			F SCO GRADE	-	
U • 2 0 • 3 0 • 0 u • 9 2 • 0	MEAN 3.0. 75TH 5uTH 25TH	13 % 110 % 101	.0 <b>%</b>  .5	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 5 % 5	9.5 58.1 51.3	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	9. % 58. % 52.	7 5 1	MEAN S.D. 75TH 30TH 25TH	γ. γ.	51.8 9.9 58.3 52.1	
CATV GRADE 4					TAP 1 GRADE 11	TAP 2 GRAJE 11	TAP 3 GRALE 11	% ABOVE MIN.SUB LEVEL		CJST PER CHILD		% NON- FAIL	% RLT.
105.6	99.4 1 103.3 1 93.8 1 95.8	106.7 103.0	68.6 72.0 69.1 68.2	L03.7	50.4 52.6 51.2 47.9	50.6 53.1 51.8 48.7	50.2 53.5 51.6 48.1	94 75 93 33	1896 9520 1478 7341	53 <b>7</b> 633	9177 9320	97.6 97.7 96.9 97.3	99.4 98.2

#### CATEGORY 2 SYSTEMS

#### ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

				OMPOSITE		TAP SCORE 1			TAP SCORE				
1182	GRADE	4	ITES	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE	11		GR
MEAN	6	5.4	MEAN	96	5.1	MEAN	4	7.8	MEAN	4	8.1	MEAN	
ა.ს.	1	0.2	S.D.	1.	2.5	S.D.		9.3	S.D.		9.7	S.D.	1
75TH	% 74	+.1	75 TH	% 10	4.7	75 <b>T</b> H	% 5	54.3	75TH		4.6	75TH	
50TH	% 6	5.4	50 TH	% 94	+•9	50TH	% 4	7.6	50TH		8.0	50TH	
25 <b>T</b> H	% 5	3 • 3	25TH	% 86	5•2	25TH	% 4	1.1	25TH		1.2	25TH	
		CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	IAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% A80	VE	COST	Ì
SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	GKAUE	GRADE	GRADE		GRADE			MIN.S		P_R	ı
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVE			
CLARKE	5	97.3	94.0	96.8	67.4	96.4	48.9	47.9	50.1	82	9896	522	7
CLAYTON	4	98.8	92.1	96.9	66.2	96.2	46.4	47.9	48.1	92	25891		7
FLOYD	1	97.5	94.0	98.1	65.5	96.3	49.5	48.6	47.6	91	9485		7
HALL	3	96.ũ	93∙3	94.3	65 • 2	94.4	47.2	46.6	45.3	85	10011		7
HOUSTON	չ	98.1	96.2	98.4	68.6	98.2	49.4	49.4	48.7	82	14758		7
WALKER	1	95.8	92.0	95.3	65.5	94.5	46.5	47.6	46.5	82	101+2		6

CATEGORY 3 SYSTEMS CATV RADE

3.8 7.5 6.0 8.1 5.8

ADA ABOVE 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

#### CATEGORY 2 SYSTEMS

#### ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

		1POSIT		IAP SCORE 1 GRADE 11			TAP SCORE 2 GRADE 11			TAP SCORE 3 GRADE 11			
<b>4</b> 2	MEAN		5.1	MEAN		7 • 8	MEAN		8.1	MEAN		47.9	
1	S.D. 75TH	% 10	2•5 4•7	S.D. 75 <b>T</b> H	% 5	9•3 4•3	S.D. 75TH	% 5	9.7 4.6	S.D. 75TH	%	9•4 54•3	
4 3	50TH 25TH	-	4•9 5•2	50TH 25TH		7.6 1.1	50TH 25TH		8.0 1.2	50TH 25TH		47.5 41.9	
CATV RADE 4	CAIV GRAUE 8			ITBS GRADE 8		TAP 2 GRADE 11	TAP 3 GRADE		SUB	COST P=R CHILD		% NON- FAIL	% RET.
7.5 d.8 7.5 6.0 8.1 5.8	94.0 92.1 94.0 93.3 90.2 92.0	96.8 96.9 98.1 94.3 98.4 95.3	67 • 4 66 • 2 65 • 5 65 • 2 68 • 6 65 • 5	96.4 96.2 96.3 94.4 98.2 94.5	48.9 46.4 49.5 47.2 49.4 46.5	47.9 47.9 48.6 46.6 49.4 47.6	5 U · 1 48 · 1 47 · 6 45 · 3 48 · 7 46 · 5	82 92 91 85 82 82	9896 25891 9485 10011 14758 10142	447 422 335 473	7831 7699 7348 7636	98.4 96.9 95.7 96.1 95.2 96.2	98.1 97.8 98.0 98.1

CATEGORY 3 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84



#### CATEGORY 4 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE
NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 5 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

> ITE UE 4

> > 9.9

SA GF

98

COMPOSITE			COMPOSITE			TAP SCORE 1		<b>E</b> 1	TAP SCORE 2		E 2	
119	5 (	SKALE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE :	11	(	GRADE :	11
MEA	N	64	+ • 3	MEAN	93	3 • 1	MEAN	4 (	5 • 7	MEAN	4	7.0
S.0	•	ç	9 • 9	S.D.	1	<b>4 • 8</b>	S.J.	10	3.3	S.D.	1	ŋ <b>.</b> 5
75T	H ;	% 7:	1.6	75TH	% 10:	1.4	75 TH	% 53	3.7	75TH	% 5	3.9
50T	H :	% 6 <i>8</i>	2.7	>0 <b>T</b> H	% 90	1.6	50TH	% 46	5.3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 4	6.6
251			<b>6∙</b> 9	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8.	3.0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 39	9.3	25TH	% 3	9.3
			CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	26 <b>T</b> I	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% ABO	VE
SYSTEM NAM	Ε	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRAUE	GRADE	MIN.S	UB
		DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVE	L AD
PIBB		8	94.7	89.7	92.7	64.6	92.2	45.2	45.9	44.4	73	2814
DOUGHERTY		<b>1</b> €	94.2	89.7	93.6	63.6	91.7	44.9	46.2	45.9	72	2066
GLYNN		15	98.5	93.3	95.4	65.7	93.3	47.3	47.7	47.4	79	1099
MUSCOGEL		11	95.4	92.2	96.1	64.2	94.2	48.1	47.9	47.4	78	3434
RICHMONU		<b>1</b> ú	94.1	91.1	94.2	64.1	93.3	47.2	47.0	40.6	63	3122

#### CATEGORY 4 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 CR ABOVE
NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 5 SYSTEMS

# ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

ITE SE	•		1POSITE GRADE		TAP SCORE 1 GRADE 11		TAP SCORE 2 GRADE 11		TAP SCORE 3 GRADE 11					
64	• • 3	MEAN	9;	3.1	MEAN	4.6	6.7	MEAN	4	7•0	MEAN	L	·6·3	
	9 • 9	S.D.		4 • 8	S.J.		0.3	S.D.	= -	0.5	S.D.		9.8	
71	L•6	75 TH	% 10:	1.4	75TH		3.7	75TH		3.9	75 <b>T</b> H		3.3	
62	2.7	>0 <b>T</b> H	% 9	0.6	50TH	% 40	6.3	50TH	% 4	6.6	50TH	% 4	5.9	
56	·9	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8.	3.0	25TH	% 39	9.3	25TH	% 3	9.3	25 T H	% 3	89•8	
	CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	SETI	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% ABO	VE	COST	ATS	%	%
SA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.S	UB 8U	PER	IN	-AGN	RET.
SI	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVE	L ADA	CHILD	SYS	FAIL	
8	94.7	89.7	92.7	64.6	92.2	45.2	45.9	44.4	73	28144	547	8529	93.6	98.6
٤	94.2	89.7	93.6	63.6	91.7	44.9	46.2	45.9	72	20665	444	7572	97.9	96.9
<b>خ</b> .	98.5	93.3	95.4	65.7	93.3	47.3	47.7	47.4	79	10998	456	7910	95.8	97.8
1	95.4	92.2	96.1	64.2	94.2	48.1	47.9	47.4	78	34341	409	8212	95.9	98.4
Ն	94.1	91.1	94.2	64.1	93.3	47.2	47.0	40.6	63	31221	560	9320	93.9	98.9

#### CATEGORY 6 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 7 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000

INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 8 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

> 60.9 9.2 66.0 58.9 55.0

> > 89.

	IPOSITE COAST	COMPOSITE ITBS GRADE 8		-	TAP SCORE 1		TA	P SCORE 29
1192	GRADE 4	IIBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE 11		GRADE 11
MEAN	60.9	MEAN	8	7•9	MEAN	43.2	MEAN	43.7
S.D.	9•2	S.0.	1.	2.9	S.D.	10.2	S.D.	
75TH		75TH		5 • 4	75TH	% 49.8	75 <b>T</b> H	
HT0c	•	> 0 TH		5 • 2	5 <b>0T</b> H	% 42.1	50 <b>T</b> H	% 42.5
∠5 <b>T</b> H	% 55·0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 79	9 • 0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 36.4	25 <b>T</b> H	% 36.0
	CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1 TAP	2 TAP 3	% ÁBQVE
SYSTEM NAME	CESA GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE GRAD	E GRADE	MIN.SUB
	DIST 4	8	11	4	8	11 11	11	LEVEL A
ATLANTA	4 89.9	85.1	89.1	60.4	86.2	42.0 42.5	43.1	54 8418
CHATHAM	15 91.0	90.4	92.8	62.2	92.2	45.4 46.0		60 3191

ERIC

CATEGORY 6 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORL AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 7 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 8 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

IE E 4		MPOSIT GRADE		TAP SCORE 1 GRADE 11			P SCORE 2 GRADE 11	TAP SO	ORE 3 DE 11	
60.9 9.2 66.0 58.9 55.0	MEAN S.D. 75TH >0TH 25TH	% 9. % 8!	7•9 2•9 5•4 5•2 9•0	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 4 % 4	3.2 0.2 9.8 2.1 6.4	ME AN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 42.5	MEAN S.D. 75TH % 50TH % 25TH %	43.7 9.9 49.5 42.8 37.5
CATV A GRADE T 4				IT3S GRADE 8	TAP 1 GRADE 11	TAP 2 GRADE 11	TAP 3 GRADE 11	% ABOVE MIN.SUB LEVEL ADA	_	S % % N NON- RÉT. S FAIL
89.9 91.0	85 • 1 90 • 4	89.1 92.8	60 • 4 62 • 2	86.2 92.2	42.0 45.4	42.5 46.0	43.1 44.7	54 84166 60 31934		5 98.9 98.3 1 92.7 97.9



TE

#### CATEGORY 9 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 10 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 CR ABOVE
NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 11 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000

INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 12 SYSTEMS

ADA ABOVE 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84
NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY



#### CATEGORY 13 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000

INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99

CAT VERBAL SCORE AF GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 14 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

IT

ME 5. 75 50 25

V JA L GRA

> 89. 89. 89. 93. 93. 94. 92. 92. 91.

