

**National Assessment Governing Board**

**Meeting of August 3-4, 2012**

**Washington, DC**

**OFFICIAL SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONS**

**Complete Transcript Available**

**National Assessment Governing Board Members Present**

David Driscoll, Chairman  
Mary Frances Taymans, Vice Chair  
Andrés Alonso  
David Alukonis  
Lou Fabrizio  
Anitere Flores  
Alan Friedman  
Shannon Garrison  
Terry Holliday  
Brent Houston  
Hector Ibarra  
Tonya Miles  
Dale Nowlin  
Sonny Perdue  
Susan Pimentel  
James Popham  
Andrew Porter  
Fielding Rolston  
Cary Sneider  
Leticia Van de Putte  
Eileen Weiser

John Easton (ex-officio)

**National Assessment Governing Board Members Absent**

Doris Hicks  
Thomas Luna  
Jack Markell  
Blair Taylor

### **National Assessment Governing Board Staff**

Cornelia Orr, Executive Director  
Mary Crovo, Deputy Executive Director  
Michelle Blair  
Dora Drumgold  
Lawrence Feinberg  
Ray Fields  
Stephaan Harris  
Susan Loomis  
Munira Mwalimu  
Tessa Regis  
Angela Scott

### **National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Staff**

Peggy Carr, Associate Commissioner  
Gina Broxterman  
Samantha Burg  
Jamie Deaton  
Angela Glymph  
Arnold Goldstein  
Andy Kolstad  
Taslina Rahman  
Holly Spurlock  
Suzanne Triplett  
Bill Ward  
Bobbi Woods  
Brenda Wolff

### **American Institutes for Research (AIR) Staff**

George Bohrnstedt  
Kim Gattis  
Cadelle Hemphill  
Sharyn Rosenberg

### **Educational Testing Service (ETS) Staff**

Jay Campbell  
Amy Drescher  
Steve Lazer  
Rebecca Moran  
Andreas Oranje  
Mary Pitoniak  
Greg Vafis

**Fulcrum IT**

Jud Cole  
Scott Ferguson  
Lori Rokus

**Hager Sharp**

Jo Anne Lim  
Debra Silimeo  
Melissa Spade

**Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)**

Wade Buckland  
Laress Wise  
Steve Sellman

**Pearson Educational Measurement**

Connie Smith  
Brad Thayer

**Reingold**

Erin Fenn  
Valerie Marrapodi  
Kiera McCaffrey

**Westat**

Chris Averett  
Lauren Byrne  
Nancy Caldwell  
Keith Rust  
Dianne Walsh

**Widmeyer Communications**

Neby Ejigu  
Peter Hahn  
Daniel Kaufman  
Jacqueline Lipson

## **CRP, Inc.**

Veleka Allen  
Shamai Carter  
Jasmine Fletcher  
Sondra Gaines  
Kathy Smoot

## **Attending Speakers**

Joel Hansen, Department of Defense Education Activity  
Jeff Nellhaus, Director, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Assessment Consortium  
Ann Whalen, Director of Policy and Program Implementation, U.S. Department of Education  
Joe Willhoft, Executive Director, Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)

## **Others/Attendees**

Sofia Espailat, U.S. Department of Education  
Catherine Gewertz, Education Week  
Lisa Gross, Kentucky Department of Education, Member NAGB/CCSSO Policy Task Force  
Heather Koons, MetaMetrics  
Mark Partridge, Optimal Solutions Group  
Larry Snowwhite, McGraw-Hill  
Kirsten Taylor, Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)  
Erin Twamley, Optimal Solutions Group

## **Call to Order**

The August 3, 2012, session of the National Assessment Governing Board was called to order by Chairman David Driscoll at 8:31 a.m.

## **Approval of the Agenda and the August 2012 Board Meeting Minutes**

Chairman David Driscoll reviewed the August 2012 agenda and requested a motion for approval. Andrew Porter moved for Board approval of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Fielding Rolston and passed unanimously.

Mr. Driscoll noted that the May 2012 Board meeting minutes were circulated to members for review. He requested a motion for approval of the minutes. A motion was made by Lou Fabrizio to approve the May 2012 Board meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Andy Porter and passed unanimously.

## **Chairman's Remarks**

Mr. Driscoll remarked that it is a pivotal time for the Governing Board, NCES and the nation as the Board is faced with a series of challenges. These challenges include the loss of veteran Board members over the last two years due to term expirations, the upcoming presidential election in November which has stalled the debate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) until January, the Common Core State Standards, and the unprecedented financial crisis that could possibly lead to sequestration and major funding cuts for education if matters are not addressed in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Driscoll suggested a review of the Governing Board's policies. He noted that the Board's last policy review resulted in the development of achievement levels, reporting state level NAEP, and other activities that pushed the Governing Board to the forefront of reporting student achievement in the U.S.

There is a renewed interest in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). The Governing Board and NCES are examining the relationship between NAEP and these international assessments. A report is planned for late 2012 on the study linking NAEP and TIMSS in math and science. Mr. Driscoll also thanked NCES and Governing Board staff for effectively keeping the lines of communication open with the two assessment consortia as they work to develop the state assessments.

Mr. Driscoll stated that the nation is experiencing rapid change in school district leadership which will have a significant impact on education policy and outcomes for the nation's students. The Governing Board must become more nimble in adapting to change if NAEP is to remain the gold standard of student assessment, and a reliable source that the public depends on to tell the truth about student achievement. He added that the continued work on 12<sup>th</sup> grade preparedness will be a crucial part of the Board's future work.

Mr. Driscoll reported that the outreach dinner on Wednesday, August 1, was attended by approximately 30 local area parent leaders and parent-focused organizations. The goal of the event was to encourage parent leaders to use NAEP to improve student achievement, and provide an update on the Board's current and future outreach activities. Mr. Driscoll stated that the input received from participants who attended last year's event in Washington, DC was one of the factors that led to the creation of the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement chaired by Board member Tonya Miles. This year the Board asked the parent leaders about progress in reaching parent audiences and the importance of NAEP in raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps. Attendees candidly remarked that there is still a lot of work to do to make solid connections between NAEP and parents. Mr. Driscoll stated that the Governing Board has made a commitment to the parent engagement initiative. He encouraged Board members to get involved.

Mr. Driscoll made the following announcements:

- Governor Jack Markell resigned from the Board due to other commitments and his leadership role at the National Governors' Association.

- Susan Pimentel was nominated as Board Vice Chair at the meeting of the Executive Committee.

Blair Taylor has accepted the position of Chief Community Officer at Starbucks in Seattle, WA. This will be the last meeting for four Board members—David Alukonis, Andrew Porter, Mary Frances Taymans, and Eileen Weiser due to completion of two four-year terms for each member.

Mr. Driscoll thanked outgoing Board members for their contributions to the Board’s work.

### **Presentation on Department of Defense Schools and NAEP**

Joel Hansen, Acting Associate Director for Education, Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) provided a briefing on the Department of Defense Schools and NAEP.

Mr. Hansen indicated that DoDEA plays a major role in the education of children of military members stationed in the U.S., Europe, and the Pacific. DoDEA operates 194 schools in 12 countries and serves approximately 86,000 students. However, there are approximately 2 million military children of enlisted personnel serving on Active, Guard and Reserve duty and 75% of children whose parents are on active-duty are under the age of 12. There are also 150-160 non-DoDEA schools which are located on military installations in the United States.

Mr. Hansen stated that the lives of military-connected students are closely linked to world events. These students have a wide range of experiences and gain a broad perspective as global citizens. Military-connected students are also very resilient but many face unique challenges and suffer emotional trauma brought on by frequent transitions, separation from a deployed parent(s), and lack of contact with extended family. Research suggests that such pressures have a negative impact on some students’ performance in school. The average military dependent student in K-12 will move six to nine times. The DoDEA school community participates in the Interstate Compact to mitigate the stressors often placed upon military-connected students. The compact is a voluntary network of 40 states that track students throughout their school years.

Mr. Hansen described the demographics of DoDEA students and teaching staff. The majority of students are minorities, and thirty percent qualify for free or reduced priced lunch. Eighty percent of the teachers are white females with master’s degrees, and there is a low turnover rate among teachers.

Mr. Hansen reported that DoDEA uses multiple performance-based assessments to report student progress:

- Terra Nova—an annual assessment of student achievement that provides a comparison of national results. Seventy-three percent of the students scored higher than the national average.

- NAEP—DoDEA students score among the highest in the top ten states in reading and science. The achievement gap is smaller than the national average, and has decreased over the past decade.
- SAT—students score slightly below the national average and achievement gaps persist between White students and Black and Hispanic students, though the gaps are narrowing slightly.
- AP Exams—participation rates have increased. The number of students that score 3 or above has increased over time.

Mr. Hansen reported that overall DoDEA students perform better on NAEP and have higher graduation rates than students across the nation, but gaps in achievement persist between White students and Black and Hispanic students. Mr. Hansen remarked that there is no definitive research or data to suggest why achievement gaps are narrower among military-connected students. A study was conducted recently by Vanderbilt University to examine factors that may contribute to the rising achievement among DoDEA minority students. Mr. Hansen highlighted the key findings of the study:

- The structure of life on military installations supports family and other engagement in children’s educational lives.
- A corporate commitment to schools engenders strong family-school relationships.
- Teachers and school counselors are perceived as caring committed professionals who support student and family engagement.
- School size matters—smaller schools allow teachers to be more engaged with students.

Mr. Hansen summarized the DoDEA NAEP results by race/ethnicity and gender. He noted that results for grade 4 and grade 8 Reading, Math and Science indicate that the score gap between White and minority students remains narrower than the nation’s score gap. The DoDEA female/male score gap remained the same as the nation’s score gap. On average, females score slightly higher in Reading than males and scores have not changed significantly over time.

Key initiatives currently being implemented by DoDEA:

- 1) Developing a new Community Strategic Plan.
- 2) Adopting the Common Core State Standards.
- 3) Refurbishing schools via a grant through Marine Corps Military Construction Program (MILCON) to focus on more student-centric instruction to adapt to different learning and instructional styles.

- 4) Establishing the DoDEA Virtual School, a fully accredited program that grants diplomas. Three students from Europe graduated from the DoDEA Virtual School this year.

Mr. Hansen engaged in a question and answer session with Board members.

