

Getting to Know Michigan's New Cut Scores

NOVEMBER 2, 2011

BY DEB WAHLSTROM

Students in the state's elementary and middle schools have taken this year's MEAP tests. While the blueprints for the tests are the same, there will be one key difference: The bar for determining whether or not a student scores proficient has gone up.

In our work with school districts around the state, we have often had collaborative head shaking (side-to-side, not up-and-down) when we've talked about the low bar that has been in place in Michigan for years. We have wanted to hold our students to a higher standard. We have wanted our students to have to achieve success on more than 1/3 of the test in order to be scored proficient. Common sense and logic tells us that if we allow students to be designated as being proficient when scoring about 1/3 of the items correct, then we are setting them and our schools up for failure.

The high schools in the state have taken a particularly hard hit, because of the "proficient" students coming through their doors who are not really for high school work.

This is an issue that has needed to be addressed for years. And with the approval of the new cut scores for the MEAP and MME tests, the bar will change this year.

Since the change is this year and the students take the test in the fall (on the previous year's curriculum), it will be interesting to see the results. Maybe there is a reason the memo from the MDE came out on Halloween. This might feel like scary stuff.

What makes it scary? A third-grade student who took the test last year had to earn about 44% of the points in order to be "proficient." This year's third-grade students will have to earn 67% of the points in order to be proficient. That's a difference of 23 points from last year to this year. As you know, when students have to get more questions correct in order to be designated proficient, there likely won't be the same number or percent of students at the proficient level.

And that has everyone worried.

So it's important that we all understand the changes and think about the impact this year – and how this all plays out as the state moves through its implementation of the Common Core State Standards. You see, this is a state issue, not just a district issue. There are things in the works that are much bigger than the district.

Study the new cut scores.

I've pulled together a number of resources to bring you charts that provide several things: The trend in percent correct over the past several years (School Year 2008-2009 through 2010-2011) and the corresponding cut scores for those.

Resources used to create these charts included:

Fall 2008 MEAP Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2						
The percentages in this chart represent the percentage of points a student must earn to be considered proficient in Fall 2008 MEAP tests.						
Grade	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Science	
3	43%	43%	52%			
4	42%	43%	48%			
5	43%	47%	52%	47%		
6	43%	43%	35%			52%
7	36%	50%	48%			
8	34%	57%	48%	41%		
9						50%

MEAP Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2, Fall 2008. SmartData/Successline Inc.

Fall 2009 MEAP Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2						
The percentages in this chart represent the percentage of points a student must earn to be considered proficient in Fall 2009 MEAP tests.						
Grade	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Science	
3	32%	45%	N/A			
4	36%	42%	N/A			
5	40%	52%	N/A	45%		
6	32%	48%	N/A			45%
7	34%	55%	N/A			
8	37%	48%	N/A	42%		
9						48%


MEAP Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2, Fall 2009. SmartData/Successline Inc.

Fall 2010 MEAP Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2						
The percentages in this chart represent the percentage of points a student must earn to be considered proficient in Fall 2010 MEAP tests.						
Grade	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Science	
3	45%	43%	52%			
4	42%	43%	48%			
5	43%	47%	52%	47%		
6	43%	43%	35%			52%
7	36%	50%	48%			
8	34%	57%	48%	41%		
9						50%

MEAP Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2, Fall 2010. SmartData/Successline Inc.

Percentage Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2						
The percentages in this chart represent the percentage of points a student must earn to be considered proficient in the 2008-2011 tests.						
Year Period	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Science	
Spring 2008	56%	67%	63%	39%	37%	
Spring 2009	57%	45%	58%	48%	44%	
Spring 2010	40%	47%	51%	41%	43%	
Spring 2011	40%-45%	47%-53%	57%	42%-48%	39%	

MME Raw Score to Proficiency Level 2, Spring 2008 through Spring 2010. Spring 2010. SmartData/Successline Inc.