COMPDSITE			COMPOSITE		TAP SCORE 1		E 1	TAP SCORE 2				
	2611	GRACE	4	ITeS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE :	11	(	GRADE 1	1
	MEAN	6	5•0	MEAN	q	3.9	MEAN	4	7.5	MEAN	47	. 5
	3.0.		9.7	S • Ú •		2.1	5.0.		9.1	S.D.		
	75 <b>T</b> H		2.1	75 <b>T</b> H								• 4
						1.9	75TH		3.4	75TH		. 4
	50TH		3.7	50TH		2.0	50TH		7.0	50TH		
•	591H	% 5	7.5	25 TH	% 8.	+ •2	25 <b>1</b> H	% 4:	1.1	25 <b>T</b> H	% 41	• 0
			CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	E
SYSTEM	NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE		GRADE		MIN.SU	
		DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	
BALDWIN		9	88.5	89.4	92.1	61.1	92.0	45.6	43.2	44.7	82	5781
BARTON		1	90.3	86.5	94.4	62 • 6	90.2	45.7	45•ö	44.6	82	5134
CARROLL		6	94.1	89.6	93.6	63.9	92.1	46.4	47.3	44.8	84	7147
CATOOSA		1	97.3	93.5	97.8	66 • 0	95.5	48.4	48.5	46.3	93	6847
CHEROKE		۷	95.5	93.7	95.1	65.7	95.0	47.3	47.3	46.Ü	85	7023
COLUMBI	_	16	96.0	93.4	94.3	65 • 8	95.6	48.1	47.8	47.1	81	5777
1)OUGLAS	-	4	95.7	94.1	95.8	64.2	95.2	48.1	48.2	46.3	92	7385
FORSYTH		3	97.9	_	100.6	65 • 7	93.0	50.3	50.5	48.9	9 ú	4086
HABERSH		š	99.5	96.2	98.5	67.6	99.1	48.9	48.4	49.0	88	4395
LOWNDES		17	94.2	92.1	92.2	63.9	92.6	44.7	45.2	45.6	84	
PAULDIN		1	95.9	92.5	96.8	65.0	94.1	50.2	49.0			5912
KOCKDAL	-	4	98.7	95.2	96.0	66 • 8	96.3			48.8	87	4311
								49.3	48.4	48.€	83	4688
SPALDIN	-	7	95.9	91.0	96.6	66 • 0	93.3	49.0	49.2	48.2	87	8386
WHITFIE	LU	٤	95.1	90.2	95.2	65•3	92.3	46.3	47.4	46.8	89	8510

#### CATEGORY 13 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 14 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	COMPOSITE			TAI	P SCOR	E 1	TAI	P SCORE	2	TAP SCORE 3			
	ITeS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE 1	.1		GRADE		
Ì	MEAN	9	3.9	MEAN	. 4	7.5	MEAN	47	· 5	MEAN		46.6	
	S.u.	1	2.1	S•0•		9.1	S.D.	g	• 4	5.D.		8.9	
l	75 <b>T</b> H	% 10	1.9	75TH	% 5	3.4	75TH		. 4		%		
	50TH	% 9	2.0	50TH	% 4	7 • 0	HTOć		• 5			46.5	
l	25TH	% 8	+ • 2	25 <b>T</b> H	% 4	1.1	25TH		• 0			40.5	
٧		CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	E	COST	ATS	%	%
Ľ	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SU	18	PER	IN	NON-	RET.
	8	11	4	8	11	11	11			CHILD		FAIL	
	83.4	92.1	61.1	92.0	45.6	43.2	44.7	82	5781	448	7418	93.5	97.7
	86.5	94.4	62 • 6	90.2	45.7	45.6	44.6	82	5134	3 3 0	7141	97.2	96.5
l	89.6	93.6	63.9	92.1	46 • 4	47.3	44.8	84	7147	318	7069	95.8	97.5
	93.5	97.8	66.0	95.5	48.4	48.5	46.3	93	6847	3+8	7131	96.0	97.7
	93.7		65.7	95.0	47.3	47.3	46.0	89	7023	379		94.7	
ł	93.4	94.3	65 • 8	95.6	48.1	47.8	47.1	81	5777	413		93.3	
İ	94.1	95.8	64.2	95.2	48.1	48.2	46.3	92	7385	451		95.3	
		100.6	65 • 7	93.0	50.3	50.5	48.9	9ú	4086	339		94.7	
ŀ	96.2	98.5	67.6	99.1	48.9	46.4	49.0	88	4395			96.4	
	92.ì	92.2	63.9	92.6	44.7	45.2	45.6	84	5912			97.4	
	92.5	96.8	65.0	94.1	50.2	49.0	40.8	87	4311			95.4	
l	95.2	96.0	66 • 8	96.3	49.3	48.4	48.6	83	4688			96.5	
	91.0	96.6	66 • 0	93.3	49.0	49.2	48.2	87	8386			92.8	
	90.2	95.2	65.3	92.3	46.3	47.4	46.8	89	8510			95.1	



CATEGORY 15 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORL AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 16 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME P RCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

#### CATEGORY 17 SYSTEMS

# ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	POSITE GRADE 4	COMPOSIT		SCORE 1		TAP SCGRE 2 GRAOE 11		
MEAN S.D. 75TH SOTH 25TH	% 62.8	S.O. 1 75TH % 10 50TH % 9	3.3 2.6 2.1 0.9 3.1	MEAN S.O. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 46.3	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	10.2 % 53.3 % 46.1	EAN D. 5TH OTH 5TH
SYSTEM NAME	CATV CESA GRADE DIST 4			ITBS GRADE 8	TAP 1 TAP GRADE GRA 11 11	DE GRADE		ATV ADE 8
BULLOCH COFFEE COLQUITT COWETA HENRY LAGRANGE MARIETTA NEWTON POLK KOME TIFT WALTON WAYNE	14 93.2 18 92.6 1b 93.5 6 90.9 7 91.8 6 91.5 4 98.5 7 89.9 1 97.3 1 96.0 17 96.3 5 93.3 14 93.3	91.4 93.3 87.9 91.7 89.3 93.4 91.2 94.7 88.1 89.5 91.9 96.5 97.7 102.4 87.1 91.7 92.0 98.5 92.5 94.7 90.3 92.0 90.0 93.9 92.9 90.7	63.6 63.3 64.8 62.7 63.0 62.7 68.0 64.0 66.5 64.6 64.1 63.4	93.9 90.4 91.8 93.7 91.3 96.0 98.0 91.1 93.9 93.1 92.9 92.9	46.3 46.4 47.44.9 45.49.5 48.7 47.0 47.47.0 47.5 47.5 47.5 47.5 47.6 44.6 44.6 44.6 44.6 44.6 44.6 44.6	2 46.6 8 47.0 2 46.0 U 44.0 5 48.6 5 51.6 2 45.1 1 45.2 2 47.3 7 46.5 7 46.3	66 5937 65 5238 67 6912 77 7361 62 5649 67 4616 75 4743 79 6199 74 6560 77 5237 72 6197 80 4556 66 4609	.9 3 2 .9 .7 .0 .3 .0

#### CATEGORY 18 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84



#### CATEGORY 17 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

CO	MPOSIT	E	TAF	SCOR	E 1	TAF	SCC.	GRE 2		TAF	SCOR	RE 3	
TBS	GRADE	8	(	SRADE :	11	G	SRADE	11		(	GRADE	11	
EAN	9;	3.3	MEAN	41	5.9	MEAN		46.6		MEAN	L	6.5	
D.	1	2.6	S.D.	•	9.9	S.D.		19.2		S.D.		9.6	
БТН	% 18	2•1	75TH	% 5	3 • 8	75 <b>T</b> H	%	53.3		75 <b>T</b> H	% 5	3.3	
DTH	% 9	C 3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 41	5 • 3	50TH	%	46.1		50TH	% 4	5.9	
5 <b>T</b> H		1 . ئ	25 <b>T</b> H	% 39	9•5	25 <b>T</b> H	%	39.1		25TH	% 3	9.9	
A T V	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% AE	BOVE		COST	ATS	%	%
ADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN	SUB		PER	IN	NON-	RET.
ક	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEI	VEL .	ADA	CHILD	SYS	FAIL	
٠ ۷	93.3	63 • 6	93.9	46.3	46.6	40.6	66		937	433	5734	95.7	98.6
. 9	91.7	63.3	90.4	46.2	45.2	46.6	ó!	5 5	238	423			97.2
. 3	93.4	64 • 8	91.8	46.3	45.8	47.0	6	7 6	912	439	713ù	97.0	97.9
. 2	94.7	62.7	93.7	46.4	47.2	46.C	77	7 7.	361	448	7406	95.5	97.4
. 1	89.5	63.0	91.3	44.9	45.U	44.0	67	2 5	649	466	7141	94.5	97.9
. 9	96.5	62.7	96.0	49.5	48.5	48.6	67	7 4	616	¥35	7216	96.5	97.6
. 7	102.4	68.0	98.0	51.8	51.5	51.6	79	5 4	743	488	8076	92.6	98.4
. 1	91.7	64.0	91.1	45.9	46.2	45.1	79	9 6:	199	424	7813	93.7	97.2
. 0	98.5	68.1	93.9	48.7	47.1	45.2	7	4 6	560	395 /	7357	95.8	97.3
. 5	94.7	66.5	93.1	47.0	47.2	47.3	77	7 5	237	501	7444	93.9	96.8
• 3	92.0	64.6	92.9	46.8	45.7	46.5	72	2 6	197	442	7127	95.2	97.2
• U	93.9		92.9	47.5	47.7	46.3	84	<b>u</b> 4	556	408			97.6
. 9	90.7	63.4	95.1	45.0	44.4	44.9	6			434			97.5

CATEGORY 18 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84



#### CATEGORY 19 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 20 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000

INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

E 4

1.6 9.7 7.7 9.6 5.0

> C / GR /

	COM	1POSIT	E	CO	MPGSIT	<u> </u>	TAF	SCORE	TAP SCORE 2			
	ITBS	GRADE	4	ITES GRADE 8			(	RADE :	11 -	(	GRADE 11	
	MEAN	6	1.6	MEAN	9:	1.2	MEAN	45	5.0	MEAN	45.1	
	S.D.		9.7	S.u.	1.	2.3	S.D.	Ç	9 • 8	S.D.	9.7	
	75TH		7.7	75 <b>T</b> H	% 99	9.0	75 T H	% 5:	1.1	<b>7</b> 5TH	% 51.	
	50TH		9.6	50 <b>T</b> H	% 87	7•9	50TH	% 41	+ • 5	50 <b>T</b> H	% 44.4	
	25 <b>T</b> H	% 5	5.0	25TH	% 81	1.9	25 <b>T</b> H	% 36	8.5	25 <b>T</b> H	% 38.7	
~ <b>~=</b>			CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1		TAP 3		
SYSTEM	NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUB	
		DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	
CRISP		12	91.0	67.7	88.6	61 • 6	91.2	43.6	43.9	43.6	54 4	
DECATUR	S CO	16	86.0	84.3	87.8	60 • 4	87.6	43.5	43.0	43.4	59 4	
LMANUEL	-	<b>1</b> i	88.9	89.1	90.6	61.4	92.0	45.3	45.2	44.5	55 <b>4</b>	
MERIWET	THER	6	90.0	84.2	87.7	59.9	88.0	45.5	44.7	44.9	57 4	
THOMAS	/ILLE	16	95.7	91.4	90.2	65.3	94.1	43.9	45.3	45.2	6û 4	
VALDOST	ΓA .	17	89.7	91.8	93.9	61.6	94.0	48.0	48.C	40.0	57 €	

#### CATEGORY 19 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 28 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

E		MPCSIT		TAF	SCOR	Ε 1	TAF	SCORE	2	TAI	P SCO	RE 3	
4	ITAS	GRADE	8	(	SRADE	11	(	GRADE 11	Ĺ		GRADE		
1.6	MEAN	9:	1.2	MEAN	4	5 <b>.</b> 0	MEAN	45.	.1	MEAN	4	44.6	
9.7	S.u.		2.3	S.D.		9 • 8	S.D.	9.	. 7	S.D.		8.9	
7.7	75TH		9.0	75 <b>T</b> H		1.1	75TH	% 51.	5	75TH		50 • 0	
9.6	50TH		7•9	50TH	-	4.5	50 <b>T</b> H	% 44.	, 4	50TH	% !	+3.5	
5 • O	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8:	1.9	25 <b>T</b> H	% 3	8.5	25 <b>1</b> H	% 38.	,7	25TH	% :	38 • 4	
CATV	CATV		ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOVE	<u> </u>	COST	ATS	%	%
GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUE	3	PER	IN	NON-	
4	8	11	4	8 .	11	11	11	LEVEL	AUA	CHILD		FAIL	
91.0	87.7	88.6	61.6	91.2	43.6	43.9	43.6	54	4100	472	7359	96.2	97•9
86.0	84.3	87.8	60.4	87.6	43.5	43.0	43.4	5 <del>9</del>	4983	392		92.6	
88.9	83.1	90.6	61.4	92.0	45.3	45.2	44.5	55	4295	<b>433</b>		94.5	
90.0	84.2	87.7	59.9	88.0	45.5	44.7	44.9	57	4243	427	6825	93.6	97.0
95.7	91.4	90.2	65.3	94.1	43.9	45.3	45.2	6 û	4023		7395	95.3	95.6
89.7	91.8	93.9	61.6	94.0	48.0	48.0	40.0	57	6942	431	6652	94.2	97.6

#### CATEGORY 21 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 22 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000

INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 23 SYSTEMS

ADA 4001 TO 9000
INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9
NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY



## CATEGORY 24 SYSTEMS

## ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

		1POSIT	_		MPOSIT			SCOR			SCORE		
	1182	GRALE	4	1182	GRADE	8	,	GRADE .	11	(	SRADE 1	1 ALE	
	MEAN	5	<b>ರ</b> • 6	MEAN	8	4 • O	MEAN	4	3.0	MEAN	40	• ti	8
	S.D.		7.0	S.D.		3 <b>.</b> 4	S.O.		8 • 4	s∙D•	8	• 0	7
	75TH	% 6	1.4	75 TH	% 80	ó•6	75TH	% 4	5.1	<b>7</b> 5TH	% 44	• 3	1
	50 <b>T</b> H	% 5	7.4	50TH	% 8	2.3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 3	<b>3.</b> 3	50TH	% 39		
	25 <b>T</b> H	% 5	4.5	25TH	% 7	3.9	25 <b>1</b> H	% 3	4.1	25TH	% 34	• 5	4
			CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	I <b>T</b> BS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	E	
SYSTEM	NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRAUE	GRADE	MIN.SU	B ESA	
		DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	
BURKE		10	83.0	79.4	80.2	58.6	84.0	40.3	40.0	41.0	27	4039	

模.



