National Assessment Governing Board

Executive Committee

May 17, 2012

AGENDA

4:30 pm	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview *David Driscoll,* Chair • Nominations process for Election of the Board Vice Chair • Planning for Governing Board 25th Anniversary	 Attachment A Attachment B
4:35 pm	Committee Issues and Challenges *Committee Chairs*	
4:45 pm	Updating Governing Board Policy: Reviewing the Past, Looking to the Next 25 Years *David Driscoll*	Attachment C
5:00 pm	Committee Discussion: NAEP and Common Core State Standards and Assessments *Cornelia Orr*	Attachment D
5:20 pm	**ACTION ITEM** Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement Recommendations *Doris Hicks, Ad Hoc Committee Member*	Attachment E
Closed Session 5:30 – 6:00 pm		
5:30 – 6:00 pm	Personnel Matter *David Driscoll*	
6:00 pm	Adjourn	

Nomination of Governing Board Vice Chair for the Term October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012

While the Governing Board Chair is appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Education, the Vice Chair is elected annually by the Governing Board from among its current members. The practice of the Board electing its Vice Chair has been in effect since the Board's inception in 1988 and is incorporated in the Board's By-laws.

Because Governing Board terms begin each October 1, the Governing Board elects the Vice Chair annually at the quarterly Board meeting conducted the preceding August. The Executive Committee is responsible for nominating a candidate for consideration by the full Board. The nomination process is set in motion each year at the May Board meeting.

At the May 17, 2012 Executive Committee meeting, Chairman Driscoll will discuss the process for nominating the Vice Chair for the term beginning October 1, 2012.

Planning for the Governing Board 25th Anniversary

The 25th anniversary of the Governing Board's first meeting in 1988 coincides with the December 5-7, 2013 Board meeting.

For its 10th and 20th anniversaries, the Governing Board conducted substantive commemorative events with a focus on serious stock-taking and discussions of major policy issues. This included a review of lessons learned and consideration of the policy outlook for education, assessment, and the role of NAEP.

For the 10th and 20th anniversary commemorations, planning committees were established comprised of current and former Governing Board members. Papers were commissioned and public events were conducted in the form of conferences.

The planning committee for the 20th anniversary was chaired by Amanda Avallone, and included Richard Boyd (former Board chair), Edward Donley, David Driscoll, Michael Guerra, Christine Johnson, Mark Musick (former Board chair) and Eileen Weiser.

The 20th anniversary conference program and list of commissioned papers are provided on the following pages.

At the May 2012 meeting, the Executive Committee will discuss the process for planning the Governing Board's 25th anniversary events.

National Assessment Governing Board
20th Anniversary Conference

March 4, 2009
National Press Club
529 14th Street, N.W., 13th Floor
Washington, DC 20045

20th Anniversary Conference Program
NAEP and the Progress of Education in America

1:00 – 1:30 pm
Ballroom

Welcome

Darvin Winick
Chair, National Assessment Governing Board

Amanda Avallone
Vice Chair, National Assessment Governing Board

Mary Crovo
Interim Executive Director, National Assessment Governing Board

Keynote Speakers

Honorable Lamar Alexander
U.S. Senator, Tennessee

Honorable Edward M. Kennedy
U.S. Senator, Massachusetts (invited)

1:40 – 2:35 pm

Concurrent Panels

Holeman

NAEP and the States

Henry Johnson
Former Assistant U.S. Secretary of Education

Mark D. Musick
Professor, East Tennessee State University

Steven Paine
West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools

Gene Wilhoit
Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers

Moderator: David Driscoll
Former Massachusetts Commissioner of Education

Ballroom

Achievement Gaps

Peggy Carr
Associate Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics

Michael Casserly
Executive Director, Council of the Great City Schools

Kati Haycock
President, Education Trust

Michael Nettles
Senior Vice President, Educational Testing Service

Moderator: Richard Boyd
Former Mississippi State Superintendent of Education

2:45 – 3:35 pm **Concurrent Panels**

Ballroom **Grade 12 NAEP: Measuring Preparedness for College and Work**

George Thornton, *Professor, Colorado State University*

Christine Johnson
Assistant to the Provost, University of Colorado, Denver

Charles Kolb
President, Committee for Economic Development

John Stevens
Former Executive Director, Texas Business and Education Coalition

Moderator: Jay Mathews
Education Columnist, Washington Post

Holeman **Testing Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners**

Daniel Domenech
Executive Director, American Association of School Administrators

Miriam K. Freedman
Attorney and Author

Sharif Shakrani
Professor, Michigan State University

Martha Thurlow
Director, National Center on Educational Outcomes

Moderator: Mary Blanton
Attorney

3:45 – 4:00 pm **Remarks**
Ballroom
Honorable Arne Duncan
U.S. Secretary of Education

4:00 – 5:00 pm **Plenary Panel**

Ballroom **NAEP and Standards for American Education**

Michael Cohen
President, Achieve, Inc.

Chester E. Finn, Jr.
President, Thomas B. Fordham Foundation

Jack Jennings
Director, Center on Education Policy

Diane Ravitch
Research Professor, New York University

Moderator: Richard Whitmire
President, Education Writers Association

The National Assessment Governing Board is an independent, bipartisan board whose members include governors, state legislators, local and state school officials, business representatives, and members of the general public.

Congress created the 26-member Governing Board in 1988 to oversee and set policy for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Also referred to as The Nation's Report Card, NAEP has served since 1969 as the only nationally representative, continuing measure of student achievement in the United States. The National Assessment informs the public about what America's students know and can do in various key subject areas at grades 4, 8, and 12; monitors progress over time; and compares achievement data among states and various student demographic groups.

20th Anniversary Conference Planning Committee Members

Amanda Avallone, Chair
Richard Boyd
Edward Donley
David Driscoll
Michael Guerra
Christine Johnson
Mark Musick
Eileen Weiser

www.nagb.org

Conference Papers

Twelfth Graders and All Their Futures
Paul E. Barton
Former Director, Policy Information Center at Educational Testing Service

Issues Regarding NAEP and Students with Disabilities
By Miriam K. Freedman
Attorney and author

12th Grade Preparedness: National and Colorado Perspectives
By Christine Johnson
Assistant to the Provost, University of Colorado, Denver

Notes on State NAEP
By Mark Musick
Former Chairman, National Assessment Governing Board and President Emeritus, Southern Regional Education Board

Grade 12 Preparedness
By John Stevens
Former Executive Director, Texas Business and Education Coalition

Grade 12 NAEP: Measuring Preparedness for College and Work
By George Thornton
Professor, Colorado State University

Back to the Future for NAEP: NAEP and Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners
By Martha Thurlow
Director, National Center on Educational Outcomes

TOP

Historical Papers

A History of NAEP Achievement Levels: Issues, Implementation, and Impact, 1989-2009
By Mary Lyn Bourque
Former assistant director for psychometrics, Governing Board

National Assessment Governing Board and Voluntary National Tests:
A Tale of Tribulations Without Trials
Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C
By Michael Guerra
Former Governing Board member

NAEP Assessment Frameworks
By Carol Jago !
Teacher and author; member, NAEP reading and writing framework committees. !

