National Assessment Governing Board

Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology

Report of March 5, 2010

COSDAM Attendees: Lou Fabrizio (Chair), Tonya Miles, Jim Popham, Andrew Porter, Darvin Winick
Other Governing Board Members: Director of the Institute of Education Sciences John Q. Easton (*Ex officio*).
Governing Board Staff: Michelle Blair, Susan Loomis, and Executive Director Cornelia Orr.
Other Attendees: NCES: Stuart Kerachsky (Acting Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics), Peggy Carr (Deputy Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics), Jonathan Beard, Janis Brown, Patricia Etienne, Steve Gorman, Eunice Greer, Andrew Kolstad, Drew Malizio, Val Plisko, and Eugene Owen.   ACT: Nancy Petersen. ETS: Stephen Lazer and John Mazzeo. Hager Sharp: Siobhan Mueller. HumRRO: Lauress Wise. McGraw Hill Education: Larry Snowhite. MetaMetrics: Heather Koons. Pearson: Brad Thayer. New York State Department of Education: David Abrams. Westat: Keith Rust.

Lou Fabrizio, Chair of the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM), called the meeting to order and welcomed members and guests. A special welcome was given to new COSDAM member Jim Popham whose schedule did not permit his participation in the November 2009 meeting.   Mr. Fabrizio noted that the COSDAM agenda is very full and includes a closed session beginning at 11:30 a.m.

ACTION ITEM
1. NAEP Reading Achievement Levels Descriptions

Mr. Fabrizio asked Susan Loomis to review the information regarding the development of achievement levels descriptions for reading and present the motion for consideration by COSDAM.

Ms. Loomis noted that the new National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for reading will be reported starting in 2009 on the trend scale established for the 1992 reading NAEP. COSDAM had recommended that trend be maintained if technically feasible, and that the existing cut scores be used to report results for the new assessment in reading starting in 2009. The cut scores set for the 1992 assessment will be used for reporting results on the new assessment implemented in 2009. However, because the content of the assessment has changed, new achievement levels descriptions are needed to describe what students should know and be able to do at each NAEP achievement level and grade.

In November 2009, COSDAM approved a study to be conducted for the Governing Board by ETS to develop anchor descriptions for each item in the reading item pool at each grade level. Those descriptions were used to compare performance observed for students on the 2009 assessments to the NAEP policy definitions for each level, to the achievement levels descriptions developed in 1992 to state what students should know and be able to do, and to the preliminary descriptions developed for 2009. The alignment was generally rated as moderate or high. The panelists in this study participated in the development of the NAEP reading framework and/or serve on the NAEP standing committee for reading, and they each have a high level of content expertise related to the reading NAEP. They then used the policy definitions and their expertise with the NAEP reading framework to draft descriptions of the knowledge and skills that students should exhibit at each achievement level for each grade. Having already developed descriptions of actual performance within each achievement level range, the panelists were informed in their work by their observations of actual student performance; but, they understood that the achievement levels descriptions are to indicate what students *should* be able to do and not be limited by actual student performance.

The achievement levels descriptions (ALDs) drafted by these panelists were posted on the Governing Board website for public comment, following a notice in the ***Federal Register*** announcing the public comment collection. State and district reading coordinators, representatives of reading organizations and other key stakeholders, and other individuals involved in development of the NAEP reading framework and items were also contacted directly and asked to comment. Only 23 comments were submitted.

Recommendations from the public comment effort were evaluated and some used to modify the draft ALDs. The reading panelists communicated extensively in the process of finalizing the achievement levels descriptions to recommend to the Governing Board.

COSDAM discussed the process briefly. Jim Popham commented that the process for developing the achievement level definitions was impressive. He suggested that it would be desirable to include experts who are less familiar with NAEP frameworks and item development in future processes for crafting achievement level definitions as an additional way to enhance credibility. John Easton clarified that approval of these achievement levels definitions would allow them to be used in the upcoming release of the 2009 Reading Report Card for grades 4 and 8 scheduled for late March 2010.