#### CATEGORY 24 SYSTEMS

## ADA 4001 TO 9000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

yrE PT 1	_		GRADE	_		P SCOR Grade			P SCORE 2 GRADE 11		P SCOI GRADE		
6 5	8.6 7.0 1.4 7.4	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 86 % 86	4 • 0 8 • 4 5 • 6 2 • 3 8 • 9	ME AN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 4 % 3	0.3 8.4 5.1 9.3 4.1	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 39.0	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% %	41.0 8.1 46.1 40.4 35.1	
ESA IS <b>T</b>	CATV GRADE 4		CATV GRADE 11						% ABOVE MIN.SUB LEVEL A	COST PER Da Child		% NON- FAIL	% RET.
7.0	83.0	79.4	80.2	58.6	84.0	40.3	40.0	41.0	27 40	39 413	6941	93.8	97.0

#### CATEGORY 25 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 59 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 CR ABOVE

	OSITE RALE 4	COMPO AD SETI			CORE 1 DE 11		SCORE 2 ADL 11			
MEAN 5.0. 75TH % 50TH % 25TH %	69.0	MEAN S.U. 75TH % 50TH % 25TH %	98.8 13.8 108.8 98.2 87.4	MEAN S.D. 75TH % 50TH % 25TH %	49.9 9.2 56.4 50.2 43.7	MEAN S.D. 751H % 50TH % 25TH %	50.8 43.8	) 5 3		
SYSTEM NAME		GRADE GR	RADE GRADE		ADE GRADE	GRADE M	IN.SUB LEVEL AD	CATV RADE 4		
CALHOUN CITY DALTON FAYETTE GAINESVILLE	102.2 100.2 100.9 101.5	96.4 100	9.3 71.4 1 9.5 69.1 8.2 67.9 2.3 68.9 1	98.4 49 97.2 48	.8 50.9 .6 48.3	48.8 50.1 47.6 51.3	97 201 89 396 85 290 82 319	0.2		

#### CATEGORY 25 SYSTEMS

# ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

ſ													
	CO	MPOSITE	:	TAF	SCORE	<b>E</b> 1	TAF	SCORE	2	TA	F SCO	RE 3	
	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE 1	L1	0	RADE 1	1	(	GRADE	11	
0	MEAN	98	3.8	MEAN	49	9.9	MEAN	50	• 3	MEAN	ι	+9.5	
j .	Š.∪.		8 • 8	S.D.	Ç	3.2	S.D.	9	• 9	S.D.		9.7	
5	75TH	% 10a	3.8	75 <b>T</b> H	% 56	5 • 4	75TH	% 57	. 4	75 <b>T</b> H	% 5	56.5	
ົງ	50TH	% 90	3.2	50 <b>T</b> H	% 50	2.0	50 TH	% 50	• 8	50 <b>T</b> H	% "	+9.7	
3	25 <b>T</b> H	% 87	-4	2 <b>5</b> TH	% 43	3 • 7	25TH	% 43	• 8	25TH	% "	+3.1	
CATV	CAIV	CATV	ITBS	TTBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% ABCV	Ę	COST	ATS	%	%
		GRADE					GRADE	MIN.SU		PER	Ili	NON-	RLT.
4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	CHILD	SYS	FAIL	
2.2	98.7	99•3	71.4	106.3	50.3	49.7	48.8	97	2013	449	7747	93.0	95.3
0.2	96.4		69.1	98.4	49.8	50.9	50.1	89	3969	563	8606	96.5	97.1
).9	95.1	_	67.9	97.2	48.5	48.3	47.6	85	2900	456	6869	94.2	98.1
1.5	99.0			100.6	50.5	51.9	51.3	82	3196	5 3 9	7785	95.1	98.2



#### CATEGORY 26 SYSTEMS

## ADA 2600 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	COMPOSITE ITBS GRALE 4			COMPOSIT_ 1TES GRADE 8			TAP SCORE 1 GRADE 11			TAP SCORE 2 GRAD⊏ 11			4
MEAN	6	4•6	MEAN	9.	4.2	MEAN	4	7.6	MEAN	47	• 7	MCA	• 6
>•D•		9.6	S.U.	1	1.9	S.D.	,	9.2	3.4.	9	• 8	3 • D	• 6
75TH	% 7	1.4	75TH	% 10	2.1	75 T H	% 5	4.1	75TH			75 T	. 4
50TH	% 6	2.7	50TH	% 9	2.3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 4	7.5	5CTH			50 T	. 7
∠5 <b>T</b> H	% 5	7.3	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8!	5.0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 4	0•9	25TH			25T	• 3
		CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	Ξ	COST	CAT
SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	CKADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GKADE	MIN.SU	3	P=K	6 RAE
	D121	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA		4
BARROW	5	94.3	92.4	94.8	63.9	93.0	47.5	46.9	40.7	83	3553	403	94.3
CARROLLTON	ь	95.9	98.7	99.0	64.8	98.3	49.5	49.4	49.2	82	2379		95.9
CHATTOOGA	i	92.9	8J.5	96.2	64.3	92.2	47.7	47.1	47.1	82	3384	379	92.9
DADE	1	95•6	92.6	96.8	63.9	94.6	47.5	48.0	47.5	85	2166	335	95 . 4
FANNIN	2	94.5	93.9	97.6	65.7	96.0	48.4	50.1	46.5	89	2736	463	94.5
FRANKLIN	3	97.6	91.4	95.4	65.8	92.9	46.4	48.1	47.2	81	2903	425	97.0
GURDON	1	92.4	92.9	93.5	63.5	94.9	44.2	43.0	45.9	87	3383	372	92.4
HARALSON		92.9	90.3	95.1	62.1	91.3	47.4	45.0	47.6	85	2228	413	92.9
JEFF DAVIS	14	95.6	93.5	89.7	63.5	93.2	44.7	44.9	44.4	85	2343	403	95.6
MUKKY	ذ	95.9	91.3	97.8	65 • 2	92.9	48.7	48.6	47.6	88	3226	361	95.9
STEPHENS	ં	98.7	92.2	98.1	67.7	96.6	43.9	48.5	40.0	82	3998	428	98.7

#### CATEGORY 26 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

ţ	CO	MPGSIT.	-	TAI	P SCOR	₹Ē 1	TA	SCORE	2	ТΔ	P SCO	RF 7	
4	ITES	GRADE	8		GRADE			GRADE 1			GRADE		
•6	MEAN	9	<b>+ •</b> 2	MEAN	ı	·7.6	MEAN	47	. 7	MEAN		47.2	
• 6	S.U.	1:	1.9	S.D.		9.2	J.U.		. 8	5.D.		8.9	
• 4	75TH	% 10	2.1	75 T H	% 5	54.1	75TH		• 9	75TH	%	53.5	
• 7	50 <b>T</b> H	% 9	2.3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 4	+7.5	5CTH			50TH		46.8	
•3	25TH	% 8!	5.0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 4	•0 • 9	25TH			25TH		41.6	
CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	L TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	<u>:</u>	COST	ATS	%	%
GRADE	GKADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRAUE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SU	3	P=X		NON-	
4	8	11	4	8	11	11	<b>i1</b>			CHILD		FAIL	
94.3	92.4	94.8	63.9	93.0	47.5	46.9	40.7	83	3553	403	6824	94.8	96.0
95.9	98.7	99.0	64.8	98.3	49.5	49.4	49.2	82	2379			97.1	
92.9	8J.5	96.2	64.3	92.2	47.7	47.1	47.1	82	3384			90.5	
95 • 6	92.6	96.8	63.9	94.6	47.6	48.0	47.5	85	2106			92.1	-
94.5	93.9	97.6	65.7	96.û	48.4	50.1	46.5	89	2736			95.2	
97•6	91.4	95.4	65.8	92.9	46.4	48.1	47.2	81	2903			93.3	
92.4	92.9	93.5	63.5	94.9	44.2	43.0	45.9	87	3383			96.2	
92.9	90 · :	95.1	62.1	91.3	47.4	45.0	47.6	85	2228			97.1	
95.6	93.5	89.7	63.5	93.2	44.7	44.9	44.4	85	2343			95.6	
95.9	91.3	97.8	65.2	92.9	48.7	48.6	47.6	88	3226			93.2	
98.7	92.2	98.1	67.7	96.6	48.9	48.5	40.0	82	3998			95.2	

#### CATEGORY 27 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 28 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

CO	MPOSITE	COMPOSITE	TAP SCORE	1 TAP	SCORE 2
SET1	GRADE 4	ITUS GRADE 8	GRADE 1	1 GR	RADE 11
MEAN	71.1	MEAN 99.6	MEAN 48	.1 MEAN	49.8
S•0•	9.7	5.0. 11.4	S•D• 8	.6 S.D.	9.6
7 <i>5</i> TH	% 78.2	75TH % 107.8	75 <b>T</b> H % 53	.3 75TH %	4 56.1 2
SOTH	% 71.3	50TH % 99.5	50TH % 47	•9 50TH %	
∠5TH	% 63.9	25TH % 90.8	25TH % 42	.6 25 <b>T</b> H %	
	CATV	CAIV CATV I	TBS ITBS TAP 1	TAP 2 TAP 3 %	V ALOVE SATV
SYSTEM NAME	CESA GRADE	GRADE GRADE GR	ADE GRADE GRADE	GRADE GRADE M	
	DIST 4	8 11	4 8 11	11 11	LEVEL ADA 4
CARTERSVILLE	E 1 102.5	97.0 100.1 71	.1 99.6 48.1	49.8 50.9	79 2172 12.5

#### CATEGORY 27 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 28 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

COMPOSITE

	Sbři	GRADE	8	(	GRADE :	11	(	GRADE 1:	l	(	GRADE	11	
1	MEAN	9	9.6	MEAN	4	8.1	MEAN	49.	. 8	MEAN		50.9	
1 7 2 3	S.D.	1:	L • 4	S.D.		8.6	5.D.	9.	. 6	3.D.		10.8	
2	75TH	% 107	7.8	75 <b>T</b> H	% 5	3.3	75TH	% 56	. 1	75 <b>T</b> H	%	58.7	
3	HTGe	% 9:	3.5	50TH	% 4	7.9	50TH	% 49.	, 7	50TH	%	50.4	
9	25TH	% 9	8.0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 4	2.6	25 <b>1</b> H	% 43.	. 7	25 <b>T</b> H	%	44.7	
CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% AEOV	:	COST	ATS	%	%
RADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUE	3	P:R	IN	NON-	
4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	CAIFD	SYS	FAIL	
2.5	97.3	100.1	71.1	99.6	48.1	49.8	50.9	79	2172	521	7828	95.1	99.9

