



2013

Guide to Reports



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2	Student Record Labels	16
Background	3	Parent Reports	17
Introduction	5	Class Rosters	21
Report List	6	Item Analysis Reports	25
Printed Report Change	7	Summary Reports	29
Report/Print Suppression	7	Demographic Reports	32
Multiple-Choice-Item Scores	8	Comprehensive Reports	34
Constructed-Response Item Scores	8	Additional Sources of Assessment Results	36
Scale Scores / Performance Levels	9	Contact Information	37
Performance Levels and Scale Score Tables	10		
Ranges within Performance Levels	11		
Performance Level Changes	12		
Reports and Descriptions	13		
Individual Student Reports	16		

Background

On April 7, 2007, the U.S. Department of Education (USED) issued regulations describing Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards (AA-MAS). The regulations permit a state to develop an assessment aligned with modified academic achievement standards as part of its assessment and accountability system under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). These regulations can be downloaded at <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/speced/toolkit/index.html>.

In Michigan, the general assessment for grades 3 through 8 is the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP). According to the AA-MAS regulations, only the academic achievement standards are modified, not the content standards upon which the assessment is based. In Michigan, the content standards for the general assessments are the Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs). For more information on the GLCEs, please visit the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation Web page at www.michigan.gov/oeii.

It is important that modified academic achievement standards be aligned with grade level content standards in order for students to have an opportunity to achieve at grade level. Therefore, students must have access to, and instruction in, grade level content.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) was awarded a grant from the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs to develop AA-MAS that will fulfill an important need in the Michigan Educational Assessment System. This project has dual purposes: (1) to design a replicable process for modifying the existing MEAP English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 by reducing length and difficulty levels while maintaining appropriately challenging content that reflects the state's GLCEs; and (2) to create an online professional development system that can be adopted and adapted by states, school districts, and individual educators.

Through the efforts of the MDE and its collaboration with the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA); Office of Special Education; Office of Education Improvement and Innovation; Center for Educational Technology and Information; as well as local district educators; assessment experts; and other stakeholders; Michigan has a continuum of assessments that reflects a tradition of highest technical quality, which is founded in robust curriculum standards, and the knowledge and skills of a diverse population.

Background (continued)

MEAP-Access is part of Michigan's assessment continuum, providing a valid, and reliable measure of the achievement of students who struggle with the academic content areas of ELA and mathematics and who do not meet grade level expectations for the grade in which they are enrolled. Michigan educators have struggled in making decisions about participation in statewide assessments for students who have difficulty learning grade level content in the same timeframe as their peers. Often, these students have participated in MEAP with accommodations, which has proved to be inappropriately difficult, or taken MI-Access Functional Independence (FI) which did not provide an appropriate level of challenge.

MEAP-Access was first administered as a pilot test in 2009 and then approved for operation in the fall of the same year. The results from the fall assessment indicated that while many of the items had been modified they remained difficult for many students. Educators also reported some difficulty identifying the appropriate students to participate in the assessment. A one-year delay was granted by the State Board of Education to conduct a more extensive series of committee reviews, cognitive laboratory studies, and further piloting of items in the Fall of 2010.

During the Fall of 2011 the revised operational MEAP-Access assessment was administered statewide and the results improved in comparison to Fall 2009. The improved results created the need to set cut scores on the MEAP-Access assessments for school accountability and reporting purposes. The Bureau of Assessment Accountability (BAA) assembled stakeholders and educators to conduct a standard setting session. The panelists recommended two cut scores to separate three performance levels:

- Exceeded Expectations - Level 1
- Met Expectations - Level 2
- Progressing Toward Expectations - Level 3

Students achieving levels 1 and 2 are counted as proficient in school and district accountability calculations.

Introduction

This guide is provided to assist educators and parents in understanding and using the Fall MEAP-Access assessment results.

MEAP-Access is an alternate assessment designed for students with disabilities in grades 3-8 and assesses mathematics, reading, and writing. Writing is assessed in grades 4 and 7 only. MEAP-Access is designed to assess grade level content expectations.

