Biography: CCSSO Executive Director Chris Minnich

Chris Minnich assumed his role as Executive Director of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in December, 2012. Chris has worked at CCSSO since 2008, when he was hired to direct the Council's standards program-the work that would later become the Common Core State Standards (Common Core). In 2009 he assumed the role of Strategic Initiative Director of Standards, Assessment and Accountability, where he led the development and adoption of the Common Core in 45 states. In 2010, Minnich became the Senior Membership Director, where he has served as the lead contact for all 57 of CCSSO's members. In the last two years, Minnich has led the Council's advocacy and communications teams in rallying states to collaboratively reform their standards and accountability systems. His efforts have been invaluable in advancing the national implementation of the Common Core, and cultivating essential cooperation between states and the federal government to improve education for all students.

Minnich has an extensive background in assessment and accountability work. From 2005-2008, he held multiple positions at Harcourt (now Pearson), all focused on the advancement and improvement of assessments. Minnich led the development and deployment of a teacher-centered online portal focused on assessment education.

As the Director of Test Design and Implementation at the Oregon Department of Education from 2003-2005, Minnich led the statewide, online assessment implementation for the Oregon Department of Education.

Minnich holds a Bachelor of Science in Political Science from the University of Washington, Seattle, as well as a Masters of Public Policy from the University of Maryland, College Park. Minnich lives in Alexandria, VA with his wife Whitney and his son Carson.

October 1, 2013

Dear Colleague,

Chief state school officers have demonstrated strong leadership in adopting new standards that are designed to make sure all students graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills necessary for success in college and careers. The new standards challenge our students to develop a deeper understanding of subject matter, learn how to think critically, and apply what they are learning to the real world. States are working hard to implement these new standards and raise the bar for students across the country.

To realize the full potential of these standards, states are designing new assessments to match the rigor of their college- and career-ready standards and to accurately measure student progress toward readiness. The underlying purpose behind new assessments is to help to inform better teaching and learning. These new assessments will not be limited to surface level knowledge — they will better assess the deep knowledge students need to succeed post-graduation.

It is the right and responsibility of each state to determine the appropriate path for ensuring its students are taking high-quality assessments. Many states have joined an assessment consortium, either the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC) or Smarter Balanced, to work together to build new, high-quality assessments. The states working together on these assessments have demonstrated significant promise in creating new assessments aligned to the new standards and will field test these assessments starting in the spring of 2014. We applaud these efforts and will continue to work to strongly support these states as they refine and finalize the new assessments. Other states will select a different path as they transition to new assessments aligned to their new standards, and we remain supportive of these states and are working with them to ensure all students have an opportunity to know if they are on track for success in college and careers.

Regardless of the approach, all states must remain committed to ensuring that their students are taking high-quality assessments. Each consortium or state will go through a rigorous process to ensure the assessments are truly measuring student progress. States will adhere to a set of principles to ensure the assessments they select are meeting the high-bar they expect. The principles included herein are intended to be used as a tool to help states hold themselves and their assessments accountable for high quality.

States took a significant step in adopting college- and career-ready standards that raised the bar for students. Moving to new assessments that accurately measure the standards is the next step. States are

further exerting their leadership by committing to this transition to new, high-quality assessments to ensure *every* student graduates from high school prepared for their future.

Sincerely,

Chris Minnich
Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers

States' Commitment to High-Quality Assessments Aligned to College- and Career-Readiness

Introduction

CCSSO, on behalf of the states, hereby commits to further states' proactive leadership in promoting college and career readiness for all students by establishing or adopting high quality systems of assessments, including both formative and summative assessments, based on college- and career-ready (CCR) standards. These assessments will **align** to CCR standards, **report** annually on each student's progress toward readiness, adhere to best **test administration** practices, and be **accessible** to all students. Many states are already demonstrating leadership in moving in this direction by developing higher-quality college- and career-ready assessments through participation in the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) or Smarter Balanced assessment consortia; other states are also developing new CCR assessments. Our intent is to ensure that CCR-aligned assessments support an education that prepares all students for success in college and careers.

As part of states' comprehensive assessment systems, states are moving toward systems that improve upon traditional assessments so that students' in-depth knowledge can be measured. These assessment systems will: assess higher-order cognitive skills; assess critical abilities with high-fidelity; be internationally benchmarked; be instructionally sensitive and educationally valuable; and be valid, reliable, and fair.[1] States' ability to implement systems of assessment that meet these criteria is evolving, along with the technology that is used as part of instructional practice to teach and assess these types of college and career skills and knowledge.

High-Quality Summative Assessment Principles for ELA/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments Aligned to College- and Career-Readiness Standards[2]

To ensure that all students have access to an education that prepares them for college and careers, summative assessments in grades 3 – 8 and high school should:

1. **ALIGN to CCR standards, by**

   —*in ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS / LITERACY ASSESSMENTS:*

   A. **ASSESSING STUDENT READING AND WRITING ACHIEVEMENT IN BOTH ELA AND LITERACY**: The assessments are English language arts and literacy tests that are based on an aligned balance of literary and informational texts.

---

[1] These criteria are taken from a June 2013 report "*Criteria for High-Quality Assessment*," written by Linda Darling-Hammond, Joan Herman, James Pellegrino, Jamal Abedi, J. Lawrence Aber, Eva Baker, Randy Bennett, Edmund Gordon, Edward Haertel, Kenji Hakuta, Andrew Ho, Robert Lee Linn, P. David Pearson, James Popham, Lauren Resnick, Alan H. Schoenfeld, and Richard Shavelson. Click here to access the report.

[2] Federal review of assessments should remain limited solely to summative assessments. While the principles set forth herein should apply to all assessments, including formative, the principles are intended to provide guidance to the US Department of Education (USED) on its peer review process for summative assessments only.

B. **FOCUSING ON COMPLEXITY OF TEXTS**: The assessments require appropriate levels of text complexity; they raise the bar for text complexity each year so students are ready for the demands of college- and career-level reading no later than the end of high school. Multiple forms of text are assessed, including written, audio, visual, and graphic as technology permits.

C. **REQUIRING STUDENTS TO READ CLOSELY AND USE EVIDENCE FROM TEXTS**: The assessments consist of reading and writing test questions, tasks, and/or prompts, as appropriate, that demand that students read carefully and deeply and use specific evidence from increasingly complex texts to obtain and defend correct responses.

D. **REQUIRING A RANGE OF COGNITIVE DEMAND:** The assessments require students to demonstrate a range of higher-order, analytical thinking and performance skills in reading, writing, and research based on the depth and complexity of CCR standards, allowing robust information to be gathered for students with varied levels of achievement. Assessments should have a significant portion of total score points come from items that demonstrate a deeper level of knowledge (i.e., represent the high complexity levels designated by taxonomies of cognitive demand).

E. **EMPHASIZING WRITING THAT DEMONSTRATES PROFICIENCY IN THE USE OF LANGUAGE, INCLUDING VOCABULARY AND CONVENTIONS**: The assessments require students to demonstrate college- and career-ready abilities in writing, vocabulary knowledge and tools, and the use of language and its conventions.

F. **ASSESSING RESEARCH AND INQUIRY**: The assessments require students to demonstrate research and inquiry skills, demonstrated by the ability to find, process, synthesize, organize, and use information from sources.

G. **ASSESSING SPEAKING AND LISTENING**: Over time, and as assessment advances allow, the assessments measure the speaking and listening communication skills students need for college and career readiness.

— *In MATHEMATICS ASSESSMENTS:*

H. **FOCUSING STRONGLY ON THE CONTENT MOST NEEDED FOR SUCCESS IN LATER MATHEMATICS:** The assessments help educators keep students on track to readiness by focusing strongly on the content most needed in each grade or course to pave the way for later mathematics. In a CCR-aligned assessment system, the elementary grades focus strongly on arithmetic; the middle grades focus strongly on ratio, proportional relationships, pre-algebra, and algebra; and high school focuses on widely applicable prerequisites for careers and postsecondary education.

I. **ASSESSING A BALANCE OF CONCEPTS, PROCEDURES, AND APPLICATIONS**: The assessments measure conceptual understanding, fluency and procedural skill, and application of mathematics, as set out in CCR standards.

J. **CONNECTING PRACTICES TO CONTENT:** The assessments include brief questions and also longer questions that connect the most important mathematical content of the grade or course to mathematical practices, such as reasoning and modeling.

K. **REQUIRING A RANGE OF COGNITIVE DEMAND**: The assessments require students to demonstrate a range of performance based on the depth and complexity of CCR standards, allowing robust information to be gathered for students with varied levels of achievement. Assessments include questions, tasks, and/or prompts, as appropriate, about the basic content of the grade or course as well as questions that reflect the complex challenge of CCR standards. Assessments should have a significant portion of total score points come from items that demonstrate a deeper level of knowledge (i.e., represent the high complexity levels designated by taxonomies of cognitive demand).

2. **Yield valuable REPORTS ON STUDENT PROGRESS, by:**
   A. **FOCUSING ON PROGRESS TO READINESS:** Score reports illustrate a student's progress on the continuum toward college and career readiness, grade by grade, and course by course. Reports stress the most important content, skills, and processes and show how the assessment focuses on them.
   B. **PROVIDING TIMELY DATA THAT INFORMS INSTRUCTION:** Reports are instructionally valuable, are easy to understand by all audiences, and are delivered in time to provide useful, actionable data to students, parents, and teachers.

3. **Adhere to best practices in TEST ADMINISTRATION, by:**
   A. **MAINTAINING NECESSARY STANDARDIZATION AND ENSURING TEST SECURITY**: In order to ensure the validity, fairness, and integrity of state test results, the assessment systems maintain the security of the items and tests as well as the answer documents and related ancillary materials that result from test administrations.

4. **Provide ACCESSIBILITY to all students, by:**
   A. **FOLLOWING THE PRINCIPLES OF UNIVERSAL DESIGN:** The assessments are developed in accordance with the principles of universal design and sound testing practice, so that the testing interface, whether paper- or technology-based, does not impede student performance.
   B. **OFFERING APPROPRIATE ACCOMMODATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS:** Allowable accommodations that maintain the constructs being assessed are offered where feasible and appropriate. Decisions about accessibility are based on individual student needs.