Lou Fabrizio requested that a note be added to the achievement levels document to indicate that the shaded statements at the start of each level are summaries. The motion for the approval of the achievement level definitions with that addition was moved by Andrew Porter, seconded by Mr. Popham, and unanimously approved by the Committee. The motion is presented below, and the achievement levels descriptions are appended to this report.

Motion:
The Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology recommends that the National Assessment Governing Board approve the following achievement level descriptions for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance at grades 4, 8, and 12 for the National Assessment of Educational Progress in reading in 2009 and subsequent years.

2. NAEP Evaluation Report and NCES Actions

Peggy Carr, Associate Commissioner for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), spoke to COSDAM about the recommendations in the NAEP Evaluation Report and described the activities that NCES has already undertaken, as well as activities currently planned. Ms. Carr commented on the NCES response to three separate recommendations with the following points.

- NAEP measures a broad range of content common to many states; it cannot be aligned with the curriculum of any one state or any collection of states.
- NCES has sponsored projects to assist the states in conducting content alignment studies. She noted that it is not the role of NCES to actually conduct alignment studies for the 50 states and other jurisdictions. If such an effort were conducted by NCES, it could be interpreted as attempting to influence standards and curriculum, which is prohibited. Mr. Popham asked for more information about the assistance that NCES has provided to states.
- A study (*Sensitivity of NAEP to the Effects of Reform-Based Teaching and Learning in Middle School Mathematics)* sponsored by NCES through the NAEP Validation Studies Panel shows evidence that NAEP can detect the effects of reform initiatives. COSDAM members asked Ms. Loomis to secure and distribute copies of the report.
- NAEP has undertaken several initiatives since the 1998 NAEP to research the consequences of differences in inclusion and participation rates across states, especially regarding students with disabilities and English language learners. Ms. Carr listed seven such initiatives. Mr. Porter noted that the policy recommendation by the Governing Board's Ad Hoc Committee will be a positive addition to the NAEP initiatives.
- NAEP has had an active research agenda since its inception. The Design and Analysis Committee was initiated in 1988; the NAEP Validity Studies Panel in 1995; the Quality Assurance Technical Panel in 2004. NCES has appointed a Research and Development Coordinator and program director, as well as a Research and Development Steering Committee.
- NAEP has moved from a printed technical report to on-line technical documentation that can be updated with the release of data.

Mr. Popham commented that the NAEP Evaluation was generally very positive and NCES should be proud of its work. But, he noted that the recommendation to develop a plan for developing a validity framework is worthwhile and should be considered more fully. With respect to the technical documentation of NAEP, Andy Porter noted that the NCES standards for reporting require a long review process.

Darv Winick commented that the NAEP evaluation report appeared superficial in some respects and applauded the sophisticated, in-depth, and substantive character of the NCES response summarized in Ms. Carr's presentation. Mr. Popham agreed.

3. Update on 12th Grade Preparedness Research Program

At the request of Mr. Fabrizio, Ms. Loomis provided a brief overview of the studies underway and the general activities involved in the 12th grade preparedness research program. Mr. Winick initiated the discussion by acknowledging that updates from the NAEP High School Achievement Commission will be provided to COSDAM and the Reporting and Dissemination Committee on a regular basis.

Ms. Loomis noted that the data sharing agreement with Florida has now been completed and that data will be transferred for the Governing Board's studies within the next few days. Ms. Loomis reported that initial analyses with the SAT data were completed for discussion with the Technical Advisors. Recommendations of the Technical Advisors will be incorporated for additional analyses of these data.

Ms. Loomis suggested that a discussion of a process for reviewing results and vetting results will be needed. One strategy may be needed for dissemination of reports developed in the interim and another strategy for vetting the compilation of findings and determining what and how to report results. Ms. Loomis said that the Board does not want to contribute to misuse of NAEP information by having the individual reports shared without the benefit of the full compilation of studies. Mr. Popham noted that a cover note could be included with a statement to help readers understand the nature of the information in the individual study reports—that each study report is only one part of a composite and should not be interpreted in isolation. Mr. Winick noted that the process must be transparent: there is no option to keep the results private. Mr. Winick noted that just by virtue of the Board's ongoing discussion of preparedness, the Board is building a demand for preparedness information. He said that the Board should not withhold findings from the individual studies until the full compilation of the studies is available; study findings should be released in a timely fashion as they become available. The Board needs to develop a process for releasing results as they become available.

