

National Assessment Governing Board

Meeting of November 21-22, 2014

Washington, DC

OFFICIAL SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONS

Complete Transcript Available

National Assessment Governing Board Members Present

Terry Mazany, Chairman
Susan Pimentel, Vice Chair
Andrés Alonso
Mitchell Chester
Lucille Davy
Lou Fabrizio
Frank Fernandes
Rebecca Gagnon
Shannon Garrison
James Geringer
Doris Hicks
Andrew Ho
Terry Holliday
Tonya Matthews
Tonya Miles
Ronnie Musgrove
Dale Nowlin
Joseph O'Keefe
James Popham
Fielding Rolston
Cary Sneider
Chasidy White
Sue Betka, Acting Director, Institute of Education Sciences (ex-officio)

National Assessment Governing Board Members Absent

Anitere Flores
Leticia Van de Putte

National Assessment Governing Board Staff

Cornelia Orr, Executive Director
Mary Crovo, Deputy Executive Director
Michelle Blair
Lily Clark
Dora Drumgold
Stephaan Harris

Laura LoGerfo
Munira Mwalimu
Tessa Regis
Sharyn Rosenberg
Angela Scott
Anthony White

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Staff

Peggy Carr, Associate Commissioner
Janis Brown
Gina Broxterman
Jing Chen
Jamie Deaton
Pat Etienne
Elvira Germino Hausken
Arnold Goldstein
Eunice Greer
Linda Hamilton
Shawn Kline
Drew Malizio
Dan McGrath
Michael Moles
Holly Spurlock
Bill Tirre
Ebony Walton Chester
Bill Ward
Grady Wilburn
Amy Yamashiro

American Institutes for Research (AIR) Staff

Victor Bandeira de Mello
Markus Broer
Kim Gattis
Cadelle Hemphill
Ruth Isaia
Young Yee Kim
Teresa Neidorf
Fran Stancavage

CCSSO

Katie Carroll, CCSSO
Nathan Olson, Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction,
CCSSO/Governing Board Policy Task Force Representative

CRP, Inc.

Shamai Carter
Kathy Smoot
Edward Wofford

Educational Testing Service (ETS) Staff

Jonas Bertling
Jay Campbell
Amy Dresher
Rebecca Moran
Rochelle Michel
Andreas Oranje
Greg Vafis

Fulcrum IT

Scott Ferguson

Hager Sharp

David Hoff
Joanne Lim
Debra Silimeo
Lauren Werner

Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)

Steve Sellman
Laurens Wise

Optimal Solutions

Rukayat Akinbiyi
Yvette Clinton

Pearson Educational Measurement

Peg Heck
Paul Nichols
Connie Smith

Reingold Inc.

Amy Buckley
Sarah Johnson
Valerie Marrapodi

Westat

Chris Averett
Keith Rust
Dianne Walsh

Widmeyer Communications

Siobhan Mueller
Jason Smith

Other Attendees

Karen Akins, U.S. Department of Education
Caitlin Emma, Politico Pro
Catherine Gewertz, Education Week
Jagir Patel, U.S. Department of Education
Seth Winick, HMWK, Austin, Texas

Attending Speakers

Arne Duncan, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education
Marcella Goodridge-Keiller, Office of General Counsel, U.S. Department of Education
Andrew Kolstad, Former Senior Technical Advisor, NCES
Chris Minnich, Council of Chief State School Officers
Gary Phillips, American Institutes for Research

Call to Order

The November 21, 2014 session of the National Assessment Governing Board was called to order by Chairman Terry Mazany at 8:30 a.m.

Approval of November 2014 Agenda and the August 2014 Board Meeting Minutes

Chairman Mazany reviewed the November 2014 agenda and requested a motion for approval. Fielding Rolston moved for Board approval. The motion was seconded by Rebecca Gagnon and passed unanimously.

Mr. Mazany noted that the August 2014 Board minutes were circulated to members for review. Lou Fabrizio moved for Board approval of the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Shannon Garrison and passed unanimously.

Opening Remarks

Chairman Mazany congratulated Shannon Garrison on her reappointment to the Board and thanked her for her leadership.

The Chairman stated that the Governing Board has outstanding new members, and invited them to make introductory remarks. He noted that Mitchell Chester, Chief State School Officer from Massachusetts, will not be able to attend the first day of the meeting and will provide remarks at Saturday's session.

Frank Fernandes, secondary school principal from Hawaii, expressed his excitement and appreciation for being selected to serve on the Board. He noted that he hopes to bring his perspective to the Board from his experience working with middle school students, at an age when they undergo tremendous physical, emotional, and psychological changes.

Tonya Matthews, general public representative, and President and CEO of the Michigan Science Center in Detroit, noted that she is originally from the Washington, DC area. She commented that her first involvement with the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Governing Board was as a public reviewer of NAEP science items in 2012, which was a wonderful experience. Ms. Matthews stated that she is very excited to be on the “sparking side” of education where we figure out a way to create access and excitement for every child. She noted that to do this you need to know where you are and not fear the response to that question.

Chasidy White, 8th grade teacher representative, has taught world history at Brookwood Middle School in Alabama for the past 12 years, and she noted that she “loved every minute of it.” Ms. White described her international experiences with peace education. She said that her work on the Board will fulfill her desire for students to get the best education possible, and that she is thrilled at the opportunity.

Chairman Mazany noted that the Governing Board celebrated its 25th anniversary and the 45th anniversary of NAEP is this year. To put that timeline into context, he provided examples of remarkable advancements made in similar timeframes, such as the proliferation of household computers and cell phones.

Mr. Mazany noted that he believes NAEP provides the long view, and is a national treasure as a “truth teller” to help our country understand the strengths and weaknesses in student achievement trends in an otherwise decentralized system of education. In his remarks at the Executive Committee meeting, the Chairman spoke of the Board’s responsibility for, and history of, innovation. He asked the Board to consider its responsibility to further that innovation.

The Chairman said the world changes as a result of entrepreneurs and innovators (e.g., digital data and new innovative platforms using data). He recognized that the hardest thing to do is to commit to something unfamiliar, yet we must become comfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity because we cannot afford for education to be left behind. In particular, the Board plays a leadership role in this context.

The Chairman noted that what we choose to measure and optimize makes a lot of difference. He provided numerous examples of entertainment innovation, and noted that it is important to understand how young people consume media if we are to understand the perspective of young people.

The Chairman noted that entire industries go through dramatic shifts. The technology used to win the America’s Cup sailing race changed drastically in only one year and victories are now dependent on software adjustments based on real-time data from sensors on the boat. He noted that there are many tools available that combine real-time data analytics with visualizations that can be used to make better decisions. NAEP does this too, by providing analytic models for the data and visualizations for examining details of those data. The Chairman said that the Board’s innovation ambition should not be to create a million new things, but to find the handful of things that work for NAEP and that can be elegantly integrated. He stated that we can find this innovation by observing. The Board and NAEP are well-positioned for how this type of innovation takes place. He said that the imperative for innovation comes from this new world of technology and the pace of change.

Executive Director's Report

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

- A new Board member orientation meeting was convened on November 5, 2014. The meeting was very productive with a full agenda. The following local policy makers participated in a working lunch session:
 - Michael Casserly, Executive Director, Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS)
 - Bob Farrace, Director, Public Affairs, National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
 - Felice Levine, Executive Director, American Educational Research Association (AERA)
 - Chris Minnich, Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
 - Brad Thomas, Senior Education Policy Advisor, House Committee on Education and the Workforce

- Ms. Orr introduced new National Assessment Governing Board staff:
 - Anthony White, Contract Specialist, formerly with the General Services Administration.
 - Laura LoGerfo, Assistant Director for Reporting and Analysis. Ms. LoGerfo has a strong background in research and formerly worked at NCES on the High School Longitudinal Study, within the U.S. Department of Education.

- Ms. Orr introduced Nate Olson. He is a communications manager with the state of Washington, in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Schools. He was invited to attend and observe this Board meeting as a representative from the CCSSO/Governing Board Policy Task Force.

- Since the May 2014 quarterly meeting, the Board awarded the following two contracts:
 - Content Alignment Studies to NORC at the University of Chicago.
 - Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Achievement Levels Setting to NCS Pearson.

- The National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE) of IES has awarded a contract for the Evaluation of the NAEP Achievement Levels to the National Academy of Sciences. The purpose of the evaluation is to conduct an evaluation of the student achievement levels used in reporting NAEP results for the reading and mathematics assessments in grades 4, 8, and 12, to determine whether the achievement levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public. The Commissioner of NCES will use the evaluation results to determine if the trial designation can be removed. The evaluation will rely on advice from an independent committee of experts.

- Two conference proposals on the topic of assessment literacy have been accepted by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). The assessment literacy proposal was also submitted for presentation at the CCSSO National Conference on Student Assessment, but acceptances have not been announced yet.

- Ms. Orr noted that the Governing Board and its communications contractor, Reingold Inc., received the Silver Summit Marketing Effectiveness Award. The award was for the NAEP 2013 Grade 12 Mathematics and Reading Report Card release and reporting on academic preparedness findings.

Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Update

Sue Betka, IES Acting Director, provided an update on IES activities, focusing on Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS).

Ms. Betka noted that Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems are intended to help states develop and expand data systems in order to make data-informed decisions to improve student learning and close achievement gaps.