**National Assessment Governing Board
Council of Chief State School Officers
Policy Task Force**

Overview
As part of the Board's continuing outreach efforts, the Governing Board contracted with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in September 2007 to form a Task Force charged with providing state feedback and recommendations to the Board on NAEP policy areas and projects. The Task Force consists of 12 high-level state education agency staff members who were chosen based on expertise and interest in assessment, and geographic representation of the nation. Task Force members include:

- 1 chief state school officer
- 5 deputy superintendents
- 3 associate superintendents of accountability and assessment
- 3 public information officers

Schedule of Task Force Meetings
The Task Force convenes for two in-person meetings and four WebEx meetings annually.

Policy Issues
During the Task Force's 35 meetings to date, they have addressed a number of key policy issues:
- NAEP reporting process
- Inclusion and accommodations
- NAEP schedule of assessments
- Reading trend line
- NAEP race/ethnicity reporting
- Common Core State Standards and Assessments
- Misuse and misinterpretation of NAEP data
- International benchmarking
- Board initiatives on raising achievement and closing gaps
- NAEP 12th grade preparedness

On each issue, Task Force members provided substantive input on these NAEP topics and made significant contributions in a variety of related areas. Task Force Chair Pat Wright will also provide a presentation to the Board on December 6, 2012 to provide an overview of the Task Force's recent discussions.

Outreach
Beyond the Task Force meetings, members have addressed their peers on the group's purpose and activities to date. Such venues have included briefings to state chiefs at CCSSO's Legislative Conferences and to state assessment directors at meetings of the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC). Additionally, there have been panel presentations on the Task Force at the annual CCSSO National Conference on Student Assessment.

Policy Task Force Members (2013-2014)*

Patricia Wright, Task Force Chair
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Virginia Department of Education
Richmond, VA

Deborah Sigman, Task Force Vice Chair
Deputy Superintendent
California Department of Education
Sacramento, CA

David V. Abbott
Deputy Commissioner/General Counsel
Rhode Island Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Providence, RI

Liza Cordeiro
Executive Director, Office of
Communications
West Virginia Department of Education
Charleston, WV

Vincent Dean
Director, Office of Standards and Assessment
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, MI

Pete Goldschmidt
Director of Assessment
New Mexico Public Education Department
Santa Fe, NM

Kelli Gauthier
Director of Communications
Tennessee Department of Education
Nashville, TN

Susie Morrison
Deputy Superintendent/Chief of Staff
Illinois State Board of Education
Springfield, IL

Michael Muenks
Coordinator of Assessment, Office of College
and Career Readiness
Missouri Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Jefferson City, MO

Nate Olson
Communications Manager
Washington Office of Superintendent of
Public Instruction
Olympia, WA

Joyce Zurkowski
Director of Student Assessment
Colorado Department of Education
Denver, CO

*The Task Force is currently recruiting to fill one deputy slot vacancy.

National Assessment Governing Board
Council of Chief State School Officers
Policy Task Force

The following charts summarize Task Force input on topics addressed since the Task Force first met in December 2007. In many areas, the Task Force has provided important input for on-going projects, draft policies, or other documents as noted in the "Follow-up Activities" column. For areas where additional follow-up activities are possible, an asterisk (∗) signals an opportunity for the Board to consider the Task Force's suggestions.

This document represents an ongoing tracking of issues and topics discussed by the Task Force across eleven separate areas denoted as Topic #1 through Topic #11. Updates to this document since November 2012, are denoted in <mark>yellow highlighting</mark>. Topics with new Task Force discussion points are:
- Topic #3: NAEP Schedule of Assessments
- Topic #4: Grade 12 NAEP
- Topic #6: NAEP Background Questions
- Topic #7: Common Core State Standards

∗ Denotes Task Force input for future Board consideration

TOPIC #1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS

Addressed in December 13, 2007, May 29, 2008, July 20, 2010, and January 7, 2011 in-person meetings; and the December 7, 2010, February 15, 2011, and April 22, 2011 WebExes.

TOPIC#1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Executive summary of NAEP Report Cards Increase audience attention to the Executive Summary by conveying more clearly the key findings of each Report Card.	Report Cards have: ▫ Streamlined the overall presentation of findings in the Executive Summary ▫ Used lists to prominently display key findings ▫ Improved data displays for a general public audience ▫ Removed less essential footnotes ▫ New online Report Card addresses the Task Force recommendations
Reporting socioeconomic status data Some Task Force members discussed that the locality/district type classifications that result from current SES data collection procedures often yield district-level labels that do not match the actual socioeconomic conditions in the district. For example, districts may be classified as suburban even though the schools' student populations mirror urban populations.	***** The Board is monitoring NCES-led efforts to improve socioeconomic status measures. Some of these efforts were piloted in the 2010 assessment administrations. The 2013 recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Background Information also addresses prospective improvements.
Shaping development of Report Cards Identify questions the data should attempt to answer. Use these questions and question types to shape Report Cards.	***** NCES and Board staffs met in late 2009 with representatives of the 11 pilot states to discuss the 2009 report of grade 12 state-level results in reading and mathematics. NCES and Board staffs are using new NAEP report formats, including *Findings in Brief for 2011*. Starting in 2013, Report Cards have been redesigned in order to take advantage of web-based delivery and interactivity.

TOPIC#1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
General NAEP talking points as a resource Develop talking points to explain what NAEP is; and develop talking points about specific interpretation challenges in reviewing assessment results. These can be distributed to states, media, and other stakeholders.	✳ NCES has been updating NAEP brochures for a general audience. See Topic #8's follow-up activities for additional details on efforts to address misinterpretation of NAEP data. The Board's communications contractor Reingold has conducted an audit of Board communications. The Board adopted a communications plan related to the audit's findings in November 2010.
Report-Card-specific talking points Develop talking points to convey the "common message" in release of specific NAEP Report Cards.	✳ This resource is provided to NAEP State Coordinators; and is also to be included in executive summaries of Report Cards. The audit of Board communications conducted by Reingold and the May 2010 Board discussion on future directions for the Board suggest expanded efforts to support Report Card releases.
Anti-testing sentiment Address anti-testing sentiment, highlighting how districts and schools benefit from NAEP.	In November 2010, the Board's Reporting and Dissemination Committee recommended a communications plan that addresses this issue, and the Board adopted the plan.
Social media Recognize that several social media sites support ongoing conversations, and if NAEP moves in this direction, efforts will be needed to maintain a continuous conversation.	The Board's Reporting and Dissemination Committee recommended a communications plan that incorporates social media tools. The Board's communication plan was adopted in November 2010.

TOPIC#1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Prioritizing NAEP audiences Prioritize target audiences, highlighting policy and business audiences.	The Board's Reporting and Dissemination Committee considered a communications plan that outlines NAEP's target audiences. The Board's communication plan was adopted in November 2010. The Board has been increasing outreach to the business community via the NAEP Business Policy Task Force. A business community outreach webinar was held to discuss the grade 12 NAEP results for the 11 states that participated in the grade 12 NAEP state pilot.
Accessible informational resources Consider a more accessible format for the NAEP Data Explorer, such as an iPhone app.	* NCES and Board staffs are working to develop ideas for apps using NAEP data and items.
Improving outreach to schools - Consider the most effective outreach strategy for schools in each state. In some states, the NAEP State Coordinator has the ideal skill set to lead these efforts. - Carefully craft messages about the intended use and purpose of NAEP. - Emphasize information beyond NAEP scores (e.g., profiles on what students are able to do and should be able to do). - Recognize that as more data are made available, there is a greater possibility for misinterpretation and inappropriate use of these data. - Maintain a balance between making NAEP meaningful as a significant driver of policy, and making NAEP meaningful at the school level. - Clarify the benefits of NAEP from the school perspective. - Capitalize on ways to use NAEP items and performance criteria that are consistent with the Common Core State Standards, given the large number of adopting states.	* Several of these ideas are being considered by the Board as part of the action proposals addressing *Topic #10: Board Initiatives on Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps.* The Board's *Information for Educators* initiative will be implemented beginning in 2014.
Enhancing outreach to states The Task Force provided the following suggestions on state use of NAEP information beyond score reports: - Strategically engage state or consortia assessment programs to create a shared knowledge base and collaboration around lessons learned (e.g., webinars, users' groups). - Leverage NAEP college and job training preparedness efforts to support assessment consortia efforts on college and career readiness (e.g., setting a common college placement test score). - Introduce NAEP data tools to educators during pre-service as a resource for teaching data use.	* Several of these ideas are being considered by the Board as part of the action proposals addressing *Topic #10: Board Initiatives on Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps.* Senior Board staff met with consortia leaders in January 2011 to explore concrete areas for collaboration between NAEP and the consortia. The group meets for periodic follow-up regularly.

TOPIC#1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
NAEP and social media Bridge traditional and new social media communications efforts by formatting Twitter submissions in a newsletter format.	*****
Improving pre-release Report Card briefings for governors and chiefs ▪ Highlight for chiefs major data changes and unexpected findings. ▪ Identify for chiefs a small number of policy issues present in several states. Identifying these issues in advance of the briefing and addressing a portion of the briefing to these issues would be useful. ▪ Highlight notable subscale trends at the state level. ▪ Continue to host joint pre-releases for NAEP state coordinators and public information officers; these are viewed as the most useful convenings. ▪ Support NAEP knowledge in new chiefs through NAEP Ambassadors.	For 2011, chiefs and governors in-person briefings were changed to notification of the embargoed release website with question-and-answer follow-up on request. In 2013, the Board implemented online briefings for chiefs.
Providing embargo access to new media outlets ▪ Move slowly on this topic. As more media outlets are given access to NAEP results, issues will continue to arise. ▪ Continue to provide early access to states and districts before NAEP data are public in order to give adequate preparation time for media inquiries. ▪ Share with states how other federal agencies approach releasing embargoed information to the media.	***** See summary of Board action on this topic below.
Considering a policy on embargo practices ▪ Formalize current embargo practices through a written policy, with expanded access provided to certain new audiences. ▪ Prioritize access to media outlets that report the news rather than those that provide opinions to keep the focus on accurate factual representation of data. ▪ Clarify in the embargo process that readership is a criterion for determining whether the source should have early access. ▪ Consult states regarding organizations or individuals who request embargo access and who lack media qualifications. If there is an established relationship between the state and the requestor, this may help with embargo access determinations.	The Board reviewed the NAEP embargo process and commissioned research on other organizations' embargo policies to inform this review. This process resulted in a narrow set of NAEP embargo guidelines for traditional news sources and reporters on assignment. This set of embargo guidelines will be examined after several releases to determine whether broader access should be granted to non-traditional news sources. The Reporting and Dissemination Committee will be reviewing the Board's embargo policy guidelines in light of the changing media landscape.

