

National Assessment Governing Board

Assessment Development Committee

May 12 – 13, 2016

AGENDA

Thursday, May 12		
8:30 am – 4:00 pm	Closed Session Review of NAEP Items for Reading, Mathematics, Civics, U.S. History, and Geography <i>Committee Discussion</i>	Secure material provided under separate cover
Friday, May 13		
10:00 – 10:05 am	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview <i>Shannon Garrison, Chair</i>	
10:05 – 10:40 am	<p>Update on NAEP Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Report Release Activities <i>Mary Crovo, Deputy Executive Director</i> <i>Cary Sneider, ADC Vice Chair</i>• NAEP Mathematics Framework and the Common Core State Standards: Session at the National Council on Measurement and Education (NCME) <i>Committee Discussion</i>• NAEP Item Review Schedule <i>Mary Crovo</i>	<p>Attachment A</p> <p>Attachment B</p>
10:45 am – 12:15 pm	Closed Session Continued Review of NAEP Items <i>Committee Discussion</i>	Secure material provided under separate cover

NAEP Mathematics Framework and the Common Core Standards

Session at the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME)

April 10, 2016

On Sunday, April 10, 2016, the Governing Board hosted a session at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) to follow up on issues about the relationship between the NAEP Mathematics Framework and the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Mathematics—in particular a concern raised by the NAEP Validity Studies Panel (NVS) that the NAEP mathematics assessment at grade 4 includes some topics that now appear in later grades under the CCSS.

Executive Director Bill Bushaw introduced the session, presenters Michael Cohen of Achieve and Chester Finn of the Fordham Institute, and the moderator, Chair Terry Mazany. Mr. Bushaw noted that the audience included Board members Lucille Davy and Andrew Ho.

Michael Cohen

- The issue is not about how the NAEP Math Framework aligns to the Common Core State Standards, but rather how the framework relates to how mathematics is being taught across all 50 states, regardless of whether the Common Core State Standards are used.
- As the gold standard in assessment since its establishment, NAEP has been used to monitor achievement trends nationwide. NAEP is often used to audit and evaluate the rigor of state assessments and state achievement levels, such as Achieve’s comparisons of the percentage of students scoring at or above Proficient on NAEP and the percentage of students reaching Proficient on state assessments.
- When the NAEP Mathematics Framework was created, there was huge variation in terms of how mathematics was taught across states. At the current time, however, there is much more similarity in what mathematics topics are taught, even among states that never adopted or have un-adopted the Common Core State Standards.
- As long as state NAEP is used as the benchmark to judge state assessments, there are consequences to a mismatch between what is assessed by NAEP and what is commonly taught across the country. Therefore, the NAEP Mathematics Framework should be reviewed to determine whether it needs to be updated.

Chester Finn

- Mr. Cohen assumes that NAEP should be a servant of the states, which is a huge shift to NAEP's role historically. In the 1960s, there was a promise that NAEP would not be used to evaluate states.
- While he acknowledged the alignment issues between NAEP and CCSS in mathematics, Mr. Finn noted that his viewpoint is political rather than psychometric.
- There has been a tremendous amount of change in recent years in state content standards, curricula, implementation, assessments, and accountability systems. NAEP is the only assessment that has been stable during a time of flux at the state level; NAEP is the only measuring stick that is not made of rubber.
- The American public has negative perceptions of the Common Core State Standards, and the integrity of NAEP will be at risk if it is associated with something that is so disliked.
- The NAEP program is heavily burdened with a current workload that includes the transition to digital-based assessments; inclusion of English language learners and students with disabilities; bridge studies; academic preparedness for college; assessment of new subjects; and several other initiatives.
- In an era of limited resources, the NAEP program already can't afford everything that should be happening, such as state level administration of the grade 12 assessments in Reading and Mathematics or adding more districts to the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) program. There are many priorities that should be more important than changing the NAEP Math Framework at this time.

Additional Remarks

- Mr. Cohen acknowledged the concerns about timing but noted that the Governing Board's process for reviewing NAEP takes a considerable amount of time. He reiterated that NAEP cannot remain the gold standard if there is systematic bias in its measurement.
- Mr. Finn responded that it would be difficult for Congress to increase the budget for NAEP amidst new controversy and reiterated his political concerns. He added that even if the Governing Board's pace for changing the framework is slow, merely an announcement of the intention to change the framework could trigger controversy that should be avoided at this time.

