



Guide to Reports



Fall 2011

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
Fall 2011 Highlights	3
Writing.....	3
Science.....	3
Item Descriptors.....	4
Fall 2011 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 2011 - 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 Label	16
Parent Report	18
Class Roster.....	22
Item Analysis Report.....	26
Summary Report	32
Demographic Report.....	36
Comprehensive Report.....	39
Section 4: Additional Sources of Assessment Results	41
Contact Information	42

Section 1— Introduction

This guide was developed to assist educators in understanding and using the Fall 2011 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) results. Reports prepared for the MEAP include both individual level (Individual Student Report, Parent Report, Class Roster, Student 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 reports 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 2011 Highlights

Cut Scores

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 are noticeable higher than the previous. The new cut scores have been applied to previous years' data allowing for meaningful trend comparisons. Additional information on the new cut scores can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Science

The Fall 2011 science test had matrixed operational items. This means that some operational items appeared only on certain forms of the test. The result of this matrix design is that science is reported by form number. Some reports, such as the Item Analysis Report and the Class Roster, reflect these groupings.

Item Descriptors

MEAP Item Descriptor documents will be available for each grade level and each subject area assessed in fall 2011. 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 2011 MEAP administration. They 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 2011 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 and continue to not be reported on aggregated reports.

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 2011 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 2011, 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 included in this guide; 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

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

panel recommends the score that best separates each performance level from the next to the Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent of Public Instruction 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. The writing cut scores were adopted in early 2011 following this process.

The new career- and college-ready cut scores established in September of 2011 for reading, mathematics, science, and social studies were the result of an intensive collaborative research study conducted by ACT, the National Center for Educational Achievement (NCEA) and the BAA Measurement Research and Psychometric unit with significant contributions from the BAA Technical Advisory Committee, Michigan's institutes of higher education, and others. Additional information regarding the new cut scores can be found on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

**MEAP Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges
Fall 2011 – Grades 3-9**

Subject	Grade	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
		Not Proficient	Partially Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
Mathematics	3	205 - 321	322 - 335	336 - 370	371 - 427
	4	285 - 422	423 - 433	434 - 469	470 - 554
	5	358 - 515	516 - 530	531 - 583	584 - 671
	6	472 - 613	614 - 628	629 - 674	675 - 762
	7	581 - 713	714 - 730	731 - 775	776 - 873
	8	676 - 808	809 - 829	830 - 864	865 - 961
Reading	3	194 - 300	301 - 323	324 - 363	364 - 417
	4	285 - 394	395 - 418	419 - 477	478 - 529
	5	385 - 500	501 - 520	521 - 564	565 - 631
	6	491 - 601	602 - 618	619 - 652	653 - 726
	7	574 - 697	698 - 720	721 - 759	760 - 824
	8	690 - 795	796 - 817	818 - 852	853 - 921
Science	5	351 - 525	526 - 552	553 - 566	567 - 666
	8	665 - 825	826 - 844	845 - 862	863 - 969
Social Studies	6	483 - 592	593 - 624	625 - 648	649 - 734
	9	778 - 898	899 - 927	928 - 959	960 - 1045
Writing	4	261 - 361	362 - 399	400 - 428	429 - 512
	7	536 - 665	666 - 699	700 - 732	733 - 804

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Ranges within 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	205-301	302-312	313-321	322-328	329-335	336-344	345-355	356-370	371-427
	4	285-400	401-412	413-422	423-427	428-433	434-443	444-455	456-469	470-554
	5	358-482	483-500	501-515	516-522	523-530	531-545	546-563	564-583	584-671
	6	472-585	586-600	601-613	614-620	621-628	629-641	642-656	657-674	675-762
	7	581-685	686-700	701-713	714-721	722-730	731-743	744-758	759-775	776-873
	8	676-784	785-797	798-808	809-818	819-829	830-840	841-851	852-864	865-961
Reading	3	194-275	276-288	289-300	301-311	312-323	324-335	336-348	349-363	364-417
	4	285-362	363-379	380-394	395-406	407-418	419-434	435-452	453-477	478-529
	5	385-474	475-488	489-500	501-510	511-520	521-532	533-546	547-564	565-631
	6	491-579	580-591	592-601	602-609	610-618	619-628	629-639	640-652	653-726
	7	574-672	673-685	686-697	698-708	709-720	721-732	733-745	746-759	760-824
	8	690-772	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 2011 Item Descriptor booklets can be found, once available, 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: **LastNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FirstNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**
District Student ID: **12345678901234567890** Date of Birth: **01/01/1900** State UIC: **1234567890**
Gender: **F** Ethnicity: **White**
English Language Learner: **N** Formerly LEP: **N** SpecEd: **N**
Accommodations: **None**

