



Guide to Reports



Fall 2012

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
Fall 2012 Highlights	3
Online Social Studies Pilot.....	3
Item Descriptors	4
Invalid Tests	4
Contact Us	4
Fall 2012 MEAP Report Descriptors.....	5
Section 2: Scoring	6
Definitions.....	6
Multiple Choice Item Scores	6
Constructed Response Item Scores	6
Scale Scores.....	7
Performance Levels.....	7
MEAP Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges - Fall 2012- Grades 3-9	9
Ranges within MEAP Performance Levels	10
MEAP Performance Level Change Table.....	11
Section 3: Reporting	12
Individual Student Report	13
Student Record Label.....	16
Parent Report	18
Class Roster	22
Item Analysis Report.....	24
Summary Report	29
Demographic Report.....	33
Comprehensive Report.....	36
Section 4: Additional Sources of Assessment Results	38
Contact Information	39

Section 1— Introduction

This guide was developed to assist educators in understanding and using the Fall 2012 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) results. Reports prepared for the MEAP include both individual level (Individual Student Report, Parent Report, Class Roster, Student Record Label) and aggregate level reports (Comprehensive Report, Demographic Report, Item Analysis Report, Summary Report).

Aggregate reports reflect the data needed to meet state and federal legislative requirements. In accordance with these mandates, separate aggregate results are provided for the following student populations: 1) all students, 2) students with disabilities, and 3) all except students with disabilities.

Reports included in district and school packets are listed in the table on page 5. Included in the table is a brief description of each report, a list of the student populations represented in the report, and the report recipients. Detailed descriptions of the reports are provided in Section 3 of this guide. ***Schools must distribute MEAP Parent Reports to students' parents or guardians as soon as possible after printed reports arrive, if a copy of the report has not already been distributed.***

All MEAP report PDFs are provided via the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA) Secure Site and, when hard copies are printed, BAA prints reports based upon a district elected printing option. Districts may have "all reports printed" or have just the Individual Student Reports, Parent Reports, and Student Record Labels printed ("green" option). When the "green" option is selected, schools may print the remaining reports from the BAA Secure Site. If no option was selected by the district, the "green" option was selected by default.

Fall 2012 Highlights

Online Social Studies Pilot

Students who participated in the Fall 2012 MEAP Online Social Studies Pilot are included on student level reports and their results have been incorporated into the aggregated reports. These students are not identified as online students on the paper and PDF reports, however, they are flagged as tested online in the school's Student Data file.

Item Descriptors

MEAP Item Descriptor documents are available for each grade level and each subject area assessed in fall 2012. These documents can be accessed at www.michigan.gov/meap. In addition, narrative and informational writing scoring guides are available at www.michigan.gov/meap as well as the analytic and holistic writing rubrics.

Item descriptors will be available for 100% of operational test items from the fall 2012 MEAP administration. They identify the Grade Level Content Expectation (GLCE) being assessed and provide a general description of the item itself, an indication of which response was the correct response, a description of the distracters, and in most cases, a description of why each distracter was an incorrect response. The purpose of item descriptors is to provide educators with instructionally-relevant data about student performance on state assessments.

Invalid Tests

Students who attempted a MEAP content area test in fall 2012 but did not receive a valid test score are now reported on the student level reports. While the test score is not reported, the reason for the invalid test is provided. These students do not count toward accountability but will negatively impact participation rates. Students who do not receive a valid score will not be reported on aggregated reports. Tests may be flagged as invalid for the following reasons:

- ◆ Student Prohibited Behavior
- ◆ Tested in incorrect grade (Out of Level)
- ◆ Did not meet attemptedness criteria
 - Less than 5 multiple choice responses bubbled
 - All constructed response items blank
- ◆ Non-standard accommodation administered
- ◆ Missing MSDS data (cannot properly identify student)
- ◆ Other mis-administrations
 - Student not given correct test
 - Multiple answer documents returned
 - See MEAP Test Administration Manual for additional examples

Contact Us

The Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA) welcomes your comments and feedback. We are committed to providing Michigan students, educators, parents, and other stakeholders an assessment program of the highest quality and reliability.

Phone: 1-877-560-8378, option 2

Fax: 517-335-1186

E-mail: BAA@michigan.gov

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Fall 2012 MEAP Report Descriptors

Report	Description	Population	Distribution
Individual Student Report (ISR)	Separated by content area, the ISR provides detailed information on individual student achievement, including scale score, performance level, earned points and points possible. Sorted by class/group code (if provided), and student name.	All Students	School
Student Label	Summarizes individual student achievement in each content area.	All Students	School
Parent Report	Summarizes individual student achievement in each content area, including earned points and points possible, percent correct, and performance level change information (if applicable).	All Students	1 copy to School (to be distributed to students' Parents/Guardians)
Class Roster	Separated by content area, the roster provides detailed information on student achievement, including scale score, performance level, earned points and points possible. Sorted by class/group code (if provided), and student name.	All Students	Class/Group School
Item Analysis Report	Separated by content area, the item analysis provides the primary GLCE measured by each test item, a brief description of the GLCE, the item descriptor number, and individual item statistics, including the percentage of students selecting each response.	All Students Students w/ Disabilities All Except Students w/ Disabilities	Class/Group School District State
Summary Report	Summarizes student achievement for all content areas, including mean scale score and performance level information, as well as year--to--year transitions. The School Summary also provides student score distributions for each content area.	All Students Students w/ Disabilities All Except Students w/ Disabilities	School District ISD State
Demographic Report	Summarizes the total number of students assessed, mean scale score, and performance level information for each demographic subgroup containing at least 10 students.	All Students Students w/ Disabilities All Except Students w/ Disabilities	School District ISD State
Comprehensive Report	Summarizes the total number of students assessed, mean scale score, and performance level information for the district or ISD. The district report provides a summary for the district and each school within the district. The ISD report provides a summary for the ISD, followed by each public school district, and then each Public School Academy (PSA) within the ISD.	All Students	District ISD

Section 2: Scoring

Definitions

All of the processes employed to assess overall student performance begin at the item level. There are two types of items on the MEAP: Multiple Choice (MC) items and Constructed Response (CR) items. Item scores are used to create subscores for each content area and are used in the statistical models and transformations that result in scale scores.

Multiple Choice Item Scores

The majority of the MEAP is comprised of multiple choice items. For these items, students select from the available options, only one of which is a correct response to the item. Students who select only the correct option receive a score of one (1) on the multiple choice item. Students who select one of the incorrect options, multiple options, or did not respond receive a score of zero (0). The string of responses from the multiple choice items (e.g. 1,0,0,0,1,...,1) serve as input for the statistical models used to derive scale scores. Multiple choice items are scanned and scored by computer.

Constructed Response Item Scores

In Fall 2012, the reading and writing tests contained operational constructed response items. The reading operational item was a 3-point reading comprehension item. The rubric used to score each grade-level reading comprehension item contains language directly from the reading passage, such that publishing the rubric would compromise the reading passage itself. For this reason, the scoring rubric is not available on the MEAP website; however, an item descriptor for each grade level is published in the MEAP Item Descriptors located on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

Reading constructed response items requiring short answer responses are evaluated by human scorers. Guided by precise criteria, scorers review a response for accuracy and completeness and assign 0 to 3 points based on how well the requirements of the prompt are fulfilled. Extensive professional practice and research have refined and validated the critical steps that ensure consistency in scoring. Scorers are trained to ignore extraneous factors such as neatness and to focus on the comprehension demonstrated in the response. Due to the high-stakes nature of these large-scale assessments, the BAA has taken every step possible to minimize scoring subjectivity.