Memorandum, Approval of Recommended New Cut Scores on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) AND Michigan Merit Examinations (MME) Consistent with Career and College Readiness. From Mike Flanagan, Chairman to State Board of Education (September 6, 2011)

MEAP AND MME NEW CUT SCORES
Michigan (September 13, 2011)

NEW CUT SCORES - MATHEMATICS				NEW CUT SCORES - READING			
Grade	Proficient	Advanced	Minimum	Grade	Proficient	Advanced	Minimum
1-8	1363	1115	1130	1-8	1161	1138	1141
9	847	830	847	9	792	818	819
10	714	714	714	10	646	721	742
11	814	828	875	11	802	819	853
12	1119	1131	1161	12	1011	1011	1049
13	483	426	426	13	399	408	438
14	322	328	371	14	301	324	354

NEW CUT SCORES - SCIENCE				NEW CUT SCORES - SOCIAL STUDIES			
Grade	Proficient	Advanced	Minimum	Grade	Proficient	Advanced	Minimum
1-8	1166	1119	1144	1-8	1107	1119	1138
9	829	847	867	9	809	829	860
10	529	531	567	10	551	579	599

MEAP and MME New Cut Scores (effective September 13, 2011), Michigan Department of Education, September 2011.

On the following page, you'll find an explanation about how to read the charts, followed by charts for all tests and corresponding grade levels.

Important reminder: The data shows the “old” score – how your school achieved with past cut scores. The “new” score gives you an idea of how your school stacks up against the new cut scores. The MDE is not backing up and redoing scores; it simply wants you to be aware of the implication of the old cut scores vs. the new cut scores for your schools and districts.

Comparison of "Old" versus "New" Cut Scores
MEAP, Fall 2008 through Fall 2011

Reading, Grade 3						Reading, Grade 4						Reading, Grade 5					
Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Scale Score	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Scale Score	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Scale Score
% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score			% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score			% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		
43	300	67	324	24	41	400	64	425	23	47	500	64	521	17	54	571	
45	300	67	324	22	47	400	64	425	22	52	500	64	521	17	54	571	
44	300	67	324	23	44	400	64	425	20	44	500	64	521	18	54	571	
44	300	67	324	24	44	400	64	425	23	44	500	64	521	18	54	571	

Reading, Grade 6						Reading, Grade 7						Reading, Grade 8					
Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Scale Score	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Scale Score	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Scale Score
% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score			% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score			% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		
43	300	67	324	24	41	400	64	425	23	47	500	64	521	17	54	571	
45	300	67	324	22	47	400	64	425	22	52	500	64	521	17	54	571	
44	300	67	324	23	44	400	64	425	20	44	500	64	521	18	54	571	
44	300	67	324	24	44	400	64	425	23	44	500	64	521	18	54	571	

Notes for reading the Cut Score Charts

The "old" cut scores are those from the 2008-2009 school through the 2010-2011 school year.

The "new" cut scores that go into effect with the Fall 2011 MEAP tests. This lines up the new cut score against the old for the past three years.

This column shows the difference. In 2008, a student had to earn about 43% of the points to achieve proficiency. If the new benchmark score were applied, the student would have had to earn an additional 24 percentage points to score proficient.

The scale score is also being adjusted. Where we once knew that a third grader had to score a 300 on any test to be proficient, we now will need to refer to charts – as there is a new scale score for proficiency for every test at every grade level.

2008-2009 school year
2009-2010 school year
2010-2011 school year
2011-2012 school year
MEAP Tests Given in the Fall of the School year
MME Tests Given in the Spring of the School year

Reading, Grade 3					
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	43	300	67	324	24
2009	45	300	67	324	22
2010	44	300	67	324	23
2011			67	324	

Last year, students had to earn about 44% of the total points to be designated proficient.

This year, students must earn about 67% of the total points to be designated proficient.

Students will have to earn an additional 23 percentage points to be proficient. Remember, students only had to earn 44% of the questions/points last year. This year it is 67% of the questions correct – a difference of 23.