All 50 states, five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia are eligible to apply for SLDS grants. State Education Agencies are the fiscal agent for SLDS grants but grant funds can be shared with other partner agencies and/or local education agencies. Since 2006, IES has awarded \$613.7 million in SLDS grants to 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands. Five different competitions were conducted and 98 discretionary competitive grants have been awarded. The sizes of the grants vary from \$3 million to \$27 million and depend on states' activities and priorities. Thirty-eight states have received more than one grant. IES will announce a new competition for 2015. These grants will focus on encouraging more use of SLDS to help improve student achievement and close achievement gaps.

Board members discussed with Ms. Betka access and use of data from SLDS.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Peggy Carr, Acting NCES Commissioner, reported on the following activities at NCES:

Ms. Carr stated that a focus of this Board meeting on technology-based assessment (TBA) is in part a reflection of NAEP stakeholders' demand to know more. To provide transparency, NCES has developed more concise and clearer language to describe the process of "trans-adapting" NAEP paper-and-pencil questions to technology-based items. She noted that there is a white paper and a PowerPoint presentation on TBA to explain to NAEP stakeholders the design and approach for this work. She noted that there are many opportunities that make the move to TBA worthwhile, such as universal design, which will allow accommodations and greater access to these items and tasks. TBA also provides opportunities for measuring the current constructs better and measuring constructs in NAEP frameworks that we have not been able to assess before.

Ms. Carr also mentioned the NAEP Innovation Symposium conducted in September 2014 examined opportunities that are evident in other frameworks, such as the problem-solving framework in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) to identify possibilities for NAEP in the future. NAEP staff and contractors will summarize the Innovation Symposium discussions in a written document and share it with the Board in the near future.

Ms. Carr discussed her three goals as Acting Commissioner:

- Focus on internal structure, integration and efficiency at NCES. There are opportunities for increased efficiency by linking studies (such as better socioeconomic data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study or additional information about preparedness from the High School Longitudinal Study).
- Build staff capacity following the retirement of several staff. Provide coaching for new staff and revive NCES's Visiting Scholars Program.
- Increase the reach of NCES products and services by better leveraging social media and data tools.

Board members discussed with Ms. Carr the transition to technology-based assessments.

Remarks from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

Chris Minnich, Executive Director of CCSSO, noted that as a result of the recent elections, there will be changes in CCSSO's membership. He believes that even with a change in membership, CCSSO's agenda will continue to reflect higher standards for students, better state assessments, and greater accountability. He stated that there will be challenges in this work over the next few years, but in the long-term there will be fundamentally different sets of student achievement expectations across the country.

Mr. Minnich noted that currently state chiefs care deeply about how teachers are being prepared. CCSSO released a report two years ago about how to change educator preparation across the country, and now 45 states have taken some of those actions at the K-12 level. One leading edge issue for CCSSO will be determining how to work with partners in higher education and with alternate certification pathways, to ensure that educators are prepared to be successful as they start their teaching experience.

Mr. Minnich reported that Terry Holliday will finish his term as the President of CCSSO in December 2014. Under his leadership, Mr. Holliday encouraged CCSSO to look at career readiness, not just college readiness. On December 1, 2014, CCSSO will release recommendations for career readiness initiatives at the state level.

Mr. Minnich noted that approximately 25 states will be administering a new state assessment this year, which makes NAEP's role even more important. He urged the Board to maintain NAEP trend lines, while evolving with technology.

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

Recess for Committee Meetings

The first session of the November 21, 2014 Board meeting recessed for committee meetings at 10:21 a.m., which were held until 12:30 p.m.

Meeting Reconvened: Closed Session

Mapping State Proficiency Standards onto National Assessment of Educational Progress Scales: 2011-2013

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of section 552b(C) of Title 5 U.S.C. the National Assessment Governing Board met in closed session on November 21, 2014 from 12:45 p.m. to 1:45 p.m. to receive a briefing on mapping state proficiency standards onto NAEP scales for 2011-2013.

Peggy Carr, Acting NCES Commissioner, introduced the two other panel members—Gary Phillips of the American Institutes for Research and Andrew Kolstad, former Senior Technical Advisor at NCES.

Ms. Carr provided a brief background for the state mapping study. She noted that the 2013 mapping study is the fifth in a series of NCES studies on mapping state proficiency standards. Four earlier reports were released using state data for reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 from 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009.

Ms. Carr provided a briefing on the methodology used to map state proficiency standards onto the NAEP scales for reading and mathematics for grades 4 and 8, using sample charts of the 2013 results. She noted the sampling error and measurement error in the study. She provided an overview of how to interpret the “NAEP equivalent score,” which is the estimate of where the state standard falls on the NAEP scale.

Ms. Carr emphasized that the study compares state standards relative to NAEP, not to state performance. She also noted that state standards do change over time, which is reflected in the 2013 results when compared to the 2009 and 2011 results. Ms. Carr commented that this study will be even more critical in 2015 when the Common Core State Standards are implemented in many states.

Andrew Kolstad described the challenges faced in replicating results, and offered the following illustrative examples:

- Across state variation – States using the same assessment and cut score mapped to different NAEP scale scores, sometimes with statistical significance.
- Within state variation – Urban school districts within some states use the same assessment and cut score but map statistically to different points on the NAEP scales.
- Multi-year variation – States with no changes in their assessment or cut scores mapped to different points on NAEP in different years.

A committee of experts was established to provide expertise to address these challenges. The committee included:

- NAEP’s Design and Analysis Committee and the NAEP Validity Studies Panel
- Technical staff from various states
- Contractor staff with experience working with NAEP data

- Academic scholars who had published prior versions of the NAEP mapping study findings and methodology.

The committee of experts made multiple recommendations to NCES for their consideration regarding this mapping methodology, including the following:

- NCES should continue to use the equipercentile method to estimate the NAEP scale equivalents.
- NCES should produce a single estimate for states using the same assessments and cut scores.
- The current error band correctly includes sampling and measurement error. It should be generalized to include other sources of error, such as prediction error or relative error.

Gary Phillips highlighted the need to carefully examine the following three methodological issues:

- Measuring relative error, caused by the fact that NAEP and state tests are measuring different things;
- Considering consortia of states using the same standards as an aggregate; and
- Determining the frequency at which to conduct the mapping, to be able to monitor trends in proficiency standards in states over multiple years.

Board members engaged in a question and answer session following the presentation.

Meeting Reconvened: Open Session

The November 21, 2014 Board meeting reconvened in open session at 2:08 p.m.

Oath of Office for New Board Members and Secretary's Remarks

Chairman Mazany introduced Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, noting that Mr. Mazany and Secretary Duncan have a long history of working in Chicago in support of student achievement in the Chicago Public Schools.

Secretary Duncan administered the oath of office to the new and reappointed Board members.

The Secretary made remarks conveying his appreciation for the Board's work and role of NAEP as the gold standard and "truth teller." He credited NAEP for helping spur a national movement of states adopting higher standards. He noted the challenges in raising standards at the local level, in terms of supporting principals and teachers and communicating to families, which is something many states are dealing with as they transition to the PARCC and Smarter Balanced assessments. He posited that 50 states with 50 standards was "version 1.0" and the consortia standards and assessments are "version 2.0." Secretary Duncan called upon the Board to begin thinking about what "version 3.0" of assessment may be. This vision could include frequency and alignment of assessments (both formative and summative), measuring student growth, capturing non-cognitive skills (e.g., grit, tenacity) in addition to traditional subjects, and increasing transparency and communication.

The Secretary stressed the importance of transparency to support students and teachers, and having an honest conversation about which schools, districts, and states are raising the bar for all children and closing gaps. He mentioned new investments by states in early childhood education and the importance of knowing whether children are entering kindergarten academically, socially and emotionally ready. He stressed the importance of the Board's role to increase public confidence in public education, by providing leadership and honest assessments.

Board members engaged in a question and answer session with Secretary Duncan.

Mr. Popham asked the Secretary about his plans regarding teacher evaluation initiatives.

The Secretary responded that he believes in multiple measures and flexibility for states and districts, but a piece of teacher evaluation should be based upon how much their students are learning.

Mr. Geringer commented that he believes the Secretary's comments support Mr. Geringer's vision of the role that digital technology can play in education – which can enable us to understand how children learn, not just what they learn.

The Secretary concurred with Mr. Geringer's comments and stated that assessments should be a part of learning, not separate from it.

Ms. Hicks asked the Secretary to elaborate on his new Comprehensive Educator Equity Plans.

The Secretary explained that the goal for the nation is to determine how to encourage more great teachers and principals to work in communities that have been historically underserved. The Department has asked states to develop their own equity plans to encourage and incentivize great teachers and principals to work in communities that need the most support.

Mr. Ho asked the Secretary to comment on priorities for NAEP, regarding the breadth and depth of its activities, in light of increasing budget constraints.

The Secretary responded that NAEP's role is more important than ever, and is the “ultimate bipartisan issue.” He committed to working closely with Chairman Mazany and the staff to ensure NAEP has the resources it needs.

Ms. Pimentel asked the Secretary to comment on any new teacher preparation initiatives.

The Secretary responded by saying “stay tuned.” He further commented that it is unfair to the teacher profession and students to have so many mediocre teacher preparation programs. His goal is to elevate and strengthen the teaching profession.