Three writing constructed response items are included in the writing tests: a Narrative Writing prompt, an Informational Writing prompt and a Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample. The Narrative and Informational prompts are scored using analytic scoring rubrics. Trait ratings include 3 points per trait for Ideas (points doubled), Organization, Style and Conventions. The Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample is scored using a holistic rubric with ratings from 0-4. Again, scorers are extensively trained to score student writing and avoid scoring subjectivity. Scorers are trained to ignore extraneous factors such as neatness and focus on the strengths of the responses rather than the weaknesses. Rubrics and scoring guides for the three writing prompt types can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Scale Scores

MEAP scale scores are created from statistical scoring models that make use of each student's responses to both the Multiple Choice (MC) and Constructed Response (CR) items. The purpose is to model students' overall achievement in each content area based on the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs). MEAP scale scores are equated from year to year and form to form, meaning that any differences in the difficulty of items from one year to the next or from one form to the next are accounted for in the calculations of the scale score for the current cycle. Therefore, MEAP scale scores from the same grade and subject can be compared against each other regardless of the year or form of the MEAP the student took.

A simple Item Response Theory (IRT) model: the Rasch Partial Credit (1-parameter) model is used to determine the students' ability estimates. The use of this model results in a table for each subject area that describes a one-to-one relationship between the number of points earned by a student and the scale score earned by the student. This one-to-one relationship between points earned and scale score is a by-product of the statistical scoring model used for scoring the MEAP assessment. Some reports are reported by subscore (domain, focal point, or discipline). Subscores are not equated from year to year, therefore, are less reliable than scale scores and provide only an approximate measure of student performance.

Performance Levels

MEAP scale scores within each subject area can be described in ranges. The labels applied to these ranges are known as performance levels. The MEAP performance levels are: (1) Advanced, (2) Proficient, (3) Partially Proficient, and (4) Not Proficient. The divisions between the levels are often referred to as *cut scores*. Scale score and performance level range tables are located on the following pages.

The cut scores are typically recommended by a panel comprised of educators and other stakeholders throughout the state in a process known as standard setting. To set these standards, the panel uses detailed descriptions of what students in each of

of the performance levels should know and be able to do. Based upon these detailed descriptions and actual assessment items, the panel recommends the score that best separates each performance level from the next to the Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction. The State Superintendent then recommends the results of the standard setting (or modifications of these standards) to the Michigan State Board of Education (SBE). The SBE is the authority who approves the final cut scores and performance level ranges. While the performance level descriptors necessarily differ by grade and subject area, student achievement, as defined by the obtained performance level, can be reasonably compared across subjects within a grade. Such a comparison can be used to indicate whether students are meeting Michigan grade level content expectations in each subject.

In fall 2011, new cut scores were established to ensure parents, students, and teachers are well informed about where students stand relative to being on-track to proficiency in the next grade for grades 3-9, and on-track to career- and college-readiness in high school. The prior cut scores represented a more basic level of achievement needed for the old manufacturing economy. As a result the career- and college ready cut scores adopted in September, 2011 were noticeable higher than the previous. The new cut scores have been applied to previous years' data allowing for meaningful trend comparisons. Additional information on cut scores can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap.

**MEAP Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges
Fall 2012 – Grades 3-9**

Subject	Grade	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
		Not Proficient	Partially Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
Mathematics	3	208 - 321	322 - 335	336 - 370	371 - 416
	4	283 - 422	423 - 433	434 - 469	470 - 542
	5	363 - 515	516 - 530	531 - 583	584 - 668
	6	470 - 613	614 - 628	629 - 674	675 - 769
	7	571 - 713	714 - 730	731 - 775	776 - 864
	8	668 - 808	809 - 829	830 - 864	865 - 957
Reading	3	188 - 300	301 - 323	324 - 363	364 - 423
	4	283 - 394	395 - 418	419 - 477	478 - 537
	5	385 - 500	501 - 520	521 - 564	565 - 630
	6	490 - 601	602 - 618	619 - 652	653 - 730
	7	574 - 697	698 - 720	721 - 759	760 - 826
	8	688 - 795	796 - 817	818 - 852	853 - 921
Science	5	350 - 525	526 - 552	553 - 566	567 - 668
	8	668 - 825	826 - 844	845 - 862	863 - 971
Social Studies	6	481 - 592	593 - 624	625 - 648	649 - 729
	9	778 - 898	899 - 927	928 - 959	960 - 1046
Writing	4	247 - 361	362 - 399	400 - 428	429 - 513
	7	531 - 665	666 - 699	700 - 732	733 - 809

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Ranges within 2012 MEAP Performance Levels

Because mathematics and reading are assessed each year in grades 3 through 8, it is possible to track changes in individual students' achievement from grade-to-grade. Tracking transitions between the four performance levels (Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced) can be made more precise by tracking changes within each performance level (for example, a transition from the low range of the Proficient category to the high range of that same category). These small ranges are presented in the table below.

Subject	Grade	Ranges								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Math	3	208-301	302-312	313-321	322-328	329-335	336-344	345-355	356-370	371-416
	4	283-400	401-412	413-422	423-427	428-433	434-443	444-455	456-469	470-542
	5	363-482	483-500	501-515	516-522	523-530	531-545	546-563	564-583	584-668
	6	470-585	586-600	601-613	614-620	621-628	629-641	642-656	657-674	675-769
	7	571-685	686-700	701-713	714-721	722-730	731-743	744-758	759-775	776-864
	8	668-784	785-797	798-808	809-818	819-829	830-840	841-851	852-864	865-957
Reading	3	188-275	276-288	289-300	301-311	312-323	324-335	336-348	349-363	364-428
	4	283-362	363-379	380-394	395-406	407-418	419-434	435-452	453-477	478-537
	5	385-474	475-488	489-500	501-510	511-520	521-532	533-546	547-564	565-630
	6	490-579	580-591	592-601	602-609	610-618	619-628	629-639	640-652	653-730
	7	574-672	673-685	686-697	698-708	709-720	721-732	733-745	746-759	760-824
	8	688-772	773-784	785-795	796-806	807-817	818-828	829-839	840-852	853-921

MEAP Performance Level Change

Performance level change is used to compare student performance from year to year, and applies only to MEAP reading and mathematics because these are the only subjects tested each year in grades 3-8. Using the old MEAP cut scores prior to September 2011, each of the four performance levels (advanced, proficient, partially proficient, and not proficient) were wide enough to have a high, mid, and low range reliably distinguishable within each performance level. This more precise categorization is useful for tracking performance level change because it allows for the detection of changes *within* a performance level, not just between performance levels. Applying the new, more rigorous career- and college-ready cut scores, some of the performance levels are not wide enough to reliably distinguish between three ranges within the performance level. Because of this, a 9 x 9 transition table is now used (instead of the former 12 x 12) to track performance level change.

The table below delineates the transitions a student can demonstrate on the MEAP reading and mathematics assessments from year to year. On the left side of the table is the previous year’s MEAP achievement divided into the various ranges of performance levels. Across the top of the table is the current year’s MEAP achievement. Each student’s change in performance can be described as fitting into one of these cells by looking at the combination of the performance in the previous grade and the current grade. For example, a student who scored in the low Proficient range both last year and this year will fit within the cell “M”, indicating the student is maintaining the performance level achieved in the previous year.

Transition categories are: Significant Decline (SD), Decline (D), Maintaining (M), Improvement (I), or Significant Improvement (SI). These categories reflect whether students are changing their performance relative to increasing expectations.

