meap™

Michigan Educational Assessment Program

Guide to Reports
Grades 3–9

Fall 2006

MICHIGAN Department of Education

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Released Items 2
Reports Table 3
Section 1 – Scoring 4
English Language Arts *(pages 5–9)*
Social Studies *(pages 10–14)*
Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges *(page 15)*
Section 2
Report Descriptions and Samples 17
Contact Information 45

Introduction

This guide was developed to assist educators in understanding and using the Fall 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) assessment results.

New this fall is the addition of progress reports for students in grades 4 - 8 on the MEAP assessments. Student progress can be reported for those students who were in the previous grade in Fall 2005, took MEAP in both Fall 2005 and Fall 2006, and had a matching Unique Identification Code (UIC) for both Fall 2005 and Fall 2006. Student performance levels for the current and previous year will be included in Summary Reports, Feeder School Reports, Class Rosters, Individual Student Reports and Parent Reports.

Essential report summaries are included in your shipment of reports that will provide information on the status and progress of Michigan's students. These reports are intended to reflect the data needed to meet the expectations of state and federal legislation. In accordance with these mandates, separate summary results are provided for the following three student population groups: all students, students with disabilities, and all except students with disabilities.

The table on page 3 lists the reports in the sequence they occur within your District and School packets. Included in the table is a brief purpose statement for each report, a list of the student populations represented in the report, and the report distribution. Detailed descriptions and key components of the reports are provided in this document as well.

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

Released Items

The ***Released Item documents*** to be used with the reports are available for each grade level and content area assessed, at www.michigan.gov/meap. Copyright permissions for the ***Fall 2006 ELA Reading Selections*** did not include Internet permissions. Ten printed copies of the Released Item Reading Selections for Grades 3–8 will be mailed to each school and district with their Final Reports.

If you have questions regarding the *Released Item documents* please contact the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability:

Phone: 1-877-560-8378
Fax: 517-335-1186
E-mail: meap@michigan.gov

Fall 2006 MEAP Reports — Grades 3–9

Report Title	Purpose	Reported Populations	Distribution
Summary Report *pages 18–19*	A comparative set of mean scale score information for each grade level, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. All content areas and levels of performance are reported.	Separate reports for all students, students with disabilities, and all except students with disabilities	School District ISD State
Demographic Report *pages 20–21*	A comparative set of mean scale score information for each grade, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. All content areas and levels of performance are reported for each demographic subgroup with at least 10 students.	Separate reports for all students, students with disabilities, and all except students with disabilities	School District ISD State
Feeder School Report *pages 22–23*	A comparative set of mean scale score information for feeder schools. All content areas and levels of performance are reported.	All students coming from the feeder school within the district at transition grade levels	Feeder School District
Item Analysis Report *pages 24–27*	A description of each multiple-choice and constructed-response item on the assessment, including the primary Michigan benchmark measured by each item. This report shows the percentage of students selecting each response (MC), or scoring at each point (CR), and indicates item statistics summarized by class or group, school, district, and state.	Separate reports for all students, students with disabilities, and all except students with disabilities	Class/Group School District State
Class Roster *pages 28–31*	Summary score information by class, for each strand and benchmark (GLCE) assessed within each content area, including detail information for each student assessed.	All Students	Class/Group School
Individual Student Report *pages 32–33*	Printed for individual students, this report provides a detailed description of the student's performance on each strand and benchmark (GLCE).	All Students	Class/Group School
Student Record Label *pages 34-35*	Summaries of individual student performances in all content areas in label format.	All Students	School
Parent Report *pages 36–40*	Printed for individual students, this report provides a summary description of the student's performance by strand, for each content area assessed on the MEAP.	All Students	1 copy
Comprehensive Report *pages 41–42*	Summary score information is provided in each content area assessed by the MEAP. 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 district, PSA, and non-public school within the ISD.	All Students	District ISD

Section 1
Scoring

Criteria set by Michigan educators are used to score all MEAP assessments.

Definitions

Scale Score

A scale score is defined as a stable score on the assessment that is reported for each student. It is constructed in such a way that it has clear meaning. On the Grade 3 assessment, a score of 300 is assigned to a third-grade student who barely meets Michigan standards. The same pattern is followed for each grade level assessment (e.g., 400 is assigned to a fourth-grade student who barely meets Michigan standards, 500 is assigned to a fifth-grade student who barely meets Michigan standards, etc.). The scale score is stable because it allows for students' scores to be reported on the same scale regardless of which year they took the assessment, and which form of the assessment the student took.

Scale scores are not comparable across grade levels. A scale score of 400 on the Grade 3 assessment **does not** indicate that the third-grade student would be considered as meeting standards on the Grade 4 assessment.

Performance Level

A performance level is defined as a range on the score scale that corresponds to student achievement levels, *Apprentice, Basic, Met Michigan Standards*, and *Exceeded Michigan Standards*. The divisions between the levels are called cut scores, and are recommended by a panel comprised of educators and other stakeholders throughout the state. This 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 panel recommends the score that best separates each performance level from the next. The Michigan State Board of Education approves the final cut scores and Performance Level ranges.

Machine-Scoring Process

Multiple-choice assessment items are scored by computer. In responding to these items, students must select the one best answer from the four choices in grades 4–9, (or three choices in grade 3), in order to get the item correct. Each item is worth one point. There is no penalty for guessing. Multiple responses and omitted items are scored as incorrect.

Handscoring Process

All constructed-response items requiring short or extended written responses are evaluated by human scorers. The technique used in English language arts (ELA) and social studies is 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 holistic scoring. Because these are large-scale, high-stakes assessments, MEAP staff have taken every step possible to minimize scoring subjectivity.

Pearson Educational Measurement has been hired as the contractor for the handscoring process. All written responses are handscored by a trained scorer that has received extensive training. The scorer must pass a qualifying test before being permitted to score student responses.

During the scoring process, periodic quality control checks are in place to ensure that scorers are evaluating responses consistently.

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.

Specific score point descriptions and sample student papers will be available at the MEAP web page (www.michigan.gov/meap).

The remainder of this section contains scoring information for the ELA and social studies extended-response items. In math and science, a unique scoring rubric is created for each constructed-response item. Therefore, the math and science scoring rubrics are not included in this guide.

Scoring the English Language Arts (ELA) Assessment
Grades 3–8
Fall 2006

Each English Language Arts (ELA) assessment contains a mixture of item types. Every grade-level assessment includes multiple-choice items and three items that require students to write a response:

- Prompt for *Writing from Knowledge and Experience*
- *Response to a Student Writing Sample*
- *Response to Paired Reading Selections*

Because each prompt requires a different type of response, there is a separate scoring rubric for each of the three prompts (pages 6–8).

All responses are scored as rough drafts and not as polished pieces of writing. Each response is scored by one scorer, with 20% of the student responses scored by a second scorer for quality control purposes.

Writing

- The *Writing from Knowledge and Experience* prompt is scored holistically using a six-point writing rubric.
- The *Response to the Student Writing Sample* is scored based upon a four-point writing rubric.
- The scores earned on the above two extended response items are added together, contributing up to 10 of the 15 possible points of a student's overall writing score.
- The remaining third of the writing test is comprised of five multiple-choice writing items, each worth one point.
- For writing, the four levels of achievement (e.g., Exceeded Michigan Standards, Met Michigan Standards, etc.) are set on the total of 15 possible points.

Reading

- The *Response to the Paired Reading Selections* is scored based upon a six-point rubric.
- It is scored only for reading content, not for the quality of the writing.
- A student's score on the *Response to the Reading Selections* is added to a student's score on the multiple-choice reading items for a total reading score.
- The four levels of achievement for reading are set on the reading scale score.