### **Executive Director's Report**

Cornelia Orr, Executive Director of the Governing Board, reported on the following activities:

- Mary Crovo made a presentation on NAEP Reading assessment results at the Baltimore Coalition for Grade Level Reading Conference sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Cornelia Orr made a presentation to the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) assessment subcommittee on the NAEP background questions.
- Governing Board staff participated in the NAGB/CCSSO Policy Task Force WebEx. The next WebEx will be held on August 6, 2012.
- The Hands-On Tasks and Interactive Computer Tasks (HOTs/ICTs) release event was held on June 19, 2012 in Washington, DC. The live event with webcast was well attended and the audience was highly engaged. NCES provided samples of hands-on tasks. Panelists included NCES Commissioner Jack Buckley, Harvard University Professor Chris Dede and Board members Alan Friedman and Eileen Weiser.
- Board staff Michelle Blair was invited to attend and participate in the International Research Workshop in Toulouse, France. Ms. Blair presented a research proposal using NAEP High School Transcript data.
- The Governing Board launched its redesigned website. Ms. Orr highlighted some of the new features targeted to various audiences such as parents and business leaders.

Ms. Orr made reference to the 2012 Summer Olympics and noted that Board member Shannon Garrison carried the torch through Edinburgh, Scotland for the games. Ms. Garrison's accomplishment was featured in an article on UCLA's Graduate School of Information and Education Studies website, which noted that she was one of five teachers recognized by the Samsung Corporation and John Legend's *Show Me Campaign* for going "the extra mile."

Ms. Orr also mentioned that U.S. gymnast and Olympic champion Gabrielle Douglas attends the Florida Virtual School about which the Board learned at its meeting in Miami. Ms. Orr pointed out that it is an interesting example of how athletes can compete at the highest levels of their sport and maintain their school work.

Ms. Orr announced that Board staff member Susan Loomis will retire in October. Ms. Loomis joined the Board in October 2004 and has served as the Board's chief technical expert on all matters

related to the design and methodology of NAEP. Ms. Loomis also provides support for the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM). Prior to joining the Governing Board, Ms. Loomis worked for ACT where she worked as a contractor to help the Board establish achievement levels for various NAEP subjects.

### **National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Update**

John Easton, Director of the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) provided an update on the following NCES activities:

- Results from the Hands-On Tasks and Interactive Computer Tasks (HOTs/ICTs) from the 2009 Science assessment were released on June 19, 2012. This is the first time the NAEP Science assessment included interactive computer tasks. Mr. Easton noted a key finding that students were able to conduct simple scientific inquiry, but had difficulty with more complex investigations and using evidence to support conclusions.
- The 2011 National Indian Education Study Report was released on June 19, 2012. The study highlighted 4th and 8th grade Reading and Math assessment results for American Indian and Alaska Native students in 12 states. Mr. Easton reported that there has been no significant change in scores since 2005, which has resulted in continued performance gaps as compared to non-American Indian/Alaska native students.
- Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) results will be released on December 11, 2012. The NAEP-TIMSS linking study will be released later.
- Data collection for the National Household Education Survey was completed in July 2012. The survey combines the Parent Family Involvement in Education and the Early Childhood Program Participation Survey and covers learning from birth through grade 12.
- Data collection for the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS) is complete. The study examines academic, social and physical development at various points from birth through 8th grade.
- Data collection for the new National Survey of Teachers and Principals, a nationally representative survey of teachers and principals, is currently underway. This new survey replaces the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS).

### **Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Update**

John Easton provided an overview of IES research training opportunities.

Mr. Easton stated that IES sponsors a number of institutes and programs that provide training opportunities for researchers:

- NCES Survey Use Training Program
- National Center for Education Research (NCER) Predoctoral Training Program
- NCER and National Center for Special Education Research (NCSEER) Postdoctoral Training Programs
- NCSEER Early Career Awards
- Summer Research Training Institutes

Mr. Easton spoke in detail about the NCER Predoctoral Training Program and the Summer Research Training Institutes. The Predoctoral Interdisciplinary program was designed to help young researchers improve their use of data sets. The five-year program was first completed in 2004 and 2005 under former IES Director Russ Whitehurst. There are currently 16 programs at universities across the country—five began in 2008 and 11 in 2009. Approximately 800 fellows have been trained or are being trained, and 170 have finished training and are active researchers. The key emphasis of the program is an interdisciplinary focus coupled with rigorous design methodology.

Mr. Easton stated that NCES hosted three summer research training institutes this year: 1) Cluster-Randomized Trials 2) Design and Analysis of Practical Quasi-Experiments for use in Education, and 3) Intervention Research Design and Analysis.

IES has established a Researcher and Policymaker Training Program. Policymakers, state legislators, governor's associations, and state boards of education have an opportunity to partner with researchers on a particular topic. Researchers can make policymakers aware of current research to support them in creating and implementing policies that can be evaluated.

Mr. Easton thanked outgoing Board members for their diligence, vigilance and service to the Governing Board. He stated that the Board serves as a good model for bringing people together with similar goals but different perspectives, and this has led to immeasurable improvements to NAEP.

### **Recess for Committee Meetings**

The first session of the August 3, 2012 Board meeting recessed for committee meetings from 9:52 a.m. to 12:54 p.m.

### **Meeting Reconvened**

#### **Closed Session**

### **NAEP 2011 NAEP Writing Report Card**

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of section 552b(C) of Title 5 U.S.C. the National Assessment Governing Board met in closed session on August 3, 2012 from 12:54 p.m. to 2:01 p.m. to receive a briefing on the 2011 NAEP Writing computer-based assessment.

Peggy Carr of NCES provided an overview of the Writing assessment. The exam, which was NAEP's first fully computer-based national assessment in a major subject area, was administered from January through March 2011 to a nationally representative sample of 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students. Results were reported as average scale scores and percentages of students by achievement levels. Ms. Carr noted that the results from the computer-based Writing assessment cannot be compared to results from previous NAEP paper-and-pencil Writing assessments.

The writing tasks measured students' ability to write for specific purposes and audiences, using the computer and common word processing tools. Ms. Carr provided an overview of the scoring and described the new components of the computer-based assessment.

Ms. Carr provided examples of writing tasks at grades 8 and 12. She summarized the results by achievement levels, race/ethnicity, gender, family income, and parent education levels. Ms. Carr also highlighted student performance as it related to student background factors such as their writing experience, use of computers, and use of word processing tools such as copy, cut and paste and other tools.

### **Open Session**

The third session of the August 3, 2012 Board meeting convened in open session at 2:19 p.m.

### **Race to the Top Implementation and NAEP**

Ann Whalen, Director of Policy and Program Implementation, U.S. Department of Education, provided a briefing on the relationship between NAEP and the Department's Race to the Top initiative. Ms. Whalen also provided an update on implementation of Race to the Top.

Ms. Whalen stated that the Race to the Top competition, authorized under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), provided \$4.35 billion dollars in grant money to support implementation of comprehensive reform in states and local school districts across four key areas:

- Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students for success in college and the workplace.
- Recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals.
- Building data systems that measure student success and inform teachers and principals how they can improve their practices.
- Turning around the lowest-performing schools.

Ms. Whalen stated that the overarching goals of the grant program are to drive substantial gains in student achievement, improve high school graduation and college enrollment, and narrow achievement gaps.

Ms. Whalen provided a general overview of the grant program competition that had two types of selection criteria: 1) State Reform Conditions Criteria to assess states' progress and success in creating conditions related to the four education reform areas; and 2) Reform Plan Criteria to assess states' plans for future efforts in the four education reform areas.

States were asked to provide narrative responses to address the criteria, performance measures, supporting evidence, and any other supplemental information to demonstrate their use of NAEP data, and progress made in raising achievement and closing gaps. States also provided an analysis of the data for student subgroups with respect to NAEP including race/ethnicity, students with disabilities, and English language learners. This allowed for a better understanding of how states planned to use NAEP results to judge the impact of their education reform efforts.

Grant applications were reviewed by an independent expert panel and grants were awarded in three phases. Twelve grants were made in phases one and two, and seven grants were awarded in phase three.

Ms. Whalen noted that the applicants were not consistent in how they chose to use NAEP data on closing achievement gaps. Further, states were not consistent in how they tracked outcomes of education reform initiatives or their future plans for reform. Some states set ambitious goals and targets while others set modest goals, or did not provide any targets in relation to improved NAEP results.

Ms. Whalen explained that the Department uses the data gathered for the Race to the Top states in several ways:

1. State Specific Reports—yearly reports for the public to assess Race to the Top grant implementation and performance management for each state. The reports highlight the multiple measures that are used to define success, identify challenges, and provide lessons learned. The reports are of tremendous value because they have sparked important conversations among states as they implement the grants.
2. Annual Performance Report Data Display—an online data display of annual performance for Phase I and Phase II grantees. It includes a state-by-state comparison of each state's performance compared to its targeted goal.

Ms. Whalen stated that during the review process, the Department found that states needed to build their knowledge on how to set and use targets and goals. Some states have developed a better understanding of NAEP and their state NAEP assessment data, which helps to inform conversations with policymakers about a state's progress and reform goals. States are working to build common tools and resources as they transition to the Common Core State Standards.

Ms. Whalen engaged in a question and answer session with Board members.

### **Meeting Recess**

The third session of the August 3, 2012 Board meeting concluded at 2:56 p.m.

## **Meeting Reconvened**

The Saturday, August 4, 2012 session reconvened at 8:30 a.m.

## **Board Discussion Session**

### **Reflections from Outgoing Board Members**

David Alukonis, Andrew Porter, Sr. Mary Frances Taymans, and Eileen Weiser reflected on their terms of service as Governing Board members. Each talked about their work on the Board's various standing committees, the opportunity to work with other talented Board members and the ability to make a contribution to NAEP. Each outgoing member commented that they have enjoyed their service on the Board and wished members and staff success on current initiatives and future work.

### **Making a Difference and Parent Engagement Activities**

Board member Tonya Miles provided an update on the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement. Ms. Miles served as Chair during the Ad Hoc Committee's 17-month tenure.

Ms. Miles discussed the overview of recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Parent Engagement, which were adopted by the Board on May 19, 2012.

1. Specify the target audience: national, state, and local parent leaders and parent organizations.
2. Establish relationships with recognized parent and community-based organizations.
3. Develop presentations and materials targeted to parents for use by Governing Board members and others.
4. Develop parent pages on the Governing Board and NAEP websites.
5. Conduct a parent education summit in late 2012 or early 2013.

Ms. Miles highlighted outreach activities conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee:

- March 7, 2012—presentation at the National PTA Annual Legislative Conference in Arlington, VA. The topic was "National Assessment of Educational Data: How Parents Can Use Data to Inform Decisions." The session was attended by parents, PTA officers, members, and their affiliates.
- April 20, 2012—U.S. Department of Education Parent Summit. The focus of the summit was family engagement. Representatives attending the summit extended an invitation to the Board to speak at other events across the country and share more information about the Ad Hoc Committee's work.
- June 21, 2012—National PTA 116<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference in San Jose, CA. Many parents stated that they use NAEP data and are interested in receiving more information to inform their discussions with teachers, principals, school administrators, school board members, and policymakers on ways to improve student achievement.