MEAP-Access reports resemble the format and look of the MEAP reports and include both individual-level reports (Parent Reports, Individual Student Reports, and Student Record Labels) and aggregate-level reports (Class Rosters, Item Analysis Reports, Summary Reports, Demographic Reports, and Comprehensive Reports).

The aggregate reports are intended to reflect the data needed to meet the expectations of state and federal legislation. MEAP-Access aggregate reports differ from MEAP in that the aggregate results are provided for “All Students” who participate in the assessment.

Student performance levels will be reported for the current year and the change in achievement from grade-to-grade will be populated where applicable.

Reports for district and schools are listed in the table on page 6.

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 later in this guide. Schools must distribute MEAP-Access Parent Reports to students’ parents or guardians as soon as printed reports arrive, if a copy of the report has not already been distributed.

All MEAP-Access report PDFs are provided at the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA) Secure Site. Beginning with Fall2013 test results, hard copies are printed for Parent Reports, and Student Labels only.

Report List

Report	Purpose	Distribution
Individual Student Report	This report provides a detailed description of the student’s performance on each Grade Level Content Expectation (GLCE) assessed within each subject area.	Class/Group School
Student Record Label	These labels provide a summary of individual student achievement and performance level in all subject areas tested in label format.	School
Parent Report	This report includes a letter from the state Superintendent along with summary descriptions of the student’s performance by sub-score, for all subject areas assessed.	1 copy per school
Class Roster	This report provides summary score information by class/group (if provided), for each sub-score and GLCE assessed within each subject area, including detail information for each student assessed.	Class/Group School
Item Analysis Report	This report provides a description of each multiple-choice and constructed-response item, including the primary GLCE measured by each item. This report shows how students responded to test items as a percentage (MC), or received each score point (CR), and indicates item statistics summarized by class/group, school, district, and state.	Class/Group School District State
Summary Report	This report provides a comparative set of total score information for each grade level, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. This report also contains a summary of performance level results.	School District ISD State
Demographic Report	This report provides a comparative set of total score information for each grade, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. All subject areas and levels of performance are reported for each demographic group and subgroups.	School District ISD State
Comprehensive Report	This report provides summary score information in each subject area. The District Comprehensive Report will provide summary score information for the district and each school within the district. The ISD Comprehensive Report provides summary score information for the ISD, followed by each public school district, and Public School Academy (PSA) within the ISD.	District ISD

Printed Report Change

Districts have had two printing options in recent years to either have all the reports printed or a “Green” option of limited reports. Beginning with fall 2013 these options are no longer available. Instead, the Division of Accountability Services (DAS) will send hard copy prints of Parent reports and the Student Record labels only. All other reports will be available at the BAA secure site and may be downloaded electronically.

Report/Print Suppression

If you do not receive any printed reports for all student and aggregate groups, the reasons may be:

- Some aggregate reports are not produced if the number of students assessed is below 10 for a content area. Be sure to check the individual report section of this guide for specific details on each report suppression.
- Schools may also have unpaid fees for missing barcode labels or late material return fees. Unpaid fees suppress the reports for all current and future administration reports. Once payment in full is received by the contractor, the report suppression

would be lifted.

- If you received only parent reports and student record labels but were expecting a full complement reports this is due to the report printing changes for fall 2013 mentioned in the “Printed Report Change” section on this page.

Multiple-Choice Item Scores

The multiple-choice items have three answer choices. A correct response is scored as 1 for each item and an incorrect response is scored as a 0. If a student chooses not to indicate a response it is scored as a 0 and is marked as an incorrect answer.

Constructed-Response Item Scores

The constructed response items on the MEAP-Access writing assessment require a short written response by the student. Human scorers evaluate the responses to determine the score on the item.

Each narrative and informational writing response is scored on an analytical rubric. The analytical rubric covers four separate writing traits; ideas, organization, style, and conventions. A student can get a score of 0 to 3 for each of the four traits and the total score for each of the writing responses is the sum of the scores across the four traits with the score for ideas doubled. The total score for each writing response ranges from 0 to 15.