The Secretary closed his remarks by stating that he appreciated the hard work of NAEP in moving the nation forward. He reiterated his charge to the Board to leverage its unique position and determine next steps. He further stated that he would work as a partner with the Board to help it achieve its vision.

Meeting Recessed and Reconvened

The November 21, 2014 Board meeting recessed at 2:32 p.m. and reconvened in closed session at 2:46 p.m.

Closed Session

NAEP Budget Overview

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of section 552b(C) of Title 5 U.S.C. the National Assessment Governing Board met in closed session on November 21, 2014 from 2:46 p.m. to 4:15 p.m. to receive a briefing on and to discuss the NAEP Schedule of Assessments and the budget.

Peggy Carr, Acting Commissioner of NCES provided an overview of the NAEP Budget. She emphasized the need to keep in mind key timelines that factor into NAEP budget discussions.

Ms. Carr provided actual and estimated 2013-2018 assessment cycle costs by fiscal year for the following budget categories:

- Mandated Assessments Already Launched – Reading, Science, and Math for 2015-2021
- Remaining Governing Board Schedule Decisions – Arts (grade 8; 2016), Writing (grades 4, 8, and 12; 2017), U.S. History, Civics, Geography (grades 8 and 12; 2018), TEL (grade 8; 2018), Science (grades 4, 8, and 12; 2019), Long Term Trend Reading and Math (2020) and Economics (grade 12; 2020).

Board members engaged in discussions and a question and answer session on the NAEP budget and subject area assessments in the coming years.

Meeting Recessed and Reconvened

The November 21, 2014 Board meeting recessed at 4:16 p.m. and reconvened in open session at 4:32 p.m.

Annual Ethics Briefing for Governing Board Members

Marcella Goodridge-Keiller provided Board members with their annual ethics briefing. She referenced the Ethics Primer, which highlights the ethics rules and regulations for Board members who are appointed as special government employees. The document was provided to members in their briefing materials.

Ms. Keiller highlighted specific areas of direct application to members such as representation on external panels and speaking arrangements. Ms. Goodridge-Keiller encouraged members to call or email her if they have any questions or are not sure how ethics rules apply to their work.

Board members engaged in a question and answer session following the ethics presentation.

Meeting Recessed

The November 21, 2014 Board meeting recessed at 4:58 p.m.

Meeting Reconvened: Closed Session

The November 22, 2014 Board meeting reconvened at 8:34 a.m. in closed session.

NAEP Mathematics in Puerto Rico: 2011 and 2013

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of section 552b(C) of Title 5 U.S.C. the National Assessment Governing Board met in closed session on November 22, 2014 from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. to receive a briefing and engage in discussion on the forthcoming 2013 NAEP Puerto Rico Mathematics Report.

Andrés Alonso, Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee, provided context and background for the Puerto Rico NAEP mathematics assessment. Mr. Alonso traced the origins of NAEP in Puerto Rico, noting the tremendous technical challenges and policy implications. He highlighted key dates and milestones, culminating in the 2013 NAEP assessment in Puerto Rico.

Arnold Goldstein of NCES provided an overview of the 2013 NAEP mathematics results in Puerto Rico by the following areas:

- 2013 results compared to 2011 results;
- Results by mathematics content areas; and
- Demographic and classroom context.

Mr. Goldstein provided background information on the development of the mathematics assessment in Puerto Rico.

- Fourth and eighth grade public school students were assessed in NAEP mathematics in 2003, 2005, and 2007.
- In these first three administrations there were challenges in scoring and scaling results as a result of a high portion of omitted questions, incorrect responses and inconsistent responses.
- NCES undertook special studies and incorporated Knowledge and Skills Appropriate (KASA) questions into the 2011 Puerto Rico mathematics assessment to address these challenges.
- The scaling was successful in 2011, and the assessment design was replicated in 2013.
- The 2013 results will be reported as a special study.
- NCES hopes to report the 2015 NAEP mathematics results for Puerto Rico with the rest of the states, rather than as a special study.

Mr. Goldstein provided highlights of the 2013 mathematics results at grades 4 and 8, including:

- School and student participation rates and sample sizes;
- Average scores and score changes from 2011 results;
- Percentile scores and changes in scores between 2011 and 2013;

- Achievement levels results at below basic, basic, proficient and advanced; and
- Results of the five “subscales” in mathematics: number properties and operations; measurement; geometry; data analysis, statistics, and probability; and algebra.

Contextual data were presented to provide information about the educational environment for students in Puerto Rico, with results compared to the nation and states. Indicators included the percentage of the population living in poverty, median household income, and per pupil expenditures. The teacher questionnaire collected information on items such as if the necessary materials and resources were provided by schools for mathematics instruction, teacher credentials, and the number of hours of math instruction per week.

Board members engaged in a question and answer session with Mr. Goldstein. Board member comments primarily focused on the value of including contextual variables in the reporting of results, with great caution to ensure that contextual variables are not presented in a way that imply causality or distract from the reporting of student achievement results.

Meeting Reconvened: Open Session

The Board meeting reconvened in open session at 9:30 a.m.

Inside NAEP: Recent NAEP Reports and Outreach

Terry Mazany stated that the purpose of this session was to provide members with a walkable historic timeline of NAEP reports, as displayed in the back of the room; receive presentations by four Board members about recent NAEP releases; and discuss upcoming NAEP Report Cards and focus reports.

Mr. Mazany noted that the Board’s recently approved Communications Plan focuses on three key audiences (parents, educators, and policymakers), and aims to increase the impact and engagement of NAEP reporting. He provided an overview of how NAEP reporting has evolved, and noted that the move from large bound reports to online releases makes the content infinitely more accessible to many more audiences. He posited that this is another opportunity for the Board to continue innovating.

Mr. Mazany invited four Board members to discuss various NAEP releases in which they participated. He stated that one of the Board’s key values is its diversity of members’ voices participating in NAEP releases, which adds to the richness in understanding the findings.

Susan Pimentel discussed her experience with the recently-released 2013 Report Card on 12th grade reading and mathematics results. She noted the value in pairing these results with the Board’s academic preparedness research. The release occurred at Dunbar High School in Washington, DC and included representatives from the school in addition to the Board and NCES. The panel engaged in a lively discussion with students after presenting the results.

She noted that the contextual variables that are now incorporated into the reports add to an understanding of the results. For example, the NAEP reading scores have essentially been flat for

a very long time, but it was interesting to her that students who disagreed with the statement “reading is enjoyable” scored on the average 45 points lower than those who strongly agreed. Ms. Pimentel noted that these NAEP results are valuable for educators, regardless of whether their students took NAEP.

Dale Nowlin reiterated Ms. Pimentel’s enthusiasm for the value of integrating the contextual information into the results release, as was done for the 2013 Report Card. He also noted another critical result, which was that even though the 12th grade mathematics scores have risen over time, the achievement gaps have persisted.

Tonya Miles discussed the 2013 Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) release. She noted that TUDA provides an opportunity to look at NAEP at a local level, which is particularly helpful to reaching all stakeholder groups (educators, policymakers, parents, and students). She noted that the 2013 TUDA release included a national webinar and statements from Board member Anitere Flores, NCES Commissioner Jack Buckley, and Executive Director Michael Casserly of the Council of the Great City Schools. In addition, Board member Shannon Garrison released a statement about the Los Angeles TUDA results. The release included a social media component, with a Facebook chat by Ms. Flores and Delia Pompa, Senior Vice President at the National Council of La Raza. Ms. Miles noted the value of Board members contributing to releases to extend the reporting of the results, increasing stakeholders’ awareness of the data, and encouraging other stakeholders to take action to improve achievement and close achievement gaps. In particular, she cited the importance of involving parents in understanding what these local data mean so they have information to ask questions of their child's teacher, administrator, school board, policymaker, or legislators.

Shannon Garrison discussed her experience with the 2012 fourth grade writing assessment release. The release included a small-scale usability study to explore how the software would need to differ to assess fourth graders versus twelfth and eighth graders and a pilot writing assessment of approximately 13,000 students nationwide. She participated in a webinar and live demonstration of the reporting site with several other panelists. The study evaluated fourth graders' ability to write using a computer and commonly available word processing tools. The study also supported NAEP’s transition to computer-based assessments, and resulted in insights about computer-based assessment design. Ms. Garrison also commented that the study results were interesting and informative for teachers because student responses varied depending on the task (e.g. some students were good at conveying their experiences, but they were not as good at explaining or persuading). Results also varied by students’ use of tools embedded in the assessment (e.g., 47 percent of the highest-scoring students used spellcheck at least four times while 35 percent of the lowest-performing students did not use this tool at all).

Dale Nowlin spoke about highlights of the 2005 High School Transcript Math Curriculum Study. At the release, he participated in a panel discussion with Jack Buckley, the President of the University of Maryland-Baltimore, and Linda Rosen who is CEO of Change the Equation, representing a consortium of businesses interested in STEM education. Higher NAEP mathematics scores were correlated with students taking more rigorous courses. This study was conducted to better understand the correlation between the rigor of math courses taken and NAEP scores. It showed that course titles did not necessarily match course content (e.g., students in a "regular algebra class" tended to have a more rigorous curriculum than students who were in an algebra class labeled "honors"). Mr. Nowlin noted that state policy changes to offer more

advanced coursework did not result in increased achievement because students were taking classes for which they were not well-prepared. As a teacher, he stated that we should identify strategies educators and policymakers can use to make rigorous curriculum accessible to more students, rather than just changing course requirements.