Comparison of "Old" versus "New" Cut Scores MEAP, Fall 2008 through Fall 2011

	Reading, Grade 3					Reading, Grade 4					Reading, Grade 5				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	43	300	67	324	24	43	400	64	419	21	47	500	64	521	17
2009	45	300	67	324	22	42	400	64	419	22	52	500	64	521	12
2010	44	300	67	324	23	44	400	64	419	20	44	500	64	521	20
2011			67	324				64	419				64	521	

	Reading, Grade 6					Reading, Grade 7					Reading, Grade 8				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	43	600	61	619	18	50	700	70	721	20	57	800	64	818	7
2009	48	600	61	619	13	55	700	70	721	15	48	800	64	818	16
2010	42	600	61	619	19	52	700	70	721	18	45	800	64	818	19
2011			61	619				70	721				64	818	

Comparison of "Old" versus "New" Cut Scores MEAP, Fall 2008 through Fall 2011

	Math, Grade 3					Math, Grade 4					Math, Grade 5				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	45	300	72	336	27	42	400	58	434	16	43	500	61	531	18
2009	33	300	72	336	39	36	400	58	434	22	40	500	61	531	21
2010	34	300	72	336	38	29	400	58	434	29	39	500	61	531	22
2011			72	336				58	434				61	531	

	Math, Grade 6					Math, Grade 7					Math, Grade 8				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	43	600	58	629	15	36	700	60	731	24	34	800	58	830	24
2009	37	600	58	629	21	34	700	60	731	26	37	800	58	830	21
2010	35	600	58	629	23	32	700	60	731	28	35	800	58	830	23
2011			58	629				60	731				58	830	

Comparison of "Old" versus "New" Cut Scores MEAP, Fall 2008 through Fall 2011

	Science, Grade 5					Science, Grade 8				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	47	300	83	553	36	41	400	75	845	34
2009	45	300	83	553	38	42	400	75	845	33
2010	45	300	83	553	38	40	400	75	845	35
2011			83	553				75	845	

	Social Studies, Grade 6					Social Studies, Grade 9				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	52	600	66	625	14	50	700	64	928	14
2009	45	600	66	625	21	48	700	64	928	16
2010	43	600	66	625	23	41	700	64	928	23
2011			66	625				64	928	

Comparison of "Old" versus "New" Cut Scores MME, Spring 2008 through Spring 2011

	Reading, Grade 11					Mathematics, Grade 11					Science, Grade 11				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	67	1100	57	1108	-10	58	1100	58	1116	0	39	1100	65	1126	26
2009	45	1100	57	1108	12	57	1100	58	1116	1	48	1100	65	1126	17
2010	47	1100	57	1108	10	40	1100	58	1116	18	41	1100	65	1126	24
2011	45	1100	57	1108	12	40	1100	58	1116	18	38	1100	65	1126	27
2012			57	1108				58	1116				65	1126	

	Social Studies, Grade 11					Writing, Grade 11				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	37	1100	63	1129	26	53	1100			
2009	44	1100	63	1129	19	58	1100			
2010	43	1100	63	1129	20	51	1100			
2011	39	1100	63	1129	24	57	1100			
2012			63	1129						

Ideas for Using the Cut Score Charts

	Science, Grade 5					Science, Grade 8				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	47	300	83	553	36	41	400	75	845	34
2009	45	300	83	553	38	42	400	75	845	33
2010	45	300	83	553	38	40	400	75	845	35
2011			83	553				75	845	

Once you've reviewed the previous charts, consider thinking of the different ways you can use them. I've included a few ideas for your consideration:

	Social Studies, Grade 6					Social Studies, Grade 9				
	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct	Old Cut Scores		New Cut Scores		Difference in Percent Correct
	% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score		% Correct	Scale Score	% Correct	Scale Score	
2008	52	600	66	625	14	50	700	64	928	14
2009	45	600	66	625	21	48	700	64	928	16
2010	43	600	66	625	23	41	700	64	928	23
2011			66	625				64	928	

1. **Make a copy of the charts and give them to teachers.** Make time for teachers to study the charts and ask questions.