Year X Grade Y MEAP Performance Level		Year X+1 Grade Y+1 MEAP Performance Level								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Not Proficient	Low	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	High	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI
Partially Proficient	Low	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI
	High	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI
Proficient	Low	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I
Advanced	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M

Section 3: Reporting

The sample reports included in this Guide to Reports are intended to provide examples of the report formats, data organization, and types of information contained in each report.

Data contained in these sample reports do not refer to any specific district, school, assessment item, or student.

Individual Student Report (ISR)

The intent of the Individual Student Report (ISR) is to provide a detailed description of each student’s performance in the MEAP subject areas assessed in that grade level. This report is designed to help educators identify a student’s academic strengths and areas which may need improvement. Schools may include these reports in student record files.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the subject area, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. It also lists the name of the teacher (if provided using a Class/Group ID sheet when answer documents were returned for scoring, or if entered during Tested Roster), class/group code, and the names of the school and district the student was enrolled in at the time the assessment was administered.

Section B contains student identification and demographic information, as well as a summary of the student’s performance in that subject area. The specific identification and demographic fields reported are:

Student Name	Ethnicity
District Student ID	English Language Learner
Date of Birth	Formerly LEP
Student UIC	Special Education
Gender	Accommodations

If a student’s test was marked invalid, a short reason will be provided. Performance data is not provided for invalid tests in Section C and, if applicable, Section D.

Section C provides detailed information on the individual student’s performance on each assessment item. All items, except for field test items, are included. The number of points earned and the total number of points possible are reported. Fall 2012 Item Descriptor booklets can be found for each grade level and subject area on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Section D appears on the ISR for reading and writing. It provides constructed response data, including the number of points possible and the number of points earned by the student. Writing trait ratings are provided for writing prompts and condition codes are reported if applicable. If a condition code is present, then the student receives an overall score of zero (0) for the item. A description of the condition codes is provided in the legends at the bottom of the reading and writing ISRs.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
 District Code: **99999**

Student Name: **LastNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FirstNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx X**
 District Student ID: 12345678901234567890 Date of Birth: 01/01/1900 State UIC: 1234567890
 Gender: M Ethnicity: Hispanic of Any Race
 English Language Learner: N Formerly LEP: N SpecEd: N
 Accommodations: Multiple-Day

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT

A

Grade 09
Fall 2012
Social Studies

Teacher Name:
 Class/Group:
 School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
 School Code: **99999**



Summary of Social Studies Results

Subject	Scale Score	2012 Achievement Performance Level
Social Studies	907	3-Partially Proficient

B

GLCE Code	Domain Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
History		12/21
8U3.3.04	Explain how the Constitution resolved major issues	1/3
8U3.3.06	Explain: Bill of Rights/limited government	0/1
8U4.1.04	Explain development of the Supreme Court	0/1
8U4.2.03	Explain the Expansion of the West	0/2
8U5.1.05	Describe the resistance of enslaved people	0/2
8U5.2.01	Explain reasons for secession	0/1
6W1.1.01	Describe early migrations of people among continents	1/1
6W1.2.03	Explain the impact of the Agricultural Revolution	1/1
7W1.2.01	Describe natural environm: agricultural settlements	1/1
6W2.1.03	Describe early peoples reflected geography: N. Amer.	1/1
7W2.1.04	Define concept of cultural diffusion	1/1
7W3.1.05	Describe major achievements of Eastern Hemisphere	1/1
7W3.1.06	Use maps to locate trade networks: classical era	1/1
7W3.1.09	Describe legal codes, communications: regional empire	1/1
7W3.2.01	Describe beliefs of five major world religions	1/1
7W3.2.03	Describe Afro-Eurasian religions: unified perceptions	2/2
Geography		0/14
6G1.3.01	Use themes of geography to describe regions/places	0/1
7G1.2.06	Apply geographical inquiry: analyze issue: E. Hemispher	0/1
7G1.3.01	Use geography themes to describe regions or places	0/1
6G2.1.01	Describe regional landform/climate: W. Hemisphere	0/1
6G2.2.01	Describe the human characteristics of the region	0/1
6G5.1.01	Describe environmental effects of human action	0/1
6G5.1.02	Describe technology affects human modifications	0/1
7G2.1.01	Describe landforms/climate of E. Hemisphere regions	0/1
7G3.2.02	Identify why ecosystems are attractive for human use	0/1
6G4.2.01	List technologies used to move people/products/ideas	0/1
7G4.3.02	Describe patterns of settlement by using maps	0/1
7G4.4.01	Identify conflict/cooperation among cultural groups	0/1
7G5.1.01	Describe environmental effects of human action	0/1

C

GLCE Code	Domain Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
Geography continued		0/14
7G5.2.01	Describe how change is environ. can affect humans	0/1
Civics/Government		4/4
6C1.1.01	Analyze competing ideas: democracy/dictatorship	1/1
7C1.1.01	Explain purpose/government affect individual/society	1/1
6C4.3.03	How countries work in international organizations	1/1
7C4.3.03	Explain different international/region organizations	1/1
Economics		4/5
6E2.3.01	Describe impact of sanctions/tariffs/treaties	1/1
7E1.1.01	Explain incentives in different economic systems	1/1
6E3.3.01	Compare traditional/command/market economies	1/2
7E3.1.04	Explain communications: affect economic interactions	1/1

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT



A

Grade 07
Fall 2012
Writing

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

Student Name: **LASTNAMEXXX, FIRSTNAMEXXXX M**

District Student ID: 99999999

Gender: F

English Language Learner: N

Accommodations: None

B

Date of Birth: 05/22/2000 State UIC: 9999999999
Ethnicity: Hispanic of Any Race
Formerly LEP: N SpecEd: N

Summary of Writing Results

Subject	Scale Score	2012 Achievement Performance Level
Writing	715	2-Proficient

MULTIPLE CHOICE		
GLCE Code	Domain Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
Writing Genre		
W.GN.06.01	Produce writing w/ or ID genre characteristics	1/1
		C
Writing Process		
W.PR.06.01	Consider audience and purpose for writing	3/3
W.PR.06.02	Apply or ID a variety of pre-writing strategies	1/1
W.PR.06.05	Proofread and edit writing	2/2
Personal Style		
W.PS.06.01	ID/exhibit style/voice to enhance written message	3/3
Grammar and Usage		
W.GR.06.01	Write with or ID correct grammar and usage	3/3
Spelling		
W.SP.06.01	Spell frequently misspelled words correctly	2/3

If Condition Code present, Earned Points equal zero.

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE		
GLCE Code	Writing Prompt Trait	Condition Code* Earned / Possible Points
Narrative Writing		
W.GN.06.01	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	2/3
W.PR.06.02	Organization	1/3
W.PS.06.01	Style	2/3
W.GR.06.01	Conventions	3/3
Informational Writing		
W.GN.06.02	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	2/3
W.PR.06.02	Organization	2/3
W.PS.06.01	Style	3/3
W.GR.06.01	Conventions	3/3
	D	
Response to Student Writing Sample (SWS)		
W.PR.06.02	Revise drafts	2/4

* Condition Codes: A = Off-topic ‡
B = Illegible or written in a language other than English
C = Blank
D = Insufficient to rate
‡ For SWS only, A = Off-topic/Off-task

Student Record Label

A Student Record Label is provided for each student assessed during the fall 2012 cycle. The labels are mailed to the school for placement in the student record file (CA-60).

Section A contains the district name and code and the school name and code.

Section B contains the student’s name, Unique Identification Code (UIC), District Student ID (STU), if provided by the school, date of birth, gender, and grade.