The Chairman invited Board members to engage in discussion about the impact of NAEP reports and thoughts about how we can communicate results more effectively.

Meeting Recess

The November 22, 2014 session of the National Assessment Governing Board recessed at 10:19 a.m. until 10:30 a.m.

Committee Reports and Board Actions

The standing committee Chairs summarized the discussions of their respective committees.

The Reporting and Dissemination Committee presented the Release Plan for the 2013 Mathematics Report Card for Puerto Rico as an action item, which was approved unanimously by the Board.

The Executive Committee passed the following resolution for Board action:

NCES should continue test development on NAEP subjects in addition to 4th, 8th, and 12th grade reading and mathematics, including the arts (8) geography/U.S. history/civics (8, 12) and writing (4, 8, 12).

The Executive Committee will propose possible solutions to the full Board regarding the NAEP Schedule of Assessments, with consideration for the budget constraints and different priorities, for action at the March 5-7, 2015 meeting.

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

Mr. Mazany noted that, with regard to the NAEP budget, there was consensus to seek additional revenues, if possible. He stated that he would work with NAGB and NCES staff to communicate the justification for additional funds to be included in the Department of Education budget request. He also stated that the Board should develop a legislative strategy and utilize Board members in that effort.

The Chairman said he would be tasking the Executive Committee to provide leadership on the strategic planning for the Board, with the goal being to have a range of options for consideration at the May 2015 Board meeting, followed by further discussion and action at the August 2015 meeting.

Mr. Mazany concluded the meeting by commending the new Board members for their participation and thanking the staff for their work.

The Chairman then showed a video that provided an example of innovation in the world of advertising. He invited all Board members to similarly identify new examples of innovations that define our future and to share them at upcoming Board meetings.

Meeting Adjourned

The November 22, 2014 meeting of the Board adjourned at 11:58 a.m.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



Terry Mazany, Chairman

February 20, 2015

Date

National Assessment Governing Board

Executive Committee

Report of November 20, 2014

Executive Committee Members: Terry Mazany (Chair), Susan Pimentel (Vice Chair), Lou Fabrizio, Rebecca Gagnon, Shannon Garrison, Tonya Miles, Fielding Rolston, Cary Sneider.

Other Board Members: Lucille Davy, Frank Fernandes, James Geringer, Doris Hicks, Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, Tonya Matthews, Ronnie Musgrove, Dale Nowlin, Joseph O’Keefe, James Popham, Chasidy White, Ex Officio Member: Sue Betka.

Governing Board Staff: Cornelia Orr, Mary Crovo, Lily Clark, Michelle Blair, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Munira Mwalimu, Sharyn Rosenberg, Anthony White.

Other Attendees:

NCES Staff: Peggy Carr, Elvira Germino Hausken, Arnold Goldstein, Eunice Greer, Linda Hamilton, Shawn Kline, Drew Malizio, Dan McGrath, Michael Moles, Holly Spurlock, William Tirre, Amy Yamashiro. *Other Attendees:* ETS: Jay Campbell, Amy Drescher, Andreas Oranje, Greg Vafis, Lisa Ward. HumRRO: Steve Sellman, Laouress Wise. AIR: Kim Gattis, Cadelle Hemphill, Fran Stancavage. Hager Sharp: David Hoff. Reingold: Amy Buckley. Pearson: Connie Smith.

1. Welcome, Introductions, Comments, and Agenda

Chair Terry Mazany called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. He expressed appreciation for the warm and generous welcome in his new role as Chair and noted that the work ahead will be exciting with the great Board and staff.

Mr. Mazany welcomed Rebecca Gagnon to the Executive Committee in her new role as Vice Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee and congratulated Ms. Gagnon on her recent reelection to the Minneapolis school board. He also congratulated Shannon Garrison on her reappointment for a second term on the Board.

Mr. Mazany mentioned his meeting with the new Board members at their orientation session on November 5, 2014 in Washington, DC. He then introduced the new members and noted that they would provide more detailed introductions about themselves at the full Board meeting on Friday morning. In attendance at the Executive Committee meeting were: Frank Fernandes (Secondary School Principal), Tonya Matthews (General Public Representative), and Chasidy White (8th Grade Teacher). The Chair also noted that new member Mitchell Chester (State School Chief) was not present but would be joining the meeting on Saturday.

Chair Mazany stated that the Board’s Executive Director, Cornelia Orr, would provide the Executive Committee with updates, then he would lead a strategic discussion, and finally the Committee would meet in closed session regarding the NAEP budget. He noted that at the August 2014 Board meeting, we were left with a “cliffhanger” about the state of the budget; yet thanks to the hard work of the previous Governing Board Chair, David Driscoll, and NCES

Acting Commissioner, Peggy Carr, the Board has a much deeper understanding of the NAEP budget.

2. Updates: Governing Board Staffing, NAEP Reauthorization Status, 2015 Budget Appropriation Status

Governing Board Staffing – Cornelia Orr introduced the newest members of the Governing Board staff. Anthony (Tony) White is the new Contract Specialist. Laura LoGerfo is the new Assistant Director for Reporting and Analysis. Ms. Orr noted that the Governing Board is now fully staffed for the first time in well over a year, and referred the Committee to an updated organization chart included as Attachment A of the meeting materials.

NAEP Reauthorization Status – Ms. Orr noted that progress has been made on NAEP reauthorization. The *Strengthening Education through Research Act* (HR 4366) passed in the House in May of 2014. Since our last Governing Board meeting in July 2014, the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee passed a bill with minor changes to the House bill. After Thanksgiving the Senate HELP Committee intends to bring the bill, which is considered noncontroversial, to the Senate floor for passage by Unanimous Consent before the end of this Congress’s term. A unanimous consent vote would mean that there would be no vote, discussion, or debate of the bill. The Senate’s changes to the bill are agreeable to the House; therefore a conferencing of the bill between the House and Senate versions would not be necessary.

As a result of the recent election, it is expected that Senator Lamar Alexander of Tennessee will become the Chairman of the Senate HELP Committee. He is very supportive of NAEP and the Governing Board. Preliminary conversations with his staff indicate that while they are still working out many of the details around what Senator Alexander hopes to achieve within the Committee’s broad jurisdiction, his main priorities next year will be fixing No Child Left Behind, reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Reform.

2015 Budget Appropriation Status – Since our previous Governing Board meeting, Congress passed a Continuing Resolution (CR) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 budget. Ms. Orr noted that the CR is good news for NAEP, because our budget would be \$5 million less if the President’s proposed budget was passed. The CR imposed a small reduction (less than a 1%) over the FY 2014 level.

Before the CR was passed in September, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services (HHS), Education and Related Agencies had marked up its bill for FY 2015. This subcommittee added proviso language to their budget mark-up that specifically relates to the Governing Board’s work. If passed, the language would have required us to report to them within 30 days on what will be assessed and when U.S. history will be assessed (proviso language was included on page 3 of Attachment B). Ms. Orr mentioned that Senator Alexander is a member of this subcommittee and has been a strong proponent of NAEP, specifically U.S. history and Civics. He was very concerned when the NAEP assessments in civics, U.S. history, and geography were given only at 8th grade in 2014.

The CR expires on December 11, 2014. Therefore, this Congress will need to vote on the budget soon.

3. Discussion: Strategic Thinking about NAEP and NAGB: Mission and Values, Policy Drivers/Initiatives, Budget Constraints

Chair Mazany began the conversation on the future of NAEP by reflecting on the history of NAEP and the Governing Board. He stated that while we often emphasize the “gold standard” of NAEP, the history of NAEP is also a story of innovation. From NAEP’s inception, the mission to draw conclusions about educational progress over time was groundbreaking. This forward-thinking continues to be evident throughout our work, for example in our approaches to sampling, measuring trends, analytic modeling, scaling, achievement level setting, item response theory, use of contextual variables, population inclusions, Internet reporting and dissemination, and in our decision to assess urban districts.

To continue this theme of innovation for NAEP, Mr. Mazany stated that it is time to consider “What is our innovation ambition?” and to develop a thoughtful innovation agenda for the Governing Board to pursue. He noted that all of the Governing Board Committees have a role to play in increasing the impact of NAEP. Recently through reporting, assessment, and engaging parents and the public, the Board has been advancing in this regard. He tasked each Committee chair to consider what “frontier of innovation” his or her Committee could be leading. He noted that we will need time beyond the quarterly Board meetings to knit these ambitions together and develop a strategy.

In developing our vision for NAEP, the Chair noted that the Board should be mindful of three risks:

1. The state of the **Common Core State Standards**: the increasing uncertainty of its outcomes could result in a movement back towards decentralized assessment and curriculum, in which case NAEP then retains and increases its importance as a trusted source of student achievement information.
2. The **nature and use of assessments** nationally: with growing criticism surrounding the role, amount, and purpose of assessments occurring in schools, the Assessment Literacy Work Group becomes increasingly important. The Governing Board should determine whether NAEP should become a convener to lead national conversations about assessment and its role in improving teaching and learning.
3. **International Assessments**: we should consider the roles of PISA and TIMSS and where NAEP stands relative to these international assessments.