Anchor papers (exemplars or validity papers) that fall at each score point in the rubric are provided through a rangefinding process

performed by the state's contractor for MEAP-Access, Measurement Inc. After rangefinding, the contractor uses an extensive training process to train human scorers on how to evaluate the responses and to provide scores for the items. As part of this training, the papers identified in rangefinding are used as exemplars to ensure that all scorers are applying the scoring rubric in a similar fashion and scores assigned to particular score points are consistent. Scorers are also trained to ignore extraneous factors such as neatness and to focus on the strengths of the response rather than the weaknesses. Human scorers must pass a qualifying test before being permitted to score student responses operationally. During the operational hand-scoring process, periodic quality control checks using the validity papers are used to make sure that scorers are evaluating responses consistently. Due to the high stakes nature of these assessments, every possible step to minimize scoring subjectivity is taken throughout the scoring process.

Scale Scores

The MEAP-Access 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). The MEAP-Access scale scores will be 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, the MEAP-Access scale scores from the same grade and subject can be compared against each other regardless of the year or form of the MEAP-Access assessment the student will take in the future.

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-Access assessment. Some reports are reported by subscore (domain, focal point, or discipline). Subscores are not equated from year-to-year; therefore, the subscores are less

reliable than scale scores and provide only an approximate measure of student performance.

Performance Levels

The MEAP-Access scale scores within each subject area can be described in ranges. The labels applied to these ranges are known as performance levels. The MEAP-Access performance levels are: (1) Exceeded, (2) Met, (3) Progressing Towards Expectations. The divisions between these levels are referred to as cut scores. Scale score and performance level range tables are located on the following pages.

The cut scores were recommended by several panels comprised of educators and other stakeholders in a standard setting process. To set these standards, the panelists used detailed performance level descriptors to recommend scores separated into the different performance levels. The final recommendations from the standard setting panels were submitted Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction for review and approval.

While the performance level descriptors necessarily differ by grade and subject area, student achievement, the percent of students achieving performance level can be reasonably compared across subjects within a grade. Such a comparison can be used to indicate what percent of students are meeting Michigan grade level content expectations in each subject.

MEAP-Access Performance Levels and Scale Scores - Grades 3-8

Subject	Grade	Level 3 Progressing Towards Expectations	Level 2* Met Expectations	Level 1* Exceeded Expectations
Mathematics	3	1191 - 1299	1300 - 1322	1323 - 1393
	4	1288 - 1399	1400 - 1420	1421 - 1489
	5	1391 - 1499	1500 - 1521	1522 - 1595
	6	1493 - 1599	1600 - 1622	1623 - 1699
	7	1594 - 1699	1700 - 1716	1717 - 1795
	8	1696 - 1799	1800 - 1815	1816 - 1894
Reading	3	1201 - 1299	1300 - 1317	1318 - 1391
	4	1297 - 1399	1400 - 1417	1418 - 1489
	5	1389 - 1499	1500 - 1515	1516 - 1586
	6	1489 - 1599	1600 - 1620	1621 - 1687
	7	1592 - 1699	1700 - 1720	1721 - 1785
	8	1694 - 1799	1800 - 1823	1824 - 1888
Writing	4	1296 - 1399	1400 - 1434	1435 - 1507
	7	1591 - 1699	1700 - 1727	1728 - 1794

* Proficient Performance Level

Ranges within MEAP-Access Performance Levels

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 year-to-year transitions between the three performance levels (Progressing Towards Expectations, Met Expectations and Exceeded Expectations) can be made more precise by tracking changes within and across performance levels (for example, a transition from the low range of the Level 1 category to the high range of that same category). These ranges are presented in the table below.