Section C contains the subject areas assessed, the Scale Score (SS) received, and the Performance Level the student attained in each subject area. The Performance Level Change in mathematics and reading is reported for students in grades 4-8.

Performance Levels

- Level **1** – Advanced
- Level **2** – Proficient
- Level **3** – Partially Proficient
- Level **4** – Not Proficient

Performance Level Change Ranges

- SI – Significant Improvement
- I - Improvement
- M - Maintaining
- D - Decline
- SD - Significant Decline
- NM - No valid matching student record

If the student was not assessed in a subject area, or if the test was marked invalid , a Scale Score cannot be reported and the reason is indicated in the Scale Score and Performance Level columns.

99999 SAMPLE DISTRICT **A**
 99999 SAMPLE SCHOOL

LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX,

UIC# 1234567890 **B** STU# 12345678901234567890

DOB: 01/01/1900

Gender: M

Grade: 5

Fall 2012

Subject	SS	Performance Level	Perf.Level Change
Reading	559	2-Proficient	M
Writing		C	
Mathematics	613	1-Advanced	SI
Science	552	3-Partially Proficient	
Social Studies			

meap™

Parent Report

The intent of the Parent Report is to provide a summary description of their student's performance in each subject area assessed on the MEAP. This report is designed to help parents and guardians identify the academic strengths of their student and areas that may need improvement. Information from this report may be helpful when discussing academic progress of the student with the classroom teacher(s). ***Please ensure that Parent Reports are distributed to parents or guardians as soon as possible after printed reports arrive at your school.***

Section A provides the title of the report, the grade the student was in when the assessment was administered, the assessment cycle, the name of the student, and the student's Unique Identification Code (UIC). It also lists the name of the school and the school district the student was enrolled in at the time the assessment was administered.

Section B consists of a brief introductory letter addressed to the parent or guardian of the student describing the purpose of the MEAP, advising of any major changes, and offering suggestions on how the MEAP results might be used.

Section C gives a brief description of each of the four performance levels.

Section D provides the student's scale score and performance level obtained in each subject area assessed for the current year.

Section E provides performance level change information in reading and mathematics from the previous test administration to the current MEAP administration. Performance level change information is available only reading and mathematics because these are the only two subjects assessed each year.

Section F describes in more detail how the student performed in each subject area.

Fa gives a short explanation of the assessment for each subject area. In addition, the student's performance level for the subject is listed with information on how the performance relates to Michigan standards. For example, if a student received a Level 2 on the eighth grade mathematics assessment, that student is "Proficient" and has met grade level expectations for Michigan students.

Section F continued

Fb provides a graphical representation of the student's overall performance on a specific subject area assessment.

Fc consists of more detailed information regarding the student's performance. Each subject area is divided into subscore groupings: mathematics is divided into focal points, science is grouped within disciplines, and reading, writing, and social studies are divided into domains. For each subject area, the total points earned versus the total points possible for each subscore grouping is reported.

Writing is reported differently. The narrative writing and the informational writing prompts' rubric scores are listed for each writing trait. If received, the condition code is reported and the student will earn a total score of zero (0) for the prompt. A description of the condition codes is provided. In addition, the multiple choice test items and the Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample score (listed as Revise Drafts) are reported for each student.

NOTE: The MEAP results for individual students are most reliable and valid at the overall scale score level for each subject. These scale scores are reliably associated with a performance level. Parents can have confidence that the reported scale scores and performance levels provide accurate information for each subject. Student subscores (at the domain, focal point, or discipline level) are less reliable measures than scale scores and performance levels because there are fewer items per subscore grouping. The subscore results provide only an approximate measure of the student's performance level. Parents should be careful in drawing conclusions about a student's strengths or weaknesses at the subscore level. It is more appropriate to use this subscore information together with classroom assessment data, information provided by the student's teacher(s), and other performance information to guide learning activities.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



MICHIGAN
Department of
Education

District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

Parent Report

Grade 04
Fall 2012

School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**



A

Report For:
LASTNAMEXXXX, FIRSTNAMEXXXX M
UIC: 9999999999

B

Dear Parent or Guardian:

In the fall of 2012, schools across Michigan administered the MEAP assessments to students in grades 3 through 9. Reading and mathematics are assessed in grades 3 through 8, writing in grades 4 and 7, science in grades 5 and 8, and social studies in grades 6 and 9. (For more detail, visit www.mi.gov/meap.)

When reviewing your student's results, please keep in mind that the MEAP assessments are linked to Michigan's content standards. They measure what students are expected to know and be able to do at specific grade levels and in specific content areas to be on-track for career- and college-readiness by the time they graduate from high school.

Student performance is reported as one of four performance levels: Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, or Advanced. A brief description of each performance level has been included along the right-hand side of this page. Please take a moment to review these descriptions.

Students need active parent/guardian involvement in their education to reach their fullest potential. Know what content is being covered in your student's courses throughout the school year and when your student's homework assignments and projects are due. Discuss your student's studies and interests regularly. Encourage your student to seek learning opportunities outside of school. A no-cost, online resource I highly recommend is the Michigan e-Library (www.mel.org).

I encourage you to discuss your student's MEAP results with teachers and other school professionals who know your student personally. Parents/guardians and teachers have a greater opportunity to help students succeed when they work together to inspire and support student achievement.

Sincerely,



Mike Flanagan
State Superintendent
Michigan Department of Education

Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1: Advanced (L1)
 The student's performance exceeds grade level expectations and indicates substantial understanding and application of key concepts defined for Michigan students. The student needs support to continue to excel. C

Level 2: Proficient (L2)
 The student's performance indicates understanding and application of key grade level expectations defined for Michigan students. The student needs continued support to maintain and improve proficiency.

Level 3: Partially Proficient (L3)
 The student needs assistance to improve achievement. The student's performance is not yet proficient, indicating a partial understanding and application of the grade level expectations defined for Michigan students.

Level 4: Not Proficient (L4)
 The student needs intensive intervention and support to improve achievement. The student's performance is not yet proficient and indicates minimal understanding and application of the grade level expectations defined for Michigan students.

For more information, please visit www.michigan.gov/meap

RESULTS FOR YOUR CHILD				
Subject	2012 Achievement Scale Score	2012 Achievement Performance Level	2011 Achievement Performance Level	Student's Performance Level Change
Reading	444	2-Proficient D	2-Proficient	Last fall, your child scored near the middle of the Proficient performance level. This fall, your child scored near the middle of the Proficient performance level.
Writing	462	1-Advanced	* Not Available E	* Not Available
Mathematics	421	4-Not Proficient	3-Partially Proficient	Last fall, your child scored near the low end of the Partially Proficient performance level. This fall, your child scored near the high end of the Not Proficient performance level.

* Science, social studies, and writing are not measured in every grade, so year-to-year progress cannot be reported.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Fa

Reading

On the reading assessment the students were asked to read for understanding within and across texts and respond to multiple-choice questions and one constructed response question (short essay). All questions on the reading assessment are based upon the Michigan Department of Education English Language Arts Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs) for reading. (www.michigan.gov/ela)

The table at the right shows the points earned by your student, the points possible within each of the domains of the reading test, and the percent correct.

A STUDENT AT THE PROFICIENT LEVEL:

Used knowledge about reading (genre, structure, text features, etc.) to accurately construct meaning and synthesize themes within and across texts. With instructional support, the student should maintain and improve proficiency.