- June 27, 2012—National Coalition of Parents Involved in Education, Washington, DC. The NAEP Parent Engagement initiative was the focus of this session. Several organizations expressed an interest in partnering with the Governing Board to develop website links, plan additional events, and receive copies of the parent engagement brochure.

Ms. Miles said this effort represents a strong beginning for the Board’s outreach efforts to parents and parent leaders. She stated that many parent groups were impressed with the Board’s desire to reach out to them, to discuss partnership opportunities, and to find ways the parent leaders could use NAEP data and resources to help improve student achievement in their areas. Ms. Miles reminded Board members that resources are also available to them if they desire to reach out to their communities.

Mr. Driscoll commented that two themes resonated throughout the evening at the Board’s outreach dinner on Wednesday, August 1—partnership and leadership. He stated that the Ad Hoc Committee has begun to reach out to a wide range of parent groups and it is important to sustain partnerships with those organizations represented, and establish new partnerships going forward. Mr. Driscoll stated that parent group members indicated that they care greatly about the success of their schools, but would find it helpful to understand what steps they can take and what tools and resources are available to help them make an impact in their schools and communities.

Mr. Driscoll stated that the Board’s role going forward should be to continue partnerships with local parent groups in communities across the country and provide leadership in making it easier for teachers, parents, and other groups to find and use relevant NAEP information.

Board member Jim Popham suggested that the Board should lead the charge to implement initiatives to promote assessment literacy among stakeholders. He stated that it is important that they understand the purpose of various tests and how the tests relate to each other.

Alan Friedman commented that it is crucial for the public to know how the NAEP assessment differs from the Common Core assessments and state assessments. He suggested the Board create a brochure for all stakeholders to clearly explain the various assessments.

Hector Ibarra commented that it is important to reach out to the Latino population—the fastest growing group in the U.S. He stated that he has found it difficult to convey the importance of assessments to the parents he serves. Many parents are dealing with other issues but need to understand the importance of NAEP and how they can help their children.

Dale Nowlin stated that the use of background questions may add some relevance to a wider audience.

Leticia Van de Putte stated that she and her staff host a family Well-Being and Back-to-School Fair in San Antonio. The activities and format of the event attract families who would not otherwise participate. Many of the participants’ incomes are below the poverty level and 99% of the students receive free or reduced priced lunch. Ms. Van de Putte commented that when involving and empowering stakeholders at the grass roots level, be prepared for some push back from school board members and school district leaders because stakeholders will begin to make more demands.

School administrators and teachers find it a great opportunity to engage in a dialogue with parents and help them learn more about the NAEP assessment and the results at the local and national level.

Andrés Alonso stated that when he assumed the role as CEO of the Baltimore City Public School system, he had to close more than 60 schools based on accountability issues. He found that many parents did not understand the rationale for doing so even when provided with clear explanations and data. Mr. Alonso noted that there is a great opportunity to engage stakeholders who desire more information.

### **Reporting NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Research**

Board members engaged in a discussion on Reporting NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness.

Eileen Weiser suggested the Board delay reporting on preparedness until the 2013-based ACT studies are completed. Ms. Weiser stated that it is important not to give the impression that the Board cannot report on college and career readiness by prematurely releasing a partial report.

Alan Friedman stated that while a lot of thought went into the report, the ADC committee's concerns were that the draft chapters are not written for a broad policy audience. There are no definitive findings from the 2009 studies, and the ADC thinks it would not be appropriate to release a report. Mr. Friedman added that it is possible that a premature report would be subject to misuse and misinterpretation.

Lou Fabrizio reported that the COSDAM committee engaged in a lengthy discussion and developed six summary points:

1. The meaning and use of the results must be clearly stated.
2. The results of the NAEP preparedness research should be interpreted correctly.
3. The finding that preparedness college and career are not the same must be clearly stated.
4. The NAEP definition of preparedness must be clearly distinguished from the definition of readiness or preparedness developed by other organizations doing research in this area.
5. The tone of the report is acceptable.
6. The final report should provide evidence about preparedness that will prompt states to want to take action.

Terry Holliday commented that other groups will release reports on readiness and preparedness over the next six to nine months and it is important that the Board remains a relevant part of this discussion. But he feels it is more important for the Board to release an accurate report. Mr. Holliday stated that the Board's current data show that college and career readiness are not the same thing. He added that if the Board reports its initial findings it would potentially prevent policymakers from thinking they can measure both aspects with one assessment.

Susan Pimentel stated that based on the report the Board cannot say that college and career readiness are not the same, nor can it say how they are different.

Andy Porter suggested that the Board form an ad hoc committee to review the report and determine whether the Board should release findings from the 2009 research studies. Several states are moving forward with similar reports and it is important for the Board to get feedback on its research and what can be reported.

Mr. Driscoll stated that the consensus of the Board is that additional work is necessary and the Board may consider involving a third party to determine what can be reported based on the 2009 preparedness research studies.

### **NAEP and Common Core State Standards and Assessments**

Cornelia Orr, Executive Director of the Governing Board, provided a briefing on NAEP and the Common Core State Standards.

Ms. Orr reported that a discussion draft copy of “NAEP and the Common Core State Standards and Assessments” was included in the August Board briefing book. She stated that on occasion the Board receives questions about the relationship between NAEP and the Common Core. The Board requested at the May 2012 meeting that staff draft a one-page document on this topic to share with the public. It is anticipated that NCES and the Board will receive additional questions leading up to the implementation of the Common Core assessments.

Board members provided input on recommended changes to the document. Comments included specifically stating what NAEP accomplishes compared to the Common Core assessments. It was also suggested that the Board promote its strengths such as NAEP’s ability to monitor progress over time, provide state-by-state comparisons, offer assessments in a wide range of subjects beyond reading and mathematics, and that NAEP is the gold standard of assessments.

Additional comments included the importance of highlighting that NAEP’s reading and math assessments are complementary to the Common Core assessments. NAEP is not political and will continue to have an important role because of the composition of the Governing Board. It was also noted that the Common Core may have difficulty measuring all of the Common Core State Standards because of the limited time allocated for the assessments. Concerns were also raised about each school’s ability to meet the technology requirements to implement the assessments.

Mr. Driscoll stated that the Board will not release the report but will review the document and take into consideration the changes suggested by Board members.

### **Planning the Board’s 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Activities**

Mr. Driscoll asked the Board to formulate ideas for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary activities. He stated that he is open to new approaches for the upcoming anniversary events. Mr. Driscoll wants to highlight the Board’s current initiatives. No definite plans for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary agenda have been made at this time. Mr. Driscoll will be appointing an Ad Hoc Committee in the near future to begin planning the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary events.

### **Meeting Recessed and Reconvened**

The August 4, 2012 session of the Governing Board meeting recessed at 10:35 a.m. and reconvened at 10:55 a.m.

### **Committee Reports and Board Actions**

The Board received highlights of discussions from the standing Committees. The following resolutions were adopted as action items:

- Policy Statement on NAEP Background Questions and the Use of Contextual Data in NAEP Reporting.
- Revised Eligibility Criteria and Procedures for Selecting Districts for Participation in the NAEP Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA).
- Approval of the nomination of Susan Pimentel as Board Vice Chair for Election by the Board for a term from October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013.
- Approval of tasks and discrete items for the 2013 Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) pilot test to be conducted at grade 8, with changes in the tasks and items to be communicated in writing to NCES.
- Approval of the release plan for the NAEP 2011 Reading Vocabulary Report.

The full text of the action items are provided in the full Committee reports appended to these minutes.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

The August 4, 2012 session of the Board meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Driscoll, Chairman

11/13/2012  
Date

# National Assessment Governing Board

## Executive Committee

### Report of August 2, 2012

**Attendees:** David Driscoll, Chair, Mary Frances Taymans, Vice Chair, David Alukonis, Lou Fabrizio, Alan Friedman, Tonya Miles, Susan Pimentel, Eileen Weiser. Other Board Members: Shannon Garrison, Hector Ibarra, Jim Popham, Andy Porter, Fielding Rolston, Cary Sneider, Leticia Van de Putte. NAGB Staff: Cornelia Orr, Mary Crovo, Ray Fields, Michelle Blair, Susan Loomis, Larry Feinberg, Stephaan Harris, Munira Mwalimu, Tessa Regis. IES: John Q. Easton. NCES Staff: Peggy Carr, Drew Malizio, Brenda Wolff, Holly Spurlock, Suzanne Triplett. ETS: Jay Campbell, Greg Vafis, Andres Oranje, Mary Pitoniak. HumRRO: Steve Sellman. Westat: Chris Averett. AIR: George Bohrnstedt, Kim Gattis. Optimal Solutions Group: Mark Partridge. Fulcrum IT: Scott Ferguson. Hager Sharp: Debra Silimeo. Pearson: Brad Thayer, Connie Smith. Widmeyer: Neby Ejigu, Jaqui Lipson. McGraw-Hill Education: Larry Snowwhite. CRP: Sondra Gains.

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair David Driscoll called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. He mentioned that Governor Jack Markell has resigned from the Governing Board, citing his new role as Chair of the National Governors Association (NGA) as the reason. Governing Board staff will be working with NGA to begin the process of identifying a candidate for the Democratic Governor vacancy Governor Markell's resignation creates to recommend to Secretary Duncan for appointment.

#### 2. Continuation of the NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Commission

Mr. Driscoll recounted Governor Ronnie Musgrove's presentation at the May 2012 Board meeting on the activities of the NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Commission. He said that the Commission's work has been valuable in sharing information with and gaining input from leaders around the country on the NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> grade preparedness initiative. With the issuance of the Board's report on the first phase of the preparedness research expected in the fall of 2012, Governor Musgrove had closed his presentation with a request for guidance on whether the Governing Board would view the Commission as having fulfilled its charge or whether, with additional research planned for 2013, the Commission should continue. Mr. Driscoll asked the Committee members for their comments and there was general agreement that the Commission should continue. It was noted that Commission Chair Musgrove and Vice Chair Greg Jones have indicated that it would be an honor to continue to serve if asked.