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT

Social Studies

A

Grade 06
Fall 2011

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



B

Summary of Social Studies Results

Subject	Score	2012 Achievement Performance Level
Social Studies	596	3-Partially Proficient

GLCE Code	DOMAIN Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points	GLCE Code	DOMAIN Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
	HISTORY	8/19		CIVICS/GOVERNMENT	2/10
3H3.0.05	Use text: how Am. Ind. & settlers adapted to environ	0/1	4C2.0.02	Identify contexts when specific rights are involved	0/1
3H3.0.06	Describe Interactions: Amer. Indians and Europeans	0/1	3C3.0.01	Distinguish roles of state and local government	0/1
3H3.0.09	Describe how Michigan attained statehood	0/1	4C3.0.01	Give examples how Constitution limits fed. powers	0/1
3H3.0.10	Create a timeline to sequence early Michigan history	1/1	4C3.0.02	Give examples of federal and state powers	0/1
4H3.0.03	How does location of nat. resources affect MI after 1837	1/1	4C3.0.04	Describe the three branches of US federal government	1/1
4H3.0.08	Describe past/current threats to MI nat resources	0/1	4C3.0.07	Explain fed. tax use to serve purposes of government	0/1
5U1.1.01	Use maps to locate peoples in various US regions	1/1	3C5.0.01	Identify rights and responsibilities of citizenship	0/1
5U1.1.02	Compare Amer. Indians in Southwest/Pacific Northwest	1/1	4C5.0.01	Explain responsibilities of citizenship	0/1
5U1.2.02	Use case studies: compare goals of European explorers	0/1	4C5.0.02	Describe rights/responsibilities of citizenship	0/1
5U1.3.01	Use maps to locate the major regions of Africa	0/1			
5U1.4.02	Compare Europe/Am. Indian/Africa: N. America post 1492	0/1		ECONOMICS	4/7
5U1.4.04	Describe Columbian Exchange impact on three worlds	1/1	3E1.0.01	How scarcity, opportunity cost and choice affect MI	1/1
5U2.3.02	Describe daily life of NE/Middle/Southern colonists	0/1	3E1.0.04	Describe how entrepreneurs produce goods/services	1/1
5U3.1.04	Describe impact of First/Second Continental Congress	1/1	4E1.0.02	Describe some characteristics of a market economy	0/1
5U3.1.05	How Declaration/Independ explained need to separate	1/1	4E1.0.04	Explain how price affects decisions about purchasing	1/1
5U3.1.06	Identify individuals leading American Revolution	0/1	4E1.0.06	Explain how competition affects higher/lower prices	1/1
5U3.3.05	Why Framers wanted to limit the power of government	0/1	4E1.0.08	Explain why public goods are not privately owned	0/1
5U3.3.07	Describe need for Individual rights/Bill of Rights	0/1	3E2.0.01	How specialization affects MI Interdependence	0/1
5U3.3.08	Describe rights found in 1st/2nd/3rd/4th Amendments	1/1			
	GEOGRAPHY	2/7		KNOW, PROC, SKILLS	1/2
3G1.0.02	Use thematic maps: describe Michigan characteristics	0/1	5P3.1.02	Analyze current public issue related to Constitution	0/1
4G1.0.05	Use maps: describe US elevation, climate, population	0/1	5P3.1.03	How values affect differences: constitutional issues	1/1
4G2.0.01	Describe ways US can be divided into regions	0/1			
4G2.0.02	Compare Michigan region to another US region	0/1			
4G4.0.02	Describe: Immigration affects US cultural development	1/1			
3G5.0.02	Describe uses of Michigan natural resources	1/1			
4G5.0.01	Assess effects of human activity on US environment	0/1			
	CIVICS/GOVERNMENT	2/10			
3C1.0.01	Give example: how state govment fulfills its purpose	1/1			

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



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

Student Name: **LastNameXXXXXXXXXXXX, FirstNameXXXXXXXXXXXX X**
District Student ID: **12345678901234567890** Date of Birth: **01/01/1900** State UIC: **1234567890**
Gender: **M** Ethnicity: **Asian**
English Language Learner: **N** Formerly LEP: **N** SpecEd: **N**
Accommodations: **None**

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT

Writing

A Grade 07
Fall 2011

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



Summary of Writing Results

Subject	Score	2012 Achievement Performance Level
Writing	673	3-Partially Proficient

