

National Assessment Governing Board

Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology

Report of March 1, 2013

COSDAM Members: Lou Fabrizio (Chair), Fielding Rolston, (Vice Chair), Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, Tonya Miles, and Jim Popham.

Governing Board Staff: Cornelia Orr, Ray Fields, Michelle Blair, and Munira Mwalimu.

Other Attendees: John Q. Easton, Director of the Institute of Education Sciences and Ex Officio member of the Governing Board. NCES: Commissioner Jack Buckley, Associate Commissioner Peggy Carr, Janis Brown, Jing Chen, Andrew Kolstad, Kashka Kubzdela, and Bill Tirre. AIR: Young Yee Kim and Fran Stancavage. Colorado Department of Education: Joyce Zurkowski. EPIC: David Conley and Mary Seburn. ETS: Steve Lazer and Andreas Oranje. Hager Sharp: David Hoff. HumRRO: Laress Wise. MetaMetrics: Heather Koons. National Alliance of State Science & Mathematics Coalitions: Kenn Heydrick. Westat: Marcie Hickman and Keith Rust. Widmeyer: Jason Smith.

NAEP Participation Issues and Options: Implementation of Board Policy on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners

The Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) met in a joint session with the Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee to discuss options for aggregating NAEP student participation data in NAEP reports. This is a continuing issue in implementing the 2010 Board Policy on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. See the Reporting and Dissemination Committee report of March 1, 2013 for a summary of the joint session.

Following the joint COSDAM/R&D session, COSDAM members adjourned to their separate meeting room. Lou Fabrizio, COSDAM Chair called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

NAEP Participation Issues and Options: State Participation in Voluntary NAEP National Assessments

Keith Rust of Westat briefed COSDAM on state-level participation in NAEP assessments for which participation is not mandated by law. Mr. Rust stated that grades 4 and 8 NAEP reading and mathematics are mandated in the No Child Left Behind law. In his briefing, Mr. Rust noted patterns in states that have refused to participate in voluntary NAEP assessments over time, and described the statistical adjustments conducted to continue national-level reporting. He also summarized the validity analyses conducted to determine whether statistics produced via the adjustments were biased. The results of these validity analyses were favorable, suggesting no

cause for concern regarding bias. However, there are some states that repeatedly refuse to participate in non-mandated NAEP assessments.

COSDAM considered whether there were proactive measures the Board should take to ensure national participation, and how to handle analysis and reporting when some states refuse to participate. John Easton noted some cities included in the NAEP Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) would like to continue participating in the NAEP assessment even though they may be located in a state that has refused to participate. Tonya Miles asked whether the reasons for Maryland's repeated decisions not to participate in NAEP have changed over time. Jack Buckley and Peggy Carr summarized that the reasons are principle-based and have remained unchanged, despite a change in the state's education leadership.

Cornelia Orr asked about participation in NAEP field trials. Mr. Rust responded that refusals to participate have not been especially pronounced, and that for NAEP computer-based assessments, the mode of the assessment is so attractive that some states considering refusal are prompted to participate.

Jim Popham noted that improving public understanding of the utility of education and assessment more broadly would support efforts to maximize participation in NAEP. Tonya Miles noted the problem of state participation issues, particularly at grade 12, is relevant to the Chairman Driscoll's March 1, 2013 proposal for grade 12 reporting, i.e., lack of state participation may challenge NAEP preparedness reporting efforts. Mr. Fabrizio commented that issues of testing burden in states and the use of tests for teacher evaluations are additional factors that may discourage participation in voluntary NAEP assessments. The Committee acknowledged that this issue has many political aspects. Additional discussion is needed to determine the best ways for the Board to move forward.

NAEP 12th Grade Academic Preparedness Research

Mr. Fabrizio invited Governing Board Executive Director, Cornelia Orr to provide opening remarks. Ms. Orr summarized discussion in COSDAM's November 2012 meeting where the Committee cautioned on starting new work in the job training area. She noted that several projects in the job training area are currently underway, and COSDAM expressed support for completing all ongoing projects. She introduced two key staff, Dave Conley and Mary Seburn, from the Board's contractor, the Education Policy Improvement Center (EPIC). EPIC is tasked with conducting course content analyses for both college and job training areas. Ms. Orr noted that both of these projects have been ongoing for some time.

Mr. Conley and Ms. Seburn stated the purpose of this research, which is to identify what NAEP content is addressed in entry level credit-bearing courses. They described the details of the methodology being used to conduct this research, and some of the issues confronted in job training versus college, which included, for example, different levels of detail in the academic expectations presented in course syllabi. A final report for the job training research will be complete before the May 2013 Board meeting. The final report for the college project should be available next year, since that project started on a later timeline. Mr. Popham mentioned the variability in the framework objectives themselves as a challenge in conducting this study,

specifically objectives that were compound and thereby multifaceted in nature. He complimented EPIC's approach to addressing this issue, which includes implementing decision rules in a standardized manner.

The Committee noted the Technical Report for Phase 1 of the Board's Academic Preparedness Research was released on February 15, 2013. Ms. Orr acknowledged the efforts of Widmeyer Communications, the Board contractor assisting in development and dissemination of the report.

The Committee also offered some ideas related to the full Board morning discussion of a grade 12 reporting proposal for interpreting the NAEP proficient achievement level in view of preparedness research findings. Mr. Easton noted that he was unsure of where the Board is in terms of the preparedness reporting initiative, since some research is still underway. He also commented that most of the completed research seems indirect in terms of tying inferences from other assessment programs to NAEP. Mr. Popham and Andrew Ho echoed the concerns raised by Mr. Easton. Mr. Ho noted that we may also be subjugating NAEP by tying our inferences to those of other assessment programs. Terry Holiday noted that preparedness reporting was also relevant to the assessment consortia, and expressed that it is unclear whether NAEP should enter this policy landscape with an assertion about preparedness. Mr. Fabrizio stated that it seems to be the consensus of the committee that NAGB proceed with caution on this topic. Members nodded in agreement.

Preliminary Discussion on Setting NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Achievement Levels

In opening remarks, Mr. Fabrizio summarized the current status of the 2014 NAEP TEL assessment at grade 8. Field testing is underway in January to March of 2013, and the Board must be prepared with achievement levels for reporting the TEL results from the operational assessment in 2014. Setting achievement levels on a computer based, interactive and cross-disciplinary assessment such as TEL represents a cutting-edge endeavor. To determine the appropriate methodology to pursue in achievement level setting for the TEL assessment, the Board usually starts with an issues paper outlining what needs to be addressed. The Committee's discussion provides an opportunity for members to share their perspectives on the issues that should be addressed in this upcoming issues paper.

Mr. Popham repeated earlier concerns he raised about whether NAEP TEL was a reasoning test. He wants to ensure the assessment does not merely reflect an intelligence test. Mr. Ho noted multidimensional complexity as a problem; to support scaling and achievement level setting, a unidimensional foundation is needed.

Mr. Holliday noted the importance of the context in which we are operating, that is we are in a period of budgetary contractions and cuts. Additionally, some jurisdictions are in some form of testing for as much as 40 percent of the school year. He noted that it is important to avoid a situation where the methodologies we pursue are far out of sync with this context. Mr. Fabrizio noted that feedback from states is that they are eager for the TEL assessment, because they are not able to afford this type of computer-based measure at the state level.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

Louis M. Fabrizio

Lou Fabrizio, Chair

March 22, 2013

Date