

National Assessment Governing Board Assessment Development Committee

May 16-17, 2013

AGENDA

Thursday, May 16, 2013		
8:00 am – 1:45 pm	<p>Closed Session ACTION: Review of Secure Material for NAEP Science Interactive Computer Tasks (ICTs) <i>Andrew Latham, ETS</i> <i>Committee Discussion</i></p>	Secure material provided under separate cover
Friday, May 17, 2013		
CLOSED SESSION 10:00 – 11:00 am		
10:00 – 11:00 am	<p>Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview <i>Alan Friedman, ADC Chair</i></p> <p>2013 Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Pilot Test: Update and Preliminary Observations <i>Bill Ward, NCES</i></p>	
OPEN SESSION 11:00 am – 12:30 pm		
11:00 – 11:10 am	<p>Release of Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and Implications for NAEP <i>Alan Friedman</i></p>	Attachment A
11:10 – 11:45 am	<p>Update on Reporting Grade 4 Computer-Based Writing Information <i>Arnold Goldstein, NCES</i></p>	Attachment B
11:45 am – 12:00 pm	<p>Assessment Development Under the New NAEP Contracts <i>Arnold Goldstein, NCES</i></p>	
12:00 – 12:30 pm	<p>Revisiting the NAEP Foreign Language Assessment <i>Mary Crovo, Governing Board Staff</i></p>	Attachment C
Information Item	<p>NAEP Item Review Schedule</p>	Attachment D



For Immediate Release

Chad Colby, Achieve: (202) 419-1570

Marina Stenos, Widmeyer: (646) 213-7251

Final Next Generation Science Standards Released

State-created standards for science education in the 21st Century

WASHINGTON - April 9, 2013 - On Tuesday, April 9, the final [Next Generation Science Standards](#) (NGSS), a new set of voluntary, rigorous, and internationally benchmarked standards for K-12 science education, were released.

[Twenty six states and their broad-based teams](#) worked together for two years with a [41-member writing team](#) and [partners](#) to develop the standards which identify science and engineering practices and content that all K-12 students should master in order to be fully prepared for college, careers and citizenship. The NGSS were built upon a vision for science education established by the *Framework for K-12 Science Education*, published by the National Academies' National Research Council in 2011.

The lead state partners include Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington and West Virginia.

"The NGSS aim to prepare students to be better decision makers about scientific and technical issues and to apply science to their daily lives. By blending core science knowledge with scientific practices, students are engaged in a more relevant context that deepens their understanding and

helps them to build what they need to move forward with their education - whether that's moving on to a four-year college or moving into post-secondary training," said Matt Krehbeil, Science Education Program Consultant, of Kansas.

"This blending of the dimensions described in the *Framework for K-12 Science Education* aligns with what research has shown are the most effective practices in teaching science. Students who experience quality instruction based on the NGSS will be prepared to understand the world around them and will be college and career ready."

"As emphasized in the *Framework*, an active learning of scientific practices is critical, and takes time. A focus on these practices, rather than on content alone, leads to a deep, sustained learning of the skills needed to be a successful adult, regardless of career choice," said Bruce Alberts, PhD, who is Editor-in-Chief of *Science* and served two six-year terms as President of the National Academy of Sciences. "We must teach our science students to *do something* in science class, not to memorize facts."

The creation of the NGSS was entirely state-driven, with no federal funds or incentives to create or adopt the standards. The process was primarily funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, a leading philanthropy dedicated to improving science education in the U.S. The NGSS are grounded in a sound, evidence-based foundation of current scientific research-including research on the ways students learn science effectively-and identify the science all K-12 students should know.

"In Michigan, our conversation about education always includes workforce training. Whenever we adopt a new set of standards we make sure to promote the opportunities the standards afford, not just in terms of college readiness, but in terms of workforce readiness. That's particularly relevant with the NGSS," said Susan Codere, Project Coordinator for the NGSS in Michigan.