Addressed in December 13, 2007, May 28, 2009, and January 25, 2010 in-person meetings; and March 11, 2008, March 24, 2009, July 14, 2009, September 11, 2009, November 3, 2009, April 6, 2010, and June 13, 2011 WebEexes.

TOPIC#2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Misconceptions of accommodations' usage Address media questions on whether states are attempting to influence NAEP results by providing greater numbers of accommodations.	In recent Report Cards: Provided more context on use of accommodations in a national assessment setting, which are generally consistent with state assessment practices, including a special Report Card section on inclusion and accommodations under the new policy on inclusion adopted by the Board on March 6, 2010.
State demographics Address variations in exclusions and accommodations due solely to different population characteristics in a state.	In recent Report Cards: Improved explanation of likely reasons for state variations in proportion of special needs students, (especially English language learners), as well as state policy differences. These factors contribute to differences in exclusion and accommodation rates on NAEP.
Basis for variance in exclusion rates Expand the interpretation of results section in Report Cards to explain the basis for differences among states – the NAEP policy on accommodations and inclusion and state policies. This section should support states in communicating this issue to the press and districts.	***** See a summary of efforts to improve explanatory notes above.
Expertise related to SD and ELL students Include broad expertise relevant to students with disabilities and English language learners in the charge to the Board's Ad Hoc Committee.	Members appointed to the Ad Hoc Committee had broad expertise in teaching, research, and policy related to SD and ELL students. The Board widened the expertise brought to bear on this important issue by convening Expert Panels to provide further recommendations on the issues specific to English language learners and students with disabilities.

TOPIC#2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Within-year and across-year variations Ensure that the Ad Hoc Committee addresses the variations in exclusion rates within states over time, as well as variations among states in a given year.	In the policy adopted by the Board on March 6, 2010: A policy goal of high inclusion is emphasized—95 percent or higher for all students. Below an 85-percent participation rate for SD students or ELL students, reporting will prominently designate these participation rates in NAEP Report Cards.
Determining inclusion for each student - Add a NAEP appendix or a checkbox to individual education programs (IEPs) in case the student is sampled for NAEP, to indicate whether the student should participate in NAEP and how. States are concerned about consistency of decision protocols to exclude students at the school level, both from building-level staff and NAEP contractor staff. A coordinated effort is needed. - Create a guidance document to support state development of IEP templates.	Based on the Board-commissioned research to identify model rules for uniform national criteria, the Expert Panel recommendations, and the public comments received, the final policy developed by the Ad Hoc Committee has determined that that modifying IEP forms should not be pursued at this time.
The current decision trees Some Task Force members suggested that the Board standardize NAEP inclusion because it is a national test administration, and standardization supports NAEP's credibility. Other Task Force members disagreed, citing interruptions in the day-to-day accommodations the student already receives and different state definitions of English language learners. - Start with a least invasive approach, and then scale up if needed. - Examine how current policy can align with Title I. - Examine how prospective changes will be communicated to IEP teams. In considering the possibility of uniform national rules: - Uniform national rules may have unintended negative consequences if more students opt out. Participation and inclusion rates may decrease. - Consistency in inclusion is important to maximize comparability. Using the language screener would allow case-by-case determinations for each student. - Policy guidance in defining ELL subgroups could provide comparability.	In the policy adopted by the Board: The current decision tree is to be replaced with a new decision tree that standardizes participation in NAEP. An operational definition for ELL is provided for NAEP, and a language screener is supported as a future research and development effort.

TOPIC#2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Feasibility of new accommodations Investigate the feasibility of new accommodations to increase inclusion. Task Force members discussed that it is not clear from research whether reading aloud and permitting calculators threatens construct validity.	**✻** In the policy adopted by the Board: The guiding principles indicate a high priority for maximum inclusion of students while also maintaining the validity and comparability of collected data. Research is also a key component of the policy. The Governing Board has received presentations from NCES on various studies that address increased accessibility of NAEP. The Board will receive ongoing updates on this topic.
Prominence of exclusion rate data ▪ Add an indicator for level of exclusion adjacent to the NAEP Report Card achievement level state-by-state bar chart to increase attention to the inclusion issue and to provide clearer information. Footnotes and appendices can be easily overlooked. ▪ Use the next administration of NAEP to encourage maximum inclusion of SDs and ELLs without flagging jurisdictions whose inclusion rates do not meet the 95% and 85% goals. ▪ Identify states' distance from the 85% inclusion goal to motivate improvement.	In the policy adopted by the Board: Below an 85-percent participation rate for SD students or ELL students, reporting will prominently designate these participation rates in NAEP Report Cards.
Guidance for states Provide compelling guidance on this issue, similar to how NCLB regulations prompted states to align with 1% and 2% waivers for students with disabilities.	In the policy adopted by the Board: Resources that clearly outline the purpose and value of NAEP and of full student participation in the assessment are integral to encouraging high participation rates.

TOPIC#2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Considerations offered for the Ad Hoc Committee's deliberation ▪ What is NAEP's goal regarding inclusion? Does NAEP aim to include all students? A mission statement on this issue is one way to clearly communicate NAEP's goal. ▪ States vary greatly in the type of accommodations allowed. States with many accommodations are perceived as trying to influence their NAEP results. ▪ For comments on prospective policy options, the Education Information and Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) may be an avenue for discussion in order to get a more representative response from states. ▪ In considering research on accommodations, there is a solid body of knowledge on accommodations, especially since NCLB was enacted. This should be used as a resource as the Board moves forward.	In the policy adopted by the Board: The guiding principles indicate a high priority for maximum inclusion of students while also maintaining the validity and comparability of collected data. Research is also a key component of the policy. Comments from both the Task Force and EIMAC were collected and considered.
Policy suggestions for the Ad Hoc Committee ▪ Adopt a guiding principle that includes language about maximizing meaningful participation in order to provide the most accurate assessment of student performance. ▪ Focus on maintaining the purpose of NAEP. ▪ Encourage NAEP to accommodate to students. ▪ Distinguish modifications, which change what is being measured, from accommodations.	In the policy adopted by the Board: As noted above, the guiding principles indicate a high priority for maximum inclusion of students while also maintaining the validity and comparability of collected data. Also, accommodations and modifications are distinguished.
Feedback on preliminary recommendations of SD Expert Panel ▪ Clarify whether the 95% participation rate mentioned in the fourth recommendation includes or excludes students with significant cognitive disabilities. ▪ Clarify language about reporting NAEP results separately for IEP and 504 students. The Task Force noted that data variability within and across states regarding 504 students may make it difficult to disaggregate these data. ▪ List accommodations that are not permitted by NAEP instead of those that are permitted by NAEP. Specifying accommodations permitted by NAEP may inadvertently limit states from employing acceptable accommodations.	In the policy adopted by the Board: The participation rates and the reporting of IEP and 504 students are clarified in the policy. A list of NAEP-appropriate accommodations as well as non-allowed accommodations is to be provided to schools.
Feedback on preliminary recommendations of ELL Expert Panel ▪ Disaggregating data on ELLs, including by English language proficiency, will create a significant data burden on under-resourced state education agencies. Additionally, the data requested may be out of date, and both English proficiency assessment cut scores and proficiency levels vary across states. ▪ Instead of disaggregating students by proficiency level, consider comparing ELLs and former ELLs. This would be less problematic in terms of the data burden placed on states, and it would still distinguish students along the development continuum.	In the policy adopted by the Board: Support is provided for data displays of ELLs and former ELLs.

TOPIC#2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Feedback on final recommendations of the Expert Panels ▪ While endorsing the policy principles, the Task Force cautions against adding new requirements for states, such as the collection of additional data elements. ▪ Task Force members appreciate the emphasis placed on fairness to students, equity across states, and maximum inclusion.	In outreach efforts with stakeholders, data collection and other implementation issues are being addressed.
Outreach to support implementation ▪ Use NAEP ambassador meetings as an opportunity to gain high-level support for field-level implementation. ▪ Ensure that communication efforts do not overlap with peak test release time in the states. ▪ Send out early, succinct communication points to schools to begin the preparation phase. ▪ Collaborate with assessment teams to ensure all rules are being followed as closely as possible. ▪ Develop a PowerPoint and post it on the web to allow users to tailor it to their own special needs. Include a brief timeline providing an historical context for NAEP policy changes.	* Various outreach efforts have been implemented with workshops held for states and districts participating in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) on implementing the Board's new SD/ELL policy.
Reporting NAEP data under the new inclusion policy ▪ The margin of error should be generous enough to avoid penalizing states that have the same inclusion rate but have different sample sizes. If it is possible that different states could have the same participation/inclusion rates with one being flagged and the other not being flagged, then communication will be needed to help the public understand the differences. ▪ Provide general descriptive information in the reports about state and NAEP allowable accommodations to explain why students are excluded. ▪ Display the percentages of students with disabilities and English language learners in addition to the participation rates. ▪ Develop a communication plan with advance notice to states and talking points to probe thinking before the pre-release workshop. Include public information officers in the pre-release workshop and identify issues that are expected to be confusing to media and the public.	* The first round of NAEP reports under the new inclusion policy were released on November 1, 2011. These reports included a special Report Card section on inclusion and accommodations under the new policy. In December 2013, the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology will meet jointly with the Reporting and Dissemination Committee to address implementation issues related to the Board's policy on students with disabilities and English language learners.

TOPIC #3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS

Addressed in December 13, 2007 and August 23, 2013 in-person meetings and April 22, 2011, April 17, 2013, and June 6, 2013 WebExes.