Looking Back and Looking Forward: Inclusion of All Students in the National Assessment of ! Educational Progress !
By Rebecca Kopriva
Senior Scientist, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research (WCER) University of Wisconsin - Madison with Julia Lara, Independent Consultant

To Be a Governing Board Member
By Diane Ravitch
Former Governing Board member and education historian

The NAEP Long Term Trend Assessment: A Review of Its Transformation, Use, and Findings
By Lawrence C. Stedman
Professor of education, State University of New York at Binghamton

Changes in NAEP Reporting - Publications, Technology, and Media Coverage
By John Stevens
Former chairman, Governing Board Reporting and Dissemination Committee

Updating Governing Board Policy for NAEP: Reviewing the Past, Looking to the Next 25 Years

Following the November 1994 Board meeting, then Chair William Randall established a work group on strategic planning for NAEP. The work group was composed of Board members, chaired by Board member Mark Musick, and staffed by Ray Fields.

The need for strategic planning was prompted by several factors. The first trial state assessment—in mathematics at grade 8—had been conducted in 1990, with successive trials in 1992 and 1994 in reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8, either by single subject and grade or in different subject/grade combinations. There was a degree of unpredictability to the schedule of state assessments, due in large part to the evolving nature of the legislative authorizations for state assessments and a changing budget outlook for NAEP. This scheduling unpredictability was frustrating to states and the management of NAEP program operations.

In addition, the Governing Board, almost from its inception, had expressed concern to NCES about the excessive period of time from the end of NAEP testing to the release of assessment results, frequently as long as two years. The Board also was concerned about the fact that the format and content of NAEP reporting was aimed more at researchers than the general public, educators, and policymakers.

Through an extensive process of structured full-Board deliberation, consultation with NAEP stakeholders and experts, consultation with NCES, and public comment, the work group prepared the policy statement on "Redesigning the National Assessment of Educational Progress." In August 1996, the Governing Board adopted the policy statement that appears on the following pages.

This seminal policy has served as a compass for the Board and NAEP. It contains the underlying basis for many of the fundamental positions the Board holds today. For example, it is the original source of 6 months as the goal for reporting NAEP results, the definition of the "general public" as the primary audience for NAEP reports, and the rationale for the 10-year outlook for the schedule of assessments, to name a few.

However, the educational environment has changed substantially since 1996. For example, the following elements are present today, but not in 1996:

(1) the requirement under Title I that all states participate in NAEP at grades 4 and 8, in reading and mathematics,
(2) increased attention by policymakers and the public to international assessments,
(3) heightened focus on increasing the rigor of K-12 education outcomes and closing achievement gaps,
(4) the concern that test-based accountability may be narrowing school curricula, and
(5) the use of NAEP to compare the rigor of state standards and the consequent development of Common Core State Standards and Assessments.

The Executive Committee has determined that it is appropriate now to review current Board policy and, in light of the current education landscape, recommend revisions and additions. The Executive Committee will discuss a process for accomplishing this at the May 17, 2012 meeting.

Adopted: August 2, 1996

National Assessment Governing Board

Redesigning the National Assessment of Educational Progress

Policy Statement

Foreword
This policy statement was adopted in 1996, at a time when Congress had codified National Education Goals targeted for accomplishment by the year 2000. It was the expectation that the National Assessment of Educational Progress would be a primary means for monitoring progress in achieving the goal addressing student achievement and this expectation is reflected in the policy below. The National Education Goals legislation is no longer in effect and has been superceded by other national policies, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) being the most germane. Therefore, the references to National Education Goals in this policy statement are no longer relevant.

Under NCLB, state level participation in assessments in reading and mathematics in grades 4 and 8 became mandatory. Participation is required on a biennial basis, affecting costs and technical design. However, the overall intent and impact of the policy—to clarify purpose, define the audience, set forth limitations, maintain quality and integrity, and bring efficiencies to the design of the assessment—remain in effect and continue to guide the policy setting and operations of the National Assessment. (Foreword added August 2007.)

A Better Way to Measure Educational Progress in America

An effective democracy and a strong economy require well-educated citizens. A good education lays a foundation for getting a good job, leading a fulfilling life, and participating constructively in society.

But is the education provided in your state and in America good enough? How do our 12th graders compare with students in other nations in mathematics and science? Do our 8th grade students have an adequate understanding of the workings of our constitutional democracy? How well do our 4th grade students read, write, and compute? The National Assessment of Educational Progress is the only way for the public to know with accuracy how American students are achieving nationally and state-by-state.

The National Assessment tests at grades 4, 8, and 12. By law, it covers ten subjects, including reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The National Assessment has performance standards that indicate whether student achievement is "good enough." The National Assessment is not a national exam taken by all students. In fact, only several thousand students are tested per grade, comprising carefully drawn samples that represent the nation and the participating states. Since its first test in 1969, the National Assessment has earned a trusted reputation for its quality and credibility. That reputation must be maintained.

The National Assessment is unique because of its national, state-by-state, and 12th grade results. State and local test results cannot be used to provide a national picture of student achievement. States and local schools use different tests that vary in many ways. The results cannot simply be "added up" to get a national score nor can state scores on their different tests be compared. The National Assessment Governing Board believes that twelfth grade achievement is important to monitor at the national level, because the 12th grade marks the end of elementary and secondary education, the transition point for most students from school to work, to college, or to technical training. The National Assessment is the only source of nationally representative data at the 12th grade. College entrance tests such as the ACT and the SAT are taken only by students planning on higher education; the results do not represent the achievement of the total 12th grade class. And to date, virtually no state-based assessment program tests 12th graders.

While there is much about the National Assessment that is working well, there is a problem. Under its current design, the National Assessment tests too few subjects, too infrequently, and reports achievement results too late—as much as 18 to 24 months after testing. Testing occurs every other year. During the 1990's, only reading and mathematics will be tested more than once using up-to-date tests and performance standards. Six subjects will be tested only once and two subjects not at all during the 1990's.