L4 Not Proficient	L3	L2	L1 Advanced
		444	
283	395	419	470

Reading Domains	Points		% Correct
	Earned	Possible	
Word Recognition & Word Study	2	3	67%
Narrative Text	3	5	60%
Informational Text	3	5	60%
Comprehension	17	20	85%

Fb

Writing

On the writing assessment students were asked to write a story using their own knowledge and experience, write an informational piece about a given topic using a specific organizational pattern, answer multiple-choice questions about grade-level (peer) writing samples and write a response to a question about a grade-level (peer) writing sample. All questions on the writing assessment are based upon the Michigan Department of Education English Language Arts Grade Level Content Expectation (GLCEs) for writing. (www.michigan.gov/ela)

The two tables to the right display the number of points earned by your student and the number of possible points for each part of the writing test.

A STUDENT AT THE ADVANCED LEVEL:

Wrote in an exceptionally clear and focused manner; fully developed ideas with specific details; used effective organization and language that enhanced meaning; consistently used the Conventions of Standard English; and expertly evaluated the writing of others. With instructional support, the student should continue to excel.

L4 Not Proficient	L3	L2	L1 Advanced
			462
247	362	400	423

Writing Prompts (30 points)

	Ideas	Organization	Style	Conventions	Condition Code
Narrative Writing	6/6	3/3	3/3	3/3	
Informational Writing	6/6	2/3	2/3	3/3	

Condition Codes: A=Off-topic B=Illegible or written in a language other than English
C=Blank D=Insufficient to rate

Multiple Choice (16 points) + Revise Drafts (4 points)

Earned/Points Possible	Writing Genre		Writing Process		Grammar and Usage		Spelling
	Writing Genre	Writing Process	Style	and Usage	Spelling		
2/2	4/4	2/2	5/5	3/3			
Revise drafts	3/4						

Mathematics

At the beginning of fourth grade, students are expected to understand whole numbers up to 10,000. They should be able to add and subtract two-digit numbers and estimate the sums and differences of three-digit numbers. They are expected to know multiplication facts and related division facts. Students know fractions as parts of the whole. Students measure with common units. Students measure area and perimeter and classify and compare shapes and solids. They solve problems using bar graphs. (www.michigan.gov/mathematics)

The mathematics focal points at the right show the points earned by your student, the points possible, and the percent correct.

A STUDENT AT THE NOT PROFICIENT LEVEL:

Requires intensive intervention and support to improve achievement. The student did not demonstrate mathematical skills and concepts consistent with grade level expectations.

L4 Not Proficient	L3	L2	L1 Advanced
	421		
283	423	424	470

Mathematics Focal Points	Points		% Correct
	Earned	Possible	
Understanding of Fractions	3	5	60%
Multiplication and Division	6	12	50%
Properties of 2D, 3D Shapes	6	8	75%
Understanding Area, Perimeter	7	14	50%
Connections	13	20	65%

What is the margin of error (← →) ?

The diamond indicates your child's scale score for the tested subject. This is your child's overall subject scale score and is used to determine the level your child achieved. The horizontal bar indicates the margin of error. If your student had taken this same test or a similar test on another day, he/she would likely have scored within this range.

Class Roster

The Class Roster provides summary score information for each subscore grouping (domain, focal point, or discipline) and GLCE assessed within each subject area, as well as detailed information for each student assessed. This report may include multiple pages to report all subscore groupings and GLCEs. This report will be sorted by class/group code (if a Class/Group ID Sheet was returned to the scoring contractor or a class/group code was added during Tested Roster). The Writing Class Roster reports the multiple choice test items results on the first page of the report. The second roster page will display the Narrative, Informational, and Peer Response results for each student. Science results are displayed by form number.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the grade level reported, the assessment cycle, the subject area and, for science, the form number. The teacher name, class/group code, the school name and code, and the district name and code are also provided.

Section B lists each student's name followed by their Unique Identification Code (UIC), and Date of Birth (DOB). The scale score and performance level attained by the student for the current year are reported for all subjects. The previous year performance level, as well as the performance level change, is reported for mathematics and reading.

If a student's test was marked invalid, a reason code is reported in place of the scale score. Descriptions of the codes are listed at the bottom of the page. Performance data is not provided for invalid tests in Section C . Invalid scores are not included in mean calculations.

Section C provides the following information for each subscore grouping and GLCE, detailed by student:

- GLCE assessed
- Number of points possible
- Number of points earned by the student
- Reading constructed response and writing prompt rubric scores and condition codes for reading and writing

Students who were assessed with a braille or an emergency test form are indicated with an asterisk. While the scale scores for these students are reported and included in the scale score mean calculations, they are not included in the more detailed subscore reporting and calculations.

Section D reports the number of students assessed within each class/group code and the mean score for each subscore grouping and GLCE. As stated above, students with invalid tests are not included in the mean calculations.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

CLASS ROSTER

A

**Grade 08
Fall 2012
Science
Form 01**



Teacher Name: **LASTNAME, FIRSTNAME**
Class/Group: **9999**
School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

Student Information	2012 Scale Score	2012 Performance Level	Science Processes													Physical Science										Continued			
			S.IP.07.11	S.IP.07.13	S.IP.07.14	S.IP.07.16	S.IA.07.11	S.IA.07.13	S.IA.07.14	S.IA.07.15	S.RS.07.11	S.RS.07.12	S.RS.07.13	S.RS.07.15	S.RS.07.18	Discipline Total	P.FM.05.21	P.FM.05.22	P.FM.05.41	P.EN.06.11	P.EN.06.12	P.EN.07.32	P.EN.07.62	P.PM.07.11	P.PM.07.21		P.PM.07.22	P.CM.06.11	P.CM.06.12
Points Possible	804	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
SAMPLE, STUDENT 1 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 12/02/1998	804	4	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5
SAMPLE, STUDENT 2 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 05/01/1999	821	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	8	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 3 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 02/19/1999	821	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 4 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 08/07/1999	843	3	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 5 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 11/26/1999	799	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 6 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 05/15/1999	825	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	8	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 7 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 09/22/1999	843	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 8 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 12/04/1998	791	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 9 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 11/04/1998	849	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	9	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	8	
SAMPLE, STUDENT 10 UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 05/04/1999	828	3	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	
Students Reported = 10																													
Students with Valid Scores = 10																													
Mean	822		1.0	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.6	5.6	

**Student participated using Braille or Emergency test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.
Performance Level
 1 - Advanced (863 - 971)
 2 - Proficient (845 - 862)
 3 - Partially Proficient (826 - 844)
 4 - Not Proficient (668 - 825)

NA - Not Assessed
 NR - Not Attempted
 NS - Nonstandard Accommodation

NV - No Valid Test Score
 OL - Tested in Incorrect Grade
 PB - Prohibited Behavior

Item Analysis Report

The Item Analysis Report provides summary information for each operational multiple choice item and constructed response item on the assessment, including the primary Michigan Grade Level Content Expectation (GLCE) measured by each item. The summary information reports the percentage of students selecting each response and indicates the correct response. The Item Analysis Report is generated for three student populations:

- All Students
- Students with Disabilities
- All Except Students with Disabilities

The aggregate data are reported by class/group, school, district, and state. This report may include multiple pages.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the student population included in the report, the grade level, the assessment cycle, and the subject area. The teacher name, class/group code, the school name and code, the district name and code, and the number of students assessed are also provided. Please note that students who participated using a Braille or Emergency test form, or who are home-schooled, are not included in the assessed count. In addition, only students with valid scores are included in the count.