TOPIC#3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Key subjects and grades for states Consider focusing on grades 4 and 8 reading and mathematics if Congress does not increase funding for NAEP. NAEP grades 4 and 8 are most valuable in state policy making. NAEP should also assess state-level science and writing.	Congress appropriated a $10 million increase for NAEP in Fiscal Year 2008. Therefore, cuts to the NAEP schedule of assessment were not needed for Fiscal Year 2008. In May 2009, the Board decided to administer the 2011 NAEP Writing assessment at the national level only in both grades 8 and 12 for this first-ever computer-based NAEP assessment.
Grade 12 NAEP Several Task Force members said that grade 12 should not be tested in NAEP, partly because state standards on secondary school specialty subjects diverge and the challenge of motivating students in grade 12 is formidable. These Task Force members supported the use of currently existing assessment instruments and other indicators of college preparation to identify whether an information base already exists for the progress of 12th graders. Other Task Force members indicated some support for testing at grade 12, highlighting that 12th graders might be more motivated to take a writing assessment than a multiple-choice test, partly because a writing assessment offers them an opportunity to express themselves. Also, grade 12 is important to providing a comprehensive view of assessment. Some of these Task Force members supported assessment of subjects on a cohort-basis so that the same cohort of students would be tested at grades 4, 8, and 12, and progress would be observed for each cohort.	In May 2010, the Board made several changes to the NAEP assessment schedule. One change was to increase the frequency of the grade 12 NAEP reading and mathematics assessments while providing for continued voluntary state-level participation. Both of these changes are also aligned with the Board's preparedness reporting initiative. In August 2013, the Board acted to reduce the frequency of grade 12 NAEP.
Frameworks as a resource for states Consider not only the benefit of the test data but the benefit of the NAEP frameworks when considering the schedule of future assessments. The Task Force acknowledged that NAEP frameworks are especially helpful to states—they are "keystone" documents. Many states use NAEP frameworks as a resource when revising their elementary and middle school standards.	***** The Board is examining ways to increase dissemination of NAEP frameworks through the Web and other outreach activities. The new Governing Board communications contractor Reingold has suggested several strategies for making NAEP frameworks more accessible to a wider audience.

TOPIC#3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Considerations on Computer-Based Grade 4 Writing ▪ Although some Task Force members noted that NAEP computer-based writing assessment at 4th grade may signal where we need to be as a nation, other Task Force members provided the following considerations for implementing a valid computer-based writing assessment at grade 4: ▪ Lack of experience. Students vary in their classroom experience with computers at grade 4. Several states do not begin computer-based writing assessment until grade 5. Some members voiced support for NAEP computer-based writing at grade 4 despite variability in students' experience. ▪ Developmental concerns. Some teachers are concerned that prior to grade 5, students may lack the developmental ability to compose writing on a computer. ▪ Capacity. State technology capacity remains a concern. Some states are transitioning to grade 4 computer-based assessments, but this is very uneven across the states.	***** Further action on the schedule may be needed, depending on the NAEP budget situation.
Planning the NAEP Schedule through 2022 ▪ *ESEA subjects.* Focusing NAEP resources on subjects mandated to be tested in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will help to align with national priorities. For example, if science is a higher priority in the reauthorization, then science would appear more frequently on the NAEP schedule of assessments. ▪ *NAEP reading and mathematics.* Maintaining NAEP's audit function by testing a variety of subjects as distinct from the Common Core State Standards may be useful to states, but some Task Force members questioned the need for future NAEP testing in reading and math. Criteria and considerations for priorities should include the Common Core and where NAEP can provide the best information to states. ▪ *Subjects other than NAEP reading and math.* Given future alignment among states and between consortia assessments and NAEP, there will be a heightened need for NAEP data in subjects not typically assessed by states, such as economics, civics, and the arts. ▪ *Common Core-NAEP alignment.* If revision to NAEP frameworks is planned, then align the NAEP frameworks to the Common Core State Standards on a more aggressive schedule in order to implement aligned tests earlier than proposed on the draft NAEP assessment schedule. ▪ *State readiness for computer-based delivery.* Obtain a status summary on whether and how states are administering computer-based assessments. There is a need for caution and flexibility in the schedule given the magnitude of changes and questions about capacity.	***** Further action on the schedule was taken in 2013 in light of the NAEP budget situation. There will be future discussions on budget at the December 2013 Board meeting.

TOPIC#3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Priorities for the schedule given the changing funding landscape
▪ The Task Force reiterated the value of having NAEP assessments that the state is not able to do on its own, including the computer-based assessments. This is an important benefit from NAEP.
▪ If it is necessary to prioritize due to limited resources, 12th grade assessments are less of a priority. For 12th grade assessment, there are questions about the motivations of the students and how the information is used. In addition, the 12th grade assessment will be less of a priority as states implement the new college and career-ready assessments. There is potential that states could be sending mixed messages to the public with both assessments.
▪ Other priorities are the new NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) assessment. This is an important issue and area to emphasize. Ideally, TEL could be expanded and states could have state-level results.
▪ Information from NAEP in new areas, such as the grade 4 computer based writing pilot, is especially useful in informing related state initiatives.
▪ A foreign language assessment will likely be more appealing to some states than others.
    □ For some states a foreign language assessment is very appealing. If done, it would need to be highly targeted to specific students.
    □ If this is identified as an area of expansion, however, NAGB may want to consider whether there is anything more generic that could be assessed as opposed to a specific language.
	✱
	The Board is considering the Task Force's feedback in ongoing discussions of the NAEP budget situation.

Considering the overall subject coverage of the NAEP Schedule
▪ Reducing the sample size may be preferable to completely eliminating an assessment in a subject area. Focal vs. non-focal reporting seems to be a promising strategy.
▪ The Task Force encouraged NAGB to consider the new landscape with the assessment consortia and what will be covered by the assessment consortia.
    □ Given that the assessments in math and English language arts will now be much more comparable across states, the Governing Board should consider how to avoid providing redundant information.
    □ There is value in keeping the NAEP Reading and Mathematics assessments for several years as states make this transition to help states make determinations about comparability. NAEP serves as an important independent indicator. It will be particularly useful to have a fixed assessment for some period of time (perhaps through 2020).
▪ Maintain current frequency of NAEP reading and mathematics during at least the transition period toward college and career ready assessments – in light of changing membership in consortia, NAEP's role as an independent monitor is important.
▪ Long-term trend NAEP's focus solely on basic skills is discordant with the current national context of education—this is subsumed in main NAEP assessments. This justifies reducing the frequency of this assessment, and possibly discontinuing it entirely.
	✱
	The Board is considering the Task Force's feedback in ongoing discussions of the NAEP budget situation.

TOPIC#3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Low priorities from the state perspective ▪ National only level reporting has little utility at the state level. ▪ From a state perspective, TUDA is less of a priority.	**∗** The Board is considering the Task Force's feedback in ongoing discussions of the NAEP budget situation.
Considerations in selecting the mode of assessment ▪ The Governing Board should consider concerns about time and burden of online testing in the coming years given the increased backlash against assessments.	**∗** The Board is considering the Task Force's feedback in ongoing discussions of the NAEP budget situation.