Chair Mazany encouraged Board members to think boldly about what NAEP’s next innovation frontier should be, as the Governing Board can add tremendous value. He reminded Committee members that the Board has access to experts and partners to help inform these discussions and decisions. He further noted that he is not presupposing answers to these questions, and invited thoughts and reactions from the group.

Tonya Miles supported the vision of developing a strategic plan. She applauded the work of considering innovation across the Committees and noted that the Executive Committee could serve as a critical fourth group to be a part of the strategic planning.

Sue Pimentel responded to the Chair's comments about scrutiny of the role of assessments nationally. In her previous research on NAEP, she was struck by how few teachers understood NAEP and its purpose. She expressed support for the Board to convene discussions about how different assessments play different roles.

Cary Sneider agreed with Ms. Pimentel's comments and the three issues identified by the Chair. In concurrence with the second issue, Mr. Sneider noted the recent press coverage regarding the substantial proportion of the school year that some states use to administer assessments.

Mr. Sneider and Shannon Garrison asked the Chair to elaborate on his request of the Committees and the process for developing the Board's innovation strategy.

Mr. Mazany said that Committee Chairs should devote some time in their Friday meetings to poll members and create an inventory of their innovation ideas to serve as a starting point. Members should identify needs, gaps, or opportunities to be addressed. Suggestions do not need to be limited to the scope of each Committee's purview given the broad expertise of members beyond their Committee roles. Mr. Mazany also noted that he would be providing examples of innovation in his opening remarks on Friday morning, which would help prompt more thinking.

He has already talked with Governing Board senior staff, Cornelia Orr and Mary Crovo, to set aside time for a future strategic planning conversation. This will occur once we have identified the topics, organized the necessary research and information, and provided it in advance to Board members to enable good deliberation. He asked members to think about what is within our mission and mandate, what a bold vision looks like, and what we hope to accomplish.

Chair Mazany presented a slide titled "organizing for excellence" which outlined how alignment, coherence, and equity at the district level support success, and he suggested these same ideas will be helpful for developing the Board's national innovation agenda. To illustrate, he posited that we should consider if we have a point of view about the alignment (or lack thereof) of assessments within districts and also between districts and states. There is a great deal of national emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, yet many students lack access to the rigorous curriculum required to consider college and career options in STEM fields. There is a mismatch between what young people are experiencing outside and inside the classroom. Finally, all of this work relies on a foundation of equity. Disparity is the primary driver of reform initiatives. The Board should consider how we can inform conversations about equity for opportunity. Chair Mazany stated that we need to figure out how, in our innovation ambition, we can use the NAEP resources to make progress on equity. He invited Board members to provide thoughts on other dimensions to consider in this visioning task.

Ms. Pimentel supported the Chair's mention of parents, students, and community partners, and the Chair's recognition of our increasing focus on parents as part of innovation. She commented that she is excited about the Chairman's vision and noted that our work is so deliberate, careful, and thoughtful and yet we are always pushing the boundaries.

The Chair ended the portion of the agenda open to the public at 5:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION 5:00 pm – 6:00 pm

Executive Committee Members: Terry Mazany (Chair), Susan Pimentel (Vice Chair), Lou Fabrizio, Rebecca Gagnon, Shannon Garrison, Tonya Miles, Fielding Rolston, Cary Sneider.

Other Board Members: Lucille Davy, Frank Fernandes, Jim Geringer, Doris Hicks, Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, Tonya Matthews, Ronnie Musgrove, Dale Nowlin, Joseph O’Keefe, James Popham, Chasidy White, Ex Officio Member: Sue Betka.

Governing Board Staff: Cornelia Orr, Mary Crovo, Lily Clark, Michelle Blair, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Munira Mwalimu, Sharyn Rosenberg, Anthony White.

Other Attendees:

NCES Staff: Peggy Carr, Elvira Germino Hausken, Arnold Goldstein, Eunice Greer, Linda Hamilton, Shawn Kline, Drew Malizio, Dan McGrath, Michael Moles, Holly Spurlock, William Tirre, Amy Yamashiro.

4. NAEP Schedule of Assessments and the NAEP Budget

The Executive Committee met in closed session from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Peggy Carr, NCES Acting Commissioner, discussed costs and contract options under NAEP contracts for FY 2013 through FY 2017. Board members engaged in a question and answer session with Ms. Carr on various components of the NAEP budget, as well as timelines for Board decisions regarding the NAEP schedule of assessments. Chair Mazany thanked Ms. Carr and her staff for providing a thorough, clear budget briefing to the Executive Committee. The information provided in this briefing will be useful in the full Board closed session discussion of the NAEP budget and assessment schedule on Friday, November 21.

The Executive Committee schedule and budget discussion was conducted in closed session because the disclosure of technical and cost data would significantly impede implementation of the contract awards and negotiations for awards. Therefore this discussion is protected by exemption 9(B) of section 552b(C) of Title 5 U.S.C.

Mr. Mazany adjourned the Executive Committee meeting at 6:00 p.m.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Terry Mazany".

Terry Mazany, Chair

December 3, 2014

Date

National Assessment Governing Board
Assessment Development Committee
Report of November 20-21, 2014

Thursday, November 20, 2014 – Closed Session

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) met in closed session on November 20, 2014 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. to review secure NAEP test questions.

Attendees: ADC – Shannon Garrison (Chair), Cary Sneider (Vice Chair), Frank Fernandes, Doris Hicks, Dale Nowlin, Susan Pimentel, Chasidy White; Governing Board Staff – Mary Crovo, Michelle Blair, Laura LoGerfo; NCES – Eunice Greer, Elvira Germino Hausken, Ebony Walton Chester, William Ward, Amy Yamashiro; AIR – Alka Arora, Kim Gattis; ETS – Marc Berger, Jay Campbell, Gloria Dion, Andreas Oranje, Greg Vafis; CRP – Shamai Carter; Hager Sharp – David Hoff, Joann Lim; HumRRO – Steve Sellman; Pearson – Connie Smith; Optimal Solutions – Brian Kramer, Rukayat Akinbiyi; Yvette Clinton.

Briefing on Technology Based Assessments (TBA) Activities in Reading and Mathematics

Eunice Greer of NCES provided an update on the NAEP TBA work. The presentation covered an overview of NAEP and transitioning to TBA, followed by in-depth information on the TBA transition for reading and mathematics. Ms. Greer displayed a timeline for the TBA transition showing the item development, pilot testing, and operational phases. The primary goal of the TBA transition is to maintain NAEP trends while leveraging technology to improve how NAEP measures student achievement. The ADC members viewed secure NAEP reading and mathematics items during this presentation.

Following the briefing by Ms. Greer, the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) heard a presentation by Andreas Oranje of ETS. Mr. Oranje addressed TBA transition steps in detail, illustrated how a multistage testing design will function for NAEP mathematics, and included secure mathematics items to illustrate key points.

Greg Vafis of ETS continued the TBA presentation with additional examples of the tablet platform and secure reading and mathematics test questions, including functions available to students during the assessment. For example, students at grades 4, 8, and 12 will have a grade-specific equation editor to use during the mathematics TBA.

ADC members raised a number of questions about the TBA transition and the ease with which students will interact with the NAEP platform being developed for the TBA. It will be important that students know how to take the assessment on the tablets, and be comfortable with the icons and other functions provided on the tablet platform. Members requested a teleconference briefing in the near future on the TBA tutorial and help functions.

The ADC emphasized the importance of cognitive labs and small-scale try-outs as NAEP incorporates interactive tasks into its existing assessments such as reading. To ensure trend lines are maintained with the addition of new interactive tasks, the ADC expressed strong support for more cognitive lab work to determine how students, particularly younger children, perform on these tasks. Given scarce resources the ADC noted that non-essential special studies, such as the proposed Oral Fluency Study, should not be conducted. While such a study has been administered by NAEP twice in the past, the literature is now full of studies on this topic. NAEP resources should be focused on work that relates directly to the transition to technology based assessments and the maintenance of NAEP trend lines.

The ADC then addressed the terminology being used for the new tablet-based NAEP assessments. To ensure consistency between the definition of technology as used in the Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) assessment, ADC members recommended a change in the “TBA” label. Technology is more inclusive than computers, therefore the ADC agreed that these new assessments be labeled “digital based assessments” or DBA. This label will more accurately reflect the nature of the new assessments while adhering to the broad definition of technology that NAEP has endorsed.

Review of Mathematics Digital Based Assessments

Gloria Dion of NCES presented secure mathematics task concept sketches at grades 4 and 8, for review by the ADC. These concept sketches are the first phase of review by the ADC for the new digital based assessment tasks in mathematics. The sketches are similar to an annotated outline for each task that describes the measurement goals, the specific mathematics objectives to be assessed, and an outline of the DBA task to be developed. ADC members discussed each task concept sketch in turn, and provided general and specific comments. Committee action on the math concept sketches will take place in open session on Friday, November 21.

Friday, November 21, 2014 – Open Session

Attendees: ADC – Shannon Garrison (Chair), Cary Sneider (Vice Chair), Frank Fernandes, Doris Hicks, Dale Nowlin, Susan Pimentel, Chasidy White; Governing Board Staff – Mary Crovo; NCES – Holly Spurlock, Eunice Greer, Elvira Germino Hausken, William Ward; AIR – Teresa Neidorf, Kim Gattis; ETS – Jay Campbell, Ruth Isaia, Hilary Persky, Greg Vafis; Hager Sharp – Joann Lim; Pearson – Connie Smith; Optimal Solutions – Brian Kramer; Fulcrum IT – Scott Ferguson.

