

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 819

TM 034 208

TITLE Delaware Student Testing Program: State Report for 2001 DSTP Writing Assessment.

INSTITUTION Delaware State Dept. of Education, Dover. Assessment and Accountability Branch.

PUB DATE 2002-02-00

NOTE 30p.; Document Number 95-01/02/02/08. For the 2000 DSTP writing assessment report, see ED 455 270.

PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Scores; Scoring; \*State Programs; State Standards; \*Test Results; \*Testing Programs; \*Writing Tests

IDENTIFIERS Delaware; \*Delaware Student Testing Program

## ABSTRACT

To help teachers, administrators, and parents understand student performance in writing, a state-level report is prepared each year to analyze students writing scores and provide guidelines for the interpretation of the results. This report compares students scores on the 2001 Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) with scores on the 2000 DSTP using the new scoring rules for writing. In 2001, Delaware students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 took the DSTP writing assessment. Each student responded to a text-based writing task and a stand-alone writing prompt. Each students response to the text-based task was scored by one trained reader using a five-point scoring rubric, and responses to the stand-alone writing were scored by two raters. This report contains the newly calculated means and standard deviations for the writing scores from 1998 through 2000. The generalizability of writing scores is low across the discourses of writing tasks, writing topics, and occasions, but a summary is presented for reference uses. The results of the writing assessments suggest that writing performance remained similar to the previous year in grades 3 and 10, but improved slightly for grades 5 and 8. For the stand-alone task, there was no difference from the previous year for grades 3 and 10, but slightly higher scores for grades 5 and 8. A similar pattern was seen for the text-based writing task. A cross-grade pattern shows that the frequency distributions of writing scores shifted gradually from the lower-score end to the higher-score end, so that more students received a higher score, and fewer a lower score, in 2001 than in 2000. An attachment contains supplemental information about test results. (SLD)

# Delaware Student Testing Program

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Woodruff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

## State Report for 2001 DSTP Writing Assessment

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared by the Assessment and Analysis Group  
Assessment and Accountability Branch  
Delaware Department of Education

February 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Officers of the Delaware Department of Education**

Valerie A. Woodruff  
Secretary of Education

Jennifer W. Davis  
Deputy Secretary of Education  
David Blowman  
Executive Assistant

Robin R. Taylor, M.Ed  
Associate Secretary, Assessment and Accountability Branch  
Mark A. Dufendach, Ed.D.

Associate Secretary, Finance and Administrative Services Branch  
Nancy J. Wilson, Ph.D.

Associate Secretary, Curriculum and Instructional Improvement Branch

Wendy B. Roberts, Ph.D.  
Director, Assessment and Analysis Group  
Darlene J. Bolig, Ed.D.  
Helen Dennis, M.Ed.  
Jeffery Fleming, M.S.  
Katia F. Foret, Ph.D.  
James F. Hertzog, M.Ed.  
Nancy Maihoff, Ph.D.

Jon Manon, Ph. D., University of Delaware  
Joann F. Prewitt, M.A.  
Julie A. Schmidt, Ph.D.  
Carole D. White, M.B.A.  
Liru Zhang, Ph.D.

**Support Staff:**

Elaner M. Brown      Barbara F. O'Neal  
Krista D. Holloway      Erin L. Pieshala  
Kimberly K. Rodriguez      Gail Truxon

**State Board of Education**

Joseph A. Pika, Ph.D., President  
Jean W. Allen, Vice President  
Robert J. Gilsdorf  
Mary B. Graham, Esquire  
Valarie Pepper  
Dennis J. Savage  
Claiboune D. Smith, Ph.D.

The Department of Education does not discriminate in employment or educational programs, services or activities, based on race, color, national origin, age or handicap in accordance with state and federal laws. Inquiries should be directed to the Department of Education, Human Resources and Quality Management, P.O. Box 1402, Dover, DE 19903-1402, or Telephone (302) 739-4604. For more information about the DSTP, write to the Department of Education, Assessment & Accountability Branch, P.O. Box 1402, Dover, DE 19903-1402, or telephone (302) 739-6700.