Why is the National Assessment testing so few subjects and fewer subjects now than years ago? Over the years, the National Assessment has become increasingly complex. Its quality and integrity have led to a multitude of demands and expectations beyond its central purpose. Meeting those expectations was done with good intentions and seemed right for the situation at the time. However, additions to the National Assessment have been "tacked on" without changing the basic design, driving up costs and reducing the number of subjects that can be tested.

For example, where a single 120 page mathematics report once sufficed, mathematics reporting in 1992 consisted of seven volumes totaling almost 1,800 pages, not including individual state reports. Also, there are now two separate testing programs for reading, writing, math, and science. One monitors trends using tests developed during the 1970's; the other reflects current views on instruction and uses performance standards to report whether achievement is good enough.

The current National Assessment design is overburdened, inefficient, and redundant. It is unable to provide the frequent, timely reports on student achievement the American public needs. The challenge is to supply more information, more quickly, with the funding available.

To meet this challenge, the National Assessment design must be changed, building on its strengths while making it more efficient. The design of the National Assessment must be simplified. The purpose of the National Assessment must be sharply focused and its principal audience clearly defined. Because the National Assessment cannot do all that some would have it do, trade-offs must be made among desirable activities. Useful but less important activities may have to be reduced, eliminated, or carried out by others. The National Assessment must "stick to its knitting" in order to be more cost-effective, reach more of the public, provide more information more promptly, and maintain its integrity.

National Assessment Redesign

To provide the American public with more frequent information in more subjects about the progress of student achievement, changes must be made in the way that the National Assessment is designed and the results are reported. These changes are described in this policy statement. Undergirding these changes is an explicit statement of the purposes, objectives, audiences, and limitations of the National Assessment.

While change is in order, many current policies should continue. For example, reliability, validity, and quality of data will remain hallmarks of the National Assessment. The sample of tested students will be as representative as possible, using policies and procedures that maximize the number of students included who are disabled or are of limited English proficiency. And reporting on trends over time will remain a central commitment of the National Assessment.

The intent of this policy statement is to guide current operations of the National Assessment, the development of new requests for proposals for contracts for conducting the National Assessment and the activities and structure of the National Assessment Governing Board. Contracts for current operations extend through assessments to be conducted in 1998. New contracts would cover assessments as early as 1999 and thereafter.

Purpose and Objectives of the National Assessment of Educational Progress

The purpose of the National Assessment is stated in its legislation:

> **"...to provide a fair and accurate presentation of educational achievement in reading, writing, and the other subjects included in the third National Education Goal, regarding student achievement and citizenship."**

Thus, the central concern of the National Assessment is to inform the nation on the status of student achievement. The National Assessment Governing Board believes that this should be accomplished through the following objectives:

1. To measure national and state progress toward the third National Education Goal and provide timely, fair, and accurate data about student achievement at the national level, among the states, and in comparison with other nations;

2. To develop, through a broadly inclusive process, sound assessments to measure what students know and can do as well what students should know and be able to do; and

3. To help states and others link their assessments with the National Assessment and use National Assessment data to improve education performance.

The specific changes in the design of the National Assessment described below are discussed in relation to these objectives.

The Audience for the National Assessment

The primary audience for National Assessment results is the American public, including the general public in states that receive their own results from the National Assessment. Reports should be written for this audience. Results should be released within 6 months of testing. Reports should be understandable, free of jargon, easy to use, and widely disseminated. Although more comprehensible, direct, and useful, the reports will not trade accuracy for simplicity. The tradition of high quality of National Assessment reports will be continued, with no erosion of validity and reliability. Assessment questions and samples of student work that illustrate performance standards are likely to receive heightened prominence in reports.

Principal users of National Assessment data are national and state policymakers and educators concerned with student achievement, curricula, testing, and standards. National Assessment data will be available to these users in forms that support their efforts to interpret results to the public, to improve education performance, and to perform secondary analysis.

Limitations: What the National Assessment Is Not

The National Assessment is intended to describe how well students are performing, but not to explain why. The National Assessment only provides group results; it is not an individual student test. The National Assessment tests academic subjects and does not collect information on individual students' personal values or attitudes. Each National Assessment test is developed through a national consensus process. This national consensus process takes into account education practices, the results of education research, and changes in the curricula. However, the National Assessment is independent of any particular curriculum and does not promote specific ideas, ideologies, or teaching techniques. Nor is the National Assessment an appropriate means, by itself, for improving instruction in individual classrooms, evaluating the effects of specific teaching practices, or determining whether particular approaches to curricula are working.

OBJECTIVE 1: To measure national and state progress toward the third National Education Goal and provide timely, fair, and accurate data about student achievement at the national level, among the states, and in comparison with other nations.

Assess all subjects specified by Congress: reading, writing, mathematics, science, history, geography, civics, the arts, foreign language, and economics.

The gap must be closed between the number of subjects the National Assessment is required to assess and the number of subjects it can assess at the national level under the current design. By law, the National Assessment is required to assess ten subjects and report results and trends. In order to chart progress and report trends, subjects must be assessed more than once. However, during the 1990's only reading and mathematics will have been assessed more than once using up-to-date tests and performance standards to report how well students are doing.

Some have suggested that a solution is to combine into a single assessment several related subjects (e.g. reading and writing and/or history, geography, civics, and economics). Under such an approach, assessment data would be reported using both an overall score and sub scores for the respective disciplines. Although such an approach has the appeal of reducing the number of separate assessments, its feasibility, desirability, and costs are unknown. Also, such an approach has far-reaching implications for the test frameworks that guide the development of each assessment and for reporting results. These implications must be considered carefully. For the immediate future, subjects will continue to be assessed separately. However, the National Assessment Governing Board is committed to providing the public with more information as efficiently as possible. The Governing Board will consult with technical experts and education policymakers, in conjunction with the development of assessment frameworks, to determine the feasibility, desirability, and costs of combining several related subjects into a single assessment.

- **The National Assessment shall be conducted annually, two or three subjects per year, in order to cover all required subjects at least twice a decade.**
- **The National Assessment shall assess all subjects listed in the third National Educational Goal—reading, writing, mathematics, science, history, geography, civics, the arts, foreign language and economics—according to a publicly released schedule adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board, covering eight to ten years, with reading, writing, mathematics, and science tested more frequently than the other subjects.**
- **The National Assessment Governing Board shall consult with technical experts and with education policymakers, in conjunction with the development of assessment frameworks, to determine the feasibility,**

desirability, and costs of combining several related subjects into a single assessment.