TAP SCORE 1 TAP SCORE 2 TAP SCORE 3

#### CATEGORY 29 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	1PUSITE	COMPOST	Té	TA	P SCOR	E 1	TA	P SCOR	F 2
173S	GRADE 4	ITBS GRAD	E 8		GRADE			GRADE	
MEAN	63.7	MEAN	91.8	PEAN	L	5 <b>.</b> ʊ	MEAN		5.4
٠٠٠.	9.5	S.U.	12.3	S.D.		0.0	S.D.		
75TH		75TH %	99.5	75TH		2.3			0.1
	% 61.7	50TH %	89.1	50TH		2•3 5•5	75TH		2.3
∠5TH		25TH %	82.3	25 <b>T</b> H		8.8	50TH 25 <b>T</b> H		5.0 8.5
	CATV	CATV CAT	v ITBS	2911	TAD 1	TAD 2	TAP 3		
SYSTEM NAME		GRALE GRAD			GRADE	GRADE		% AB0	
	UIST 4	3 11	4	8	11		-	MIN.S	_
	,	• •	7	0	11	11	11	LcvE	۲ ا
AMERICUS	12 91.1	86.7 90.7	62.6	90.4	47.9	45.5	45.6	61	2
APPLING	14 94.0	8° 2 89.6		92.6	43.8	43.8	44.4	69	3
BERRIEN	17 97.0	93.6 92.8		94.4	47.6	46.4	47.2	74	2
BUTTS	7 87.6	87.0 96.6		91.2	47.2	45.3	45.2	72	2
CAMDEN	15 93.1	89.1 90.6		90.2	43.1	44.2	43.6	75	
DECATUR CITY	4 91.9	83.4 94.5		89.8	46.9	47.7	47.6	62	2 3
∪00GE	13 90.2	88.8 88.8		91.8	43.9	43.2	44.0	63	3; 3
DUBLIN	13 97.9	95.2 101.9		98.7	53.1	52.4	53.0	65	,
t.FFINGHAM	15 87.2	89.4 93.3		91.7	46.5	47.1	46.5		3
FLBCKT	5 92.9	91.4 89.5		93.3	44.0	43.8	44.4	70	3
HART	3 95.4	87.3 91.7		90.2	44.4	44.8		70	36
JONES	8 93.6	91.1 89.4		93.0	44.9	45.1	44•8 45•4	77	3
LAMAR	7 89.7	85.3 63.0	61.1	89.2	40.7	40.3		63	21
LIBERTY	15 92.6	88.5 93.3	64.2	91.4	46.5		41.6	76	2:
MADISON	5 95·8	92.3 96.0	65.0	94.8	49.2	44.9 48.1	44.9	79	3,
MCDUFFIL	16 90.7	85.5 89.9	62.8	90.0	45.2		47.3	80	36
MONROE	ê 92 <b>•</b> 1	84.9 86.6	61.6	90.5		45.1	44.€	65	33
PICKENS	2 94.6	92.9 95.6	64.9	94.6	43.6	41.7	43.1	<u>63</u>	23
PIERCE	18 96.ú	91.2 92.2	65.8	92.8	47.4	48.8	48.2	77	20
TATTNALL	14 92.8	85.1 90.1	62.4		47.6	44.8	47.3	8ù	23
	JE 10	0701 3001	06 • 4	88.1	44.3	44,8	44.7	61	54

#### CATEGORY 29 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

4		MPOSITA GRADE			P SCOF			P SCORE GRADE 1:			F SCO GRADE		
3.7 9.5 u.2 1.7	MEAN S.U. 75TH 50TH 25Th	12 % 99 % 85	1.8 2.3 9.5 9.1 2.3	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 5 % 4	+5 • 8 10 • 0 52 • 3 +5 • 5	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 45	.1 .3 .0	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH	% %	45.6 9.4 51.8 45.2	
CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	. TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOVE MIN.SUE Lcvel	Ξ 3	25TH COST PER CHILD	ATS IN	39.6 % NON- FAIL	% R= <b>T•</b>
91.1 94.0 97.6 97.6 93.9 91.9 97.2 97.6 95.4 95.7 95.7 95.7 95.7 94.6	80.7 89.6 87.0 89.1 88.4 88.8 95.2 87.3 91.4 87.3 91.1 88.5 95.5 80.9 92.9	90.7 89.6 92.8 96.6 94.5 88.9 93.5 91.7 89.7 89.6 93.8	62.6 64.1 66.9 62.0 63.8 64.5 61.9 67.3 61.5 64.2 63.8 64.3 61.1 64.2 65.0 62.8 61.6 62.8	90.4 92.6 94.4 91.2 90.8 91.8 91.7 93.3 93.0 89.4 90.5 94.6	47.9 47.0 47.0 47.0 43.0 43.0 43.0 44.0 44.0 45.0 44.0 45.0 47.0	45.8 46.3 44.3 47.2 47.2 52.4 43.8 44.1 45.1 45.7 48.1 45.7 48.8	45.6 44.2 45.2 45.6 44.0 54.6 44.8 44.7 44.7 44.7 44.7 44.8 44.7 44.8 44.7 44.8 44.8	61 69 74 72 75 62 63 70 77 63 79 80 65 77	2771 3461 2612 2337 2949 3671 3416 3555 3645 3381 2750 2078 3233 3062 3390 2375 2082	442 479 425 577 435 420 420 420 433 434	7245 6768 7366 7803 8280 6638 7311 6749 6859 6989 6544 73062 6997 6820 7313	96.6 94.6 96.2 95.6 95.9 95.9 95.9 95.9 97.9 92.6 93.6	97.3 97.9 97.1 98.4 98.5 97.7 97.2 97.7 98.0 97.7 98.1 95.3 97.7 97.9 96.8
96.0 92.8	91.2 85.1	92.2 90.1	65 • 8 62 • 4	92.8 88.1	47.6 44.3	44.8	47.3 44.7	8ù 61	2364 2987	421	6774	95.4 98.5 97.0	98.1

### CATEGORY 29 (CONTINUED) SYSTEMS

RAL

SYSTEM HAME	CLSA DIST	CAT V GRADE	GRACE 8	CATV GRADE 11	ITAS GRADE 4					% ABOVE MIN.SUE LEVEL	3	04I.
TELFAIR	13	93.9	9 <b>ù</b> •¢	96.9	64.1	93.3	45.2	46.0	43.4	21	2395	493
THOMAS	16	90.0	87.4	89.7	61.4	89.9	45.3	45.4	40.3	52	3640	435
<b>PUTSAMONT</b>	7	94.5	92.7	93.8	64.9	95.2	49.4	47.2	41.6	74	2543	444
I D OM 3 S	14	93.9	07.u	96.5	63.9	3 ن ۵	45.2	45.1	45.4	62	2322	378
IROUP	b	93.7	89.4	9í.ó	65.5	9.4	43.9	45.1	44.6	73	2733	431
UFSON	7	90.4	88.1	83.9	62.4	90.4	43.2	41.	41.9	55	2484	333
VIDALIA	1-	96.1	92.4	92.4	64.3	93.9	45.3	46.4	40. C	65	2231	375
hARE	10	96.1	94.3	96.7	64.9	94.0	48.3	47.4	47.6	79	3493	412
WILKINSON	č	89.1	79.5	83.4	60.8	86.1	41.8	41.5	42.5	8 <b>i</b> i	2108	443

CATEGORY 30 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000

INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 31 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

### CATEGORY 29 (CONTINUED) SYSTEMS

LAIV RACE			GRADE	GRAJE	GRADE	GRACE	MIN.SUB LEVEL	1	CHIL?	1:4	% NON- FAIL	
ப் . க	96.9	64.1	93.3	45.2	46.6	43.4	<b>2</b> 1	2395	493	5546	95.7	97.1
		61.4					52	3640	455	7175	99.7	97.8
		54.9					74	2543	444	759 ქ	94.8	95.9
7 a u		53.9			45.1		62	2322	378	6744	94.1	97.1
		65.5			_		73	2733	431	7035	90.9	96.6
		62.4					55	2484	333	6731	93.0	97.6
		54.3					65	2231	378	6617	97.5	97.6
		64.9			47.4		79	3493	412	7318	97.8	37.5
		60.8			41.5	42.5	8 ü	2108	443	7073	97.9	98.5

CATEGORY 30 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000
INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84
NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGOR: 31 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY



#### CATEGORY 32 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	IPOSIT			MPOSIT			P SCOR			P SCORE		SITE
ITBS	GRADE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE 1	.1	ADE -
MEAN		2.3	MEAN	9:	1.0	MEAN	4	4.5	MEAN	44	•1	62
S.O.		9.3	S.D.	1:	1.8	S.D.	1	0.0	S.D.	10	. 4	9
75TH	% 6	7.9	75TH	% 98	3.7	75TH	% 5	1.0	75 <b>T</b> H	% 51	. 2	67
50TH	<b>%</b> 6	ù.3	50 TH	% 88	3.2	50 <b>T</b> H	% 4	3.7	50TH	% 43	.1	6 <b>ù</b>
25TH	% 5	<b>5.</b> 6	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8:	1.9	25 <b>T</b> H	% 3	7.5	25 <b>TH</b>		. 3	55
		CATV	CATV	CATY	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	E	
SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE		GRADE	MIN.SU		LSA (
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL		IST
C0 <b>0</b> K	17	91.6	87.7	90.4	61.7	89.9	43.8	45.0	44.4	60	281	17
EARLY	16	89.7	88.3	87.2	62.4	91.9	44.8	44.1	44.6	46	~	i LE
FITZGERALD	17	98.9	90.8	93.4	65.4	92.9	46.7	46.0	46.1	53	215	7
GRADY	1٤	89.6	87.0	88.7	61.5	90.1	44.1	44.1	44.1	57	385	 
HARRIS	1:	87.4	u • 68	85.5	59.8	88.7	42.8	40.3	41.5	49	244	1:
LAURENS	13	92.5	87.1	89.0	62.6	89.8	45.0	43.3	43.9	58	387	3
MORGAN	ל	88.3	89.1	89.3	60.8	93.2	45.1	44.1	45.0	53	240	. 5
PEACH	b	93.3	92.0	92.8	64.0	93.6	46.9	47.7	47.1	60	343	8 8
SCHREVEN	16	89.2	84.5	34.7	62.2	89.2	40.8	40.9	42.3	57	295	LÜ A
WAYCROSS	1 ხ	96.1	91.5	96.6	64.3	91.9	45.2	45.5	43.7	57	381	1.6
WORTH	16	89.8	85.2	86.4	61.3	89.9	43.8	43.0	43.0	59	357	16



#### CATEGORY 32 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

SIT	E	CO	4POS IT	Ē	TAI	P SCOR	E 1	TAF	SCORE	2	TA	P SCOI	RE 3	
ADE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11		SRADE 1			GRADE		
	2.3	MEAN	9:	1.0	MEAN	4	4.5	MEAN	44	• 1	MEAN		44.1	
•	9.3	S.D.	1:	1.8	S.D.	1	<b>0 •</b> 0	S.D.	10	• 4	S.D.		9.3	
	7.9	75TH	% 9	8.7	75 <b>T</b> H	% 5	1.0	75 <b>T</b> H	% 51	• 2	75 <b>T</b> H	%	9.9	
6	ù•3	50 TH	% 88	8 • 2	50TH	% 4	3.7	50TH			50TH		+3.3	
5	5.6	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8:	1.9	25TH	<b>%</b> 3	7.5	25TH			25 <b>1</b> H		37.9	
	CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	Ε	COST	ATS	%	%
LSA	GRADE	GRABE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SU	3	PER		NON-	
IST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL		CHILD		FAIL	
17	91.4	87.7	90.4	617	89.9	43.8	45.0	44.4	60	281 <b>£</b>	432	6233	97.2	97.4
LΕ	89.7	88.J	87.2	62 • 4	91.9	44.8	44.1	44.6	46	2583	541		98.0	
.7	98.9	90 ∙ ბ	93.4	65.4	92.9	46.7	46.8	46.1	53	2150	496		94.0	
ĹĹ	89.6	87.0	88.7	61.5	90.1	44.1	44.1	44.1	5 <b>7</b>	3851			95.3	
1:	87.4	u • 68	85.5	59.8	88.7	42.8	40.3	41.5	49	2446			97.6	
13	92.5	87 · 1	89.0	62.6	89.8	45.0	4333	43.9	58	3878			94.0	
ל	88•.	89.1	89.3	6J•8	93.2	45.1	44.1	45.0	53	2408			92.7	
b	93.3	92.0	92.8	64 • Û	93.6	46.9	47.7	47.1	60	3437			92.2	
Lΰ	89.2	84.5	34.7	62.2	89.2	40.8	40.9	42.3	57	2957			95.6	
Lδ	96.1	91.5	90.6	64.3	91.9	45.2	45.5	43.7	57	3812			95.4	
16	8•96	85。2	86.4	61.3	89.9	43.8	43.0	43.0	59	3571			95.5	