2. **Give a copy of the charts to parents.** At an upcoming PTA meeting, consider sharing this important

information with parents.


3. **Link to a copy of this document on your website.** Encourage parents and community members to download and review the document.
4. **Make a copy for students.** A natural time to do this for elementary and middle schools is when the Fall 2011 data is released a bit later in the year. If you work with high school students, show them the changes now.
5. **Review your MME data from last year.** Determine the specific areas of weakness and make sure you are addressing those areas in your curriculum and with your 11th grade students. If you give the EXPLORE and PLAN, you should be reviewing areas of weaknesses and strengths and making curriculum adjustments based on your data.
6. **Share the data with your school improvement team.** You will have a special challenge this year. All of your goals were likely made with last year's data. The cut scores for the assessments have changed, thus you will likely not meet the same goals with the new cut scores. How will your school team deal with this? Begin this chat now. Once we see how the new data is released, I'll give you some ideas about how to do this. The state will give data in both ways – so we will have something to use, but let's see how the data looks and then go from there. Remember that the data you use for your school goals should follow the same parameters from one year to the next. For example, let's say you have the parameter to use only full-academic year students in your school improvement plans. Most of the data from the MISCHOOOLDATA.org website includes all students and not just those who are considered full academic year. So just be mindful

when you're bringing data together from different sites and sources to keep your parameters the same.

- Update documents and materials that speak to cut scores.** For example, if you have information on your website that talks about a 500 being the proficient score in reading for a fifth grader, you'll want to change that to a 521 being the proficient score.
- Visit the Michigan Schools Public Relations Association website** to review and use materials in a special [Cut Scores Communication Toolkit](#).

In addition to the Cut Score Charts, you'll likely want to also review the online data for your school and/or district.

New Cut Scores Applied to Past Data



For informational purposes, the MDE is providing an historical look at data to give schools and districts an understanding of what student achievement would have been had the new cut scores been in place at that time. Your historical data, with the cut scores applied, is being released to the public on November 3, 2011.

This is available on MISchoolData.org.

A quick look at how to read the data is provided on the next page.

New Cut Scores Applied to Past Data

The new cut scores for math applied to past data. For the 2011 MME, this school would have 4.5% of its students proficient on the math test.

FOCAL School A				
MME Math - Percent Proficient				
Group	2008	2009	2010	2011
All students	4.9	6.6	6.3	4.5
All except students with disabilities	5.9	7.8	7.1	5.1
Students with disabilities	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Economically disadvantaged	2.5	3.3	1.1	4.3
Not economically disadvantaged	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Limited English proficient	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Not limited English proficient	5	6.6	6.3	4.5
Male	6.2	3.8	11.9	5
Female	3.5	8.8	0	4.1
Asian	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Black/African American	0	3.5	2.5	1.7
Hispanic of any race	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native American/Alaska Native	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
White	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Two or more races	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

FOCAL School A				
MME Math - Mean Scale Scores				
Group	2008	2009	2010	2011
All students	1074.3	1073.8	1065	1072.3
All except students with disabilities	1079.3	1080.3	1068.6	1079.2
Students with disabilities	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Economically disadvantaged	1069.1	1067.5	1061.3	1069
Not economically disadvantaged	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Limited English proficient	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Not limited English proficient	1074.3	1073.8	1065.4	1072.3
Male	1074.0	1068.4	1070.5	1074
Female	1074.7	1078.0	1059.6	1063
Asian	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Black/African American	1062.6	1064.9	1059.4	1053
Hispanic of any race	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native American/Alaska Native	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
White	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Two or more races	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

This column shows the average scaled score for School A, the focus school.

You can choose a comparison school. School B would have had 4.6% of its students proficient in math.