**It was moved that the NAEP 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Commission continue its work. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

### **3. Committee Issues and Challenges**

#### **Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM)**

Lou Fabrizio, COSDAM Chair, said the Committee will address two main topics at the August 2012 meeting: reporting on the 12<sup>th</sup> grade academic preparedness research and an action item that will be brought to the full Board to update and clarify the Governing Board policy on the Trial Urban District Assessment program. In open session, the Committee will receive a briefing on NCES plans to link NAEP and PISA. In closed session, ETS will brief the Committee on the results of the NAEP Mathematics Computer Based study, which examined the feasibility of computer-adaptive testing in NAEP and also provides data that may be useful as an indicator of student engagement in testing. There will also be a briefing on the status of NCES plans for an independent evaluation of the NAEP achievement levels.

#### **Assessment Development Committee (ADC)**

Alan Friedman, ADC Chair, said the Committee had conducted five conference calls since the May Board meeting to review approximately 500 assessment items and background questions. The Committee met in closed session on August 2, 2012 from 9:00 a.m. to about 3:30 p.m. to review and approve scenario tasks and discrete items for piloting for the 2014 Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) assessment at grade 8. After the item review was completed, the Committee went into open session to discuss reporting on the 12<sup>th</sup> grade academic preparedness research. On August 3, the Committee will meet in a joint session with the Reporting and Dissemination Committee to discuss the recommendations of the Expert Panel on NAEP Background Questions. Following the joint meeting, the Committee will meet in closed session to receive briefings on the Knowledge and Skills Appropriate Study and on the preliminary results of the pilot for the 2011 NAEP Grade 4 Computer-Based Writing Assessment.

#### **Reporting and Dissemination Committee (R & D)**

Eileen Weiser, R & D Chair, noted the plan for a joint meeting with ADC to discuss the recommendations of the Expert Panel on NAEP Background Questions. With respect to upcoming report release plans, two action items are expected—one for the Meaning Vocabulary Report and one for the Board's report on 12<sup>th</sup> grade academic preparedness research. In addition to the release plan for the preparedness research report, the Committee will discuss the content and approach to be taken in reporting on the preparedness research, a topic being addressed by COSDAM and ADC as well. The Committee will also receive briefings on the outcomes of the Science in Action report release, the projected schedule for upcoming reports, and the implementation of the policy on including students with disabilities and English-language learners in NAEP.

#### **Nominations Committee**

David Alukonis, Chair of the Nominations Committee, said that the incoming Committee members (for the Board term beginning on October 1, 2012) will attend the August 4, 2012 Nominations Committee meeting. He said that announcements are imminent on the Secretary's appointments for terms to begin on October 1, 2012. The slots being filled are

- Local School Board Member
- State School Board Member

- Testing and Measurement Specialist
- Non-Public School Administrator
- Republican Governor
- Republican State Legislator

Mr. Alukonis stated that the cycle for nominations for terms beginning October 1, 2013 is underway. The five openings are in the following Board categories:

- General Public Representative (2)
- Elementary School Principal
- Testing and Measurement Specialist
- State Legislator (Democrat)

#### **ACTION ITEM**

#### **4. Nomination of the Board Vice Chair for Election by the Board for the Term October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013**

The Secretary of Education appoints the Board Chair and the Governing Board elects its Vice Chair. The election of the Vice Chair occurs each August for the coming term—October 1 through the following September 30. At the May 2012 Board meeting, David Alukonis was appointed to handle the process of identifying a candidate for Vice Chair for nomination by the Executive Committee. He conferred first with Board members whose terms are ending, then with Executive Committee members, and then with the remaining Board members. He said that there was consistent support for one candidate. Then Mr. Alukonis moved that Susan Pimentel be nominated as the candidate for Vice Chair.

**The Executive Committee unanimously approved the nomination of Susan Pimentel and will present the nomination for action by the full Board during the August 4, 2012 plenary session.**

#### **5. Governing Board 25th Anniversary Planning**

Mary Crovo, Deputy Executive Director, said that possible dates for the Governing Board 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary commemoration are December 2013 or March 2014, and that the event would be conducted in connection with the Board quarterly meeting. She reviewed the planning process and agendas for the 10<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary commemorations. The 10<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary commemorations were planned, respectively, by committees composed of then-current and former Board members. Ms. Crovo said that there was interest in taking a different approach than had been taken in the earlier events, which had involved commissioned papers, a conference structure, and presentations. She said that the Chair would appoint a committee of current and former Board members to begin the planning process.

**6. Plans for an Executive Committee Retreat in September 2012**  
**Updating Governing Board Policy: Reviewing the Past, Looking to the Next 25 Years**

Chairman David Driscoll said that there is a “perfect storm” of events and issues that indicate a need for a day-long Executive Committee meeting to consider the long-range policy matters facing NAEP. These include, but are not limited to the loss of many veteran Board members over the last three years, the impact of the financial crisis on the NAEP budget, the debate on ESEA reauthorization, the need to revisit and review Board policies for NAEP, the attention to international assessments, the challenge to “make a difference” to help foster improved achievement and the closing of achievement gaps, and the 12<sup>th</sup> grade preparedness initiative. Mr. Driscoll proposed September 5, 6, or 7, 2012 as the date for the meeting and asked Committee members to let Ray Fields know their availability on those dates.

**7. Committee Discussion: NAEP and Common Core State Standards and Assessments**

Cornelia Orr, Executive Director, said that the Board and staff continue to receive questions about the relationship between NAEP and the Common Core State Standards and Assessments. The Governing Board began a discussion of this issue at the May 2012 meeting, where a challenge was made to Board members to develop a concise, one-page statement that could be used with the public. Ray Fields has prepared a discussion draft of such a document, incorporating ideas from the May 2012 Board discussion. Ms. Orr said that there would be a full Board discussion on this topic during the plenary session on August 4, 2012.

**8. Committee Discussion: Considerations in Assessing 8th and 12th Grade Civics and U.S. History at the State Level**

Cornelia Orr referred Committee members to the background information in the briefing materials related to the continuing congressional interest since 2004 for NAEP to conduct state-level assessments in civics and U.S. history. She said that the presentation at the May 2012 Board meeting on changes in demography suggest that it was never more important to measure and report on student knowledge about U.S. history and civics and that having state-level results could be beneficial in shining a light on achievement in these subject areas. She described the steps that have been taken since the Executive Committee authorized staff to explore the feasibility of obtaining external funding for this purpose during the Committee’s June 27, 2012 conference call. She also discussed the pros, cons and potential impediments of obtaining external funding, and in doing so in time to conduct state-level assessments in connection with the 2014 national assessments in civics and U.S. history. Ms. Orr said that firm commitments for funding would probably be needed by December 2012, to provide time for operational planning and for identifying potential volunteer states. She asked for the Committee’s guidance on whether state-level assessments in civics and U.S. history would be useful to conduct and whether staff should continue to identify options for non-federal funding. The Committee members’ discussion included the following points: that assessing civics and U.S. history is valuable to the nation; that a state-level pilot would be worthwhile to conduct if feasible financially; that staff should continue to identify options for funding and, if external funding is

sought, that it is essential to consider the source of that funding; that there may be resistance from the field to increased testing; and that using non-federal funds to carry out this pilot could be viewed as a precedent with unintended negative consequences for regular funding. Ms. Orr said that staff will follow this guidance and report on progress at the Executive Committee retreat and, if necessary, via a specially scheduled conference call.

## **9. Committee Discussion: Making a Difference and Parent Engagement**

Chairman Driscoll said the August 1, 2012 outreach meeting with parent leaders and representatives of parent organizations was candid and substantive. The individuals present were from both national and grass-roots local organizations from the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. The attendees were supportive and appreciative of the Board's efforts to reach parents. They viewed the NAEP data as a source of truth about student achievement, provided many useful suggestions for improving the parent pages on the Board website, and challenged the Governing Board to provide the data in ways that the attendees and their counterparts could use in a positive, productive way to challenge the status quo.

## **10. Status of FY 2013 Appropriation for NAEP and the Governing Board**

Ray Fields, Assistant Director for Policy and Research, said that preliminary action on the FY 2013 appropriation has been taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education. The House and Senate versions are different, which means that the NAEP and Governing Board appropriation levels would be subject to a conference committee resolution of the differences. The Senate bill provides the levels in the President's request: \$124.6 million for NAEP, a \$5 million reduction from FY 2012, and \$7.7 million for the Governing Board, a \$1 million reduction. The House bill provides funding at the FY 2012 levels: \$129.6 million for NAEP and \$8.7 million for the Governing Board. There has been public reporting of an agreement for a six-month Continuing Resolution through the end of March 2013, but the bill has not been drafted and the details about funding levels during the six-month period have not been made public.

## **11. NAEP Contracts, Budget and Schedule for 2013 and Beyond**

Cornelia Orr said that the NAEP schedule of assessments drives the budget. Accordingly, over the last year, the Governing Board has taken actions affecting the schedule when funding limitations required an adjustment. For example, the 4<sup>th</sup> grade writing assessment was postponed, new development of test questions for civics, geography and U.S. history was postponed, and the 8<sup>th</sup> grade science assessment was added to the NAEP schedule to permit a study to link NAEP and TIMSS in 2011. Ms. Orr said that no decision on the schedule is needed at the August 2012 Board meeting and that the 2013 assessments can go forward as planned. However, decisions on the schedule for 2014 and beyond are likely to be needed by the March 2013 Board meeting. Several factors add to the uncertainty about the decisions that will be needed. These factors include the NAEP funding levels for FY 2013 and beyond, the costs of

conducting the assessments under contracts that support NAEP operations that will be awarded over the next few months, and a pending administrative decision about NAEP printing costs.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David P. Driscoll, Chair

August 3, 2012  
Date

# **National Assessment Governing Board**

## **Partially Closed Session**

### **Report of August 3, 2012**

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of section 552b(C) of Title 5 U.S.C. the National Assessment Governing Board met in closed session on August 3, 2012 from 12:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. to receive a briefing on the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress Writing 2011 Computer Based Assessment.

Peggy Carr provided an overview of the writing assessment and reported that the national sample included 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students. The assessment was administered from January 2011 through March 2011 to a nationally representative sample of 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students. Results were reported as average scale scores and achievement levels. Ms. Carr noted that the results from the computer-based writing assessment cannot be compared to results from paper-and-pencil assessments.

The writing tasks measured students' ability to write on the computer for specific purposes and audiences. Ms. Carr provided an overview of the scoring and described the new components of the computer-based assessment.

Ms. Carr provided examples of writing tasks at grade 8 and 12 and she summarized the results by achievement levels, race, ethnicity, gender, family income, and parent education levels. Ms. Carr also highlighted student performance as it related to student background factors such their writing experience, use of the computer, use of the thesaurus, and use of the text-to-speech tool.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

---

David Driscoll, Chairman

August 4, 2012  
Date

# National Assessment Governing Board

## Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology

August 3, 2012

**COSDAM Attendees:** Lou Fabrizio (Chair), John Q. Easton (*Ex officio* member of the Governing Board and Director of the Institute of Education Sciences), Terry Holliday, Jim Popham, Andrew Porter, Leticia Van de Putte, and Fielding Rolston.