Action on NAEP Mathematics Concept Sketches

In open session, the ADC took the following action on the secure mathematics materials reviewed on Thursday, November 20 in closed session. This action was taken under the standing delegation of authority granted to the ADC by the Board for item review activities.

ACTION:

The Assessment Development Committee approves the NAEP mathematics concept sketches in grades 4 and 8 for the 2016 digital based pilot assessment, with changes to the concept sketches to be communicated in writing to NCES.

Update on 2014 NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Assessment

William Ward of NCES provided an update on activities related to the 2014 TEL assessment, which was administered to a nationally representative sample of 8th graders in January – March 2014. Mr. Ward began his presentation by reviewing milestone activities in the TEL timeline. For example, in 2010 the Board adopted the TEL Framework and item development began soon after. In 2011 NCES and NAEP contractors conducted usability studies and small-scale try-outs followed by large-scale try-outs of the TEL items in 2012. Activities in 2013 included the national pilot test and outreach activities leading up to the 2014 operational administration. More than 22,000 students in public and private schools took part in the TEL assessment.

Currently the TEL analyses are underway and work is progressing on reporting cognitive process and contextual variable modules. The latter information is based on the student contextual variables administered with the TEL assessment. ADC members requested an information discussion in February to obtain more information on the TEL analyses. In addition, the ADC requested a joint meeting with the Reporting and Dissemination Committee at the March 2015 quarterly meeting. The purpose of this joint meeting is to discuss various issues related to TEL reporting. Finally, the ADC will need a conference call to finalize its review of the TEL discrete items in early December.

Update on NAEP and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Comparison Study

Teresa Neidorf of AIR updated the ADC on the progress of the NAEP/NGSS comparison study. Since the previous briefing at the August 2014 Board meeting, AIR conducted the comparison ratings and analyses following review by content experts of the NAEP Frameworks in Science, TEL, and Mathematics as compared to the NGSS standards. Based on preliminary findings of the study, the ADC requested an opportunity to review the draft report. Given the fact that NAEP has separate Frameworks and assessments in Science, TEL, and Mathematics it is important to characterize the degree of alignment with the NGSS document.

NAEP Item Review Schedule

Mary Crovo of the Governing Board staff provided a brief overview on the ADC's new schedule for item review in the era of digital based assessments. The ADC will review the interactive tasks at three stages of development: 1) at the initial phase of concept sketches (or passage approval for reading); 2) at the alpha stage where the task design, items, rubrics, and screen shots

of graphics have been developed; and 3) at the final clearance stage after the task has been programmed and all interactive features can be viewed on the computer tablet. Ms. Crovo then outlined the types of decisions the ADC can make at each stage, ranging from stage 1 decisions (acceptance, revision, or rejection) to stage 3 decisions (correction of major errors, for example). ADC members confirmed their understanding of the review process and the different decision points. Ms. Crovo highlighted that this three-phase review is designed to maximize ADC input while adhering to an efficient item review schedule for the NAEP development team. The new review process will be examined after a period of months to determine if changes are needed.

ADC Comments Related to Chairman Mazany’s Opening Remarks

At the Chairman’s request, the ADC discussed implications for NAEP innovation. In his opening remarks at the November 21 Board plenary session, in-coming Board Chairman, Terry Mazany, noted that NAEP is at a critical point in terms of “innovation ambition” and the role of the Governing Board. Mr. Mazany requested that each standing Committee address this issue as it relates to the Board’s congressionally-mandated responsibilities—particularly those assigned to the respective Committees.

ADC members noted that the Board should acknowledge and document ways in which NAEP is already innovating in various areas of assessment. For example, using multi-stage testing to report in greater detail about certain subpopulations of students is an innovation for NAEP. Members also stated that using the observable data gathered via digital based assessments has great potential for innovative reporting strategies. Our challenge is to develop innovative ways to report NAEP findings that will reach more people and encourage them to make wider use of the information to inform education improvements. The ADC also acknowledged that the charge for innovation ambition while maintaining NAEP trend lines is going to be a very challenging set of issues. Finally, members commented on the importance of strategic thinking and planning as the Board moves forward with these new ideas for NAEP.

Friday, November 21, 2014 – Closed Session NAEP 2011 Writing Assessment Overview and Discussion

In accordance with the provisions of exemption (9)(B) of Section 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) met in closed session on November 21, 2014 from 11:45 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. to review secure NAEP test questions.

Attendees: ADC – Shannon Garrison (Chair), Cary Sneider (Vice Chair), Frank Fernandes, Doris Hicks, Dale Nowlin, Susan Pimentel, Chasidy White; Governing Board Staff – Mary Crovo; NCES – Holly Spurlock, Eunice Greer, Elvira Germino Hausken, William Ward; AIR – Kim Gattis; ETS – Jay Campbell, Ruth Isaia, Greg Vafis; Hager Sharp – Joann Lim; Pearson – Connie Smith; Fulcrum IT – Scott Ferguson.

At its August 2014 meeting, the ADC had requested an overview of the current NAEP Writing Framework and the computer-based assessment. Elvira Germino Hausken of NCES and Mary Crovo briefed the ADC on the Writing Framework and the assessment, which included sharing secure prompts at the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade. This presentation resulted from remarks provided by Michael Cohen of Achieve, to the full Board in August 2014. Mr. Cohen asked the Board to examine its current Writing Framework and assessment in light of the Common Core State Standards, which includes writing to sources as a key area of instruction. Mr. Cohen noted that the NAEP Writing assessment does not provide extended reading materials for students to use in their writing tasks.

Following the briefing on the NAEP Writing Framework and the assessment, the ADC acknowledged that writing based on multiple sources is an important skill in everyday life as well as a key instructional activity in the classroom. However, in the classroom this type of writing activity is typically done over a period of multiple days with teacher feedback on drafts of student writing. However, NAEP is an on-demand assessment of writing skills and each student is given two writing tasks, each of which must be completed in 30 minutes using a laptop and commonly available word processing tools. The ADC expressed concern that making a drastic change to the NAEP Writing assessment without careful study would disrupt the trend line and may confound the ability to measure reading vs. writing skills. As an outcome of this discussion, the ADC recommended that a special study of writing to sources (based on longer reading passages) could be done in the future, if resources permit. Such a study would be necessary before any decisions could be made to change the Writing Framework or assessment.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



Shannon Garrison, Chair

12/8/14

Date

National Assessment Governing Board Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology

November 21, 2014

Attendees

COSDAM Members: Chair Lou Fabrizio, Vice Chair Fielding Rolston, Lucille Davy, James Geringer, Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, and James Popham.

Other Board Members: Board Chair Terry Mazany.

Governing Board Staff: Executive Director Cornelia Orr, Michelle Blair, and Sharyn Rosenberg.

Other Attendees: Sue Betka, Acting Director of the Institute of Education Sciences and ex officio member of the Governing Board. NCES: Jing Chen, Patricia Etienne, Eunice Greer, Drew Malizio, Daniel McGrath, Bill Tirre, and Amy Yamashiro. AIR: Victor Bandeira de Mello, Markus Broer, Young Yee Kim, and Fran Stancavage. CRP: Edward Wofford. Education Week: Catherine Gewertz. ETS: Jonas Bertling, Steve Lazer, Rochelle Michel, Rebecca Moran, and Andreas Oranje. Hager Sharp: Lauren Werner. HumRRO: Laurie Wise. Optimal Solutions Group: Rukayat Akinbiyi. Pearson: Peg Heck and Paul Nichols. Westat: Keith Rust and Dianne Walsh. Widmeyer: Siobhan Mueller. Other: Andrew Kolstad.

Introductions and Review of Agenda

Lou Fabrizio, Chair of the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM), called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. and welcomed members and guests. Mr. Fabrizio noted that Mitchell Chester is a new member of COSDAM but unfortunately was unable to be present for this COSDAM meeting. Mr. Chester had a prior commitment out of the country that was made before he was notified of his appointment to the Board.

Project Update and Design Document for Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Achievement Levels Setting (ALS)

Sharyn Rosenberg, the Governing Board Assistant Director for Psychometrics, noted that the NAEP legislation specifies that the Governing Board is responsible for developing achievement levels for each subject area and grade tested by NAEP. In 1995, the Board adopted a policy on Developing Student Performance Levels for the National Assessment of Educational Progress; this policy is used to guide procurements on NAEP achievement levels setting. Ms. Rosenberg noted that COSDAM received an overview of the TEL ALS project at the August meeting, just a few weeks after the contract was awarded to NCS Pearson (Pearson). Ms. Rosenberg stated that a lot of work on the project has occurred during the last few months, and several changes have been made.

Paul Nichols, the TEL ALS project director at Pearson, provided an update on recent project activities. Since the last COSDAM meeting on August 1st, the Technical Advisory Committee on Standard Setting (TACSS) met to discuss drafts of the Planning Document and Design Document. Following recommendations of the TACSS, Pearson will present the results from the achievement levels setting study for Board action at the August 2015 meeting rather than the May 2015 meeting, as originally planned.

