

Potential Changes to NAEP Framework Development Processes

Under the leadership of the Assessment Development Committee (ADC), the Board updated its Framework Development policy in March 2018. One of the primary revisions reflected in the current policy was to account for the process of updating existing frameworks; the previous policy emphasized the development of new frameworks and contained little explicit guidance on monitoring and revising frameworks without starting from scratch. In addition, the revised policy focuses on high level guidance rather than procedural details; the latter is intended to be captured by an accompanying Framework Development Procedures Manual. A procedures manual has not yet been created but this task is included in a Technical and Logistical Services contract that has recently been awarded to the Manhattan Strategies Group (MSG) with a subcontract to the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO).

The current policy has now been in place since March 2018 and has guided the updates of the NAEP Mathematics Framework (adopted by the Board in November 2019) and the NAEP Reading Framework (adopted by the Board in August 2021). There is a need to evaluate the extent to which the current policy and procedures should be revised, and to determine how procedures should be documented in a Framework Development Procedures Manual that will be developed in advance of the next framework update.

To provide additional background and inform potential recommendations, Board staff commissioned two papers. As a consultant, former Governing Board Executive Director Cornelia Orr synthesized [historical information on NAEP framework development](#). As part of the Board's previous contract for Technical Support in Psychometrics, Assessment Development, and Preparedness for Postsecondary Endeavors, the Center for Assessment (under subcontract to the Human Resources Research Organization) prepared a technical memo on [how NAEP framework development relates to procedures for developing other assessments](#). The two papers were included in previous ADC and Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) materials and discussions on framework processes.

Board staff worked with the ADC leadership and members to develop preliminary recommendations for revising the Board policy and processes for framework development. The initial recommendations were discussed in a joint planning meeting of ADC and COSDAM in September and revised in preparation for discussions with the full Board at the upcoming quarterly meeting. The goal is to adopt a revised policy and create a Framework Development Procedures Manual prior to convening panels for the NAEP Science Framework update in late spring of 2022, if the Board decides that an update to the NAEP Science Framework is necessary. The [Achievement Levels Procedures Manual](#) provides an example of how a Board policy can be further elaborated for implementation.

Several of the recommended changes to the framework update process are related to how the Board can surface and provide direction on important policy and controversial issues upfront and at key points throughout the process rather than waiting until after seeking public comment on a draft framework. The timing of Board input is not specified in the policy but traditionally the Board has prioritized receiving recommendations from content experts without regard to most

other factors and releasing those directly for public comment; Board policy discussions have taken place following a public comment period on a draft framework. By this point, framework development panels have worked for a year or more without any policy considerations placed on the process. Based on experience with both the NAEP Mathematics and Reading Framework updates in recent years, it is not ideal for the process if public comment on a draft framework surfaces controversial issues that were not previously considered by either the Board or the panel. More broadly, in the two decades since most NAEP assessment frameworks were last updated, the context surrounding education and assessment has changed significantly – e.g., greater alignment in states’ standards in some content areas, transitions to digital assessment, new opportunities to engage with stakeholders through virtual meetings and digital media – necessitating consideration of other factors earlier in the process as well as new approaches.

In the attached policy document, proposed edits are indicated in “tracked changes,” rationales for substantial changes are noted in comment boxes, and proposed changes that apply only to the procedures manual are indicated in comment boxes.

The Strategic Vision includes a goal to: *Optimize the utility, relevance, and timing of NAEP subject-area frameworks and assessment updates to measure expectations valued by the public.* To address this goal, staff have also suggested undertaking additional research to inform the implementation of frameworks, including the feasibility of smaller, more frequent updates. It currently takes approximately 5-6 years from the time that the Board adopts a framework until NCES implements the changes in the operational assessment. Staff have suggested additional research and expert consultation in conjunction with NCES; the outcomes of such work may warrant additional updates to the policy statement and procedures manual in the future.