Integrated ELA Score

- ELA scale scores are calculated using a weighted average (two-thirds reading, one-third writing) of each individual student's reading and writing scale scores.
- ELA performance level cut scores are also determined by using a weighted average of the scale score cuts for reading and writing
- A student must have a valid reading score ***and*** a valid writing score to obtain an integrated ELA score. Students receive a valid score for reading ***or*** writing if at least five multiple-choice or constructed-response raw score points are attempted.

Michigan Educational Assessment Program
Fall 2006 English Language Arts Assessment
Grades 3–8

Writing from Knowledge and Experience

Scoring Rubric and Condition Codes

6 The writing is exceptionally clear and focused. Ideas and content are thoroughly developed with relevant details and examples where appropriate. The writer's control over organization and the connections between ideas moves the reader smoothly and naturally through the text. The writer shows a mature command of language including precise word choice that results in a compelling piece of writing. Tight control over language use and mastery of writing conventions contribute to the effect of the response.

5 The writing is clear and focused. Ideas and content are well developed with relevant details and examples where appropriate. The writer's control over organization and the connections between ideas effectively moves the reader through the text. The writer shows a command of language including precise word choice. The language is well controlled, and occasional lapses in writing conventions are hardly noticeable.

4 The writing is generally clear and focused. Ideas and content are developed with relevant details and examples where appropriate, although there may be some unevenness. The response is generally coherent, and its organization is functional. The writer's command of language, including word choice, supports meaning. Lapses in writing conventions are not distracting.

3 The writing is somewhat clear and focused. Ideas and content are developed with limited or partially successful use of examples and details. There may be evidence of an organizational structure, but it may be artificial or ineffective. Incomplete mastery over writing conventions and language use may interfere with meaning some of the time. Vocabulary may be basic.

2 The writing is only occasionally clear and focused. Ideas and content are underdeveloped. There may be little evidence of organizational structure. Vocabulary may be limited. Limited control over writing conventions may make the writing difficult to understand.

1 The writing is generally unclear and unfocused. Ideas and content are not developed or connected. There may be no noticeable organizational structure. Lack of control over writing conventions may make the writing difficult to understand.

0 The response was not able to be scored.

Condition codes:

- **A** Off-topic
- **B** Written in a language other than English or illegible
- **C** Blank or refused to respond

Michigan Educational Assessment Program
Fall 2006 English Language Arts Assessment
Grades 3–8

Writing: *Peer Response to a Student Writing Sample*

Scoring Rubric and Condition Codes

4 The response clearly and fully addresses the task and demonstrates an understanding of the effective elements of writing that are relevant to the task. Ideas are supported by relevant, specific details from the student writing sample. There may be surface feature errors, but they do not interfere with meaning.

3 The response addresses the task and demonstrates some understanding of the effective elements of writing that are relevant to the task. Ideas are somewhat supported with a mix of general and specific relevant details from the student writing sample. There may be surface feature errors, but they do not interfere with meaning.

2 The response demonstrates limited ability to address the task and may show limited understanding of the effective elements of writing that are relevant to the task. Ideas may be supported with vague and/or partially relevant details from the student writing sample. There may be surface features that partially interfere with meaning.

1 The response demonstrates an attempt to address the task with little, if any, understanding of the effective elements of writing that are relevant to the task. The response may include generalizations about the student writing sample with few, if any, details. There may be surface feature errors that interfere with meaning.

0 The response was not able to be scored.

Condition codes:

- **A** Off-topic or insufficient
- **B** Written in a language other than English or illegible
- **C** Blank or refused to respond
- **D** Summarizes, revises, and/or copies the student sample, making no connection to the question asked

Michigan Educational Assessment Program
Fall 2006 English Language Arts Assessment
Grades 3–8

Reading: *Response to the Paired Reading Selections*

Scoring Rubric and Condition Codes

6 The student clearly and effectively chooses key or important ideas from each reading selection to support a position on the question and to make a clear connection between the reading selections. The position and connection are thoroughly developed with appropriate examples and details. There are no misconceptions about the reading selections. There are strong relationships among ideas. Mastery of language use and writing conventions contributes to the effect of the response.

5 The student makes meaningful use of key ideas from each reading selection to support a position on the question and to make a clear connection between the reading selections. The position and connection are well developed with appropriate examples and details. Minor misconceptions may be present. Relationships among ideas are clear. The language is controlled, and occasional lapses in writing conventions are hardly noticeable.

4 The student makes adequate use of ideas from each reading selection to support a position on the question and to make a connection between the reading selections. The position and connection are supported by examples and details. Minor misconceptions may be present. Language use is correct. Lapses in writing conventions are not distracting.

3 The student takes a clear position on the question. The response makes adequate use of ideas from one reading selection or partially successful use of ideas from both reading selections to support the position. The position is developed with limited use of examples and details. Misconceptions may indicate only a partial understanding of the reading. Language use is correct but limited. Incomplete mastery over writing conventions may interfere with meaning some of the time.

2 The student takes a clear position on the question. There is partially successful use of ideas from one reading selection or minimal use of ideas from both reading selections to support the position. The position is underdeveloped. Major misconceptions may indicate minimal understanding of the reading. Limited mastery over writing conventions may make the writing difficult to understand.

1 The student takes a position on the question but only makes minimal use of ideas from one reading selection or the student attempts to support an unclear position with minimal use of ideas from both reading selections. Ideas are not developed and may be unclear. Major misconceptions may indicate a lack of understanding of the reading. Lack of mastery over writing conventions may make the writing difficult to understand.

0 The response was not able to be scored.

Condition codes:

- **A** Off-topic or insufficient
- **B** Written in a language other than English or illegible
- **C** Blank or refused to respond
- **D** Retells or references the reading selections with no connection to the question asked
- **E** Responds to the question with no reference to either of the reading selections

Michigan Educational Assessment Program
Fall 2006 English Language Arts Assessment
Grades 3–8

Comment Codes

In addition to the holistic scores, students may receive feedback in the form of a comment code on their response to the *Writing from Knowledge and Experience* prompt and their *Response to the Paired Reading Selections*. Students receiving a 0 score will not receive a comment code. Numerical codes representing the comments are as follows:

Writing from Knowledge and Experience

1. Lacks focus on one central idea.
2. Demonstrates limited control over sentence structure, vocabulary and/or conventions.
3. Needs details and examples to adequately develop the ideas and content.
4. Lacks coherent organization and/or connections between ideas.
5. Needs richer development of the central idea with some additional, relevant details and examples to get a higher score.
6. Needs tighter control of organization and/or the connections among ideas to get a higher score.
7. Needs greater precision and maturity of language use to get a higher score.
8. Earned the highest score point of 6.

Response to the Paired Reading Selections

1. Lacks a clear position.
2. Lacks clarity, which causes confusion.
3. Needs examples and details from the reading selections to adequately develop the position.
4. Supports the position with examples and details from only one reading selection.
5. Does not make a connection across the two reading selections.
6. Contains misconceptions about the content of the reading selections.
7. Needs richer support of the position with some additional examples and details from the reading selections.
8. Needs greater precision and mastery of language use.
9. Earned the highest score point of 6.

Scoring the Social Studies Assessment
Grades 6 and 9
Fall 2006

Social Studies assessments for Grades 6 and 9 contain two item types. Each grade-level assessment includes multiple-choice items, with up to 10 items from each of the following strands: History, Geography, Civics, Economics, and Inquiry. There is also one Decision-Making item that requires students to write a persuasive essay about a public policy issue in response to a data section prompt. The student response is scored holistically using a three-point writing rubric for Grade 6 and a four-point writing rubric for Grade 9. *(The Scoring Rubric for Grade 6 is on page 11. The Scoring Rubric for Grade 9 is on page 13.)* All responses are scored as rough drafts and not as polished pieces of writing. Each response is scored by one scorer with 20% of the student responses scored by a second scorer for quality control purposes.

