

# **National Assessment Governing Board**

## **Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology**

### **Report of May 15, 2015**

**COSDAM Committee Members:** Lou Fabrizio (Chair), Fielding Rolston (Vice Chair), Mitchell Chester, James Geringer, Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, and Jim Popham.

**Governing Board Staff:** Sharyn Rosenberg, Michelle Blair, Lily Clark, and Tessa Regis.

**NCES Staff:** Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr.

**Other Attendees:** AIR: Fran Stancavage. ETS: Steve Lazer, Andreas Oranje. Fulcrum: Saira Brenner. HumRRO: Laress Wise. Optimal Solutions Group: Rukayat Akinbiyi. Pearson: Steve Fitzpatrick, Connie Smith, Cathy White. Westat: Dianne Walsh. Widmeyer: Siobhan Mueller.

#### **1. Introductions and Review of Agenda**

Chair Lou Fabrizio called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and welcomed members and guests. He noted that Lucille Davy was unable to attend this meeting due to a conflict with her son's graduation from law school. Mr. Fabrizio reviewed the agenda.

#### **2. Draft Resolution on Maintaining Trend with Transition to Digital Based Assessments**

Mr. Fabrizio began by noting that the Board has had several conversations about the importance of maintaining trends during the transition of NAEP from paper-and-pencil assessments to digital-based assessments (DBA). During the March Board meeting, COSDAM members provided input for a Resolution that would explain the importance of focusing on *how* rather than *whether* trends can be maintained. Mr. Fabrizio explained that Governing Board staff worked with him, in addition to Andrew Ho and NCES staff, to draft a Resolution for Board discussion.

Andrew Ho introduced the Resolution and discussed the urgency of maintaining trend in a time when state tests and testing policies are rapidly changing. All COSDAM members supported the sentiment of the Resolution; there was brief discussion about a minor editorial change.

Terry Holliday stated that a Resolution would not be necessary if NAEP were not moving to DBA; the easiest way to maintain trends would be to continue using paper-and-pencil assessments. There was discussion about the need to articulate the reasons why NAEP is

moving to DBA, but the committee reached consensus that such justification should be covered by a separate Resolution (i.e., the Resolution on the Imperative for Increased NAEP Funding).

There was a motion by Jim Popham, and a second by Mitchell Chester, to move the Resolution to the full Board for possible action at this meeting rather than at the August meeting.

NOTE: On Saturday morning, the full Board voted unanimously to adopt the Resolution (attached).

### **3. Update on NAEP Academic Preparedness Research**

Mr. Fabrizio provided some context for the origins of the academic preparedness initiative, starting with the 2002 National Commission on NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> grade assessment and reporting. He noted that for more than a decade, the Governing Board has been engaged in planning and research to use NAEP as an indicator of academic preparedness for college and job training. Last year, the reporting of the 2013 grade 12 NAEP Reading and Mathematics results included plausible estimates of the percentage of students academically prepared for introductory, credit-bearing, non-remedial, college courses. A report is underway to summarize lessons learned from the research on using NAEP as an indicator of academic preparedness for job training.

Sharyn Rosenberg of the Governing Board staff gave a brief update on the status of the Board's ongoing research studies with state and national partners. She noted that Illinois will not be a partner for this work because all parties were unable to reach a data sharing agreement. Results from the exploratory studies at grade 8 (linking NAEP to ACT Explore in Reading and Math for three states and the content alignment study to support this work) are planned agenda items for the August COSDAM meeting.

There was some discussion about the difficulty of performing additional studies at the state level in the future, given that the current assessment schedule does not include grade 12 assessments at the state level. State legislation around data privacy is an additional barrier to performing studies that link NAEP to state longitudinal data systems. Terry Holliday raised a concern that the preparedness research may not be very useful without grade 12 results at the state level.

Jim Popham stated that the preparedness research has always made him uneasy and that future conversations should focus on whether NAEP should be doing this at all rather than what we should be doing next in this area. Peggy Carr, Acting Commissioner of NCES, noted that it may be possible to continue the academic preparedness research in more innovative and efficient ways, such as with the sample of students in the High School Longitudinal Study (HSLs) who took NAEP. Mr. Fabrizio invited her to share more information about this topic at a future COSDAM meeting.

#### **4. Other Issues and Questions**

Ms. Rosenberg reported that she and Deputy Executive Director Mary Crovo would be attending an open meeting on May 27<sup>th</sup> with the Committee that is charged with evaluating the NAEP achievement levels. The topic of the meeting is uses of NAEP achievement levels; additional information will be shared with COSDAM during the August meeting.