During the November plenary discussion, ADC Vice Chair Mark Miller and ADC member Patrick Kelly will present key highlights of the proposed changes to the Board’s processes for framework updates and facilitate Board member discussion. No action is anticipated at this meeting; additional changes to the policy and procedures are intended as an outcome from the November meeting discussion for potential action at the March 2022 Board meeting.



Adopted: TBD

National Assessment Governing Board

Assessment Framework Development

Policy Statement

It is the policy of the National Assessment Governing Board to conduct a comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative process to determine and update the content and format of all assessments under the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The primary result of this process shall be an assessment framework (hereafter, "framework") with objectives to guide development of NAEP assessments for students in grades 4, 8, and 12 that are valid, reliable, and reflective of widely accepted professional standards.

Commented [A1]: RATIONALE: "Assessment" has been added to the name of the policy to ensure it is clear that NAEP frameworks are assessment frameworks; this text from the current policy already indicates that other references to "framework" are shorthand for "assessment framework."

The Governing Board, through its Assessment Development Committee (ADC), shall monitor the framework development and update processes to ensure that the final Governing Board-adopted framework and specifications, ~~contextual variables documents~~, and their development processes comply with all principles and guidelines of the Governing Board Assessment Framework Development Policy.

Introduction

Since its creation by Congress in 1988, the Governing Board has been responsible for determining the content and format of all NAEP assessments. The Governing Board has carried out this important statutory responsibility by engaging a broad spectrum of stakeholders in developing recommendations for the knowledge and skills NAEP should assess in various grades and subject areas. From this comprehensive process, the Governing Board develops a framework to outline the content and format for each NAEP assessment at grades 4, 8, and 12. Development of a framework for a new assessment is guided by the schedule of NAEP assessments adopted by the Governing Board.

Under provisions of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-279), Congress authorized the Governing Board to continue its mandate for determining the content and format of valid and reliable assessments based on widely accepted technical and professional ~~testing~~ standards for test development and active

participation of stakeholders. This mandate aligns with the purpose of NAEP, which is to provide fair and accurate measurement of student academic achievement.

Given this mandate, the Governing Board must ensure that the highest standards of test development are employed in framework development to support the validity of educational inferences made using NAEP data. The Governing Board Item Development Policy [separately](#) details principles and guidelines for NAEP assessment items, and the Governing Board has final authority on the appropriateness of all assessment items.

By law, NAEP assessments shall not evaluate personal beliefs or publicly disclose personally identifiable information, and NAEP assessment items shall be secular, neutral, and non-ideological and free from racial, cultural, gender, or regional bias.

~~The NAEP framework development and update processes shall be informed by a broad, balanced, and inclusive set of factors. The frameworks shall reflect current curricula and instruction, research regarding cognitive development and instruction, and the nation's future needs and desirable levels of achievement. This delicate balance between "what is" and "what should be" is at the core of the NAEP framework development process.~~

Commented [A2]: RATIONALE: This text was moved from the previous Principle 4

To develop the recommended framework for Board adoption, the Governing Board convenes stakeholders ([via panels and broad outreach](#)) to identify [and/or provide feedback on](#) the content and design for each NAEP assessment.

In this process, involved stakeholders [shall](#) include:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Teachers | Policymakers |
| Curriculum Specialists | Business Representatives |
| Content Experts | Parents |
| Assessment Specialists | Users of Assessment Data |
| State Administrators | Researchers and Technical Experts |
| Local School Administrators | Members of the public |

This Policy complies with the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act of 2002 ([P.L. 107-279](#)) and the documents listed below which express widely accepted technical and professional standards for test development. These standards reflect the agreement of recognized experts in the field, as well as the policy positions of major professional and technical associations concerned with educational testing. A procedures manual shall provide additional detail about how this Policy is implemented.

The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. (2014). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education.

Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education. (2004). Washington, DC: Joint Committee on

Testing Practices.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistical Standards. (2012).