Document Control No. 95-01/02/02/08

## State Report of the 2001 DSTP Writing Assessment

### I. Introduction:

To help teachers, administrators, and parents understand student performance in writing, the Assessment and Analysis Group prepares a state-level report each year. We analyze students' writing scores and provide guidelines for the interpretation of the results. In this report, we compare students' scores on the 2001 DSTP with students' scores on the 2000 DSTP using the new scoring rules for writing (For detailed information, please read the section of DSTP Writing Assessment).

### II. DSTP Writing Assessment

In 2001, Delaware students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 took the DSTP writing assessment. Each student responded to a text-based writing task and a stand-alone writing prompt. The text-based writing task was linked to a passage in the DSTP reading test. For the stand-alone writing task, while students were encouraged to use prewriting skills to develop, organize, and draft their responses to the prompt. Only the final draft was scored.

Each student's response to the text-based writing was scored by one trained reader using a 5-point scoring rubric; responses to the stand-alone writing were scored by two trained readers using the same scoring rubric (See Attachment A) and the sum of the two scores was reported. The lowest score for the text-based writing is 0 and the highest possible score is 5; the lowest score for the stand-alone writing is 0 and the highest possible score is 10. The total writing raw score is a combination of the text-based writing score and the stand-alone writing score with the lowest score of 1 and the highest possible score of 15. According to the new scoring rule, if a student receives a 0-score on one writing task, but a valid, non 0-score on the other writing, this student will receive a valid total writing score. However, if a student misses both parts of the writing assessment, such as a 0-score, an invalid score, this student will not receive a valid total writing score. The newly calculated means and standard deviations for the 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 writing scores are presented in this report, however, interpretations and comparisons were focused on the 2000 and 2001 data.

### III. Results of DSTP Writing Assessment

Overall Writing Performance To make a more meaningful comparison of writing scores across years, effect size is used for analysis. The measure of effect size (ES) or standard mean difference varies from zero. That is, when there is no difference, ES is zero; if the 2001 average score is higher, ES is positive; if the 2000 average score is higher, ES is negative. Effect size is comparable from measure to measure, even if the score scales on the measures are different. A widely used criterion for the interpretation of ES-values as proposed by Cohen (1988), evaluates .20 - .49 as a small difference, .50 - .79 as medium, and .80 or higher as large. Many researchers, however, strongly encourage using these

criteria as a reference only and consider the particular situation of a given test to avoid misleading interpretations (Willingham and Cole, 1997; Glass et al, 1981). In this report, ES-values are interpreted in the latter way.

Tables 1a and 1b present the types of writing and descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the 2001 and 2000 writing assessments using the new scoring rules. The average writing scores are 5.89 for grade 3, 7.34 for grade 5, 7.92 for grade 8, and 7.38 for grade 10 in 2001. The results of effect size suggest that (1) all ES-values are positive ranging from .01 to .44; (2) the near zero ES for grade 3 (ES=.01) and 10 (ES=.17) indicate no significant difference in the average writing scores between 2001 and 2000; and (3) the small ES for grades 5 (ES=.40) and 8 (ES=.44) indicate a slightly higher average score for 2001 than 2000.