Section B lists the Item Descriptor Number, reporting category, and GLCE being assessed for each multiple choice item. The Fall 2012 Item Descriptors for each grade level and subject area are posted on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Section C indicates the percentage of students selecting each response to the multiple choice questions in section B. A plus sign (+) denotes the correct response. The percentage of students skipping or omitting an item, as well as the percentage of students filling in multiple bubbles for a given item, are also reported. Science is reported for the total group on the first page, then this is followed by results by form number. Most schools will have Form 1 results along with results for the form assigned to the school/district.

Section D (applies to reading and writing only) lists the Item Descriptor Number, the GLCE being assessed, and the Mean

Score for the constructed response item. The percentage of students achieving each score level are reported, as are the number of student responses that received each condition code. A mean comparison table for the Narrative and Informational Writing prompts is provided at the bottom of the page to facilitate a quick review.

Condition codes provide a reason the student's response received a score of zero (0). Possible condition codes are listed below:

A = Off topic‡

B = Illegible or written in a language other than English

C = Blank

D = Insufficient to rate

E = Incorrect Answer (reading only)

‡ For SWS only, A = Off-topic/Off-task (This applies only to the Student Writing Sample.)

Use of Item Analysis Results

Some assessment items may be particularly difficult or easy. Educators may consider how well their student groups did on an assessment item or subscore grouping in relation to the state results reported. State results provide a good comparison for how easy or difficult an assessment item was for all students.

Some GLCEs may be assessed by only a single item. This may make interpretation of item analysis reports more difficult. However, many GLCEs are assessed by multiple items. In most situations, a larger number of assessment items provides more reliable results which is more likely to support inferences teachers and curriculum leaders might have with regards to student performance at the GLCE, domain, focal point, or content area level.

Therefore, teachers and districts may use the Item Analysis Report to pose a hypothesis about how a group of students performed within a GLCE or a subscore grouping (domain, focal point, or discipline). This hypothesis should be evaluated in light of the number of items assessed and in combination with other assessment and classroom information and professional judgment.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

SCHOOL ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT All Except Students with Disabilities

A **Grade 07**
Fall 2012
Writing



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

No. of Students Assessed = 178

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Writing Genre	7	W.GN.06.01	81+	3	7	8	0	0
Writing Process	1	W.PR.06.01	2	0	8	90+	0	0
Writing Process	3	W.PR.06.01	93+	4	1	2	0	0
Writing Process	10	W.PR.06.01	5	3	83+	8	1	0
Writing Process	9	W.PR.06.02	71+	12	13	3	0	0
Writing Process	8	W.PR.06.05	6	12	75+	7	1	0
Writing Process	16	W.PR.06.05	14	39+	36	11	1	0
Personal Style	2	W.PS.06.01	21	15	53+	11	1	0
Personal Style	5	W.PS.06.01	26	65+	6	3	1	0
Personal Style	14	W.PS.06.01	10	65+	10	15	1	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Grammar and Usage	6	W.GR.06.01	6	4	16	74+	0	0
Grammar and Usage	12	W.GR.06.01	24	12	61+	3	0	0
Grammar and Usage	15	W.GR.06.01	8	15	66+	11	0	0
Spelling	4	W.SP.06.01	2	2	15	81+	0	0
Spelling	11	W.SP.06.01	19	17	24	40+	0	0
Spelling	13	W.SP.06.01	79+	7	12	2	0	0

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE												
Item Descriptor Number	Writing Prompt Trait	GLCE Code	Mean Score	Percent of Students at Each Score Based on 3 or 4-point Rubric					Number of Students Receiving Condition Codes			
				0	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D
				18	Narrative Writing							
	Ideas(score doubled in overall score)	W.GN.06.01	2.2	3	9	56	32					
	Organization	W.PR.06.02	2.3	0	7	57	35					
	Style	W.PS.06.01	2.3	0	7	61	32					
	Conventions	W.GR.06.01	2.3	0	12	47	42					
19	Informational Writing							0	0	0	0	
	Ideas(score doubled in overall score)	W.GN.06.02	1.7	1	38	54	8					
	Organization	W.PR.06.02	1.7	1	37	53	10					
	Style	W.PS.06.01	1.9	0	24	65	11					
	Conventions	W.GR.06.01	2.1	0	22	47	31					
17	Response to Student Writing Sample (SWS)											
	Revise drafts	W.PR.06.02	2.0	3	16	60	19	2	5	0	0	0

Condition Codes:
A = Off-topic ‡
B = Illegible or written in a language other than English
C = Blank
D = Insufficient to rate
‡ For SWS only, A = Off-topic/Off-task

MEANS COMPARISON		
Traits	Narrative Writing	Informational Writing
Ideas	2.2	1.7
Organization	2.3	1.7
Style	2.3	1.9
Conventions	2.3	2.1

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students using a Braille or Emergency test form or with invalid test scores are not included in the Item Analysis Report.

+ = Correct Response
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

DISTRICT ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT Students with Disabilities

A

**Grade 05
Fall 2012
Science**



No. of Students Assessed (All Forms) = 27

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Discipline Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	
Science Processes								
Inquiry Process	4	S.IP.04.12	11	7	4	78+	0	0
Inquiry Process	22	S.IP.04.15	59+	15	4	22	0	0
Inquiry Process	44	S.IP.04.16	33+	15	37	15	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	14	S.IA.04.12	30	19	37	15+	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	21	S.IA.04.13	26	26	22	26+	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	34	S.IA.04.14	15	30	4	52+	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	23	S.RS.04.11	41	4	33+	22	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	25	S.RS.04.15	30+	15	33	22	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	26	S.RS.04.18	19+	44	19	19	0	0
Physical Science								
Forces & Motion	35	P.FM.03.37	15	19	56+	11	0	0
Forces & Motion	37	P.FM.03.38	30	30+	11	30	0	0
Energy	39	P.EN.03.11	19	11	33+	37	0	0
Energy	40	P.EN.03.22	15	33+	19	33	0	0
Energy	42	P.EN.04.51	11	15	63+	11	0	0
Prop. of Matter	6	P.PM.02.13	15	11	63+	11	0	0
Prop. of Matter	8	P.PM.03.51	11	4	85+	0	0	0
Prop. of Matter	9	P.PM.03.52	4	15	15	67+	0	0
Prop. of Matter	11	P.PM.04.23	37+	15	22	26	0	0

B

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Discipline Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	
Physical Science								
Changes in Matter	12	P.CM.04.11	7	7	4	81+	0	0
Life Science								
Org. Living Things	1	L.OL.02.14	52+	0	7	41	0	0
Org. Living Things	3	L.OL.03.32	19	44+	4	30	0	4
Heredity	48	L.HE.02.13	22+	30	11	37	0	0
Evolution	46	L.EV.04.21	15	15	11	59+	0	0
Ecosystems	45	L.EC.04.21	33	15	22	30+	0	0
Earth Science								
Earth Systems	18	E.ES.03.41	19	15		11	0	0
Earth Systems	20	E.ES.03.42	30+	26	22	22	0	0
Solid Earth	15	E.SE.03.13	15	19+	22	44	0	0
Solid Earth	17	E.SE.03.22	26	48+	11	15	0	0
Fluid Earth	27	E.FE.02.12	4	81+	0	15	0	0
Fluid Earth	29	E.FE.02.21	33	7	22	37+	0	0
Earth Space Time	30	E.ST.04.22	33	7	52+	4	0	4
Earth Space Time	32	E.ST.04.24	52+	26	19	4	0	0

C

Continued on next page

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students using a Braille or Emergency test form or with invalid test scores are not included in the Item Analysis Report.

