



Guide to Reports



Fall 2010

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
Fall 2010 Highlights	3
Writing	3
Science	3
Item Descriptors	4
Fall 2010 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 2010 - 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
Contact Information	41

Section 1— Introduction

This guide was developed to assist educators in understanding and using the Fall 2010 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 reports are provided via the OEAA Secure Site and, when hard copies are printed, OEAA 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 (a "green" option). When the "green" option is selected, schools may print the remaining reports from the secure site. If no option was selected by the district, the "green" option was selected automatically.

Fall 2010 Highlights

Writing

In Fall 2010, the MEAP writing test was lengthened to allow a more thorough assessment of students' writing skills. The new writing test was administered in grades 4 and 7. A narrative prompt, informational prompt and a response to a student writing sample were completed by fourth and seventh grade students. Operational writing scores are reported for grades 4 and 7 using scale scores as well as analytic and holistic rubric scores that can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Science

The Fall 2010 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 are available for each grade level and each operational subject area assessed in Fall 2010. These documents can be accessed at www.michigan.gov/meap. The Narrative and Informational Writing prompts will be released while the actual student writing samples from the Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample are released.

The 2009-2010 State of Michigan budget cuts required the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) to examine available resources and adopt program changes to ensure the sustainability of Michigan's assessments and the essential services provided by the OEAA. The decision was made to discontinue the practice of releasing 50% of operational assessment items, beginning with the Fall 2009 MEAP. Released items have been replaced by item descriptors.

Item descriptors are available for 100% of operational test items from the Fall 2010 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.

Writing CDs developed for schools include the actual Narrative and Informational Writing prompts and part of the Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample, scoring guides that display the scoring rubrics with sample student responses for each trait, and each school's student responses.

The Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability 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: oeaa@michigan.gov

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Fall 2010 MEAP Report Descriptors

Report	Description	Population	Distribution
Individual Student Report	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' Parent/Guardian)
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. 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. On 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 a 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 2010, 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 Item Descriptors located on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

Constructed response items requiring extended written responses are evaluated by human scorers. The technique used to score the operational reading items is called holistic scoring; the most widely used scoring method for large-scale assessments. Guided by precise criteria, scorers review a response for an overall or 'whole' impression and assign a score. Extensive professional practice and research have refined and validated the critical steps that ensure consistency in scoring. Scorers are trained to evaluate writing, not writers. Scorers are trained to ignore extraneous factors such as neatness and to focus on the strengths of responses rather than the weaknesses. Due to the high-stakes nature of these large-scale assessments, the OEAA 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, and are reported in the Individual Student Report, the Parent Report and the Class Roster. The Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample is scored using a holistic rubric with ratings from 0-4 and is displayed in the reports listed above. Again, scorers are extensively trained to score student writing.

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 recommended by a panel comprised of educators and other stakeholders throughout the state in a process known as standard setting. To set these standards, the panel uses detailed descriptions of what students in each of the performance levels should know and be able to do. Based upon these detailed descriptions and actual assessment items, the

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.

**MEAP Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges
Fall 2010 – Grades 3-9**

Subject	Grade	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
		Not Proficient	Partially Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
Mathematics	3	205 - 278	279 - 299	300 - 326	327 - 427
	4	285 - 377	378 - 399	400 - 431	432 - 554
	5	358 - 476	477 - 499	500 - 526	527 - 671
	6	472 - 579	580 - 599	600 - 621	622 - 761
	7	581 - 675	676 - 699	700 - 721	722 - 873
	8	676 - 783	784 - 799	800 - 819	820 - 961
Reading	3	194 - 279	280 - 299	300 - 337	338 - 417
	4	285 - 372	373 - 399	400 - 442	443 - 529
	5	386 - 481	482 - 499	500 - 537	538 - 631
	6	492 - 579	580 - 599	600 - 637	638 - 726
	7	575 - 683	684 - 699	700 - 737	738 - 823
	8	691 - 779	780 - 799	800 - 833	834 - 921
Writing	4	264 - 361	362 - 399	400 - 428	429 - 532
	7	531 - 665	666 - 699	700 - 732	733 - 832
Science	5	351 - 475	476 - 499	500 - 532	533 - 661
	8	665 - 780	781 - 799	800 - 831	832 - 967
Social Studies	6	483 - 586	587 - 599	600 - 618	619 - 733
	9	777 - 880	881 - 899	900 - 928	929 - 1045

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 Partially 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	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High
Math	3	205-239	240-259	260-277	279-285	286-292	293-299	300-308	309-317	318-326	327-344	345-368	369-427
	4	285-336	337-357	358-377	378-385	386-392	393-399	400-410	411-420	421-431	432-449	450-470	471-554
	5	358-429	430-454	455-476	477-484	485-492	493-499	500-508	509-517	518-526	527-545	546-569	570-671
	6	472-535	536-558	559-579	580-586	587-592	593-599	600-607	608-614	615-621	622-640	641-662	663-761
	7	581-632	633-654	655-675	676-683	684-691	692-699	700-707	708-714	715-721	722-739	740-761	762-873
	8	676-739	740-763	764-783	784-789	790-794	795-799	800-806	807-812	813-819	820-839	840-861	862-961
Reading	3	194-244	245-264	265-279	280-286	287-292	293-299	300-309	310-323	324-337	338-357	358-389	390-417
	4	285-336	337-357	358-372	373-385	386-392	393-399	400-410	411-424	425-442	443-462	463-490	491-529
	5	386-442	443-464	465-481	482-487	488-493	494-499	500-511	512-523	524-537	538-554	555-579	580-631
	6	492-535	536-563	564-579	580-586	587-593	594-599	600-610	611-621	622-637	638-655	656-684	685-726
	7	575-636	637-664	665-683	684-689	690-694	695-699	700-711	712-723	724-737	738-759	760-789	790-823
	8	691-739	740-763	764-779	780-786	787-793	794-799	800-809	810-820	821-833	834-849	850-874	875-921

MEAP Performance Level Change Table

For mathematics and reading, the four performance levels have each been divided into three ranges (low, mid, and high) to enable the more precise tracking of changes in student performance. The table below delineates the transitions a student can demonstrate on these MEAP subjects 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.