Subject	Grade	Ranges							
		Level 3 - Progressing			Level 2 - Met*		Level 1 - Exceeded*		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High
Mathematics	3	1191-1230	1231-1265	1266-1299	1300-1310	1311-1322	1323-1339	1340-1358	1359-1393
	4	1288-1331	1332-1366	1367-1399	1400-1409	1410-1420	1421-1439	1440-1461	1462-1489
	5	1391-1435	1436-1468	1469-1499	1500-1510	1511-1521	1522-1541	1542-1564	1565-1595
	6	1493-1535	1536-1568	1569-1599	1600-1610	1611-1622	1623-1642	1643-1665	1666-1699
	7	1594-1633	1634-1667	1668-1699	1700-1707	1708-1716	1717-1738	1739-1762	1763-1795
	8	1696-1733	1734-1767	1768-1799	1800-1807	1808-1815	1816-1837	1838-1861	1862-1894
Reading	3	1201-1233	1234-1267	1268-1299	1300-1308	1309-1317	1318-1333	1334-1352	1353-1391
	4	1297-1335	1336-1368	1369-1399	1400-1408	1409-1417	1418-1434	1435-1453	1454-1489
	5	1389-1428	1429-1464	1465-1499	1500-1507	1508-1515	1516-1530	1531-1548	1549-1586
	6	1489-1516	1517-1558	1559-1599	1600-1609	1610-1620	1621-1631	1632-1645	1646-1687
	7	1592-1628	1629-1664	1665-1699	1700-1709	1710-1720	1721-1733	1734-1749	1750-1785
	8	1694-1727	1728-1764	1765-1799	1800-1811	1812-1823	1824-1837	1838-1854	1855-1888

* Proficient Performance Level

MEAP-Access Performance Level Changes

Performance level change is used to compare student performance from year to year for reading and mathematics in grades 4 through 8. The three performance levels have ranges of high, mid, and low to reliably distinguish the ranges 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 alone. A transition table is used to track performance level change.

The table below shows the transitions a student can demonstrate from year to year. On the left side of the table is the previous year’s achievement divided into the various ranges of performance levels. Across the top of the table is the current year’s 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. This transition table is populated in the summary reports.

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.

Previous Year MEAP-Access Performance Level		Current Year MEAP-Access Performance Level								
		Progressing = L3			Met = L2		Exceeded = L1			
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	
Progressing	Low	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	
	Mid	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	
	High	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	
Met	Low	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	
	High	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	
Exceeded	Low	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	

Reports and Descriptions

Individual Student Reports

The intent of the Individual Student Report is to provide a detailed description of each student's performance in the MEAP-Access 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 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 by GLCE. All items, except for field test items, are included. The number of points earned and the total number of points possible are reported.

Section D appears on the ISR for writing only. 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.

Student Record Label

A Student Record Label is provided for each student assessed after the Fall testing cycle. The labels are mailed to the school for placement in the student’s record file.

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 (DOB), 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 will be reported when previous assessment administration information is available for this specific student.

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			
99999 SAMPLE SCHOOL			
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXXXXXXXX,	
UIC# 1234567890		STU# 12345678901234567890	
DOB: 01/01/1900	Gender: F	Grade: 3	
B	Subject	SS	Performance Level
	Reading	1326	1-Exceeded
	Writing		
	Mathematics	1277	3-Progressing C
Fall 2013 			

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-Access. 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 printed reports arrive at your school.

Section A provides the title of the report, the grade, 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.

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

Section C gives a brief description of each of the three perfor-

mance levels.

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

Section E will provide information on the student performance level changes from year to year if available.

Section F 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 grade level expectations. For example, if a student received a Level 2 on the eighth grade mathematics assessment, that student has met grade level expectations for Michigan students.

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

Parent Report - continued

Section H consists of more detailed information regarding the student's performance. Each subject area is divided into subscore groupings: mathematics is divided into focal points; Reading, and writing 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 the student received a condition code, 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.

NOTE: The MEAP-Access 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) 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
Department of
Education

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

Parent Report

Grade 04
Fall 2013

A

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



Report For:
FIRSTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX X LASTNAMEXXXXXX
UIC: 1234567890

Dear Parent or Guardian:

In fall 2013, schools across Michigan administered the MEAP-Access assessments in reading and mathematics to students in grades 3 through 8 and writing in grades 4 and 7. These assessments are based on grade level expectations with modified achievement standards and measure what a student is expected to know and be able to do at specific grade levels and in specific content areas. For more detail, visit www.mi.gov/meap-access.