MULTIPLE CHOICE		
GLCE Code	DOMAIN Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
	WRITING GENRE	0/1
W.GN.06.02	Produce writing w/ or ID org. that supports ideas	0/1
	WRITING PROCESS	3/6
W.PR.06.01	Consider audience and purpose for writing	1/2
W.PR.06.02	Apply or ID a variety of pre-writing strategies	0/1
W.PR.06.03	Revise drafts for clarity, coherence and consistency	1/2
W.PR.06.05	Proofread and edit writing	1/1
	PERSONAL STYLE	1/3
W.PS.06.01	ID/exhibit style/voice to enhance written message	1/3
	GRAMMAR AND USAGE	1/3
W.GR.06.01	Write with or ID correct grammar and usage	1/3
	SPELLING	1/3
W.SP.06.01	Spell frequently misspelled words correctly	1/3

* Condition Code present, Earned Points equal zero.

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE		
GLCE Code	WRITING PROMPT Trait	Condition Code* Earned / Possible Points
	NARRATIVE WRITING	D
W.GN.06.01	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	0/3
W.PR.06.02	Organization	1/3
W.PS.06.01	Style	2/3
W.GR.06.01	Conventions	2/3
	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	2/3
W.GR.06.01	Conventions	2/3
	RESPONSE TO STUDENT WRITING SAMPLE (SWS)	
W.PR.06.03	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 2011 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 DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX				
99999 SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX				
LNAMEXXXXXXXX, FNAMEXXX X				
UIC# 9999999999		STU# 12345678901234567890		
DOB: 01/01/2001	Subject	SS	Performance Level	Perf. Level Change
Gender: F	Reading	530	2-Proficient	I
Grade: 5	Writing			
	Mathematics	577	1-Advanced	SI
Fall 2011	Science	482	3-Partially Proficient	
meap [™]	Social Studies			

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 information on the career- and college-ready cut scores implemented for the fall 2011 assessment cycle.

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.

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


Section F continued

Fc consists of more detailed information regarding the student's performance. Each subject area is divided into sub score 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) is 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 2011



A

School Name: Sample SchoolName
School Code: 99999

Report For:
FIRSTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX X LASTNAMEXXXXXXXX
UIC: 1234567890

Dear Parent or Guardian:

In September of 2011, the State Board of Education adopted cut scores on the MEAP that reflect more rigorous expectations of student achievement. Cut scores are the level of achievement needed to attain Partial Proficiency, Proficiency, and Advanced performance levels. These new cut scores are being used in Mathematics, Reading, Science, and Social Studies beginning with the MEAP assessment administered to students in October 2011.

One of the purposes of the new cut scores is to provide teachers, students, and parents with a more accurate reporting as to how students are progressing toward Career and College Readiness. We want your child, and every child in Michigan, to have the knowledge and skills for the high-tech jobs of the 21st century.


Please take an active role in your child's education. Read to your children. Take them to a local library, have books in your home, and explore educational websites on the Internet that interest them. I suggest going to the Michigan e-library website (www.mel.org) for fun and useful educational links for your kids. Ask your children about their school work every day and help them with their homework. Children need your interest and involvement in their education.

This fall, schools administered the MEAP assessments to students in grades 3 through 9. Students took the reading and mathematics assessments in all grades 3 through 8. Students took writing assessments in grades 4 and 7, science in grades 5 and 8, and social studies in grades 6 and 9.

Within each performance level (Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced), information has been included to encourage support for continued excellence and to provide intervention for students who did not achieve grade level expectations. Please take a moment to review this information shown on the right-hand side of this page.

We encourage you to discuss the MEAP results, including the new performance level cut scores, with teachers and other school professionals who know your student personally. Parents and teachers have a greater opportunity to help students succeed when they work together to encourage student learning.

Sincerely,



Michael P. Fianagan
 Superintendent of Public Instruction
 State of Michigan

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.

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	2011 Achievement		Comments
	Score	Performance Level	
Reading	459	2-Proficient	New cut scores related to Career and College Readiness are in effect beginning with the Fall 2011 MEAP. These new cut scores require students to attain a higher score than in the past in order to reach the Partially Proficient, Proficient, or Advanced performance levels in Mathematics, Reading, Science and Social Studies. Because the level of achievement needed to attain these performance levels is higher this year than in the past, your student's performance level may be lower than it was in previous years.
Writing	442	1-Advanced	
Mathematics	432	3-Partially Proficient	

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

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 domain 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
		459	
260	390	419	529

Reading Domains	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Word Recognition & Word Study	3	4	75%
Narrative Text	6	7	86%
Informational Text	3	3	100%
Comprehension	17	19	90%

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
		442	
264	392	400	522

Writing Prompts (30 points)					
	Ideas	Organization	Style	Conventions	Condition Code
Narrative Writing	6/6	3/3	3/3	2/3	
Informational Writing	4/6	2/3	2/3	2/3	

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)				
	Writing Process	Style	Grammar and Usage	Spelling
Earned/Points Possible	6/6	2/2	5/5	3/3
Revise drafts	2/4			

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 PARTIALLY PROFICIENT LEVEL:
Requires assistance to improve achievement. The student demonstrated only partial understanding of the mathematical skills and concepts needed to solve problems consistent with grade level expectations.