Grade X MEAP Achievement		Grade X + 1 MEAP Achievement											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	High	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
Partially Proficient	Low	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	High	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI
Proficient	Low	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI
Advanced	Low	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I
	High	SD	SD	SD	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 any specific 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), 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

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 2010 Item Descriptor booklets can be found for each grade level and subject area on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Section D appears in 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. Condition codes are reported if applicable. If a student receives an overall score of zero (0) there will be a condition code indicating why a zero was given. A description of the condition codes is provided in the legends at the bottom of the reading and writing ISRs.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT

Social Studies



A

Grade 09
Fall 2010

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: \$SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

B

Student Name: LNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Student ID: 00659458 Date of Birth: 01/01/2001 State UIC: 9999999999
Gender: M Ethnicity: Two or more races
English Language Learner: N Formerly LEP: N SpecEd: N
Accommodations: Social Studies-None

Summary of Social Studies Results

Subject	Score	2010 Achievement Performance Level
Social Studies	1032	1-Advanced

GLCE Code	DOMAIN Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points	GLCE Code	DOMAIN Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
	HISTORY	23/23			
6W1.1.01	Describe early migrations of people among continents	1/1	6G4.2.01	List technologies used to move people/products/ideas	1/1
6W1.2.03	Explain the impact of the Agricultural Revolution	1/1	7G4.3.02	Describe patterns of settlement by using maps	1/1
7W1.2.01	Describe natural environm: agricultural settlements	2/2	7G4.4.01	Identify conflict/cooperation among cultural groups	1/1
6W2.1.03	Describe early peoples reflected geography: N.Amer.	1/1	6G5.2.01	Describe how change is environ. can affect humans	1/1
7W2.1.04	Define concept of cultural diffusion	1/1	7G5.1.01	Describe environmental effects of human action	1/1
7W3.1.05	Describe major achievements of Eastern Hemisphere	1/1	7G5.1.03	Identify human-induced changes cause other changes	1/1
7W3.1.06	Use maps to locate trade networks: classical era	1/1			
7W3.1.09	Describe legal codes, communications: regional empire	1/1		CIVICS/GOVERNMENT	3/3
7W3.2.01	Describe beliefs of five major world religions	1/1	6C1.1.01	Analyze competing ideas: democracy/dictatorship	1/1
7W3.2.03	Describe Afro-Eurasian religions: unified perceptions	1/1	6C4.3.03	How countries work in International organizations	1/1
8U3.3.04	Explain: Constitution resolved major issues	1/1	7C4.3.02	Explain cooperation needed: international issues	1/1
8U3.3.05	Analyze debates: Constitution ratification	1/1			
8U3.3.06	Explain: Bill of Rights/limited government	1/1		ECONOMICS	5/5
8U3.3.07	Describe origins: constitutional government	1/1	7E1.1.01	Explain incentives in different economic systems	1/1
8U4.1.04	Explain development of the Supreme Court	1/1	7E1.1.02	Describe the circular flow model	1/1
8U4.2.01	Compare the Northeast and the South	1/1	6E2.3.01	Describe impact of sanctions/tariffs/treaties	1/1
8U4.2.03	Explain the Expansion of the West	1/1	6E3.3.01	Compare traditional/command/market economies	1/1
8U5.1.03	Compare views: Calhoun/Webster/Clay	1/1	7E3.1.04	Explain communications: affect economic interactions	1/1
8U5.1.04	Describe increased sectional tensions	1/1			
8U5.1.05	Describe the resistance of enslaved people	1/1			
8U5.1.06	Describe Constit. Convention/Civil War	1/1			
8U5.2.03	Examine Abraham Lincoln's presidency	1/1			
	GEOGRAPHY	13/13			
6G1.2.04	Use photographs for answering geographic questions	1/1			
6G1.3.01	Use themes of geography to describe regions/places	1/1			
7G1.2.01	Locate major landforms/rivers/climates: E. Hemisphere	1/1			
7G1.3.01	Use geography themes to describe regions or places	1/1			
6G2.2.02	Explain how communities are affected by technology	1/1			
7G2.1.01	Describe landforms/climate of E. Hemisphere regions	1/1			
6G3.2.02	Identify why ecosystems are attractive for human use	1/1			

C



INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT



A

Writing

Grade 07
Fall 2010

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

Student Name: LNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Student ID: 00728443
Gender: M
English Language Learner: N
Accommodations: Writing-None
Date of Birth: 01/01/2001
Ethnicity: White
Formerly LEP: N
SpecEd: N
State UIC: 9999999999

B

Summary of Writing Results

Subject	2010 Achievement	
	Score	Performance Level*
Writing	720	2-Proficient

MULTIPLE CHOICE		
GLCE Code	DOMAIN Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
WRITING GENRE		
W.GN.06.01	Produce writing w/ or ID genre characteristics	0/1
W.GN.06.02	Produce writing w/ or ID org. that supports ideas	1/1
WRITING PROCESS		
W.PR.06.01	Consider audience and purpose for writing	0/2
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	1/1
PERSONAL STYLE		
W.PS.06.01	ID/exhibit style/voice to enhance written message	1/4
GRAMMAR AND USAGE		
W.GR.06.01	Write with or ID correct grammar and usage	1/4
SPELLING		
W.SP.06.01	Spell frequently misspelled words correctly	0/2

C

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE		
GLCE Code	WRITING PROMPT Trait	Condition Code* Earned / Possible Points
NARRATIVE WRITING		
W.GN.06.01	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	1/3
W.PR.06.02	Organization	3/3
W.PS.06.01	Style	3/3
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	1/3
W.PS.06.01	Style	2/3
W.GR.06.01	Conventions	2/3
RESPONSE TO STUDENT WRITING SAMPLE		
W.PR.06.03	Revise drafts	2/4

D

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

† If Condition Code present, Earned Points equal zero.

Student Record Label

A Student Record Label is provided for each student assessed during the Fall 2010 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 during the Pre-ID process, date of birth, gender, and grade.