"The Next Generation Science Standards are going to pull together inquiry and practice, and recognize the role of engineering. Pulling together the cross-cutting concepts is going to be a challenge, but it's really effective pedagogy," said Ellen Ebert, Washington State's Director of Science for Teaching and Learning at the Office of the Superintendent of Public

Instruction. "In Washington State we're looking at the NGSS to propel students into 21st century-we're looking at college and career readiness. This is a real opportunity to help students see the potential of science in their lives."

"The Next Generation of Science Standards promise to help students understand why is it that we have to know science and help them use scientific learning to develop critical thinking skills-which may be applied throughout their lives, no matter the topic. Today, students see science as simply a list of facts and ideas that they are expected to memorize. In contrast to that approach education researchers have learned, particularly in the last 15 to 20 years, that if we cover fewer ideas, but go into more depth, students come away with a much richer understanding. Unlike previous standards, where you have separation of inquiry and ideas that students should know, in the NGSS they are now together," said Joseph S. Krajcik, Professor of Science Education in the College of Education at Michigan State University and a member of the writing team.

Achieve, a non-partisan nonprofit education organization, coordinated the states' efforts.

About NGSS

Next Generation Science Standards for Today's Students and Tomorrow's Workforce: Through a collaborative, state-led process, new K-12 science standards were developed that are rich in content and practice, arranged in a coherent manner across disciplines and grades to provide all students an internationally benchmarked science education. The NGSS are based on the *Framework for K-12 Science Education* developed by the National Research Council. For more information, please visit our website at www.nextgenscience.org.



Reporting on the 2011 Grade 4 Writing Pilot: Progress Report

At the March Governing Board meeting, the Assessment Development Committee heard about NCES plans to report the results and lessons learned from the pilot test of the grade 4 computer-delivered writing assessment. Since that time, we have refined these plans and we are beginning to develop products for various audiences.

Our overall approach is to create a web page that focuses on the grade 4 writing pilot. This web page will serve as a portal to products that are engaging, interactive, and easily readable. These products will be directed toward two main types of audiences—test developers and consumers.

Test developers include state testing directors and their staffs, as well as private test development companies. Products for these audiences will focus on lessons learned about test design, constructing test questions, and the appropriate use of graphics, videos, and other elements not possible on paper-and-pencil tests. The results of our usability studies and focus groups will help to inform these products.

Consumers include teachers, parents, the business community, and policy makers, as well as the general public. Products for these audiences will focus on observable data, such as the use of editing tools, the length of student responses, and universal design features such as text-to-speech.

The May 17 presentation to the Assessment Development Committee will include examples of these web-based products.

NAEP FOREIGN LANGUAGE FRAMEWORK

MAY 13, 2000

EXCERPTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) has targeted the year 2003 for the first foreign language NAEP (FL NAEP). In May 1999, NAGB awarded a contract to the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to conduct a national consensus building project. CAL worked in collaboration with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to develop recommendations for the Governing Board on the framework and specifications for the FL NAEP.

Focusing on the characteristics of foreign language education in the United States today, the consensus building committees propose a two-stage procedure for the FL NAEP. In the first stage, a language survey/background questionnaire will be administered to a representative national sample of 12th grade students to collect data on demographics, experiences with foreign language learning both in school and beyond, attitudes toward language study, and self reporting of language abilities. This sample will include both students who have studied a foreign language in school and those who have not. In the second stage, the Spanish NAEP will be administered to nationally representative samples of 12th grade students, drawn from students in the first sample, who have learned Spanish in a variety of ways and for different lengths of time. The Spanish NAEP report will examine the achievement of students exposed to various lengths of Spanish language study, to show the connection between length of study and achievement. This issue is critical for foreign language education today, as determined by the consensus building committees and through a national review of the draft framework.

The Spanish NAEP is based on the consensus building committees' proposed general framework for assessing communicative ability in languages other than English. In this framework, listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills are assessed within three modes of communication: the *interpersonal* mode, which involves two-way, interactive communication; the *interpretive* mode, which relates to the understanding of spoken or written language; and the *presentational* mode, which involves creating spoken or written communication.