L4 Not Proficient	L3	L2	L1 Advanced
		432	
260	423	434	470

Mathematics Focal Points	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Understanding of Fractions	8	9	89%
Multiplication and Division	5	12	42%
Properties of 2D, 3D Shapes	6	13	46%
Understanding Area, Perimeter	5	13	46%
Connections	8	12	67%

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 (see two-page samples on the following pages). 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 2011
SCIENCE
Form 03



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

Student Information	2011 Scale Score	2011 Performance Level	Science Processes													Physical Science												
			S.IP.07.12	S.IP.07.13	S.IP.07.14	S.IP.07.16	S.IA.06.14	S.IA.07.11	S.IA.07.13	S.IA.07.15	S.RS.07.11	S.RS.07.14	S.RS.07.16	S.RS.07.17	S.RS.07.19	Discipline Total	P.FM.05.21	P.FM.05.34	P.FM.05.42	P.EN.06.41	P.EN.07.31	P.EN.07.33	P.EN.07.61	P.FM.07.23	P.FM.07.24	P.OM.06.12	P.OM.07.21	Discipline Total
Points Possible			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	13
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	797	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	788	4	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	779	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	749	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	667	4																										
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	789	4																										
Students Reported = 21																												
Students with Valid Scores = 21																												
Mean	815	NA	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	7.1	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.8	0.5	6.2

** Student participated using Braille or Emergency test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.

Performance Level	Science Scale Score Range
1-Advanced	(863 - 962)
2-Proficient	(845 - 862)
3-Partially Proficient	(826 - 844)
4-Not Proficient	(718 - 825)

NA - Not Applicable
NS - Nonstandard Accommodation
NV - No Valid Test Score
OL - Tested in Incorrect Grade
PB - Prohibited Behavior

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



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

CLASS ROSTER

Grade 04
Fall 2011
WRITING



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

Student Information	2011 Scale Score	2011 Performance Level	MULTIPLE CHOICE										Continued
			Writing Process				Personal Style		Grammar and Usage		Spelling		
			W.PR.03.01	W.PR.03.02	W.PR.03.04	Domain Total	W.PS.03.01	Domain Total	W.GU.03.01	Domain Total	W.SP.03.01	Domain Total	
Points Possible			1	1	4	6	2	2	5	5	3	3	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX JIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	395	3	1	1	4	6	2	2	4	4	1	1	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX JIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	395	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX JIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	403	2	1	1	3	5	1	1	2	2	2	2	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX JIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	400	2	1	0	3	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX JIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	362	3			**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX JIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	406	2			**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Students Reported = 21													
Students with Valid Scores = 21													
Mean	419	NA	0.9	0.8	3.6	5.4	1.8	1.8	4.4	4.4	2.6	2.6	

** Student participated using Braille or Emergency test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.

Performance Level **Writing Scale Score Range**
1-Advanced (429 - 552)
2-Proficient (400 - 428)
3-Partially Proficient (362 - 399)
4-Not Proficient (264 - 361)

Note: These domain totals include multiple choice scores only.

NA - Not Applicable
NS - Nonstandard Accommodation
NV - No Valid Test Score
OI - Tested in Incorrect Grade
PB - Prohibited Behavior

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



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

CLASS ROSTER

A

**Grade 04
Fall 2011
WRITING**



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

Student Information	2011 Scale Score	2011 Performance Level	CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE													
			Narrative Writing					Informational Writing					Student Writing Sample (SWS)			
			Ideas W.GN.03.01 <small>(# of scores contribute to the overall score)</small>	Organization W.PR.03.02	Style W.PS.03.01	Conventions W.GR.03.01	Condition Code	Ideas W.GN.03.03 <small>(# of scores contribute to the overall score)</small>	Organization W.PR.03.02	Style W.PS.03.01	Conventions W.GR.03.01	Condition Code	Revise Drafts W.PR.03.04	Condition Code		
Points Possible continued			3	3	3	3					3	3	3	3		4
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIIC: 12345678 DOB: 01/01/1900	395	3	1	2	2	2					1	1	1	1		2
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIIC: 123456789 DOB: 01/01/1900	395	3	3	3	3	3					2	2	2	2		3
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	403	2	2	2	2	2					2	2	1	2		2
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	400	2	2	2	2	2					2	1	2	2		2
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	362	3									**				**	**
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	406	2									**				**	**
Students Reported = 21																
Students with Valid Scores = 21																
Mean	419	NA	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.2					2.2	1.8	2.0	2.1		1.9

