

2 Analyze the Performance Level Data

Insert for Process Step 2

- To analyze performance level data, have a paper copy of your School Summary Report in front of you. At the elementary school level, you should look at the Summary Report for your current grade AND the next grade level, because with the Fall testing schedule, the MEAP assesses the standards from the previous grade. Looking at your current level will show you what your students were tested on the previous year and indicate what may need to be retaught. Looking at the report for the next grade level allows teachers to see what their current students will be tested on the next Fall. Even though 2nd graders are not assessed with the MEAP, 2nd grade teachers should look at the 3rd grade report to inform their instruction and instructional calendar. Also, depending on the grade configuration of your district, you may need to obtain the Summary Report for the next grade level from another building or access the report using the instructions provided in the previous step. For MEAP data, the first page of the report for third grade will look like the one shown. The first pages for grades 3 – 9 are similar but vary in the subjects tested.



District Name:
District Code:

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

Grade 03

Fall 2012



School Name:
School Code:

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		(188-423)		(188-300)	(301-323)	(324-363)	(364-423)	(324-423)
	2012	58	303	298-308	55%	28%	17%	0%	17%
	2011	60	307	302-312	33%	50%	17%	0%	17%
	2010	67	304	296-312	52%	19%	27%	1%	28%
	2009	67	310	305-315	33%	37%	28%	1%	30%
MATHEMATICS	Scale Score Range		(208-416)		(208-321)	(322-335)	(336-370)	(371-416)	(336-416)
	2012	58	304	301-308	90%	7%	3%	0%	3%
	2011	58	308	305-311	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%
	2010	64	308	305-311	83%	16%	2%	0%	2%
	2009	64	311	308-314	83%	11%	6%	0%	6%

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

- On your report, review the Performance Level Data in the last column labeled Levels 1 & 2. This column represents the total percentage of students who achieved a Proficient or Advanced score in each subject area.



District Name:
District Code:

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

Grade 03
Fall 2012



ACHIEVEMENT - SUMMARY

		No. of Students Assessed		Scale Score		Performance Levels				1 & 2
Year				Mean	Margin of Error	4-Not Proficient	3-Partially Proficient	2-Proficient	1-Advanced	(324-423)
READING	Scale Score Range		(188-423)		(188-300)		(301-323)	(324-363)	(364-423)	17%
	2012	58	303	298-308	55%	28%	17%	0%	17%	
	2011	60	307	302-312	33%	50%	17%	0%	28%	
	2010	67	304	296-312	52%	19%	27%	1%	30%	
	2009	67	310	305-315	33%	37%	28%	1%		
MATHEMATICS	Scale Score Range		(208-416)		(208-321)		(322-335)	(336-370)	(371-416)	
	2012	58	304	301-308	90%	7%	3%	0%	(336-416)	
	2011	58	308	305-311	91%	9%	0%	0%	3%	
	2010	64	308	305-311	83%	16%	2%	0%	0%	
	2009	64	311	308-314	83%	11%	6%	0%	2%	
										6%

NA - Not Applicable.

Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual students.



1 / 9
Page 1 of 9

Fall 2012

- Now, on your report for reading look at the percentages in the Levels 1 & 2 column over the past few years to look for a trend in the percentages. Are the percentages going up, down or staying the same? Look at the most recent two years and draw a circle or box around the percentages for these years. Have the percentages increased, decreased or stayed the same?

When reviewing the performance level data, check to see if there has been a significant change in the Number of Students Assessed in the second column from the left. If there has been a significant increase or decrease, calculate the actual number of students performing at the Proficient or Advanced levels by multiplying the percentage in the last column by the Number of Students Assessed shown to determine the actual number of students who are proficient.



District Name:
District Code:

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

Grade 03

Fall 2012

School Name:



	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		(188-423)		(188-300)	(301-323)	(324-363)	(364-423)	(324-423)
	2012	58	303	298-308	55%	28%	17%	8%	17%
	2011	60	307	302-312	33%	50%	17%	8%	17%
	2010	67	304	296-312	52%	19%	27%	1%	28%
	2009	67	310	305-315	33%	37%	28%	1%	30%

MATH	2011	58	308	305-311	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%
	2010	64	308	305-311	83%	16%	2%	0%	2%
	2009	64	311	308-314	83%	11%	6%	0%	6%


NA - Not Applicable.
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual students.