Core Democratic Values – Grade 6

The persuasive essay item asks students to take a stand on a public policy issue in response to a prompt, and to support their position using the *Core Democratic Values*. The students are referred to the following information located in the back of their assessment booklet.

Some Core Democratic Values of American Constitutional Democracy

Core democratic values are ideas in which Americans believe. These values unite all Americans. They are saved for us in important documents, speeches, and writings of the nation. Below is a list of some core democratic values. **You may use any core democratic value to support your position, including those not on this list.** Be sure to explain **how** the value you choose supports the position you take.

Life
Liberty
The Pursuit of Happiness
Public or Common Good
Justice
Equality
Diversity
Truth
Popular Sovereignty
Patriotism
The Rule of Law
Individual Rights

Michigan Educational Assessment Program
Social Studies Assessment
Fall 2006

Holistic Scoring of Civic Writing – Grade 6

3 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. Students use words such as support/oppose, for/against, agree/disagree, or should/should not. The student provides at least one supporting point that is based on the *Core Democratic Values*, **and** at least one piece of supporting information from the *Data Section* that is accurate, valid, and relevant. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

2 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. Students use words such as support/oppose, for/against, agree/disagree, or should/should not. The student provides at least one supporting point that is based on the *Core Democratic Values*, **or** at least one piece of supporting information from the *Data Section* that is accurate, valid, and relevant. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

1 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

0 The response was not able to be scored.

Condition codes:

A Off-topic
B Written in a language other than English or illegible
C Blank or refused to respond

The following characteristics in a student response will **not** contribute toward a positive score:

- The student does not take a stand, or says that someone else (parents, school, or government) should decide the issue.
- The supporting point based on the *Core Democratic Values* contradicts the stated position.
- The supporting information from the *Data Section* contradicts the stated position.
- *Data* interpretations are not accurate, valid, or relevant.

Comment Codes – Grade 6

In addition to the holistic scores, students may receive feedback in the form of a comment code. Students receiving a 0 score will not receive a comment code. Numerical codes representing the comments are as follows:

1. Includes clear and supported position statement
2. Contains supporting Core Democratic Value
3. Uses supporting information from Data Section

Scoring the Social Studies Assessment
Grades 9
Fall 2006

The persuasive essay item asks students to take a stand on a public policy issue in response to a prompt, and to support their position using the *Core Democratic Values*. The students are referred to the following information located in the back of their assessment booklet.

Some Core Democratic Values of American Constitutional Democracy

Core democratic values are the fundamental beliefs and constitutional principles of American society. These values unite all Americans. They are expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and other significant documents, speeches, and writings of the nation. Below is a list of some core democratic values. **You may use any core democratic value to support your position, including those not on this list.** Be sure to explain **how** the value you choose supports the position you take.

Fundamental Beliefs

Life
Liberty
The Pursuit of Happiness
Public or Common Good
Justice
Equality
Diversity
Truth
Popular Sovereignty
Patriotism

Constitutional Principles

The Rule of Law
Separation of Powers
Representative Government
Checks and Balances
Individual Rights
Freedom of Religion
Federalism
Civilian Control of the Military

Holistic Scoring of Civic Writing – Grade 9

4 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. Students use words such as support/oppose, for/against, agree/disagree, or should/should not. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

The student must provide at least one supporting point from ***each*** of the following:

- position support based on the *Core Democratic Values*
- supporting information from the *Data Section* that is accurate, valid, and relevant to the student's position
- supporting social studies information that comes from the student's *prior knowledge* of civics, economics, geography, or history, that is accurate, important, and relevant to the student's position. This information must be something other than the information supplied by the *Data Section* or a *Core Democratic Value*.

3 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. Students use words such as support/oppose, for/against, agree/disagree, or should/should not. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

The student provides at least one supporting point from ***two*** of the following:

- position support based on the *Core Democratic Values*
- supporting information from the *Data Section* that is accurate, valid, and relevant to the student's position
- supporting social studies information that comes from the student's *prior knowledge* of civics, economics, geography, or history, that is accurate, important, and relevant to the student's position. This information must be something other than the information supplied by the *Data Section* or a *Core Democratic Value*.

2 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. Students use words such as support/oppose, for/against, agree/disagree, or should/should not. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

The student provides at least one supporting point from ***one*** of the following:

- position support based on the *Core Democratic Values*
- supporting information from the *Data Section* that is accurate, valid, and relevant to the student's position
- supporting social studies information that comes from the student's *prior knowledge* of civics, economics, geography, or history, that is accurate, important, and relevant to the student's position. This information must be something other than the information supplied by the *Data Section* or a *Core Democratic Value*.

1 The response must give a clearly stated position on the issue and support for that position. The student's supporting points must be explained in enough detail to show a clear connection to the position taken.

0 The response was not able to be scored.

Condition codes:

A Off-topic
B Written in a language other than English or illegible
C Blank or refused to respond

continued on page 14

Holistic Scoring of Civic Writing – Grade 9 *continued*

The following characteristics in a student response will **not** contribute toward a positive score:

- The student does not take a stand, or says that someone else (parents, school, or government) should decide the issue.
- The supporting point based on the *Core Democratic Values* contradicts the stated position.
- The supporting information from the *Data Section* contradicts the stated position.
- *Data* interpretations are not accurate, valid, or relevant.
- Student responded based on feelings or opinions instead of *prior knowledge* of civics, economics, geography, or history.
- Support based on *prior knowledge* contradicts the stated position.

Comment Codes – Grade 9

In addition to the holistic scores, students may receive feedback in the form of a comment code. Students receiving a 0 score will not receive a comment code. Numerical codes representing the comments are as follows:

1. Includes a clear and supported position statement
2. Contains supporting *Core Democratic Value*
3. Uses supporting information from Data Section
4. Provides supporting knowledge from Social Studies

Michigan Educational Assessment Program
Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges
Fall 2006
Grades 3-9

Please see Scale Score and Performance Level definitions on page 4 of the Fall 2006 Guide to Reports.

Subject	Grade	Level 4 Apprentice	Level 3 Basic	Level 2 Met Standards	Level 1 Exceeded Standards
Mathematics	3	188 - 278	279 - 299	300 - 326	327 - 406
	4	270 - 377	378 - 399	400 - 431	432 - 533
	5	353 - 476	477 - 499	500 - 526	527 - 662
	6	465 - 579	580 - 599	600 - 621	622 - 755
	7	564 - 675	676 - 699	700 - 721	722 – 844
	8	668 - 783	784 - 799	800 - 819	820 - 957
Reading	3	188 - 279	280 - 299	300 - 337	338 - 628
	4	280 - 372	373 - 399	400 - 442	443 - 656
	5	386 - 481	482 - 499	500 - 537	538 - 659
	6	487 - 579	580 - 599	600 - 637	638 - 824
	7	578 - 683	684 - 699	700 - 737	738 - 900
	8	677 - 779	780 - 799	800 - 833	834 - 955
Writing	3	167 - 270	271 - 299	300 - 348	349 - 463
	4	283 - 361	362 - 399	400 - 450	451 - 546
	5	376 - 461	462 - 499	500 - 553	554 - 650
	6	479 - 562	563 - 599	600 - 649	650 - 745
	7	580 - 668	669 - 699	700 - 757	758 - 837
	8	688 - 773	774 - 799	800 - 845	846 - 928
ELA	3	181 - 276	277 - 299	300 - 341	342 - 573
	4	281 - 368	369 - 399	400 - 445	446 - 619
	5	383 - 474	475 - 499	500 - 542	543 - 656
	6	484 - 573	574 - 599	600 - 641	642 - 798
	7	579 - 678	679 - 699	700 - 744	745 - 879
	8	681 - 777	778 - 799	800 - 837	838 - 946
Science	5	360 - 475	476 - 499	500 - 532	533 - 661
	8	658 - 780	781 - 799	800 - 831	832 - 954
Social Studies	6	475 - 586	587 - 599	600 - 618	619 - 741
	9	768 - 880	881 - 899	900 - 928	929 - 1060

(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

Section 2
Report Descriptions

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)
Sample Reports
Fall 2006

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.