Principles for Framework Development

Principle 1: Elements of Frameworks

Principle 2: Development and Update Process

Principle 3: Periodic Framework Review

~~Principle 4: Resources for the Process~~

Principle ~~4~~5: Elements of Specifications

Principle ~~5~~6: Role of the Governing Board

Guidelines for the Principles

Principle 1: Elements of Frameworks

The Governing Board is responsible for developing a framework for each NAEP assessment. The framework shall define the scope of the domain to be measured by delineating the knowledge and skills to be tested at each grade, the format of the NAEP assessment, ~~and the achievement level~~ descriptions, and recommendations for subject-specific contextual variables.

Guidelines

- a) The framework shall determine the extent of the domain and the scope of the construct to be measured for each grade level in a NAEP assessment. The framework shall provide information to the public and test developers on three key aspects of the assessment:
 - *What* is to be measured, including definitions of the constructs being assessed and reported upon and descriptions of the purpose(s) of the assessment;
 - *How* that domain of content is most appropriately measured in a large-scale assessment, including the format requirements of the items and the assessment, the content and skills to be tested at each grade, sample items for each grade to be tested, the weighting of the item pool in terms of content and cognitive process dimensions, and any additional requirements for the assessment administration unique to a given subject area, such as provision of ancillary materials and uses of technology; and
 - ~~*How much*~~ of the content domain, in terms of knowledge and skills, should students know and be able to do at the ~~basic~~ *NAEP Basic*, ~~proficient~~ *NAEP Proficient*, and ~~advanced~~ *NAEP Advanced* levels in achievement level descriptions for each grade to be tested. The achievement level descriptions shall be based on the Governing Board's policy definitions for ~~basic~~ *NAEP Basic*, ~~proficient~~ *NAEP Proficient*, and ~~advanced~~ *NAEP Advanced* achievement and shall incorporate the content and process dimensions of the assessment at each grade.
- ~~• The framework shall determine the construction of items for each NAEP assessment. The achievement level descriptions in each framework shall also be used in the level setting process.~~
- b) The framework shall inform the development of subject-specific contextual questionnaires for students, teachers, and school administrators by identifying variables that may help contextualize the assessment results (See the Governing Board Policy on Collecting and Reporting Contextual Data).
- c) The framework shall focus on important, measurable indicators of student achievement to inform the nation about what students know and are able to do without endorsing or advocating a particular instructional approach.
- d) Content coverage in each subject and grade shall be broad, inclusive of content valued by

Commented [A3]: RATIONALE: This sentence is unclear and redundant with the previous guideline.

Commented [A4]: RATIONALE: The Board policy on achievement level setting already describes (with more nuance) how the achievement level descriptions created with the framework will be used in the achievement level setting process.

Commented [A5]: RATIONALE: To make clear that contextual variable recommendations should be incorporated into the framework and specifications documents and do not need to be an additional document.

the public as important to measure, and reflect high aspirations for student achievement.
(See *Principle 1* for more detail on the factors balanced in content coverage.)

- e) Frameworks shall be written to be clear and accessible to educators and the general public. The framework shall use clear language, accessible to educators and to the general public, and contain sufficient information to inform all stakeholders about the nature and scope of the given assessment. Following Governing Board adoption, the framework shall be widely disseminated.

Commented [A6]: PROCURES MANUAL will describe a role for communication experts in the framework development process. In addition to ensuring that the language is clear and accessible, communications experts can help surface controversial issues in a subject area, provide advice for navigating potential challenges throughout the process.

Principle 2: Development and Update Process

The Governing Board shall develop and update frameworks through a comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative process that involves active participation of stakeholders listed in the Introduction section.

Commented [A7]: RATIONALE: Principle 2 has been revised to reflect the general sequence and steps of the framework development process and to be more parallel with the achievement levels policy. It is intended to address a concern raised by some stakeholders that the steps and sequence of the current process is unclear.

Guidelines

- ~~a) In accordance with the NAEP statute, framework development and update processes shall be fair and open through active participation of stakeholders representing all major constituents in the various NAEP audiences, as listed in the introduction above.~~
 - ~~Framework panels shall reflect diversity in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, region of the country, and viewpoints regarding the content of the assessment under development.~~
 - ~~Public comment shall be sought from various segments of the population to reflect many different views, as well as those employed in the specific content area under consideration.~~

- a) When the Board reviews a framework for potential updates (see *Principle 3*), Board deliberations shall begin by discussing major policy and assessment issues in the content area. Such issues may be identified through seeking and collecting public comment, as well as through engaging relevant content experts.