+ = Correct Response
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Summary Report

This multiple page report provides a comparative set of mean scale score information for each grade level, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. The Summary Report is generated for three student populations:

All Students

Students with Disabilities

All Except Students with Disabilities

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (school, district, ISD, or state), the student population reported, the grade level, the assessment cycle, and the subject area. School, district, and ISD names and codes are included.

Section B provides achievement summary data for multiple years for each subject area. The summary data reported includes the year, the number of students assessed, the mean scale score, scale score margin of error, the percentage of students attaining each achievement level, and the percentage of students that achieved proficiency, meaning they attained either a Level 1 (Advanced) or Level 2 (Proficient) for that subject area. The four most current years of summary data are reported. These data have been recalculated using the career- and college-ready cut scores established in September, 2011. Home schooled students are excluded from the students assessed count at all reporting levels. Private school students are included only at the school level. ISD level reports include both LEA districts and charter schools within the ISD boundaries.

Section C provides summary data on student performance level change compared to the previous administration of the reading and mathematics MEAP tests. The summary data includes the current year and the previous year, the number and percentage of students matched across the two administrations, and the percentage of students in each sub-category of performance level change (e.g., Significant Decline, Decline, Maintaining, Improvement, and Significant Improvement) within each subject area.

Section D provides three progress tables with year-to-year transition counts for students in grades 4-8 who were in the previous grade in fall 2011, took the MEAP in both fall 2011 and fall 2012, and had a matching Unique Identification Code (UIC) for both assessment cycles. This data is provided for mathematics and reading. There is no progress table provided for science, social studies, or writing as those subjects are not assessed in each grade. The progress tables provide the number and percentage of students matched between previous and current MEAP administrations.

Section E provides summary data for each subject area score distribution at the school level only. The summary data reported includes the code and descriptor for each GLCE, the number of students assessed (by form number for science), the mean points earned, the total number of points possible, and the percentage of students earning each point value.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

A

All Students
Grade 06
Fall 2012



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

ACHIEVEMENT - SUMMARY

B

	Year	No. of Students Assessed	Scale Score		Performance Levels				
			Mean	Margin of Error	4-Not Proficient	3-Partially Proficient	2-Proficient	1-Advanced	Levels 1 & 2
			(490-730)		(490-601)	(602-618)	(619-652)	(653-730)	(619-730)
READING	2012	34	619	612-626	24%	26%	41%	9%	50%
	2011	44	628	619-637	23%	25%	20%	32%	52%
	2010	44	613	606-620	39%	23%	36%	2%	39%
	2009	51	621	612-630	25%	29%	20%	25%	45%
MATHEMATICS	2012	34	621	615-628	35%	29%	35%	0%	35%
	2011	43	620	615-625	37%	30%	33%	0%	33%
	2010	44	610	605-615	59%	23%	18%	0%	18%
	2009	51	632	624-640	31%	10%	55%	4%	59%
SOCIAL STUDIES	2012	36	613	609-616	6%	75%	19%	0%	19%
	2011	43	650	646-654	0%	2%	26%	72%	98%
	2010	44	603	597-609	27%	61%	11%	0%	11%
	2009	50	608	600-616	38%	32%	30%	0%	30%

FALL 2011 to FALL 2012 PERFORMANCE LEVEL CHANGE COUNTS (PERCENTS)

C

	Student Group	Performance Level Change Category				
		Significant Decline	Decline	Maintaining	Improvement	Significant Improvement
READING	Not Previously Proficient	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	7 (41%)	5 (29%)	4 (24%)
	Previously Proficient	5 (31%)	5 (31%)	5 (31%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
	All Students	5 (15%)	6 (18%)	12 (36%)	6 (18%)	4 (12%)
MATHEMATICS	Not Previously Proficient	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	17 (61%)	6 (21%)
	Previously Proficient	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
	All Students	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	4 (13%)	19 (59%)	6 (19%)

NOTE: 33 students (97%) were successfully matched from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012

NOTE: 32 students (94%) were successfully matched from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012

NA - Not Applicable.
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.
This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students



Grade 06
Fall 2012
Reading



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 MEAP Reading Transition Counts

Fall 2011 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2012 MEAP Reading Performance Level								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Not Proficient	Low	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
	High	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
Partially Proficient	Low	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
	High	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Proficient	Low	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	Mid	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	0
Advanced	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

NOTE: 33 students (97.1%) were successfully matched from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012

Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 MEAP Reading Transition Percents

Fall 2011 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2012 MEAP Reading Performance Level								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Not Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	6.1	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proficient	Low	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	6.1	9.1	6.1	0.0
Advanced	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1

Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 MEAP Reading Transition Percents in Each Row

Fall 2011 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2012 MEAP Reading Performance Level								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Not Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proficient	Low	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0
	Mid	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	22.2	33.3	22.2	0.0
Advanced	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Demographic Report

The Demographic Report provides a summary breakdown of scores by demographic subgroup for each subject area assessed. Summary data reported includes the number of students assessed in each subgroup, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each performance level, and the percentage of students in the “Advanced” and “Proficient” performance levels (Levels 1 & 2) within each subject area. The Demographic Report is generated for three student populations:

- All Students
- Students with Disabilities
- All Except Students with Disabilities

The demographic subgroup scores are aggregated by school, district, ISD, and state. The demographic subgroups are:

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Economically Disadvantaged (ED)
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Formerly Limited English Proficient (FLEP)
- Migrant
- Homeless

Accommodations subgroups are also reported as follows:

- Standard Accommodations (All Students)
- Non-Standard Accommodations (All Students)
- Standard Accommodations (for English Language Learners)
- Non-Standard Accommodations (for English Language Learners)

Please note the following: 1) summary scores are not provided for subgroups containing less than ten students, 2) home schooled students are not reported, 3) private school students are only reported at the school level, and 4) students with invalid tests are included only in the Non-Standard Accommodations subgroups. There is not a separate reporting subgroup for students enrolled in the district less than one full academic year (LTFAY); all students who tested, unless specified above, are reported. The determination of LTFAY for Scorecard purposes will be calculated separately from the enrollment data submitted via the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS).

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (school, district, ISD, or state), the student population included in the report, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. School, district, and ISD names and codes are included, as applicable.

Section B lists the demographic subgroups, as well as the total student population being reported. Ethnicity subgroups are defined by federal requirements.

Section C reports the number of students included in the subgroup, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each performance level, and the percentage of students in the “Advanced” and Proficient” performance levels (Levels 1 & 2) within each subject area.

Note: Results are not reported for groups of <10.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



ISD Name: **SAMPLE ISD**
ISD Code: **99**

ISD DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT Students with Disabilities