Section C contains the Subject areas assessed, the Scale Score (SS) received, the Performance Level the student attained in each subject area, and the Performance Level Change 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

99999 DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 99999 SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A
 LNAMEXXXXXXXXXX, FNAMEXXXX X

STU# 12345678901234567890 UIC# UIC: 9999999999

DOB: 01/01/100
 Gender: M
 Grade: 7 **B**

Subject	SS	Performance Level	Perf.Level Change
Reading	701	2-Proficient C	D
Writing	705	2-Proficient	
Mathematics	646	4-Not Proficient	SD
Science			
Social Studies			

Fall 2010
meap[™]

Parent Report

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

Section A provides the title of the report, the assessment cycle, the grade the student was in when the assessment was administered, 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 and summarizing information contained in the Parent Report.

Section C provides the student's scale score in each subject area assessed for the current year, the performance level obtained in mathematics and reading for the current and previous year, and an indication of the student's performance level change for those subjects. (Note: Grade 3 students will have "NA - Not Applicable" for the previous year's performance level.)


Section D provides information on students' performance level change from grade to grade in mathematics and reading.

Section E describes how the student performed in each subject area. Each subject area is divided into subscore groupings: mathematics is divided into focal points, reading into domains, and science and social studies into disciplines. For each subject area, the total points earned versus the total points possible for each subscore grouping is displayed. The brief explanation for each subject area provides the performance level the student attained and the accompanying scale score, as well as information on how the student's performance relates to Michigan standards. For example, if a student received a Level 2 on the eighth grade mathematics assessment, that student is "Proficient" and has met grade level expectations for Michigan students.

Section F displays the new writing parent report section. The Narrative Writing and the Informational Writing prompts' rubric scores are listed for each trait. 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) 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: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 88888

Parent Report

Grade 04
Fall 2010



School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 88888

Report For:
FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX X
LnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear Parent or Guardian:

During October 2010, schools administered the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) assessments. The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law requires all students in grades 3 through 8, including FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, to take the reading and mathematics assessments. Students also have the opportunity to take writing assessments in grades 4 and 7, science in grades 5 and 8, and social studies in grades 5 and 9.


Within each performance level (Advanced, Proficient, Partially Proficient and Not Proficient), information has been included to encourage support for continued excellence and to provide support and 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.

The MEAP assessments measure what a student should know and be able to do in each of the subject areas and grades assessed. MEAP specifically addresses content identified in the Michigan Curriculum Framework. Most schools have adopted similar curriculum standards. The results presented in this report provide a valid and reliable assessment of how well FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX performed overall in each subject area assessed.

We encourage you to discuss the MEAP results for FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX with teachers and other school professionals who have the benefit of knowing your student personally. Teachers are able to use the MEAP results, together with other tests and classroom performance information, to provide a more complete analysis and plan for your student's continued learning.

Parents and teachers have a greater opportunity to help students succeed when they work together to encourage student learning.

Sincerely,



Michael F. Flanagan
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Michigan

Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1: Advanced
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
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
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
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 FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Subject	Score	2010 Achievement Performance Level	2009 Achievement Performance Level	Student's Performance Level Change
Reading	467	1-Advanced	1-Advanced	Last fall, FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX scored near the high end of the Advanced performance level. This fall, FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX scored near the middle of the Advanced
Writing	420	2-Proficient	NA*	NA*
Mathematics	439	1-Advanced	1-Advanced	Last fall, FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX scored near the high end of the Advanced performance level. This fall, FnameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX scored near the low end of the Advanced

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

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.

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

A STUDENT AT THE ADVANCED LEVEL:
Used knowledge about reading (genre, structure, text features, etc.) to accurately and insightfully construct meaning and synthesize and evaluate themes within and across texts. With instructional support, the student should continue to excel. (www.michigan.gov/ela)

Level 4
Not Proficient

Level 3

Level 2
Proficient

Level 1
Advanced

457

Reading Domains	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Word Recognition & Word Study	4	4	100%
Narrative Text	5	7	71%
Informational Text	2	3	67%
Comprehension	19	19	100%

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.

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 PROFICIENT LEVEL:
Wrote in a clear and focused manner, developed ideas with some details, used adequate organization and grade level appropriate language, usually used the Conventions of Standard English, and effectively evaluated the writing of others. With instructional support, the student should maintain and improve proficiency. (See www.michigan.gov/ela)

Level 4
Not Proficient

3

Level 2

Level 1
Advanced

420

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

	Writing Process	Grammar Style, and Usage	Spelling	
Earned/Points Possible	2/7	1/2	1/4	0/3
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.

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 ADVANCED LEVEL:
Performed mathematical skills, understood concepts and solved complex, non-routine problems consistent with grade level expectations. With instructional support, the student should continue to excel. (www.michigan.gov/mathematics)

Level 4
Not Proficient

3

Level 2

Level 1
Advanced

438

Mathematics Focal Points	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Understanding of Fractions	7	9	78%
Multiplication and Division	5	12	42%
Properties of 2D, 3D Shapes	8	13	62%
Understanding Area, Perimeter	9	13	69%
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 the 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. Previous year performance level, as well as the performance level change, are reported for mathematics and reading.

