

# National Assessment Governing Board Reporting and Dissemination Committee

Friday, August 3, 2018

9:30 am – 12:00 pm

## AGENDA

---

9:30 – 9:35 am

Welcome

*Rebecca Gagnon, Chair*

---

9:35 – 9:45 am

Follow-up from Contextual Variable Review

*Laura LoGerfo, Assistant Director for Reporting and Analysis*

---

9:45 – 10:30 am

Considerations for Long-Term Trend

*Rebecca Gagnon*

---

10:30 – 11:15 am

Charter School Data on NAEP

*Arnold Goldstein, CRP, Inc.*

Attachment A

---

11:15 am – 12:00 pm

Strategic Vision: Retrospective and Anticipatory

*Stephaan Harris, Assistant Director for Communications*

*Laura LoGerfo*

Attachment B

---

## Focused Reporting on NAEP: Charter Schools

This document describes CRP's plan for reporting on important features of the nation's charter schools. NAEP is the primary data source for this reporting, supplemented by a literature review and an interview with a charter school expert. The analyses will focus on the NAEP mathematics and reading assessments administered at the national, state, and select urban district levels in the 4th and 8th grades from 2002, when NAEP started to collect charter school information, to 2017. The work will describe the organizational characteristics of charter schools, the characteristics of their students, and charter school performance compared to non-charter public schools.

### **Definition of Charter Schools**

The NAEP school administrator questionnaire includes a charter school supplement that addresses the various purposes for which charter schools are created and whether the school serves particular groups of students or focuses on a specific educational emphasis.

In the nation as a whole, over half the charter schools that include 4th grade had no particular focus, while 27 percent had a curricular focus, 15 percent were founded on an educational theory, and 7 percent were based on a moral philosophy. In Colorado, by contrast, 58 percent of charter schools had a specific educational theory and 18 percent a moral philosophy. In Utah, 81 percent were based on a particular educational theory.

In terms of legal organization, nationally 38 percent of charter schools that include a 4th grade were part of a local education agency (LEA), 26 percent were independent of an LEA, and 36 percent were in a separate LEA. In Alaska, Georgia, and Maryland, however, 100 percent of the charter schools were part of an LEA. In Michigan, 73 percent were independent from an LEA. And in Idaho, 83 percent were in separate LEAs.

Similar diversity is shown in the type of organization that granted the schools' original charter: a school district, state board of education, postsecondary institution, state charter grantor, city or state board, or other entity.

### **Characteristics of Charter Schools and Students**

The charter school report will describe the demographic characteristics of charter school students in comparison to non-charter school students. CRP will highlight states, and perhaps large urban school districts, in which these characteristics differ, to illustrate the diversity of charter schools throughout the nation. Demographic characteristics of students will include race/ethnicity,

eligibility for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), and the schoolwide prevalence of students with disabilities and English language learners.

Nationally, 32 percent of charter school students in 8th grade were white, 27 percent were black, and 32 percent were Hispanic. In large cities, the race/ethnic composition of charter schools was quite different: 15 percent white, 42 percent black, and 34 percent Hispanic. This distribution also contrasts with non-charter schools in large cities: 21 percent white, 21 percent black, and 45 percent Hispanic.

Charter and non-charter schools in large cities did not differ in percent of students eligible for the National School Lunch Program—64 percent in charter schools and 65 percent in non-charter schools. They also had similar percentages of students with disabilities and English language learners.

### **Academic Performance**

CRP will show 2017 NAEP reading and math scores for states with higher performance by charter schools as well as those with higher performance by non-charter schools to represent the wide variation in performance. Contextual data will indicate that charter schools may serve specific population groups or objectives that need to be considered when comparing charter and non-charter academic performance.

Nationally, 4th grade NAEP reading scores in charter schools have improved from 212 in 2003 to 222 in 2017 (non-charter schools: 217 to 221). The percent of students at or above Proficient has increased from 27 to 36 percent (non-charter schools: 30 to 35 percent). In mathematics at grade 8, charter schools improved from 268 in 2005 to 282 in 2017 (non-charter schools: 278 to 282). The percent at or above Proficient increased in charter schools from 21 percent to 33 percent (non-charter schools: 29 to 33 percent).