Student performance is reported as one of three performance levels: Progressing Towards Expectations, Met Expectations, and Exceeded Expectations. 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. Help your student seek learning opportunities outside of school. One resource I highly recommend is the free, online Michigan e-library (www.mel.org).

I encourage you to discuss your student's MEAP-Access 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

For more information on your school and school district, please visit:
www.michigan.gov/mischooldata

Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1: Exceeded Expectations (L1)
 The student's performance indicates a consistent understanding and application of key grade level expectations defined for Michigan students. The student needs continued support to maintain and improve proficiency.

Level 2: Met Expectations (L2)
 The student's performance indicates an adequate understanding and application of the grade level expectations defined for Michigan students. The student needs assistance to improve achievement.

Level 3: Progressing Toward Expectations (L3)
 The student's performance indicates a limited or minimal understanding and application of the grade level expectations defined for Michigan students. The student needs intervention and support to improve achievement.

In addition to showing which performance level(s) your child achieved, this report provides information to encourage improvement and success.

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

RESULTS FOR YOUR CHILD

Subject	2013 Achievement		2012 Achievement Performance Level	Student's Performance Level Change
	Scale Score	Performance Level		
Reading	1322	3-Progressing	3-Progressing	Last fall, your child scored near the high end of the Progressing performance level. This fall, your child scored near the low end of the Progressing performance level.
Writing	1381	3-Progressing	* Not Available	* Not Available
Mathematics	1357	3-Progressing	3-Progressing	Last fall, your child scored near the high end of the Progressing performance level. This fall, your child scored near the middle of the Progressing performance level.

* Writing is not measured in every grade, so year-to-year progress cannot be reported.

Reading

F

On the reading assessment the students were asked to read for understanding within texts and respond to multiple-choice questions. 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 **PROGRESSING TOWARD EXPECTATIONS LEVEL**: Requires intensive intervention and support to improve achievement. The student attempted to use knowledge about reading (genre, structure and text features, etc.) to construct meaning and to identify themes. (www.michigan.gov/ela)

L3 Progressing		L2	L1 Exceeded
1322			
1297	1400	1418	1490

Reading Domains	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Word Recognition & Word study	0	11	0%
Narrative Text	0	8	0%
Informational Text	0	0	0%
Comprehension	1	13	8%

G

Writing

On the writing assessment students were asked to write a story using their own knowledge and experience, write an informational and narrative piece about a given topic using a specific organizational pattern, and answer multiple-choice questions about 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 **PROGRESSING TOWARD EXPECTATIONS LEVEL**: Write about the assigned tasks with little or no detail, organization or control of the Conventions of Standard English; used language that interfered with meaning; and reviewed, minimally if at all, the writing of others. The student will require intensive intervention and support to improve. (www.michigan.gov/ela)

L3 Progressing		L2	L1 Exceeded
1381			
1304	1400	1435	1505

Writing Prompts (30 points)

	Ideas	Organization	Style	Conventions	Condition Code
Narrative Writing	2/6	1/3	1/3	1/3	
Informational Writing	2/6	2/3	2/3	1/3	

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

Multiple Choice (10 points)

	Writing Process	Grammar and Usage	Spelling
Earned/Points Possible	0/1	0/6	0/3

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, and fractions as parts of the whole. Students measure with common units, 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 **PROGRESSING TOWARD EXPECTATIONS LEVEL**: Requires intensive intervention and support to improve achievement. The student did not demonstrate mathematical skills and concepts consistent with grade level expectations. (www.michigan.gov/mathematics)

L3 Progressing		L2	L1 Exceeded
1357			
1292	1400	1421	1481

Mathematics Focal Points	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Understanding of Fractions	2	5	40%
Multiplication and Division	0	7	0%
Properties of 2D, 3D Shapes	0	1	0%
Understanding Area, Perimeter	1	9	11%
Connections	3	13	23%

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 Rosters

The Class Rosters provide summary score information for each subscore grouping (domain/focal point) 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 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 results on the narrative and informational writing responses for each students.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the grade level, the assessment cycle, and subject area. 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 will be populated this report if it is available.

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 or 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, writing prompt rubric scores, and condition codes. Students who were assessed with a braille 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 sub-score 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.