Ms. Loomis said that staff will develop a procedure to share with COSDAM in May 2010. She also suggested that it may be necessary for COSDAM to hold interim meetings in order to review the results of studies. Mr. Fabrizio asked for staff to follow-up with COSDAM to schedule teleconferences and other meetings as needed.

Mr. Porter noted that this is a special time. The Common Core Standards will soon be announced, and the Common Core Standards are likely to have implications for the Governing Board's preparedness research. He asked staff to prepare a one-page report on the implications of the Common Core Standards for the NAEP 12th Grade Preparedness Research Program.

With respect to the judgmental standard setting studies planned for 5-7 exemplar jobs, Mr. Popham recalled his own experience in one study with substantial differences in different vocational areas. He predicted that this research will lead to different outcomes and challenges for each exemplar job area.

4. **Review and Recommendations Regarding Technological Literacy Test Specifications**

Mr. Fabrizio asked Ms. Loomis to discuss the role of COSDAM in providing recommendations on item specifications. She noted that the Governing Board will be asked to take action on the Technological Literacy Framework at this March 2010 meeting. The test specifications will not be subject to Board approval until May 2010, so there is an opportunity for COSDAM to provide more complete input regarding the test specifications.

Ms. Loomis asked the Committee to note specific recommendations for the assessment included in the framework and test specifications. She asked for COSDAM to consider the technical implications for developing and reporting the assessment, given these features.

- Scenarios are to be used as a primary feature of the assessment so that clusters of items will be asked about scenarios that constitute either half or one-quarter of the total assessment of each student.

- The results are to be reported in terms of the three subscores: Technology and Society, Design and Systems, and Information and Communication Technology. She noted that the framework document states that "a composite score can be expected to have less relevance than the scores from the three areas" (p. 5-2). She asked COSDAM to consider the implications of this for setting achievement levels and reporting performance.

Mr. Porter noted that since NAEP reporting is aggregated, the difference in prevalence of one subscale or another does not matter. Michelle Blair noted that the assessment is at the national level, only; there will be no opportunity to report differences among states. Mr. Popham noted that research studies will be needed to evaluate the feasibility of reporting primarily by subscale and for setting achievement levels on the subscales or composite scale. Cornelia Orr reminded the committee that the initial implementation will be a research probe, and the initial implementation is being delayed until 2014 to provide time for assessment development and research prior to administration of the operational assessment.

Mr. Fabrizio asked COSDAM members to send comments and recommendations on the test specifications to Ms. Loomis. The Board is scheduled to take action on the specifications in May 2010.

5. **International Linking Studies for NAEP with TIMSS and PIRLS**

Andrew Kolstad, NCES Senior Technical Advisor, presented information about the design plans for the linking study of NAEP and Trends in International Math and Science Study (TIMSS) for grade 8 in both science and mathematics. He noted that the design is essentially the same as that used in trend studies for reading and grade 12 mathematics. He described several design features that were included specifically in response to

"lessons learned" from other studies, such as the need to account for fatigue effects in developing the block design for administration. An important feature of the linking study design is the inclusion of representative samples for states to permit validation of the linking at the state level. Given the clarity with which the information was shared at the meeting and the detailed design information that Mr. Kolstad had made available in advance for the COSDAM briefing tab, the Committee members had no additional questions.

Gary Phillips, Vice President and Chief Scientist at the American Institutes for Research discussed a study design that could be used for linking performance on the grade 4 NAEP reading with performance on the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS). Mr. Phillips noted that he has implemented this design for linking NAEP with several other assessments, including PIRLS, and that he intends to do so again when the data become available.