The framework states that communicative ability will be assessed through authentic communication tasks that are called for in daily life, school, and work. Assessment tasks will reflect four interrelated goals that provide the basis for communication. These goals include the following:

- gaining knowledge of other cultures;
- connecting with other academic subject areas to acquire knowledge;
- developing insights into the nature of language and culture through comparisons; and
- participating in multilingual communities at home and around the world.

Performances will be evaluated on how well the student understands (comprehension) and can be understood (comprehensibility). The criterion of comprehension/comprehensibility subsumes language knowledge, the appropriate use of communication strategies, and the application of cultural knowledge.

The consensus building committees recommend that the Spanish NAEP focus on assessing four of the six assessment areas in the general FL NAEP framework. The Spanish assessment will require demonstration of the following:

listening and speaking in the interpersonal mode,
listening in the interpretive mode,
reading in the interpretive mode, and
writing in the presentational mode.

The two assessment areas not assessed by the Spanish NAEP, due to practical considerations of time and expense, are reading and writing in the interpersonal mode and speaking in the presentational mode. The four assessment areas chosen are those most used in real-world communication by secondary school students. Each assessment area has different formats and specifications. The interpretive mode (both listening and reading) will be assessed using multiple-choice and short constructed-response type exercises; the presentational mode through short and extended constructed-response type exercises, and the interpersonal mode through a one-on-one conversation format. Although specifications vary across assessment areas, they are all based on and tied together by the framework. Each of the four assessment areas has its own preliminary achievement level descriptions.

Whereas the student background variables will be collected through the language survey/background questionnaire, other questionnaires will collect data on teachers, instructional practices, schools, and communities.

The consensus building committees have also proposed three small scale studies, placing highest priority on the assessment of foreign language achievement in a language other than Spanish and at a level other than secondary; namely, an assessment of the achievement of 4th grade learners of Japanese. Such a study will provide policy makers with information on the early stages of achievement of students who begin the study of a foreign language that shares few similarities with English in elementary school.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

What is the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)?

Often called the "Nation's Report Card," the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the only nationally representative, continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Administered in grades 4, 8, and 12, NAEP plays an essential role in evaluating the conditions and progress of U.S. education nationwide. Since 1969, NAEP has conducted assessments periodically in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography, and other fields. Both public and private school students are sampled and assessed.

As the Nation's Report Card, NAEP provides the following:

a state-of-the-art measure of the condition of education in our schools;
thirty years of data showing patterns and trends of student achievement in core content areas;

- a valid, reliable, and objective measure of today's educational standards;
- an objective indicator for gauging the impact of national and state reform efforts; and
- a reliable source of student assessment data that is regularly used by Congress, professional organizations, national and state policymakers, and the media.

Who is responsible for NAEP?

NAEP was established by Congress. The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB), also created by Congress, sets the policies that determine who will be assessed, when they will be assessed, and how the results will be reported. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is responsible for overseeing the operations and implementation of the assessment. Specific tasks related to the NAEP are handled by outside contractors.

What information does NAEP provide to the public?

NAEP provides a variety of information to the American public. Among the many reports are the *Report Card*, which gives detailed information on the results of each assessment for curriculum specialists, assessment specialists, and teachers, and the *Report Card Highlights*, a summary of assessment results addressed to the general public and policy makers. NAEP also releases to educators and others a number of tasks from each of its assessments, and data from NAEP studies are available for secondary analyses.

What kind of information does NAEP collect?

Student performance is assessed through a wide variety of tasks. While some tasks are multiple choice, requiring students to select the best answer given, NAEP assessments also use constructed response items (open-ended questions) and performance type items (requiring students to produce extended complex performances) to demonstrate their knowledge and skills.

In addition to the assessments, NAEP uses surveys and questionnaires to collect information from students, teachers, and administrators about instructional practices, materials and equipment, class size, curricula, and a host of other important variables related to educational achievement.

How does NAEP collect this information?

Because of its unique design, NAEP can administer thousands of questionnaires and assessment items yet require only 50 minutes or so of student time. The random sample of students included

in the assessment is representative of every type and size of school and community in the nation, from the largest urban districts to the smallest rural areas.