Further review of students' writing scores (Table 2a-2b) found a cross-grade pattern: the frequency distributions of writing scores shifted slightly from the lower end to the higher end in 2001 compared with 2000. In grade 3, the percentage of students having 6-points increased from 22% in 2000 to 29% in 2001; whereas the percentage of students having 5-points dropped from 25% in 2000 to 20% in 2001. In grade 5, the percentages of students having 8- and 9-points increased from 10% and 19% in 2000 to 17% and 23%, respectively, in 2001; whereas the percentages of students having 5-, 6-, and 7-points dropped from 17%, 18%, and 20% in 2000 to 10%, 15%, and 17%, respectively, in 2001. In grade 8, the percentages of students receiving 9- and 10-points increased from 12% and 4% in 2000 to 27% and 9%, respectively; whereas, the percentages of students receiving 5-, 6-, 7-, and 8-points dropped from 11%, 14%, 22%, and 30% in 2000 to 4%, 11%, 14%, and 28%, respectively. In grade 10, the percentage of students having 8-points increased from 22% in 2000 to 34% in 2001; whereas the percentages of students having 5- and 6-points dropped from 13% and 16% in 2000 to 6% and 12%, respectively, in 2001.

The percentage of students at each performance level is nearly the same in 2000 and in 2001 for grade 3 (Tables 3a-3b). In grade 5, the percentage increased by 16% for meeting the standard, and 2% for exceeding the standard from 2000 to 2001; the percentage dropped by 12% and 6% for well below and below the standard, respectively. In grade 8, the percentage increased by 17% and 2% for meeting and exceeding the standard, respectively; the percentage dropped by 8% and 11% for well below and below the standard, respectively. Similarly, in grade 10, the percentage increased by 14% for meeting the standard from 2000 to 2001; the percentages for well below and below the standard dropped by 8% and 4%, respectively.

*Performance on Stand-Alone Writing* The average score of stand-alone writing (Table 1a-1b) is slightly lower for grade 3 in 2001 than 2000 (4.27 vs. 4.40), but slightly higher for grade 5 (5.26 vs. 4.90), 8 (5.56 vs. 5.49), and 10 (5.50 vs. 5.29). The near-zero ES for grade 3 (-.10), 8 (.06), and 10 (.16) indicates that there is no significant difference in the stand-alone score over time. An ES of .26 in grade 5 suggests a slight increase of the average performance from 2000 to 2001.

The frequency distributions of stand-alone scores show varying patterns from grade to grade. In grade 3, the percentage of 0-, 5-, and 6-points dropped by 2%, 3%, and 5%, respectively, from 2000 to 2001; whereas the percentage of 4-points increased by nearly 12%. In grade 5, the percentage of students having 5-points or below dropped by 1% to 5%; whereas the percentage of students having 6- to 8-points increased by 2% to 4%. In grade 8, the percentage of students receiving 6-points increased by 7%, but the percentage of 4- and 5-points dropped by 2% to 3% from 2000 to 2001. In grade 10, the percentage of students having 6- and 7-points increased by 3% to 7%; whereas the percentage of 4- and 5-points dropped by 3% to 10% across years.

*Performance on Text-Based Writing* The average score for text-based writing (Table 1a-1b) is slightly higher in 2001 than 2000 for grades 3 (1.66 vs. 1.50) and 10 (2.02 vs. 1.94) and higher for grades 5 (2.12 vs. 1.70) and 8 (2.44 vs. 1.80). The near-zero ES for grades 3 and 10 indicates no significant difference in text-based scores across years; the ES of .54 for grade 5 suggests that the 2001 average score is about a half of standard deviation higher than the 2000 average score; the ES of .89 for grade 8 suggests that the 2001 average score is nearly one standard deviation higher than the 2000 average score.

Table 5 shows that a similar pattern across grades that the shape of the frequency distributions seemed to shift from lower scores to higher scores for text-based writing. In grade 3, the percentage of 2-points increased from 35% in 2000 to 53% in 2001, respectively; but the percentage of 1-point dropped from 57% to 30%, respectively. In grade 5, the percentages of 2- and 3-points increased from 40% and 13% in 2000 to 49% and 29% in 2001, respectively; but the percentages of 0- and 1-point dropped from 3% and 41% to less than 1% and 20%, respectively. In grade 8, the percentage of 3- and 4-points increased from 12% and 1% in 2000 to 37% and 8% in 2001, respectively; but the percentage of 1- and 2-points dropped from 32% and 55% in 2000 to 8% and 47% in 2001, respectively. Similarly in grade 10, the percentage of 2-points increased from 45% in 2000 to 69% in 2001; but the percentage of 1-point dropped from 32% to 14%. The percentage of 3- and 4-points dropped slightly from 18% in 2000 to 16% in 2001 and from 4% to less than 1%.