**Governing Board Staff:** Cornelia Orr, Susan Loomis, Ray Fields, and Michelle Blair.

**Other Attendees:** NCES: Associate Commissioner Peggy Carr, Gina Broxterman, Samantha Burg, Andrew Kolstad, and Taslima Rahman. AIR: George Bohrnstedt and Sharyn Rosenberg. CRP: Veleka Allen. Education Week: Catherine Gewertz. ETS: Steve Lazer and Andreas Oranje. Hager Sharp: Melissa Spade. HumRRO: Laress Wise. McGraw-Hill Education: Larry Snowwhite. MetaMetrics: Heather Koons. Optimal Solutions: Mark Partridge. Pearson: Connie Smith. Westat: Nancy Caldwell. Widmeyer: Nebyat Ejigu.

Lou Fabrizio, Chair of the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM), called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed members and guests. He noted that all members of the Committee were present at this meeting, with the exception of Governor Markell who has now resigned from the Governing Board.

### **Reporting Research for 12th Grade NAEP Preparedness Research: Validity Evidence for Reporting Preparedness on Reading and Mathematics NAEP**

Mr. Fabrizio noted that COSDAM has monitored the research for 12<sup>th</sup> grade preparedness for almost a decade now. After a few observations regarding the program of research, Mr. Fabrizio asked Governing Board Staff Susan Loomis and Ray Fields to lead the COSDAM discussion of the 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Reporting session. Susan Loomis provided a brief overview of the goals of the staff to be responsive to comments made by COSDAM and the full Board at the May 2012 meeting. The discussion at this August 2012 meeting should focus on the discussion questions included in the briefing materials distributed to the Board last week by Cornelia Orr. Mr. Fields noted that this report includes only a few sections of the report to let the Board see what we might want to say about the research. This partial report is intended to provide enough information to allow discussion of the questions posed to the Board.

The first discussion topic was audience. Staff attempted to shift the tone of the information reported in May and address the report more directly to a policy audience. Terry Holiday stated that the big question is whether the report provides convincing evidence to the public that “proficient” is now equated to college and career preparedness/readiness. He noted that Kentucky has tied the state proficient level to the ACT, Inc. college and career readiness standards. In Kentucky, Proficient is equivalent to college and career readiness. The Department of Defense equated ASVAB to the ACT for Kentucky. He emphasized that the audience for the report has to be state policy makers.

Andy Porter asked about the equivalence of college and career readiness. He noted that if the audience is largely states, then the Governing Board needs to know what states need and try to tailor our research and reporting to support their efforts. Otherwise, it will be difficult to be sure the state policy makers understand what the results mean.

Leticia Van de Putte noted that the business community in Texas wants results that are useful: What does it mean? She understands that part of the work of the Governing Board is to provide a rationale for why this preparedness research really matters. She notes that we have an unparalleled opportunity to show that it *does* matter. First, we have to know that we have it right—that the results are accurate. Then we need to show why it matters. She noted that the business community wants a workforce that can be trained—that has critical thinking skills. The importance of preparedness is not only with respect to having a qualified workforce, however; it is also important for producing consumers of products. Wage earners are needed for consumers of goods and services that businesses want to produce. She notes that if states can show that they have high levels of 12<sup>th</sup> grade students who are prepared for college and job training, they will attract new businesses. NAEP results can have an important impact, even without individual student preparedness scores to report. Having aggregate data for the states about the proportion of students that are prepared for college and job training and the level of preparedness they exhibit is a powerful factor for the future economy of states. The “preparedness” attribute is a stronger attraction than tax breaks as an influencing factor on locational decisions of businesses.

Mr. Holiday noted that the report needs to play-up the point that preparedness for college and career are *not* the same. This is an important finding, and it is contrary to what some others are reporting. It is important to get this message out to states so they do not just accept this and expect to find that prepared for college and career are the same. Kentucky has found that preparedness for college and career are not at the same performance level.

Mr. Fabrizio observed that there is currently no mention in the report of how the NAEP definition of preparedness and the research for NAEP differs from other studies. This is important to avoid misinterpretation of the NAEP results relative to the findings of other studies.

Mr. Fields asked COSDAM to comment on the tone of the report. Does it seem objective?

Tone was not a concern for Jim Popham, he was not sure that tone really matters. What matters, he said, is that the test results be actionable. We need to be sure that we get people involved in reviewing the results to answer whether the research findings matter. *Can* we answer the question of what the results mean and how the results matter?

Mr. Holiday said that he thinks the answer to *why* the results matter is that state leaders need data to show how their levels—proficient and college-career readiness levels—compare to the national level and to one another. States need some way to compare their results. Having the NAEP preparedness data will give states more information for judging whether their new college and career standards are reasonable. The new standard that states will have to set for proficient with the Common Core State Standards will be much higher than in the past, and the NAEP preparedness data will help states to see that the new levels are more in line with objective performance requirements.

Ms. Van de Putte said that we need to make states want to want to do this. We have to show them the data and then they will figure out how to use it. We can only give them evidence—we cannot make them use it. States have to be made to understand the data, and they will find how to use it.

### **Trial Urban District Assessment Policy Modifications (ACTION ITEM)**

These changes clarify eligibility requirements and bring the policy in line with current practice. COSDAM reviewed these modifications in May 2012. Mr. Fields noted that a few very minor modifications were made after the May 2012 meeting, and those were highlighted in yellow.

Two districts (one for Texas and one for North Carolina) would be added to the list of eligible districts as a result of the proposed modifications. Lou Fabrizio and Leticia Van de Putte recused themselves for the vote on this item, and Tonya Miles chaired the committee discussion.

Mr. Porter recommended that the name of the central city/metropolitan region be included in the list of eligible districts, along with the school district name, so that identification of the “urban district” would be more evident.

Discussion clarified that this is a list of eligible districts, and not a list of districts that will actually participate in TUDA. The discussion also revealed the potential need for a policy to prioritize district participation in the event that funding falls so short that all eligible districts that wish to participate cannot be included.

Ms. Miles noted the need for deletion of one duplicate word on page 2.

Mr. Porter moved, and Fielding Rolston seconded, the motion for approval of the TUDA policy modifications. COSDAM unanimously approved the modifications, and the record shows that Ms. Van de Putte and Mr. Fabrizio were present, but not voting on this action item.

**ACTION:** COSDAM recommends approval by the Board of the modifications to the TUDA policy, as include in Attachment A of the August 2012 COSDAM materials.

### **Linking NAEP and PISA**

The Governing Board had urged the National Center for Education Statistics to develop a research plan for linking NAEP with the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). Taslima Rahman of NCES presented details of the study design for linking NAEP and PISA. The technical challenge of linking NAEP and PISA is rather large due to the differences in assessment programs: when in the school year the assessments are administered, the amount of time for testing, the reporting scale, accommodations (not offered in PISA), and achievement/performance levels. The study design was especially impacted by the fact that PISA assesses students in age groups (15-year olds will be in this study) and NAEP assesses students by grade (both students in grades 8 and 12 will be used in this study). The study will be for mathematics. Both a national sample and state samples will be included, and some students in grades 9, 10, and 11 will be sampled, in addition to the larger NAEP samples for grades 8 and 12. The design includes administration of grade 8 NAEP only, grade 12 NAEP only, and a “braided” booklet including both grades 8 and 12.

Mr. Popham expressed concerns about the need to explain what the results of the linking study mean. Mr. Porter followed-up that point by asking for an example of statement that could be made as a result of the study that cannot now be made. Mr. Porter anticipated that extensive

“corrections” and caveats will be needed to explain the meaning of the study results and provide for appropriate interpretations of findings. Peggy Carr noted that there will also be concern regarding the likelihood of large error bands around the state and national comparisons.

**CLOSED SESSION 11:25 a.m. –11:50 a.m.**

**COSDAM Attendees:** Lou Fabrizio (Chair), John Q. Easton (*Ex officio* member of the Governing Board and Director of the Institute of Education Sciences), Terry Holliday, Jim Popham, Andy Porter, Leticia Van de Putte, and Fielding Rolston.

**Governing Board Staff:** Susan Loomis and Michelle Blair

**Other Attendees:** NCES Associate Commissioner Peggy Carr.

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology met in closed session on August 3, 2012 from 11:25 a.m. to 11:50 a.m. in order to discuss plans by NCES to issue a procurement for the purpose of evaluating NAEP achievement levels.

**Independent Evaluation of NAEP Achievement Levels**

Peggy Carr presented plans to COSDAM for an evaluation of NAEP achievement levels. Note that only NCES staff were allowed to participate with COSDAM and Governing Board staff for this closed session because it involves details regarding a procurement that has already been announced.

At the beginning of his appointment, NCES Commissioner Buckley announced his intention to have this evaluation to determine if the "warning" about the trial basis of achievement levels could be removed from the NAEP Report Cards. Ms. Carr noted that the plan is to issue the procurement for open and competitive bidding, rather than as a sole source procurement. The Department of Education’s contracts office must make the final determination regarding this, however.

Ms. Carr noted that the reliability and validity of achievement levels would be the focus of the evaluation. Mr. Porter asked for an example of external validity that could be collected for NAEP achievement levels. Mr. Popham urged that “validity” be replaced by “defensibility.”

Mr. Porter noted that it will be very difficult to collect information to evaluate achievement levels and very hard to evaluate the information. He suggested that NCES re-think the scope of work for this because he did not feel that the current plan would successfully accomplish the purpose of the evaluation.

**CLOSED SESSION 11:50 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

**COSDAM Attendees:** Lou Fabrizio (Chair), John Q. Easton (*Ex officio* member of the Governing Board and Director of the Institute of Education Sciences), Terry Holliday, Jim Popham, Andy Porter, Leticia Van de Putte, and Fielding Rolston.

**Governing Board Staff:** Susan Loomis

**Other Attendees:** NCES: Samantha Burg, Andrew Kolstad and Taslima Rahman. AIR: George Bohrstedt and Sharyn Rosenberg. ETS: Steve Lazer and Andreas Oranje. Hager Sharp: Melissa Spade. HumRRO: Laurie Wise. Pearson: Connie Smith. Westat: Nancy Caldwell.

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology met in closed session on August 3, 2012 from 11:50 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in order to discuss information regarding a report including secure data and results of research conducted to explore using student response time in a computer based assessment as an indicator of student engagement.