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

CLASS ROSTER

Grade 03
Fall 2013
Mathematics



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

Student Information	2013 Scale Score	2013 Performance Level	Base Ten Number System				Addition, Subtraction Fluency										Working with Geometric Shapes				Connections							
			N.ME.02.01	N.ME.02.02	N.ME.02.03	Focal Point Total	N.FL.02.06	N.FL.02.10	N.FL.02.11	N.MR.02.07	N.MR.02.08	N.MR.02.09	M.PS.02.02	M.UN.02.01	M.PS.02.10	M.TE.02.11	M.UN.02.05	Focal Point Total	G.GS.02.01	G.GS.02.04	G.SR.02.05	G.TR.02.06	Focal Point Total	N.MR.02.16	M.TE.02.04	D.RE.02.02	D.RE.02.03	Continued
Points Possible			2	2	2	6	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	16	2	2	1	2	7	2	1	2	1	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1277	3H	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1277	3H	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1281	3H	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	
Students Reported = 3																												
Students with Valid Scores = 3																												
Mean	1278		0.7	1.0	0.7	2.3	1.0	0.3	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.3	

**Student participated using Braille test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.
 L, M, and H indicate scores in the (L)ow, (M)iddle, or (H)igh ranges of the performance levels.

Performance Level Mathematics Scale Score Range
 1 - Exceeded (1323 - 1393)
 2 - Met (1300 - 1322)
 3 - Progressing (1203 - 1299)

NA - Not Assessed
 NI - Not Identified as Special Education
 NR - Not Attempted
 NS - Nonstandard Accommodation

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



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

CLASS ROSTER

A **Grade 03**
Fall 2013
Mathematics



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

Student Information	Connections
	Focal Point Total
B	Continued
Points Possible	6
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	C
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	2
Students Reported = 3	
Students with Valid Scores = 3	
Mean	1.3
	D

**Student participated using Braille test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.
 L, M, and H indicate scores in the (L)ow, (M)iddle, or (H)igh ranges of the performance levels.

Performance Level	Mathematics Scale Score Range
1 - Exceeded	(1323 - 1393)
2 - Met	(1300 - 1322)
3 - Progressing	(1203 - 1299)

NA - Not Assessed
 NI - Not Identified as Special Education
 NR - Not Attempted
 NS - Nonstandard Accommodation
 NV - No Valid Test Score
 OL - Tested in Incorrect Grade
 PB - Prohibited Behavior



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

CLASS ROSTER

A

**Grade 03
 Fall 2013
 Reading**



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

Student Information	2013 Scale Score	2013 Performance Level	Word Study				Narrative Text			Informational Text		Comprehension		
			R.WS.02.08	R.WS.02.10	R.WS.02.11	Domain Total	R.NT.02.02	R.NT.02.03	Domain Total	R.IT.02.03	Domain Total	R.CM.02.02	R.CM.02.03	Domain Total
Points Possible			1	2	9	12	2	3	5	1	1	7	7	14
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1326	1L	1	1	8	10	1	3	4	1	1	6	5	11
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1326	1L	1	1	8	10	1	3	4	1	1	6	5	11
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	1336	1M	1	1	9	11	1	3	4	1	1	7	5	12
Students Reported = 3														
Students with Valid Scores = 3														
Mean	1329		1.0	1.0	8.3	10.3	1.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	6.3	5.0	11.3

**Student participated using Braille test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here. L, M, and H indicate scores in the (L)ow, (M)iddle, or (H)igh ranges of the performance levels.

Performance Level **Reading Scale Score Range**
 1 - Exceeded (1318 - 1391)
 2 - Met (1300 - 1317)
 3 - Progressing (1201 - 1299)

NA - Not Assessed
 NI - Not Identified as Special Education
 NR - Not Attempted
 NS - Nonstandard Accommodation

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

Item Analysis Reports

The Item Analysis reports provide summary information for each operational multiple-choice item and constructed-response item on the assessment, including the 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 “All Students” assessed except for students who were marked as invalid, assessed using the Braille form, or were home-schooled.