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

Section D reports the number of students assessed within each class/group code and the mean score for each subscore grouping and GLCE.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



CLASS ROSTER



A Grade 08
Fall 2010
SCIENCE
FORM 06

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

Discipline GLCE	2010 Scale Score	2010 Performance Level	Science Processes													Physical Science					Discipline Total	Continued												
			S.IP.07.11	S.IP.07.12	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.07.15	S.RS.07.16	S.RS.07.17	P.FM.05.21	P.FM.05.31	P.FM.05.42	P.EN.07.31	P.EN.07.32			P.EN.07.33	P.EN.07.61	P.PM.07.22	P.PM.07.23	P.PM.07.24	P.ON.06.12	P.ON.07.21	P.ON.07.22				
Points Possible			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	813	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	8		
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	750	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2			
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	659	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	769	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3			
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	857	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	773	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2			
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	857	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	11	
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	781	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3			
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameex UI: 999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	829	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	7				
No. of Students Assessed = 54																																		
Mean	810.2	NA	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6	7.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.4	7.6			

** 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	(852 - 987)
2-Proficient	(800 - 831)
3-Partially Proficient	(781 - 799)
4-Not Proficient	(685 - 780)
NM - No Matching Student	
NA - Not Applicable	

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 District Code: 99999

CLASS ROSTER

A Grade 04
 Fall 2010
 WRITING



Teacher Name:
 Class/Group:
 School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 School Code: 99999

Domain GLCE	MULTIPLE CHOICE											
	2010 Scale Score	2010 Performance Level	Writing Process				Personal Style		Grammar and Usage		Spelling	
			W.PR.03.01	W.PR.03.02	W.PR.03.04	Domain Total	W.PE.03.01	Domain Total	W.GR.03.01	Domain Total	W.SP.03.01	Domain Total
Points Possible			1	2	4	7	2	2	4	4	3	3
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	394	3	1	2	4	7	2	2	4	4	3	3
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	407	2	1	2	3	6	1	1	4	4	3	3
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	426	2	0	2	2	4	1	1	1	1	3	3
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	426	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	401	2	0	1	1	2	C 0	0	0	0	0	0
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	430	2	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	2
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	437	1	1	1	3	5	0	0	2	2	2	2
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	432	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	369	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	434	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	377	4	0	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
LNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	458	1	1	2	2	5	2	2	0	0	3	3
No. of Students Assessed = 56												
Mean	357.1	NA	0.5	1.1	1.6	3.4	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6

** 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 - 522)
2-Proficient	(400 - 428)
3-Partially Proficient	(362 - 399)
4-Not Proficient	(284 - 361)
NM - No Matching Student	
NA - Not Applicable	

Note: These domain totals include multiple choice scores only.

Fall 2010 Run Date: 03/21/2011

POAMXQ01T

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



CLASS ROSTER

A

Grade 04
Fall 2010
WRITING



District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 9999

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 9999

Trait GLCE	CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE													
	2010 Scale Score	2010 Performance Level	Narrative Writing					Informational Writing					Response to Student Writing	
			Ideas W.G.N.03.01 <small>(This score is subject to re-evaluation)</small>	Organization W.P.R.03.02	Style W.P.S.03.01	Conventions W.G.R.03.01	Condition Code	Ideas W.G.N.03.03 <small>(This score is subject to re-evaluation)</small>	Organization W.P.R.03.02	Style W.P.S.03.01	Conventions W.G.R.03.01	Condition Code	Revise Drafts W.P.R.03.04	Condition Code
Points Possible			3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3		4	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	407	2	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0		4	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	426	2	1	3	3	3		1	3	3	3		0	A
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	428	2	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3		1	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	401	2	1	1	1	3		1	1	1	3		3	
LNameXXXXX, FNameXXXXX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	430	2	3	3	3	3	C	3	2	2	2		1	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	437	1	3	2	2	2		3	2	1	2		4	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	432	1	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3		2	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	369	4	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		2	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	434	1	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3		3	
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	377	4	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	A
LNameXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, FNameX UIC: 9999999999 DOB: 01/01/01	458	1	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3		4	
No. of Students Assessed = 56							D							
Mean	397.1	NA	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1		1.1	1.0	1.0	1.2		1.4	

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

Performance Level	Writing Scale Score Range	Condition Codes
1-Advanced	(429 - 532)	A = Off-topic
2-Proficient	(400 - 428)	B = Illegible or written in a language other than English
3-Partially Proficient	(362 - 399)	C = Blank
4-Not Proficient	(294 - 361)	D = Insufficient to rate
NM - No Matching Student		
NA - Not Applicable		

Item Analysis Report

The Item Analysis Report provides summary information for each multiple choice item and each constructed response item on the assessment, including the primary Michigan GLCE measured by each item. The summary information reports the percentage of students selecting each 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 are not included in this count.

Section B lists the Item Descriptor Number and the benchmark and GLCE being assessed for each multiple choice item. The Fall 2010 Item Descriptors for each grade level and subject area are posted on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Section C indicates the percentage of students selecting each response to the multiple choice questions in section B. A plus sign (+) denotes the correct response. 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 small mean comparison table for the Narrative and Informational Writing prompts is provided at the bottom of the page to facilitate a quick review.

The condition codes are reported at the individual student level on the Individual Student Report (ISR) for the Fall 2010 assessments.

Condition Codes provide a reason the student's response received a score of zero (0). The Fall 2010 Condition Codes are listed in the lower right quadrant of the reading and writing Item Analysis Reports. The codes are the 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)

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, while other GLCEs are assessed by multiple items. A larger number of assessment items provides more reliable results. This may make interpretation of item analysis reports more difficult.

Teachers 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 further evaluated using classroom and other assessment information before making decisions to adjust curriculum or instruction.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



SCHOOL ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT All Except Students with Disabilities