Provide National Assessment results for states

In 1988, testing at the state level was added to the National Assessment as a trial, with participation strictly voluntary, subjects and grades specified in law, and an independent evaluation required. Previously, the National Assessment had reported only national and regional results. For the first time, the information was relevant to individuals in states who make decisions about education funding, governance, and policy. As a result, states now are major users of National Assessment data.

Participation was strong in the first state-level assessment in 1990 and has grown to include even more states. In 1996, 44 states and 3 jurisdictions participated in the mathematics assessments at grade 4 and 8 and the science assessment at grade 8. The independent evaluation concluded that the trial state assessments produced valid and reliable data. The evaluation report recommended, and Congress agreed, that state-level assessments, with continued evaluations, be included in the 1994 reauthorization of the National Assessment.

Currently, the National Assessment draws a separate sample to obtain national results in addition to the samples drawn for individual state reports. Keeping the schools drawn for national samples completely partitioned from the state samples increases costs and creates additional burdens on states, particularly small states. Options should be identified for making the national and state samples more efficient and less burdensome. For example, it may be possible to reduce the current state sample size of 100 schools to a smaller number (e.g. 65-75) without a great loss in precision.

States participate in the National Assessment for many reasons, including to have an unbiased, external benchmark to help them make judgments about their own tests and standards. National Assessment data are used to make comparisons to other states, to help determine if curriculum and standards are rigorous enough, to develop questions about curricular strengths and weaknesses, to make state to international comparisons, and to provide a general indicator of achievement.

There is a strong interest among states to participate in the National Assessment to get state level information at grades 4 and 8 in reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The level of interest in participating in the National Assessment varies with respect to the other subjects (i.e., history, geography, civics, economics, the arts, and foreign language) and at grade 12, where state officials say that obtaining cooperation from high schools and 12th grade students is difficult.

Some states, however, would like to be able to use National Assessment tests in the other subjects and at grade 12. Such use of National Assessment tests would be conducted as a service, with the reporting of results and maintenance of data under the control of the state. States will be able to use National Assessment tests if they adhere to requirements to protect the integrity of the National Assessment program and pay the additional costs. At

the present time, states that participate in the National Assessment to get state level information at grades 4 and 8 in reading, writing, mathematics, and science provide in-kind support to cover the cost of in-state coordination and test administration. The National Assessment program covers the majority of costs, including test development, sampling, analysis, and reporting. States that wish to use National Assessment tests in other subjects and at grade 12 would pay for much of these additional costs.

States are active partners in the National Assessment program. States help develop National Assessment test frameworks, review test items, and assist in conducting the tests. The National Assessment program is effective, to a great degree, because of the involvement of the states.

Because it is useful to them, and because they invest time and resources in it, states want a dependable schedule for National Assessment testing. With a dependable schedule, states that want to will be better able to coordinate the National Assessment with their own state testing program and make better use of the National Assessment as an external reference point.

- **National Assessment state-level assessments shall be conducted on a reliable, predictable schedule according to an eight to ten year plan adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board.**
- **Reading, writing, mathematics, and science at grades 4 and 8 shall be given priority for National Assessment state-level assessments.**
- **States shall have the option to use National Assessment tests in other subjects and at grade 12 by assuming a larger share of the costs and adhering to requirements that protect the integrity of the National Assessment program. However, the National Assessment Governing Board shall seek ways to make such use of National Assessment tests attractive and financially feasible.**
- **Where possible, changes in national and state sampling procedures shall be made that will reduce burden on states, increase efficiency, and save costs.**

Vary the amount of detail in testing and in reporting results

More subjects can be assessed if different strategies are used. Currently, each time the National Assessment is conducted, it uses a similar approach, regardless of the nature of the subject or the number of times an assessment in a subject has been administered. This approach is locked-in through 1998 under current contracts. Under this approach, a larger number of students is tested in order to provide not just overall results, but fine-grained details as well (e.g. the achievement scores of 4th grade students whose teachers that year had five hours or more of in-service training). The National Assessment also collects "background" information through questionnaires completed by students, teachers, and principals. The questionnaires ask about teaching practices, school policies, and television watching, to name a few. Data analyses are elaborate. Reports are detailed and exhaustive, involving as many as seven separate reports per subject. Although the National Assessment

has been praised for this thoroughness, the cost of this thoroughness is that fewer subjects are assessed, assessments occur less frequently, and reports take longer to produce.

The different strategies needed might include several approaches to testing and reporting, all of which should be designed in ways that maintain the National Assessment's commitment to providing valid and reliable data of high quality. For example, these approaches could take the form of "standard report cards," "comprehensive reports," and special, focused assessments.

A standard report card would provide overall results in a subject with performance standards and average scores. Results for standard report cards could be reported by sex, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, and for public and private schools, but would not be broken down further. This may reduce the number of students needed for testing and may reduce associated costs. Generally, subcategories within a subject (e.g. algebra, measurement, and geometry within mathematics) would not be reported. However, data from the National Assessment would continue to be available to state and local educators and policymakers for additional analysis.

Comprehensive reports, like the current approach, would be an in-depth look at a subject, perhaps using a newly adopted test framework, many students, many test questions, and ample background information. In addition to overall results using performance standards and average scores, subcategories within a subject could be reported. Results would be reported by sex, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, and for public and private schools, and might be broken down further as well. In some cases, more than one report may be issued in a subject. Comprehensive reporting in a particular subject would occur infrequently, perhaps once in ten years, but under a planned schedule of assessments.

Special, focused assessments on timely topics also would be conducted. They would explore a particular question or issue and may be limited to particular grades. Generally, the cost would be less than the cost of a standard report card. Examples of these smaller-scale, focused assessments include: (1) assessing subjects using targeted approaches (e.g. 8th grade arts), (2) testing special populations (e.g. in-school 12th graders versus out-of-school youth), and (3) examining skills and knowledge across several subjects (e.g. readiness for work).

The use of background surveys also would be varied. The three kinds of background surveys—student, teacher and principal questionnaires—would not necessarily all be employed each time a subject is assessed. Instead, the use of such surveys would be limited and selective, with reports of results focused on a core of background questions addressing the most essential issues. Also, background surveys used for standard report cards in a particular year would be designed to complement, rather than duplicate, background surveys used for comprehensive reports in the same year.