Commented [A8]: RATIONALE: It is important to surface a broad range of views and potential controversies for a given subject at the outset of the framework development process so that it can inform initial Board direction and the selection of panelists to represent diverse perspectives on the issues that are of most importance to the Board.

- b) After considering the policy and assessment issues in the content area, the Board shall develop a charge to articulate the need for an update to the framework and to specify policy guidance, constraints (including but not limited to those imposed by the NAEP legislation), and any specific tensions to resolve in the development of framework recommendations. The Board charge shall explicitly address whether maintaining trends with assessment results from the previous framework should be prioritized above other factors.

Commented [A9]: RATIONALE: Providing more direction from the Board in the initial charge will help prevent a situation where the Board provides policy guidance and imposes constraints only after framework panels have worked for a year or more on a draft document.

- b)c) Framework development and update processes shall be executed primarily via two panels: a Visioning/Steering Panel with a subset of members continuing as the Development Panel. This process shall result in three-two documents for Board consideration: a recommended framework and recommended assessment and item specifications, and recommendations for contextual variables that relate to the subject being assessed. For each framework,

Commented [A10]: RATIONALE: The name "Visioning Panel" may contribute to a perception that the group's charge is very aspirational; "Steering Panel" may better communicate the necessity of being bound by constraints and parameters. (Prior to the 2018 Board policy, the initial panel was called the "Steering Committee"; "Steering Panel" is proposed until/unless a better alternative can be identified).

- The Framework Visioning Steering Panel shall formulate high-level guidance about the state of the field and how to implement the Board charge to inform the process, ~~providing these in the form of guidelines.~~ The major part of the Visioning Steering Panel work will be at the beginning to provide initial guidance for developing a recommended framework. The Visioning Steering Panel shall be comprised of the stakeholders referenced in the introduction above section. At least 20 percent of this panel shall ~~have classroom teaching experience~~ be current classroom teachers in the subject areas under consideration. This panel may include up to 30 members with additional members as needed.
- The Framework Development Panel shall develop drafts of the ~~three-two~~ project documents and engage in the detailed deliberations about how issues outlined in the Board charge and Visioning Steering Panel discussion should be reflected in a recommended framework. As a subset of the Visioning Steering Panel, the Development Panel shall have a proportionally higher representation of content experts and educators, whose expertise collectively addresses all grade levels designated for the assessment under development. At least 30 percent of this panel shall be current classroom teachers in the subject areas under consideration. Educators shall be drawn from schools across the nation, including individuals who work with students from high-poverty and low-performing schools, as well as public and private schools. This panel may include up to ~~15-20~~ members, with additional members as needed.

~~e) In addition to a recommended framework, the framework development or update process shall result in assessment and item specifications (see Principle 5) and recommendations on related contextual variables to be collected from students, teachers, and school administrators. Recommendations shall take into account burden, cost, quality of the data to be obtained, and other factors. (See the Governing Board Policy on Collecting and Reporting Contextual Data.)~~

~~d) The scope and size of a framework development project shall determine the size of framework panels and the number of panel meetings needed. A framework update project may require smaller panels and fewer meetings if a smaller scope is anticipated for recommended revisions. Each project shall begin with a review of major issues in the content area. For a framework update, the project shall also begin with an extensive review of the current framework, and the Visioning Panel shall discuss the potential risk of changing frameworks to trends and assessment of educational progress. (See 1/b).~~

~~e) A nominations process shall be used to seek broad input on recommendations for well-qualified individuals who represent diverse demographic characteristics, stakeholder groups, and perspectives on the key issues identified in the Board charge to the panels.~~

~~f) From the pool of nominees, the Board will select those with the most outstanding content and education credentials to represent multiple perspectives on the key issues identified in the Board charge to the panels. The ADC shall review panelist nomination materials and recommend a slate of panelists, which shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.~~

Commented [A11]: PROCEDURES MANUAL will contain additional detail about the qualifications of panelists, including diversity of demographic characteristics, definition of classroom teaching experience, need for individuals with previous assessment experience which may include a state testing director, etc.