Mr. Phillips noted that NCES has used equipercentile equating for studies to relate state cut scores to NAEP cut scores, and he has used statistical moderation methods. Whatever method used, he recommended that the national public and private schools sample for NAEP be used and that the following features be included:
- Use plausible values for both NAEP and PIRLS
- Compute an average from five separate linkings—one for each plausible value
- Compute jack-knife error variance estimates for both NAEP and PIRLS
- Validate the link through state-NAEP links if possible

He noted that the costs of this type of study are minimal.

Mr. Phillips showed additional ways to extend the information available and to place results in a context more easily understood by the general public. Mr. Phillips reported that the results of his research to link the 2007 NAEP and 2006 PIRLS indicated that the cut scores for NAEP are set higher than for PIRLS. And, he noted that NAEP science standards (based on the 1996 framework) are higher than those for TIMSS. His research also shows that states reporting the highest percentage of students scoring at or above the state proficient standard tend to be the states having the lowest standards. The correlation between the benchmarked proficient score and the percentage at or above the state proficient cut scores is -.76 for PIRLS.

Stuart Kerachsky stated that NCES has not yet committed to the linkage of NAEP to PIRLS, so statements about what NCES "will do" are not warranted.

Mr. Winick noted that having country-by-country data to allow comparison of states to nations is a concern. He cautioned against comparisons that ignore language differences.

6.   Updates on On-Going COSDAM Issues

Mr. Fabrizio briefly reviewed the information for on-going COSDAM issues.

- Eligibility Criteria for Participation in Trial Urban District Assessments: Mr. Fabrizio noted that the Executive Committee asked COSDAM to review the eligibility requirements for participation to determine if changes were needed in the policy. The eligibility of current districts will also be evaluated because of apparent declines in enrollments and changes in demographic characteristics of some districts. Ms. Loomis indicated that a report will be prepared for COSDAM review in May 2010 so the Board will be prepared to take action, if needed, in a timely manner.
- Appropriate Uses and Interpretations of NAEP Data: Mr. Fabrizio reminded COSDAM that information regarding work underway by NCES and contractors was included in the briefing materials.
- Development of NAEP Policy on Maintaining Trend: Several groups are working on this issue, and Governing Board staff will monitor this work to develop policy recommendations for consideration by COSDAM.

7. Recommendations for Future Agenda Topics

Mr. Fabrizio noted that computer adaptive testing was previously suggested as a topic. Mr. Popham suggested that COSDAM examine the extent to which there are implications for NAEP actions to benefit students. Mr. Porter reiterated his interest in the Common Core Standards, and he suggested that the committee discuss not only the implications for 12th preparedness research but also for other aspects of the NAEP program. For example, what would be the impact on NAEP if a single national assessment were developed for the Common Core Standards project? Mr. Winick concurred and suggested that Common Core Standards be an on-going topic for COSDAM.

SESSION 11:30 a.m.– 12:45 p.m.
COSDAM Attendees: Lou Fabrizio (Chair), Tonya Miles, Jim Popham, Andrew Porter, and Darvin Winick.
Other Governing Board Members: Director of the Institute of Education Sciences John Q. Easton (*Ex officio*).
Governing Board Staff: Executive Director Cornelia Orr and Susan Loomis.
Other Attendees: NCES: Jonathan Beard, Janis Brown, Patricia Etienne, Steve Gorman, Eunice Greer, Andrew Kolstad, Drew Malizio, and Bill Tirre. NAEP-ESSI: Enis Dogan. AIR: George Bohrnstedt. ETS: Stephen Lazer and John Mazzeo. WestEd: Senta Raizen. Westat: Keith Rust.

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology met in closed session on March 5, 2010 from 11:30 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. in order to review reports including secure data and results of research conducted to set achievement levels cut scores for the National Assessment of Educational Progress in science.

Nancy Petersen, ACT Project Director for the 2009 NAEP Science Achievement Levels-Setting (ALS) reviewed the results of the study conducted January 28-31, 2010 in San Antonio.

Ms. Petersen provided a profile of the panelists for each grade, an overview of the steps in the process, results of panelists' evaluations of the process and consequences data. She noted that some adjustments had been made to the agenda for the operational procedures in order to provide more time for the item review to prepare panelists for the actual task of setting cut scores.

