Reporting and Dissemination Committee

November 4, 2021
3:30 – 5:00 pm
Zoom

AGENDA

3:30 – 4:45 pm	**Anticipating the Next NAEP Release: Lessons from State Assessments and Questions to Consider** *Tonya Matthews, Chair* *Damian Betebenner, Center for Assessment*	*Attachment A*
4:45 – 5:00 pm	**General Updates** *Marty West, Vice Chair*	*See Executive Committee tab for SV update*

Anticipating the Next NAEP Release:

Lessons from State Assessments and Questions to Consider

The Reporting and Dissemination Committee meeting on November 4th will focus on anticipating issues likely to arise from reporting the 2022 Nation's Report Card in reading and mathematics. Presumably, the public will compare 2022 results to 2019 results and will try to determine how COVID-19 shaped NAEP scores and trends.

Reporting and Dissemination Committee members know that NAEP should not be used to draw causal conclusions or to evaluate impacts of policies or disruptions to education. However, the data will provide valuable insights. Thus, the central question for the meeting will be: ***How can we prepare now to help NAEP's stakeholders and the public use and interpret next year's results?***

The discussion at R&D will be informed by several sources. At the November 4th meeting, Damian Betebenner from the Center for Assessment will present about his work interpreting state assessment data within the context of COVID, explaining potential pitfalls to anticipate. To prepare for his presentation, please read this post.

Note that this meeting's discussion will center on next year's reporting specifically. Yet, over the last two years, stakeholders have recommended ways to improve NAEP reporting generally. These ideas may hold relevance to reporting issues for NAEP 2022.

First, in March 2021, the Governing Board hosted Gerunda Hughes to discuss equity and NAEP. Early indicators point to COVID's differential effects on student learning by subgroup and by prior performance. Delving into how Dr. Hughes' recommendations intersect with post-COVID results on NAEP may prove useful.

Gerunda Hughes asked the Governing Board to make each aspect of NAEP more equitable, including its reporting. Hughes urged the Board to:

- Expand NAEP's subgroup comparisons to capture and report differences created by societal inequity, cultural inequity, familial inequity, staffing and instructional inequity, assessment inequity, among others.
- Report all comparisons between subgroups defined by race/ethnicity (as opposed to the current approach of using white students as the reference group). Highlight differences in ways that foster new insights to help improve student achievement, not highlight already known disparities.

- Broaden the set of contextual variables and demographics which NAEP reports.
- Facilitate secondary analyses with contextual data.

In addition, the TUDA Task Force, a partnership with the Council of the Great City Schools which comprises a dozen leaders from districts participating in the Trial Urban District Assessment program (TUDA), emphasized the importance of setting expectations for NAEP 2022 results and raised critical questions about NAEP reporting:
- What are more useful and actionable ways of disaggregating data to understand how COVID shaped performance?
- How can reporting contextualize the Importance of NAEP within the pandemic and consider the impact of *changed learning opportunities* on results?

The TUDA Task Force members counseled the Governing Board to ensure communications distinguish what NAEP results can say from what they cannot. The Task Force also urged the Board to publicize NAEP's track record in helping states and districts focus on skills where students are improving and where they need additional support. The Board should not offer policy solutions but should amplify facts and statistics.

[Ian Rowe, a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and advocate for using NAEP data](), has implored the education community to change the reporting of disparities in academic outcomes. Rowe questions why reports frame outcomes primarily through performance gaps by poverty and race. Even if gaps between black students and white students narrow by a few points, the majority of black students and the majority of white students remain below *NAEP Proficient* on reading and mathematics. The gap shrinks; the deficit persists. If NAEP collects and reports different data—disaggregating results so that racial and income categories are no longer viewed as monolithic—stakeholders may arrive at a more nuanced and accurate understanding of academic disparities, which may lead to change.

In an email to the Board, committee member Tyler Cramer praised recent examples of the Board's efforts to highlight ways that NAEP data inform conversations on educational equity. He urged the Board to extend this work by connecting NAEP data to school finance data and/or to civil rights data, clarifying what NAEP can and cannot do, especially when compared to state assessments.

In sum, as the committee deliberates on how to report and message NAEP 2022 results, stakeholders from within and beyond the Board urge NAEP reporting to:

1. Consider how *changed learning opportunities* may shape results
2. Highlight all subgroup comparisons
3. Disaggregate data beyond monolithic categories of race/ethnicity and NSLP-eligibility
4. Report on differences created by other types of inequity - societal, cultural, familial, financial (i.e., school resources), etc.

5. Clarify NAEP's unique contributions, specifying what NAEP can and cannot do, to enable accurate interpretations of results

In the discussion after Dr. Betebenner's presentation, committee members will consider how these recommendations could be incorporated within reporting and messaging NAEP 2022.