District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

A Grade 05
Fall 2010
READING

School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

No. of Students Assessed = 49

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Reading								
Word Study	1	R.W.04.07	20	18	45+	12	4	0
Word Study	7	R.W.04.07	55+	20	8	12	0	4
Narrative Text	5	R.NT.04.03	12	51+	24	4	4	4
Narrative Text	6	R.NT.04.03	18	6	55+	20	0	0
Narrative Text		R.NT.04.03	20	49+	18	0	0	4
Narrative Text		R.NT.04.03	61+	10	12			2
Narrative Text		R.NT.04.03	8	12	14			2
Narrative Text	17	R.NT.04.03	12	10	18	59+	0	0
Narrative Text	18	R.NT.04.03	18	18	53+	6	2	2
Narrative Text	24	R.NT.04.03	14	53+	12	20	0	0
Narrative Text	25	R.NT.04.03	14	8	59+	18	0	0
Narrative Text	16	R.NT.04.04	8	14	59+	6	0	2
Narrative Text	20	R.NT.04.04	16	10	10	53+	4	6
Narrative Text	21	R.NT.04.04	63+	8	14	10	0	4
Informational Text	2	R.IT.04.01	18	57+	16	6	0	2
Comprehension	3	R.CM.04.02	24	41+	18	16	0	0
Comprehension	12	R.CM.04.02	10	55+	20	12	2	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Comprehension	19	R.CM.04.02	14	6	16	51+	0	2
Comprehension	22	R.CM.04.02	51+	16	10	20	2	0
Comprehension	23	R.CM.04.02	8	14	63+	12	0	2
Comprehension	4	R.CM.04.03	20	10	10	59+	0	0
Comprehension	8	R.CM.04.03	51+	24	10	14	0	0
Comprehension	10	R.CM.04.03	16	8	8	63+	2	2
Comprehension	13	R.CM.04.03	14	16	59+	6	2	2
Comprehension	26	R.CM.04.03	16	12	16	55+	0	0
Comprehension	27	R.CM.04.03	18	10	57+	10	2	2
Comprehension	28	R.CM.04.03	47+	18	18	14	2	0
Comprehension	29	R.CM.04.03	10	55+	20	10	2	2
Comprehension	30	R.CM.04.03	20	39+	16	22	0	2
Comprehension	31	R.CM.04.03	12	14	59+	14	0	0

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE											
Item 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
9	R.CM.04.02	1.7	20	22	27	31	0	0	1	0	9

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 07
Fall 2010
WRITING

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

No. of Students Assessed = 58

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	
Writing								
Writing Genre	18	W.GN.06.01	52+	12	17	16	0	3
Writing Genre	9	W.GN.06.02	59+	12	12	12	6	0
Writing Process	3	W.PR.06.01	12	14	9	62+	2	2
Writing Process	17	W.PR.06.01	16	12	60+	10	0	2
Writing Process	5	W.PR.06.02	16	48+	17	17	2	2
Writing Process	10	W.PR.06.03	69+	10	14	7	0	0
Personal Style	4	W.PS.06.01	9	7	69+	10	2	3
Personal Style	7	W.PS.06.01	9	60+	12	19	0	0
Personal Style	11	W.PS.06.01	21	7	10	62+	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	
Personal Style	15	W.PS.06.01	19	47+	22	9	3	0
Grammar and Usage	8	W.GR.06.01	7	14	67+	9	0	3
Grammar and Usage	12	W.GR.06.01	57+	5	10	22	3	2
Grammar and Usage	13	W.GR.06.01	16	72+	3	9	0	0
Grammar and Usage	15	W.GR.06.01	14	14	9	64+	0	0
Spelling	6	W.SP.06.01	12	5	67+	16	0	0
Spelling	14	W.SP.06.01	21	9	12	55+	0	3

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE														
Item Descriptor Number	Writing Prompt Trait	GLCE Code	Mean Score	Percent of Students at Each Score Based on 3 or 4-point Rubric					Number of Students Receiving Condition Codes					
				0	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D		
1	Narrative Writing													
	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	W.GN.06.01	0.7	62	19	7	12							
	Organization	W.PR.06.02	0.8	59	21	3	17							
	Style	W.PS.06.01	0.8	64	9	10	17							
	Conventions	W.GR.06.01	0.9	59	7	19	16							
2	Informational Writing													
	Ideas (this score is doubled in overall score)	W.GN.06.02	0.7	62	16	10	12							
	Organization	W.PR.06.02	0.7	59	22	9	10							
	Style	W.PS.06.01	0.7	67	5	19	9							
	Conventions	W.GR.06.01	0.8	62	9	21	9							
19	Response to Student Writing Sample													
	Revise drafts	W.PR.06.03	1.1	55	12	10	10	0	29	1	1	1		

Condition Codes:

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

MEANS COMPARISON		
Traits	Narrative Writing	Informational Writing
Ideas	0.7	0.7
Organization	0.8	0.7
Style	0.8	0.7
Conventions	0.9	0.8

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 08
Fall 2010
SCIENCE

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

No. of Students Assessed (All Forms) = 58

MULTIPLE CHOICE									
Domain Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Omit %	Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %			
Science Processes									
Inquiry Process	27	S/IP.07.12	17	22	41+	14	2	3	
Inquiry Process	28	S/IP.07.14	21	10	14	53+	0	2	
Inquiry Process	18	S/IP.07.16	17	55+	15	7	2	0	
Inq Analysis Comm.	46	S/JA.06.14	9	59+	10	5	0	0	
Inq Analysis Comm.	8	S/JA.07.13	14	22	12	0	0	0	
Inq Analysis Comm.	29	S/JA.07.15	16	16	41+	19	2	7	
Reflect Soc Imp	47	S/RS.07.11	14	59+	12	16	0	0	
Reflect Soc Imp	26	S/RS.07.16	14	55+	10	19	0	2	
Reflect Soc Imp	17	S/RS.07.17	12	10	66+	7	2	3	
Physical Science									
Forces & Motion	39	P/FM.05.21	14	66+	9	10	2	0	
Forces & Motion	41	P/FM.05.42	17	14	9	57+	0	3	
Energy	44	P/EN.07.31	55+	17	9	12	5	2	
Energy	42	P/EN.07.61	14	24	50+	9	2	2	
Prop. of Matter	11	P/PM.07.23	19	10	9	59+	0	3	
Prop. of Matter	13	P/PM.07.24	59+	17	10	14	0	0	
Changes in Matter	16	P/CM.05.12	7	10	17	59+	5	2	
Changes in Matter	14	P/CM.07.21	71+	9	9	10	0	2	

