

National Assessment Governing Board

Reporting and Dissemination Committee

Report of March 4, 2016

Joint Meeting with Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology: Collaboration on Infographics and Communicating NAEP Findings

Committee on Standards, Design, and Methodology Members: Andrew Ho (Chair), Mitchell Chester, Jim Geringer, Jim Popham, Fielding Rolston, Linda Rosen, Joe Willhoft.

Reporting and Dissemination Committee Members: Rebecca Gagnon (Chair), Father Joseph O’Keefe (Vice Chair), Alberto Carvalho, Terry Mazany, Tonya Miles, Ronnie Musgrove, Ken Wagner.

Governing Board Staff: Michelle Blair, Bill Bushaw, Lily Clark, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Sharyn Rosenberg.

NCES Staff: Peggy Carr, Halima Adenegan, Gina Broxterman, Samantha Burg, Jing Chen, Jamie Deaton, Enis Dogan, Pat Etienne, Linda Hamilton, Lauren Herrell, Dana Kelly, Emmanuel Sikali, Bill Tirre, Brad Thayer, Ebony Walton, Bill Ward, Grady Wilburn, Amy Yamashiro.

Other Attendees: AIR: George Bohrnstedt, Markus Broer, Cadelle Hemphill, Young Yee Kim, Fran Stancavage. CCSSO: Fen Chou. CRP: Arnold Goldstein, Subin Hona, Andrew Kolstad. DCG: Karen Bell, Meredith Davis. ETS: Amy Dresher, Jonas Bertling, Andreas Oranje, Lisa Ward. Fulcrum: Vasanth Kutty. Hager Sharp: James Elias, David Hoff, Debra Silimeo. HumRRO: Monica Gribben, Laress Wise. Optimal Solutions: Rukayat Akinbiyi, Sam Toriola. Pearson: Llana Hines. Westat: Chris Averett, Greg Binzer, Keith Rust, Dianne Walsh. Widmeyer: Jason Smith.

Joint Meeting with Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology: Collaboration on Infographics and Communicating NAEP Findings

Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee Chair Rebecca Gagnon and Committee on Standards, Design, and Methodology (COSDAM) Chair Andrew Ho called to order the joint session of the two Committees. Ms. Gagnon explained the reason for the joint meeting: as R&D is accelerating its dissemination of NAEP data with infographics, R&D members want to ensure the technical accuracy of this public-facing work through collaboration with COSDAM members.

The first question to address in the joint meeting solicited members’ feedback on the questions people ask about the Board’s efforts to disseminate results. In reply, R&D Committee Vice Chair, Father

Joseph O’Keefe, noted two primary questions he fields whenever he presents: (1) How does NAEP sample students? and (2) Since NAEP data cannot be used for causal inferences, what then can be said about private schools?

Jim Popham and Jim Geringer raised a more fundamental question about the essential purpose of NAEP. Jim Popham averred that the purpose and the meaning of NAEP should drive what the Governing Board does with NAEP results. Jim Geringer pointed out that any review of any budget demands the question “for what purpose?” Tonya Miles concurred and added that parents want to know what NAEP means for their children. But the structure of NAEP requires the Board to transcend that question in its outreach and show how NAEP applies to the greater good.

In response to a question from Ronnie Musgrove, Jim Popham suggested that the Board produce a list of accomplishments as a catalyst for speaking about NAEP’s purpose. Linda Rosen stated that the business community is more concerned with next steps than with all the caveats of NAEP results; relevance requires action.

Mr. Ho responded that the Governing Board is not well designed or even charged to answer those questions of action. Committee members acknowledged this limitation and agreed that perhaps the Governing Board should collaborate with external partners and researchers after any release of NAEP data. Partnering with organizations that conduct rigorous research can prompt action when the Board cannot.

Mitchell Chester encouraged the Board to become more deliberate in engaging the research community, such as funding sources to incentivize researchers’ attention on NAEP data. Perhaps three or four studies could be released by external, independent partners and researchers at the same time as an initial NAEP release to enrich the conversation about the results from the very start. Several members from both Committees applauded this suggestion. The enthusiasm for this suggestion begged the follow-up question, “how do you protect the data embargo but have people dig into the data?”

Ken Wagner raised a concern about an over-emphasis on psychometric accuracy that may prevent the Board from entering policy conversations. Ms. Rosen highlighted the inherent contradiction in NAEP: the Board hosts public releases with media coverage to attract a broad audience, but NAEP may be of utmost value to researchers, a very narrow audience.

Alberto Carvalho addressed the tension between findings that are statistically significant versus practically meaningful. For example, small differences can lead to overinflated conclusions. What does a two-point decline actually mean? Ms. Gagnon pointed to the need for collaboration with COSDAM on issues that are both technical and practical.

COSDAM and R&D members agreed on the following next steps:

1. Anticipate questions that people will ask about NAEP, such as confusion about causality, whether significant differences are actually meaningful, and how students are sampled to participate and prepare easy-to-digest ready responses;
2. Ask "now what?" when planning communications and outreach. Which the Board may not answer but which should be addressed through external partners and researchers who can create a sense of urgency and galvanize others' pursuit of these answers;

3. Leverage external partnerships with organizations that conduct rigorous research to provide interpretations of NAEP data, perhaps at the same time as a release (or approximately);
4. Investigate the possibility of awarding grants or mini-grants to incentivize researchers to analyze NAEP data, which falls under the purview of NCES. The Board should determine the best approach to supporting such efforts;
5. Sustain an ongoing collaborative relationship between COSDAM and R&D chairs to keep each Committee apprised of their respective work and to elicit feedback from their respective Committees on the other's work products; and
6. Include reports from previous Governing Board work on the members' site to build institutional memory that can guide the Board's path forward.