#### CATEGORY 33 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 34 SYSTEMS

ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY



#### CATEGORY 35 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	MPOSITE GRADE			MPOSIT GRADE			P SCOR Grade			P SCORE SRADE 1		SITE ADE
MEAN S•0• 7•TH 90TH 25TH	% 63 % 58	• 3 • 9 • 4		1 % 9 % 8 % 8 % 8 % 8 % 8 % 8 % 8 % 8 % 8	6.8 0.1 1.6 4.2 9.8	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 4 % 3	0 • 8 9 • 1 6 • 3 9 • 5 4 • 9	MEAN 5.D. 75TH 50TH 25TH	8 % 45 % 39	.9 .9 .3 .1	59 83 58 54
SYSTEM NAME	CESA (	CATV GRADE 4	CATV GRADE 8	CATV GRADE 11	ITBS GRADE 4	ITBS GRAJE 8	TAP 1 GRADE 11		TAP 3 GRADE	% ABOV MIN.SU LEVEL	3	-5A +
BROOKS DUOLY GREENE HANCOCK JEFFERSON MITCHELL SUMTER WASHINGTON	12 8 5 8 9 8 10 8 16 8	85.3 88.3 88.6 85.3 86.7 85.5	87.0 80.4 79.9 81.5 84.3 77.2 81.2 84.1	86.8 83.7 79.5 79.7 81.1 82.5 80.8 82.3	62.3 59.1 62.2 57.0 59.7 58.9 60.7 59.0	89.2 84.9 85.4 85.3 88.8 83.5 85.9 88.3	41.6 42.8 40.1 39.7 40.1 40.5 42.1 41.0	41.8 41.2 39.5 37.1 40.3 39.2 40.1 39.8	42.5 40.5 40.9 38.6 41.1 42.1 41.3 42.9	39 34 29 17 39 32 26 31	28 22 20 22 39 20 39	72590629



#### CATEGORY 35 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

BIT. AUE			1POSIT GRADE			TAP SCORE 1 GRADE 11 MEAN 40.8			SCORE SRADE 1			P SCOI GRADE		
6 5	9.8 8.3 3.9 8.4	MEAN S.O. 75TH 50TH	1 % 9 % 8	6.8 0.1 1.6 4.2	S.D. 75TH 50TH	% 4 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	9.1 6.3 9.5	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH	8 % 45 % 39	.9 .3 .1	MEAN S.D. 75TH 50TH	% %	41.4 8.2 46.1 41.7	
	CATV GRADE 4		CATV	9.8 ITBS GRADE 4	25TH ITBS GRAJE 8	TAP 1	TAP 2 GRADE 11	Z5TH TAP 3 GRADE	% ABOV	<u>:</u> 3	25TH COST PCR CHILD	ATS IN	% NON- FAIL	% RET.
.7 .2 .5 .9 .1 .6 .1.2 .9	89.8 85.3 88.6 85.3 86.7 85.5 88.7	87.0 80.4 79.9 81.5 84.3 77.2 81.2 84.1	86.8 83.7 79.5 79.7 81.1 82.5 80.8 82.3	62.3 59.1 62.2 57.0 59.7 58.9 60.7 59.0	89.2 84.9 85.4 85.3 88.8 83.5 85.9 88.3	41.6 42.8 40.1 39.7 40.1 40.5 42.1 41.0	41.8 41.2 39.5 37.1 40.3 39.2 40.1 39.8	42.5 40.5 40.9 38.6 41.1 42.1 41.3 42.9	39 34 29 17 39 32 26 31	2885 2230 2050 2248 3939 2205 2054 3927	454 409 468 433 542 334	6222 6574 6914 6461 6818 5924	93.2 91.7 98.0 92.2 97.7 93.6 91.5 97.5	96.3 96.9 97.4 97.2 96.8



#### CATEGORY 36 SYSTEMS

#### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

COM	COMPOSITE ITBS GRADE 4		CO	MPOSIT	E	TAF	P SCOR	₹E 1	TAI	P SCORE	2		
ITBS	GRADE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE 1	1	1	
MEAN	5	7.9	MEAN	84	4.8	MEAN	3	39.7	MEAN	39	• 9	м	9
S.D.	1	6.7	S.D.	1/	0.9	S.D.		9.0	S.D.	9	• 0	S	7
75 <b>T</b> H	% 6.	1.1	<b>7</b> 5TH	% 80	9.0	75 <b>T</b> H	% 4	4.7	75 <b>T</b> H	% 46	• C	7	
>0TH	% 51	6.9	50 <b>T</b> H	% 8	2.3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 3	39.2	THناد	% 39	• 0	5	9
25 <b>T</b> H	% 54	4.1	25 <b>T</b> H	% 77	7.6	25 <b>T</b> H	% 3	32.4	25 <b>T</b> H	% 33	• 3	2	1
		CATV								% ABOV		<b>C</b> C	CATV
SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SU	В	PE	RADE
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	AUA	СН	4
MACON	12	83.9	82.2	83.9	58.0	85.8	41.0	41.4	42.8	20	2985	47	3 <b>.9</b>
TERRELL	16	83.8	77.6	76.1	57.8	83.6	37.4	37.3	36.6	30	2338	47	3 <b>- 8</b>



### CATEGORY 36 SYSTEMS

### ADA 2000 TO 4000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

	CO	MPOSIT	E	TAI	SCOR	E 1	TA	P SCORE	2	TΔ	P SCOR	F 3	
	IT8S	GRADE	8		GRADE :	-		GRADE 1			GRADE	-	
3	MEAN	84	<b>+ •</b> 8	MEAN	31	9.7	MEAN	39	• 9	MEAN	4	0.5	
7	S.D.	1	0.9	S.D.	•	9.0	S.D.	9	• 0	S.D.		8.6	
<u></u>	75TH	% 89	9.0	75TH	% 4	4.7	75TH	% 46	• 0	75 T H		5.4	
b	50TH	% 84	2.3	`50TH	% 39	9.2	っしTH	_		50 <b>T</b> H		0.3	
i	25 <b>T</b> H	% 77	7 • 6	25TH	% 3	£ • 4	25TH	% 33	• 3	2 <b>5T</b> H		4.7	
CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% ABOV	E	COST	ATS	Z.	%
RADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE					MIN.SU		PER		NON-	
4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL		CHILD	SYS		
3 <b>.</b> 9	82.2	83.9	58.0	85.8	41.0	41.4	42.8	20	2985	470	5968	96.3	98.0
3 <b>.8</b>	77.6	76.1	57.8	83.6	37.4	37.3	36.6	30	2338		6576		



#### CATEGORY 37 SYSTEMS

#### ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 GR ABOVE

	POSITE GRADE 4	COMPOSIT		P SCORE 1 Grade 11	TAP SCO Grade	
MEAN 5.0. 75TH 50TH 25TH	% 69.0	S.u. 1 75TH % 10 50TH % 9	98.9 MEAN 11.7 S.D. 17.5 75TH 97.5 50TH 90.0 25TH	% 51.2	MEAN S.O. 75TH % 50TH % 25TH %	5 68.5 10.6 5 76.3 5 9.0 4 50.3
SYSTEM NAME	CATV CESA GRADE OIST 4	GATV CATV GRADE GRADE 8 11			TAP 3 % AB GRADE MIN. 11 LEV	S A GR
BREMEN CHICKAMAUGA TRION	1 101.2 1 102.0 1 100.2	98.8 102.5 98.1 102.9 92.9 95.2	67.1 102.0 69.9 100.0 69.0 94.6	53.8 52.4 52.5 50.6 49.1 49.3	51.3 90 49.7 97 44.6 90	102



#### CATEGORY 37 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTING 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

E 4	COMPOSIT		P SCORE 1 GRADE 11	TAP SCORE 2 GRADE 11	TAP SCORF 3 GRACE 11
0.5 10.6 76.3 9.0 0.3	S.U. 1 75TH % 10 50TH % 9	98.9 MEAN 11.7 S.D. 17.5 75TH 17.5 50TH 19.0 25TH	8.0 % 57.9 % 51.2	MEAN 50.9 S.D. 8.8 75TH % 56.0 50TH % 51.0 25TH % 44.8	MEAN 48.8 S.D. 9.0 75TH % 54.4 50TH % 48.6 25TH % 43.2
	GRADE GRADE 8 11		TAP 1 TAP 2 GRADE GRADE 11 11	TAP 3 % ABOVE GRADE MIN.SUB 11 LEVEL ADA	COST ATS % % PER IN NON- RET. CHILD SYS FAIL
101.2 102.0 100.2	98.8 102.5 98.1 102.9 92.9 95.2	67.1 102.0 69.9 100.0 69.0 94.6	53.8 52.4 52.5 50.6 49.1 49.3		441 7114 96.2 97.9 383 6766 91.5 97.4 462 7812 92.4 95.7



#### CATEGORY 38 SYSTEMS

#### ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TG 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

COMPOSITE			CO	MPCSIT	Ε	TA	P SCOR	E 1	TA	P SCORE	2	
TIBS	GRADE	4	ITHS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11		GRADE 11		
MEAN		4 • 7	MEAN		3.9	MEAN	4	5.9	иEAN	45.	8	7
5.0.		9 • 4	S.D.	1:	1.8	S•0•		9.5	S.D.	9.	.7	4
15TH		1.4	75TH		1.9	75TH	% 5	2.5	75TH			4
50TH	_	<b>3.</b> 3	50TH	% 98	2 • 4	50TH	% 4	5.6	50TH			3
25 <b>T</b> H	% 57	7.4	25 <b>T</b> H	% 84	4.2	25TH	% 3	9 • 0	25 <b>T</b> H			4
		CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS			TAP 2	TAF 3	% ABOVE	-	CATV
SYSTEM NAME		GRADE	GRADE		GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUE	3	RADE
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	
BANKS	3	93.0	80.6	92.3	62.2	88.9	44.9	43.8	46.3	83	1116	3.0
BUFORD	4	96.7	94.2	92.1	64.3	94.9	46.0	45.1	45.4	32	1068	1. T. <u>-</u>
COMMERCE	5	99.7	93.7	92.6	66.4	95.1	47.3	47.2	46.5	8.8	1428	
GILMER	4	96.8	92.8	97.4	66.4	96.0	47.7	48.1	40.1	87	1861	
JACKSON	5	97.2	91.1	89.8	65.1	92.5	44.1	42.1	45.0	84	1691	
WHITE	3	95.2	93.1	91.2	62.9	94.1	43.5	44.1	43.0	83	1753	5.2



#### CATEGORY 38 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

Ì	COMPCSITE ITBS GRADE 8			TA	P SCOR	E 1	TAS	P SCOR	E 2	TA	F SCO	RF 3	
	ITBS	GRADE	8	1	GRADE	11		GRADE			GRADE		
7	MEAN	9	3.9	MEAN	4	5.9	HEAN	4	5.8	1:AN		45.4	
4	S.D.	1.	1.8	S.J.		9.5	5.0.		9.7	5.D.		8.5	
4	75TH	% 10:	1.9	75TH	% 5	2.5	75TH		1.9	75TH		51.2	
3	50 <b>T</b> H	% 9	2.4	50TH	% 4	5.6	50TH		6.0	50TH		45.1	
4	25TH	% 8	4.2	25TH	% 3	9.0	25TH		9.3	25TH		40 • U	
CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABO	VF	COST	ATS	4	%
RADE	GRADE			GRADE				MIN.S		PES		NON-	
4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVE		CHILD		FAIL	NET •
3.0	80.6	92.3	62.2	88.9	44.9	43.8	46.3	83	1116	355	7326	96.4	97.3
<b>6.</b> 7	94.2	92.1	64.3	94.9	46.0	45.1	45.4	32	1068			93.5	
9.7	93.7	92.6	66.4	95.1	47.3	47.2	46.5	88	1428			96.0	
0.6	92.8	97.4	66.4	96.0	47.7	48.1	40.1	87	1861			92.2	
7.2	91.1	89.8	65.1	92.5	44.1	42.1	45.0	84	1691			93.8	
5.2	93.1	91.2	62.9	94.1	43.5	44.1	43.0	83	1753			97.3	



CATEGORY 39 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000
INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 40 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

OSI

CES/ DIS

CO	COMPOSITE			1POSIT	<u>:</u>	TAF	SCOR	<b>1</b>	TAF	SCORE	2
ITBS	GRADE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE :	11	(	GRADE 11	. ,
MEAN	68	• ô	MEAN	96	8 • 8	MEAN	4	9•6	MEAN	50.	0
5.D.	8	• 6	S.D.	11	.9	S.D.	7	<b>7.</b> 9	5.D.	8.	1
75TH	% 75	• 9	75 TH	% 109	.5	75 <b>T</b> H	% 59	5.6	75TH	% 55.	3
50 <b>T</b> H	% 68	• 8	50TH	% 98	3	50TH	% 48	3.7	50 <b>T</b> H	% 49.	0
25 <b>T</b> H	% 61	•1	25 <b>T</b> H	% 8:	•5	25 <b>T</b> H	% 4	• • 0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 44.	û
		CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% A60VE	
SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUE	3
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	Α
RABUN	1 ت	8.00	96•8	98.5	68.6	96.8	49.6	50•ù	40.1	8 Ú	18



#### CATEGORY 39 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000
INCOME PERCENTILE 81 TO 99
CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 40 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERSAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