- **National Assessment testing and reporting shall vary, using standard report cards most frequently, comprehensive reporting in selected subjects about once every ten years, and special, focused assessments.**

- **National Assessment results shall be timely, with the goal being to release results within 6 months of the completion of testing for standard report cards and within 9 months for comprehensive reports.**

Simplify the National Assessment design

The current design of the National Assessment is very complex and, in fact, has grown more complex over the years. Here are just three examples of this complexity. (1) No student takes the complete set of test questions in a subject and as many as twenty-six different test booklets are used within each grade. Scores are calculated using sophisticated statistical procedures. (2) Students, teachers, and principals complete separate background questionnaires and may submit them for scoring at different times. Data from the questionnaires are used in calculating results of the assessments. (3) Current requirements for data analysis demand that test scores be calculated for every background variable collected by the National Assessment before any report can be produced. This lengthens the time from data collection to reporting and adds significantly to cost.

The design became more complex, in part, because the National Assessment's purposes and audiences had proliferated and the amount of background information collected had expanded. Specifying the purposes, audiences, and limitations of the National Assessment, as well as providing for varied means for testing and reporting, will result in opportunities for simplifying the National Assessment design.

- **Options shall be identified to simplify the design of the National Assessment.**

Simplify the way the National Assessment reports trends in student achievement

From its beginning in 1969, monitoring achievement trends has been a central mission of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Monitoring long-term trends in educational achievement, both for the population as a whole and for significant sub-groups, is a capacity unique to the National Assessment and should be continued as a central mission. However, as the National Assessment approaches its third decade, it must address the problem of how to assess trends in achievement when curricula continue to evolve and change. An assessment in a subject must be kept stable to monitor trends. However, stable assessments may not reflect important changes in curricula. Over time, there develops a legitimate concern about the relevance of the content of the assessment versus the ability to track change in achievement.

As a solution to this problem, since 1990, the National Assessment has reported achievement trends using two unconnected assessment programs. The tests, criteria for selecting students, and reporting are all different. The first program, "the main National Assessment," tests at grades 4, 8, and 12 and covers ten subjects. The assessments are based on a national consensus representing current views of each subject. Performance standards

are used to report whether student achievement on the National Assessment is "good enough." The schedule of subjects to be assessed in the main National Assessment is unrelated to the schedule of subjects under the second testing program.

The second assessment program reports long-term trends that go as far back as 1970. Only four subjects are covered: reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The assessments are based on views of the curricula prevalent during the 1970's and have not been changed. Testing is at ages 9, 13, and 17 except for writing, which tests at grades 4, 8, and 11. Trends are reported by average score; performance standards are not used. The long-term trend program has been valuable for documenting declines and increases in student achievement over time and a decrease in the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students.

It may be impractical and unnecessary to operate two separate assessment programs. However, it also is likely that curricula will continue to change and that current test frameworks may be less relevant in the future. The tension between the need for stable measures of student achievement and changing curricula should be recognized as a continuing policy matter for the National Assessment, requiring efficient and balanced design solutions. Among the factors to consider are: (1) setting a standard period of time for a long-term trend (e.g. 15-20 years) using a particular "metric" in a subject; (2) providing for overlapping administrations of old and new assessments and "bridge" studies to determine whether the new can be linked to the old assessment; and (3) periodic administration of older assessments (e.g. once every ten years once a new trend-line has been established so that it would be possible to compare performance in 2010 with that in 1970 on the old trend line and with that in 1990 on a new trend line).

- **A carefully planned transition shall be developed to enable "the main National Assessment," to become the primary way to measure trends in reading, writing, mathematics, and science in the National Assessment program.**

Use performance standards to report whether student achievement is "good enough"

In reporting on "educational progress," the National Assessment has, until recently, only considered current student performance compared to student achievement in previous years. Under this approach, the only standard was how well students had done previously, not how well they should be doing on what is measured by the National Assessment. Although this approach has been useful, it began to change in 1988 from a sole focus on "where we have been" to include "where we want to be" as well.

In 1988, Congress created a non-partisan citizen's group—the National Assessment Governing Board—and authorized it to set explicit performance standards, called achievement levels, for reporting National Assessment results.

The achievement levels describe "how good is good enough" on the various tests that make up the National Assessment. Previously, it might have been reported that the average mathematics score of 4th graders went up (or down) four points on a five-hundred-point scale. There was no way of knowing whether the previous score represented strong or weak performance and whether the amount of change should give cause for concern or celebration. In contrast, the National Assessment now also reports the percentage of students who are performing at or above "basic," "proficient," and "advanced" levels of achievement. Proficient, the central level, represents "competency over challenging subject matter," as demonstrated by how well students perform on the questions on each National Assessment test. Basic denotes partial mastery and advanced signifies superior performance on the National Assessment. Using achievement levels to report results and track changes allows readers to make judgments about whether performance is adequate, whether "progress" is sufficient, and how the National Assessment standards and results compare to those of other tests, such as state and local tests.

First employed in 1990, the achievement levels have been the subject of several independent evaluations and some controversy. Information from these evaluations, as well as from other experts, has been used over the last six years to improve and refine the procedures by which achievement levels are set. Although the current procedures may be among the most comprehensive and sophisticated standard-setting procedures used in education, the Governing Board remains committed to improving the process and to the continuing conduct of validity studies.

- **The National Assessment shall continue to report student achievement results based on performance standards.**

Use international comparisons

Looking at student performance and curriculum expectations in other nations is yet another way to consider the adequacy of U.S. student performance. The National Assessment is, and should be, a domestic assessment. However, decisions on the content of National Assessment tests, the achievement standards, and the interpretation of test results, where feasible, should be informed, in part, by the expectations for education set by other countries, such as Japan, Germany, and England. Although there are technical hurdles to overcome, consideration of such qualitative information can be used to good effect. In addition, the National Assessment should promote "linking" studies with international assessments, as has been done with the Third International Mathematics and Science Study, so that states that participate in the National Assessment can have state, national, and international comparisons. This, in turn, should take into account problems in making international comparisons truly comparable, such as differences in the samples of students tested, differences in the curricula, and differences in the translated test questions.