** Student participated using Braille or Emergency test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.
Performance Level
 1-Advanced (429 - 532)
 2-Proficient (400 - 429)
 3-Partially Proficient (382 - 399)
 4-Not Proficient (284 - 381)
Writing Scale Score Range
 (429 - 532)
 (400 - 429)
 (382 - 399)
 (284 - 381)
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

NA - Not Applicable
 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 is 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 2011 Item Descriptors for each grade level and subject area will be posted as they become available 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). The fall 2011 condition codes are as following:

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**

CLASS ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT All Except Students with Disabilities

Grade 06
Fall 2011
READING



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

No. of Students Assessed = 14

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Word Study	15	R.WS.05.02	14	36+	21	29	0	0
Word Study	2	R.WS.05.07	7	50+	29	14	0	0
Word Study	10	R.WS.05.07	14	14	50+	7	7	7
Word Study	29	R.WS.05.07	7	21	21	50+	0	0
Narrative Text	1	R.NT.05.03	14	21	29+	29	0	7
Narrative Text	4	R.NT.05.03	14	57+	14	14	0	0
Narrative Text	5	R.NT.05.03	50+	14	7	14	14	0
Narrative Text	7	R.NT.05.03	14	14	43+	29	0	0
Narrative Text	30	R.NT.05.03	36+	21	36	7	0	0
Narrative Text	3	R.NT.05.04	36+	21	21	1	7	0
Narrative Text	6	R.NT.05.04	21	14	43+	21	0	0
Narrative Text	16	R.NT.05.04	21	21	43+	14	0	0
Informational Text	23	R.IT.05.01	43+	21	7	29	0	0
Informational Text	9	R.IT.05.03	57+	7	21	14	0	0
Comprehension	11	R.CM.05.02	50+	21	14	14	0	0
Comprehension	12	R.CM.05.02	36	7	29+	21	0	7
Comprehension	13	R.CM.05.02	7	36	21	36+	0	0
Comprehension	26	R.CM.05.02	29+	14	29	7	7	14

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Comprehension	27	R.CM.05.02	7	64+	14	14	0	0
Comprehension	28	R.CM.05.02	50+	14	7	14	7	7
Comprehension	8	R.CM.05.03	14	43+	7	36	0	0
Comprehension	14	R.CM.05.03	21	7	14	57+	0	0
Comprehension	17	R.CM.05.03	7	64+	14	7	7	0
Comprehension	18	R.CM.05.03	14	21	7	57+	0	0
Comprehension	19	R.CM.05.03	29	29	36+	7	0	0
Comprehension	20	R.CM.05.03	64+	14	14	7	0	0
Comprehension	21	R.CM.05.03	43+	14	21	14	7	0
Comprehension	22	R.CM.05.03	57+	14	14	7	0	7
Comprehension	24	R.CM.05.03	36+	7	14	21	7	14
Comprehension	25	R.CM.05.03	7	36+	29	29	0	0

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE												
Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	Mean Score	Percent of Students at Each Score Based on 3-point Rubric				Number of Students Receiving Condition Codes					
			0	1	2	3	A	B	C	D	E	
31	R.NT.05.03	1.5	21	21	43	14	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

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

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



SCHOOL ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

All Students

A Grade 04
Fall 2011
WRITING



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOLNAME**
School Code: **99999**

No. of Students Assessed = 19

MULTIPLE CHOICE							
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING				
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %
Writing Process	5	W.PR.03.01	5	5	0	89+	0
Writing Process	2	W.PR.03.02	5	84+	0	11	0
Writing Process	4	W.PR.03.04	16	0	84+	0	0
Writing Process	5	W.PR.03.04	5	0	95+	0	0
Writing Process	8	W.PR.03.04	11	89+	0	0	0
Writing Process	17	W.PR.03.04	95+	0	0	5	0
Personal Style	9	W.PS.03.01	5	5	0	89+	0
Personal Style	11	W.PS.03.01	0	95+	0	5	0
Grammar and Usage	7	W.GR.03.01	89+	0	5	0	5
Grammar and Usage	12	W.GR.03.01	84+	5	0	5	5