How are NAEP achievement results reported?

Participation in NAEP is voluntary and by law no individual or school-level results are reported. Results are reported for representative *samples* of students.

NAEP achievement results are reported in terms of three levels: basic, proficient, and advanced.

BASIC: Students at this level demonstrate partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.

PROFICIENT: This level characterizes solid academic performance. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.

ADVANCED: Students at the advanced level demonstrate superior performance.

NAEP also reports the percentage of students who are “below basic”—those students whose performance does not yet demonstrate partial mastery of fundamental knowledge and skills.

In addition to achievement levels, NAEP results are also reported in terms of scale scores. NAEP scale score results provide information about the distribution of student achievement for groups and subgroups.

What is the 2003 NAEP Foreign Language Assessment?

In 1994, the United States Congress recognized the importance of foreign language study, formalizing it in the Goals 2000 statement of the National Education Goals. That statement reads:

*By the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, **foreign languages**, civics and government, economics, arts, history and geography (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994).*

In 1997, as part of making *Goals 2000* a reality, the National Assessment Governing Board included a foreign language assessment in its 10-year schedule, targeting the year 2003 for the first foreign language NAEP (FL NAEP). NAGB also specified two other dimensions of the assessment. The first stipulation was that the main assessment would be conducted in Spanish. The second specification was that the main assessment would be administered to secondary school students only.

Now, for the first time, the United States will have a comprehensive national source of information on what its students know and can do in a language other than English. Developing the framework for this national assessment is a critical task that presents an unprecedented opportunity to foster national discussion and to build national consensus—within the foreign language community and across government, business, industry, and the general public—on the role of foreign language education in America's future.

What is NAGB's role in the NAEP foreign language assessment?

Congress established the National Assessment Governing Board in 1988 to set policy for NAEP. Among other things, the Board is responsible for selecting the subject areas to be assessed; developing assessment objectives and test specifications through a national consensus approach;

designing the assessment methodology; developing guidelines for reporting and disseminating NAEP results; and taking actions to improve the form and use of the National Assessment.

What is the FL NAEP Consensus Building Project?

In May 1999, NAGB awarded a contract to the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to conduct a national consensus building project. CAL worked in collaboration with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to develop recommendations to NAGB for the 2003 foreign language assessment. Specifically, the Project Management Team directed the work of the Steering Committee, Planning Committee, and Technical Advisory Panel to make recommendations to the Governing Board on the following:

- a framework for the assessment;
- test and item specifications based on the framework;
- preliminary achievement level descriptions;
- a strategy for sampling students;
- background variables to be collected from students, teachers, and school administrators; and
- a strategy for reporting the NAEP results.

Members of the Project Management Team and each of the national consensus building project committees are listed in Appendix A. The timeline for the project follows:

Spring 1999: Issues Paper prepared.

Summer 1999: Consensus committee meetings held to consider the issues and to develop recommendations for the assessment framework and specifications. First draft of the framework and specifications prepared.

Fall 1999: Period of national review of draft framework and specifications.

Winter 1999: Full recommendations for the assessment framework, item specifications, background questions, and reporting strategies prepared and submitted to NAGB.

Spring 2000: Final actions on recommendations taken by NAGB.

Figure 1. The Foreign Language NAEP Assessment Framework



Evaluation Criterion

- Demonstration of Comprehension and Comprehensibility
(including the use of communication strategies and the application of cultural knowledge)

Contexts

- Daily Life
- School
- Work

Definitions

At the recommendation of the consensus building committees, the choice of the specialized terminology used in the FL NAEP framework was intentional. These terms are consistent with the widely adopted *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* and are meant to ensure that explanations are precise.

Communication

The central focus of the assessment is to measure the ability of students to communicate in a language other than English. Essentially, communication is the ability to exchange information; that is, to convey and receive messages. These messages are of many different types and may be conveyed and received in many different ways. Although language is the primary vehicle for communicating messages, being able to communicate effectively means that the individual can combine knowledge of the language system with knowledge of cultural conventions, such as norms of politeness. Knowledge of language and culture combine to make successful communication.