Audience Feedback and Questions

Chairman Terry Mazany moderated audience discussion, where the following points were raised:

- Governing Board policy calls for reconsidering the NAEP frameworks every decade, and it is time to review the Mathematics Framework under those guidelines.
- This is a tricky issue that begs for some level of compromise. If NAEP is testing things that states are not teaching, it is not clear how long NAEP will remain the gold standard.
- The mismatch between the NAEP Mathematics Framework and the mathematics currently being taught is not that large— how much of a mismatch can we handle before threatening trends? There could be an incremental shift to gradually change the framework while still maintaining trends.
- In response to the question of under what circumstances it would ever be the time to change the Mathematics Framework, Mr. Finn suggested waiting a few years—until after the 2016 election and possibly after the 2018 election. By this time, state content standards, testing plans, and cut scores should reach some kind of stability as well.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that he also would wait until after the 2016 election, but that any modifications to the framework would not be implemented before that time anyway given the Governing Board’s timeline for this work.
- One suggestion was to consider increasing the testing time for NAEP so that additional topics could be assessed. Mr. Cohen stated that this is not the time to make tests longer.
- In response to an analogy of dynamic frameworks to the consumer price index (CPI), Mr. Cohen responded that NAEP is already very complex and difficult to understand, and the use of an index would exacerbate that. Mr. Finn pointed out that there are several different CPIs rather than a single pristine CPI, and that the CPI is generally not used to track long term trends.
- One of the great contributions of NAEP is to have frameworks that reflect a consensus of what people think students should know— this is necessary to maintain the validity of interpretations of NAEP results.
 - Mr. Finn responded that frameworks are never a total consensus, and that NAEP is not only the property of educators—other stakeholders such as parents also have viewpoints on what students should know.

- It is not clear how the concept of probability can be understood by elementary school students. What is the message that NAEP is sending by continuing to include data topics in the grade 4 assessment?
 - Mr. Finn responded that it is unclear how taking out one piece of the framework and assessment may affect trend. The current framework could become the framework for measuring long-term trend if a new framework is adopted.
- What is the role of NAEP to audit and/or validate state test results? How important is this, because the answer has implications about the extent to which NAEP should chase what states are doing.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that NAEP has become an auditor and that it would be difficult to turn back the clocks on this use of NAEP, given that the federal government has required this audit function prior to adoption of the Common Core State Standards.
 - Mr. Finn countered that NAEP's audit function is to get an independent report of how students are doing, not to evaluate state content or performance standards.
 - Mr. Cohen responded that it is impossible to separate an audit of student performance with an audit of state tests.

Mr. Mazany thanked the audience for their substantive feedback and noted the benefits of having long-term historical memory to learn from individuals who have preceded the current Board members.



**Assessment Development Committee
Item Review Schedule
January 2016 – August 2016**

April 28, 2016

Review Package to Board	Board Comments to NCES	Survey/Cognitive	Review Task	Approx. Number Items	Status
1/8/16	1/22/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (8) Pilot (SBT) Draft builds	2 tasks	✓
1/25/16	2/16/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (12) Pilot (SBT) Concept sketches	2 sketches	✓
2/23/16	3/11/16	Cognitive	2019 Math (4, 8) Pilot (SBT)	4 tasks	✓
2/24/16	3/11/16	Cognitive	2019 Math (12) Pilot (SBT) Concept sketches	3 - 4 sketches	✓
4/14/16	5/20/16	Survey	2018 Social Sciences (8) Pilot	130-140	✓
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (4) Pilot (SBT) Draft builds	2 tasks	For Review at May Board Meeting ↓
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2018 US History (8) Pilot (DI)	150	
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2018 Civics (8) Pilot (DI)	115	
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2018 Geography (8) Pilot (DI)	100	
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (4, 8) Pilot (DI)	60-65	
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2019 Math (4, 8) Pilot (DI)	270-275	
4/28/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (12) Pilot (DI) Passage Review	4 Meaning Vocabulary	

Review Package to Board	Board Comments to NCES	Survey/ Cognitive	Review Task	Approx. Number Items	Status
5/5/16	5/20/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (12) Pilot (DI) Passage Review	4 Passages	
6/2/16	6/23/16	Survey	2019 Math (4, 8) Pilot	20*	
6/2/16	6/23/16	Survey	2019 Reading (4, 8) Pilot	10**	
6/2/16	6/23/16	Survey	2017 Math (4, 8) Operational	100***	
6/2/16	6/23/16	Survey	2017 Reading (4, 8) Operational	100***	
6/2/16	6/23/16	Survey	2017 Writing (8) Operational	100***	
6/2/16	6/23/16	Survey	2017 Writing (4) Operational	40	
6/27/16	7/15/16	Survey	2019 Science (4, 8, 12) Pilot Existing item pool review	100-110	
7/20/16	8/12/16	Cognitive	2017 Reading (4, 8) Operational (DI)	20-25	
7/20/16	8/12/16	Cognitive	2017 Writing (4) Operational (DI)	22	
7/20/16	8/12/16	Cognitive	2017 Writing (8) Operational (DI)	3	
7/21/16	8/12/16	Cognitive	2017 Math (4, 8) Operational (DI)	210	
7/20/16	8/12/16	Cognitive	2019 Reading (4) Pilot (SBT)	2 tasks	

NOTE: "SBT" indicates Scenario-Based Task
 "DI" indicates Discrete Item

* The number listed represents new items in addition to the 2017 Math operational items.

** The number listed represents new items in addition to the 2017 Reading operational items.

***These items were reviewed in May 2015 for inclusion in the 2016 Pilot. This will be a keep/drop review based on 2016 Pilot data. No new items will be added to the review package.