MULTIPLE CHOICE							
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING				
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %
Grammar and Usage	13	W.GR.03.01	84+	0	5	11	0
Grammar and Usage	15	W.GR.03.01	5	0	0	0	0
Grammar and Usage	16	W.GR.03.01	11	5	0	0	0
Spelling	3	W.SP.03.01	89+	0	5	5	0
Spelling	10	W.SP.03.01	79+	16	5	0	0
Spelling	14	W.SP.03.01	0	0	11	89+	0

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE														
Item Descriptor Number	Writing Prompt Trail	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		
1	Narrative Writing													
	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	W.GN.03.01	2.1	0	11	74	16							
	Organization	W.PR.03.02	2.2	0	5	74	21							
	Style	W.PS.03.01	2.1	0	11	74	16							
	Conventions	W.GR.03.01	2.2	0	16	53	32							
19	Informational Writing													
	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	W.GN.03.03	2.2	0	5	74	21							
	Organization	W.PR.03.02	1.8	0	21	74	5							
	Style	W.PS.03.01	2.0	0	11	79	11							
	Conventions	W.GR.03.01	2.1	0	16	58	26							
18	Response to Student Writing Sample (SWS)													
	Revise drafts	W.PR.03.04	1.9	16	0	58	26	0	3	0	0	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	2.1	2.2
Organization	2.2	1.8
Style	2.1	2.0
Conventions	2.2	2.1

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students who participated using a Braille or Emergency test form 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

Grade 08
Fall 2011
SCIENCE



No. of Students Assessed (All Forms) = 5

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Discipline Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	
Science Processes								
Inquiry Process	27	S.IP.07.12	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Inquiry Process	28	S.IP.07.13	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Inquiry Process	18	S.IP.07.16	40	60+	0	0	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	46	S.IA.06.14	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	8	S.IA.07.13	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	29	S.IA.07.15	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	47	S.RS.07.11	20	60+	20	0	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	26	S.RS.07.16	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	17	S.RS.07.17	0	20	80+	0	0	0
Physical Science								
Forces & Motion	39	P.FM.05.21	0	80+	0	20	0	0
Forces & Motion	41	P.FM.05.42	0	0	0	80+	20	0
Energy	44	P.EN.07.31	80+	20	0	0	0	0
Energy	42	P.EN.07.51	20	0	80+	0	0	0
Prop. of Matter	11	P.PM.07.23	20	0	0	80+	0	0
Prop. of Matter	13	P.PM.07.24	40+	40	20	0	0	0
Changes in Matter	16	P.CM.06.12	20	20	0	60+	0	0
Changes in Matter	14	P.CM.07.21	80+	0	20	0	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Discipline Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	
Life Science								
Org. Living Things	1	L.OI.05.41	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Org. Living Things	5	L.OI.07.21	0	0	60+	40	0	0
Org. Living Things	3	L.OI.07.63	80+	0	20	0	0	0
Heredity	50	L.HE.05.11	60+	20	20	0	0	0
Evolution	6	L.EV.05.14	0	80+	0	20	0	0
Evolution	48	L.EV.05.21	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Ecosystems	53	L.EC.06.23	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Ecosystems	51	L.EC.06.42	0	0	40	60+	0	0
Earth Science								
Earth Systems	24	E.ES.05.61	60+	0	40	0	0	0
Earth Systems	23	E.ES.07.74	0	20	0	80+	0	0
Earth Systems	31	E.ES.07.82	80+	0	20	0	0	0
Solid Earth	21	E.SE.06.41	60+	0	20	20	0	0
Solid Earth	19	E.SE.06.62	0	0	0	80+	20	0
Fluid Earth	32	E.FE.07.12	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Earth Space Time	34	E.ST.05.11	20	60+	20	0	0	0
Earth Space Time	36	E.ST.05.21	0	80+	0	20	0	0

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 who participated using a Braille or Emergency test form are not included in the Item Analysis Report.

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

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



DISTRICT ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT Students with Disabilities