2

• 1 • 3 • 0

E B

18

OSITE RADE 4			1POSIT			SCOR!			P SCORE GRADE 11			P SCOR		
64	d•ô	MEAN	9	8•0	MEAN	4	9.6	MEAN	50.	0	MEAN		48.1	
٤	3.6	S.D.	1:	1.9	S.D.	7	7.9	S.D.	8.	. 1	s∙D•		8.7	
. 7:	<i>i</i> • 9	75TH	% 105	5.5	75TH	% 59	5.6	75TH	% 55.	3	75TH	% !	53.4	
. 68	3.8	50 <b>T</b> H	% 9	5.3	50TH	% 4	8.7	50 <b>1</b> H	% 49.	. 0	:OTH	% (	47.6	
61	1.1	25TH	% 8	o •5	25 <b>T</b> H	% 4	<b>+ •</b> 0	25 <b>T</b> H	% 44.	Û	2 <b>5</b> TH	%	+2.6	
	CATV	CATV	CATV	I T BS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% A60V8	Ξ	COST	ATS	%	%
CESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUE	3	PER	IN	NON-	RET.
DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	CHILD	SYS	FAIL	
<b>ئ</b> ئ	100.8	96.8	98.5	68.6	96.8	49.ô	50.u	40.1	8 ប	1851	432	6642	97.5	97.2

#### CATEGORY 41 SYSTEMS

#### ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

CAT V RADE 4

3.4 7.9 3.0 3.8

1.5 7.7 2.3

0.1 4.5 4.1 0.7

8.1 1.5 9.0

2.0 2.2

	POSIT			1POSIT			P SCOR			P SCORE		Ţ
ITBS	GRADE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11		GRADE 1	1	ı
MEAN		3.1	MEAN		L • 7	MEAN		6.0	MEAN	45	•6	MEA
ა•D•		9•5	S.D.		L•9	S.D.		9.5	S.D.	9	• 9	5.0
75 <b>T</b> H		9.7	75 <b>T</b> H		9 • ც	75 <b>T</b> H		2 1	75TH	% 52	• 7	75 T
50TH		1.0	5 û TH	% 88	3.9	50TH	% 4	5.8	50TH	% 45	• 6	50T
25 <b>T</b> H	% 50	5.2	∠5TH	% 88	2 • <b>6</b>	25 <b>T</b> H	% 3	9.1	25 <b>T</b> H	% 38	• 9	251
		CATV	CATV							% AB0V	E	COSI
SYSTEM NAME				GRADE				GRADE	GRALE	MIN.SU	8	$\rho_{\rm C} \chi$
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	CHIE
BACON	1 c	91.9	91.2	94.7	61 • 1	91.0	46.6	47.1	45.7	65	1827	459
6EN HILL	17	92.4	0	0	65.5	0	0	U	0	70		304
BLECKLEY	13	98.4	90.4	0	66.3	93.	0	Û	6	74		472
BRANTLEY	18	97.3	93.4	92.8	65.6	27.7	45.3	46.1	45.c	77	1521	
CHARLTON	18	87.5	87.5	91.5	60.5	90.2	45.8	45.2	47.1	68	1730	435
CUCHRAN	15	93.L	87.9	93.4	64.4	92.5	47.3	47.6	47.7	63	1288	448
DAWSUN	3	ົບ	93.5	97.1	3	97.2	46.5	45.7	44.4	76	795	459
<b>ECHOLS</b>	17	89.8	88.5	92.4	59.6	91.3	46.4	44.3	42.8	61	460	490
LVANS	14	91.5	96.1	93.0	<b>6</b> 2.8	92.7	46.8	47.û	44.8	65	1695	440
GLASCOCK	1 U	87.7	81.6	91.4	62.1	87.4	50.0	47.5	46.5	65		333
HEARD	દ	92.3	83.8	90.9	62.1	91.3	45.9	44.6	46.3	73	1206	423
HOGANSVILLE	દ	90.1	85.3	82.5	62.0	91.2	41.8	41.4	42.5	62	1080	401
JASPEK	9	94.5	84.8	85.4	64.1	88.7	44.1	42.4	44.2	75	1204	485
JEFFERSON	5	94.1	95.1	92.9	63.0	95.7	45.7	47.4	46.2	76	1448	442
LÉE	16	90.7	87.3	84.2	63.3	90.0	42.1	41.1	42.6	62	1732	462
LUMPKIN	3	96.0	90.8	97.4	64.2	93.7	49.7	48.2	49.4	75	1724	433
MCINTOSH	15	88.1	87.3	86.6	59.4	87.6	42.5	41.6	41.6	73	1814	465
MONTGOMERY	13	91.5	88.9	85.1	61 N	90.0	41.0	39.6	42.6	6 <b>7</b>	1298	371
OCONEE	5	99.0	91.2	97.0	66.1	93.6	51.0	49.1	48.7	75	1629	459
PIKË	7	92.0	84.3	88.2	61 • 6	88.0	44.0	41.7	43.6	62	1573	
TOWNS	3	92.2	97.5	97.7	63.2	98.2	49.4	50.5	47.9	76		430

#### CATEGORY 41 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

	COMPOSITE												
	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE 1	11	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE	11	
1	MEAN	9:	L.7	MEAN	46	5 • 0	MEAN	4	5.6	MEAN	L	•5.6	
	S.B.		1.9	S.D.		9.5	S.D.		9.9	S.D.		8.9	
5 7	75 <b>T</b> H		9.8	75 <b>T</b> H		2.1	75TH		2.7	75 <b>T</b> H		51.5	
3	50 TH		3.9	50TH		5 • 8	50TH		5.6	SOTH		•5.3	
2	25 <b>T</b> H		2.6	25 <b>T</b> H		9.1	25TH		8.9			39.9	
CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITAS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% AB0	VΕ	COST	ATS	%	X.
			JRADE							PER			RET.
i	8		4						L ADA				
۷ و ځ	91.2	94,7	61.1	91.0	46.6	47.1	45.7	65	1827	459	6913	98.4	97.1
- • 4		0		0	0	Ú	0	7 ü	706	304	7260	90.4	99.6
3.4		0	66.3	93.4	0		0	74	846	472	6120	97.5	99.5
7.3	93.4	92.8	65.6	93.7	45.3	46.1	45.6	77	1521	400	6763	96.1	97.7
7.9		91.5	69.5	90.2	45.8	45.2	45.1	68	1730	435	6838	95.7	97.5
3 . u	87.9	93.4	64.4	92.5	47.3	47.6	47.7	63	1288	448	5985	96.0	97.3
3 • U Ú	93.5	97.1	Э	97.2	46.5	45.7	44.4	76	795	459	6018	98.5	97.7
3.8	83.5	92.4	59.6	91.3	46.4	44.3	42.8	61	460	490	6067	92.5	97.6
1.5	96.1	93.0	62.8	92.7	46.8	47.û	44.8	65	1695	440	66 <b>7</b> 0	95.5	98.3
7.7	81.6	91.4	62.1	87.4	50.0	47.5	46.5	65	51 <b>3</b>	333	7994	92.5	97.2
2.3	83.8	90.9	62 1	91.3	45.9	44.6	46.3	<b>7</b> 3	1 86	423	6489	98.1	97.7
0.1	85.3	82.5	62 • <b>0</b>	91.2	41.8	41.4	42.5	62	1080	401	6778	94.2	96.6
4.5	84.8	85.4	64.1	88.7	44.1	42.4	44.2	75	1204	485	6520	92.7	97.3
4.1	95.1	92.9	63.0	95.7	45.7	47.4	46.2	76	1448	442	6492	93.1	96.8
0.7	87.3	84.2	63.3	90.0	42.1	41.1	42.6	62	1732	462	6629	96.1	97.1
6.0	90.8	97.4	64.2	93.7	49.7	48.2	49.4	75	1724	433	6974	95.4	98.4
8.1	87.3	86.6	59.4	87.6	42.5	41.6	41.6	73	1814	465	7104	87.4	97.1
1.5	88.9	85.1	61.0	90.0	41.0	39.6	42.6	67	1298	371	6440	96.3	98.5
9.0	91.2	97.0	66.1	93.6	51.0	49.1	48.7	75	1629	459	7658	96.1	97.3
2.0	84.3	88.2	61.6	88.0	44.0	41.7	43.6	62	1573	406	6234	95.2	96.8
2.2		97.7	63.2	98.2	49.4	50.5	47.9	76	900	430	6692	94.7	98.3
I													



### CATEGORY 41 (CONTINUED) SYSTEMS

CAT

SYSTEM NAME		GRADE	% ABOVE MIN.SUE LEVEL	В							
UNION	3	93.7	91.5	100.0	65.2	93.1	49.4	51.1	48.8	69	1569
WESTPOINT	ь	94.5	90.1	87.7	63.5	92.6	44.8	43.9	45.5	62	878

CATEGORY 42 SYSTEMS

ACA BELOW 2000

INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 43 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000

INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

### CATEGORY 41 (CONTINUED) SYSTEMS

CATY CATY CATY ITBS ITBS TAP 1 TAP 2 TAP 3 % ABOVE COST ATS % % RADE GRADE GRADE GRADE GRADE GRADE GRADE MIN.SUB PER IN NON- RET. LEVEL 'ADA CHILD SYS FAIL 4 8 11 11 91.5 100.0 65.2 93.1 49.4 51.1 48.8 3.7 69 6426 97.6 96.2 1565 416 4.5 90.1 87.7 63.5 92.6 44.8 43.9 45.5 62 878 494 6627 97.3 96.7

> CATEGORY 42 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000

INCOME PERCENTILE 61 TO 80

CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 43 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY



#### CATEGORY 44 SYSTEMS

#### ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

AT V ADE

• 6

.4

6 2

+.0

COMPOSITE			100	1POSITE	:	TAF	SCORE	<b>1</b>	TAF	SCORE	2	Т
ITAS GR	ADE	4	ITES	GRADE	8	0	RADE 1	L <b>1</b>	(	RADE 11	L	
MEAN	61	. • 9	MEAN	90	· 2	MEAN	41	••0	MEAN	43.	. 6	MEA
5.D.	ç	J • 3	S.U.	12	2.2	S.D.	ç	3 <b>.</b> 7	S.D.	9.	9	S.D
75TH %	67	<b>'•</b> 6	75TH	% 97	7 • 8	75TH	% 50	<b>3.</b> 6	75TH			75T
50TH %	60	• 0	5ûTH	% 87	7.2	50 <b>T</b> H	% 43	3.6	50TH	% 42.	. 6	50T
25TH %	55	6 • 6	25 <b>T</b> H	% 81	L • 0	25TH	% 37	7.2	25 <b>T</b> H	% 36.	. 1	251
		CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOVE	Ξ	COST
SYSTEM NAME C	ESA	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUE	3	PER
D	IST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	CHIL
BRYAN	15	92.9	89.8	90.4	64.1	93.4	44.2	44.3	43.8	60	1852	387
CANDLER	14	96.4	86.6	90.3	63.8	89.1	44.7	45.2	45.4	49	1410	418
CHATTAHOOCHLE	11	84.6	82.2	84.6	52.8	86.1	41.0	41.1	40.6	43	416	376
CLINCH	18	92.ų	85.0	88.8	61.9	88.1	44.3	45.0	44.2	54	1447	468
IRWIN	17	90.4	87.6	86.4	62.5	91.5	45.3	44.U	42.9	52	1809	502
JENKINS	<b>1</b> 0	84.4	85.9	85.7	58.1	90.5	42.9	42.4	42.0	41	1839	465
JOHNSON	9	86.2	84.3	84.3	60.8	90.1	41.6	42.3	44.4	53	1539	446
LANIER	17	89.1	90.1	92.3	60.8	91.6	45.6	46.2	42.5	56	1270	405
LINCOLN	1 บ	92.6	87.9	84.6	62.4	90.3	42.0	41.4	41.5	55	1368	335
LONG	15	90.8	82.1	84.0	61.5	85.1	41.3	42.5	45.1	58	823	470
MILLER	16	93.9	87.3	90.8	63.6	93.1	44.2	44.5	45.5	51	1423	5 +7
OGLETHORPE	5	87.5	87.4	89.0	61.1	90.0	44.4	43.2	44.4	52	1746	414
	16	86.8	84.0	91.2	62.4	88.2	47.6	47.0	45.9	57	1545	
PULASKI	13	92.9	94•Ü	91.3	65.2	94.1	46.6	45.9	48.3	48	1739	
PUTNAM	9	90.1	84 . U	82.5	61.0	87.7	41.4	40.8	41.5	53	1867	
	16	98.2	87.1	9ۥ4	66.0	91.5	50.2	49.4	49.1	52	1918	
SOCIAL LIRCLE	5	86.6	89.6	87.2	59.1	90.9	44.1	44.5	43.2	60		370
<del>-</del>	11	88.2	81.3	75.7	59•6	83.1	36.9	35.8	37.2	49	1361	
	13	86.3	82.2	91.1	60.6	85.6	46 • 8	46.0	44.6	57	1299	
TURNER	17	94.0	82.8	88.7	64.3	87.1	44.5	45.5	45.0	53	1969	416