Modes of Communication

Although there are several ways communication can be characterized, the method here follows that of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*. This approach defines three modes of communication, based on the context and the purpose of the communicative interaction.

Interpersonal

The *interpersonal* mode involves two-way, interactive communication, such as conversing face-to-face or exchanging e-mail messages. It is characterized by direct communication between individuals who are in personal contact, thus allowing the participants to clarify their meaning when misunderstandings occur. In this mode, participants in the interaction use both linguistic and non-linguistic feedback from others to ascertain the extent to which their message is being successfully communicated, and can make adjustments and clarifications accordingly. Necessary to achieving successful communication in this mode are the productive language abilities of speaking and writing as well as the receptive abilities of listening and reading, and the ability to use and interpret non-verbal behavior, including body language in face-to-face interactions.

Interpretive

The *interpretive* mode relates to the understanding of spoken or written language, such as listening to a broadcast or reading a magazine. It involves having a culturally appropriate understanding of the meaning of oral or written messages sent via print and visual images. In this mode, the original author is not present to clarify misunderstandings. Necessary to achieving successful communication in this mode are the receptive language abilities of listening and reading, and the ability to use visual images to assist in comprehension.

Presentational

The *presentational* mode involves spoken or written communication, such as giving a speech or writing a story. It involves producing spoken or written messages for an audience with whom there is no immediate personal contact. Thus, there is no possibility to clarify intended meanings when misunderstandings occur. Such messages need to reflect awareness of cultural differences in order to be presented in a manner that will enable appropriate interpretation by persons from a cultural background where the foreign language is spoken. Necessary to achieving successful

communication in this mode are the productive language abilities of speaking and writing and the ability to use visual images.

National Assessment of Educational Progress 2004 Foreign Language Assessment Development

Update from February 24, 2003

Overview

- ◆ Award date: August 31, 2000
- ◆ Award Recipient: Educational Testing Service (ETS)
- ◆ Main activity: item development
- ◆ Assessment modes: listening in the interpretive mode, reading in the interpretive mode, and writing in the presentational mode, conversational proficiency
- ◆ Testing window: field test in Fall 2003; operational Fall 2004

Process

A cooperative agreement to develop items for the NAEP 2003 Foreign Language assessment was awarded by NCES on August 31, 2000 to the Educational Testing Service. The award period is from September 5, 2000 through December 30, 2003. In addition to developing background and cognitive items, the award recipient will also train scorers, and score and evaluate the NAEP 2002 Foreign Language Field Test. Since the cooperative agreement was awarded, the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) revised the schedule of NAEP assessments so that the Foreign Language assessment is planned for 2004.

The NAEP 2004 Foreign Language assessment will be conducted at the national level at grade 12 only. It will provide information on how well students in the United States can communicate in Spanish. The results will report on how well nationally representative samples of 12th grade students who have learned Spanish in a variety of ways and for different lengths of time can communicate in Spanish.

The assessment will be based on the Board adopted Foreign Language Framework. In this framework, listening, speaking, reading and writing skills are assessed within three modes of communication, *interpersonal*, *interpretive*, and *presentational*. Communicative ability is to be assessed through authentic communication tasks as called for in daily life, school, and work. The assessment tasks are meant to reflect four interrelated goals that provide the basis for communication: gaining knowledge of other *cultures*; *connecting* with other academic subject areas to acquire knowledge; developing insights into the nature of language and culture through *comparisons*; and participating in multilingual *communities* at home and around the world.

Performances on assessment tasks are to be evaluated on the criterion of how well the student understands (comprehension) and can be understood (comprehensibility). This criterion subsumes language knowledge, the appropriate use of communication strategies, and the application of cultural knowledge to enhance communication.