Commented [A12]: RATIONALE: This is redundant with information included in Principle 1.

Commented [A13]: RATIONALE: This is redundant with the Principles 2a and 2b.

Commented [A14]: RATIONALE: An open call for nominations enables all interested stakeholders to recommend potential panelists.

Commented [A15]: RATIONALE: To allow for more Board member involvement in the selection of panelists without unnecessarily adding significant time to the framework development process.

e)g) The process that panels employ to develop recommendations for new or updated frameworks ~~Framework development and updating~~ shall be comprehensive in approach and conducted in an environment that is open, balanced, and even-handed. Panels shall consider all viewpoints and debate all pertinent issues in formulating consensus recommendations on the content and design of a NAEP assessment, including findings from research. Reference materials shall represent multiple views.

h) For each ~~project~~ new or updated framework, protocols shall be established to support panel deliberations and to develop a unified proposal for the content and design of the assessment. Written summaries of all hearings, forums, surveys, and panel meetings shall be made available in a timely manner to inform Board deliberations.

i) The framework panels shall consider a wide variety of resources during deliberations, including but not limited to relevant research, trends in state and local standards and assessments, use of previous NAEP results, curriculum guides, widely accepted professional standards, scientific research, other types of research studies in the literature, key reports having significant national and international interest, international standards and assessments, other assessment instruments in the content area, and prior NAEP frameworks, if available.

j) A Technical experts shall be involved ~~Advisory Committee shall be convened to uphold the highest technical standards for development of the NAEP framework and specifications. As a resource to the framework panels, these experts shall respond to technical issues raised during panel deliberations.~~

k) An Educator Advisory Committee shall be convened to include additional practitioners in the framework development process. As a resource to the framework panels, these practitioners shall provide meaningful consultation on issues raised during panel deliberations that need input from those in the field teaching the subjects being assessed.

l) Public comment shall be sought from a broad array of stakeholders and interested members of the public to reflect multiple perspectives on the draft framework recommendations that have been developed. Outreach efforts should directly engage all stakeholder groups identified in the Introduction section.

m) If the Development Panel or the Board cannot reach consensus on key issues in the framework, the Board may decide to seek further stakeholder input such as through additional public comment and/or independent reviews by content experts on a framework that has been significantly revised following an earlier public comment period. The Board shall determine whether and how any further revisions to a framework shall be made.

n) The final framework and specifications documents are subject to full Board approval.

Commented [A16]: RATIONALE: Moved from Principle 4 and edited for clarity.

Commented [A17]: RATIONALE: Moved from Principle 4 and the convening of a TAC was made more explicit.

Commented [A18]: RATIONALE: In addition to teachers now comprising 6 out of 20 Development Panelists, this new advisory committee would be a means of soliciting additional input in a manner that is less burdensome to teachers than serving on the panel.

PROCEDURES MANUAL will specify details for the composition of this group and their more specific charge.

Commented [A19]: RATIONALE: Reference to public comment moved from previous Principle 2a and further clarified.

Commented [A20]: RATIONALE: To be transparent about additional steps that could be taken if necessary to achieve a broader consensus.

Principle 3: Periodic Framework Review

Reviews of existing frameworks shall determine whether an update is needed to continue valid and reliable measurement of the content and cognitive processes reflected in evolving expectations of students.