She provided data on the cut scores and percentages of students scoring at or above each on the 2009 science NAEP recommended by panelists for the pilot study and those for the operational achievement levels-setting study.

Ms. Petersen asked if there were other data or analyses that the Committee would like to review prior to reaching a decision in May. Ms. Loomis indicated that data for performance on the science Advanced Placement tests would be provided, in addition to some other data to address the external validity of the cut scores.

Mr. Porter suggested that he would most like to know how a well-qualified group of people would perform on the NAEP science assessment and what percentage of a group of recognized science experts would score as high as the NAEP advanced level.

The Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

_____   _____

Lou Fabrizio, Chair   Date

National Assessment of Educational Progress
Reading Achievement Level Descriptions

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading achievement level descriptions present expectations of student performance in relation to a range of text types and text difficulty and in response to a variety of assessment questions intended to elicit different cognitive processes and reading behaviors. The specific processes and reading behaviors mentioned in the achievement level descriptions are illustrative of those judged as central to students' successful comprehension of texts. These processes and reading behaviors involve different and increasing cognitive demands from one grade and performance level to the next as they are applied within more challenging contexts and with more complex information. While similar reading behaviors are included at the different performance levels and grades, it should be understood that these skills are being described in relation to texts and assessment questions of varying difficulty. (NOTE: Shaded text is a short, general summary to describe performance at each achievement level.)

Grade 4

Basic

Fourth-grade students performing at the *Basic* level should be able to locate relevant information, make simple inferences, and use their understanding of the text to identify details that support a given interpretation or conclusion. Students should be able to interpret the meaning of a word as it is used in the text.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to make simple inferences about characters, events, plot, and setting. They should be able to identify a problem in a story and relevant information that supports an interpretation of a text.

When reading informational texts such as articles and excerpts from books, fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to identify the main purpose and an explicitly stated main idea, as well as gather information from various parts of a text to provide supporting information.

Proficient

Fourth-grade students performing at the *Proficient* level should be able to integrate and interpret texts and apply their understanding of the text to draw conclusions and make evaluations.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to identify implicit main ideas and recognize relevant information that supports them. Students should be able to judge elements of author's craft and provide some support for their judgment. They should be able to analyze character roles, actions, feelings, and motives.

When reading informational texts such as articles and excerpts from books, fourth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to locate relevant information, integrate information across texts, and evaluate the way an author presents information.

Student performance at this level should demonstrate an understanding of the purpose for text features and an ability to integrate information from headings, text boxes, graphics and their captions. They should be able to explain a simple cause-and-effect relationship and draw conclusions.

Advanced

Fourth-grade students performing at the *Advanced* level should be able to make complex inferences and construct and support their inferential understanding of the text. Students should be able to apply their understanding of a text to make and support a judgment.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, fourth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to identify the theme in stories and poems and make complex inferences about characters' traits, feelings, motivations, and actions. They should be able to recognize characters' perspectives and evaluate character motivation. Students should be able to interpret characteristics of poems and evaluate aspects of text organization.

When reading informational texts such as articles and excerpts from books, fourth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to make complex inferences about main ideas and supporting ideas. They should be able to express a judgment about the text and about text features and support the judgment with evidence. They should be able to identify the most likely cause given an effect, explain an author's point of view, and compare ideas across two texts.

Grade 8

Basic

Eighth-grade students performing at the *Basic* level should be able to locate information; identify statements of main idea, theme, or author's purpose; and make simple inferences from texts. They should be able to interpret the meaning of a word as it is used in the text. Students performing at this level should also be able to state judgments and give some support about content and presentation of content.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should recognize major themes and be able to identify, describe, and make simple inferences about setting and about character motivations, traits, and experiences. They should be able to state and provide some support for judgments about the way an author presents content and about character motivation.

When reading informational texts such as exposition and argumentation, eighth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to recognize inferences based on main ideas and supporting details. They should be able to locate and provide relevant facts to construct general statements about information from the text. Students should be able to provide some support for judgments about the way information is presented.