B

C

MULTIPLE CHOICE									
Domain Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					Omit %	Multi %
			A %	B %	C %	D %			
Life Science									
Org. Living Things	1	L/OL.05.41	17	22	43+	12	0	5	
Org. Living Things	5	L/OL.07.21	17	5	52+	24	2	0	
Org. Living Things	3	L/OL.07.63	57+	12	21	7	0	3	
Heredity	50	L/HE.05.11	53+	9	5	12	12	9	
Evolution	6	L/EV.05.14	19	53+	10	16	2	0	
Evolution	48	L/EV.05.21	16	21	53+	7	2	2	
Ecosystems	51	L/EC.05.42	3	17	24	52+	3	0	
Earth Science									
Earth Systems	24	E/ES.05.61	57+	7	10	26	0	0	
Earth Systems	23	E/ES.07.74	19	22	28	31+	0	0	
Earth Systems	31	E/ES.07.82	57+	3	21	17	2	0	
Solid Earth	21	E/SE.05.41	53+	24	7	14	2	0	
Solid Earth	19	E/SE.05.62	14	10	16	57+	0	3	
Fluid Earth	32	E/FE.07.12	59+	12	12	16	2	0	
Earth Space Time	34	E/ST.05.11	16	59+	9	17	0	0	
Earth Space Time	36	E/ST.05.21	12	71+	10	5	0	2	

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



SCHOOL ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT



All Students

Grade 08

Fall 2010

SCIENCE

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

No. of Students Assessed (All Forms) = 58

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
No. of Students Assessed (Form 01): 4								
Inquiry Process	9	S.IP.07.15	25	75+	0	0	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	38	S.IA.07.11	50	25+	0	25	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	10	S.RS.07.14	25	75	0+	0	0	0
Reflect Soc Imp	30	S.RS.07.15	25	25+	0	50	0	0
Forces & Motion	40	P.FM.05.31	50	25	0	25+	0	0
Energy	43	P.EN.06.12	0	25	25+	50	0	0
Energy	15	P.EN.06.41	25+	50	0	25	0	0
Prop. of Matter	12	P.PM.07.22	25	50+	0	25	0	0
Changes in Matter	45	P.CM.07.23	25+	50	0	25	0	0
Org. Living Things	52	L.OL.05.42	75+	25	0	0	0	0
Heredity	7	L.HE.05.12	25	25+	25	25	0	0
Evolution	4	L.EV.05.11	25	75+	0	0	0	0
Ecosystems	49	L.EC.06.21	0	0	75	25+	0	0
Ecosystems	2	L.EC.06.31	25	25	25+	25	0	0
Earth Systems	25	E.ES.07.13	0	0	50	50+	0	0
Earth Systems	33	E.ES.07.72	0	50+	25	25	0	0
Solid Earth	22	E.SE.06.11	0	25	75+	0	0	0
Solid Earth	20	E.SE.06.52	25	50	25+	0	0	0
Earth Space Time	35	E.ST.05.25	25	25	0	50+	0	0
Earth Space Time	37	E.ST.06.42	25+	0	25	50	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
No. of Students Assessed (Form 08): 54								
Inquiry Process	9	S.IP.07.11	13	19	11	57+	0	0
Inq Analysis Comm.	38	S.IA.07.11	15	20	9	52+	2	2
Reflect Soc Imp	10	S.RS.07.14	15	15	59+	9	0	2
Reflect Soc Imp	30	S.RS.07.15	6	57+	11	20	4	2
Forces & Motion	40	P.FM.05.31	13	19	11	57+	0	0
Energy	43	P.EN.07.32	59+	6	11	22	0	2
Energy	15	P.EN.07.33	63+	15	15	7	0	0
Prop. of Matter	12	P.PM.07.22	9	65+	9	15	2	0
Changes in Matter	45	P.CM.07.22	22	35+	28	13	2	0
Org. Living Things	52	L.OL.07.51	50+	11	19	15	4	2
Heredity	7	L.HE.07.22	9	43+	37	9	0	2
Evolution	4	L.EV.05.11	17	54+	15	15	0	0
Ecosystems	49	L.EC.06.21	44+	2	0	0	24	30
Ecosystems	2	L.EC.06.22	19	11	61+	7	0	2
Earth Systems	25	E.ES.07.13	17	24	2	57+	0	0
Earth Systems	33	E.ES.07.72	22	65+	7	6	0	0
Solid Earth	22	E.SE.06.11	6	19	54+	19	2	2
Solid Earth	20	E.SE.06.12	13	11	65+	9	2	0
Earth Space Time	35	E.ST.05.24	7	69+	6	17	0	2
Earth Space Time	37	E.ST.05.24	63+	19	9	9	0	0

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, 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. Four years of summary data are reported, with 2005 as the baseline year for the revised MEAP. In addition to subject area summaries, the ISD Summary Report will include Section B summary data for the current assessment cycle for each district and charter school within its boundaries.

Section C provides summary data on student performance level change compared to the previous administration of the MEAP. 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 2009, took the MEAP in both Fall 2009 and Fall 2010, and had a matching Unique Identification Code (UIC) for both Fall 2009 and Fall 2010. This data is currently provided for mathematics and reading. There is no progress table provided for science, social studies, or writing. The progress tables provide the number and percentage of students matched between Fall 2009 and Fall 2010.

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



SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

A All Students



District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 District Code: 99999

Grade 07
 Fall 2010

School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 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		(575-823)	(575-823)	(584-699)	(700-737)	(738-823)	(700-823)	
	2010	58	703	691-715	34%	17%	26%	22%	48%
	2009	61	722	716-728	5%	10%	67%	18%	85%
	2008	66	716	710-722	14%	15%	47%	24%	71%
	2005	63	707	701-713	16%	19%	37%	3%	65%
WRITING	Scale Score Range		(531-832)	(531-832)	(666-699)	(700-732)	(733-832)	(700-832)	
	2010	58	702	694-710	16%	28%	36%	21%	57%
	2009	NA							
	2008	NA							
	2005	NA							
MATHEMATICS	Scale Score Range		(581-873)	(581-873)	(676-699)	(700-721)	(722-873)	(700-873)	
	2010	58	747	727-768	22%	3%	16%	59%	74%
	2009	61	708	703-713	8%	28%	36%	28%	64%
	2008	66	713	707-719	8%	24%	29%	39%	68%
	2005	63	698	692-704	17%	35%	33%	14%	48%

FALL 2009 to FALL 2010 PERFORMANCE LEVEL CHANGE COUNTS (PERCENTS)