It is important to note that 630 third graders received a 0-score on the text-based writing in 2001. Further analysis was conducted to determine if geographic location (by district and school), student background (by special education and limited English proficient), and writing skills (their scores on the stand-alone writing) were the possible reasons for 0-scores (Attachment B). No particular patterns have been found. Since then the Assessment and Analysis Group, the English language arts Test Development Committee, and the DSTP Technical Advisory Committee have reviewed the text-based writing data and made recommendations to improve the text-based writing. A research study is currently under design for collecting additional information to support the final decisions.

#### IV. Summary

It is very important to note that the generalizability of writing scores is low across the discourses of writing tasks, writing topics, and occasions. The following summary based on the results of statistical analysis can only be used as a reference. Even though effect size is used for analysis in this report, caution should be taken when using the results of cross-year comparisons. Since only raw scores are reported in writing, comparisons across grades are inappropriate.

1. In 2001, the average writing score was 5.98 for grade 3, 7.34 for grade 5, 7.92 for grade 8, and 7.38 for grade 10. The results of analysis suggest that writing performance remained similar to the previous year for grades 3 and 10. The 2001's scores were slightly higher than 2000 for grades 5 and 8.
2. The average score for the stand-alone writing task was 4.27, 5.26, 5.56, and 5.50 for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10, respectively in 2001. The near-zero effect size suggests no difference in the stand-alone writing scores from the previous year for grades 3 and 10, but slightly higher scores for grades 5 and 8 in 2001.
3. The average score for the text-based writing task was 1.66, 2.12, 2.44, and 2.02 for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10, respectively. The near-zero effect size for grades 3 and 10 indicates no difference in text-based scores between 2000 and 2001; the effect sizes of .54 and .89 for grades 5 and 8, respectively, suggest that the 2001 average score is about one half to nearly one standard deviation higher than the 2000 average score.
4. A cross-grade pattern shows that the frequency distributions of writing scores shifted gradually from the lower-score end to the higher-score end. In other words, more students received a higher score and fewer students received a lower score in 2001 than in 2000 on both stand-alone and text-based writing tasks.

#### V. Reference

- Glass, G. V. et al (1981). *Meta-analysis in social research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Willingham, W. W. and Cole, N. S. (1997). *Gender and Fair Assessment*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Table 1a  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes of Writing Scores

Grade	2001				2000			
	Writing Score	Stand-Alone	Text-Based	Text-Based	Writing Score	Stand-Alone	Text-Based	Text-Based
3	N.	8699	8690	8541	7886	7892	7766	7766
	Mean	5.89	4.27	1.66	5.88	4.40	1.50	1.50
	S. D.	1.68	1.15	0.77	1.81	1.45	0.67	0.67
	Effect Size	<b>0.01</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	<b>0.22</b>				
Type of Writing								
5	N.	8423	8404	8294	7560	7552	7404	7404
	Mean	7.34	5.26	2.12	6.57	4.90	1.70	1.70
	S. D.	1.94	1.39	0.75	1.91	1.39	0.82	0.82
	Effect Size	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.54</b>				
Type of Writing								
8	N.	8567	8530	8379	8177	8136	7813	7813
	Mean	7.92	5.56	2.44	7.18	5.49	1.80	1.80
	S. D.	1.68	1.06	0.76	1.67	1.13	0.68	0.68
	Effect Size	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.89</b>				
Type of Writing								
10	N.	7927	7840	7588	7435	7343	7043	7043
	Mean	7.38	5.50	2.02	7.06	5.29	1.94	1.94
	S. D.	1.82	1.30	0.58	2.01	1.28	0.84	0.84
	Effect Size	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.11</b>				
Type of Writing								