Mr. Nichols provided an overview of the Design Document and highlighted the following changes. Pearson will use a modified item mapping (i.e., Bookmark) methodology, and the entire standard setting process will be computerized. As a subcontractor to Pearson, Measurement Incorporated (MI) will provide the standard setting software, which is based on a modification of the software used for the recent Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) standard setting activities. A usability study will be conducted in early December to provide feedback on how panelists navigate between the two computers. COSDAM members did not have any questions about the project changes or about the Design Document.

Mr. Nichols noted that the Design Document is currently out for public comment, from October 29th until November 28th, but no comments have been received thus far. Pearson has a web page for public comment, and the link has been sent to over 100 interested organizations as part of the panelist nomination effort; there is also a link to the public comment site from the Governing Board home page. Jim Geringer expressed concern about not receiving any comments; other COSDAM members noted that the document is very long and technical.

Mr. Nichols requested feedback from COSDAM on a proposed plan to collect public comment on the *outcomes* of the TEL ALS. The Governing Board policy on developing student performance levels specifies that public comment be sought at critical junctures throughout the process, including for the proposed levels. However, the proposed levels traditionally have been treated as embargoed data and have not been distributed prior to the Report Card release. Mr. Nichols proposed that a small group of interested stakeholders (such as state testing directors) be convened in late June 2015 in conjunction with the National Conference on Student Assessment (NCSA) in San Diego. Participants would be required to sign a confidentiality agreement, and the results of the ALS process would be shared. COSDAM members agreed that this proposal was reasonable but requested that participants include policymakers in addition to state testing directors. COSDAM members expressed interest in revisiting the 1995 Board policy on developing student performance levels but preferred to wait until after the report from the evaluation of NAEP achievement levels is released in 2016.

Update on Transition to Technology-Based Assessment (TBA)

Andreas Oranje of Educational Testing Service (ETS) provided an overview of the current plans for transitioning NAEP assessments onto a digital platform with a focus on the draft white paper, which was sent to COSDAM members via email earlier that week. In 2015, the paper-based assessments in Reading, Mathematics, and Science will continue to be administered and used for reporting NAEP results. In addition, technology-based assessments will be administered as part of the TBA start-up process, for the purpose of conducting a mode study (examining potential differences in student performance attributable to the mode of administration) and exploring

whether and how the trend can be maintained. The 2015 TBA start-up activities will be based on existing paper-based items that have been “trans-adapted,” or transferred to a digital platform. In 2016, pilot tests will be conducted using new TBA items that do not have current paper-based equivalents, such as scenario-based tasks. In addition, the trans-adapted items will be re-administered in 2016 to determine the extent to which the new content can be scaled with the existing content. The current plan for 2017 is to administer the Reading and Mathematics assessments exclusively by tablets that would be provided by the NAEP administrators.

Mr. Oranje noted that the draft white paper was recently reviewed by three NAEP expert panels: the Design and Analysis Committee (DAC), the NAEP Validation Studies panel (NVS), and the Quality Assurance Technical Panel (QATP). Feedback from these expert groups will be incorporated in the final version of the white paper. The following suggestions were made by the expert panels: 1) disentangle TBA from MST (multi-stage testing), which is not inherent in the design; 2) address digital equity/fairness in the TBA studies; 3) add a state validation component, which is not currently planned and would involve significant costs; 4) provide an argument for the value of scenario-based tasks; and 5) add evaluation criteria for the decision about whether trend can be maintained. In particular, COSDAM members were interested in exploring a state validation component and retaining a paper-based component in 2017.

COSDAM members emphasized the critical importance of the 2017 NAEP results and maintenance of trend, given all of the changes occurring in state assessments. Terry Holliday stated that if the cost of moving to TBA is that we lose the trend, then NAEP’s gold standard will be undermined. There was consensus that everything possible must be done upfront to maintain the trend, and that the question should be reframed as *how* rather than *whether* trend can be maintained. There was considerable discussion about the extent to which the trend decision is a policy issue. It is unlikely that the data from the bridge studies will be definitive, and the narrative around the trend decision (including any caveats) will be as important as the trend decision itself.

Upcoming Procurement: Review of Existing Studies on Motivation and Engagement in NAEP

Ms. Rosenberg noted that there have been several previous discussions about the tendency for people to question whether students (especially at grade 12) put forth their best effort on a low-stakes assessment. She described an upcoming procurement to conduct a critical review and summary of research on student motivation and engagement on NAEP, with the following goals: 1) to critically evaluate the claims that have been made; 2) to summarize the extent to which results are consistent across studies; and 3) to recommend future research that should be performed.

COSDAM members offered the following input on the procurement: include grades 4 and 8 in addition to grade 12; consider research related to motivation and engagement on state tests as well as NAEP; consider the extent to which findings from previous studies may still be current; consider effects of item types and mode of administration; and keep the budget for the procurement modest.

Approaches to Innovation

Finally, COSDAM members were asked to reflect on Chairman Terry Mazany’s charge to discuss ideas for innovation. Mr. Geringer asked, “Innovation for what purpose – are we asking the right question?”

The following topics were raised related to innovation: the move to TBA; exuberance in how we solve the problem of maintaining trend, not just the move to TBA itself; the process by which we develop items that measure instructional sensitivity; comparing state trends to NAEP trends; using gaming data to gather dynamic and realtime feedback to inform learning; and increasing NAEP’s web presence through data visualization.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

Louis M. Fabrizio

12-15-14

Lou Fabrizio, Chair

Date

National Assessment Governing Board Reporting and Dissemination Committee Report of November 21, 2014

Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee Attendees:

R&D Committee Members: R&D Committee Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon, Tonya Matthews, Father Joseph O'Keefe, Tonya Miles, Governor Ronnie Musgrove

Other Board Members: Chair Terry Mazany

Governing Board Staff: Laura LoGerfo, Stephaan Harris, Lily Clark, Anthony White

NCES: Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr, Jamie Deaton, Ebony Walton Chester, Grady Wilburn, Linda Hamilton, Gina Broxterman, Arnold Goldstein

Contractors: Jonas Bertling, Lisa Ward (ETS); Valerie Marrapodi, Sarah Johnson, Amy Buckley (Reingold); Yvette Clinton (Optimal); Cadille Hemphill (American Institutes of Research); Debra Silmeo, David Hoff, (Hager Sharp); Steve Sellman (HumRro)

Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon opened the meeting and welcomed new Board member Tonya Matthews and new staff member Laura LoGerfo.

Puerto Rico 2013 Mathematics Assessment

The Committee discussed the release of the Puerto Rico 2013 Mathematics Assessment. For reference, approximately 4,600 4th graders and about 5,200 8th graders in public schools across Puerto Rico participated in the assessment. This 2013 assessment permitted inclusion of the Puerto Rico scores on the same scale as the NAEP state assessments. Roughly a third of Puerto Rico's student population is enrolled in private schools, though NAEP did not administer the math assessment in private schools, to retain consistency with the state-level NAEP assessments that are administered only in public schools.

Both Father O'Keefe and Tonya Matthews suggested that future assessments in Puerto Rico perhaps should include private schools, because as an island territory, Puerto Rico may be more similar to urban districts than to states. No state has such a high proportion of students in private schools as Puerto Rico, which affects the ability to report on the achievement of Puerto Rico students as a whole. However, NCES Acting Commissioner, Peggy Carr, informed the Committee that the intended plan was to consider Puerto Rico as equivalent to a state, report Puerto Rico's results with the regular release of national and state-level NAEP results, and not sample Puerto Rico private school students as the NAEP state-level assessments include only public school students. The Committee expressed concern about this approach as not fitting the profile of Puerto Rico and perhaps providing an incomplete picture of student achievement in the territory.

Reporting and Dissemination Committee Chair, Andrés Alonso, was unable to participate in the Committee meeting due to a schedule conflict, but he sent comments for Vice Chair Gagnon to present on his behalf. Ms. Gagnon summarized Mr. Alonso's comments, which centered on three main points: (1) translation; (2) context; and (3) comparison. These three points are elaborated as follows: First, the 2013 Puerto Rico Mathematics release should be presented in both English and Spanish to promote the report broadly. Second, the results suggest a negatively framed narrative. The context for these results must be considered, and emphasizing relevant contextual variables along with the NAEP achievement scores may represent the best approach for release. Third, Ms. Gagnon conveyed Mr. Alonso's caution about finding the most appropriate comparison for the Puerto Rico mathematics assessment scores. A comparison between Puerto Rico and a state may not be appropriate based on demographics, such as comparing students in Puerto Rico to Hispanic students in an English-centric mainland system.

Gina Broxterman from NCES reported on her trip to Puerto Rico where she met with the Acting Secretary of Education for Puerto Rico and members of the assessment staff there. The staff with whom Ms. Broxterman met were knowledgeable about assessment and NAEP and reviewed an embargoed version of the report. The Puerto Rico Department of Education staff noted that they had already been approached by the media about their participation in NAEP and expect harsh scrutiny of the results.

Ms. Broxterman highlighted several challenges unique to this release of the Puerto Rico NAEP results: (1) This release is off-cycle, so Puerto Rico stands alone to address questions and concerns about the results; (2) In the last two years, Puerto Rico adopted the Common Core State Standards curriculum and has undertaken efforts to improve the educational experience and to provide teachers with professional development, however the effects of these efforts will not be reflected in the 2013 NAEP results; and (3) Memories of the negative feedback from the public and media about Puerto Rico's performance on PISA may lead to anxious anticipation about this release. Puerto Rico staff did not offer any suggestions or preferences for release.