Student Group	Performance Level Change Category					
	Significant Decline	Decline	Maintaining	Improvement	Significant Improvement	
READING	Not Previously Proficient	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	5 (63%)
	Previously Proficient	25 (51%)	9 (18%)	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	4 (8%)
	All Students	27 (47%)	9 (16%)	7 (12%)	5 (9%)	9 (16%)
MATHEMATICS	Not Previously Proficient	3 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	14 (78%)
	Previously Proficient	11 (28%)	5 (13%)	4 (10%)	8 (21%)	11 (28%)
	All Students	14 (25%)	5 (9%)	4 (7%)	9 (16%)	25 (44%)

NOTE: 57 students (98%) were successfully matched from Fall 2009 to Fall 2010

NOTE: 57 students (98%) were successfully matched from Fall 2009 to Fall 2010

NA - Not Applicable.
 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 Students



District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

Grade 07
Fall 2010
Reading

School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
School Code: 99999

Fall 2009 to Fall 2010 MEAP Reading Transition Counts

Fall 2009 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2010 MEAP Reading Performance Level											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	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
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partially Proficient	Low	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Proficient	Low	0	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	1	1
	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
	High	2	3	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	2
Advanced	Low	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0
	Mid	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: 57 students (98.3) were successfully matched from Fall 2009 to Fall 2010



Fall 2009 to Fall 2010 MEAP Reading Transition Percents

Fall 2009 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2010 MEAP Reading Performance Level											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	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	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	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	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	0.0
Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	3.5	5.3	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	3.5	5.3	7.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	3.5	1.8	1.8	3.5	0.0	3.5
Advanced	Low	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	0.0	3.5	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	0.0
	Mid	0.0	5.3	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	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	0.0	0.0

Fall 2009 to Fall 2010 MEAP Reading Transition Percents in Each Row

Fall 2009 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2010 MEAP Reading Performance Level											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	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	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	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	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	25.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	11.1	16.7	22.2	0.0	5.6	0.0	11.1	5.6	5.6	11.1	0.0	11.1
Advanced	Low	0.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	37.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	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	0.0	0.0

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

Page 2 of 21

Fall 2010 Run Date: 03/04/2011

POAJYM005

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 District Code: 99999

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

Grade 07
 Fall 2010

Mathematics Score Distribution



School Name: SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 School Code: 99999

GLCE Code	FOCAL POINT Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Points	Points Possible	Percent of Students Scoring		
					0	1	2
	Rational number operations	58	13.7	27			
N.MR.06.01	Understand + of fractions as the inverse of x	58	1.1	2	31	31	38
N.FL.06.02	Write a statement to represent dividing fractions	58	1.0	2	41	21	38
N.MR.06.03	Solve for the unknown in equations	58	0.9	2	45	19	36
N.FL.06.04	x and + any two fractions, including mixed numbers	58	1.0	2	38	21	41
N.ME.06.05	Order rational numbers and place on the number line	58	0.6	1	43	57	
N.ME.06.06	Show rationals as fractions or terminating decimals	58	0.5	1	50	50	
N.ME.06.07	Understand fractions as a quotient of two integers	58	0.5	1	52	48	
N.MR.06.08	Understand - and + as inverse of + and x	58	0.5	1	52	48	
N.FL.06.09	Compute with integers, use # line & chip models	58	1.2	2	28	21	52
N.FL.06.10	Compute with positive rational numbers	58	1.1	2	31	24	45
N.ME.06.11	Find equivalent ratios by scaling up or down	58	0.7	2	48	29	22
N.FL.06.12	Calculate part of a number given the % and number	58	1.1	2	31	29	40
N.MR.06.13	Solve contextual problems involving percentages	58	0.4	1	57	43	
N.FL.06.14	Estimate calculations involving rational numbers	58	1.0	2	31	34	34
N.FL.06.15	Solve applied problems with appropriate decimals	58	1.0	2	40	22	38
A.PA.06.01	Solve applied problems involving rates	58	1.0	2	34	31	34
	Expressions and equations	58	9.2	18			
A.FO.06.03	Use letters, with units, to represent quantities	58	0.9	2	45	21	34
A.FO.06.04	Distinguish between algebraic expression/equation	58	1.1	2	36	19	45
A.FO.06.05	Use conventions for writing algebraic expressions	58	0.4	1	57	43	
A.FO.06.06	Represent words using algebraic equations	58	1.2	2	28	22	50
A.FO.06.07	Simplify linear expression & evaluate using values	58	0.5	1	52	48	
A.RP.06.08	Relationships can be shown by graphs and tables	58	0.5	1	53	47	
A.PA.06.09	Solve problems involving linear functions	58	0.6	1	45	55	
A.RP.06.10	Show relationships using equations, tables, graphs	58	0.5	1	47	53	
A.FO.06.11	Relate simple linear equations to contexts; solve	58	1.1	2	29	31	40
A.FO.06.12	Add, subtract numbers on both sides of equations	58	0.9	2	40	26	34
A.FO.06.13	Multiply, divide numbers on both sides of equations	58	0.9	2	43	19	38
A.FO.06.14	Solve equations of the form $ax + b = c$	58	0.6	1	45	55	
	Properties of 3D shapes	58	2.5	5			
M.UN.06.01	Convert measures within a single system	58	0.6	1	45	55	
M.PS.06.02	Draw patterns for rectangular prisms	58	0.8	2	45	29	26
M.TE.06.03	Compute volume & surface area of rectangular prisms	58	1.1	2	31	26	43
	Continued on Next Page						

E

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 Score Distribution.
 Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Page 6 of 21

Fall 2010 Run Date: 03/04/2011

POAJYMD05

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) no summary scores are provided for subgroups containing less than ten students, and 2) students who have been enrolled in your district for less than one full academic year (LTFAY) at the time of the MEAP assessment administration are not reported as a subgroup on this report. Calculation of this data for AYP purposes will be determined 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, 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



DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT All Except Students with Disabilities