COMPARISON School B				
MME Math - Percent Proficient				
Group	2008	2009	2010	2011
All students	2.8	5	3.7	4.6
All except students with disabilities	3.1	5.5	4	5.1
Students with disabilities	0	0	0.6	0.3
Economically disadvantaged	1.8	3.5	2.4	2.9
Not economically disadvantaged	4.2	7.4	6.4	8.5
Limited English proficient	3.6	8.3	5.4	11.4
Not limited English proficient	2.8	4.9	3.6	4.2
Male	3.5	5.8	4.8	5.5
Female	2.4	4.5	3	3.9
Asian	2	21.4	19	25
Black/African American	2.5	4.5	3.4	4
Hispanic of any race	6.2	10.3	3.4	8.3
Native American/Alaska Native	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
White	13.3	15.1	14	19.1
Two or more races	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

COMPARISON School B				
MME Math - Mean Scale Scores				
Group	2008	2009	2010	2011
All students	1068.9	1069.5	1059.7	1060.5
All except students with disabilities	1072.4	1073.4	1063.3	1075.5
Students with disabilities	1029.9	1025.1	1023.2	1027.8
Economically disadvantaged	1065.6	1065.7	1055.0	1053
Not economically disadvantaged	1073.3	1075.1	1069.2	1072.2
Limited English proficient	1075.1	1076.7	1073.5	1074.1
Not limited English proficient	1068.6	1069.2	1059.0	1069.6
Male	1070.0	1069.7	1059.6	1071.1
Female	1068.2	1069.3	1059.8	1060.1
Asian	1072.4	1092.1	1062.5	1073.4
Black/African American	1068.3	1068.8	1058.7	1069.6
Hispanic of any race	1079.0	1080.9	1077.7	1070.8
Native American/Alaska Native	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
White	1081.3	1070.6	1075.4	1071.5
Two or more races	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

This column shows the average scaled score for School B, the Comparison School.

This chart takes your school's data and subtracts the other school's data to show the difference in achievement between the two. School A (4.5%) scored lower than School B (4.6%). School B scored .1% point better than did School A. (A negative score means the comparison school did better.)

FOCAL minus COMPARISON:				
MME Math - Percent Proficient				
Group	2008	2009	2010	2011
All students	2.1	1.6	2.6	-0.1
All except students with disabilities	2.8	2.3	3.1	0.5
Students with disabilities	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Economically disadvantaged	0.7	-0.2	-1.3	1.4
Not economically disadvantaged	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Limited English proficient	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Not limited English proficient	2.2	1.7	2.7	0.3
Male	2.7	-2	7.1	-0.5
Female	1.1	4.3	-3	0.2
Asian	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Black/African American	-2.5	-1	-0.9	-2.3
Hispanic of any race	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native American/Alaska Native	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
White	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Two or more races	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

FOCAL minus COMPARISON:				
MME Math - Mean Scale Scores				
Group	2008	2009	2010	2011
All students	5.4	4.3	5.7	11.8
All except students with disabilities	6.9	6.9	5.3	7.7
Students with disabilities	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Economically disadvantaged	3.5	1.8	6.3	11.6
Not economically disadvantaged	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Limited English proficient	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Not limited English proficient	5.7	4.6	6.4	11.7
Male	4.0	-1.3	10.9	3
Female	6.5	9.7	-0.2	11.2
Asian	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Black/African American	-5.7	-3.9	0.7	7
Hispanic of any race	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native American/Alaska Native	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
White	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Two or more races	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander*	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A

This column shows the difference in the average scaled score. School A (1072.3) scored higher than School B (1060.5) resulting in a difference of 11.8 scale score points.

What the Data Don't Show

Remember that the MEAP and MME results **are not your AYP results**. They are the data that are used to calculate and determine your AYP results.

The data **are not your accreditation scores**. They are the data that are used to calculate and determine your accreditation scores.

One of the challenges we've always had in Michigan is that of the state publishing the MEAP AND MME results for all students – whether they are full academic year or not. And that's okay. We just have to help everyone understand the data as they are released. This is simply an aggregate of all the students who took the test and had a valid score. The results of a student who came to your school just weeks before the test will be included in your MEAP and MME data.