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 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 is also provided. Please note that students who participated using a Braille 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.

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.

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.

Item Analysis Report - Condition Codes

Condition codes: when a student's response receives a valid score of zero (0) a reason code is provided. The reason codes are as follows:

A = Off topic

B = Illegible or written in a language other than English

C = Blank

D = Insufficient to rate

Use of Item Analysis Results

Some assessment items while modified, may still be particularly difficult or easy. Educators may consider how well their students 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 provide 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.

Teachers and districts may use the Item Analysis Report to pose a hypothesis about how this group of students performed within a GLCE or a subscore grouping (domain, or focal point). 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.



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

CLASS ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

A

**Grade 07
 Fall 2013
 Writing**



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

No. of Students Assessed = 17

B

MULTIPLE CHOICE							
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING				
			A %	B %	C %	Omit %	Multi %
Writing Process	12	W.PR.06.03	29	59+	12	0	0
Personal Style	9	W.PS.06.01	41+	29	29	0	0
Personal Style	11	W.PS.06.01	6	12	82+	0	0
Grammar and Usage	3	W.GR.06.01	0	71+	29	0	0
Grammar and Usage	4	W.GR.06.01	12	76+	12	0	0
Grammar and Usage	7	W.GR.06.01	18	35	47+	0	0
Grammar and Usage	10	W.GR.06.01	24	65+	12	0	0
Spelling	5	W.SP.06.01	18	0	82+	0	0
Spelling	6	W.SP.06.01	82+	12	6	0	0
Spelling	8	W.SP.06.01	53+	12	35	0	0

C

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE											
Item Descriptor Number	Writing Prompt Trait	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
1	Narrative Writing							0	0	1	0
	Ideas (score doubled in overall score)	W.GN.06.01	0.9	24	59	18	0				
	Organization	W.PR.06.02	1.2	18	47	35	0				
	Style	W.PS.06.01	1.4	6	53	41	0				
	Conventions	W.GR.06.01	1.2	6	76	12	6				
2	Informational Writing							0	0	1	0
	Ideas (score doubled in overall score)	W.GN.06.02	1.1	18	59	24	0				
	Organization	W.PR.06.02	1.1	18	59	24	0				
	Style	W.PS.06.01	1.3	6	59	35	0				
	Conventions	W.GR.06.01	1.3	6	59	35	0				

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

D

MEANS COMPARISON		
Traits	Narrative Writing	Informational Writing
Ideas	0.9	1.1
Organization	1.2	1.1
Style	1.4	1.3
Conventions	1.2	1.3

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 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 Reports

The summary reports provide a comparative set of mean scale score information for each grade level, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. Performance level changes will be included in this report when consecutive year achievement data is available.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (school, district, ISD, or state), 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 that may be counted as attaining each achievement level. 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 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, the mean points earned, the total number of points possible, and the percentage of students earning each point value.

Section D 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, the mean points earned, the total number of points possible, and the percentage of students earning each point value.



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

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

A **Grade 03**
Fall 2013



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

ACHIEVEMENT - SUMMARY

	Year	No. of Students Assessed	Scale Score		Performance Levels			
			Mean	Margin of Error	3-Progressing	2-Met	1-Exceeded	Levels 1 & 2
READING	Scale Score Range		(1201-1391)		(1201-1299)	(1300-1317)	(1318-1391)	(1300-1391)
	2013	3	1329	1323-1336	0%	0%	100%	100%
	2012	NA						
	2011	NA						

MATHEMATICS	Scale Score Range		(1203-1393)	(1203-1299)	(1300-1322)	(1323-1393)	(1300-1393)
	2013	3	1278	1276-1281	100%	0%	0%
2012	NA						
2011	NA						

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.

Demographic Reports

The Demographic reports provide 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 “Exceeded” and “Met” performance levels (Levels 1 & 2) within each subject area. The Demographic Report is generated for all students assessed.

Please note the following:

- summary scores are not provided for subgroups containing less than ten students (<10),
- home-schooled students are not reported,
- private school students are only reported at the school level, and
- students with invalid tests are included only in the Non-Standard Accommodations subgroups.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (school, district, ISD, or state), the grade level, and the assessment cycle.