A **Grade 08**
Fall 2012

ISD	READING							MATHEMATICS							SCIENCE							
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at			No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at			No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at			
					Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*					Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*					Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*	
Total Students with Disabilities	1802	804	41	34	22	2	24	1808	796	82	12	5	1	6	2262	800	90	7	2	1	3	
Gender																						
Male	1196	803	44	32	22	2	24	1207	797	80	13	5	2	7	1485	801	89	8	3	1	4	
Female	606	805	36	40	22	1	24	601	793	86	10	3	0	4	777	797	94	5	2	0	2	
Ethnicity																						
American Indian or Alaska Native	<							<							10	802	90	10	0	0	0	
Asian	14	822	21	29	36	14	50	14	817	50	14	29	7	36	19	809	68	21	11	0	11	
Black or African American	823	797	53	33	14	0	14	826	793	92	7	2	0	2	1079	794	97	3	0	0	0	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<							<							<							
White	845	809	32	35	30	4	33	846	801	74	16	7	2	10	1006	806	83	11	4	2	6	
Two or More Races	26	808	27	42	31	0	31	25	795	88	12	0	0	0	30	799	97	3	0	0	0	
Hispanic of Any Race	88	803	36	40	24	0	24	91	798	80	14	3	2	5	118	798	94	3	2	1	3	
Additional Reporting Groups																						
Economically Disadvantaged	Yes	1204	800	47	34	18	1	19	1215	792	88	10	2	0	3	1538	797	95	4	1	0	1
	No	598	810	29	36	30	4	35	593	803	71	16	10	3	13	724	807	81	12	5	2	7
English Language Learners	Yes	121	797	50	35	15	0	15	127	792	88	9	2	0	2	153	796	96	4	0	0	0
	No	1681	804	41	34	23	2	25	1681	796	82	12	5	1	6	2109	800	90	7	2	1	3
Formerly Limited English Proficient		<						<							<							
Migrant		<						<							<							
Homeless		22	801	41	36	23	0	23	22	788	91	9	0	0	0	25	795	96	4	0	0	0
Accommodations																						
Standard - All		324	803	44	32	23	1	24	803	793	87	9	3	0	3	1092	798	94	4	1	0	1
Nonstandard - All **		<						<							<							
Standard - ELL Only		<						21	793	81	14	5	0	5	28	798	96	4	0	0	0	
Nonstandard - ELL Only **		<						<							<							

Performance Level
1 & 2 - Advanced and Proficient
1 - Advanced
2 - Proficient
3 - Partially Proficient
4 - Not Proficient

< - No scores or percents provided if less than 10 students.
* Value may not equal the exact sum of Level 1 & Level 2 due to rounding.
** Results for these students are invalid and not reported. They are not included in the Total Students count.

Comprehensive Report

The Comprehensive Report provides mean scale score and performance level information for each grade level by subject area. The District Comprehensive Report lists data for the district, followed by each public school and Public School Academy (PSA) that is part of the district. The ISD Comprehensive Report provides the data for the ISD as a whole and for each district and Public School Academy within the ISD. Home schooled and private school students are not included on the Comprehensive Report. Only students with valid tests are included in the Number of Students Assessed count.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (District or ISD), the student population included in the report, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. District and ISD names and codes are included as applicable.

Section B identifies the ISD, district, and schools as determined by the report aggregation (District or ISD).

Section C provides the number of students assessed, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each proficiency level, and the percentage of students that met or exceeded grade level expectations for Michigan students within each subject area.

Note: Results are not reported for entities with <10 students.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
 District Code: **99999**

DISTRICT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT

A

All Students

Grade 04
 Fall 2012



District	READING							WRITING					MATHEMATICS								
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *
SAMPLE DISTRICT	883	420	14	36	47	2	49	885	390	7	64	24	5	29	897	416	62	17	20	1	21
SAMPLE SCHOOL 1	86	415	14	41	45	0	45	86	388	5	76	16	3	20	88	415	67	19	14	0	14
SAMPLE SCHOOL 2	11	427	0	36	64	0	64	11	395	0	64	36	0	36	12	422	58	8	33	0	33
SAMPLE SCHOOL 3	46	411	22	46	33	0	33	47	386	6	70	19	4	23	46	409	80	9	11	0	11
SAMPLE SCHOOL 4	63	417	16	36	46	0	46	62	392	3	66	27	3	31	63	418	65	14	21	0	21
SAMPLE SCHOOL 5	101	423	9	39	50	2	52	101	390	5	59	32	4	36	101	415	62	16	20	2	22
SAMPLE SCHOOL 6	95	435	7	27	57	8	65	95	399	1	54	37	8	45	95	425	45	19	35	1	36
SAMPLE SCHOOL 7	78	408	32	33	35	0	35	80	376	21	64	13	3	15	88	410	69	9	22	0	22
SAMPLE SCHOOL 8	202	417	15	42	43	0	43	202	385	8	72	19	1	20	203	415	64	20	15	1	16
SAMPLE SCHOOL 9	56	421	13	32	54	2	55	56	389	4	73	20	4	23	56	416	68	20	11	2	13
SAMPLE SCHOOL 10	108	423	15	31	51	3	54	108	396	6	53	33	8	42	108	417	57	22	20	0	20
SAMPLE SCHOOL 11	37	437	3	22	68	8	76	37	406	5	43	27	24	51	37	429	46	16	32	5	38

Performance Level
 1 & 2 - Advanced and Proficient
 1 - Advanced
 2 - Proficient
 3 - Partially Proficient
 4 - Not Proficient

~ No summary scores provided if less than 10 students.
 * Value may not equal the exact sum of Level 1 & Level 2 due to rounding.

Section 4: Additional Sources of Assessment Results

To access Fall 2012 MEAP results, there are several options available to you. These options include the following:

1. BAA Secure Site Data files

Three data files are available for download from the BAA Secure Site Student Test Scores window for authorized school and district users. The BAA Secure Site can be accessed by authorized users. (www.michigan.gov/baa-secure)

These files are:

- Student Data File— includes individual student test results and performance
- Aggregate Data File—includes aggregated school, district, or ISD assessment results
- Student Analysis File Extract (SAFE) - contains item level data for each student with a valid test score in a given subject

2. MI School Data

MI School Data is an online portal that provides views of Michigan education data to help make informed educational decisions, to help improve instruction and to enable school systems to prepare a higher percentage of students to succeed in rigorous high school courses, college and challenging careers. (www.michigan.gov/mischooldata)

3. Writing CDs

CDs containing the images of the 4th and 7th grade writing responses will be mailed to MEAP District Coordinators in the first quarter of the calendar year. The CDs are produced by school and, in addition to the student responses to the writing prompts, will

include scoring guides for each of the three types of writing prompts. The scoring guides for writing on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

4. MEAP Downloadable Data Files

There are a number of downloadable files available to the public from the Downloadable Data Files link on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap). These files include gap analysis, demographics, and proficiency comparisons for both public and non-public schools. These files will be made available when MEAP results are released to the public.

5. Public Interface to the BAA Secure Site

The Demographic Report (described on pages 36 – 38 of this guide) can be accessed through a public interface on the BAA Secure Site. This report can be filtered by State, ISD, District, or School. The interface can be accessed from the MEAP Test Results link on the MEAP web site (www.michigan.gov/meap).

Contact Information

School administrators, teachers, and counselors should become familiar with the report layouts and information contained in this document. If you have questions after reviewing this Guide to Reports, or need additional information about MEAP administration procedures, content, scheduling, appropriate assessment of or accommodations for students with disabilities or English language learners (ELLs), please contact the Michigan Department of Education, Bureau of Assessment and Accountability, using the contact information listed below:

Bureau of Assessment and Accountability

Joseph Martineau, Executive Director

Vincent Dean, Director, Office of Standards and Assessment

James Griffiths, Manager, Assessment Administration and Reporting

Gayle de Jong, MEAP Project Manager, Test Administration and Reporting

Kate Cermak, Analyst, Test Administration and Reporting

Andrew Middlestead, Manager, Test Development

Rodger Epp, Science Consultant

Vacant, Writing and Social Studies Consultant

Kyle Ward, Mathematics Consultant

John Jaquith, Assessment Consultant for Students with Disabilities

Jennifer Paul, Assessment Consultant for English Language Learners

Steven Viger, Manager, Psychometrics, Accountability, Research & Evaluation

Phone: 1-877-560-8378, option 2

Fax: 517-335-1186

Web site: www.michigan.gov/meap

E-mail: BAA@michigan.gov