- **National Assessment test frameworks, test specifications, achievement levels, and data interpretations shall take into account, where feasible, curricula, standards, and student performance in other nations.**

- **The National Assessment shall promote "linking" studies with international assessments.**

Emphasize reporting for grades 4, 8, and 12

An aspect of the National Assessment design that needs reconsideration is age versus grade-based reporting. At its inception, the National Assessment tested only by age. Current law requires testing both by age (ages 9, 13, and 17) and by grade (grades 4, 8, and 12). Grade-based results are generally more useful than age-based results. Schools and curricula are organized by grade, not by age. Grades 4, 8, and 12 mark key transition points in American education. Grade 12 performance is particularly important as an "exit" measure from the K-12 education system. Grades 4, 8, and 12 are specified for monitoring in National Education Goal 3. Age-based samples may be more appropriate with respect to international comparisons and, given high school dropout rates, would be more inclusive for age 17 than for grade 12 samples, which are limited to youth enrolled in school. However, assessing the knowledge and skills of out-of-school youth may properly fall under the purpose of another program, such as the National Adult Literacy Survey.

Although grade-based reporting is generally preferable, there is a problem about the accuracy of grade 12 National Assessment results. At grade 12, a smaller percentage of schools and students that are invited actually participate in testing than is the case with 4th and 8th graders. Also, more 12th graders fail to complete their tests than do 4th and 8th graders. In addition, when asked, "How hard did you try on this test?" and "How important is doing well on this test?" many more 12th graders than 4th or 8th graders say that they didn't try hard and that the test wasn't important. Low participation rates, low completion rates, and indicators of low motivation suggest that the National Assessment may be underestimating what 12th graders know and can do.

One possible reason for low response and low motivation is that schools and students receive very little in return for their participation in the National Assessment beyond the knowledge that they are performing a public service. They do not receive test scores nor do they receive other information from the National Assessment that teachers and principals might wish to use as a part of the instructional program. This should be changed. The National Assessment design should use meaningful, practical incentives that will give school principals and teachers a greater reason to participate and students more of a reason to try harder. The underlying idea is clear: if principals and teachers see direct benefits, they are more likely to agree to participate in the National Assessment. Students may be more likely to take the assessment seriously if they see that their teachers and principals are enthusiastic about participating. Without practical incentives, even at grades 4 and 8, the willingness of district and school administrators and staff to participate in the National Assessment may diminish over time.

- **The National Assessment shall continue to test in and report results for grades 4, 8, and 12; however, in selected subjects, one or more of these grades may not be tested.**
- **Age-based testing and reporting shall be permitted when deemed appropriate and when necessary for international comparisons and for**

long-term trends, should the National Assessment Governing Board decide to continue long-term trends in their current form.

- **Grade 12 results shall be accompanied by clear, highlighted statements about school and student participation, student motivation, and cautions, where appropriate, about interpreting 12th grade achievement results.**
- **The National Assessment design shall seek to improve school and student participation rates and student motivation at grade 12.**
- **The National Assessment shall provide practical incentives for school and district participation at grades 4, 8, and 12.**

Use innovations in measurement and reporting

The National Assessment has a record of innovations in large-scale testing. These include the early use of performance items, sampling both students and test questions, using standards describing what students should know and be able to do, and employing computers for such things as inventory control, scoring, data analysis, and reporting. The National Assessment should continue to incorporate promising innovative approaches to test administration and improved methods for measuring and reporting student achievement.

Technology can help improve National Assessment reporting and testing. For example, reports could be put on computer disc, transmitted electronically, and made available on the World Wide Web. Test questions could be catalogued and made available on-line for use by state assessment personnel and classroom teachers. Also, the National Assessment could be administered by computer, eliminating the need for costly test booklet systems and reducing steps related to data entry of student responses. Students could answer "performance items" in cost-effective, computerized formats. The increasing use of computers in schools may make it feasible to administer some parts of the National Assessment by computer under the next contract for the National Assessment, beginning around the year 2000.

Other examples of promising methods for measuring and reporting student achievement include adaptive testing and domain-score reporting. In adaptive testing, each student is given a short "pre-test" to estimate that student's level of achievement. Students are then administered test exercises that are in the range of difficulty indicated by the pre-test. Since the test is "adapted" to the individual, it is more precise and can be markedly more efficient than regular test administration. In domain-score reporting, a subject (or "domain") is well defined, a goodly number of test questions are developed that encompass the subject, and student results are reported as a percentage of the "domain" that students "know and can do." This is in contrast to reporting results using an arbitrary scale, such as the 0-500 scale used in the National Assessment.

- **The National Assessment shall assess the merits of advances related to technology and the measurement and reporting of student achievement.**

- **Where warranted, the National Assessment shall implement such advances in order to reduce costs and/or improve test administration, measurement, and reporting.**
- **The next competition for National Assessment contracts, for assessments beginning around the year 2000, shall ask bidders to provide a plan for**
  (1) conducting testing by computer in at least one subject at one grade, and
  (2) making use of technology to improve test administration, measurement, and reporting.

OBJECTIVE 2: To develop, through a broadly inclusive process, sound assessments to measure what students know and can do as well as what students should know and be able to do.

Keep test frameworks and specifications stable

Test frameworks spell out in general terms how an assessment will be put together. The frameworks also determine what will be reported and influence how expensive an assessment will be. Should 8th grade mathematics include algebra questions? Should there be both multiple-choice questions and questions in which students show their work? What is the best mix of such types of questions for each grade? Which grades are appropriate for assessment in a subject area? Test specifications provide detailed instructions to the test writers about the specific content to be tested at each grade, how test questions will be scored, and the format for each test question (e.g. multiple choice, essay, etc.).

Since 1989, the National Assessment Governing Board has been responsible for developing test frameworks and specifications for NAEP. The Governing Board has done this through a broadly inclusive process, involving hundreds of teachers, curriculum experts, directors of state and local testing programs, administrators, policymakers, practitioners in the content area (e.g., chemists for science, demographers for geography, etc.) and members of the public. This process helps determine what is important for the National Assessment to test, how it should be measured, and how much of what is measured by the National Assessment students should know and be able to do in each subject.

The process of developing frameworks and specifications involves consideration of both current classroom teaching practices and important developments in each subject area for inclusion in the National Assessment. In order to ensure that National Assessment data fairly represent student achievement, the test frameworks and specifications are subjected to wide public review before adoption and test questions developed for the National Assessment are reviewed for relevance and quality by representatives from participating states.

An important role of the National Assessment is to report on trends in student achievement over time. For the National Assessment to be able to measure trends, the frameworks (and hence the tests) must remain stable. However, as new knowledge is gained in subject areas and as teaching practices change and evolve, pressures arise to change the test frameworks and tests to keep them current. But, if frameworks, specifications, and tests change too frequently, trends may be lost, costs go up, and reporting time may increase.