**Multi-Stage Adaptive Field Trial: Response Time Indicators of Engagement**

The final presentation was by Andreas Oranje about the research for computer based NAEP assessments to determine if reliable estimates of student engagement can be captured from data on response time. Some information about this research strategy was presented to COSDAM and the Governing Board last year by Steven Wise, and his presentation showed the potential for how the computer based assessments in NAEP can be used to provide indications of student engagement.

The multi-stage adaptive field trial study results show little indication of “disengagement” by the 8<sup>th</sup> graders in the study. Additional research with 12<sup>th</sup> grade NAEP will be helpful.

Additionally, this methodology helps to more accurately sort “missing data” for coding as “omitted” responses and “not reached” items. Overall, the results showed an increase in the estimate of overall test difficulty, but there was no impact on the overall performance score on the assessment.

Mr. Popham described this as a “tremendous study.” He had praise for the great research design and implementation and for the fact that this research was a common sense approach to answer an important question.

Mr. Porter noted that this model is a very constrained model and that we can anticipate even more exciting measurement advances as NAEP pushes forward with research in computer adaptive testing.

Tonya Miles expressed some concerns about the use of computer adaptive testing in NAEP, especially about the response time assumptions about student behaviors.

Mr. Porter noted that more precise measurement of student ability, especially the lowest ability levels, is advanced with the use of adaptive testing. This benefits NAEP assessments in Puerto Rico, for example.

In closing, Mr. Fabrizio noted that this is the last meeting of COSDAM for both Andy Porter and Susan Loomis. He thanked Mr. Porter and Ms. Loomis for their service to COSDAM and the Governing Board.

The August 2012 meeting of COSDAM was adjourned at 12:30 PM.

I certify the accuracy of this report.

*Louis M. Fabrizio*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lou Fabrizio, Chair

August 20, 2012

Date

# National Assessment Governing Board

## Reporting and Dissemination Committee

### Report of August 3, 2012

**Attendees:** Committee Members – Chair Eileen Weiser, Andres Alonso, David Alukonis, Anitere Flores, Sonny Perdue, and Mary Frances Taymans; Assessment Development Committee Members – Chair Alan Friedman, Shannon Garrison, Brent Houston, Hector Ibarra, Dale Nowlin, Susan Pimentel, and Cary Sneider; Governing Board Staff – Executive Director Cornelia Orr, Mary Crovo, Larry Feinberg, and Stephaan Harris; NCES – Associate Commissioner Peggy Carr, James Deaton, Angela Glymph, Arnold Goldstein, Holly Spurlock, Bill Ward, and Brenda Wolff; ETS – Amy Dresher, Rebecca Moran, Mary Pitoniak, and Greg Vafis; Westat – Lauren Byrne and Keith Rust; Reingold Communications – Valerie Marrapodi and Erin Fenn; HagerSharp Communications–Joanne Lim and Debra Silimeo; Widmeyer Communications – Jacqui Lipson; HUMRRO – Wade Buckland and Steve Sellman; AIR – Kim Gattis, Cadelle Hemphill, and Sharyn Rosenberg ; Pearson – Brad Thayer; Optimal Solutions – Erin Twamley; Fulcrum IT – Jud Cole, Scott Ferguson, and Lon Rokus; CRP – Jasmine Fletcher and Sondra M. Gaines; CCSSO – Kirsten Taylor; DDED – Sofia Espailat; and Consultant – Alan Ginsburg

#### **1. NAEP Background Questions [Joint Meeting with Assessment Development Committee]**

The Reporting and Dissemination Committee met with members of the Assessment Development Committee to continue the Board’s review of the expert panel report on improving NAEP background questions and making better use of the contextual information they provide. The report, entitled, *NAEP Background Questions: An Underused National Resource*, was presented to the Board in March 2012.

Members of both committees expressed strong support for the expert panel’s central recommendation that use of contextual data based on background questionnaires should be increased in NAEP reporting, both in report cards for test results and in special focused reports on specific topics of interest. Sister Mary Frances Taymans, the vice chair of the Board, said providing greater context would improve public understanding of the academic results and permit more valid comparisons. Alan Friedman, chair of the Assessment Development Committee, said he hoped background questions would be treated with the same seriousness as the academic data NAEP collects. He said background information can be valuable in seeding important discussion and future research. Member Sonny Perdue said NAEP reporting would be greatly enriched by providing information on life experiences that affect children’s learning both in and out of school.

Member Andres Alonso said the contextual data provide a very powerful framework for interpreting achievement results and offer avenues for understanding how schools might go about their work. Although NAEP cannot support strong cause-and-effect conclusions, its background information can enrich the conversation about policy alternatives. Several members said it would be important to present data that is relevant to important policy issues without assuming the stance of policy advocate. Member Cary Sneider supported adding a tool for regression analysis to the NAEP Data Explorer.

The committees reviewed staff discussion questions and supported most of the specific recommendations in the expert panel report. However, rather than creating a single permanent Board committee responsible for both core and subject-specific background items, as the panel recommended, members indicated support for an ad hoc committee to serve for one year. This group would monitor implementation of the resolution, review the 2003 NAEP Background Information Framework, and recommend a permanent arrangement for Board consideration of background questions and the reporting of contextual data.

**ACTION: After further discussion, the Committees voted unanimously to recommend Governing Board adoption of the Policy Statement on NAEP Background Questions and the Use of Contextual Data in NAEP Reports, subject of further slight changes approved by the Committee chairs. The resolution is appended as Attachment A to this report.**

## **2. Review of Recent NAEP Release: Science in Action**

Stephaan Harris, of the NAGB staff, reviewed the June 19 release of the NAEP Science in Action Report: Hands-On and Interactive Computer Tasks from the 2009 Science Assessment. A total of 226 persons attended in-person or via webcast, more than the audience for the Science 2009 and 2011 releases, and double the Science 2009 TUDA release audience. The report received considerable coverage in both traditional and social media even though it had no trend information. Valerie Marrapodi, of Reingold Communications, said 17 original stories appeared in print and online during the 24 hours after release. The stories by CNN and Associated Press received an additional 199 online placements.

## **3. Projected Schedule for Future NAEP Reports**

Angela Glymph, of the NCES staff, provided the Committee with a listing of NAEP reports scheduled for release during the remainder of 2012. The major reports and projected months of release were:

- 2011 Writing Report Card in August
- 2011 Reading Vocabulary Report in October
- 2011 Mega-States and 2005 Math Course Content Analysis in November.

The report linking 8th grade NAEP in mathematics and Science to the 2011 Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), which had been scheduled for release in

December with the international TIMSS release, may be delayed. Arnold Goldstein, of the NCES staff, said the Mega-States report on the nation's five largest states had been postponed because of other release priorities and a redesign that includes new online data displays with interactive graphics. He said new model pages and graphics would be submitted shortly for Board review with an intended release in November.

#### **4. Release Plan for NAEP 2011 Reading Vocabulary Report**

The Committee reviewed the online webinar release plan prepared by Governing Board staff for the October 2012 release of the NAEP 2011 Reading Vocabulary Report. Mr. Harris said the release would be preceded by an embargoed briefing or mailing to Congressional staff, depending on interest. Embargoed access would be offered to news media and to representatives of state education departments and governors through the Council of Chief State Officers and the National Governors Association. There would be a post-release stakeholder event. The Board website will have an interactive release page with audio-visual components for the press release, statements, and other materials.

**ACTION: The Committee approved the proposed release plan for the NAEP 2011 Reading Vocabulary Report, as appended in Attachment B to this report, and recommended its adoption by the Governing Board.**

#### **5. Governing Board Reporting on 12th Grade Preparedness**

The Committee reviewed materials provided by staff on the proposed reporting of Governing Board research on the preparedness of 12th graders for college and job training. The materials included draft outlines for a policy report with research summaries and findings aimed at a broad policy audience, and for an online-only technical report with the full texts of all research studies.

Also included for Board feedback were initial drafts of three key chapters of the policy report: brief summaries of the research conducted so far, including the 2009 NAEP-SAT linking study; a section with alternatives for placing preparedness reference points on the NAEP scale; and a discussion of whether the Proficient achievement level might be a reasonable standard for reporting college preparedness. The report would be termed a progress report and include research plans for the 2013 NAEP. Based on the Board discussion in May 2012, the report has been reconceptualized. Because not enough evidence has been assembled to date, there will be no firm conclusions about preparedness reference points and no extended presentation of the percentage of students reaching them.

Continued research plans call for a 2013 NAEP-ACT linkage study and efforts to link NAEP with ASVAB, the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery, which has extensive research data relating test scores with success in military occupations (many with civilian counterparts).

Committee members felt that the evidence gathered so far by the Board’s research is limited and incomplete; it would be unwise to issue a report for policy-makers until clear findings can be reported. Issuing a weak report this fall could cause the public to conclude that preparedness cut scores cannot be developed and undercut the impact of a much stronger report with additional evidence on preparedness from the 2013 NAEP.

The Committee felt, however, that all completed research studies should be released. These would show the important questions being addressed and may be helpful to others involved with the same issues, such as the Common Core assessment consortiums and state education departments. Staff should consider releasing this information in mid-November or December 2012 without a release event. The Committee decided not to approve the release plan proposed by staff for the release to serve as a culminating 12th Grade Preparedness Commission symposium at which the final report of the preparedness research is shared with key stakeholders and the media.

Member David Alukonis suggested that, depending on its development, a report for the general public on the 12th grade preparedness research might be timed for release at the Board's 25th anniversary event, expected in December 2013 or March 2014.

Members agreed to the following:

**Any policy or general public report on 12th grade preparedness—and attendant release activities and promotion—should be delayed until further research is conducted based on the 2013 NAEP.**

**Completed research studies should be released as a package on the Internet, accompanied by brief summaries of their methodology and key findings without a public event by the Board or its 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Preparedness Commission. The release should be accompanied by a statement on the status of the Board’s preparedness research and future plans.**

## **6. Implementation of Policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners**

In March 2010, after work by an ad hoc committee and extensive public input, the Governing Board adopted a new policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities (SD) and English Language Learners (ELL). The policy was based on recommendations by two expert panels and aimed to increase participation and reduce the variations in exclusion rates among the states and urban districts in NAEP.

Keith Rust, of Westat, the sampling and data collection contractor for NAEP, briefed the Committee on problems that may arise in implementing the policy and decisions made by NCES for the 2013 NAEP administration.

Under the policy, the only students that schools may exclude from NAEP are those with the most significant cognitive disabilities and English language learners who have

been in United States schools for less than one year. Where accommodations are permitted on state tests but not on NAEP—most frequently read-aloud for reading and calculators for all sections of math—students are to be urged to take NAEP without them, but may use NAEP-allowable accommodations as needed.

