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

Overview

The Task Force consists of 12 high-level state education agency staff members who were chosen based on expertise and interest in assessment, and geographic representation of the nation. As part of the Board's continuing outreach efforts, the Governing Board contracted with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in September 2007 to form this Task Force charged with providing state feedback and recommendations to the Board on NAEP policy areas and projects. This partnership continues to be important to the Board's work, with annual contract renewals to extend the work. The Task Force convenes for two in-person meetings and four WebEx meetings each year.

Task Force members include:

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

Policy Issues

During the Task Force's 45 meetings to date, they have addressed a number of key policy issues:

- NAEP reporting process
- Inclusion and accommodations
- NAEP schedule of assessments
- NAEP 12th grade preparedness
- Reading trend reporting
- NAEP contextual questions
- Common Core State Standards and Assessments
- Misuse and misinterpretation of NAEP data
- International benchmarking
- Board initiatives on raising achievement and closing gaps
- Future of NAEP initiatives
- Assessment literacy initiative
- NAEP digital-based assessment transition
- Strategic planning initiative

On each issue, Task Force members provided substantive input on these NAEP topics and made significant contributions in related areas. Task Force Vice Chair Shelley Loving-Ryder will brief the Board on November 20, 2015 to highlight key issues from the Task Force's recent discussions.

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

Policy Task Force Members (2015-2016)*

Lizzette Gonzalez Reynolds
Task Force Chair
Chief Deputy Commissioner
Texas Education Agency

Shelley Loving-Ryder
Task Force Vice Chair
Assistant Superintendent,
Student Assessment and School Improvement
Virginia Department of Education

Kim Benton
Chief Academic Officer,
Deputy State Superintendent
Mississippi Department of Education

Brenda Cassellius
Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Education

Paul Leather
Deputy Commissioner
New Hampshire Department of Education

Nate Olson
Communications Manager
Washington Office of Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Judy Osgood
Public Information Officer
Nevada Department of Education

Michael Sibley
Director of Communications
Alabama Department of Education

Scott Smith
Director of Career Standards and
Assessments
Kansas State Department of Education

Joyce Zurkowski
Executive Director, Student Assessment
Colorado Department of Education

*The Task Force is currently recruiting to fill one deputy vacancy and one testing director vacancy.

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

SUMMARY OF WORK TO DATE

The following tables summarize Task Force input on topics addressed since their last briefing to the Board in November 2013. The Task Force has provided important input for on-going projects, draft policies, or other documents. In noting relevant follow-up activities, an asterisk (∗) for a row signals an opportunity for the Board to consider the Task Force's suggestions in ongoing work.

Topics with new Task Force discussion points are:
- Topic #1: NAEP Reporting Process
- Topic #2: NAEP Inclusion and Accommodations
- Topic #3: NAEP Schedule of Assessments
- Topic #6: NAEP Contextual Questions
- Topic #7: Common Core State Standards and Assessments
- Topic #8: Misuse and Misinterpretation of NAEP Data
- Topic #12: Assessment Literacy Initiative
- Topic #13: NAEP Digital-Based Assessment (DBA) Transition
- Topic #14: Strategic Planning Initiative
- Rising NAEP Issues Based on Previous Task Force Discussions

Key discussion points from the Task Force for each topic are listed below.

∗ Denotes Task Force input for future Board consideration

TOPIC #1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS

Addressed in meetings on December 13, 2007 (in-person), May 29, 2008 (in-person), July 20, 2010 (in-person), December 7, 2010, January 7, 2011(in-person), February 15, 2011, April 22, 2011, and July 9, 2015 (in-person).

This topic addresses reporting NAEP results, including initial releases.

TOPIC#1: NAEP REPORTING PROCESS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Revise state snapshot reports to encourage wider use. The state snapshot report should be modified to make it more meaningful and useful.	*
Keep language on webpages simple and clear for general audiences. The NAEP results landing web page should be reviewed to ensure simple and clear messages that are easily understood by all audiences, with a deeper level of data presented on other pages.	*
Create compact state summaries of NAEP data for state chiefs. Create and disseminate a one-pager showing trends and gaps of the state for each state chief.	*
Champion appropriate use of NAEP data. Considering the various misuses of NAEP data, the Task Force wants the Board be a champion of appropriate use of NAEP data.	*
Monitor trend quality issues from demographic shifts. NAEP should review how the dramatic demographic changes over short periods of time relate to NAEP trend reporting.	*

TOPIC #2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS

Addressed in meetings on December 13, 2007 (in-person), March 11, 2008, March 24, 2009, May 28, 2009 (in-person), July 14, 2009, September 11, 2009, November 3, 2009, January 25, 2010 (in-person), April 6, 2010, June 13, 2011, and February 4, 2015 (in-person).