TOPIC #4: GRADE 12 NAEP

Addressed in December 13, 2007, May 29, 2008, December 16, 2008, May 28, 2009, January 7, 2011, August 15, 2011, January 8, 2013, and August 23, 2013 in-person meetings; September 16, 2008, March 24, 2009, June 13, 2011, June 12, 2012, and August 6, 2012 WebExes.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Facilitating transparency of the process Clarify purpose and timelines for reporting preparedness.	The issuance of the Technical Panel Final Report addresses this information. Task Force members also recommended research priorities, which were taken into account when the Board adopted the Program of Preparedness Research at the March 2009 quarterly Board meeting.
Using multiple tests Several Task Force members noted that states appreciate the ability to use multiple existing tests and minimize the testing burden.	Based on the discussions of the Technical Panel, the Board is pursuing various statistical relationship studies. Some of these studies examine NAEP performance in relation to performance on other assessments widely used as indicators of preparedness.
Addressing the motivation of 12th graders Some Task Force members noted that 12th graders would not be motivated unless stakes were attached to NAEP. Motivation of 12th graders taking NAEP remains a concern of the Task Force. Address the firm preconception that grade 12 students will not be motivated. Even if participation levels are high, it will take more than compelling data to gain support.	Several of the studies in the Board's Program of Preparedness Research relate NAEP performance to performance on other assessments. These analyses may provide a rich opportunity to examine motivation concerns for grade 12 NAEP examinees. The Board received an embargoed briefing in May 2009 and November 2009 regarding participation data and results of NAEP initiatives to increase participation and motivation. Another briefing on grade 12 participation and engagement was provided at the November 2010 Board meeting.
Reporting results from the state-level grade 12 NAEP pilot Some Task Force members noted that the grade 12 state pilot should be reported in a similar fashion as other NAEP assessments. Other Task Force members suggested that the pilot nature of the project be stressed. Acknowledge limitations in generalizing findings from an 11-state pilot.	NCES and Governing Board staff met with pilot states to discuss reporting issues and gather recommendations for 2009 reporting of grade 12 state-level results. The Board has adopted a resolution that calls for the first round of preparedness research findings to be reported separately from the standard NAEP Report Card data.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Pilot status of the grade 12 NAEP state-level assessment Provide the opportunity in the future for the Task Force to review data and preparedness research findings to further identify whether the "pilot" status of the state-level grade 12 NAEP assessment is appropriate.	*
Benchmarking performance at grade 12 Considering that most state assessments are directed at the 10th or 11th grade level, some Task Force members questioned the value of benchmarking performance at a 12th grade level.	*
Prospective information to collect from examinees Some Task Force members expressed interest in revising the student questionnaire, expanding the sample to allow for disaggregation based on student postsecondary options to further contextualize results, and setting achievement levels regarding preparedness.	The Board had already approved the 2009 background questionnaire, but it does include questions related to educational aspirations and postsecondary plans. The 2009 Grade 12 NAEP Report Card presents data regarding student aspirations. The Board convened an expert panel on background questions, and an Ad Hoc Committee has just completed its work in exploring enhancements to NAEP contextual information.
Preparedness definitions Clarify the meaning of preparedness and its relationship to states' and other organizations' definitions of preparedness and readiness. Some members expressed concern that NAEP's definition could lead to confusion, similar to the different definitions of proficient.	* The Technical Panel Final Report outlines more explicitly the meaning of preparedness in the NAEP context. At the November 2008 Board meeting, COSDAM affirmed the importance of the Panel's work in this regard. In March 2009, the Board adopted a working definition of preparedness in the NAEP context to be refined during the course of the Program of Preparedness Research.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Engaging multiple stakeholder groups Recognize the potential for the visibility of NAEP preparedness to encourage conversations between K-12, the business sector, and higher education institutions regarding the requirements for success after high school. This could be an opportunity to engage stakeholders.	The Technical Panel Final Report calls for subject matter experts to represent various stakeholder groups. At the November 2008 Board meeting, COSDAM affirmed the importance of this recommendation. The Board has engaged a commission comprised of Board members and other individuals with experience in government, industry, and education. The commission's focus is to communicate with a wide range of audiences regarding information and plans for reporting grade 12 NAEP results in terms of preparedness.
Implications for state accountability systems Anticipate the implications of NAEP preparedness reporting on state accountability systems, state high school testing, state P-16 conversations (including the establishment of statewide college placement cut scores), other organizations' definitions of readiness/preparedness (ACT, states, Achieve), state graduation rates, international benchmarking, state legislative school improvement funding, and state reporting on individual students. What will the NAEP preparedness indicators mean in this context, and how will they add value? Clarify what the preparedness indicators do and do not indicate.	***** The Technical Panel Final Report has addressed some of these issues and has outlined scenarios to more clearly indicate what NAEP preparedness indicators mean and what they do not mean. In 2012, the Board has discussed extensively how to communicate research findings from the Board's Program of Preparedness Research.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Distinguishing 12th grade preparedness from 12th grade proficient NAEP proficiency and preparedness results will be compared, and their meanings should be clear. Determine the value of continuing to report proficiency and what value NAEP preparedness can and should provide to states; consider using preparedness in place of proficiency. Achieve has asked states to equate proficiency with readiness for credit-bearing coursework.	***** In May 2009 and August 2009, there were joint sessions for the Board's COSDAM and R&D committees to discuss both the technical and reporting perspectives of prospective preparedness statements in NAEP Report Cards. The clarity of achievement levels and preparedness indicators was a key consideration in the joint discussion. This is issue has also been revisited in 2013 discussions on prospective NAEP preparedness reporting. The Board has engaged a commission comprised of Board members and individuals with experience in government, industry, and education. The commission's focus is to communicate with a wide range of audiences regarding information and plans for reporting grade 12 NAEP results in terms of preparedness.
Research projects Utilize careful standard-setting processes, post validity studies, and a clear narrow scope when developing the preparedness indicators, in the context of the broad range of evidence needed to determine students' preparedness.	The Program of Preparedness Research adopted by the Board in March 2009, addresses the importance of post validity studies through studies that examine NAEP data relative to outcome indicators available in longitudinal datasets.
Technical documentation as a resource Contextualize the results in a comprehensive technical report stressing the pilot status of the state-level results. The report should include important contextual factors such as student participation, motivation, and preparation as well as synthesizing findings from the studies suggested by the Technical Panel on 12th Grade Preparedness Research.	A comprehensive technical report will be released for each phase of the Board's program of preparedness research. The phase 1 report will be released in late 2012.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Implications of changing NAEP to a measure of preparedness The Task Force noted the dramatic change for NAEP from being a measure of progress to a measure of preparedness. NAEP assessments at grades 4, 8, and 12 have not been used to report on preparedness for the next educational stage. Some members cautioned that this may not be an advisable avenue for NAEP, while other members felt that the Governing Board's focus on academic preparedness, as opposed to readiness, is appropriate.	✳ The Board has engaged a commission comprised of Board members and individuals with experience in government, industry, and education. The commission is focused on communication efforts and strategies for the Board's plans to report grade 12 NAEP results in terms of preparedness.
Contextual information to consider with preparedness indicators The high school graduation rate is a preparedness indicator to the public. Differences between NAEP preparedness determinations and graduation rates will be controversial. The National Governors Association compact rate has focused the discussion on all students, not just students who reach the 12th grade. Some Task Force members noted providing graduation rate information may not fit with the focus of NAEP reports.	✳
Clarifying the definition of a 12th grade student The Task Force was not clear about whether students are considered 12th graders based on their high school cohort or based on credits earned. Since over-aged and under-credited high school students are disproportionately concentrated in large urban cities, an examination of this issue in Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) districts may be helpful.	✳
Considering the Board's working definition of preparedness Task Force members agreed that having separate definitions for college and workplace is worrisome—ideally, students would leave the school system prepared for work and college. Also, Task Force discussion included the idea of tiers (or degrees) of preparedness, which should be clearly communicated in the definition of preparedness. ▪ Thoroughly consider the implications of these definitions. Given NAEP's high visibility and the lack of consensus among other preparedness initiatives, these preparedness determinations will receive a lot of attention. ▪ Provide more clarity in the college preparedness definition by noting it refers to all postsecondary institutions (e.g., four- and two-year colleges). ▪ Include a statement noting that there are common skills that need to be mastered to enter either college or the workplace. ▪ Involve the career and technical education community in the development and refinement of the definition.	In March 2009, the Board adopted a working definition of preparedness in the NAEP context to be refined during the course of the Program of Preparedness Research.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
How NAEP preparedness can be useful to states ▪ Reporting for broader representative groups of students (instead of reporting solely on college-bound students, for example) ▪ Providing a system evaluation (as opposed to student-level information) ▪ Reporting preparedness for specified postsecondary education environments rather than treating postsecondary education as monolithic ▪ Anchoring NAEP cut scores to external reference points ▪ Serving as a possible analysis tool, e.g., relating preparedness information to subscale performance ▪ Combining the transcript study with NAEP administration to link course taking with performance. ▪ Reporting degrees of preparedness rather than using a dichotomous approach	✱ In May 2010, the Board made several changes to the NAEP assessment schedule. One change was to increase the frequency of the grade 12 NAEP reading and mathematics assessments while providing for continued voluntary state-level participation. Both of these changes are also aligned with the Board's preparedness reporting initiative. As the Board moves forward with its preparedness research and reporting initiative, several of these ideas have been discussed.
Considering NAEP reading results and preparedness indicators A cross grade reading scale would allow appropriate comparisons between 4th and 8th grade data. However, the cross grade scale may be more appropriate at grades 4 and 8 than at grade 12, especially with the new focus on preparedness.	✱
Suggestions regarding grade 12 NAEP preparedness reporting ▪ Hold pre-release data-free briefings to facilitate better understanding of the results. ▪ Emphasize that the first report is just one piece of information, and that additional findings will be released as part of an iterative process. ▪ Incorporate the use of other measures to determine preparedness, e.g., transcript data.	✱ The emphasis that the first report is an initial step has been addressed in the outreach conducted by the NAEP 12th Grade Preparedness Commission. Symposia have been held in several states across the country over the past few years.
Key considerations regarding defining grade 12 NAEP preparedness ▪ Consider whether differences exist between preparedness and proficiency at grade 12. ▪ Consider whether this is meant to be a measure of those students in grade 12 or the cohort entering high school at grade 9. ▪ Consider effects of the Common Core State Standards Initiative—its definition of "readiness" seems to be headed in a different direction compared to the Governing Board's preparedness initiative. ▪ Hold joint conversations between NAEP, consortia, and vendors to support comparability. There should be efforts to align definitions of readiness and preparedness.	✱ As the Board moves forward with its preparedness research and reporting initiative, several of these ideas have been discussed. The Board has been holding ongoing conversations with the assessment consortia.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Preparedness and readiness terminology The Task Force expressed concern that NAEP and the states may be approaching a potential communication problem similar to the communication challenges caused by the differences between NAEP and state definitions of proficient. NAEP is using the term preparedness to mean the same thing as the term readiness used by the U.S. Department of Education, states, the Common Core State Standards, and the assessment consortia.	***** As the Board moves forward with its preparedness research and reporting initiative, several of these ideas have been discussed.
Strategies for using NAEP academic preparedness data ▪ Focus on the likelihood argument to connote a range of performance, e.g., x% are likely to not need remedial/developmental coursework; avoid the precise argument. ▪ Frame the results in terms of establishing a baseline of performance. ▪ Tie the results to the common goal of Common Core readiness. ▪ Emphasize the definition of preparedness being used. ▪ Distinguish between the needs of colleges and careers on a continuum, e.g., two-year, four-year, types of careers. ▪ Include comparisons with tests administered by the business community to strengthen the validation, e.g., industry certification.	***** As the Board moves forward with its preparedness research and reporting initiative, several of these ideas have been discussed.
Task Force feedback on reporting recommendations ▪ *Expanding NAEP's reporting role.* NAEP's traditional role of reporting student performance at the national and state levels appears to be expanding to include reporting preparedness. ▪ *Encouraging student tracking.* An unintended consequence of readiness and preparedness reporting may be: reinforcing the tracking of students.	*****
Task force suggestions for next steps in preparedness research and reporting ▪ Use nuance to avoid making statements that appear to relate to individual students. ▪ Continue to collaborate on aligning consortia readiness and NAEP preparedness to avoid confusion and validity concerns. ▪ Consider segmenting the types of colleges and careers that are represented by NAEP performance labels to provide more fine-grained information. ▪ Continue studying readiness for entry into job training programs in order to make statements about academic preparedness for this area. ▪ Ensure that the career preparedness discussions are focusing on what current employers expect.	As the Board moves forward with its preparedness research and reporting initiative, several of these ideas have been discussed.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Feedback: Advantages and disadvantages of a 2012 progress report on NAEP preparedness research
The Task Force valued more heavily the option of releasing the progress report on preparedness in 2012. The option of releasing the NAEP preparedness report after later phases of research are completed was less favored.
    ▪ One of the chief advantages to a 2012 release is showing that the Governing Board's work is relevant to the conversation of what preparedness means. Additionally, this is a critical time to be in the conversation.
    ▪ Challenges of releasing the progress report at this time:
    There are several competing definitions of preparedness and college and career readiness. There is concern about how the average person will understand these multiple definitions. How do they make sense of this without losing faith in the assessment industry? How does someone understand what it means to be prepared for college and career?
	✳
	
	A comprehensive technical report will be released for each phase of the Board's program of preparedness research. The phase 1 report will be released in late 2012.