The current release plan for this report comprises a webinar, which will include policymakers and media from Puerto Rico and the U.S. The Committee elaborated upon this plan and suggested various changes as described below.

First, the Committee members advised that the panel discussion for the webinar should be presented in Spanish and English simultaneously. Families and parents whom the Board is attempting to reach more broadly and deeply may not be as proficient in English as educators and policymakers in Puerto Rico. Thus the Committee concluded that a simultaneous bilingual presentation should improve accessibility and would represent a gesture of respect to Puerto Rico.

Second, the panelists should include education-related experts from Puerto Rico and from the National Council for La Raza. Vice Chair Gagnon suggested inviting a fellow Minneapolis School Board member who is originally from Puerto Rico to participate. Third, before the release, NCES and Governing Board staff will host an embargoed briefing, inviting a small number of mostly Puerto Rico policymakers and leaders to whom Board staff and NAEP staff

will show results, provide context, and answer questions as a means to prepare in advance for the public release and the subsequent media response.

A few outstanding questions remain: (1) How broadly will the NAEP mathematics results be publicized in Puerto Rico and beyond Puerto Rico? (2) What is the anticipated extent of the report's public impact? (3) What is the role of NCES in this revised approach for release?

The Committee discussed making this release an evidence-based means to galvanize support for efforts to improve Puerto Rico's education experience. Vice Chair Gagnon suggested emphasizing systemic variables that can be changed within the educational context, for example, the rigor of the curriculum in the public schools such as 8th grade algebra, differences that exist between the mainland curriculum and Puerto Rico's curriculum, and other factors. The best approach may be to consider this 2013 Puerto Rico release as a baseline report of mathematics achievement within the context of Puerto Rico's education system.

In sum, the Committee agreed to recommend a revised release plan to the Board for the Puerto Rico 2013 mathematics assessment results that includes:

- A press release linked to a prerecorded panel discussion (pictures with audio) in Puerto Rican Spanish and English.
- The Executive Summary will be translated into Spanish. Although the Committee agreed that the entire report should be released in Spanish and in English, given fiscal and time constraints, the report will be published in English.
- A focus on the contextual variables, especially school-based and system-based characteristics

The Committee concluded that the approach taken with the release of Puerto Rico's 2013 mathematics assessment results could stand as a pilot test for the newly-adopted communications plan.

ACTION: The Reporting and Dissemination Committee recommends approval of the release plan for the 2013 NAEP Puerto Rico Mathematics Report, with modifications as noted in the November 21, 2014 Committee report.

Release of the Civics, Geography, and U.S. History Assessment Results

Arnold Goldstein from NCES presented to the Committee the current plan for the web-based reporting of results from the 2014 Civics, Geography, and U.S. History assessments. In reviewing the structure of the proposed website, Mr. Goldstein noted that the landing page for the release website presents 'at a glance' information, a cross-subject comparison chart, and each subject highlighted separately. Within each subject, the website presents four layers of data and analysis: (1) primary coverage of average score changes, scores by percentile, scores by content area, scores by student group, population percentages, and student group cross-tabulation analyses; (2) analyses of student groups, achievement gaps, and percentage changes over time by student group; (3) contextual variables as instructional practices, out-of-school activity questions, use of textbooks, use of internet/computer, as well as student interests; (4) an item map and sample questions, along with information about the assessment itself – design, participation, inclusion, and other features.

The Committee agreed on the importance of these three subject areas, not just as a package but as three separate reports. Currently, there are plans for one umbrella product (release and website) for all three reports. But each subject is distinct, and the Committee expressed the wish to avoid shortchanging or overshadowing one subject and to avoid alienating the subject area constituencies.

Board Member Tonya Miles noted that students are a critically important and valuable audience for these reports; the 2010 Civics report prompted teen-oriented media outlets to promote civics education. Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon connected the critical value of these subject assessments to policymakers in a time when curricula are narrowing. Board Member Father Joseph O'Keefe urged the Committee to show the importance of these subject assessments and asked how the Board could engage 8th grade teachers in this release, perhaps by offering them a way to compare their students to the national results.

The Committee agreed that there should be a more distinct plan for each report's release, though still under the same umbrella. One suggestion was to emphasize the area of the website related to the specific data. The Committee and Board as a whole must retain the connections among the subjects, but distinguish each assessment's unique value.

In sum, the Committee must determine how to retain a cohesive whole with three separate segments for each of the three reports. The reports will be ready for review by the Committee in February or early March of 2015, with an April release expected. Revisions to the release plan will require follow-up conference calls among the Committee in the months before the March 2015 Board meeting.

Implementation of Communications Plan

Board staff member, Stephaan Harris, and Reingold representative, Amy Buckley, presented the next steps in implementing the Communications Plan the Board approved in August. The presenters elicited reactions from the Committee about the proposed action steps to engage parents, educators, and policymakers in NAEP. A quick overview of the elements follows by target audience:

- Parents: Parent Discussion Guide, Op-Ed Commentary, Email Newsletter
- Educators: NAEP Toolkit, Webinar Series, Infographics with Hidden Gems
- Policymakers: Testimonials, Conference Presentations, Roundtable Discussions

Mr. Harris asked the Committee to consider what priorities should form the first forays into implementation of the Communications Plan. Committee members expressed mostly positive reactions generally and provided feedback on specific elements.

Parents

Around the Parent Discussion Guide, Board Member Tonya Miles said that the Guide should direct people to navigate through the website, not just to click on the website and move on. Parents need multiple gates into and pathways through the Board and NAEP websites. Board Member Tonya Matthews raised questions about prompting the target audience to engage with the Board and NAEP.

Op-Ed Commentaries need to revolve around what is exciting and intriguing to website users and the public. And the Board should help connect the dots for parents on what is actionable from reports and data: they see the data, they read the report, now what? The Board through op-eds can address critical questions for parents, especially how NAEP matters to their children. Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon mentioned the NAEP Mathematics Curriculum Study as an example of a NAEP report that has a direct, immediate impact on parents and students. Parents can ask whether the content of their child's class really meets expectations of curricular rigor.

Committee members considered ways to share how parents have used NAEP data and reporting and provide specific real-life examples to make these approaches clear. Op-eds and email newsletters can spotlight NAEP's infusion into the ongoing conversation about standards. Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon suggested inserting NAEP and links to NAEP and the Board's website and reports into extant organizations' newsletters, as well as participating in national parent conferences where one appearance allows time with many audience members. Committee members urged NCES and Board staff to restart collaborations on conference presentations, organizing who presents where to avoid duplication and optimize leverage.

Educators

Committee members expanded upon the Communications Plan for educators. Board Member Father O'Keefe suggested presenting at conferences of organizations, such as the National Catholic Educators' Association (NCEA), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), Council for American Private Education (CAPE), to garner attention for NAEP and the Board. By highlighting AACTE, Father O'Keefe emphasized that the Board should not downplay the importance of engaging new teachers in assessment and NAEP issues, perhaps through professional development. The Board could work with appropriate organizations and districts to allow for participation in NAEP webinars or with the toolkit to count as professional development points (or embed in ongoing professional development efforts).

Tonya Miles volunteered fellow Board member, Shannon Garrison, to show how she expertly uses the NAEP Data Explorer with other teachers through webinars or online modules. This would encourage teachers to visit the NAEP, NCES, and Governing Board websites, then translate lessons into classroom action. This should be part of a broader strategy to mine the strengths and participation preferences of Board members.

Tonya Matthews endorsed infographics as an immediate way to relate better to broader audiences and noted the high potential for infographics to go viral. She also asked about how the Board and NAEP connect to the largest growth sector in education – homeschooling families. The current NAEP law does not permit the inclusion of home schooled students in the sample, however, it is an interesting question to consider how to reach out to that audience.

Father Joseph O'Keefe asked about follow-up from the January 2014 Parent Summit. What did Parent Summit attendees learn? And what did they do and how did they act on those lessons learned? Mr. Harris responded that a contract will be underway soon to investigate the answers to these questions as part of a Parent Summit evaluation.

Policymakers

The Committee expressed the need for policymakers to think of NAEP as an independent measure of student achievement and not to make inappropriate comparisons or draw incorrect implications from NAEP data. The Committee agreed that an effective outreach approach may center on holding roundtable discussions with congressional staff rather than with members of Congress who may not have time to process information or promote NAEP themselves. For purposes of ensuring the Board is aware of NAEP's presence on the Hill and in policy conversations, the Board staff should establish a Google alert for NAEP-related commentary from policymakers. This would help connect NAEP to national conversations on opting out of assessments, on the foundering trust in testing programs generally, on implementing Common Core State Standards, and on spending too much time on testing. Committee members concurred that NAEP should be presented as an asset in those conversations.

Similar to their feedback on the Communications Plan for parents, the Committee agreed that exemplars are the best motivators and suggested state staff show peers how they have used NAEP data and reporting in their work at the state-level and with districts. Organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers can become a potentially powerful ally in producing testimonials to connect NAEP data and state data. Also, the Committee agreed that Board members and staff should present about NAEP at conferences to realize maximal reward for the investment of time and resources.

In sum, the Communications Plan's action steps seem like positive and potentially fruitful paths to engaging parents, educators, and policymakers more effectively. At the next meeting, Board staff member and Reingold staff will discuss accomplishments to date and progress made.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



Rebecca Gagnon, Acting Chair