- **Test frameworks and test specifications developed for the National Assessment generally shall remain stable for at least ten years.**
- **To ensure that trend results can be reported, the pool of test questions developed in each subject for the National Assessment shall provide a stable measure of student performance for at least ten years.**
- **In rare circumstances, such as where significant changes in curricula have occurred, the National Assessment Governing Board may consider making changes to test frameworks and specifications before ten years have elapsed.**
- **In developing new test frameworks and specifications, or in making major alterations to approved frameworks and specifications, the cost of the resulting assessment shall be estimated. The National Assessment Governing Board will consider the effect of that cost on the ability to test other subjects before approving a proposed test framework and/or specifications.**

Use an appropriate mix of multiple-choice and "performance" questions

To provide information about "what students know and can do," the National Assessment uses both multiple-choice questions and questions in which students are asked to produce their own answers, such as writing a response to an essay question or explaining how they solved a math problem. Questions of the latter type are sometimes called "performance items." Both types of questions can vary in difficulty and the richness of information they provide, and may require students to demonstrate different kinds of skills and knowledge.

Performance items are desired because they provide direct evidence of what students can do. They range in length of test taking time from a short-answer or fill-in-the-blank format requiring about a minute of response time, to items requiring about 5 minutes of response time, to writing exercises that may allow 15 to 50 minutes response time. Although they may be desirable, performance items are more expensive than multiple-choice to develop, administer, and score. In addition, much larger proportions of students fail to respond to performance items, particularly as the amount of required response time increases.

Multiple-choice questions can be challenging and are desired because they are efficient in collecting information about student knowledge. However, multiple-choice questions are more subject to guessing than are performance items.

Currently, all students tested by the National Assessment are given both types of questions. Generally, about half the testing time is devoted to each type of question, but the amount of time for each differs based on the skills and knowledge to be assessed, as established in the National Assessment test frameworks. For example, in a writing assessment, all students are asked to write their responses to specific exercises. In other subjects, the mix of multiple-choice and performance items varies. The appropriate mix of items for each subject should be determined by the nature of the subject, the range of skills to be assessed, and cost.

- **Both multiple-choice and performance items shall continue to be used in the National Assessment;**
- **In developing new test frameworks, specifications, and questions, decisions about the appropriate mix of multiple-choice and performance items shall take into account the nature of the subject, the range of skills to be assessed, and cost.**

OBJECTIVE 3: To help states and others link their assessments with the National Assessment and use National Assessment data to improve education performance.

The primary job of the National Assessment is to report frequently and promptly to the American public on student achievement. The resources of the National Assessment must be focused on this central purpose if it is to be achieved. However, the products of the National Assessment—test frameworks, specifications, scoring guides, results, questions, achievement levels, and background data—are widely regarded as being of high quality. They are developed with public funds and, therefore, should be available for public use as long as such uses do not threaten the integrity of the National Assessment or its ability to report regularly on student achievement.

The National Assessment should be designed in a way that permits its use by others, while protecting the privacy of students, teachers, and principals who have participated in the National Assessment. This should include making National Assessment test questions and data easy to access and use, and providing related technical assistance upon request. Generally, the costs of a project should be borne by the individual or group making the proposal, not by the National Assessment.

Examples of areas in which particular interest has been expressed for using the National Assessment include linking state and local tests with the National Assessment and performing in-depth analysis on National Assessment data. States that link their tests to the National Assessment would have an unbiased external benchmark to help make judgments about their own tests and standards and also would have a means for comparing their tests and standards with those of other states.

The National Assessment shall develop policies, practices, and procedures that assist states, school districts, and others who want to do so at their own cost to link their test results to the National Assessment.

- **The National Assessment shall be designed so that others may access and use National Assessment test frameworks, specifications, scoring guides, results, questions, achievement levels, and background data.**
- **The National Assessment shall employ safeguards to protect the integrity of the National Assessment program, prevent misuse of data, and ensure the privacy of individual test takers.**

NAEP and Common Core State Standards and Assessments

The National Assessment of Educational Progress has been an instrumental element in the advent and development of the state-led Common Core State Standards Initiative. The reports by the National Center for Education Statistics mapping state standards to the NAEP scale and in relation to achievement levels have provided an empirical basis demonstrating the variability in state performance standards developed for state tests under the No Child Left Behind Act.

The Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association carefully considered this information from NAEP in deciding to begin the Common Core State Standards Initiative. In addition, NAEP reading, writing and mathematics assessment frameworks were used in developing the Common Core State Standards.

In preparing teachers, administrators, parents and students for the transition to Common Core State Standards, states and school districts are using NAEP test questions and frameworks to exemplify the rigor and kinds of student performance embodied in the Standards.

As the Standards were being developed and as the two assessment consortia have proceeded with their work, there has been continuing communication with the Governing Board.

Still, the question continues to be asked—What is the role of NAEP in an era of Common Core State Standards and Assessments? The Executive Committee will begin to discuss this question at the May 17, 2012 meeting as a prelude to the full Governing Board discussion on May 19. Background information for this discussion is provided on the following pages.

From the Governing Board Website: http://www.nagb.org/faqs.htm#corecomparison

Will NAEP be matched to the Common Core curriculum standards?

The groups that prepared the Common Core state standards and are developing the Common Core tests have drawn many of their approaches and ideas from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Many of the same people have been involved in both programs, including several members of the National Assessment Governing Board. Cooperation is ongoing, but there are no plans for NAEP and the Common Core to become wholly similar or matched. The Governing Board believes strongly that NAEP should continue to play an important role as an independent measure of student achievement under whatever education policies [or reforms] that states adopt.

For more than 40 years the National Assessment has provided the public with reliable, representative-sample information on what students know and can do in a wide range of academic subjects. Because of NAEP's sampling methodology, designed to produce sound results for large groups of students, the NAEP assessments are much broader-in content, item types, and levels of difficulty-than any exams designed to produce individual results, including those being developed for the Common Core.

Once the two sets of Common Core assessments are available in 2014-2015, there surely will be comparisons between their content and NAEP's. We expect these will show some differences as well as substantial similarities. The Board believes it will be important to maintain NAEP's distinctiveness and its trends in order to provide the nation and the states with a stable, independent measure of whether educational progress is indeed being made.