Feedback: Communication strategies to avoid misinterpretation of the progress report
    ▪ Some of the research raises questions about the relevance of certain skills tested by NAEP for students entering job training programs. More information on this feedback may be helpful and the Board should be particularly cautious in how this information is communicated.
    ▪ It is important to consider how college readiness is discussed in relation to career readiness.
    ▪ There is a need to improve the language regarding: what does preparedness mean and what does readiness mean? These questions should be addressed in the release.
    ▪ Discussion among NAEP and the two main assessment consortia (PARCC and Smarter Balanced) should be held soon to address this issue.
	✳
	
	Initial conversations with the Smarter Balanced leadership have been initiated. CCSSO has also offered to convene the respective leadership teams as a neutral party to facilitate this effort.

TOPIC#4: GRADE 12 NAEP	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Suggested communication strategies *(formulated in conjunction with the NAGB Business Policy Task Force in January 2013 in-person meeting)* • Participate in State symposia. Representatives from NAEP could come to the state and present to key stakeholders the story about 12th grade preparedness, for example. • Engage the statewide superintendents associations. There are many innovative groups of superintendents who are trying to determine how to prepare students for careers even if students do not want to go to college. • Take advantage of social media and pre-existing networks. One example is the National Parent Teachers Association. • Engage statewide business groups. Representatives from NAEP could meet with roundtable groups about targeted issues relevant to the groups. • Highlight the NAEP test questions. When people see the actual questions, it improves their understanding of NAEP. • Share information through national public television. • Define the purpose of sharing information. It would be helpful for the Governing Board to articulate a few core points about the purpose of the communications. For example, when someone sees communication from NAEP, what is it NAEP wants them to do (be better informed, to advocate for something specific, etc.)?	**∗** The Board is preparing for an early 2014 release of the first grade 12 NAEP Report Card that includes preparedness information.
Communication strategies for the 2013 grade 12 NAEP Report Card • A clear distillation of the research findings (as well as an executive summary with key takeaways) is needed in the first Report Card with preparedness results. • Explain how and why the preparedness indicator score for math falls below the proficiency cut score. • Prepare information packages for state communication directors early so they can start spreading the message in their states—tailoring for states with state pilot results. This should be part of a larger effort in supporting assessment literacy, e.g., clearly distinguishing the role of NAEP versus the role of state assessments. • Conduct informational briefings with the media early to prepare them directly. • A video would be especially effective. See the recent NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy video for a good model.	**∗** The Board is preparing for an early 2014 release of the first grade 12 NAEP Report Card that includes preparedness information.
Future considerations for the Board's grade 12 NAEP preparedness reporting and program of research • The Board's definition of preparedness appears to be vague, especially relative to other sources such as ACT. Job training also needs more detail to avoid being interpreted as basic literacy.	**∗**

TOPIC #5: NAEP READING TREND LINE

Addressed in February 22, 2008 and March 11, 2008 WebExes; May 29, 2008 in-person meeting.

TOPIC#5: NAEP READING TREND LINE

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Technical decision and process Determine criteria and process for evaluating feasibility of reading trend, and for reporting 2009 reading results.	COSDAM discussed options for criteria and timelines for decision-making.
Short-term: Communication Plan for 2009 ▪ Communicate what has happened early through a communication plan that is tiered to multiple audiences based on expertise and interest. ▪ Start communication messages with the rationale for the change, the overall issue, and key milestones. ▪ Follow with the details by repeating interlocking messages as each milestone is reached to reinforce the rationale for the change. ▪ Do not underestimate how often to repeat the message. ▪ Frame the message positively. Avoid negative words like "break." Use positive terms such as "create" or "develop." ▪ Be as transparent as possible in communicating studies of content and statistical linking.	The 2009 NAEP Reading Report Card was released. Additional resources were developed to address how trend results were communicated, given the change in frameworks.
Long-term: Policy Development ▪ Recognize implications that the reading trend decision will have on NAEP trends in future subject area assessments. ▪ Think carefully about the criteria (regardless of subject) for content and statistical linking. ▪ Consider the 2009 reading trend in the context of other trend areas. Consider conditions that necessitate a new trend and when a new trend is not needed. ▪ Consider focusing on what type of change was made and where that fits into the hierarchy of possible changes in order to drive decisions made about trend lines; statistical issues should be secondary. ▪ Consider how future trend line decisions will be affected by the current alignment between state tests and NAEP.	✱ At the November 2009 meeting, the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology noted several implications for future policy development. Discussions are expected to continue.

Addressed in June 26, 2008, June 13, 2011, April 30, 2012, and June 6, 2013 WebExes and February 16, 2012, January 8, 2013, and August 23, 2013 in-person meetings. Previously titled "NAEP Race/Ethnicity Reporting."

Task Force members shared their thoughts on potential implications that may arise as states transition toward the new race/ethnicity categories mandated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), noting that it may take years for data collection and related protocols to stabilize at the school-level. The Task Force's discussions recognized that validity of state-to-state comparisons and reporting of racial/ethnic achievement gaps will likely be challenged by this complex issue. With states implementing the new race/ethnicity categorizations at different times, the Task Force also noted that the lack of a uniform transition will mean a lack of a standard baseline. In 2011, the Board convened an expert panel working group to provide recommendations for how to maximize the use of NAEP background questions. In the Task Force's discussion of the working group 2012 recommendations report, the most useful variables to states were: career skills, school climate, parental involvement, and student expectations/aspirations. In 2013, the Task Force discussion focused on NAEP's efforts to refine measures of socioeconomic status and Board initiatives to improve NAEP questionnaires.

TOPIC#6: NAEP BACKGROUND QUESTIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Strategic considerations for the transition process ▪ During the transition period, constituent groups may develop a perception that NAEP and states are not being as transparent as possible in communicating about this issue. ▪ States that adopt the new race/ethnicity guidelines early may be able to provide guidance about communication. ▪ Impact on states will depend on state demographics.	*
Suggestions for NAEP implementation ▪ Using data collected from the EDEN system of the U.S. Department of Education, examine data from both new and old systems to allow for comparisons. ▪ Allow many racial/ethnic categories to be reported in NAEP Report Cards, e.g., allowing the possibility of summing to over one hundred percent, if appropriate. ▪ Distinguish data collection and reporting issues. ▪ Involve policy and assessment staff in these ongoing conversations to assess full implications beyond data. ▪ Poll states using the CCSSO network to determine how varied states' plans are.	* The Board is monitoring changes in race/ethnicity categories and their potential impact on trends.
Reporting race/ethnicity data under the new OMB guidelines ▪ Preserve trend lines by maintaining the old categories in the body of the report and reporting the new categories in the appendices. ▪ Specify the state's racial/ethnic population and the status of the state's racial/ethnic data collection when the test was administered, and provide general guidelines on how to interpret the NAEP data given the state's demographic and data collection context.	* The 2011 NAEP Reading and Mathematics Report Cards were released on November 1, 2011. The 2011 reports include data on the new race/ethnicity categories for NAEP reporting.

TOPIC#6: NAEP BACKGROUND QUESTIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Implications for reporting background information ■ Balance "the amount of story" with the amount of substance in terms of NAEP data. Incorporating analyses of background variables in relation to achievement in the main Report Card may present correlations, which should be carefully explained to avoid causal inferences. ■ Comparing "Common Core" and "non-Common Core" states may be problematic.	✱
Considerations for item development ■ Be mindful of any increase in test length/time. ■ There may be negative implications of adding background questions for students that are not related to in-school activities. ■ The overall purpose of background questions should determine the scope of the questions.	✱ The Board convened an expert panel on background questions, and an Ad Hoc Committee has completed its work in exploring enhancements to NAEP contextual information. The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.
Determining data collection focus areas ■ For some states, the state longitudinal data system is the best source of student level demographic information. ■ The background questions could gather information on career skills to provide insights into how to assess these skills. These data are not generally collected by states, but they would be useful to both states and parents.	✱ The Board convened an expert panel on background questions, and an Ad Hoc Committee has completed its work in exploring enhancements to NAEP contextual information. The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.

TOPIC#6: NAEP BACKGROUND QUESTIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**

Task Force feedback on the 2012 expert panel recommendations report
- *Privacy concerns.* There are concerns about the appropriateness of certain questions that could be asked and their purposes. Depending on the question, additional consents may be needed at the school or district level because of state-specific privacy concerns about maintaining student confidentiality.
- *Common uses of NAEP at the state-level.* States primarily use NAEP data for additional information to supplement state data. For example, states use their own data for root cause analysis and then use NAEP to help determine if emerging issues are shared across other states or specific to their home state.
- *Purpose of the questionnaires*
   □ The purpose of the background questions and analyses should be to illuminate correlations between NAEP student performance and background questions.
   □ The Task Force would appreciate more detailed information on this topic, such as the target audience for the information from background questions and the intended uses of background questions, including potential decisions these data are expected to inform.
	*
	
	The Board convened an expert panel on background questions, and an Ad Hoc Committee has completed its work in exploring enhancements to NAEP contextual information. The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.

Task Force suggestions for future questionnaires - Make better use of existing NAEP background data in an accessible and useful format. - Improve online NAEP data analysis tools to facilitate use of data by various audiences. - Consider removing some existing questions to create space for new questions in order to maintain the existing time allotment for background questions. - Focus some new questions on "career skills" and post-secondary plans. This information would be particularly useful to states (as previously noted). - Clarify who will use any new information produced by the questionnaires and how the information will be used, to guide which questions should be asked. - Explore different disaggregations. Aggregated state-level data may obscure meaningful differences in student performance.	***** The Board convened an expert panel on background questions, and an Ad Hoc Committee has completed its work in exploring enhancements to NAEP contextual information. The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.