The 2003 Field Test and 2004 Assessment

The National Assessment Governing Board envisioned an innovative NAEP assessment of foreign language. NCES was challenged with developing a groundbreaking national assessment that employed innovative technology in the administration and data collection phases of the assessment. The Spanish assessment will be the first NAEP assessment that employs a two-stage sampling design and two assessment forms of different ability levels. The assessment will engage students in tasks using authentic materials (reading and writing), audio (CD-ROM) stimulus materials (listening), and one-on-one conversations (speaking) via telephone.

The components of the NAEP 2004 Foreign Language assessment to be field-tested in 2003 are:

- ***Language Survey/Background Questionnaire (LS/BQ)***

The Language Survey/Background Questionnaire (LS/BQ) will be used as a language screener to define and identify native Spanish speakers, heritage Spanish learners, and all other students who study Spanish, as opposed to other languages. It will also serve as a routing mechanism to determine the level of the assessment a student should receive (or whether the student should be excluded from the Spanish assessment), and will be used to collect information on students' instructional experiences. The LS/BQ has been developed in three forms: paper and pencil, a web-based instrument, and a personal data assistant (PDA) administered instrument. There are two aspects to the LS/BQ.

Language Survey (Self-Assessment and Screener): The purpose of this portion of the LSBQ is to gather some information about students' proficiency in a foreign language and to provide information to use in determining which level of assessment a student should take in the Spanish NAEP. Students respond to a series of questions about their proficiency in reading, conversation, listening, and writing in a foreign language. Students having responded to the self-assessment for Spanish or one of five languages, French, German, Russian, Chinese, or Japanese, complete a cognitive screener. The cognitive screener provides an objective measure of language skills that supplements the subjective information of the background questions. Questions are multiple-choice, with the stems presented in English and answers in the foreign language (Spanish, French, German, Russian, Chinese, or Japanese).

Background Questionnaire: The student background questionnaire serves as router: it defines and identifies native Spanish speakers, heritage Spanish learners, and all other students who study Spanish, as opposed to other languages, for the subsequent cognitive assessment. In addition, it provides background information necessary for reporting (e.g., demographic information) and background information related to foreign language instructional experiences.

- ***Foreign Language Cognitive Assessment***

The Foreign Language cognitive assessment is an assessment of listening, reading, writing, and conversation proficiency in Spanish. Two assessment levels are anticipated.

Level 1 will be primarily for those students who have completed 1 or 2 years of Spanish instruction in high school but less than three years. Level 2 will be primarily for those students who have completed 3 years of Spanish instruction in high school. (No one will have completed four or more years early in the 12th grade if we define high school as starting in the 9th grade.)

Listening. The listening assessment is delivered by CD. Students listen to a prompt, in Spanish, and respond to multiple-choice and constructed-response items presented in English.

Reading. Students read passages in Spanish and respond to multiple-choice and constructed-response items presented in English.

Writing. The writing assessment is administered only to students taking the level 2 Spanish assessment. Students write short and extended responses to writing prompts.

A much smaller subsample of level 2 students also will participate in the conversation component described below.

Conversation. In the conversational proficiency assessment students enter into a semi-scripted conversation, via telephone. The context for the conversation involves the contractor's trained Spanish test administrator (portraying a teacher from Santiago, Chile) and the student. There are five prompts presented in a role-play structure, three in which the teacher takes the lead and two in which the student selects from a list of topics. The conversation prompts revolve around topics related to school, community, or extracurricular activities.

- ***School Questionnaire***

The School Questionnaire (SQ) contains questions for school administrators and the foreign language department head about their school's course offerings, teacher characteristics, instructional practices, and use of computer technology.

Revisiting the NAEP Foreign Language Assessment

- Status:** Information and discussion
- Objective:** To provide background information and to discuss issues related to revisiting and updating the NAEP Foreign Language Framework, in light of recent Board discussion on assessing students' Spanish language skills.
- Attachments:** C-1 Excerpts from the NAEP Foreign Language Framework, which was adopted by the Board in March 2000. See links to the complete Foreign Language Framework and Specifications at: <http://www.nagb.org/publications/frameworks.html>
- C-2 Description of the development process for the NAEP Foreign Language Assessment (dated February 24, 2003)

Context

At the May 17, 2013 meeting, the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) will have an opportunity to discuss whether the Board should revisit the Foreign Language Assessment in the near future. Recently at the March 1, 2013 meeting, Governing Board members engaged in discussions about assessing Spanish language skills as part of NAEP. The May ADC session on the NAEP Foreign Language Framework is one way of responding to that Board discussion. Currently the Board's proposed Schedule of Assessments includes Foreign Language in 2020.