Guidelines

- a) At least once every 10 years, the Governing Board, through its ~~Assessment Development Committee (ADC)~~, shall review the relevance of assessments and their underlying frameworks. In the review, the ADC shall solicit input from experts to determine if changes are warranted, making clear the potential risk to trends and assessment of educational progress posed by changing frameworks ~~to trends and assessment of educational progress~~. The Board may decide based on the input that the framework does not require revision, or that the framework may require minor or major updates. To initiate updates, the ADC shall prepare a recommendation for full Board approval. Minor updates include clarifications or corrections that do not affect the construct defined for the assessment. Major updates shall include the convening of a Visioning Steering Panel (see *Principle 2*). Framework revisions shall also be subject to full Board approval.
- b) Within the 10-year period for an ADC review, major changes in the states' or nation's educational system may occur that relate to one or more NAEP frameworks. In this instance, the ADC will deliberate on whether such changes warrant an accelerated schedule of updates to a framework and may recommend that determine whether and how changing conditions warrant an update and the Governing Board ~~via recommendation may~~ convene a Visioning Steering Panel to revise or replace the framework. Before framework panels are convened, special research and analysis may also be commissioned to inform the updates to be considered.
- c) If the Visioning Panel recommends ~~Board charge directs a Steering Panel to recommend major framework~~ updates, then a subset of Steering Panel members shall continue as the Development Panel to develop the draft framework and assessment and item specifications, in accordance with *Principle 2*. Regular reports will be provided to the ADC and the recommended framework update shall be subject to full Board approval.
- d) When a framework update is conducted, framework Visioning Steering and Development Panel recommendations shall describe the extent to which adjustments in the achievement level descriptors (see *1.a*) and contextual variables (see *1.2.be*) are needed. (See the Governing Board Policy on Achievement Levels and the Governing Board Policy on Collecting and Reporting Contextual Data for additional details.)

Commented [A21]: PROCEDURES MANUAL will further clarify what constitutes a minor update.

Principle 4: Resources for the Process

~~Framework development and update processes shall take into account state and local curricula and assessments, widely accepted professional standards, exemplary research, international standards and assessments, and other pertinent factors and~~

Commented [A22]: RATIONALE: With the reorganization of the policy, this information does not need to be presented in a separate principle; instead this information will be included in the Introduction section, Principle 2, and some of the more specific details will be moved to the Procedures manual.

information.

Guidelines

- ~~a) An initial compilation of resources shall summarize relevant research, advantages and disadvantages of the latest developments, and trends in state standards and assessments for the content area. This compilation shall also summarize how stakeholders have used previous NAEP student achievement trends in the assessment area. The compilation may include public comment. Using this compilation as a springboard, framework panel deliberations shall begin by thoroughly identifying major policy and assessment issues in the content area.~~
- ~~b) The framework panels shall also consider a wide variety of resources as deliberations proceed, including but not limited to curriculum guides and assessments developed by states and local districts, widely accepted professional standards, scientific research, other types of research studies in the literature, key reports having significant national and international interest, international standards and assessments, other assessment instruments in the content area, and prior NAEP frameworks, if available.~~
- ~~c) Technical experts shall be involved to uphold the highest technical standards for development of the NAEP framework and specifications. As a resource to the framework panels, these experts shall respond to technical issues raised during panel deliberations.~~
- ~~d) In balancing the relative importance of various sources of information, framework panels shall consider direction from the Governing Board, the role and purpose of NAEP in informing the public about student achievement, the legislative parameters for NAEP, constraints of a large-scale assessment, technical assessment standards, issues of burden and cost-effectiveness in designing the assessment, and other factors unique to the content area.~~

Principle 45: Elements of Specifications

The specifications document shall be developed for use by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) as the blueprint for constructing the NAEP assessment and items.

Guidelines

- a) The assessment and item specifications shall produce an assessment that is valid, reliable, and based on relevant widely accepted professional standards. The specifications shall also be consistent with Governing Board policies regarding NAEP design, such as groupings of items, test administration conditions, and accommodations for students with disabilities and English language learners. (See the Governing Board [Policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners](#)). The specifications shall be reviewed by technical experts involved in the process, prior to submission to the Governing Board.