**Table 1b**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Writing Scores**

Grade	1998			1999		
	Writing Score	Stand-Alone	Text-Based	Writing Score	Stand-Alone	Text-Based
3	N.	7946	7909	8054	8053	8025
	Mean	6.62	4.54	6.24	4.12	2.13
	S. D.	2.18	1.58	2.12	1.55	0.89
5	N.	7939	7924	8231	8208	8098
	Mean	7.17	4.82	7.26	5.09	2.22
	S. D.	2.15	1.41	2.04	1.34	1.00
8	N.	8333	8277	8196	8060	7981
	Mean	7.49	5.34	7.17	5.24	2.07
	S. D.	2.27	1.56	2.02	1.28	0.86
10	N.	7255	7135	7357	7162	7078
	Mean	6.63	4.75	6.42	4.71	1.90
	S. D.	1.97	1.24	2.29	1.61	0.81

**Table 2a**  
**Frequency Distributions of Writing Scores**

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
3	1	25	0.29	157	1.99
	2	212	2.44	86	1.09
	3	505	5.81	463	5.87
	4	834	9.59	712	9.03
	5	1728	19.86	1953	24.77
	6	2541	29.21	1741	22.08
	7	1413	16.24	1340	16.99
	8	951	10.93	911	11.55
	9	376	4.32	359	4.55
	10	77	0.89	116	1.47
	11	24	0.28	31	0.39
	12	10	0.11	12	0.15
	13	0	0.00	3	0.04
	14	2	0.02	2	0.03
	15	1	0.01	0	0.00
	Total	8699	100.00	7886	100.00

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
5	1	33	0.39	68	0.90
	2	48	0.57	101	1.34
	3	238	2.83	272	3.60
	4	303	3.60	502	6.64
	5	801	9.51	1248	16.51
	6	1264	15.01	1396	18.47
	7	1461	17.35	1480	19.58
	8	1912	22.70	1406	18.60
	9	1460	17.33	718	9.50
	10	556	6.60	250	3.31
	11	254	3.02	88	1.16
	12	73	0.87	22	0.29
	13	19	0.23	5	0.07
	14	1	0.01	3	0.04
	15	0	0.00	1	0.01
	Total	8423	100.00	7560	100.00

**Table 2b**  
**Frequency Distributions of Writing Scores**

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
8	1	19	0.22	41	0.50
	2	40	0.47	53	0.65
	3	75	0.88	59	0.72
	4	167	1.95	291	3.56
	5	354	4.13	870	10.64
	6	956	11.16	1145	14.00
	7	1193	13.93	1803	22.05
	8	2389	27.89	2483	30.37
	9	2278	26.59	947	11.58
	10	759	8.86	353	4.32
	11	249	2.91	102	1.25
	12	82	0.96	22	0.27
	13	5	0.06	6	0.07
	14	1	0.01	1	0.01
	15	0	0.00	1	0.01
	Total	8567	100.00	8177	100.00

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
10	1	39	0.49	75	1.01
	2	134	1.69	78	1.05
	3	141	1.78	148	1.99
	4	287	3.62	349	4.69
	5	466	5.88	975	13.11
	6	983	12.40	1174	15.79
	7	1354	17.08	1317	17.71
	8	2690	33.93	1645	22.13
	9	1157	14.60	970	13.05
	10	499	6.29	427	5.74
	11	156	1.97	189	2.54
	12	17	0.21	76	1.02
	13	4	0.05	9	0.12
	14	0	0.00	2	0.03
	15	0	0.00	1	0.01
	Total	7927	100.00	7435	100.00