With these steps forward mapped out, Ms. Gagnon thanked everyone for agreeing to the joint meeting and invited COSDAM to return for another joint session in the future.

Reporting and Dissemination Committee Meeting

Reporting and Dissemination Committee Members: Rebecca Gagnon (Chair), Father Joseph O'Keefe (Vice Chair), Alberto Carvalho, Terry Mazany, Tonya Miles, Ronnie Musgrove, Ken Wagner.

Governing Board Staff: Bill Bushaw, Lily Clark, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo.

NCES Staff: Halima Adenegan, Samantha Burg, Jamie Deaton, Linda Hamilton, Dan McGrath, Ebony Walton, Grady Wilburn.

Other Attendees: AIR: Cadelle Hemphill. CCSSO: Fen Chou. DCG: Karen Bell, Meredith Davis. ETS: Jonas Bertling, Robert Finnegan, Lisa Ward. Hager Sharp: Debra Silimeo. HumRRO: Monica Gribben. Optimal Solutions: Sam Toriola. Westat: Chris Averett, Greg Binzer, Dianne Walsh. Widmeyer: Jason Smith.

Reporting and Dissemination Chair Rebecca Gagnon called the R&D Committee back to order and turned to the remainder of the Committee's meeting agenda.

Release Plan for NAEP TEL Report Card

The Committee reviewed a release plan for the Technology and Engineering Literacy Assessment 2014 Report Card. The plan calls for a total of three events to take place across two days in May:

1. A release and discussion of the initial results;
2. A panel to focus on workforce implications of the results and the skills assessed in TEL; and
3. A discussion of invited experts and leaders in research, education, and assessment to delve into the TEL data, especially the contextual variables

The first two events will be held at the Michigan Science Center, which R&D Committee member Tonya Matthews directs, and will be webcast live for a national audience. The third event will be an invitation-only panel of assessment, higher education, school district, and curriculum experts held at Wayne State University, which will be led by Assessment Development Committee Vice Chair Cary Sneider.

The plan also calls for a series of activities before the results are released and after the release to educate key audiences on what TEL is and to extend the messaging. Tonya Miles commented that this release plan is setting a high bar for subsequent NAEP releases and suggested that the Committee determine how to distribute the excitement for this release more broadly to the other tested subjects.

ACTION: R&D Vice Chair Father Joseph O’Keefe moved the release plan for the 2014 National Assessment of Educational Progress for Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) for action by the full Governing Board, which Ronnie Musgrove seconded. The Committee unanimously approved the motion and recommended approval to the full Board on Saturday, March 5, 2016.

Update on Implementation of Communications Plan

Stephaan Harris directed Committee members to a one-page document illustrating the Board’s progress in implementing the 2014 Communications Plan. The Committee reviewed these strategies, events, and initiatives the Board conducted in 2015 and suggested a variety of activities for 2016, such as:

1. Making concerted outreach efforts to graduate students and researchers;
2. Facilitating access to NAEP data sets;
3. Working with external partners and researchers to promote results with messages the Board cannot promulgate itself; and
4. Linking (accurately) to state and international assessments to enter the larger conversation.

Ken Wagner urged his fellow Committee members to connect to the student voice throughout this work. Terry Mazany also encouraged a priority emphasis on reaching researchers. The NAEP secondary analysis research grant program represented a fruitful strategy to disseminate results widely, similar to what is deployed at the national level in the field of health care. Mini-grants capture attention, harness research talent meaningfully, and might work as long as confidentiality and embargo language is embedded within the process. That research work could culminate in a day-long event that would amplify the message and support a clearinghouse of information on the NAEP assessments.

Board members also suggested several new infographics as potentially valuable to the communications work, including how NAEP relates to international assessments and an introductory guide to NAEP sampling.

Revising Board Reporting Policy and Guidelines

The Board's Reporting Policy and Guidelines turn ten years old in August and require significant updating to reflect changes in release and reporting efforts, such as the discontinuation of print reports. The R&D Committee will engage in updating the policy and guidelines. Board staff will start this revision process by collaborating with NAEP staff at the National Center for Education Statistics, sending Committee members recommended updates in tracked changes, and inviting Committee members to respond with feedback and suggestions for additions/modifications/subtractions. There should be an initial revised draft for comment at the May 2016 R&D Committee meeting.

Closed Session: Review of Grade 12 and TEL Release Sites

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Reporting and Dissemination Committee met in closed session on March 4, 2016 from 12:05 pm to 12:35 pm in order to review and discuss reports of secure data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress in Technology and Engineering Literacy and from the 2015 Grade 12 Nation's Report Card. The Committee also discussed preparedness findings and offered general comments to guide refinement and organization of the report sites. Ms. Gagnon opened the Committee meeting at 12:35 pm.

Release Plan for NAEP Grade 12 Report Card

In the final agenda item, the R&D Committee reviewed a release plan for the National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading and Mathematics Report Card for Grade 12. The plan calls for a webinar in April that will be webcast live and feature findings and comments from panelists involved in grade 12 education and academic preparedness. Post-release activities to extend the life of this report will be conducted.

ACTION: Mr. Carvalho moved the release plan for the 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress Grade 12 Nation's Report Card for action by the full Governing Board, which Tonya Miles seconded. The Committee unanimously approved the motion and recommended approval to the full Board on Saturday, March 5, 2016.

R&D Chair Rebecca Gagnon thanked everyone for their participation in a full meeting and adjourned the Committee at 12:45 pm.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



Rebecca Gagnon, Chair

3/15/16

Date