These sample reports were printed prior to availability of real data. Data contained in these sample reports do not refer to any specific assessment item, or any specific student, school, or district.

Summary Report Description

The Summary Report has been revised to include data on student progress. The report also 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 (SWD)
- All except students with disabilities (AESWD)

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, the assessment form assigned to the school, the assessment cycle, and the content area. School, district, and ISD names and codes are included as applicable.

Section B provides summary data for multiple years for each content 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 proficiency level, and the percentage of students that met or exceeded Michigan standards within each content area. Four years of summary data will be reported. In addition to content 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.

Note: The Fall 2005 assessment was the baseline year for the revised MEAP. The Fall 2006 Summary Reports will include data from Fall 2005 and Fall 2006. Summary data will be added each year so the Fall 2009 reports will include summary data for each assessment from Fall 2006 through Fall 2009.

Section C provides summary data for each domain or benchmark within each strand. The summary data reported includes the code and descriptor for each GLCE (math) or benchmark (science and social studies), the number of students assessed using that form, the mean points earned, the total number of points possible, and the percentage of students earning each point value. This summary data will include aggregate and mean data for all students using the assessment form assigned to the school.

Note: Section C will be included on the School Summary only. This summary data will not be meaningful at the district or ISD level because each school was assigned a different form and the maximum number of points possible for each domain or benchmark will vary depending on the form administered. Districts will receive a copy of the School Summary Report for each school within their district.

Section D (Progress)

Section D provides progress reports for students in grades 4 - 8 who were in the previous grade in Fall 2005, took the MEAP in both Fall 2005 and Fall 2006, and had a matching Unique Identification Code (UIC) for both Fall 2005 and Fall 2006. This data is currently provided for ELA and math. There is no progress table provided for science or social studies. The progress table provides the number and percentage of students assessed in Fall 2006, who were also assessed in Fall 2005, by performance level. The progress table provides an indication of student progress in four categories - *gaining* (indicates progress to a higher performance level from the previous year), *maintaining* (indicates same performance level from previous year if already proficient), *not gaining* (indicates same performance level from previous year if not yet proficient), *or declining* (indicates lower performance level than previous year).

* Scale score margin of error is equivalent to the Mean score ±2 standard errors of the mean. This is the likely range within which the true average scale score would fall for the students listed on this report.

MICHIGAN Department of Education

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Except Students with Disabilities

A

Grade 7 - Form 01
Fall 2006
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

PEM 10-25-2006

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

ACHIEVEMENT

	Year	* No. of Students Assessed	Scale Score Mean	Scale Score Margin of Error	Performance Levels 4-Apprentice	3-Basic	2-Met Standards	1-Exceeded Standards	Levels 1 & 2
READING	Scale Score Range		(150-700)		(150-250)	(251-350)	(351-550)	(551-700)	(351-700)
	2006	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2005	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
WRITING	Scale Score Range		(150-700)		(150-250)	(251-350)	(351-550)	(551-700)	(351-700)
	2006	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2005	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTAL ELA	Scale Score Range		(150-700)		(150-250)	(251-350)	(351-550)	(551-700)	(351-700)
	2006	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2005	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

B

* Includes all tested forms; including Emergency form student results.

PROGRESS

	Fall 2005 Performance Levels	Fall 2006 Performance Levels: 4-Apprentice	3-Basic	2-Met Standards	1-Exceeded Standards
READING	4-Apprentice	123456 (100%) *not gaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*
	3-Basic	123456 (100%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *not gaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*
	2-Met Standards	123456 (100%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *maintaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*
	1-Exceeded Standards	123456 (100%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *maintaining*

Number (%) of Students Assessed in 2006 Also Assessed in 2005: 999,999 (100%)

D

WRITING	4-Apprentice	0 (0%) *not gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*
	3-Basic	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *not gaining*	123456 (100%) *gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*
	2-Met Standards	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *maintaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*
	1-Exceeded Standards	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *maintaining*

Number (%) of Students Assessed in 2006 Also Assessed in 2005: 999,999 (100%)

TOTAL ELA	4-Apprentice	0 (0%) *not gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*
	3-Basic	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *not gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*
	2-Met Standards	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *declining*	123456 (100%) *maintaining*	0 (0%) *gaining*
	1-Exceeded Standards	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *declining*	0 (0%) *maintaining*

Number (%) of Students Assessed in 2006 Also Assessed in 2005: 999,999 (100%)

C

STRAND	Domain	** No. of Students Assessed	Mean Points	No. of Points	Percent of Students Scoring 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
READING	Word Recognition and Word Study	999,999	2.0	3	0	0	100	0																	
	Narrative Text	999,999	14.1	20																					
	Informational Text	999,999	11.2	20																					
	Comprehension	999,999	13.2	20																					
WRITING	Writing Genres	999,999	13.5	20																					
	Writing Process	999,999	15.3	20																					
	Grammar and Usage	999,999	3.5	5																					
	Spelling	999,999	12.5	20																					

** Only includes assigned form student results. Emergency students are not included.
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Fall 2006 Run Date: 12/12/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

SAMPLE

Demographic Report Description

The Demographic Report provides a summary breakdown of scores by demographic subgroup for each content area assessed. Summary data reported includes the number of students assessed in each subgroup, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each proficiency level, and the percentage of students that met or exceeded Michigan standards within each content area. The Demographic Report is generated for three student populations:

- All students
- Students with disabilities (SWD)
- All except students with disabilities (AESWD)

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

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

Please note the following:

1) *A separate report is generated for the Students with Disabilities subgroup.*
2) *Homeless student data is also included on the Demographic Report.*
3) *No summary scores are provided for subgroups containing less than ten students.*
4) *Students that have been enrolled in your district for less than one full academic year (LTFAY) at the time of the MEAP assessment administration will no longer be reported as a subgroup on this report. Calculation of this data for AYP purposes will be determined from the enrollment data submitted via SRSD. Due to the timing of the fall assessment administration, the Michigan Department of Education has amended the LTFAY definition. A student's score is excluded from the AYP determination if the student has not been enrolled at the school on the* ***three*** *(3) previous official count days. These students are included in all applicable demographic subgroups.*

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. (Refer to the Ethnicity definitions in the MEAP Coordinator Handbook www.michigan.gov/meap for definitions.) The remaining categories are reported by a *yes* or *no* response.

Section C reports the number of students included in the subgroup, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each proficiency level, and the percentage of students that met or exceeded Michigan standards within each content area.

This is a multiple-page report with ELA scores reported on one page and Math, Science, and Social Studies scores reported on another page for each of the three student population groups identified in the first paragraph on this page.

MICHIGAN Department of Education

A

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT

All Students

Grade X
Fall 2006

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

B

C

School	READING							WRITING							TOTAL ELA						
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Percent at Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Percent at Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Percent at Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 1 & 2 *
Total All Students	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Gender																					
Male	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Female	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ethnicity																					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Asian/Pacific Islander	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Black, Not of Hispanic Origin	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Hispanic	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
White, Not of Hispanic Origin	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Multiracial	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Additional Reporting Groups																					
Economically Disadvantaged: Yes	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
No	<10							<10							<10						
English Language Learners: Yes	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
No	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Formerly Limited English Proficient	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Migrant	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Homeless	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Accommodations																					
Standard - All	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Nonstandard - All **	(999,999)																				
Standard ELL Only	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Nonstandard ELL Only **	(999,999)																				

* Percent proficient may not equal the sum of level 1 & level 2 due to rounding.
** Results for these students are invalid and not reported.

<10 No summary scores provided if <10 students.