### **Plans for Visual Presentation**

The following elements will be designed for posting on the Governing Board website and social media:

- Number of charter schools and enrollment trends, types of charter schools (part of LEA, independent of LEA, separate LEA), percent of charter schools in an organization that operates other charters, and whether they have a particular focus (curricular focus, educational theory, moral philosophy);
- Percent of students in charter schools and demographic characteristics, compared with non-charter school students; and
- Academic performance of charter school students (average scores and achievement levels), compared with non-charter school students.

Strategic Vision – Activities for Reporting and Dissemination Committee						
		Responsibility	Action	Measurable Outcomes	Start Date	Current Status
<b>Inform #1: Strengthen and expand partnerships by broadening stakeholders' awareness of NAEP and facilitating their use of NAEP resources</b>						
1.	Develop and Sustain Partnerships // Identify What Partners Need to Expand Use and Utility of NAEP	Board staff	Meet with ongoing and new partners	Increased number of partners and meetings	Summer 2015 - ongoing	New Executive Director will meet with partners
		Board staff; Communications contractor	Send newsletters to partners	Newsletters opened by recipients; Increased website traffic	October 2016 - ongoing	Higher open rates, fewer bounces
		Communications contractor – Client Relationship Management tool (CRM)	Audit and maintain database of contacts	Contact lists of partners current and error free; Increased partnerships	October 2017 - ongoing	Weekly tracking of what posts elicit attention and shares
2.	Work with Partners to Increase Awareness and Use of NAEP	Board members; Board staff; NCES staff; Communications contractor	Submit proposals to annual meetings	Increased representation at events/meetings; Increased number of conference presentations	August 2016 - ongoing	Increases in partners retweeting our work through social media; Presented to NAESP, ConnCAN, and Reading Is Fundamental
3.	Focused Reporting of NAEP Results	Board staff; CRP contractor; Communications contractor	Four tasks that will produce content to disseminate through partners	Increased traffic to website and social media; Views of artifacts; Numbers of posts and re-posts	October 2016 - ongoing	New graphics introduced biweekly; TUDA artifacts posted in June
		Board staff; Communications contractor	Produce quick graphics, videos, artifacts for dissemination	Traffic to web page; Views of artifacts; Number of posts and re-posts	January 2018 - ongoing	Graphics and videos based on 2017 data posted and underway

Strategic Vision – Activities for Reporting and Dissemination Committee						
		Responsibility	Action	Measurable Outcomes	Start Date	Current Status
4.	Highlight Contextual Data in Reporting	Board members; Board staff; NCES staff; Communications contractor; HumRRO technical support contract	Review contextual data for messaging / dissemination, including new indicators; Use contextual data in graphics, videos, toolkits	Increased number of artifacts with contextual data; Increased number of partners posting and re-posting artifacts; Traffic to social media posts with NAEP contextual data	Ongoing	Follow-up artifacts from 2017 release will focus on contextual data; HumRRO now investigating what contextual variables related to NAEP scores from curated list
Inform #2: Increase opportunities to connect NAEP to administrative data and state, national, and international student assessments						
5.	Identify Opportunities to Promote Use of NAEP Data with Federal Datasets	Board members; Board staff; NCES staff	Determine what data would be feasible, useful, and of similar quality to NAEP to promote	Launch site with NAEP results and connections to other data; Traffic to website	August 2019	
		Board members; Board staff; NCES staff	Collaborate with COSDAM about connecting NAEP with other data	Joint meeting of COSDAM and R&D to develop decisions to present to Board	March 2019	TBD
6.	Learn from Reporting of International Assessments ( <i>Also, SV #8</i> )	Board members; Board staff; NCES staff; Communications contractor	Learn about international assessments			November 2017 Board meeting