By law, student participation in NAEP is voluntary. Under the new policy students refusing to take NAEP because a particular accommodation is not allowed will be classified as refusals rather than exclusions. A score would be imputed for them, according to NAEP analysis procedures, that is the same as that of students with similar characteristics who took the exam. On the other hand, no scores are imputed for excluded students, which tends to raise state and district averages since non-SD students score higher on average than those with disabilities.

Mr. Rust said NCES is concerned that there may be a large increase in student and parent refusals in the 2013 NAEP because of the new policy. He presented a worst-case scenario, using 2011 data, under which all students excluded because NAEP did not offer an accommodation given on state tests became refusals. Although differences were slight for most states and districts, the additional refusals lowered the reported averages by 2 to 4 points in about a half dozen cases. The changes would be much greater in NAEP reading than in math.

Mr. Rust said NCES has decided that in 2013, contrary to the new policy, a school as well as a parent or student may decide not have a student tested by NAEP because of non-allowable accommodations. These students will be treated as exclusions in order not to disrupt trend. Data will be collected on whether schools, parents, or students made the decision, and will be used to evaluate whether to treat similar students as exclusions or refusals in the future.

Several Board members and staff asked clarifying questions.

## **7. Information Item**

The briefing materials for the Committee contain information from NCES on plans for testing and reporting on Puerto Rico in 2013. There will a presentation and discussion of this item at the next Committee meeting in December 2012.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Eileen Weiser, Chair

---

8-24-12

Date

## **Policy Statement on NAEP Background Questions and the Use of Contextual Data in NAEP Reporting**

### **INTRODUCTION**

By statute, the purpose of the National Assessment of Educational Progress is to provide a “fair and accurate” measure of student achievement and achievement trends. Academic or cognitive questions are its primary focus; the American public is its primary audience. However, in addition to reporting on what American students know and can do, NAEP has collected data for more than 40 years that provide a context for reporting and interpreting achievement results. According to the statute, such factors, both in and out of school, must be “directly related to the appraisal of academic achievement.”

In each assessment NAEP administers background questionnaires for students, their teachers, and schools. The questionnaires deal with educational experiences and other factors, such as teacher training or out-of-school learning activities, that are related to academic achievement. Data on several hundred background or noncognitive variables are available on the Internet through the NAEP Data Explorer. However, for more than a decade, little use has been made of this information in NAEP reports. The data have received minimal attention and had little impact despite the considerable efforts expended in developing and approving questionnaires and collecting and tabulating responses.

In October 2011 the National Assessment Governing Board convened an expert panel to recommend how to make better use of existing NAEP background questions and to propose an analytic agenda for additional topics and questions that would be useful in developing education policy and of value to the public. The panel report, entitled, *NAEP Background Questions: An Underused National Resource*, was presented to the Board in March 2012 by Marshall Smith, former U.S. Under Secretary of Education, who chaired the six-member panel.

Many of the panel recommendations build on the *Background Information Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress*, adopted by the Governing Board after it received final authority from Congress over non-cognitive items on the assessment. The framework was adopted in 2003, but has not been fully implemented.

The following policies are based on recommendations by the expert panel. The Board has also taken into consideration a wide range of public comment and the analysis provided by the National Center for Education Statistics.

It is important to understand that the National Assessment is not designed to show cause-and-effect relationships. Its data should not be used to “prove” what schools should do. But, as the *Background Information Framework* declares, NAEP’s “descriptions of the educational circumstances of students..., considered in light of research from other sources, may provide important information for public discussion and policy action.” The Board believes the National Assessment should improve upon its efforts to collect contextual information and present it clearly to the public, which will add to NAEP’s value to the nation.

## **POLICY PRINCIPLES**

1. NAEP reporting should be enriched by greater use of contextual data derived from background or non-cognitive questions asked of students, teachers, and schools. Such data will be used both in regular Report Cards and in special focused reports.
2. Reporting of background data will describe patterns and trends, including the educational experiences of different groups of students. Care should be taken not to suggest causation.
3. Detailed frameworks will be published with the theoretical rationale and research evidence that support the selection of topics and questions in background questionnaires and their connection to student achievement. Such frameworks should be updated for each assessment cycle and provide the basis for new topics and questions.
4. An ad hoc committee of the Board will be established for one year to monitor implementation of this resolution, review the *NAEP Background Information Framework*, and recommend a permanent arrangement for Board consideration of background questions and the reporting of contextual data in NAEP.

## **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES**

### ***For Questions and Questionnaires***

1. Clusters of questions will be developed on important topics of continuing interest, such as student motivation and control over the environment, use of technology, and out-of-school learning, which could be used regularly or rotated across assessment cycles.
2. Modules will be prepared for special one-time studies to provide descriptive information on issues of current policy interest.
- 3.
4. A thorough review will be conducted to eliminate duplicative or low-priority questions. Unproductive topics and questions will be dropped.

5. NAEP will include background questions from international assessments, such as PISA and TIMSS, to obtain direct comparisons of states and TUDA districts to educational practices in other countries.
6. Because of the value of preserving trends, consistent wording of questions should be maintained on topics of continuing interest. Changes in wording must be justified. However, as practices and circumstances change, new questions will be introduced in a timely manner to gather data on topics of current interest.
7. The development and use of improved measures of socio-economic status (SES) will be accelerated, including further exploration of an SES index for NAEP reporting.

### ***For Data Collection***

7. The maximum time for students to answer the background questionnaire will be increased from 10 to 15 minutes on new computer-based assessments. Consideration should be given to a similar increase in paper-and-pencil assessments.
8. Whenever feasible, assessment samples should be divided (spiral sampling) and background questions rotated in different years in order to cover more topics without increasing respondent burden. These practices will be initiated in the assessments of reading and mathematics, which are conducted frequently, and considered for other subject areas if the frequency of testing permits.

### ***For Reporting***

9. Special focused reports with data through the 2013 assessment will be issued on the following topics: private schools, charter schools, gender gaps, and black male students. Reports shall include significant contextual information as well as cognitive results. Advisory committees, composed of a range of knowledgeable persons, may be appointed to provide input on reporting issues.
10. Exploratory analyses will be carried out to determine if existing background questions may form the basis for additional focused reports. Such reports may be issued by the Governing Board as well as by the National Center for Education Statistics.
11. The NAEP Data Explorer should be further improved to make data more accessible to general, non-specialist users. Tables and very simple-to-construct charts will be prepared to present data on important topics of wide public interest. Additional means of disseminating information, using new technology such as simple apps that would allow parents, teachers, and others to access background and achievement data, will be explored.

**NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD  
RELEASE PLAN FOR  
NAEP MEANING VOCABULARY 2011 REPORT**

**The Nation's Report Card in Meaning Vocabulary 2009 and 2011**

The Nation's Report Card in Meaning Vocabulary 2009 and 2011 will be released to the general public during October 2012. Following a review and approval of the report's results, the release will be arranged as an online webinar. The release event will include a data presentation by the Commissioner of Education Statistics, with moderation and comments by at least one member of the National Assessment Governing Board. Full accompanying data will be posted on the Internet at the scheduled time of release.

With the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading Framework, NAEP introduced a more systematic assessment of vocabulary, in which students were tested on their ability to use words to comprehend the sentence or paragraph in which the word occurs. These meaning vocabulary questions measure students' ability to apply word knowledge to develop and interpret meaning. This Report Card explains the new focus on meaning vocabulary and how it fits with the comprehension assessment and illustrates what students were asked to do with specific examples. It also shows the relationship of performance on meaning vocabulary to performance on reading comprehension.

Results are presented for all three grades, for the nation and the states, and for student groups including gender and race/ethnicity and span two years – 2009 and 2011. Vocabulary results for 2009 are based on nationally representative samples of 178,800 fourth-graders, 160,900 eighth-graders, and 51,700 twelfth-graders. Results for 2011 are based on samples of 213,100 fourth-graders and 168,200 eighth-graders. (There was no twelfth-grade assessment in 2011.)

**DATE AND LOCATION**

The release event for the media and the public will occur in October 2012. The exact date and location will be determined by the Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee, in accordance with Governing Board policy, following acceptance of the final report.

**EVENT FORMAT**

- Introductions and opening statement by a National Assessment Governing Board member
- Data presentation by the Commissioner of Education Statistics

- Comments by at least one Governing Board member
- Questions from members of the press and then the general audience
- Program will last approximately 60 minutes
- Event will be broadcast live over the Internet, and viewers will be able to submit questions electronically for panelists. An archived version of the webinar, with closed captioning, will be posted on the Governing Board website.

## **EMBARGOED ACTIVITIES BEFORE RELEASE**

In the days preceding the release, the Governing Board and NCES will offer embargoed briefings or mailings to U.S. Congressional staff in Washington, DC. Representatives of governors, state education agencies, and appropriate media will have access to a special website with embargoed data after signing the Governing Board's embargo agreement.

## **REPORT RELEASE**

The Commissioner of Education Statistics will publicly release the report at the NAEP website—<http://nationsreportcard.gov>—at the scheduled time of the release event. An online copy of the report, along with data tools, questions, and various other resources, will be available at the time of release on the NAEP site. An interactive version of the release with panelists' statements, a Governing Board press release, publications and related materials will be posted on the Board's web site at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org). The site will also feature links to social networking sites, key graphics, and audio and/or video material related to the event.

## **ACTIVITIES AFTER THE RELEASE**

The Governing Board's communications contractor, Reingold, will work with Board staff to coordinate an in-person or online event designed to extend the life of the NAEP Meaning Vocabulary results by featuring current topics that would be of great interest and relevance to stakeholders with an interest in student achievement in reading and vocabulary. The event would be designed for organizations, officials, and individuals in the fields of education and policy whose work involves reading education and assessment.

# **National Assessment Governing Board**

## **Assessment Development Committee**

### **Report of August 2-3, 2012**

**August 2, 2012**

**Closed Session**

**9:00 am – 3:30 p.m.**

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) met in closed session on August 2, 2012 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

**Attendees:** ADC – Alan Friedman (Chair), Susan Pimentel (Vice Chair), Shannon Garrison, Brent Houston, Hector Ibarra, Dale Nowlin, Cary Sneider; Governing Board Staff – Mary Crovo, Michelle Blair; NCES – Bill Ward, Elvira Germino Hausken; AIR – Kim Gattis, Yan Wang; ETS – Greg Vafis, Lonnie Smith; HumRRO – Steve Sellman; Optimal Solutions – Mark Patridge, Erin Twamley; Fulcrum IT – Jud Cole, Lori Rokus, Scott Ferguson.