Fall 2006 Run Date: 11/11/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

SAMPLE

Feeder School Report

The Feeder School Report is a Summary Report provided to feeder schools at transition grade levels. For example, District A has three elementary schools (K–5) feeding into one middle school (6–8). Each elementary school will receive a Feeder School Report summarizing the data for current sixth-grade students that were enrolled in their elementary school at the end of Grade 5.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the assessment grade level reported, the form of the assessment assigned to the school, the assessment cycle, and the content area. The Feeder Grade (grade level the students were most recently enrolled in at the Feeder School), Feeder School name and code, Tested School name and code, and the district name and code are also included.

Section B provides multiple years of summary data for each content area. Summary data reported includes the year, the number of students assessed coming from the feeder school in the district, the mean scale score, the scale score margin of error,* the percentage of students attaining each proficiency level, and the percentage of students that met or exceeded Michigan standards within each content area. Four years of summary data will be reported. In addition to content 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 for each domain or benchmark within each strand. The summary data reported includes the code and descriptor for each GLCE (math) or benchmark (science and social studies), number of students assessed, the mean score, the total number of points possible, and the percentage of students earning each point value. This summary data will include aggregate and mean data for all students using the assessment form assigned to the school. The form number is located just above the page number at the bottom center of the report.

* Scale score margin of error is equivalent to the Mean score ±2 standard errors of the mean. This is the likely range within which the true average scale score would fall for the students listed on this report.

MICHIGAN Department of Education

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

FEEDER SCHOOL REPORT

All Except Students with Disabilities

A

Tested Grade 7 - Form 01
Fall 2006
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

PEM 10-25-2006

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

Feeder Grade: **6**
Feeder School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
Feeder School Code: **34567**
Tested School Name: **GREAT MIDDLE SCHOOL**
Tested School Code: **54321**

B

ACHIEVEMENT

	Year	* No. of Students Assessed	Scale Score Mean	Scale Score Margin of Error	4-Apprentice	3-Basic	2-Met Standards	1-Exceeded Standards	Level 1 & 2
					Performance Levels				
READING	Scale Score Range		(150-700)		(150-250)	(251-350)	(351-550)	(551-700)	(351-700)
	2006	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2005	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
WRITING	Scale Score Range		(150-700)		(150-250)	(251-350)	(351-550)	(551-700)	(351-700)
	2006	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2005	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTAL ELA	Scale Score Range		(150-700)		(150-250)	(251-350)	(351-550)	(551-700)	(351-700)
	2006	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2005	999,999	404	394-414	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Includes all tested forms; including Emergency form student results.

C

STRAND	Domain	** No. of Students Assessed	Mean Points	No. of Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
					Percent of Students Scoring																				
READING	Word Recognition and Word Study	999,999	2.0	3	0	0	100	0																	
	Narrative Text	999,999	14.1	20																					
	Informational Text	999,999	11.2	20																					
	Comprehension	999,999	13.2	20																					
WRITING	Writing Genres	999,999	13.5	20																					
	Writing Process	999,999	15.3	20																					
	Grammar and Usage	999,999	3.5	5																					
	Spelling	999,999	12.5	20																					

** Only includes assigned form student results. Emergency students are not included.
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Fall 2006 Run Date: 12/12/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

SAMPLE

Item Analysis Report Description

The Item Analysis Report provides summary information for each selected response (multiple-choice) item, and each constructed-response item on the assessment, including the primary Michigan benchmark (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 (SWD)
- All except students with disabilities (AESWD)

The aggregate data is reported by class or group, school, district, and state. This report may include multiple pages *(see two-page sample Item Analysis Report on pages 25 and 27)*. Page numbers are printed in the center at the bottom of each report page.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the student population included in the report, the grade level, the assessment cycle, and the content 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.

Sections B and C report data on each **multiple-choice item**.

- **Section B** lists the Released Item Number, the benchmark or GLCE being assessed, and the Item Type (core, extended core, linking, future core) for each **multiple-choice item**.

  The Fall 2006 Released Item documents for each grade level and content area are posted on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

  The Released Item Number for *linking* items references the *previous* grade level Released Item document.

- **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.

continued on page 26

MICHIGAN Department of Education

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

CLASS ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

All Except Students with Disabilities

A

Grade 7
Fall 2006
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS: READING

PEM final 10/03/05
MEAP Grade 3-8

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

Teacher Name: **LASTNAME, FIRSTNAME**
Class/Group: **1234**
School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

No. of Students Assessed = 999,999

READING RELEASED MULTIPLE CHOICE

STRAND Domain	Released Item Number	GLCE Code	Item Type	PERCENT RESPONDING A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
READING									
Informational	11	CODE	Core	0	100+	0	0	0	0
	23	CODE	Core						
	34 *	CODE	Linking						
	35	CODE	Core						
Narrative									

B C

READING RELEASED MULTIPLE CHOICE

STRAND Domain	Released Item Number	GLCE Code	Item Type	PERCENT RESPONDING A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
READING									
Comprehension	21	CODE	Core	0	100+	0	0	0	0
	33	CODE	Core						
	44	CODE	Core						
	55	CODE	Core						
Word Study									

SAMPLE

RELEASED CONSTRUCTED OR EXTENDED RESPONSE

Released Item Number	GLCE Code	Mean Score	Percent of Students at Each Score Score Based on 6-point Rubric 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Number of Students Receiving Condition Codes A	B	C	D	E	Number of Students Receiving Comment Codes 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17	CODE	3.0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	99999					99999									
18	CODE	4.6	5	10	10	10	50	10	10															
19	CODE	3.9	5	10	10	10	50	10	10															
20	CODE	4.7	5	10	10	10	50	10	10															

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

<10 No summary scores provided if <10 students.
Page X of Y

* Linking item from previous grade test.
Fall 2006 Run Date: 11/11/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

Item Analysis Report Description

continued from page 24

Sections D, E, and F report data on each **constructed-response** or **extended-response** item.

- **Section D** lists the Released Item Number, the GLCE or benchmark being assessed, and the **Mean Score** for the reported population, for each constructed-response or extended-response item.

- **Section E** reports the **percentage** of students achieving each score level on a constructed-response or extended-response item in Section D.

- **Section F** reports the **number** of student responses that received each Condition Code or Comment Code. The condition codes and comment codes are reported at the individual student level on the Individual Student Report for the Fall 2006 assessments.

  Condition Codes (student response receiving a 0 score):
  A) Off-topic/Insufficient
  B) Written in a Language other than English/Illegible
  C) Blank/Refused to respond
  D) No connection to the question (ELA only)
  E) No reference to either reading selection (ELA only)

  Comment Codes provide additional feedback to students and educators on the extended-response items in the English Language Arts and Social Studies content areas. The numeric Comment Codes are defined on the reverse side of the Item Analysis Report. They also appear on pages 9–14 of this *Guide to Reports*.

Please Note:
Some assessment items may be particularly difficult or easy. Educators may consider how well their student groups did on an assessment item, benchmark, or strand in relation to the state results reported. State results provide a good comparison for how easy or difficult an assessment item is for all students.

Several items are used to assess some benchmarks, while other benchmarks or strands may be assessed by only a single item. A larger number of assessment items provides more reliable results. Both of these factors may make the interpretation of item analysis reports more difficult.

Teachers may use the Item Analysis Report to pose a hypothesis about how a group of students has performed on a benchmark or strand within a content area. This hypothesis should be further evaluated using classroom and other assessment information before making decisions to adjust curriculum or instruction.