A

Grade 08
Fall 2010

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

District	READING							MATHEMATICS							SCIENCE						
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*
Total All Except Students with Disabilities	983	803	28%	20%	31%	21%	52%	979	811	28%	11%	14%	46%	60%	973	801	31%	12%	29%	27%	57%
Gender																					
Male	479	803	27%	22%	31%	20%	51%	474	813	26%	12%	13%	49%	62%	473	798	31%	12%	32%	26%	57%
Female	504	803	29%	18%	31%	22%	53%	505	809	31%	11%	15%	43%	59%	500	803	31%	13%	28%	29%	57%
Ethnicity																					
American Indian or Alaska Native	< 10							< 10							< 10						
Asian	11	801	45%	9%	27%	16%	45%	11	811	55%	0%	45%	45%	11	780	45%	9%	36%	9%	45%	
Black or African American	423	805	27%	19%	30%	24%	54%	422	810	28%	14%	45%	59%	419	801	31%	12%	30%	28%	58%	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander																					
White	168	800	31%	21%	30%	17%	48%	166	811	28%	11%	16%	45%	61%	166	798	32%	10%	32%	26%	58%
Two or more races	258	801	27%	22%	33%	19%	52%	256	813	28%	9%	13%	49%	63%	254	801	30%	15%	28%	27%	55%
Hispanic of any race	115	805	29%	17%	33%	22%	55%	116	811	27%	13%	18%	42%	60%	115	805	30%	10%	29%	31%	60%
Additional Reporting Groups																					
Economically Disadvantaged: Yes	833	803	28%	19%	32%	21%	53%	830	811	29%	11%	14%	46%	60%	824	801	31%	12%	30%	28%	58%
Economically Disadvantaged: No	150	803	27%	23%	29%	21%	50%	149	811	25%	11%	17%	46%	64%	149	799	30%	16%	27%	27%	54%
English Language Learners: Yes	159	800	30%	18%	30%	21%	52%	159	808	30%	9%	18%	43%	61%	159	802	32%	9%	28%	31%	58%
English Language Learners: No	824	804	27%	20%	31%	21%	52%	820	811	28%	12%	14%	46%	60%	814	800	30%	13%	30%	27%	57%
Formally Limited English Proficient																					
Migrant																					
Homeless																					
Accommodations																					
Standard -- All	< 10							24	825	25%	4%	13%	58%	71%	24	817	17%	13%	38%	33%	71%
Nonstandard -- All **																					
Standard -- ELL Only	< 10							23	823	26%	4%	13%	57%	70%	22	817	18%	9%	41%	32%	73%
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.

Comprehensive Report Description

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.

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.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



DISTRICT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT



A

All Students

Grade 06
Fall 2010

District Name: DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
District Code: 99999

District	READING							MATHEMATICS							SOCIAL STUDIES						
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at			No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at			No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Percent at		
				Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*				Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*				Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2*			
DISTRICT NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	1237	602	30%	21%	29%	20%	49%	1241	630	21%	12%	18%	48%	66%	1250	617	28%	10%	16%	46%	62%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	139	605	28%	22%	27%	23%	50%	142	625	27%	10%	20%	44%	63%	146	616	26%	14%	18%	41%	60%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	25	600	36%	16%	24%	24%	48%	25	645	12%	16%	16%	56%	72%	25	632	20%	4%	8%	68%	76%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	< 10							< 10						< 10							
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	< 10							< 10						< 10							
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	14	600	36%	14%	36%	14%	50%	14	625	36%	0%	14%	50%	64%	14	594	43%	7%	29%	21%	50%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	55	603	36%	15%	24%	25%	49%	55	624	22%	13%	15%	51%	65%	55	617	27%	5%	18%	49%	67%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	117	596	32%	26%	28%	15%	43%	120	637	19%	14%	15%	52%	67%	119	616	29%	10%	15%	46%	61%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	145	607	26%	19%	37%	19%	56%	150	624	25%	11%	17%	47%	64%	152	611	30%	11%	16%	43%	59%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	46	603	35%	17%	22%	26%	48%	46	638	13%	13%	17%	57%	74%	46	617	30%	7%	20%	43%	63%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	65	592	38%	17%	31%	14%	45%	65	614	28%	11%	22%	40%	62%	65	613	31%	14%	9%	46%	55%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	90	603	22%	26%	34%	18%	52%	90	631	19%	12%	20%	49%	69%	90	616	30%	8%	22%	40%	62%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	155	602	30%	24%	26%	21%	46%	151	626	17%	17%	22%	45%	67%	151	626	23%	8%	17%	52%	69%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	66	595	24%	29%	38%	9%	47%	66	630	25%	11%	15%	49%	65%	66	617	29%	15%	14%	42%	56%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	32	616	19%	25%	19%	38%	56%	32	611	28%	16%	19%	38%	56%	32	612	38%	3%	9%	50%	59%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	101	600	36%	16%	30%	19%	49%	101	643	15%	12%	20%	53%	73%	105	621	23%	10%	21%	46%	67%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	54	605	30%	20%	22%	28%	50%	54	625	28%	11%	15%	46%	61%	54	614	35%	7%	13%	44%	57%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	59	602	29%	19%	36%	17%	53%	58	641	17%	14%	14%	55%	69%	59	622	27%	10%	15%	47%	63%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	60	607	25%	22%	28%	25%	53%	59	636	19%	12%	17%	53%	69%	58	614	28%	14%	17%	41%	59%
SCHOOL NAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	< 10							< 10													

B

C

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.

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, Assessment Administration and Reporting

Sandra Spencer, MEAP Project Manager, Assessment Administration and Reporting

Andrew Middlestead, Manager, Test Development

Rodger Epp, Sr. Assessment Development Coordinator—Science

Wendy Gould, Reading Coordinator

Chris Dennis, Writing and Social Studies Coordinator

Kyle Ward, Mathematics Coordinator

Linda Howley, Assessment Consultant for Students with Disabilities

Jennifer Paul, Assessment Consultant for English Language Learners

Steven Viger, Manager, Measurement Research & Psychometrics

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

Fax: 517-335-1186

Web site: www.michigan.gov/meap

E-mail: oeaa@michigan.gov