#### CATEGORY 44 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

È							•						
	COMPOSITE			TAF	SCORE	Ξ 1	TAF	SCORE	2	TAI	SCOF	RE 3	
	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	SRADE :	11	(	GRADE 1	1	(	GRADE	11	
	MEAN	90	i •2	MEAN	41	4.0	MEAN	43	• 6	MEAN	ı	44.0	
Ì	S.U.	12	2.2	S.D.	(	9.7	S.D.	9	• 9	S.D.		9.0	
	75TH		7.8	75 <b>T</b> H		0.6	75TH	% 50	• 6	75TH	% !	+9.5	
	5 ÛTH		7 • 2	50 <b>T</b> H		3.6	50TH		• 6	50TH		+3.2	
	25TH		L • 0	25 <b>T</b> H		7.2	25TH		• 1	25TH		38.0	
AT V	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	E	COST	ATS	%	%
	GRADE	GRADE						MIN.SU		PER	IN	NON-	RET.
4	8			8		11	11	LEVEL		CHILD	SYS	FAIL	
. 9	89.8	90 • 4	64.1	93.4	44.2	44.3	43.8	60	1852	387	6844	94.2	96.3
,4	86.6	90.3	63.8	89.1	44.7	45.2	45.4	49	1410	418	7515	97.8	96.9
. 6	82.2	84.6	52.8	86.1	41.0	41.1	40.6	43	416	376	6233	87.5	97.4
. Ų	85.0	88.8	61.9	88.1	44.3	45.0	44.2	54	1447	468	6518	96.3	96.5
.4	87.6	86 • 4	62.5	91.5	45.3	44.Ũ	42.9	52	1809	502	5748	93.6	98.5
.4	85.9	85.7	58.1	90.5	42.9	42.4	42.0	41	1839	465	6822	95.4	97.4
.2	84.3	84.3	60.8	90.i	41.6	42.3	44.4	53	1539	446	7420	99.2	97.3
.1	90.1	92.3	60.8	91.6	45.6	46.2	42.5	56	1270	405	6757	96.4	97.0
.6	87.9	84.6	62.4	90.3	42,0	41.4	41.5	55	1368	385	6876	98.5	98.0
.8	82.1	84.0	61.5	85.1	41.3	42.5	45.1	58	823	470	6371	96.9	97.3
.9	87.3	90.8	63.6	93.1	44.2	44.5	45.5	51	1423	547	698'	94.6	99.0
• 5	87.4	89.0	61.1	90.0	44.4	43.2	44.4	52	1746	414	5632	97.3	97.3
.8	84.0	91.2	62.4	88.2	47.6	47.0	45.9	57	1545	427	6508	85.3	98.0
.9	94.0	91.3	65.2	94.1	46.6	45.9	48.3	48	1739	4+6	6938	97.5	98.6
.1	84.U	82.5	61.0	87.7	41.4	40.8	41.5	53	1867	480	7200	99.8	96.8
.2	87.1	9€ • 4	66.0	91.5	50.2	49.4	49.1	52	1918	488	6473	97.5	98.5
.6	89.6	87.2	59.1	90.9	44.1	44.5	43.2	60	923	370	7030	90.1	98.1
.2	81.5	75.7	59.6	83.1	36.9	35.8	37.2	49	1361			96.2	
3.3	82.2	91.1	60.6	85.6	46.8	46.0	44.6	57	1299			96.3	
•• G	82.8	88.7	64.3	87.1	44.5	45.5	45.0	53	1969			92.8	
l													



### CATEGORY 44 (CONTINUED) SYSTEMS

A GR

88 90 89

SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRACE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	% ABOVE MIN.SUB LEVEL
WHEELER	13	88.4	95.s	88.7	61.8	97.0	42.5	41.3	42.7	41
WILCOX	13	90.2	86.2	86.8	62.2	90.5	43.2	43.3	43.3	52
WILKES	10	89.4	95.2	89.7	61.1	96.9	45.4	42.6	46.0	44

#### CATEGORY 45 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

	MPOSITE GRADE 4	COMPOSIT ITAS GRADE		P SCORE 1 GRADE 11	TAP SC Grad	
MEAN 3.0. 75th 50th 25th	8.3 % 64.8 % 58.0	S.D. 1 75TH % 50TH % 8	87.7 MEAN 11.4 S.D. 1.8 75TH 86.6 50TH 78.6 25TH	8.6 1 % 49.5 1 % 42.8	MEAN S.D. 75TH % 50TH % 25TH %	42.0 6ú.4 8.1 8.3 48.1 64.8 42.0 58.0 36.9 54.8
SYSTEM NAME	CATV CESA GRADE DIST 4	On On On		TAP 1 TAP 2 GRADE GRADE 11 11	GRADE MIN	BOVE CA SUB A GR VEL T
WARREN	10 83.6	83.7 84.8	60.4 87.7	43.1 42.3	41.6 5	7 2 83



### CATEGORY 44 (CONTINUED) SYSTEMS

A T	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	Z ABOVE MIN.SUB LEVEL		COST PER CHILD	IN	NON-	RET.
	90.2	86.2	86.8	62.2	90.5	42.5 43.2 45.4	43.3	43.3	41 52 44	1475	494	3981 6276 6883	94.2	96.2

#### CATEGORY 45 SYSTEMS

#### ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 41 TO 60 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

T (			MPOSI			P SCOR			SCORE			P SCO		
5	4	ITES	GRAL	JE 8		GRADE	11		GRADE 1	1	(	GRADE	11	
6	û • 4	MĒAN		87.7	MEAN	L	3.1	MEAN	42	• 3	MEAN		41.6	
1	8 • 3	S.D.		11.4	S.D.		8.6	S.D.	8	. 1	S.D.		7.9	
õ	4 • 8	75TH	%	93.8	75 <b>T</b> H	% 4	9.5	75TH	% 48	. 1	75TH	%	45.7	
5	8 • 0	50 TH	%	86.6	50TH	% 4	+2 • 8	50TH	% 42	• 3	50°H		41.6	
5	4.8	25TH	%	78.6	25TH	% 3	37.2	25 <b>T</b> H			25TH	. •	37.5	
	CATV	CATV	CAT	V ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOV	Ε	Cost	ATS	%	%
A	GRADE	GRADE	GRA	DE GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SU	В	PER		NON-	· -
T	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL		CHILD		FAIL	
	83.6	83.7	84.8	8 60.4	87.7	43-1	42.3	41.6	57	1384	519	6460	93.3	95.6



#### CATEGORY 46 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL. IN THIS CATEGORY

CATEGORY 47 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

I

S 7

ว รอ

CO	MPOSIT	ב	CON	1POSIT	Ε	TAF	SCOR	E 1	TAF	SCORE	2		
ITBS	GRADE	4	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	į	RAUE 11			
MEAN	6	1.8	MEAN	86	5.8	MEAN	4	1.5	MÉAN	41.	2	M	
5.0.		b • 2	S.D.	1:	1.1	S.D.		9.6	S.D.	9.	8	Š	ľ
75TH	% 6	b • 5	75 <b>T</b> H	% 98	2.3	75 <b>T</b> H	% 4	7.3	75TH	% 47.	5	7	i i
HT0c	<b>%</b> 6	u . 3	50TH	% 8	4.3	50TH	% 4	0.1	50TH	% 40.	1	ē	
25 <b>T</b> H	% 5	5.1	25 <b>T</b> H	% 79	<b>3</b> • 3	25TH	% 3	5.1	25 <b>T</b> H	% 33.	8	, ,	
		CATV	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAF 3	% ABOVS		CC	v
SYSTEM NAME	CESA	GRADE	GRADE	CRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRALE	MIN.SUE		PE	ے ر
	DIST	4	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	AUA	СН	
ATKINSON	18	88.6	85.ú	91.7	61.7	89.0	44.1	46.8	45.0	32	1481	49	
BAKER	16	93.7	84.6	76.7	61.3	89.2	39.7	37.7	40.1	11	762	5 7	Ţ
CALHOUN CO	16	96.9	81.5	81.5	65.1	86.2	40.5	40.2	41.8	40	1593	5 /	b
CLAY	11	93.3	86.2	82.1	65.2	88.8	40.9	40.4	43.5	18	901	51	Š
CRAWFORD	3	92.0	89.7	92.7	63.9	92.1	47.7	46.8	43.9	36	1488	44	į
MARION	12	94.8	84.4	84.1	62.9	88.1	41.7	41.7	42.0	38	1274	4 ð	В
KANDOLPH	11	96.7	83.3	83.9	67.2	85.0	41.7	41.3	39.8	19	1706	5 1	<b>Y</b>
SCHLEY	12	89.7	87.3	84.1	61.3	89.4	39.2	39.5	41.4	3 <b>3</b>	57 <b>7</b>	40	þ
STEWART	11	85.2	82.1	78.5	58.9	86.5	37.4	36.7	39.4	29	1511	47	2
TALIAFERRO	1 b	90.7	78.4	74.9	61.7	86.0	37.6	35.9	38.2	4	458	39	į
TAYLOR	12	85.0	81.0	85.2	59.2	85.9	42.8	41.7	42.4	24	1636	5 J	
TWIGGS	8	89.9	77.0	81.0	60.9	81.9	41.0	41.0	42.2	27	1825	41	į.
WEBSTER	12	85.7	81.9	85.0	57.3	83.3	43.4	43.5	42.0	26	517	5 4	

#### CATEGORY 46 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 100 OR ABOVE

NO SCHOOL OR SYSTEM FELL IN THIS CATEGORY

#### CATEGORY 47 SYSTEMS

ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 84 TO 99.9

		4POSIT			P SCOR		TAF	P SCC	RE 2	TA	F SCO	RE 3	
	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE	. 11	(	GRADE	11	
	MEAN	8 (	6.8	MEAN	4	1.5	MÉAN		41.2	MEAN	4	41.8	
	S.D.	1:	1.1	S.D.		9.6	S.D.		9.8	S.D.		8.7	
	75 <b>T</b> H	% 98	2.3	75 <b>T</b> H	% 4	7.3	75 <b>T</b> H	%	47.5	75TH	%	46.5	
	50 <b>T</b> H	% 8	4.3	50TH	% 4	0.1	50TH	%	40.1	50 <b>T</b> H		41.8	
	25 <b>T</b> H	% 79	9.3	25TH		5.1	25 <b>T</b> H		33.8	25 <b>T</b> H		35.2	
						- •							
٧	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% A8	OVE	COST	ATS	%	%
	GRADE								SUB	PEX			
	8	11	4	8	11	11	11		EL AUA			FAIL	
	_		•	_					ac non	3.12.23	3.0		
	85.Ú	91.7	61.7	89.0	44.1	46.8	45.0	32	1481	493	6534	92.7	98.2
	84.6	76.7	61.3	89.2	39.7	37.7	40.1	11				89.7	
	81.5	81.5	65.1	86.2	40.5	40.2	41.8	40				96.1	
	86.2	82.1	65.2	88.8	40.9	40.4	43.5	18		515		98.1	
	89.7	92.7	63.9	92.1	47.7	46.8	43.9	36				95.0	
	84.4	84.1	62.9	88.1	41.7	41.7	46.0	38				94.8	
	83.3	83.9	67.2	85.0	41.7	41.3	39.8	19				93.8	
	87.3	84.1	61.3	89.4	39.2	39.5	41.4	33		463		95.0	
	82.1	78.5	58.9	86.5	37.4	36.7	39.4	29				95.6	
	78.4	74.9	61.7	86.0	37.6	35.9	38.2	4				94.6	
	81.0	85.2	59.2	85.9	42.8	41.7	42.4	24				93.0	
	77.U	81.0	60.9	81.9	41.0	41.0	42.2	27				91.4	
	81.9	85.0	57.3	83.3	43.4	43.5	42.0	26		527		94.4	
	0.4.9		J. • 0	00.0	7017	70 0 9	76.0	20	311	961	9301	74.4	71.01