MICHIGAN Department of Education

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

CLASS ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

All Except Students with Disabilities

Grade 7
Fall 2006
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS: WRITING

PEM final 10/03/05
MEAP Grade 3-8

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

Teacher Name: **LASTNAME, FIRSTNAME**
Class/Group: **1234**
School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

No. of Students Assessed = 999,999

WRITING RELEASED MULTIPLE CHOICE

STRAND Domain	Released Item Number	GLCE Code	Item Type	PERCENT RESPONDING A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
WRITING									
Writing Genre		CODE	Core	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Writing Process		CODE	Core						
Grammar & Usage		CODE	Core						

WRITING RELEASED MULTIPLE CHOICE

STRAND Domain	Released Item Number	GLCE Code	Item Type	PERCENT RESPONDING A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
WRITING									
Personal Style		CODE	Core	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Spelling		CODE	Core						

RELEASED CONSTRUCTED OR EXTENDED RESPONSE

Released Item Number	GLCE Code	Mean Score	Percent of Students at Each Score Score Based on 4-point or 6-point Rubric							Number of Students Receiving Condition Codes					Number of Students Receiving Comment Codes									
			0	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C	D	E	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17	CODE	3.0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	99999					99999									
18	CODE	2.6	5	10	10	10	50																	
19	CODE	3.9	5	10	10	10	50	10	10															
20	CODE	4.7	5	10	10	10	50	10	10															

D E F

SAMPLE

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

<10 No summary scores provided if <10 students.
Page X of Y

Fall 2006 Run Date: 11/11/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

Class Roster Report Description

The Class Roster provides summary score information by class, for each strand and benchmark (GLCE) assessed within each content area, as well as detail information for each student assessed. This report may include multiple pages to report all strands, benchmarks, and GLCEs *(see two-page sample Class Roster on pages 29 and 31)*. Page numbers are printed in the center at the bottom of each report page.

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

Note: A separate Class Roster Report will be generated for each assessment form administered within a class/group.

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 multiple years are also reported.

Section C provides the following information for each benchmark (GLCE), detailed by student:

- Benchmark or GLCE assessed
- Core type (core, extended core, future core, or linking item) *Please note that future core items are shaded. Future core and linking items are not included in student scale scores, strand totals, or performance levels.*
- Number of points possible
- Number of points earned by the student
- Scores are subtotaled by strand *(see page 29)*, and core type *(see page 31)*

Section D reports the class/group mean score for each benchmark (GLCE), strand, and core type.

MICHIGAN Department of Education

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

A

CLASS ROSTER

Grade 7 - Form X
Fall 2006
MATHEMATICS

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

Teacher Name: **LAST, FIRST**
Class/Group: **1234**
School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

C

Strand / GLCE	Scale Score 2006	Performance Level 2006	Performance Level 2005	Number & Operation															Algebra										Continued
				N.MR.06.01	N.FL.06.02	N.FL.06.04	N.FL.06.10	N.ME.06.11	N.ME.06.17	N.FL.06.13	N.FL.06.14	N.FL.06.15	N.ME.06.05	N.FL.06.12	N.ME.06.19	**Strand Total**	N.MR.06.03	N.ME.06.07	A.PA.06.01	A.RP.06.02	A.FO.06.03	A.FO.06.06	A.FO.06.11	A.FO.06.12	A.FO.06.13	A.FO.06.04	**Strand Total**	A.FO.06.05	
Core Type				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	E		F	F	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E		F	
MC or CR Points Possible				3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**37**	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	**22**	3	
B Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I. UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 99/99/9999	317	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	**22**	3	
Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I. UIC: 1234567890	454	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	**22**	3	
No. of Students Assessed = 999																													
D **Mean**	**386**	**NA**	**NA**	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	**36.0**	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	**22.0**	3.0	

SAMPLE

Performance Level	Scale Score Range
1 - Exceeded Standards	(551 - 700)
2 - Met Standards	(351 - 550)
3 - Basic	(251 - 350)
4 - Apprentice	(150 - 250)

Core Type:
C = Core
E = Extended Core
F = Future Core (shaded items are not included in student score or Strand totals)

Students without Benchmark / GLCE scores have tested a different form than the majority form tested in this class.
Linking Items are reported for informational purposes only and do not contribute to the student score.

Fall 2006 Run Date: 12/12/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

MICHIGAN Department of Education

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

CLASS ROSTER

Grade 7 - Form X
Fall 2006
MATHEMATICS

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

Teacher Name: **LAST, FIRST**
Class/Group: **1234**
School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

Strand / GLCE	continued	Linking	N.MR.05.1	N.MR.05.2	A.RP.05.3	M.UN.05.4	G.GS.05.5	G.TR.05.6	D.PR.05.7	Linking Total	Core Total	Extended Core Total
Core Type MC or CR Points Possible			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	20	17
Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I. UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 99/99/9999												
Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I. UIC: 1234567890												
No. of Students Assessed = 999,999												
Mean												

SAMPLE

Performance Level	Scale Score Range
1 - Exceeded Standard	(551 - 700)
2 - Met Standard	(351 - 550)
3 - Basic	(251 - 350)
4 - Apprentice	(150 - 250)

Core Type:
C = Core
E = Extended Core
F = Future Core (shaded items are not included in student score or Strand totals)

Fall **2006** Run Date: 11/11/**06** batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

Individual Student Report (ISR) Description

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

Section A identifies the title of the report, the content area, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. It also lists the name of the teacher (if provided by the district on the Class/Group ID sheet when the answer folders 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 content area. The specific identification and demographic fields reported are:

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

The **Student Performance Summary** includes the assessment form, the number of points the student earned out of the total number of points possible, the student's scale score for the current year, and the performance level attained in the current and previous year.

Section C provides detailed information on the individual student's performance for each released assessment item. All items, except field test items, are included. The number of points earned out of the total number of points possible is reported for each strand assessed.

Each strand is further subdivided into the primary Michigan benchmarks assessed. The following information is provided for each **benchmark**:

- the GLCE code and descriptor
- the item number in the *Released Items* document
- the student's response to that item number – the Response Code legend is provided in the lower left corner of the ISR
- the number of points earned out of the total number of points possible for that benchmark

Please note the following when using the data on the ISR:

- **Linking** items are assessment items from the previous grade assessment, e.g., Grade 3 assessment items also assessed on the Grade 4 assessment. The Item Number for these linking items refers to the Item Number in the **Previous Grade Level *Released Items*** document. For example, Linking Item Numbers reported on the Grade 4 ISR reference the Released Item Number in the Grade 3 *Released Items* document. Linking items are reported for information purposes and do not count toward a student's scale score or performance level.
- **Future Core** items do not contribute to the student's score. The item number and student response are reported, however no individual student score is calculated or reported for these items.
- Fall 2006 **Released Item documents** for each grade level and content area are posted on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.
  Note: *Copyright permissions for the Fall 2006 ELA Reading Selections did not include Internet permissions. Ten printed copies of the Released Item Reading Selections for Grades 3–8 will be mailed to each school and district with their Final Reports.*

Section D

Section D provides constructed response data for all content areas. Comment and condition codes are reported for reading, writing and social studies and are described on pages 6-14 of this document. Students receiving a 0 score will not receive comment codes. Math and science will report only condition codes.