A

Grade 08
Fall 2011
SCIENCE

No. of Students Assessed (All Forms) = 5

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Discipline Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
No. of Students Assessed (Form 03): 5								
Science Processes								
Inquiry Process	9	S.IP.07.14	20	80+	0	0	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	38	S.IA.07.11	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	10	S.RS.07.14	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	30	S.RS.07.19	80+	20	0	0	0	0
Physical Science								
Forces & Motion	40	P.FM.05.34	0	20	0	80+	0	0
Energy	15	P.EN.06.41	80+	20	0	0	0	0
Energy	43	P.EN.07.33	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Prop. of Matter	12	P.FM.07.24	0	0	50+	40	0	0
Changes in Matter	45	P.CM.06.12	40+	20	20	0	0	20
Life Science								
Org. Living Things	52	L.LO.07.31	80+	0	20	0	0	0
Heredity	7	L.HE.05.12	0	80+	20	0	0	0
Evolution	4	L.EV.05.13	0	0	80+	20	0	0
Ecosystems	2	L.EC.06.11	50+	20	0	20	0	0
Ecosystems	49	L.EC.06.31	100+	0	0	0	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Discipline Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Earth Science								
Earth Systems	25	E.ES.05.62	80+	0	20	0	0	0
Earth Systems	33	E.ES.07.13	40+	0	20	20	20	0
Solid Earth	22	E.SE.06.11	0	0	80+	20	0	0
Solid Earth	20	E.SE.06.14	0	20	80+	0	0	0
Earth Space Time	35	E.ST.05.25	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Earth Space Time	37	E.ST.06.41	0	0	0	100+	0	0

B

C

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students who participated using a Braille or Emergency test form 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 a progress table with year-to-year transition counts for students in grades 4-8 who were in the previous grade in Fall 2010, took the MEAP in both Fall 2010 and Fall 2011, and had a matching Unique Identification Code (UIC) for both Fall 2010 and Fall 2011. 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 Fall 2010 and Fall 2011.

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 All Students Grade 06 Fall 2011



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOLNAME**
School Code: **99999**

ACHIEVEMENT - SUMMARY

	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
READING	Scale Score Range		(492-726)		(492-601)	(602-618)	(619-652)	(653-726)	(619-726)
	2011	21	608	588-628		14%	33%	10%	43%
	2010	30	609	601-617	47%	10%	40%	3%	43%
	2009	32	617	610-624	19%	34%	44%	3%	47%
	2008	46	607	600-614	46%	26%	34%	4%	28%
MATHEMATICS	Scale Score Range		(472-761)		(472-613)	(614-628)	(629-674)	(675-761)	(629-761)
	2011	21	593	563-623		5%	0%	10%	10%
	2010	30	608	602-614	63%	30%	7%	0%	7%
	2009	32	612	606-618	50%	31%	19%	0%	19%
	2008	44	609	604-614	61%	18%	20%	0%	20%
SOCIAL STUDIES	Scale Score Range		(512-704)		(512-592)	(593-624)	(625-648)	(649-704)	(625-704)
	2011	21	599	578-619		48%	0%	10%	10%
	2010	30	596	592-600	37%	60%	3%	0%	3%
	2009	31	597	592-602	42%	58%	0%	0%	0%
	2008	46	596	592-600	39%	54%	7%	0%	7%

Note: Performance levels for prior years have been adjusted to reflect scores consistent with career- and college-ready cut scores.
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.

FALL 2010 to FALL 2011 PERFORMANCE LEVEL CHANGE COUNTS (PERCENTS)

Student Group	Performance Level Change Category				
	Significant Decline	Decline	Maintaining	Improvement	Significant Improvement
READING					
Not Previously Proficient	0 (0%)	4 (36%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)
Previously Proficient	6 (67%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
All Students	6 (30%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)
NOTE: 20 students (95%) were successfully matched from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011					
MATHEMATICS					
Not Previously Proficient	1 (7%)	8 (57%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)
Previously Proficient	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
All Students	6 (32%)	8 (42%)	1 (5%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)
NOTE: 19 students (90%) were successfully matched from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011					

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



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

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

Grade 06
Fall 2011

Mathematics



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOLNAME**
School Code: **99999**

Fall 2010 to Fall 2011 MEAP Mathematics Transition Counts

Fall 2010 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2011 MEAP Mathematics Performance Level									
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced	
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partially Proficient	Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Proficient	Low	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced	Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: 19 students (90.5%) were successfully matched from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011

Fall 2010 to Fall 2011 MEAP Mathematics Transition Percents

Fall 2010 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2011 MEAP Mathematics Performance Level									
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced	
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	5.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	15.8	10.5	5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	5.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3
Proficient	Low	10.5	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Advanced	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Fall 2010 to Fall 2011 MEAP Mathematics Transition Percents in Each Row

Fall 2010 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2011 MEAP Mathematics Performance Level									
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced	
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Proficient	Low	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Advanced	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Performance levels for prior years have been adjusted to reflect scores consistent with career- and college-ready cut scores.
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%.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT All Except Students with Disabilities