**Table 3a**  
**Frequency Distributions of Performance Levels**

Grade	Performance Level	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
3	Well Below the Standard	1575	18.1	1418	18.0
	Below the Standard	4271	49.1	3694	46.8
	Meets the Standard	2818	32.4	2726	34.6
	Exceeds the Standard	35	0.4	43	0.5
	Distinguished	0	0	5	0.1
	<i>Total</i>	8699	100.0	7886	100.0
5	Well Below the Standard	1423	16.9	2191	29.0
	Below the Standard	2729	32.4	2876	38.0
	Meets the Standard	3925	46.6	2374	31.4
	Exceeds the Standard	328	3.9	110	1.5
	Distinguished	17	0.2	9	0.1
	<i>Total</i>	8423	100.0	7560	100.0
8	Well Below the Standard	651	7.6	1314	16.1
	Below the Standard	2150	25.1	2948	36.1
	Meets the Standard	5423	63.3	3783	46.3
	Exceeds the Standard	334	3.9	124	1.5
	Distinguished	9	0.1	8	0.1
	<i>Total</i>	8567	100.0	8177	100.0
10	Well Below the Standard	1070	13.5	1625	21.9
	Below the Standard	2338	29.5	2491	33.5
	Meets the Standard	4344	54.8	3042	40.9
	Exceeds the Standard	174	2.2	265	3.6
	Distinguished	8	0.1	12	0.2
	<i>Total</i>	7927	100.1	7435	100.0

**Table 3b**  
**Frequency Distributions of Performance Levels**

Grade	Performance Level	1998		1999	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
3	Well Below the Standard	1274	16.03	1713	21.27
	Below the Standard	2490	31.34	2596	32.23
	Meets the Standard	3961	49.85	3602	44.72
	Exceeds the Standard	205	2.58	132	1.64
	Distinguished	16	0.20	11	0.14
	<i>Total</i>	7946	100.00	8054	100.00
5	Well Below the Standard	1671	21.05	1606	19.51
	Below the Standard	2862	36.05	2737	33.25
	Meets the Standard	2957	37.25	3486	42.35
	Exceeds the Standard	415	5.23	389	4.73
	Distinguished	34	0.43	13	0.16
	<i>Total</i>	7939	100.00	8231	100.00
8	Well Below the Standard	1536	18.43	1581	19.29
	Below the Standard	2445	29.34	2788	34.02
	Meets the Standard	3607	43.29	3549	43.30
	Exceeds the Standard	702	8.42	262	3.20
	Distinguished	43	0.52	16	0.20
	<i>Total</i>	8333	100.00	8196	100.00
10	Well Below the Standard	1995	27.50	2394	32.54
	Below the Standard	2776	38.26	2518	34.23
	Meets the Standard	2354	32.45	2235	30.38
	Exceeds the Standard	129	1.78	199	2.70
	Distinguished	1	0.01	11	0.15
	<i>Total</i>	7255	100.00	7357	100.00

**Table 4a**  
**Frequency Distributions of Stand-Alone Writing Scores**

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
3	0	27	0.31	202	2.56
	2	620	7.13	534	6.77
	3	876	10.08	792	10.04
	4	4174	48.03	2806	35.55
	5	1687	19.41	1744	22.10
	6	1113	12.81	1453	18.41
	7	156	1.80	264	3.35
	8	30	0.35	88	1.12
	9	4	0.05	5	0.06
	10	3	0.03	4	0.05
	Total		8690	100.00	7892

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
5	0	37	0.44	80	1.06
	2	306	3.64	334	4.42
	3	331	3.94	507	6.71
	4	1878	22.35	2026	26.83
	5	1646	19.59	1587	21.01
	6	3057	36.38	2479	32.83
	7	766	9.11	401	5.31
	8	327	3.89	122	1.62
	9	50	0.59	6	0.08
	10	6	0.07	10	0.13
	Total		8404	100.00	7552