MICHIGAN Department of Education

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT

English Language Arts

Grade 4
Fall 2006

PEM 09-21-2006

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

Teacher Name: **LAST, FIRST**
Class/Group: **1234**
School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

Student Name: **Name Lastxxxxxxx, Firstxxxxx I.**
District Student ID: 0123456789 Date of Birth: MM/DD/YYYY State UIC: 123456789
Gender: M Ethnicity: American Indian/Alaskan Native (1)
English Language Learner: N Formerly LEP: Y SpecEd: N
Accommodations: Reading-Standard; Writing-None

STUDENT PERFORMANCE SUMMARY - FORM 10

	READING	WRITING	ELA
Earned/Possible Points:	37/43	12/15	
Scale Score 2006:	466	451	461
Performance Level 2006:	1-Exceeded Standards	1-Exceeded Standards	1-Exceeded Standards
Performance Level 2005:	1-Exceeded Standards	1-Exceeded Standards	1-Exceeded Standards

STRAND or Code	DOMAIN or Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Released Item Information: Released Item Number and Response			Earned / Possible Points
READING					**37/43**
	WORD RECOGNITION & WORD STUDY				**0/ 1**
R.WS.03.08	Determine meaning of words/phrases in context	30 **C**			0/ 1
	NARRATIVE TEXT				**12/12**
R.NT.03.02	ID/describe a variety of narrative genre	20 +			1/ 1
R.NT.03.03	ID thoughts/motivations, themes, main idea, lesson	9 +	10 +	11 +	
		13 +	14 +	15 +	
		16 +	19 +	21 +	
		26 +			10/10
R.NT.03.04	Explain how authors use literary devices	12 +			1/ 1
	INFORMATIONAL TEXT				**7/ 8**
R.IT.03.01	ID/describe a variety of informational genre	2 +	17 +	18 **A**	
		25 +	28 +	29 +	5/ 6
R.IT.03.03	Explain how authors use text features	3 +	4 +		2/ 2
	COMPREHENSION				**10/14**
R.CM.03.02	Retell text with relevant details	1 +	5 +	6 **A**	
		8 +	23 +	27 +	5/ 6
R.CM.03.03	Compare/contrast relationships within/across texts	7 +	22 **3**	24 +	5/ 8
LINKING	**ITEM NUMBERS MATCH PREVIOUS GRADE TEST**				**8/ 8**
R.IT.02.01	ID/describe a variety of informational genre	27 +	28 +		2/ 2
R.IT.02.03	Explain how authors/illustrators use text features	29 +			1/ 1
R.CM.02.02	Retell main idea(s), relevant details of text	23 +	24 +	25 +	
		26 +	30 +		5/ 5

STRAND or Code	DOMAIN or Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Released Item Information: Released Item Number and Response			Earned / Possible Points
WRITING					**12/15**
	WRITING PROCESS				**8/11**
W.PR.03.01	Consider audience and purpose for writing	31 **4**	37 **3**		7/10
W.PR.03.02	Apply or ID a variety of pre-writing strategies	32 +			1/ 1
	GRAMMAR AND USAGE				**2/ 2**
W.GR.03.01	Write with or ID correct grammar and usage	33 +	34 +		2/ 2
	SPELLING				**2/ 2**
W.SP.03.01	Spell correctly freq./less freq. encountered words	35 +	36 +		2/ 2

Code	Constructed Response	Released Item Number	Earned / Possible Points	Comments or Condition Code
R.CM.03.03	Response to Reading Selections	22	3/6	X,X,X,X,X,X
W.PR.03.01	Writing From Knowledge and Experience	31	4/6	X,X,X,X,X
W.PR.03.01	Response to Writing Sample	37	3/4	X,X

Response codes: + = Correct; A,B,C,D = Incorrect; M = Multiple Answers Chosen; blank = Student Omitted;
* = Item Dropped: 0,1,2,...= CR or ER Score

Fall 2006 Run Date: 12/12/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

SAMPLE

Student Record Label Description

A Student Record Label is provided for each student assessed during the Fall 2006 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 Identifier Code Number (UIC#), District Student ID Number (STU#) if provided by the school during the Pre-ID process, date of birth, gender, ethnicity, and grade.

Section C contains the **Subject** areas assessed, the **Form** used by the student, the scale score (**SS**) received, and the **Performance Level** the student attained in each subject area.

Level **1** – Exceeded Michigan Standards
Level **2** – Met Michigan Standards
Level **3** – demonstrated Basic knowledge and skills of Michigan standards
Level **4** – considered to be at an Apprentice level, demonstrating little success in meeting Michigan standards.

Grade 3, 4 and 7 sample Student Label

Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I.
12345 DISTRICT NAME
54321 SCHOOL NAME

A

B

UIC# 1234567890
STU# 0123456789
DOB- MM/DD/YY
Gender-M
Ethnic-1
Grade-4

Subject	Scale Score	Performance Level
Mathematics	782	1-Exceeded Standards
Science		
Social Studies		
ELA Reading	782	2-Met Standards
ELA Writing	782	3-Basic
ELA Total	782	4-Apprentice

C

Fall 2006
meap™

Grade 5 and 8 sample Student Label

Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I.
12345 DISTRICT NAME
54321 SCHOOL NAME

UIC# 1234567890
STU# 0123456789
DOB- MM/DD/YY
Gender-M
Ethnic-1
Grade-4

Subject	Scale Score	Performance Level
Mathematics		
Science		
Social Studies		
ELA Reading		
ELA Writing		
ELA Total		

Fall 2006
meap™

Grade 6 sample Student Label

Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I.
12345 DISTRICT NAME
54321 SCHOOL NAME

UIC# 1234567890
STU# 0123456789
DOB- MM/DD/YY
Gender-M
Ethnic-1
Grade-4

Subject	Scale Score	Performance Level
Mathematics		
Science		
Social Studies		
ELA Reading		
ELA Writing		
ELA Total		

Fall 2006
meap™

Grade 9 sample Student Label

Lastnamexxxxxxxx, Firstnamex I.
12345 DISTRICT NAME
54321 SCHOOL NAME

UIC# 1234567890
STU# 0123456789
DOB- MM/DD/YY
Gender-M
Ethnic-1
Grade-4

Subject	Scale Score	Performance Level
Mathematics		
Science		
Social Studies		
ELA Reading		
ELA Writing		
ELA Total		

Fall 2006
meap™

SAMPLE

Parent Report Description

The intent of the Parent Report is to provide a summary description of their student's performance in each content 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).

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 provides 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 content area assessed for the current year and the performance level obtained in mathematics, reading, writing and total ELA for the current and previous year. (Note: Grade 3 students will have NA-Not_Applicable for the previous year performance level.)

Section D (the inside pages of the Parent Report, *see pages 38–39*) describes how the student performed in each content area, on each content area strand, and the total points possible for the strand. The brief explanation for each subject area provides the performance level score 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 has "Met" Michigan standards.

Section E provides space for student's mailing address or address label, (see page 40).

For students taking the English language arts (ELA) assessment, the scores and performance levels have been divided into reading, writing, and total English Language Arts (ELA) score which is a combined performance level for reading and writing. The total ELA score is weighted two-thirds reading, one-third writing.

Please Note:
The MEAP results for individual students are most reliable and valid at the overall content area scale-score level. These scale scores also are reliably associated with a performance level. Parents can have confidence that the reported content area scale scores and performance levels provide accurate information for each subject.

Student scores for strands are also provided in these Parent Reports. These are less reliable measures than subject scores and performance levels because there are fewer items within strands than on the total subject test. These results provide an approximate measure of the level of performance of the student.

Parents should be careful in drawing conclusions about a student's strengths or weaknesses at the strand level. It is more appropriate to use this strand information together with classroom assessment data, teacher-provided information, and other performance information to guide learning activities.

Parent Report

PEM 09/21/2006 Grade 3

MICHIGAN Department of Education

Grade 3
Fall 2006

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

A

School Name: **SUPERIOR ELEMENTARY**
School Code: **34567**

Report For:
Firstnamex I. Lastnamexxxxxxxx

UIC: 1234567890

B

Dear Parent or Guardian:

During October 2006, schools administered the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) assessments. The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law requires all students in grades 3 to 8, including <Firstnamex>, to take the English language arts and mathematics assessments. Students also had the opportunity to take science assessments in grades 5 and 8 and social studies in grades 6 and 9.

The MEAP assessments measure what a student should know and be able to do in each of the content 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 <Firstnamex> performed overall in each content area assessed.

We encourage you to discuss the MEAP results for <Firstnamex> 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 assessment 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,

Mike Flanagan
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Michigan

SAMPLE

C

Results for Firstnamex

Subject	Scale Score 2006	Performance Level 2006	Performance Level 2005
Mathematics	665	1-Exceeded Standards	NA-Not applicable
Reading	665	1-Exceeded Standards	NA-Not applicable
Writing	665	1-Exceeded Standards	NA-Not applicable
Total English Language Arts	665	1-Exceeded Standards	NA-Not applicable

Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1: Exceeded Standards
The student's performance exceeds proficiency standards and indicates substantial understanding and application of key curriculum concepts defined for Michigan students.