Grade 06
Fall 2011
Reading Score Distribution



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOLNAME**
School Code: 99999

MULTIPLE CHOICE and CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE																				
GLCE Code	Domain Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Points	Points Possible	Percent of Students Scoring															
					0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10					
	Word Recognition & Word Study	14	1.9	4																
R.WS.05.02	Use cues to decide meaning	14	0.4	1	64	36														
R.WS.05.07	Determine the meaning of words/phrases in context	14	1.5	3	21	21	43	14												
	Narrative Text	14	4.9	11																
R.NT.05.03	Analyze character traits and setting	14	3.6	8	0	21	7	21	7	29	7	7	0							
R.NT.05.04	Explain how authors use literary devices	14	1.2	3	29	29	36	7												
	Informational Text	14	1.0	2																
R.IT.05.01	Analyze elements/style of informational genres	14	0.4	1	57	43														
R.IT.05.03	Explain how authors use text features	14	0.6	1	43	57														
	Comprehension	14	7.5	16																
R.CM.05.02	Retell/summarize narrative/informational text	14	2.6	6	7	14	29	29	7	14	0									
R.CM.05.03	Analyze themes/truths/principles w/in/across texts	14	4.9	10	7	0	14	7	14	7	21	7	21	0	0					

Students who participated using a Braille or Emergency test form are not included in the Score Distribution.
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.

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 AYP 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 DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT

All Students

A

Grade 05
Fall 2011



ISD	READING						MATHEMATICS						SCIENCE											
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at Level 2		Level 1	Levels 1 & 2	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at Level 2		Level 1	Levels 1 & 2	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at Level 2		Level 1	Levels 1 & 2
Total All Students	302	511	35	29	31	5	36		302	499	70	21	1	8	9		302	499	78	14	1	7	8	
Gender																								
Male	147	513	33	27	35	5	40		147	501	67	23	1	10	10		147	502	76	16	1	7	8	
Female	155	509	38	30	27	5	32		155	497	73	19	2	6	8		155	496	81	12	1	6	7	
Ethnicity																								
American Indian or Alaska Native	< 10								< 10								< 10							
Asian	15	493	53	20	27	0	27		15	469	73	27	0	0	0		15	484	93	7	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	14	506	36	21	43	0	43		14	489	79	14	0	7	7		14	496	86	7	0	7	7	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	< 10								< 10								< 10							
White	243	511	35	29	31	5	35		243	500	70	20	2	8	10		243	499	79	14	1	7	8	
Two or more races	< 10								< 10								< 10							
Hispanic of any race	18	513	28	44	22	6	28		18	500	72	22	0	6	6		18	501	83	11	0	6	6	
Additional Reporting Groups																								
Economically Disadvantaged	Yes	109	516	28	35	33	5	38	109	503	68	21	3	8	11		109	502	79	11	3	7	10	
	No	193	508	40	25	30	5	35	193	496	71	21	1	8	8		193	497	78	16	0	6	6	
English Language Learners	Yes	18	529	22	28	39	11	50	18	518	44	44	0	11	11		18	519	61	28	0	11	11	
	No	284	509	36	29	31	4	35	284	498	71	19	1	8	9		284	498	80	13	1	6	7	
Formerly Limited English		< 10							< 10								< 10							
Migrant		< 10							< 10								< 10							
Homeless		< 10							< 10								< 10							
Accommodations																								
Standard - All		< 10							< 10								< 10							
Nonstandard - All **																								
Standard - ELL Only		< 10							< 10								< 10							
Nonstandard - ELL Only **																								

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

< 10 - No summary scores 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 summary by subject area. The District Comprehensive Report lists data for the district, followed by each public school and 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
All Students
Grade 04
Fall 2011



District	READING							WRITING							MATHEMATICS						
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at Level		Levels 1 & 2*	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at Level		Levels 1 & 2*	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at Level		Levels 1 & 2*
SAMPLE DISTRICT	21	414	38	14	38	10	48	21	419	0	14	52	33	86	21	406	62	29	0	10	10
Sample School	21	414	38	14	38	10	48	21	419	0	14	52	33	86	21	406	62	29	0	10	10

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

< 10 = 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 2011 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 at 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 - contains item level data for each student with a valid test score in a given subject

2. 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.

2. Writing CDs

CDs containing the images of the 4th and 7th grade writing responses will be mailed to MEAP District Coordinators in March, 2011. 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 can also be found on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

3. 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)

4. 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 of our 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
Kate Cermak, Analyst, Test Administration and Reporting
Vacant, MEAP Project Manager, Test Administration and Reporting
Andrew Middlestead, Manager, Test Development
Rodger Epp, Science Consultant
Vacant, Writing and Social Studies Consultant
Kyle Ward, Mathematics Consultant
Linda Howley, 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