**Table 4b**  
**Frequency Distributions of Stand-Alone Writing Scores**

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
8	0	9	0.11	25	0.31
	2	85	1.00	61	0.75
	3	158	1.85	167	2.05
	4	1259	14.76	1384	17.01
	5	1547	18.14	1732	21.29
	6	4529	53.09	3766	46.29
	7	736	8.63	769	9.45
	8	198	2.32	220	2.70
	9	8	0.09	5	0.06
	10	1	0.01	7	0.09
	Total	8530	100.00	8136	100.00

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
10	0	31	0.40	27	0.37
	2	208	2.65	150	2.04
	3	257	3.28	227	3.09
	4	1132	14.44	1741	23.71
	5	1478	18.85	1530	20.84
	6	3469	44.25	2751	37.46
	7	902	11.51	633	8.62
	8	352	4.49	268	3.65
	9	8	0.10	10	0.14
	10	3	0.04	6	0.08
	Total	7840	100.00	7343	100.00

**Table 5**  
**Frequency Distributions of Text-Based Writing Scores**

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
3	0	630	7.38	53	0.68
	1	2549	29.84	4434	57.10
	2	4487	52.53	2677	34.47
	3	835	9.78	553	7.12
	4	37	0.43	47	0.61
	5	3	0.04	2	0.03
	Total	8541	100.00	7766	100.00

  

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
5	0	18	0.22	233	3.15
	1	1647	19.86	3056	41.27
	2	4086	49.26	2977	40.21
	3	2372	28.60	975	13.17
	4	169	2.04	155	2.09
	5	2	0.02	8	0.11
	Total	8294	100.00	7404	100.00

  

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
8	0	29	0.35	63	0.81
	1	664	7.92	2492	31.90
	2	3927	46.87	4278	54.75
	3	3107	37.08	903	11.56
	4	651	7.77	76	0.97
	5	1	0.01	1	0.01
	Total	8379	100.00	7813	100.00

  

Grade	Score	2001		2000	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
10	0	46	0.61	30	0.43
	1	1048	13.81	2254	32.00
	2	5233	68.96	3162	44.90
	3	1233	16.25	1282	18.20
	4	25	0.33	305	4.33
	5	3	0.04	10	0.14
	Total	7588	100.00	7043	100.00



## **Attachment A**

### **Writing Scoring Rubric**

## Delaware Student Testing Program - General Rubric for Writing

The following characteristics determine the success of the response in meeting the needs of the audience and fulfilling the writing purpose.

Score of 5	Score of 4	Score of 3	Score of 2	Score of 1
<p>Score point 5 meets all the criteria listed in score point 4. In addition, a paper receiving this score shows an exceptional awareness of readers' concerns and needs.</p> <p>The student may have shown an exceptional use of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development strategies specific to the purpose for writing</li> <li>• Distinctive style, voice, tone</li> <li>• Literary devices</li> <li>• Compositional risks</li> </ul>	<p>Unified with smooth transitions, a clear and logical progression of ideas, and an effective introduction and closing.</p> <p>Sufficient, specific, and relevant details that are fully elaborated.</p> <p>Consistently complete sentences with appropriate variety in length and structure.</p> <p>A consistent style with precise and vivid word choice.</p> <p>Few, if any, errors in standard written English that do not interfere with understanding.</p>	<p>Generally unified with some transitions, a clear progression of ideas, and an introduction and closing.</p> <p>Specific details but may be insufficient, irrelevant, or not fully elaborated.</p> <p>Generally complete sentences with sufficient variety in length and structure.</p> <p>Some style and generally precise word choice.</p> <p>Some errors in standard written English that rarely interfere with understanding.</p>	<p>Minimally unified and may lack transitions or an introduction or closing.</p> <p>Some specific details but may be insufficient, irrelevant, and/or not elaborated.</p> <p>Some sentence formation errors and a lack of sentence variety.</p> <p>Sometimes general and repetitive word choice.</p> <p>Several kinds of errors in standard written English that interfere with understanding.</p>	<p>Lacks unity.</p> <p>No or few specific details that are minimally elaborated.</p> <p>Frequent and severe sentence formation errors and/or a lack of sentence variety.</p> <p>Often general, repetitive, and/or confusing word choice.</p> <p>Frequent and severe errors in standard written English that interfere with understanding.</p>