#### **CLOSED SESSION 11:30 am – 12:30 pm**

**COSDAM Committee Members:** Lou Fabrizio (Chair), Fielding Rolston (Vice Chair), Mitchell Chester, James Geringer, Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, and Jim Popham.

**Governing Board Staff:** Sharyn Rosenberg, Michelle Blair, Lily Clark, and Tessa Regis.

**NCES Staff:** Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr.

**Other Attendees:** AIR: Fran Stancavage. ETS: Steve Lazer, Andreas Oranje. Fulcrum: Saira Brenner, Kevin Price. HumRRO: Laress Wise. Optimal Solutions Group: Rukayat Akinbiyi. Pearson: Steve Fitzpatrick, Connie Smith, Cathy White. Westat: Keith Rust, Dianne Walsh.

#### **5. Project Update for Technology and Engineering Literacy Achievement Levels Setting**

Steve Fitzpatrick of Pearson provided an update on the status of the Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) achievement levels setting (ALS). A pilot study was conducted from March 16-19 in San Antonio. The software that was used for the standard setting (adapted from the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium standard setting activities) did not function as intended during the meeting. In addition, the amount of time allocated to some of the meeting activities was insufficient, resulting in long days and some rushed activities.

Following the pilot study, a decision was made to discontinue use of the software and to extend the standard setting meeting by one day. The Technical Advisory Committee on Standard Setting (TACSS) unanimously recommended that the upcoming June 1-5 meeting serve as a second pilot study rather than as the operational meeting. Consequently, a third meeting is being planned for September 28 – October 2 to serve as the operational meeting.

According to the Board policy on Developing Student Performance Levels for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, public comment should be collected throughout the achievement levels process, including on the proposed levels. Mr. Fitzpatrick noted that the public comment event (to collect feedback on the results in conjunction with the National Conference on Student Assessment) that COSDAM had previously discussed is no longer

feasible due to the revised project schedule. Following some discussion, COSDAM members agreed that it is not necessary to find a new opportunity for public comment on the proposed levels, but that the Board policy on achievement levels should be revisited next year.

Jim Popham questioned whether the TEL assessment measures knowledge and skills that are teachable. He suggested asking the teacher panelists at the standard setting meetings whether the content of the assessment can be taught.

Mr. Fabrizio adjourned the COSDAM meeting at 12:30 p.m.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

*Louis M. Fabrizio*

5-28-15

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Lou Fabrizio, Chair

Date



**National Assessment Governing Board**

**Approved Unanimously on May 16, 2015**

**Resolution on Maintaining NAEP Trends with the Transition to  
Digital-Based Assessments (DBA)**

**Whereas**, P.L. 107-279 Title III Section 302 (5) includes as the duties of this Board to (G) develop guidelines for reporting and disseminating results, and (I) take appropriate actions needed to improve the form, content, use, and reporting of results, and,

**Whereas**, P.L. 107-279 Title III Section 303 (2) states that the Commissioner of Education Statistics shall conduct a national assessment and collect and report assessment data, including achievement data trends, in a valid and reliable manner on student academic achievement, and,

**Whereas**, P.L. 107-279 Title III Section 303 (2) states that the purpose of state assessments is the “reporting of trends,” with repeated emphasis on “including achievement data trends,” and,

**Whereas**, Goal 1 of the Governing Board’s *General Policy: Conducting and Reporting The National Assessment of Educational Progress*, adopted unanimously by the Board in 2013, is, "to serve as a **consistent** external, independent measure of student achievement by which results across education systems can be compared at points in time **and over time**" (emphasis added), and,

**Whereas**, NAEP stands for the National Assessment of Educational **Progress** (emphasis added), and,

**Whereas**, state tests and state testing policies continue to differ among states, and such tests and policies change over time, and,

**Whereas**, biennial state-level NAEP trends are the only representative measure of educational progress that is comparable across states and stable over time, and,

**Whereas**, NCES is designing and implementing the DBA transition with the goal of maintaining trends, including 1) a pilot DBA administration and a full paper-and-pencil administration in 2015 and 2) a full DBA administration and a state-level paper-and-pencil administration in 2017; and,

**Whereas**, NCES will examine data and conduct analyses from both 2015 and 2017 to determine whether trend interpretations based on the DBA results are scientifically defensible;

**Whereas**, NCES will explore additional analysis and reporting options, with involvement of the Governing Board, on the potential interpretations of trends for use in reporting the 2017 Reading and Mathematics results with the transition from paper and pencil to DBA administration;

**Now, therefore, the National Assessment Governing Board resolves that, unless scientifically indefensible, unbroken state-level and national trends be reported, by average scores, percentiles, and percentages at and above the Basic, Proficient, and Advanced achievement levels, to describe educational progress in Reading and Mathematics from 2015 to 2017.**