In 2014, the Board reinitiated discussion related to its NAEP inclusion policy (March 2010) to address general reporting issues and the assessment of English Language Learners (ELLs).

TOPIC#2: NAEP INCLUSION AND ACCOMMODATIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Reviewing potential revision for the policy ▪ Policy review and revision is timely. The Task Force agreed that the Board should consider revising the policy because of how the demographics of the student population are shifting. ▪ Additional factors should be considered. Consider: students' education background, continuous enrollment, student mobility (e.g., migrant students), English language proficiency (ELP) levels, and definitions of ELL. ▪ Research is needed to understand data collection issues. Conduct a pilot study with states willing to provide data to help show the specific difficulties that need to be addressed.	***** The Board's 2010 SD/ELL policy was updated with some revision in August 2014.

TOPIC #3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS

Addressed in meetings on December 13, 2007(in-person), April 22, 2011, April 17, 2013, June 6, 2013, August 23, 2013 (in-person), April 23, 2014, February 14, 2014, and June 13, 2014.

This recurring topic provides an opportunity for the Task Force feedback on the NAEP Schedule of Assessments.

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2" align="center">TOPIC#3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT</td>
<td align="center">FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

Timing and amount of testing
- Periodicity of NAEP Reading and Math in the next few years is critical. The Task Force noted that states and districts are receiving pushback on the number of assessments in the 2015 school year due to the implementation of the new CCSS assessments. Task Force members shared there is anxiety over the release of the new proficiency levels for the CCSS assessments. Therefore, the release of the NAEP Reading and Math results will be critical. NCES staff added that several states have opted out of the next voluntary NAEP Science assessment.
- Configure the NAEP schedule to minimize overlap with Common Core testing. One suggestion was to review SBAC and PARCC assessment schedules. The NAEP schedule should be configured to maximize a time frame for NAEP and to avoid overlapping assessment time frames of the Common Core assessments.
- Excessive testing is becoming a more prominent issue. States echoed that there is a widespread sentiment among segments of the general public that the amount of testing currently in place is excessive. And some Task Force members expressed concern regarding the number of assessments being implemented.

</td>
<td valign="top">

＊

The Board approved a new schedule of assessments on March 6, 2015, extending the schedule to 2024. The Task Force's feedback was an important consideration in the Board's discussions.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

High priorities for the overall schedule
- NAEP trends provide valuable information. Some Task Force members expressed it is important to push forward with as much participation as possible because NAEP is important as tool to determine student performance trends.
- Maintain NAEP's broad coverage of subject areas. NAEP provides an important function as an objective and comprehensive external measure. The Task Force noted that NAEP is essential to the assessment landscape in this regard, providing results for math and reading as well as other subject areas.

</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

TOPIC#3: NAEP SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENTS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Higher priority subjects from the state perspective ▪ State-level NAEP Writing assessments should have a higher priority. The Task Force noted that writing is a critical skill students must develop to become college and career ready. The Task Force recommended that the NAEP Writing Assessment be administered at the state level more frequently, and if the Board could only assess one grade at the state level, they suggest targeting the 8th grade. After looking at the NAEP Schedule of Assessments, the Task Force finds that the NAEP Writing assessment should either be prioritized over other subject areas or be integrated into other subject assessments. ▪ Prioritize NAEP assessments that cover subject areas not assessed by states. The NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) assessment fills a gap in state assessment systems, and should therefore be a high priority. ▪ Prioritize the NAEP TEL assessment. Several Task Force members expressed that the NAEP TEL assessment is a very important assessment to keep on the schedule. Further, some Task Force members saw value in state level results for TEL, while other states expressed that with the recent adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards across many states, it is not clear how all of these related assessments will fit together. ▪ NAEP State Science assessment is supported for 2015. Several states expressed support for a NAEP Science assessment in 2015. Science is not tested on the state level enough, so the results of the Science assessment would be especially beneficial, in this regard.	***** The Board approved a new schedule of assessments on March 6, 2015, extending the schedule to 2024. The Task Force's feedback was an important consideration in the Board's discussions.
Low priorities from the state perspective Voluntary assessments are not appealing in many states. Because of the influx of exams, several states have trouble participating in any voluntary exams.	
Communication strategies for garnering support for the schedule NAEP's value must be actively communicated. If the country wants to be successful on an international level, the country must acknowledge that assessments provide critical information. The message needs to continue that NAEP is important as the national benchmark.	