- b) The primary audience for the specifications, or assessment blueprint, shall be NCES and the contractor(s) responsible for developing the assessment and the test questions.
- c) The specifications shall evolve from the framework and shall be written in sufficient detail so that item writers can develop high-quality questions based on the framework objectives for grades 4, 8, and 12, where applicable. The specifications shall include, but not be limited to detailed descriptions of:
 - the content and process dimensions, including the weighting of those dimensions in the pool of questions at each grade;
 - types of items;
 - guidelines for stimulus material;
 - types of response formats;
 - scoring procedures;
 - achievement level descriptions;
 - administration conditions;
 - ancillary or additional materials, if any;
 - considerations for special populations;
 - sample items, including a substantial number and range of sample items with scoring guidelines for each grade level; and
 - any unique requirements for the given assessment.
- d) Special studies, if any, to be ~~conducted as part of the assessment recommended in support of the framework~~ shall be described in the specifications. This description shall provide an overview of the purpose and rationale for the study, ~~the nature of the student sample(s), and a discussion of the instrument and administration procedures.~~

Principle 56: Role of the Governing Board

The Governing Board, through its ~~Assessment Development Committee~~ADC, shall monitor all framework development and updates. The result of this process shall be recommendations for Governing Board action in the form of ~~two~~three key documents: the framework ~~and~~; assessment and item specifications; ~~and contextual variables that relate to the subject being assessed.~~

Guidelines

- a) ~~The Assessment Development Committee (ADC)~~ shall be responsible for monitoring framework development and updates that result in recommendations to the Governing Board on the content and format of each NAEP assessment. The ADC will provide direction to the framework panels, via Governing Board staff. This guidance shall ensure compliance with the NAEP law, Governing Board policies, Department of Education and government-wide regulations, and requirements of the contract(s) used to implement the framework project.
- b) In initiating a framework update, the Governing Board shall balance needs for stable reporting of student achievement trends against other Board priorities and requirements.

Commented [A23]: QUESTION: This section has typically been a summary of the Board’s role as described in various places throughout the policy statement. Would it be better to move this to the beginning as an overview of the Board’s role rather than a summary?

Commented [A24]: RATIONALE: This guideline was moved from below to be consistent with the order of activities.

Regarding when and how an adopted framework update will be implemented, the Board may consider the NAEP Assessment Schedule, cost and technical issues, and research and innovations to support possibilities for continuous trend reporting.

a)c) When a framework ~~Visioning/Steering~~ Panel is to be convened, the ADC shall develop a charge for the panel, and the charge shall be subject to full Board approval (See 2.b.). ~~The charge will outline any special considerations for an assessment area.~~

d) The ADC shall review panelist nomination materials and develop a recommended slate of panelists, and the panelist recommendations shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.

e) The ADC shall receive regular reports on the progress of framework development ~~and updates.~~

b) ~~The full Board shall receive periodic updates about how the Board charge is being implemented and any additional policy considerations that arise during the development process, including from public comment.~~

e)f)

~~e) In initiating a framework update, the Governing Board shall balance needs for stable reporting of student achievement trends. Regarding when and how an adopted framework update will be implemented, the Board may consider the NAEP Assessment Schedule, cost and technical issues, and research and innovations to support possibilities for continuous trend reporting.~~

d)g) At the conclusion of the framework development or update process, the Governing Board shall take final action on the recommended framework ~~and~~ specifications, ~~and contextual variables~~. The Governing Board shall make the final decision on the content and format of NAEP assessments. In addition to the panel recommendations, the Board may take into account other pertinent considerations on the domain and scope of what should be assessed, such as the broader policy context of assessment in the subject area under consideration.

e) Following adoption by the Governing Board, the final framework ~~and~~ specifications, ~~and contextual variables~~ shall be provided to ~~the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)~~. These documents, which include the achievement level descriptions for *NAEP Basic*, *NAEP Proficient*, and *NAEP Advanced* ~~performance definitions and recommendations for contextual variables in the subject area~~, are provided to NCES to guide development of NAEP test questions and questionnaires.

f)h)

Commented [A25]: RATIONALE: To be more explicit that the Board is not bound by the panel recommendations, analogous to a statement that appears in the Board policy on achievement level setting.