To recap:

1. The Michigan State Board of Education has approved new cut scores.
2. In all cases, the new cut scores are higher than in the past.
3. The new cut scores are being applied in the 2011-2102 school year. This will impact the percentage of students scoring proficient on the fall 2011 MEAP and spring 2012 MME.

Select Resources and Websites

Related to Michigan's New Cut Scores

MICHIGAN DOCUMENTS

New MEAP and MME Cut Scores

http://mi.gov/documents/mde/NEW_CUT_SCORES_365039_7.pdf

Questions and Answers – New MEAP and MME Cut Scores

http://mi.gov/documents/mde/New_Cut_Scores_FAQ_365040_7.pdf

New MEAP Cut Scores and Transition Table

http://mi.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168---,00.html

Former MEAP Cut Scores

http://mi.gov/documents/mde/Former_MEAP_Cut_Scores_367499_7.pdf

September 6, 2011 Memorandum to State Board of Education

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Cut_Scores_Board_Item_362615_7.pdf

February 1, 2011 Memorandum to State Board of Education

http://michigan.gov/documents/mde/Item_1_Resetting_Cut_Scores_MME_MEAP_College_and_Career_Readiness_344799_7.pdf

Presentation on the Impact of Raising MEAP and MME Cut Scores to be Consistent with College and Career Readiness

<http://www.michigancareerconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Session-B2-Presentation-on-the-Impact-of-Raising-Cut-Scores-v2.pdf>

ACT Releases Discussion Points

<http://www.cenmi.org/News/NewsDetails/tabid/56/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/720/ACT-Releases-Discussion-Points-on-New-Cut-Scores-for-MEAP-and-MME.aspx>

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

<http://www.mspra.org/resources/>

http://mymassp.com/content/new_cut_scores%E2%80%A6three_words_big_impact

http://mymassp.com/content/discussion_raise_bar_cut_scores

<http://gomasa.org/news/michigan-state-board-education-takes-action-cut-scores-accountability-and-reform-recommendation>

<http://www.gomasa.org/sites/default/files/ACT%20Benchmarks%20Response.pdf>

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND BLOGS

<http://www.macombdaily.com/articles/2011/02/11/news/doc4d55f9c6aeacd192575168.txt>

http://www.mlive.com/news/grand-rapids/index.ssf/2011/01/meap_cut_changes_could_lower_s.html

<http://www.hollandsentinel.com/newsnow/x163793409/New-MEAP-standards-in-Michigan-make-it-tougher-to-score-proficient>

<http://toddfortroyschools.com/michigans-new-cut-scores-what-does-it-mean/>

http://www.mlive.com/education/index.ssf/2011/09/state_board_of_education_divid.html

<http://www.annarbor.com/news/michigan-board-of-education-raises-proficiency-scores-for-meap-and-mme/>

<http://www.zps.org/content/meap-tests-month-feature-new-cut-scores>

http://www.michiganstumb.com/articles/2011/04/26/news/local_news/doc4db6ac77430d4884348264.prt

http://www.michiganstumb.com/articles/2011/10/20/news/local_news/doc4ea009c1cf44c727563728.txt

<http://mrapullen.wordpress.com/2011/09/13/michigan-meap-cut-scores-raised/>

<http://detroit.cbslocal.com/2011/02/08/state-board-plans-to-raise-meap-cut-off-scores/>

<http://blogs.salineschools.com/announcements/2011/10/05/3414/>

<http://www.zps.org/category/news-tags/whats-new>

<http://www.romeobserver.com/story.asp?storyid=20451>

<http://www.toledoblade.com/Education/2011/03/31/Michigan-says-standardized-test-scores-up-for-math-social-studies-down-for-reading.print>

<http://www.annarbor.com/news/saline/saline-schools-expecting-lower-scores-on-meap-and-mme-due-to-new-state-standards/>