TOPIC #6: NAEP CONTEXTUAL QUESTIONS

Addressed in meetings on June 26, 2008, June 13, 2011, February 16, 2012 (in-person), April 30, 2012, January 8, 2013 (in-person), June 6, 2013, August 23, 2013 (in-person), June 13, 2014, February 4, 2015 (in-person), and March 19, 2015.

This discussion topic started as an examination of the implications of changing race/ethnicity categories as mandated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). In 2011, the Board convened an expert panel working group to provide recommendations for how to maximize the use of NAEP background questions, and part of this initiative updated "background questions" to be referred to instead as "contextual questions" to clarify the general objective of the questions. Later, the Task Force also discussed NAEP's efforts to refine measures of socioeconomic status, Board initiatives to improve NAEP questionnaires, and Board ideas to produce "focus reports" using information from NAEP survey questionnaires in order to provide deeper and policy-relevant analyses.

TOPIC#6: NAEP CONTEXTUAL QUESTIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Continuity and comparability of contextual questions The Task Force does have concern over the continuity and comparability of the questions and recommends partnering with the states that have similar questionnaires.	***** The Board's Assessment Development Committee and Reporting and Dissemination Committee monitor contextual questions, and will continue monitor this issue.
Considering the several focused report topics proposed ▪ The Task Force stated that they would be most interested in focused reports on charter schools, high performing states and districts, learning opportunities, and regional reports (and economic impacts should be noted in the regional reports). ▪ Broaden the algebra 1 topic. Reframe the algebra 1 in grade 8 topic to instead capture student readiness for algebra 1, in general. ▪ Add a topic to explain Proficient. Explain conceptually what Proficient means in various contexts, and address the common notion that Proficient relates to grade-level performance.	***** The Board has used the Task Force's feedback to prioritize topic ideas for the first focus reports to be developed.

TOPIC#6: NAEP CONTEXTUAL QUESTIONS

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Clarify NAEP's Authority and Intended Uses for Contextual Data The Task Force suggested proceeding with caution in the development of new research reports examining and linking student demographic data to achievement and other factors as the reports might be subject to misinterpretation. The Task Force suggested clarity regarding intended use, statutory authority, and statutory intent for the use/collection of data to address these issues.	***** The Board has used the Task Force's feedback to prioritize topic ideas for the first focus reports to be developed.
Four focus report topic ideas discussed at the March 2015 Board meeting: 1. An examination of NAEP results by region combined with an examination of practices common to high-performing or strong-growth districts. 2. An analysis of results for charter schools and private schools within the context of school choice and opportunity. 3. Analyses exploring NAEP data by multiple demographic factors as a component of several different focused reports, e.g., a focused report on in-school and out-of-school learning opportunities, with an additional analysis on the role of parent involvement in these opportunities. 4. Analyses of district and school resources in tandem with analyses of NAEP data, including allocation and student access over time. *Task Force suggestions for related topic and report configurations:* ▪ Combine examinations of best practice and resource access. Consider report configurations that examine best practices and resource access (topics 1 and 4) simultaneously. ▪ Explore regional effects of school finances on student achievement. Related to topic 4, the Task Force expressed interest in examining the regional effect of school finances on student achievement. ▪ Clarify the purpose of analyses of charter schools and private schools. For topic 2, the Task Force asked what the agenda is for looking at charter schools and private schools via the lens of school choice and opportunity. The purpose should be clearly stated. Be mindful of political agendas associated with "school choice." ▪ Consider the lack of clear definitions of parent involvement. For topic 3, there is interest in out-of-school learning opportunities, but clearer definitions and conceptualizations are needed for parent involvement (an amorphous concept in the field), and what constitutes best practices. Given this ambiguity, the Task Force expressed concern regarding the proposed research topic examining the role of parental involvement.	

TOPIC #7: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Addressed in meetings on May 28, 2009 (in-person), January 25, 2010 (in-person), July 20, 2010 (in-person), August 23, 2013 (in-person), January 21, 2014, and February 14, 2014.