#### **Review of Secure NAEP TEL Tasks and Items**

The Assessment Development Committee (ADC) met in closed session to review 21 computer-based tasks and 175 discrete items for the NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) pilot test in 2013. The pilot test will be conducted in grade 8 in preparation for the 2014 national TEL assessment in that same grade.

This meeting marked the final opportunity for ADC members to review the 21 complex TEL tasks prior to the 2013 pilot test. Beginning in 2010 the ADC reviewed outlines of task concepts, and subsequently in 2011 they reviewed preliminary computer-based renditions of the tasks. In several Board meetings the ADC reviewed fully developed tasks with complete graphics and functionality. At its May 2012 meeting, the ADC had provided extensive comments on the TEL tasks. At this August review ADC members commented on the many improvements to the tasks and felt the tasks would be very engaging to students.

Members also commented that the tasks represent an excellent assessment of the complex skills outlined in the TEL Framework in the three content areas: design and systems; technology and society; and information and communication technology. The ADC also noted that the computer-based review of the tasks went very smoothly and commended NCES and NAEP contractors for improvements in facilitating the online, secure materials for ADC reviewers. During the ADC's discussion of the 21 tasks, members noted areas for fine-tuning of the graphics, items, and scoring rubrics on some of the tasks.

Following review of the TEL tasks, the ADC discussed the 175 discrete TEL items which they saw for the first time. Some of these items contained animated graphics, while other items were more traditional multiple choice or short answer questions. ADC members had extensive comments on the discrete items such as noting when the item did not accurately measure the targeted objective in the TEL Framework. Other comments related to distracters in multiple choice items and scoring rubrics for constructed response items.

ADC action on the TEL tasks and items was taken in open session on August 3, 2012.

**August 2, 2012                      Open Session                      3:30 – 4:00 p.m.**

**Attendees:** ADC – Alan Friedman (Chair), Susan Pimentel (Vice Chair), Shannon Garrison, Brent Houston, Hector Ibarra, Dale Nowlin, Cary Sneider; Other Governing Board Members – Eileen Weiser; Governing Board Staff – Mary Crovo, Michelle Blair, Cornelia Orr, Larry Feinberg, Ray Fields; NCES – Bill Ward, Elvira Germino Hausken; Widmeyer Communications – Jacqui Lipson, Neby Ejigu; AIR – Kim Gattis; ETS – Greg Vafis; HumRRO – Steve Sellman; Optimal Solutions – Mark Patridge; Fulcrum IT – Jud Cole, Lori Rokus, Scott Ferguson.

**Discussion of NAEP Preparedness Reporting**

In open session the ADC discussed draft materials on preparedness and strategies for reporting on the Board’s program of 12<sup>th</sup> grade preparedness research. This discussion was intended to carefully examine the draft materials developed thus far, and to obtain ADC members’ response to the materials and reporting strategies in advance of the full Board preparedness session scheduled for August 4, 2012.

ADC members expressed concerns that the draft preparedness report chapters did not clearly communicate the nature of the research studies and the key findings. It was noted that the material seems to be written for researchers. For example, the draft contains too much jargon that will not be well understood by the intended audience of policymakers. Members raised the following question: since we do not have definitive findings from the 2009 research studies, is it worthwhile to release this policy report now? They concluded that the research to date did not result in solid evidence on using NAEP to report on the preparedness of 12<sup>th</sup> graders for college and job training. The ADC expressed serious doubt about the usefulness of releasing an interim preparedness report at this time.

ADC members felt strongly that the preparedness research findings to date do not conform to the Board’s rigorous, “gold standard” level of work. Members also stated that given the inconclusive nature of this report, it may be misused and misinterpreted. In addition, reporting at this time may detract from the Board’s ongoing program of preparedness research, as well as future reporting in this area.

ADC Chair Alan Friedman thanked the members for their comments and noted that he will present the ADC's views at the full Board discussion of preparedness scheduled for August 4, 2012.

**August 3, 2012                      Joint Open Session                      10:00 – 11:00 a.m.**

**Joint Meeting of the Assessment Development Committee and the Reporting and Dissemination Committee**

ADC members met with the R&D Committee to discuss the Expert Panel Report on NAEP Background Questions. A summary of this session is included in the Reporting and Dissemination Committee report.

**August 3, 2012                      Open Session                      10:55 – 11:00 a.m.**

In open session the ADC took the following action based on the TEL task and item review conducted on August 2, 2012.

**ACTION: The Assessment Development Committee approves the tasks and discrete items for the 2013 Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) pilot test to be conducted at grade 8, with changes in the tasks and items to be communicated in writing to NCES.**

**August 3, 2012                      Closed Session                      11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) met in closed session on August 3, 2012 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m..

**Attendees:** ADC – Alan Friedman (Chair), Susan Pimentel (Vice Chair), Shannon Garrison, Doris Hicks, Brent Houston, Hector Ibarra, Dale Nowlin, Cary Sneider; Governing Board Staff – Mary Crovo; NCES – Suzanne Triplett, Holly Spurlock, Bobbi Woods; AIR – Kim Gattis; ETS – Rebecca Moran, Greg Vafis; Fulcrum IT – Scott Ferguson, Lori Rokus, Jud Cole; HumRRO – Wanda Buckland; CCSSO – Kirsten Taylor; Hager Sharp – Joanne Lim; Pearson – Brad Thayer.

**NAEP Mathematics Special Study: Knowledge and Skills Appropriate Study (KaSA)**

Rebecca Moran of ETS briefed the ADC on the KaSA special study in mathematics. During the briefing Ms. Moran presented the goals and purpose of the study, secure

KaSA test questions, embargoed student performance results, and implications for future use of the KaSA model.

The KaSA study was undertaken to expand the range of item difficulty since the main NAEP assessment does not measure well at the lower end of the score distribution and is not well aligned with the performance of students in Puerto Rico. Ms. Moran noted that the purpose of the study was to measure low performing groups with reasonable accuracy and to enable the reporting of Puerto Rico results on the NAEP scale. She also explained that the desire to better measure low performing groups with NAEP assessments is a more general goal, beyond Puerto Rico, and that KaSA items would be added to the full existing range of items to improve the assessment's overall measuring abilities. It was noted that adding KaSA items would not alter the overall difficulty of the NAEP mathematics assessment.

As part of the study, KaSA items were developed to address a targeted subset of the NAEP Mathematics Framework, based on the appropriateness of subtopics and objectives. The KaSA items were then translated into Puerto Rican Spanish for administration to a representative sample of public school students in Puerto Rico in 2011 at grades 4 and 8.

ADC members discussed the KaSA items presented during the briefing and noted the performance of students in the national sample and the Puerto Rico sample. Members raised questions about the policy implications for NAEP in assessing Puerto Rican students in the future. In addition, ADC members asked about ways NAEP could report in more detail so that future assessment results from Puerto Rico could be more meaningful to parents, teachers, and policymakers. Finally, the ADC comments on potential uses of the KaSA methodology combined with computer-adaptive testing for the overall NAEP sample to provide the most helpful information on student performance across the spectrum.

### **2012 Grade 4 Computer-Based Writing Pilot: Preliminary Results and Lessons Learned**

Holly Spurlock of NCEP provided an embargoed briefing on preliminary results of the large-scale pilot conducted at grade 4 in 2012. These results represent the first national-level computer-based writing assessment of 4<sup>th</sup> graders anywhere in the U.S.

Ms. Spurlock reported that more than 500 schools and 13,000 students participated in the computer-based writing pilot. The goal of the study was to determine whether 4<sup>th</sup> graders could demonstrate their writing skills on 30-minute computer-based tasks. Students used laptops provided by NAEP and wrote their responses using a word processor developed specifically for the NAEP assessment.

The study examined student engagement, performance on different types of writing tasks, use of word processing tools, and other variables. For example, students could use

commonly available tools such as cut and paste, copy, bold, and a thesaurus, among other tools. Many accommodations for students with disabilities and English language learners were provided directly on the computer platform including text to speech and enlarged text. This provision eliminated the need for many separate testing sessions for special needs students.

The ADC members were very interested in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade performance data and asked about plans for reporting findings from this pilot test. Members felt that this information will be extremely valuable to schools, policymakers, and the Common Core Standards assessment consortia as computer-based performance testing moves to the lower elementary grades.

Holly Spurlock stated that NCES plans to issue a technical report on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade writing pilot and is considering other means of sharing this important data with a broader audience. The ADC requested information on these reporting strategies at their November/December 2012 meeting.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Alan Friedman, Chair

8/16/2012

---

Date

# National Assessment Governing Board

## Nominations Committee

### (Closed Session) Report of August 4, 2012

**Attendees:** David Alukonis (Chair), Alan Friedman, Hector Ibarra, Susan Pimentel, Andy Porter, Mary Frances Taymans, Eileen Weiser; Other Board members: Shannon Garrison, Brent Houston, Fielding Rolston, Cary Sneider; Board Staff – Mary Crovo, Cornelia Orr.

In accordance with the provisions of exemptions 2 and 6 of Section 552b (c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the National Assessment Governing Board’s Nominations Committee met in closed session on August 4, 2012 from 7:15 a.m. to 8:15 a.m.

Nominations Committee Chair, David Alukonis, called the meeting to order and reviewed the meeting agenda. Mr. Alukonis welcomed the incoming Nominations Committee members to this meeting. Their attendance is important because the Committee has four long-serving members whose terms expire on September 30, 2012 and the 2013 Nominations cycle is now underway. This meeting is an opportunity for the incoming members to take part in discussions with outgoing members related to the 2013 nominations process, prior to October 1, 2012.

For the 2012 Nominations cycle, Board staff reported that Secretary Duncan and his staff continue to praise the high quality and thoroughness of the Board’s nominations process. It is anticipated that Secretary Duncan will make his formal announcement of Board appointments in late August or early September, for terms beginning October 1, 2012. The 2012 positions are: local school board member, testing and measurement expert, non-public school administrator, state legislator (Republican), general public representative, and governor (Republican).

For the 2013 cycle, the Board will be seeking nominations in four categories: elementary school principal, testing and measurement expert, state legislator (Democrat), and general public representative (2 positions).

The Nominations Committee discussed the 2012-2013 timeline and process, and reviewed several new outreach strategies. In mid August the Board’s annual “call for nominations” will be disseminated widely via our website, email communications, and surface mail. Nominations are due on October 12, 2012. The Committee discussed the ratings process, criteria for evaluating nominees, and other details regarding specific individuals and Board categories.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

David Alukonis, Chair

8/10/2012

---

Date