Level 2: Met Standards
The student's performance is proficient and indicates sufficient understanding and application of key curriculum concepts defined for Michigan students.

Level 3: Basic
The student's performance is not yet proficient, indicating a partial understanding and application of key curriculum concepts defined for Michigan students.

Level 4: Apprentice
The student's performance is not yet proficient and indicates minimal understanding and application of key curriculum concepts defined for Michigan students.

Care must be taken in understanding the results of these assessments. Your student's scores reflect performance on a given day under standardized administration procedures. The standardized scale scores are the most stable of your student's scores. Strand scores within subject may vary more because fewer items are used to measure strands.

We encourage parents to discuss these results with the teacher who can provide more information by using results from other assessments and classroom performance. The teacher is in the best position to provide guidance in designing appropriate instruction for your student.

English Language Arts

Reading: You student's reading scale score is reported on the graph below.



Reading Domains	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Word Study	99	99	100%
Narrative Text			
Informational Text			
Comprehesion			

On the reading assessment the students were asked to read for understanding within and across texts, answer multiple-choice questions, and demonstrate their understanding of text through a written response. All questions on the reading assessment are based upon the Michigan Department of Education English Language Arts Grade Level Content Expectations in reading.

The reading domains at left shows the points possible, as well as the percent correct and points earned by your child.

A STUDENT WHO **EXCEEDED STANDARDS**:
Uses knowledge about text features and structures to accurately and insightfully construct meaning and to synthesize and evaluate themes within and across texts. Writes and supports a thorough and effective response, taking a clear position on a question without misconceptions about the texts.

D

Structure - examples include: narrative, expository
Features - examples include adjunct aids, such as maps, charts, illustrations

Writing: Your student's writing scale score is reported below on the graph below.



Writing Domains	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Writing Genres	99	99	100%
Writing Process			
Grammar and Usage			

On the writing assessment, students were asked to write about a topic using their own knowledge and experience, answer five multiple-choice questions and respond in writing to 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 Expectations in writing.

The writing domains at left shows the points possible, as well as the percent correct and points earned by your child.

A STUDENT WHO **EXCEEDED STANDARDS**:
Writes in an exceptionally clear and focused manner about a central idea or task; uses well-organized and fully developed details and language that enhance meaning and effectiveness; and assesses the quality of his/her own writing and the writing of others by applying expert standards.

SAMPLE

Total English Language Arts: Your student's Total English Language Arts scale score is reported on the graph below.



The English Language Arts (ELA) score is a total score based upon a student's performance on the separate reading and writing parts of the assessment.

What is Standard Error of Measurement (◆) ?

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 Standard Error of Measurement. If your student had taken this same test or a similar test on another day, he/she would likely have scored within this range.

Mathematics: Your student's mathematics scale score is reported on the graph below.

At the beginning of third grade, students are expected to count, read, write, and compare whole numbers up to 1,000. They should be able to add and subtract two-digit whole numbers, estimate the sums of three-digit numbers, show the meaning of the operations with objects, and apply their knowledge of addition and subtraction in real world settings. They have been introduced to multiplication and division by working with models. Students begin to understand the relationship among addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Ideas about fractions as parts of the whole are introduced. Students will measure, compare, and add and subtract lengths. They are expected to find perimeters, read thermometers, tell time, read and write amounts of money, and recognize and compare geometric shapes.

A STUDENT WHO **EXCEEDED STANDARDS**:
Performed mathematical skills, understood concepts, and solved complex, non-routine problems consistent with the Grade X Expectations.



Mathematics Strands	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Number & Operations	99	99	100%
Measurement			
Geometry			

SAMPLE

SPACE FOR THE ADDRESS LABEL

SAMPLE

E

The MEAP assessments are standardized, criterion-referenced assessments indicating what students know and can do in relation to the content defined in the Michigan Curriculum Framework. More information about the MEAP assessments can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap. Additional information about the Michigan Curriculum Framework can be found on the Michigan Department of Education web site, www.michigan.gov/mde.

MEAP assessments are made up of multiple choice and written response items developed, edited and reviewed several times by Michigan teachers and educators using a rigorous process that meets national technical standards. The raw scores in this report indicate the number of points assigned to correct responses. Scale scores are reported for each content area assessed placing the raw scores on a standard scale so that comparisons can be made between test administrations. Performance levels were determined using test information and the expert judgment of Michigan educators and other knowledgeable stakeholders.

If you have questions about this assessment, or this report, please talk to your student's teacher or principal who will be able to assist you in interpreting this report.

(THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

Comprehensive Report Description

The Comprehensive Report provides grade level summary score data by content area. The District Comprehensive Report lists summary score data for the district, followed by each school within the district. The ISD Comprehensive Report lists summary score data for the ISD, followed by each public school district, PSA, and each non-public school 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 Michigan standards within each content area.

This is a multiple page report with ELA scores reported on one page and math, science and social studies reported on another page.

PEM 09/27/06

MICHIGAN Department of Education

DISTRICT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT

All Students

A

Grade X
Fall 2006

meap Michigan Educational Assessment Program

District Name: **WANTTOBETTER PUBLIC SCHOOL**
District Code: **00040**

B

C

	READING							WRITING							TOTAL ELA						
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Percent at Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Percent at Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Percent at Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *
DISTRICT NAME	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 1	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 2	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 3	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 4	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 5	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 6	<							<							<						
SCHOOL NAME 7	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 8	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 9	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 10	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 11	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 12	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SCHOOL NAME 13	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	999,999	123	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%

SAMPLE

Performance Level
1 & 2 - Met/Exceeded
1 - Exceeded Standards
2 - Met Standards
3 - Basic
4 - Apprentice

* Percent proficient may not equal the sum of level 1 & level 2 due to rounding.
< = No summary scores provided if <10 students.

Fall 2006 Run Date: 12/12/06 batchxxx-dstschcode-0000000

Contact Information

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) coordinators and assessment administrators should become familiar with the report layouts and information contained in this document. If district MEAP coordinators have questions after reviewing this manual, or need additional information about MEAP assessment administration procedures, content, scheduling, appropriate assessment or accommodations for students with disabilities, or the English Language Learner (ELL) Program, please contact the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability, using the contact information listed below.

Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability

Edward Roeber, Senior Executive Director
Marilyn Roberts, Director
Joseph Martineau, Psychometrician
Paul Bielawski, Manager, Educational Accountability
Peggy Dutcher, Manager, Assessment for Students with Disabilities Program
William Brown, Coordinator, Test Development
James Griffiths, Manager, Assessment Administration and Reporting
Jane Faulds, English Language Arts Consultant
Kyle Ward, Mathematics Consultant
Rodger Epp, Science Consultant
Ruth Isaia, Social Studies Consultant
Sue Peterman, Department Analyst, Assessment Administration and Reporting
Patricia King, Department Analyst, Assessment Administration and Reporting

Phone: 1-877-560-8378
Fax: 517-335-1186
Web site: *www.michigan.gov/meap* (current information, assessment results, released items)
E-mail: meap@michigan.gov

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Kathleen N. Straus – President
John C. Austin – Vice President
Carolyn L. Curtin – Secretary
Marianne Yared McGuire – Treasurer
Nancy Danhof - NASBE Delegate
Elizabeth W. Bauer
Reginald M. Turner
Eileen Lappin Weiser

EX-OFFICIO
Jennifer M. Granholm – Governor
Michael P. Flanagan – Superintendent of Public Instruction

608 West Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW

The Michigan State Board of Education complies with all Federal laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the U.S. Department of Education. It is the policy of the Michigan State Board of Education that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status, or handicap shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education.