As new milestones are reached in the Common Core State Standards initiative, Task Force discussions have provided insights about state perspectives on how NAEP's role may evolve. As an ongoing cross-cutting issue, several of the Task Force's recommendations on this topic are reflected in other topics, such as Topic #3 NAEP Schedule of Assessments and Topic #10 Board Initiatives on Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps. Recent discussions focused on the role of NAEP assessments in the assessment landscape, anticipating the consortia assessments.

TOPIC#7: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
The importance of consistent measurement from NAEP The Task Force recommends that the Board continue with the math and reading assessments at the current periodicity to provide consistency for the states until the Common Core consortia establish a proven track record of implementing their tests. Some Task Force members did not fully agree due to a desire to minimize the number of assessments without hurting achievement or accountability.	✳ The Board approved a new schedule of assessments on March 6, 2015, extending the schedule to 2024. The Task Force's feedback was an important consideration in the Board's discussions.
Determining NAEP's role The Task Force noted that the role of NAEP is a topic that will continue to be discussed within the consortia. It will be important to determine the role of NAEP in the new assessment landscape and to inform states about how NAEP can complement state assessment programs.	✳ The Board has continued conversations with assessment consortia leadership, including annual briefings. NAEP outreach efforts engage consortia states and non-consortia states.

TOPIC#7: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Research and data of interest ▪ Alignment research provides useful information. When there are differences and similarities in performance between PARCC, SBAC, and NAEP, people will want to know why. Alignment research is beneficial to states and the public, more generally. ▪ Structural differences exist between NAEP and the Common Core. NAEP is distinct from state standards and assessments in a particular grade, and so states should expect to see differences in performance between a state assessment and NAEP. Further, NAEP uses an assessment framework as the basis for its assessments, while the Common Core State Standards is a curriculum framework to guide instruction and assessment. ▪ Examining the assessments from the consortia will inform next steps. It is not clear the extent to which PARCC and SBAC will cover the full range of the Common Core State Standards. NAEP may have a more general assessment, which would be useful.	✱ Several research projects have compared NAEP frameworks with the Common Core State Standards. Further comparisons will be possible when items from the consortia assessments are available.

TOPIC #8: MISUSE AND MISINTERPRETATION OF NAEP DATA

Addressed in meetings on July 20, 2009 (in-person), September 11, 2009, November 3, 2009, April 6, 2010, December 15, 2014, and February 4, 2015 (in-person).

In discussions of *Topic #1: NAEP Reporting Process*, the Task Force has emphasized the growing issue of misuse and misinterpretation of NAEP data. The growing prominence of this issue prompted the standalone topic: *Topic #8: Misuse and Misinterpretation of NAEP Data*. Noting the Board's assessment literacy discussions, the Task Force reinitiated discussion on the misuse and misinterpretation of NAEP data, as a relevant concern.

TOPIC#8: MISUSE AND MISINTERPRETATION OF NAEP DATA	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Proactive informational resources ▪ Provide more information on the purpose of NAEP. ▪ Continue to involve chiefs prior to the release of NAEP data so that chiefs are better informed and equipped to use NAEP data and respond to media inquiries. ▪ Provide chiefs with a one pager that reviews their state's NAEP results.	∗
Model appropriate uses of NAEP data ▪ The Governing Board should provide examples of states that are exceptional at utilizing NAEP data. The Task Force suggested that NAGB provide exemplars of states that interpret NAEP data exceptionally well because there are gaps on how to present and employ NAEP data when presenting the data from state NAEP results. ▪ Collaborate with public information officers (PIOs) at state education agencies. ▪ Provide a NAEP advisor to organizations reporting regularly on NAEP to ensure the data are not misconstrued.	∗

TOPIC#8: MISUSE AND MISINTERPRETATION OF NAEP DATA	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Ongoing NAEP-State differences in the definition of Proficient There is a predominant misinterpretation of NAEP data at the state level regarding how to report the NAEP Basic Level. The Task Force noted that there is confusion at the state level as to which part of the NAEP scale is the ideal range for student performance because in some NAEP reports the results for students at or above the NAEP Basic level receive emphasis, while in other reports student performance at or above the NAEP Proficient level is emphasized. From state to state, the Basic level falls at different points on each state's assessment scale relative to the state's definition of Proficient. The cut score for the Basic level in each state assessment varies relative to NAEP's definition of Proficient. When reporting results to the public, states sometimes note that the state Basic level cut score falls in the middle of the NAEP Basic level performance range, and this presents communication challenges in terms of state-to-NAEP assessment result comparisons.	∗
Different analyses to highlight equity issues NAEP should explore more ways to report gap sizes. The Task Force noted that some high performing states have some of the worst achievement gaps in terms of what is usually reported, but there are other ways to examine and report achievement gaps that would support more informed and nuanced discussions for equity and improvement issues. The traditional gap reporting should be supplemented with additional analyses that provide deeper looks at equity issues within and across racial/ethnic groups.	∗