TOPIC#6: NAEP BACKGROUND QUESTIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Determining how to measure socioeconomic status (SES) ▪ To inform which data are collected, consider: what is the desired decision to improve learning and teaching that will result by changing the definition of SES or by collecting various data related to SES? ▪ It is important to develop a definition for SES that is strong yet also one for which it is possible to collect valid and reliable data. ▪ What difference does the SES indicator make? This is an important question to drive NAEP's questionnaire. ▪ Avoid confounding the individual (or home) notion of socioeconomic status and community socioeconomic status. If the two components are put into the same variable, analysts lose the ability to disentangle where policy can impact improving schooling and where there are factors upon which a policy impact is not possible. ▪ Keep community and school indicators separate to disentangle issues such as high SES students in schools with mostly low SES students. ▪ What composite picture can be developed about whether the data to be collected for SES represent the things that have an influence on student performance? In considering which variables to include in the U.S. background questions, focus on the factors that prepare students or help them to be better prepared (access to a computer, for example). ▪ Keep NAEP's SES indicators educationally relevant, e.g., WiFi access and dedicated space for homework, but sensitivity of questions should also be carefully reviewed.	* The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.
Aggregating data to guide useful interpretations ▪ The high-density poverty measure (at the community or school level) has been used as one way to define high-risk students in some states. ▪ Comparability should not be assumed between what a low-income person has in the U.S. versus what a low-income person has in other countries, for example.	* The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.
Utility of background information for states ▪ The background information that is collected is still useful in states. It allows states to make important comparisons that go beyond overall scores to better understand the performance of different subgroups. ▪ In states with high proportions of low SES students, low SES indicators are not currently providing actionable information — additional specificity is needed. ▪ Avoid an SES indicator that is so complex that it is not comparable at the state-level.	* The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.

TOPIC#6: NAEP BACKGROUND QUESTIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Streamlining data elements collected in the questionnaire ■ The Task Force recommends determining if there is more information that can be obtained from other information systems (as opposed to collecting the information during the assessment) to reduce the amount of time this adds to the time for the assessment. ■ The Task Force recommends that the Governing Board be especially thoughtful in discussing the collection of background information given the current sensitivities on data collection. ■ The Task Force encouraged NAGB to consider how to streamline the information they collect directly from students. ■ Coordinate with other federal programs to minimize the burden on students and schools. ■ Align with the "economically disadvantaged" indicator to avoid data mismatches that complicate state comparisons between NAEP and other information sources. ■ Questions on out-of-school topics are acceptable, but should be carefully pilot tested.	* The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013.
Improving dissemination of information from background data ■ Disseminate daily or weekly emails with expert summaries, blurbs, or snippets on the contextual data that can help principals and test coordinators support student success—more attention is needed in helping states make use of this information. ■ The Task Force advocates for shorter briefs on the data so chiefs and others are more likely to read them.	* The Board is considering recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on NAEP Background Information. The Board is planning to adopt responsive changes to the framework in December 2013. The Board is also planning to prepare focus reports to further disseminate information from NAEP background questionnaires.

TOPIC #7: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

Addressed in May 28, 2009, January 25, 2010, July 20, 2010, and August 23, 2013 in-person meetings.

As new milestones are reached in the Common Core State Standards initiative, Task Force discussions have provided insights about state perspectives on how NAEP's role may evolve. Several of the Task Force's recommendations on this topic are reflected in other topics, such as Topic #3 NAEP Schedule of Assessments and Topic #10 Board Initiatives on Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps. This has been an ongoing cross-cutting issue discussed in several areas. The most recent annual briefing for the Board from state assessment consortia representatives was at the August 2013 Board meeting. The session included an extended discussion of the accommodations that are being permitted for assessments of reading. In 2013, the Task Force shared its perspectives on the current policies being considered for inclusion, particularly with respect to accommodations.

TOPIC#7: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Role of NAEP ▪ NAEP should maintain its role as an independent monitor of student achievement in the short-term. There is tremendous value in NAEP trends, and NAEP is highly regarded. ▪ NAEP may be able to serve as an anchor to judge the common core assessments, possibly by releasing a special set of items only to states. States could build assessments to anchor against NAEP as an indication of rigor. ▪ International measures could be the key contribution from NAEP that complements the Common Core.	In August 2008, August 2009, and May 2010, the Board heard presentations from the organizations spearheading the development of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). At the November 2010 and August 2011 Board meetings, the Board heard a presentation from the two assessment consortia, whose work builds on the CCSS effort. At the November 2009 meeting, the consensus of the Executive Committee was that the Board should continue being proactive in following this initiative as it develops and to be supportive and cooperative in responding to requests from CCSSO and NGA. At the May 2010 Board meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Board began discussions about the future of NAEP. This discussion has been a recurring feature of Board meetings.
NAEP communications and informational resources ▪ Differentiate NAEP and the Governing Board from the Common Core and other assessment initiatives. It is important to highlight the differences between NAEP and the assessments for the Common Core. If there are no differences, people may lose interest in NAEP. ▪ Efforts should be pursued to avoid confusion between Report Card releases and releases related to the Common Core Standards initiative. ▪ Create a compare/contrast document that clarifies similarities and intended purposes of all assessments. Focus on comparison as opposed to "alignment."	At the May 2010 Board meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Board began discussions to explore how NAEP can enhance the information it provides to the nation. This discussion has been a recurring feature of Board meetings.

TOPIC#7: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Accommodations being considered by the assessment consortia ▪ Differences in accommodation policies could generate data and information that would inform the debate on valid accommodations. ▪ Student IEPs drive accommodation decisions for many states, within the allowable parameters specified by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). ▪ Alignment with the construct (defined in advance) should inform decisions on accommodations; if an accommodation redefines a construct for NAEP, it should not be classified as an allowable accommodation for NAEP. ▪ NAEP should be consistent with ED-supported state assessment accommodations.	*

Addressed in September 11, 2009, November 3, 2009, and April 6, 2010 WebExes; July 20, 2010 meeting.

In discussions of *Topic #1: NAEP Reporting Process*, the Task Force has emphasized the growing issue of misuse and misinterpretation of NAEP data. The growing prominence of this as a standalone specific reporting issue has initiated *Topic #8: Misuse and Misinterpretation of NAEP Data*.

TOPIC#8: MISUSE AND MISINTERPRETATION OF NAEP DATA	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**

Resources for countering instances of misuse and misinterpretation
In some states, NAEP data are being used to infer average NAEP scores at the school district level and in other states the differing percentage of students performing at Proficient on NAEP and at Proficient on the state exam is used to discredit state assessment programs. States are not seen as credible when responding to these types of critical research. Focused stand-alone materials for stakeholders should be developed using affirmative language to demonstrate how NAEP should and should not be used. The Governing Board should take a more active role in countering misuse of NAEP data.
▪ Consider developing a policy statement on the appropriate use of NAEP data.
▪ Create the following proactive products:
    ▪ A statement from the Governing Board regarding recurring misuses.
    ▪ A flyer to illustrate how NAEP data can be used; address how NAEP data should not be used by using affirmative language wherever possible.
    ▪ A template letter from the Chairman of the Governing Board to respond to common misuses or misinterpretations that arise in op-ed pieces. This will be particularly useful in defending against intentional misuses of data.
	✱
	At the August 2009 Board meeting, COSDAM received a briefing from NCES on related efforts they are spearheading.
	
	At the November 2009 Board meeting, COSDAM was briefed by Task Force member Teri Siskind, who provided a summary of the Task Force's suggestions for addressing this issue.
	
	The NAEP Validity Studies (NVS) panel, an expert advisory group to NCES, has initiated efforts to develop materials that address interpretation issues.

Definitions of proficient
Clarify the relationship between state and NAEP definitions of proficient as well as the conceptual underpinnings, e.g., the larger content coverage of NAEP assessments.
▪ NAEP performance levels are aspirational goals, developed in the early 1990s.
▪ State performance levels are accountability determinations developed in terms of grade-level performance as part of No Child Left Behind.
▪ Options:
    ▫ Convey degrees of proficiency (e.g., basic proficiency, proficiency, and advanced proficiency). This suggested labeling would be easier for the public to understand in conjunction with states' reports of proficiency.
    ▫ Expand the interpretation of results section in Report Cards to include more explanation regarding differences in proficiency definitions.
▪ Consider whether the Board would like to support removing the term "Proficient" from state performance expectations in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The Task Force is ready to provide the Board with advice on this topic, if desired.
	✱
	In November 2009, the Board's Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology received a briefing from Task Force member Teri Siskind that highlighted the Task Force's concern about the usage of proficient.
	
	The Board is discussing future use of the term proficient and reauthorization legislation as part of the larger discussion on the future of the Governing Board and NAEP. This discussion began at the May 2010 quarterly Board meeting.

TOPIC#8: MISUSE AND MISINTERPRETATION OF NAEP DATA	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Making data presentations easier to interpret Consider the following changes for NAEP reports: ▪ Translate the effect size for the reader. It is difficult for states to police interpretation of scales. ▪ Change the vertical scale so that it is not as easily misinterpreted. One possibility may be to include the grade-level of the student assessed in front of his/her score (e.g., 4-350 for fourth graders, 8-350 for eighth graders, and 12-350 for twelfth graders). ▪ Reconsider the presentation of state rankings. States are ranked higher or lower than each other even if the scale score differences are insignificant or nonexistent. ▪ Compare states with surrounding states or other demographically similar states. The public may be likely to rank states using the online tool without appropriate context or understanding. In discussing the potential for a mega-states report, Task Force members pointed out the vast demographic differences between the five most populous states and discussed the potential value of analyzing states with the largest populations of certain students (e.g., English language learners (ELLs) or Native American students). This sort of analysis may be more useful instead of focusing on overall student population size. ▪ Use upcoming Report Card release to issue caveats of what the data signify and how the data can and cannot be interpreted.	**＊** As a new type of report, the Board has outlined a mega-states special analytical report that would include states with the largest public school enrollment. The primarily internet-based report would feature new data displays that can be considered for future NAEP Report Cards. The Mega-States report was released in early 2013. Starting in 2013, Report Cards have been redesigned in order to take advantage of web-based delivery and interactivity.