From the October 24, 2011 NAEP 12th Grade Preparedness Symposium, Boston, MA:

Comments of Mitchell Chester, Massachusetts Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Chair, Governing Board, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

Value of NAEP from the Perspective of the Common Core Assessment Consortia

"At this point in time, NAEP is critical. NAEP is critical to the two assessment consortia that are funded…Smarter-Balanced and the PARCC… It's critical to helping us understand whether or not the two assessments are aiming at roughly the same territory, having roughly the same expectations or not. And if they're not, helping understand what the difference in those expectations is, helping to understand what college readiness, what career readiness means."

"… if [NAEP can provide] a rich description of the kinds of skills—math, reading, writing skills that in fact are essential to being prepared…then that's helpful."

"And ultimately, NAEP needs to continue to benchmark against international comparisons and standards as it moves forward…"

EDUCATION WEEK
Published Online: April 24, 2012 Vol. 31, Issue 29

Math Teaching Often Doesn't Fit With New Standards

By Catherine Gewertz
Atlanta

Many mathematics teachers are teaching topics at higher or lower grade levels—and for more years—than the Common Core State Standards call for, according to preliminary results from new research.

That finding suggests that when the new standards are fully implemented, many math teachers could face significant shifts in what they will teach.

The information is part of a research effort led by William H. Schmidt, a Michigan State University professor who is widely known for an influential 1996 study that found the typical course of study in U.S. math was "a mile wide and an inch deep."

His new research, which does not yet have a release date, examines a nationally representative group of more than 13,000 K-12 math teachers and 600 district curriculum directors in more than 40 states. It seeks to gauge their readiness to put the common standards in math, which have been adopted by 45 states and the District of Columbia, into practice. Early results were presented at a conference of the Council of Chief State School Officers here last week.

Mr. Schmidt's team at Michigan State's Center for the Study of Curriculum, in East Lansing, asked the curriculum directors when key topics in the common-core math standards were first introduced, and in what grade levels those topics continued to be taught.

They found that typical coverage of the topics in common-core standards lags two to three years behind the grades envisioned in the common core, and persists longer.

Key topics introduced in 2nd grade in the common standards, for instance, are currently introduced between 1st and 3rd grades, the study says. The variance was even wider in middle school: Topics that the common core introduces in 6th grade are now introduced between 3rd and 8th grades, Mr. Schmidt's research shows.

Additionally, topics envisioned as unique to a given grade in the common standards now persist for multiple years, the study found. Focus topics of the standards at the 4th grade level, for instance, show up in classrooms from 1st through 8th grades, according to the research.

Teachers appear to be reluctant to shift the grade at which topics are taught, the study's findings suggest. Only one-quarter said they would drop a topic if the common standards specify that it be taught at another grade level.

Gauging Attitudes

Responding to surveys and discussing the standards in focus groups, math teachers overwhelmingly supported the standards, which emerged two years ago from a project led by the CCSSO and the National Governors Association. Nine in 10 of the teachers reported that they had heard of the standards, and seven in 10 said they had read them. Ninety percent said they liked the new learning guidelines.

"By and large, opposition to the common core is not coming from teachers. They just want support to teach it," Leland Cogan, a Michigan State University research associate who works with Mr. Schmidt, told state representatives as he presented the preliminary findings at the CCSSO gathering.

Nine in 10 of the K-6 teachers said they liked and would teach the standards. That figure slipped to 85 percent in grades 7 and 8, and to 82 percent in high school.

Nearly 8 percent of the teachers surveyed in grades 1-3 said they didn't like the standards but would teach them anyway. Nine percent of those in grades 4-6 said the same thing. Discontent correlated with grade level: More than 13 percent of the math teachers in grades 7 and 8 said they didn't like the standards but would go ahead and teach them. In high school, the figure was more than 16 percent.

Fewer than 1 percent of teachers at all grade levels said they "don't like and won't teach" the standards.

Other findings raise the question of whether teachers understand the differences between their states' former standards and the new ones, Mr. Schmidt said in an email. When they viewed sample topics for their respective grades, eight in 10 reported that they reflect "pretty much the same" content as their states' previous standards.

"The data suggest that most teachers do not recognize how difficult" it will be to move from their states' former standards to the new ones, Mr. Schmidt said.

"Given their willingness, I remain optimistic," he said, "but I believe we have to make them aware of how different these standards are and provide them with materials that both make them aware of the differences and provide them with materials to help in the implementation."

Large numbers of teachers feel unprepared to teach topics in the new standards, the study found.

One-third reported that they had not taken part in any activity designed to help them implement the new standards. And large proportions—as low as 20 percent and as high as 75 percent—reported feeling unprepared to teach some common-core math topics.

When asked to choose possible obstacles to putting the new standards into practice, teachers put a lack of parent support (49.7 percent) and the need for textbooks that support the standards (28.9 percent) at the top of their lists. Concerns about state tests' alignment to the material also was often named (28.8 percent), along with students' difficulty learning the material (20 percent) and a "lack of needed mathematics knowledge among teachers" (15 percent).

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement

Whereas, the National Assessment Governing Board is implementing an initiative to make a difference in fostering the improvement of student achievement in the United States and of closing achievement gaps by race, ethnicity, and income levels using NAEP data and resources; and

Whereas, the National Assessment Governing Board established the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement in March 2011 to

> "present recommendations…the Governing Board and representatives of the NAEP program can take directly, and/or support the efforts of others to increase parent awareness about the urgency to improve the levels of student achievement in the U.S. and the urgency to reduce the size of achievement gaps by race, ethnicity, and income levels, using NAEP data and resources"; and

Whereas, the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement presented its recommendations to the National Assessment Governing Board on March 2, 2012; and

Whereas, the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement recommended that the National Assessment Governing Board

- Specify National, State, and Local Parent Leaders and Parent Organizations as the Target Audience
- Establish Relationships with Recognized Parent and Community-based Organizations
- Develop Presentations and Materials Targeted to Parents for Use by Governing Board Members and Others
- Develop Parent Pages on the Governing Board and NAEP Websites
- Conduct a Parent Education Summit in Late Summer/Early Fall 2012; and

Whereas, adoption of the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations will be valuable, feasible, and consistent with the Governing Board's authority to "develop guidelines for reporting and disseminating results" and "…improve the form, content, use, and reporting of [NAEP} results…"; and

Whereas, implementation of the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations will require staff and financial resources and oversight by one or more standing committees of the National Assessment Governing Board;

Therefore, the National Assessment Governing Board hereby

1.) adopts the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement presented on March 2, 2012;
2.) approves the use of appropriate staff and financial resources to implement the) recommendations; and
3.) authorizes the assignment of oversight of these activities to Governing Board standing committees.