Section B lists the demographic subgroups, as well as the total number of students being reported. Ethnicity subgroups are defined by federal requirements. The demographic subgroups are: Gender, Ethnicity, Economically Disadvantaged (ED), English Language Learners (ELL), Formerly Limited English Proficient (FLEP), Migrant, Homeless.

Accommodations subgroups are also listed as follows: Standard Accommodations (All Students), Non-Standard Accommodations (All Students), Standard Accommodations (for English Language Learners), Non-Standard Accommodations (for English Language Learners).

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 “Met” and “Exceeded” performance levels (Levels 1 & 2) within each subject area.



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

DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT

A

**Grade 07
Fall 2013**



District	READING						WRITING					MATHEMATICS							
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*	
Total	22	1695	41	32	27	59	35	1686	71	17	11	29	33	1693	70	21	9	30	
Gender																			
Male	12	1693	42	33	25	58	18	1672	89	6	6	11	17	1686	76	18	6	24	
Female	10	1697	40	30	30	60	17	1702	53	29	18	47	16	1701	63	25	13	38	
Ethnicity																			
American Indian or Alaska Native	<						<						<						
Asian	<						<						<						
Black or African American	<						10	1681	80	10	10	20	<						
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<						<						<						
White	13	1700	38	23	38	62	18	1693	61	22	17	39	18	1694	61	33	6	39	
Two or More Races	<						<						<						
Hispanic of Any Race	<						<						<						
Additional Reporting Groups																			
Economically Disadvantaged	Yes	14	1698	36	43	21	64	22	1686	73	18	9	27	21	1696	67	19	14	33
	No	<						13	1687	69	15	15	31	12	1688	75	25	0	25
English Language Learners	Yes	11	1697	36	45	18	64	13	1693	69	15	15	31	13	1696	69	15	15	31
	No	11	1693	45	18	36	55	22	1682	73	18	9	27	20	1692	70	25	5	30
Formerly Limited English Proficient		<						12	1689	67	17	17	33	12	1702	58	25	17	42
Migrant		11	1697	36	45	18	64	12	1688	75	17	8	25	12	1688	75	17	8	25
Homeless		11	1697	36	45	18	64	12	1688	75	17	8	25	12	1688	75	17	8	25
Accommodations																			
Standard - All		10	1711	30	30	40	70	15	1690	60	20	20	40	22	1697	64	23	14	36
Nonstandard - All **		<						<					<						
Standard - ELL Only		<						<					<						
Nonstandard - ELL Only **		<						<					<						

Performance Level
1 & 2 – Exceeded and Met
1 – Exceeded
2 – Met
3 – Progressing

< 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 Reports

The Comprehensive reports 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 grade level, and the assessment cycle.

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 less than 10 students.

Additional Sources of Assessment Results

To access Fall 2013 MEAP-Access 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 on the 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, and Student Analysis File Extract - contains item level data for each student with a valid test score in a given subject.

2. All reports listed in this guide will be available on the BAA secure site with exception to the Student Record Label. As mentioned on page 7, the only printed reports that will be shipped will be the parent report and label.

3. Writing CDs containing the images of the 4th and 7th grade writ-

ing responses will be mailed to MEAP-Access District Coordinators in late March, 2013. 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 writing prompts. The scoring guides for writing can also be found on the MEAP-Access website (www.michigan.gov/meap-access).

4. 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)

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-Access administration procedures, content, scheduling, appropriate assessment of or accommodations for students with disabilities or English language learners (ELLs), please contact the BAA, using the contact information listed below:

Bureau of Assessment and Accountability

Vincent Dean, Director, Office of Standards and Assessment

James Griffiths, Manager, Assessment Administration and Reporting

Dan Evans, Analyst, Test Administration and Reporting

Andrew Middlestead, Manager, Test Development

John Jaquith, Assessment Consultant for Students with Disabilities

Phone: 877-560-8378, option 2

Fax: 517-335-1186

Web site: www.michigan.gov/meap-access

E-mail: BAA@michigan.gov