Brief History

The NAEP Foreign Language Framework and Specifications were originally developed between 1999 - 2000 under a contract to:

- Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL)
- American Institutes for Research (AIR)

Members of the Foreign Language Framework development panels included educators, business representatives, government agency representatives (e.g., from the Defense Language Institute in Monterey), researchers, representatives of foreign language organizations, psychometricians, and members of the general public.

Originally designed as a two-stage assessment, the Foreign Language NAEP focused on testing 12th grade students' Spanish language skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. A brief paper and electronically-delivered component was designed as a language screener for the two-stage Spanish assessment, and as a brief self-assessment in other languages. This component also contained the student background questions.

The main NAEP Foreign Language Assessment was designed to be administered to a targeted sample of 12th graders—both native Spanish speakers and students who had taken or were enrolled in Spanish language classes.

The May 2013 ADC discussion will include information on challenges experienced in the 2003 Foreign Language field test including participation rates, complexity of the assessment design, the need for more sophisticated digital technology, and other issues. Note that the operational administration for Foreign Language was originally scheduled for 2003, but it was moved to 2004 to allow for additional test development time.

Proposed Discussion Questions

1. Would the Board be interested in moving the proposed 2020 Foreign Language assessment to an earlier year?
2. What would be the rationale for moving forward with a Foreign Language NAEP at this time?
3. What development and technical issues should be addressed in determining whether to revisit this assessment?
4. How would today's technology facilitate administration of a NAEP Foreign Language assessment?
5. Which grade/s should be tested?
6. Should the assessment design focus on Spanish, with a self-assessment in other languages? Is there an alternative assessment design to be considered?
7. Are there other issues or information to be examined as next steps in the process of revisiting the Foreign Language assessment?



**Assessment Development Committee
Item Review Schedule
January 2013 – August 2013
(Updated 4/26/13)**

Review Package to Board	Board Comments to NCES	Survey/ Cognitive	Review Task	Approx Number Items	Status
1/11/13	1/22/13	Cognitive	2015 Pilot SICTs (4, 8, 12)	12 task outlines	✓
2/14/13	3/7/13	Survey Questionnaires	2015 Science (4, 8, 12)	130 items	✓
2/15/13	3/5/13	Cognitive	2015 Pilot SICTs (4, 8, 12)	12 task outlines and 6 alpha builds	✓
3/28/13	4/18/13	Cognitive	2015 Pilot SICTs (4, 8, 12)	3 task outlines and 3 alpha builds	✓
4/9/13	4/23/13	Cognitive	2015 Science HOT outlines (4, 8, 12)	11 outlines	✓
5/02/13	5/23/13	Cognitive	2015 Pilot SICTs (4, 8, 12)	10 alpha builds and 4 beta builds	For Review at May Board Meeting
5/15/13	6/3/13	Survey Questionnaires	2014 TEL Probe (8)	46 items	
6/26/13	7/3/13	Cognitive	2015 Pilot SICTs (4, 8, 12)	8 alpha builds	
7/18/13	8/8/13	Cognitive	2014 TEL Probe (8)	21tasks 70 discrete items (<i>approx</i>)	
7/18/13	8/8/13	Cognitive	2015 Science HOTs (4, 8, 12)	9 tasks	
7/25/13	8/8/13	Cognitive	2015 Pilot SICTs (4, 8, 12)	23 beta builds	

NOTE: Alpha builds will be presented to the ADC during their in-person and virtual meetings. These will not be submitted before the review. The ADC will receive outlines and beta builds prior to the ICT review meetings. (Alpha and beta builds are the first- and second-draft versions of the rendered task, respectively.)