Strategic Vision – Activities for Reporting and Dissemination Committee						
		Responsibility	Action	Measurable Outcomes	Start Date	Current Status
		Board members; Board staff; NCES staff	Invite OECD staff to present on reporting approaches	Discussions about what practices to apply to NAEP	March 2019 (?)	Future R&D meeting focused on international reporting
			Meet with NCES staff to consider crossover of reporting approaches	Board meeting plenary session re: feasible options; Possible incorporation of elements of international work in 2019 Nation's Report Card	2019 (?)	
Inform #3: Expand the availability, utility, and use of NAEP resources, in part by creating new resources to inform education policy and practice						
7.	Add Meaning to NAEP Achievement Levels	Technical support contract with HumRRO (COSDAM lead)	Use findings from HumRRO study to develop guides	Graphic and/or video instructing how to use and interpret achievement levels	October 2017 - ongoing	Met with COSDAM in May 2018 to discuss how to improve understanding and usefulness of achievement levels; R&D will contribute and review guide
8.	Research Effective Uses of NAEP	Technical contract with HumRRO;	Learn where and how NAEP is used effectively	Report on best practices—where, what, under what conditions	October 2017 - ongoing	Underway
		Communications contractor	Develop graphics and/or videos to support correct interpretation of NAEP results	Review NAEP mentions in sampling of reports and in media; Fewer reports of mis-NAEPery compared to TBD baseline		

Strategic Vision – Activities for Reporting and Dissemination Committee						
		Responsibility	Action	Measurable Outcomes	Start Date	Current Status
9.	Develop New Tools for Audiences	Board members; Board staff; NCES staff; Communications contractor	Ideas for tailored reports shared with NCES	Uses of new tool on website post-release; User feedback	August 2016; April 2018	Highlights on 2017 Nation’s Report Card addressed media interests specifically, media highlights
		Board members; Board staff; NCES staff; Communications contractor	Construct custom portals for different subjects and/or types of users	Uses of portals; User feedback	January 2019	
10.	Identify More User-Friendly Approaches to Presenting NAEP Results	Board staff	Invite partners / stakeholders to Board meetings to share needs, interests for using NAEP data	Number of plenary and R&D sessions; Posts of panel summaries; Traffic to social media posts of summaries	November 2016 - ongoing	New Executive Director will be introduced to partners
		Board members; Board staff; Communications contractor	Create “menu of engagement” list of speakers, graphics, videos, artifacts that Board staff can offer partners	Artifacts developed for and posted by partners; Number of requests by partners; Number of activities	January 2018 - ongoing	Graphics and videos shared online and tagged to partners who retweet; Presentations by Board members and staff at NAESP, ConnCAN, RIF
11.	Create “Brief Case” Studies	Board staff; Communications contractor	Learn how NAEP used effectively by states and districts to serve as guide via compelling narratives in graphics, videos, two-pagers	Increased social media traffic; Number of “brief case studies” posted and re-posted	January 2018 - ongoing	Tennessee case study disseminated widely in June; Mississippi case study underway

Strategic Vision – Activities for Reporting and Dissemination Committee						
		Responsibility	Action	Measurable Outcomes	Start Date	Current Status
12.	Facilitate Teacher Preparation Program Toolkit to Increase Access and Use of NAEP by Teachers	Board staff; Communications contractor	Meet with teacher educators to learn needs and interests	Develop tools and resources; Use of toolkits; User feedback	September 2018	Met with AACTE Executive Director to initiate this idea
		Communications contractor	Support development of toolkit by partners	Webpage on Governing Board website for teacher educators and preservice teachers	January 2019	
<b>Inform #4: Promote sustained dissemination and use of NAEP information beyond Report Card releases with consideration for multiple audiences and ever-changing multi-media technologies....</b>						
<i>Note: SV #4 permeates throughout the entire list of planned tasks and activities, so is not presented in separate rows.</i>						
<b>Innovate #6: Continue improving the content, analysis, and reporting of NAEP contextual data by considering the questions' relevance, sensitivity, and potential to provide meaningful context and insights for policy and practice</b>						
13.	Review Contextual Variables	Board members; Board staff	Review contextual variables to ensure relevance and importance	Greater use of contextual data; Updated variables	Ongoing	Reviewed core contextual items at May 2018 R&D meeting; Feedback registered and answered





**Upcoming NAEP Reports**

<b><i>2015 Student Questionnaires: Computer Access and Usage in Mathematics and Reading</i></b>	July 2018
<b><i>2015 National Indian Education Study: A Closer Look</i></b>	July 2018
<b><i>From Algebra I to Zoology: How Well Do Students Report Mathematics Coursetaking?</i></b>	August 2018
<b><i>2015 Student Questionnaires: Classroom Instruction for Mathematics, Reading, and Science</i></b>	August 2018