**For non-scorable responses see below:**

- Blank
- Off topic
- Written in a language other than
  - Refusal
  - Illegible
  - Insufficient

## **Attachment B**

### **Distributions of Off-Topic Responses to the Text-Based Writing Task in Grade 3**

**Frequency Distributions of 0-Scores on the Text-Based Writing  
Task by District Code in Grade 3**

<i>District Code</i>	<i>N.</i>	<i>%</i>
10	38	6.03
13	30	4.76
15	25	3.97
16	18	2.86
17	11	1.75
18	20	3.17
23	14	2.22
24	16	2.54
29	20	3.17
31	52	8.25
32	112	17.78
33	87	13.81
34	93	14.76
35	21	3.33
36	39	6.19
74	3	0.48
76	18	2.86
84	13	2.06
Total	630	100.00

**Frequency Distributions of 0-Scores on the Text-Based Writing  
Task by School Code in Grade 3**

School Code	N.	%	School Code	N.	%	School Code	N.	%	School Code	N.	%
10	9	1.43	260	2	0.32	575	18	2.86	680	4	0.63
11	5	0.79	261	5	0.79	583	13	2.06	682	12	1.90
14	6	0.95	264	6	0.95	610	7	1.11	690	12	1.90
110	4	0.63	266	20	3.17	612	4	0.63	692	13	2.06
112	3	0.48	310	4	0.63	614	6	0.95	710	5	0.79
116	15	2.38	312	13	2.06	616	7	1.11	712	2	0.32
124	5	0.79	314	4	0.63	618	4	0.63	722	4	0.63
128	4	0.63	318	7	1.11	620	7	1.11	732	1	0.16
130	10	1.59	320	3	0.48	622	3	0.48	736	6	0.95
132	1	0.16	322	5	0.79	632	9	1.43	738	2	0.32
176	10	1.59	324	7	1.11	634	6	0.95	740	3	0.48
240	10	1.59	326	14	2.22	635	1	0.16	749	2	0.32
242	7	1.11	332	11	1.75	636	2	0.32	752	18	2.86
244	10	1.59	334	2	0.32	638	6	0.95	759	8	1.27
246	4	0.63	339	17	2.70	642	6	0.95	760	6	0.95
248	11	1.75	450	6	0.95	658	4	0.63	776	21	3.33
250	2	0.32	452	36	5.71	660	6	0.95	Total	630	100.00
252	23	3.65	456	28	4.44	662	15	2.38			
254	11	1.75	465	23	3.65	668	6	0.95			
256	1	0.16	573	3	0.48	672	14	2.22			

**Frequency Distributions of 0-Scores on the Text-Based Writing Task by Their Total Writing Scores in Grade 3**

<i>Writing Score</i>	<i>N.</i>	<i>%</i>
2	150	23.81
3	124	19.68
4	278	44.13
5	57	9.05
6	19	3.02
7	2	0.32
Total	630	100.00

**Frequency Distributions of 0-Scores on the Text-Based Writing Task by  
Special Education, LEP, and Free/Reduced Price Lunch in Grade 3**

Special ED Students	Limited English Proficient Students		Free/Reduced Price Lunch	
	N.	%	N.	%
No	418	66.349	615	97.619
Yes	274	43.492	356	56.508
SPED				
Code	N.	%	Yes	Total
100	38	6.0317	15	2.381
200	7	1.1111	630	100
300	128	20.317		
600	7	1.1111		
601	1	0.1587		
602	1	0.1587		
1000	1	0.1587		
1200	29	4.6032		
Sub-Total	212	33.651		
Total	630	100		



*U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

TM034208



## NOTICE

### Reproduction Basis



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)