Fall 2012

4. Now, let's look at the mathematics data for third grade. In 2008, the percentage of students at Performance levels 1 and 2 was 6%. In 2012, the percentage was 3%. You can see that the percentages went down and are on their way back up, but over the past four years, there has still been a decrease. Now let's look at the past two years. In 2011, the percentage was 0% and it increased by 3% in 2012. A 3% increase is OK, but we're looking for even larger increases. We'll go over the annual growth targets and how to achieve even bigger gains later. If you are looking at data for a different grade, you may have data for additional subject areas. Take the time to do what we've just done on those subject areas as well.



SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT
All Students
Grade 03
Fall 2012



District Name:
District Code:

School Name:
School Code:

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		(188-423)		(188-300)	(301-323)	(324-363)	(364-423)	(324-423)
	2012	58	303	298-308	55%	28%	17%	0%	17%
	2011	60	307	302-312	33%	50%	17%	0%	17%
	2010	67	304	298-312	52%	19%	27%	1%	28%

	Scale Score Range		(208-416)		(208-321)	(322-335)	(336-370)	(371-416)	(336-416)
MATHEMATICS	2012	58	304	301-308	90%	7%			3%
	2011	58	308	305-311	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%
	2010	64	308	305-311	83%	16%	2%	0%	2%
	2009	64	311	308-314	83%	11%	6%	0%	6%

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

Page 1 of 9

Fall 2012

Remember that you are looking at this report to see the trend for the scores over the past few years. Occasionally, you may see a significant decrease in scores for just one year and then the scores are back on track. This may indicate that something specific happened with that one class. When you see consistently low scores over several years, however, this almost always indicates that there are curriculum and instruction issues that need to be addressed.

You will use the data obtained above to prioritize the subject area(s) on which to work. Subject areas where the percentages have decreased, subject areas in which the percentages have remained the same or subject areas in which the performance levels increased but the percentage of proficient students is still very low will need to be addressed. The goal is to have ALL students perform at the Proficient or Advanced Levels.

5. When looking at Performance Levels, it is helpful if you know your student achievement expectations for each subject area for each year, which is also known as the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO). The Michigan Department of Education will send this information to Priority schools, but you can easily calculate the growth required each year. The calculation of the AMO is provided on the next page. Here is an example of the spreadsheet that is distributed.

Student Achievement Expectations

Subject	2012	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	Proficiency										
Math	1%	9.4%	17.8%	26.2%	34.6%	43.0%	51.4%	59.8%	68.2%	76.6%	85%
Reading	19%	25.6%	32.2%	38.8%	45.4%	52.0%	58.6%	65.2%	71.8%	78.4%	85%
Writing	9%	16.6%	24.2%	31.8%	39.4%	47.0%	54.6%	62.2%	69.8%	77.4%	85%
Science	3%	11.2%	19.4%	27.6%	35.8%	44.0%	52.2%	60.4%	68.6%	76.8%	85%
Social Studies	5%	13.0%	21.0%	29.0%	37.0%	45.0%	53.0%	61.0%	69.0%	77.0%	85%

This table shows the student proficiency levels for 2012, and identifies the target proficiency to meet the goals outlined in Michigan's ESEA Flexibility.

6. To meet the goals outlined in Michigan's ESEA Flexibility Waivers, 85% of students must be Proficient or Advanced in all subject areas by 2022. To calculate these targets, you must know your current performance levels. Let's use the 2012 MEAP Mathematics data as an example.

ACHIEVEMENT - SUMMARY

MATHEMATICS	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
	Scale Score Range		(208-416)		(208-321)	(322-335)	(336-370)	(371-416)	(336-416)
	2012	58	304	301-308	90%	7%	3%	0%	3%
	2011	58	308	305-311	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%
2010	64	308	305-311	83%	16%	2%	0%	2%	
2009	64	311	308-314	83%	11%	6%	0%	6%	

- a. In 2012, this sample school had 3% of their students that scored either proficient or advanced in Math on the MEAP. First, find the difference between your current percentage and the goal of 85% by subtracting. In this case, a gain of 82% needs to be achieved by 2022.

$$85\% - 3\% = 82\%$$

- b. Now, calculate the number of years between 2012 and 2022 by subtracting. So, there are 10 years to get to the 85% goal.

$$2022 - 2012 = 10$$

- c. To calculate the target for each year until 2022, divide the growth required to reach 85% by the number of years until 2022. To move consistently toward the target of 85%, this school's MEAP Math proficiency level should increase by 8.2% each year. You can map this out as shown below. Keep in mind that these annual goals will be adjusted each year based on the most recent proficiency level. Can you see why 1%, 2% and even 5% increases are not enough? What do your numbers look like?

$$82\% / 10 = 8.2\%$$

Student Achievement Expectations in Math

2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
3.0%	11.2%	19.4%	27.6%	35.8%	44.0%	52.2%	60.4%	68.6%	76.8%	85.0%