TOPIC #12: ASSESSMENT LITERACY INITIATIVE

Addressed in meetings on October 1, 2014, December 15, 2014, February 4, 2015 (in-person), March 19, 2015, and July 9, 2015(in-person).

Since Fall 2013, the Assessment Literacy Work Group, composed of six Board members and chaired by Board member Jim Popham, has convened to help plan an initiative, which will support development of various products for the target audiences, e.g., videos, web-based materials, and conference presentations. The objective of this work is to increase the assessment literacy of parents, students, and policymakers about assessment in general, including the role of NAEP. The Work Group focused its efforts by addressing certain assessment-related understandings. The Task Force provided feedback on key planning documents, developed by the Work Group.

TOPIC#12: ASSESSMENT LITERACY INITIATIVE

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Framing and communicating the initiative's target understandings ▪ The wording for the understandings should be positively framed and promote the value of testing. The Task Force noted that several of the understandings are negatively framed such as the language regarding the accuracy of testing. The Board should ensure the framing of the understandings is constructive and focuses on how test scores are used instead of focusing on what a test does not report. The Task Force also stated that the Board should move away from the target group of "parents/grandparents" and use a broader label for the group that includes all possible caretakers for students. ▪ The wording for the understandings should be more consumable in a way that resonates with a variety of audiences. The Task Force noted that the wording used in the understandings tend to contain education jargon that target audiences make not understand. The Board will need to confirm that the final wordings for the understandings are not high level education terms so that the target audience will be able to interpret the message being delivered. Avoid education jargon. ▪ Focus on how to inform the public that educational assessments serve different purposes. The Task Force noted that the public first needs a clear understanding that assessments have different purposes. Just as assessments have different purposes, the public needs to understand that each assessment defines Proficient differently and not all assessments are directly comparable. ▪ Explain the continuum of assessment. Use infographics and other visual resources to show parents the "continuum" of assessments.	***** The Board has included the Task Force's feedback in its ongoing deliberations. The Board last discussed implementation of the communication plan for the assessment literacy during the August 2015 Board meeting.

TOPIC #12: ASSESSMENT LITERACY INITIATIVE

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Related ongoing work Several foundations and states are currently working on promoting assessment literacy and the work they are doing could be an asset to the Assessment Literacy Work Group. The Task Force noted that the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), the Foundation for Excellence in Education, and the National PTA are all tackling the issues surrounding assessment literacy and could potentially be resources for the Assessment Literacy Work Group. The CCSSO communications team, as well as state education agency communication teams could also be important resources.	***** The Board has included the Task Force's feedback in its ongoing deliberations. The Board last discussed implementation of the communication plan for the assessment literacy during the August 2015 Board meeting.
Disseminating information effectively ▪ Dissemination partners are needed in all states. The Task Force suggested that the dissemination plan should have someone in every state helping spread the message when it is time to rollout the final products. ▪ Consider who should lead this information campaign. NAEP could become a negative target by making overly broad statements on assessments. With this broad focus, NAEP should partner with and rely on other organizations to be the carrier of the informational messages. ▪ Use parent organizations to promote assessment literacy. The Task Force noted that several parent organizations are working on tackling the issues surrounding assessment literacy and could potentially be resources for the Assessment Literacy Work Group. NAGB could also use these groups to help promote parent awareness and enthusiasm for NAEP.	
Target audiences for the initiative ▪ Parents are an appropriate primary audience. The Task Force supported the proposed focus of parents being the ultimate audience and suggested that the work could also be generalized to legislatures and other groups. ▪ Consider audiences beyond parents. Teachers and principals are central to assessment literacy, and this initiative can also be used to provide encouragement to students, supporting better test performance and testing experiences. ▪ Inform new chiefs and deputies. Work with CCSSO to inform new chiefs and deputies about the purpose of NAEP, and related guidelines.	