Proficient

Eighth-grade students performing at the *Proficient* level should be able to provide relevant information and summarize main ideas and themes. They should be able to make and support inferences about a text, connect parts of a text, and analyze text features. Students performing at this level should also be able to fully substantiate judgments about content and presentation of content.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to make and support a connection between characters from two parts of a text. They should be able to recognize character actions and infer and support character feelings. Students performing at this level should be able to provide and support judgments about character motivation across texts. They should be able to identify how figurative language is used.

When reading informational texts such as exposition and argumentation, eighth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to locate and provide facts and relevant information that support a main idea or purpose, interpret causal relations, provide and support a judgment about the author's argument or stance, and recognize rhetorical devices.

Advanced

Eighth-grade students performing at the *Advanced* level should be able to make connections within and across texts and to explain causal relations. They should be able to evaluate and justify the strength of supporting evidence and the quality of an author's presentation. Students performing at the advanced level also should be able to manage the processing demands of analysis and evaluation by stating, explaining, and justifying.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry, eighth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to explain the effects of narrative events. Within or across text, they should be able to make thematic connections and make inferences about character feelings, motivations, and experiences.

When reading informational texts such as exposition and argumentation, eighth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to infer and explain a variety of connections that are intratextual (such as the relation between specific information and the main idea) or intertextual (such as the relation of ideas across expository and argument text). Within and across texts, students should be able to state and justify judgments about text features, choice of content, and the author's use of evidence and rhetorical devices.

Grade 12

Basic

Twelfth-grade students performing at the *Basic* level should be able to identify elements of meaning and form and relate them to the overall meaning of the text. They should be able to make inferences, develop interpretations, make connections between texts, and draw conclusions; and they should be able to provide some support for each. They should be able to interpret the meaning of a word as it is used in the text.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry, twelfth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to describe essential literary elements such as character, narration, setting, and theme; provide examples to illustrate how an author uses a story element for a specific effect; and provide interpretations of figurative language.

When reading informational texts such as exposition, argumentation, and documents, twelfth-grade students performing at the Basic level should be able to identify the organization of a text, make connections between ideas in two different texts, locate relevant information in a document, and provide some explanation for why the information is included.

Proficient

Twelfth-grade students performing at the *Proficient* level should be able to locate and integrate information using sophisticated analyses of the meaning and form of the text. These students should be able to provide specific text support for inferences, interpretative statements, and comparisons within and across texts.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry, twelfth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to explain a theme and integrate information from across a text to describe or explain character motivations, actions, thoughts, or feelings. They should be able to provide a description of settings, events, or character and connect the description to the larger theme of a text. Students performing at this level should be able to make and compare generalizations about different characters' perspectives within and across texts.

When reading informational texts including exposition, argumentation, and documents, twelfth-grade students performing at the Proficient level should be able to integrate and interpret texts to provide main ideas with general support from the text. They should be able to evaluate texts by forming judgments about an author's perspective, about the relative strength of claims, and about the effectiveness of organizational elements or structures. Students performing at this level should be able to understand an author's intent and evaluate the effectiveness of arguments within and across texts. They should also be able to comprehend detailed documents to locate relevant information needed for specified purposes.

Advanced

Twelfth-grade students performing at the *Advanced* level should be able to analyze both the meaning and the form of the text and provide complete, explicit, and precise text support for their analyses with specific examples. They should be able to read across multiple texts for a variety of purposes, analyzing and evaluating them individually and as a set.

When reading literary texts such as fiction, poetry, and literary nonfiction, twelfth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to analyze and evaluate how an author uses literary devices, such as sarcasm or irony, to enhance and convey meaning. They should be able to determine themes and explain thematic connections across texts.

When reading informational texts, twelfth-grade students performing at the Advanced level should be able to recognize, use, and evaluate expository and argument text structures and the organization of documents. They should be able to critique and evaluate arguments and counterarguments within and between texts, and substantiate analyses with full and precise evidence from the text. They should be able to identify and integrate essential information within and across documents.