#### CATEGORY 48 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

COM	<b>IPOSITE</b>	COMPCSI	TE	TAF	SCORE 1	TAF	SCORE
TIBS	GRADE 4	ITBS GRAD	)E 8	(	GRADE 11	(	GRADE 1
MEAN	50.2	MEAN	85.2	MEAN	44.1	MEAN	40
S.O.	7.2	S.D.	7.5	5.0.	8.7	S.D.	7
75TH		75TH %	89.3	75TH	% 50.9	75TH	% 46
эOTH	% 57.5	50TH %	83.5	50TH	% 42.5	50 <b>T</b> H	% 4 C
25TH	% 54.0	25TH %	8ܕ4	2 <b>5T</b> H	% 37.7	25TH	% 36
SYSTEM NAME	CATV				TAP 1 TAP 2	TAP 3	
STSICH NAME	DIST 4	8 11	JE GRADE 4	B 8	GRADE GRADE 11 11	GRADE 11	LEVEL .
QUITMAN	11 83.5	80.5 84.1	. 58.2	85.2	44.1 40.8	43.3	18 5 8

CATEGORY 48 SYSTEMS

## ADA BELOW 2000 INCOME PERCENTILE 0 TO 40 CAT VERBAL SCORE AT GRADE 4 BELOW 84

	ភូល	4PCS IT	t.	TA	P SCOR	E 1	TAI	SCORE	2	TA	P SCO	R <b>E</b> 3	
	ITBS	GRADE	8	(	GRADE	11	(	GRADE 11		ı	GRADE	11	
	MEAN	8	5.2	MEAN	4	4.1	MEAN	40.	8	MEAN	ı	43.3	
	S • D •		7.5	S.D.		8.7	S • D •	7.	9	S.D.		5.€	
	751H	% 8	9.3	751H	% 5	0.9	75TH	% 46.	0	<b>7</b> 5 <b>T</b> H	%	46.8	
	50 TH	% 8.	3.5	50TH	% 4	2.5	50TH	% 40.	5	50TH	%	43.5	
	25TH	% 8	Ü • 4	25TH	% 3	7.7	25TH	% 36.	3	25TH	%	40.0	
,	CATV	CATV	ITBS	ITBS	TAP 1	TAP 2	TAP 3	% ABOVE		COST	ATS	%	%
:	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	GRADE	MIN.SUB		PER	IN	NON-	
	8	11	4	8	11	11	11	LEVEL	ADA	CHIFD	SYS	FAIL	
	80.5	84.1	58.2	85.2	44.1	40.5	43.3	18	474	559	6330	92.6	96.8

FILMED FRC M BEST AVAILABLE COPY



# STATE OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STATEWIDE TESTING PROGRAM SYSTEMS REPORT

#### INDEX

SYSTEM	PAGE NO.	SYSTEM
AMERICUS CITY	15	BUFORD CITY CIT
APPLING CNTY.	15	BULLOCH CNTY. NTY
ATKINSON CNTY.	28	BURKE CNTY. CNT
ATLANTA CITY	5	BUTTS CNTY.
BACON CNTY.	2 4	CALHOUN CNTY. Y.
BAKER CNTY.	28	CALHOUN CITY Y.
BALDWIN CNTY.	67	CAMDEN CNTY.
BANKS CNTY.	22	CANDLER CNTY.
BARROW CNTY.	14	CARROLL CNTY.
BARTOW CNTY.	7	CARROLLTON CIT
BEN HILL	24	CARTERSVILLE (
BERRIEN CNTY.	15	CATOOSA CNTY.
BIBB CNTY.	45	CHARLTON CNTY.
BLECKLEY	24	CHATHAM CNTY.
BRANTLEY CNTY.	24	CHATTAHOOCHIE CNTY
BREMEN CITY	21	CHATTOOGA CNTY
BROOKS CNTY.	19	CHEROKEE CNTY.
BRYAN CNTY.	26 <b>33</b>	CHICKAMAUGA CI



# STATE OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STATEWIDE TESTING PROGRAM SYSTEMS REPORT

#### INDEX

	PAGE NO.		SYSTEM	PAGE NO.
CITY	15		BUFORD CITY	22
NTY.	15		BULLOCH CNTY.	8
CNTY.	28		BURKE CNTY.	11
ITY	. 5		BUTTS CNTY.	15
Υ.	24		CALHOUN CNTY.	28
γ.	28		CALHOUN CITY	12
NTY.	67		CAMDEN CNTY.	15
Υ.	22		CANDLER CNTY.	26
ТΥ.	14		CARROLL CNTY.	6
ТΥ.	7		CARROLLTON CITY	13
	24		CARTERSVILLE CITY	1 4
NTY.	15		CATOOSA CNTY.	6
•	45		CHARLTON CNTY.	24
	2.1		CHATHAM CNTY.	4
CNTY.	24		CHATTAHOOCHEE CNTY.	26
ТҮ	21		CHATTOOGA CNTY.	13
ТҮ.	19		CHEROKEE CNTY.	6
Υ.	26	33	CHICKAMAUGA CITY	21

SYSTEM	PAGE NO.	SYSTEM
CLARKE CNTY.	2	DOOLY CNTY.
CLAY CNTY.	28	DOUGHERTY CNTY.
CLAYTON CNTY.	2	DOUGLAS CNTY.
CLINCH CNTY.	26	DUBLIN CITY
COBB CNTY.	1	EARLY CNTY.
COCHRAN CITY	24	ECHOLS CNTY.
COFFEE CNTY.	8	EFFINGHAM CNTY.
COLQUITT CNTY.	8	ELBERT CNTY.
COLUMBIA CNTY.	6	EMANUEL CNTY.
COMMERCE CITY	22	EVANS CNTY.
COOK CNTY.	17	FANNIN CNTY.
COWETA CNTY.	8	FAYETTE CNTY.
CRAWFORD CNTY.	28	FITZGERALD CITY
CRISP CNTY.	9	FLOYD CNTY.
DADE CNTY.	13	FORSYTH CNTY.
DALTOM CITY	12	FRANKLIN CNTY.
DAWSON CNTY.	24	FULTON CNTY.
DECATUR CNTY.	9	GAINESVILLE CITY
DECATUR CITY	15	GI!MER CNTY.
DEKALB CNTY.	1	GLASCOCK CNTY.
DODGE CNTY.	15	GLYNN CNTY.



PAGE NO.	SYSTEM	PAGE NO.
2	DOOLY CNTY.	19
28	DOUGHERTY CNTY.	3
2	DOUGLAS CNTY.	6
26	DUBLIN CITY	15
1	EARLY CNTY.	:7
24	ECHOLS CNTY.	24
8	EFFINGHAM CNTY.	15
8	ELBERT CNTY.	14
6	EMANUEL CNTY.	9
22	EVANS CMTY.	24
17	FANNIN CNTY.	13
8	FAYETTE CNTY.	12
28	FITZGERALD CITY	17
9	FLOYD CNTY.	2
13	FORSYTH CNTY.	6
12	FRANKLIN CNTY.	13
24	FULTON CNTY.	1
9	GAINESVILLE CITY	12
15	GILMER CNTY.	22
1	GLASCOCK CNTY.	24
15	GLYNN CNTY.	3



SYSTEM	PAGE NO.	SYSTEM
GORDON CNTY.	13	JOHNSON CNTY.
GRADY CNTY.	17	JONES CNTY.
GREENE CNTY.	19	LAGRANGE CITY
GWINNETT CNTY.	1	LAMAR CNTY.
HABERSHAM CNTY.	6	LANIER CNTY.
HALL CNTY.	2	LAURENS CNTY.
HANCOCK CNTY.	19	LEE COUNTY
HARALSON CNTY.	13	LIBERTY CNTY.
HARRIS CNTY.	17	LINCOLN CNTY.
HART CNTY.	16	LONG CNTY.
HEARD CNTY.	2 4	LOWNDES CNTY.
HENRY CNTY.	8	LUMPKIN CNTY.
HOGANSVILLE CITY	24	MACON CNTY.
HOUSTON CNTY.	2	MADISON CNTY.
IRWIN CNTY.	26	MARIETTA CITY
JACKSON CNTY.	22	MARION CNTY.
JASPER CNTY.	24	MCDUFFIE CNTY.
JEFF DAVIS CNTY.	13	MCINTOSH CNTY.
JEFFERSON CNTY.	19	MERIWETHER CNTY.
JEFFERSON CITY	24	MILLER CNTY.
JENKINS CNTY.	26	MITCHELL CNTY.



PAGE NO.		SYSTEM	PAGE NO.
13		JOHNSON CNTY.	26
17		JONES CNTY.	15
19		LAGRANGE CITY	8
1		LAMAR CNTY.	15
6		LANIER CNTY.	26
2		LAURENS CNTY.	17
19		LEE COUNTY	24
13		LIBERTY CNTY.	15
17		LINCOLN CNTY.	26
16		LONG CNTY. '	26
24		LOWNDES CNTY.	6
8		LUMPKIN CNTY.	24
24		MACON CNTY.	20
2		MADISON CNTY.	15
26		MARIETTA CITY	8
22		MARION CNTY.	28
24		MCDUFFIE CNTY.	15
13		MCINTOSH CNTY.	24
19		MERIWETHER CNTY.	9
24		MILLER CNTY.	26
26	35	MITCHELL CNTY.	19



SYSTEM	PAGE NO.	SYSTEM
MONROE CNTY.	15	ROCKDALE CNTY.
MONTGOMERY CNTY.	24	ROME CITY
MORGAN CNTY.	17	SCHLEY CNTY.
MURRAY CNTY.	13	SCREVEN CNTY.
MUSCOGEE CNTY.	3	SEMINOLE CNTY.
NEWTON CNTY.	8	SOCIAL CIRCLE CITY
OCONEE CNTY.	24	SPALDING CNTY.
OGLETHORPE CNTY.	26	STEPHENS CNTY.
PAULDING CNTY.	6	STEWART CNTY.
PEACH CNTY.	17	SUMTER CNTY.
PELHAM CITY	26	TALBOT CNTY.
PICKENS CNTY.	15	TALIAFERRO CNTY.
PIERCE CNTY.	15	TATTNALL CNTY.
PIKE CNTY.	24 _	TAYLOR CNTY.
POLK CNTY.	8	TELFAIR CNTY.
PULASKI CNTY.	26	TERRELL CNTY.
PUTNAM CNTY.	26	THOMAS CNTY.
QUITMAN CNTY.	29	THOMASTON CITY
RABUN CNTY.	23	THOMASVILLE CITY
RANDOLPH CNTY.	28	TIFT CNTY.
RICHMOND CNTY.	3	TOOMBS CNTY.



PAGE NO.	SYSTEM	PAGE NO.
15	ROCKDALE CNTY.	6
24	ROME CITY	8
17	SCHLEY CNTY.	28
13	SCREVEN CNTY.	17
3	SEMINOLE CNTY.	26
8	SOCIAL CIRCLE CITY	26
24	SPALDING CNTY.	6
26	STEPHENS CNTY.	13
6	STEWART CNTY.	28
17	SUMTER CNTY.	19
26	TALBOT CNTY.	26
* 15	TALIAFERRO CNTY.	28
15	TATTNALL CNTY.	15
24	TAYLOB CNTY.	28
8	TELFAIR CNTY.	16
26	TERRELL CNTY.	20
26	THOMAS CNTY.	16
29	THOMASTON CITY	16
23	THOMASVILLE CITY	9
28	TIFT CNTY.	8
3	TOOMBS CNTY. 36	16

<u>sys</u>

TOW

TRE

TRI

TR0

TUR

TWI

UNI

UPS

VAL

VID

WAL

WAL

WAR

WAR

WAS

WAY

WAY

WEB

WES

WHE

WHI

WHI



SYSTEM	PAGE NO.	SYSTEM	PAGE NO
TOWNS CNTY.	24	WILCOX CNTY.	27
TREUTLEN CNTY.	26	WILKES CNTY.	27
TRION CITY	21	WILKINSON CNTY.	16
TROUP CNTY.	16	WORTH CNTY.	17
TURNER CNTY.	26		!
TWIGGS CNTY.	28		!
UNION CNTY.	25		•
UPSON CNTY.	16		
VALDOSTA CITY	9		1
VIDALIA CITY	16		
WALKER CNTY.	2		
WALTON CNTY.	8		
WARE CNTY.	16		
WARREN CNTY.	27		1
WASHINGTON CNTY.	19		
WAYCROSS CITY	17		
WAYNE CNTY.	8		
WEBSTER CNTY.	28		
WEST POINT CITY	25		
WHEELER CNTY.	27		
WHITE CNTY.	22		
W''' TELD CNTY.	6	1	