TOPIC#12: ASSESSMENT LITERACY INITIATIVE	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Collaborate with CCSSO to create NAEP-specific resources. CCSSO and NAGB should collaborate to create a document on assessment literacy to share best practices for communicating NAEP results and information.	*
Standardize NAEP data presentations via exportable graphics. To support states and partners in using correct and high quality data displays of NAEP data, graphics in NAEP Report Cards should be exportable so they can be plugged into other documents, i.e., image files branded as coming directly from the NAEP Report Card.	*
Address NAEP cut scores and include teachers in this initiative. It is important to help the general public understand NAEP cut scores, and increasing teacher understanding of NAEP assessments is also important, in addition to the Board's focus on parents.	*
Anticipate how NAEP results and new resources can be misused. The Task Force noted the importance of anticipating how NAEP results and the information will be used negatively, or in a way that works against the initiative's goals.	*

TOPIC #13: NAEP DIGITAL-BASED ASSESSMENT (DBA) TRANSITION

Addressed in February 4, 2015 in-person meeting.
Via concurrent administrations of paper-based and digital-based assessments for NAEP reading and mathematics, research will explore how NAEP trend reporting can be maintained. The Task Force has provided input on various issues relevant to the NAEP DBA transition.

TOPIC #13: NAEP DIGITAL-BASED ASSESSMENT (DBA) TRANSITION	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	**FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES**
Considerations in Implementing DBA for NAEP ▪ Administering the NAEP DBA in reading and math for all 50 states will be challenging in 2017. The Board should identify criteria to determine when the move to school-based equipment will be feasible. ▪ Upcoming transitions in college and career ready standards and assessments and the political context should be considered in crafting the transition timeline.	✱
Student capability with NAEP DBA hardware Students may not have had access to the technology that will be used in NAEP DBA. Lack of familiarity will be an issue to address.	✱ This issue is being actively monitored by NCES, to ensure that the equipment and tutorials for students address these issues.
Informing constituents about the NAEP DBA transition This transition may prompt resistance from the public. Consider a general informational campaign on the assessment's validity and purpose, and another targeted effort for educators on how this will be a resource.	✱
Transparency regarding all data being collected The Board should be very transparent about the data that will be collected from this assessment and how the data will be used.	✱

TOPIC #14: STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVE

Addressed in July 9, 2015 in-person meeting.

The purpose of the Strategic Planning Initiative led by Board Chairman Terry Mazany is to take stock of where the Board is and what new initiatives need to be developed.

TOPIC#14: STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVE	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Consider how ESEA reauthorization will impact NAEP. With the reauthorization of ESEA, it would be helpful to have a discussion on what reauthorization means for NAEP.	✳
Review the value of NAEP preparedness reporting. More work should be done to enable state-level NAEP preparedness statements and predictive statements on preparedness for the grade 8 assessments, extending NAEP preparedness reporting. Further, different high school diplomas translate differently to postsecondary preparedness, even for high-performing students who eventually learn they are not equipped for college STEM majors. This issue warrants more national attention.	✳
Consider further research on career readiness. Continue to explore what information NAEP can provide relevant to career readiness, and how academic preparedness should be defined going forward, given the importance of soft skills to preparedness.	✳
Determine how NAEP can be more nimble. NAEP needs to be more nimble in terms of the assessment itself and also reporting.	✳
Maintain NAEP's role as an assessment innovator. It is important for NAEP to continue as an assessment innovator, to help states measure skills that are difficult to assess.	✳

RISING NAEP ISSUES BASED ON PREVIOUS TASK FORCE DISCUSSIONS

Addressed in July 9, 2015 in-person meeting.

The Task Force provided input on rising issues they previously suggested for future discussion, namely: privacy and student data security; and changes in NAEP student surveys and state requirements for informed prior consent.

RISING NAEP ISSUES BASED ON PREVIOUS TASK FORCE DISCUSSIONS	
TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND INPUT	FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES
Consider risks and benefits of certain NAEP student survey questions. The risks associated with trying to obtain socioeconomic status data through some survey questions could far outweigh the benefits.	*
Find ways to assure states about the survey data being collected. There could be just one or two NAEP survey questions that could challenge a current state's student privacy laws thereby triggering the need for parental consent and prompting a state to bow out of a NAEP administration entirely. NAEP should find ways to provide assurances regarding what information is collected as well as how the information will be used.	*