TOPIC#8: MISUSE AND MISINTERPRETATION OF NAEP DATA	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Outreach efforts with stakeholders Engage the following groups proactively: - Engage national/AP/wire reporters for pre-release data-free briefings. Reinstate this with the mapping study. - Convene PIOs for pre-release data-free briefings to help PIOs prepare their state's reporters. - Reach out to schools of journalism to raise the profile of these issues among faculty, who can then provide responsive training to their students. - Engage the Education Writers Association to discuss use and misuse of data. - Consider focusing on research organizations, e.g., foundations and think tanks. - Consider state concerns about unscrupulous third party reactions to NAEP results. - Provide a timely briefing on new Report Card releases for Public Information Officers (PIOs) and other communications stakeholders on the relevant contextual information, so that they are better equipped to deal with media inquiries.	***** Governing Board and NCES discussions are underway to consider how outreach can be expanded to support a better understanding of NAEP. One key objective of the communications plan adopted by the Board is to strengthen the relevance and use of The Nation's Report Card, expanding engagement with NAEP data and research and using Report Card releases as a high profile catalyst for continuous outreach that engages and informs audiences throughout the year. The Board holds meetings with editorial boards for major news outlets around the country. These meetings address NAEP issues to raise awareness and provide clarifications that will improve reporting on NAEP. The Board's Executive Director is engaging in speaking opportunities and presentations to various policy groups. This includes groups such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the CCSSO Chiefs Policy Forum.
Supporting appropriate interpretations of NAEP data - Produce a brief document or brochure on sampling and incorporate frequent misconceptions. - Produce more materials that are easy to repackage (plug) into a story, and this will naturally encourage reporters to use the materials.	*****

TOPIC #9: INTERNATIONAL BENCHMARKING

Addressed in May 28, 2009 (as part of Topic #7: Common Core State Standards), January 25, 2010, and July 20, 2010 in-person meetings.

With national and state-level support for gathering more information on how U.S. students compare with international peers, the Task Force is discussing important considerations for the Board's future work in this area.

TOPIC#9: INTERNATIONAL BENCHMARKING

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Considerations for possible future roles of NAEP ▪ NAEP can be used as the international benchmark. ▪ Chiefs are concerned about overtesting, but there is urgency for international comparisons and a desire to improve efficiency and effectiveness. ▪ Embed non-secured NAEP items on state assessments to be used as a set of anchor data to determine alignment capabilities. ▪ International measures could be the key contribution from NAEP that complements the Common Core. With this in mind, it may be important for the nation to strongly consider grade 12 TIMSS participation.	In November 2009, the Board adopted a resolution supporting international linking projects for NAEP. In March 2010 and May 2010, the Board adopted changes to the NAEP Schedule of Assessments to further support international linking projects. Results from the 2011 NAEP/TIMSS Linking Study was released in October 2013.

TOPIC #10: BOARD INITIATIVES ON RAISING ACHIEVEMENT AND CLOSING GAPS

Addressed in January 7, 2011, August 15, 2011, and February 16, 2012 in-person meetings; February 15, 2011and April 30, 2012 WebExes.

As new initiatives are being considered by the Board addressing achievement gaps and the evolving policy context, the Task Force has provided timely suggestions.

TOPIC#10: BOARD INITIATIVES ON RAISING ACHIEVEMENT AND CLOSING GAPS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Considerations and suggestions for future initiatives in development ▪ Involve states instead of reaching schools directly without burdening state budgets. ▪ Identify stakeholder groups that are already engaging parents in community-based efforts to raise awareness of public education issues. ▪ Emphasize comparative international standing and achievement gaps to change expectations. ▪ Focus reporting on what students can do at each level, and compare these results to skills required by colleges and careers to make the information meaningful and action-oriented. ▪ Personalize NAEP by developing a tool that parents can use to identify the questions they should be asking about student performance, and help parents organize around these tools. ▪ Feature sample items to demonstrate test rigor, or make sample tests available. ▪ Extract and share lessons about teachers or use of time from the NAEP background questionnaire. ▪ Reach out to different sources, such as the Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT) and the military, regarding cutting-edge technologies for data capture that could make Artificial Intelligence (AI) scoring more accessible to states. ▪ Foster collaboration between NCES and the consortia on AI scoring.	✱ At the May 2010 Board meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Board began discussions to explore how NAEP can enhance the information it provides to the nation. This discussion has been a recurring feature of Board meetings. The Board is organizing a Parent Summit for January 2014, which will highlight ways to better engage with and understand NAEP data.
Valuable Roles for NAEP in the Common Core Era ▪ Continue to serve as a valid external auditing tool to gauge the effectiveness of common and individual state assessments. ▪ Provide supplementary information with respect to consortia assessments. ▪ Link NAEP content to various international assessments, in addition to the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). State budgets do not allow for states to participate directly in international assessments, and these linking studies provide the opportunity for states to obtain feedback on different types of assessments. ▪ Serve as a resource to guide policy at the national, state, and local levels, instead of focusing on school implementation activities. ▪ Use NAEP data other than achievement data in a meaningful way that can inform and shape policy (e.g., richer extraction of NAEP background questionnaire data about student characteristics).	✱ At the May 2010 Board meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Board began discussions to explore how NAEP can enhance the information it provides to the nation. This discussion has been a recurring feature of Board meetings. In March 2010 and May 2010, the Board adopted changes to the NAEP Schedule of Assessments to further support international linking projects.

TOPIC#10: BOARD INITIATIVES ON RAISING ACHIEVEMENT AND CLOSING GAPS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Considerations for the role of NAEP ▪ *Stretching the intended role of NAEP.* The Task Force is concerned with the Board's desire to make NAEP more relevant, given the intended purpose of NAEP. Moving away from NAEP's purpose may result in complicated messaging and negative media attention for NAEP. ▪ *Describing best practices at the state-level.* Promoting "best practices" for states is problematic and may be used against some jurisdictions. States are presented in NAEP reporting as homogeneous jurisdictions without sensitivity to differences among states. ▪ *Highlighting best practices without influencing curricular decisions.* Legislation precludes the use of NAEP to influence curricular decisions; there is a thin line between influencing curriculum and sharing best practices. ▪ *Policy context shifts affecting NAEP's role.* The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act could change the role of NAEP in the context of Common Core and consortia assessments. ▪ *Losing impact in the context of over-testing sentiment.* There is a sentiment of over-testing, and there are several negative reports on student performance, which may be overwhelming for the public. ▪ *Identifying NAEP's relevance to parents.* Research findings indicate that international comparisons are not resonating with parents.	∗ The Board developed a list of priority activities and action plans at the December 2011 Board meeting.
Suggestions for using NAEP data ▪ Use background information to contextualize what students are learning, as done with the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). ▪ Use NAEP results to identify high-performing student groups and report the results in terms of what is working for groups of students. ▪ Triangulate NAEP results with results from other large-scale assessment programs external to states (e.g., SAT, ACT, TIMSS, PISA, PIRLS) to answer the questions: What are the data telling us? How can we inform expectations about rigor?	∗ The Board convened an expert panel on contextual questions in November 2011 with a report to the Board in March 2012.
Suggestions for sharing NAEP data with new audiences ▪ Enhance pre-service teachers' understanding of NAEP by working with national teacher preparation organizations to promote NAEP's value early in teachers' careers and leverage the university research-based perspective. ▪ Build researcher capacity to appropriately use, interpret, and report on best practices. ▪ Focus the parent initiative on the college preparedness discussion, which is relevant to parents and connects to the Common Core State Standards.	∗ The Board is organizing a Summit for Parent Leaders in January 2014, which will highlight ways to better engage with and understand NAEP data.

TOPIC#10: BOARD INITIATIVES ON RAISING ACHIEVEMENT AND CLOSING GAPS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Suggested improvements for planning the parent initiative ■ Define the audience more clearly. Consider the purpose of the Board's initiative in informing parents and goal of raising achievement and closing gaps. Finally, determine what action parents are being asked to take; in other words, what does the Board want parents to do with the NAEP results? ■ Place NAEP in the larger context of state/consortia assessment for coherent communications about the value/future of NAEP and alignment with state/consortia assessment. Focus on building validity/role of NAEP at policymaker level. ■ Use sample questions to illustrate NAEP; consider how complementary the items are to state assessments. Leverage mass communications and engage the National School Public Relations Association.	**✳** The Board used the Task Force's input to refine the audience and specificity of its final recommendations for implementing the parent initiative.
Task Force suggestions for focus report development In developing focus reports, the Task Force provided the following suggestions to the Board: ■ Ensure a direct relationship between the topic and NAEP achievement. ■ Ensure objectivity of analysis. ■ Consider new background questions that will enrich the focus reports. For example, if there will be a focus report on charter schools, then identify background questions that will be relevant to this topic.	**✳** NCES has several focus reports in the development stage. The Board is considering additional topics for focus reports.
Task Force priority topics for future focus reports ■ Charter schools: A 10-year report ■ Opportunity-to-Learn ■ Education policies and instructional practices of high-performing or high-growth states and districts ■ Learning in the South ■ Other regional reports ■ Eighth-grade algebra (access to algebra rigor)	**✳**

TOPIC #11: FUTURE OF NAEP INITIATIVES

Addressed in February 16, 2012 in-person meeting.

In January 2012, NCES sponsored a summit for a broad range of SEA staff regarding the NAEP's future role and potential advances for assessment content and delivery. The summit was a follow-up to an August 2011 NCES summit with technology and innovation leaders. Participants in the January 2012 summit provided the following operational and policy suggestions:

- Lead assessment research and development on new item types and new constructs to inform the field.
- Leverage computer-based assessment to learn about student cognition, e.g., by tracking key strokes and how students use editing tools.
- Maintain NAEP's role as an external indicator, while establishing links to consortia and international assessments.

The Task Force was also asked to provide its input on the future potential roles for NAEP.

TOPIC#11: FUTURE OF NAEP INITIATIVES	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
New constructs - Investigate research-based questions and measure new constructs. Students need non-academic constructs to be competitive globally.	∗
Reporting relative to state/consortia assessments - Consider how NAEP can complement Common Core and consortia efforts. If NAEP can provide supporting validity evidence for these efforts, this would be a valuable consensus for the field. - Link the consortia results if cross-consortia performance levels are not comparable.	∗
Engaging higher education - Use linking of 12th grade NAEP preparedness with SAT, ACT, state assessments, and state longitudinal databases to initiate conversations with higher education policymakers.	∗
Career readiness - Address NAEP preparedness research and reporting to development of a career readiness standard. Currently, the NAEP preparedness initiative emphasizes SAT and ACT linking research, but these measures only address college readiness.	∗
Possible ways to use NAEP in state accountability - Offer a secure set of NAEP items for consortia and/or state standard-setting. Mapping consortia cut scores onto the NAEP scale may also be helpful in this regard. Careful implementation of these suggestions will be needed to guard against criticism regarding federal intrusion.	∗