Reporting and Dissemination Committee

Friday, May 13, 2022
8:30 – 11:00 am
Crystal VI

AGENDA

8:30 – 8:35 am	**Welcome and Updates** *Tonya Matthews, Chair*	
8:35 – 9:30 am	**Discussion on NAEP 2022 Reporting Plans** *Marty West*	*Attachment A*
9:30 – 11:00 am	**Innovating NAEP Reporting** *Tonya Matthews*	*Attachment B*

Discussing NAEP 2022 Reporting Plans

An afternoon plenary session at the Governing Board meeting on Thursday, May 12 will feature a presentation from the National Center for Education Statistics on analysis and reporting plans for NAEP 2022. Several Board members requested a plenary session on this topic, which is also critically important to the Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee. R&D members recommend (or not) that the Board officially approve the public release of each *Nation's Report Card*; to facilitate the execution of this responsibility, knowledge about the reporting plans in advance helps expedite the release process. Board members will hear and discuss the plans in plenary session on Thursday afternoon, then on Friday morning, R&D members will convene to discuss their reactions to the plans and the ensuing plenary discussion and to provide further feedback.

Innovating NAEP Reporting:
Recommendations to Consider and to Prioritize

The Reporting and Dissemination Committee meeting on Friday, May 13 will focus not only on reporting NAEP 2022 results but also on prioritizing innovative approaches to reporting for future data and releases. This memo provides background information on the latter topic.

Over the last two years, diverse stakeholders from a broad swath of education-related fields have recommended ways to improve NAEP reporting. Common themes emerge from the myriad recommendations, including that the Board should not offer policy solutions but should amplify facts and statistics. Among these facts and statistics should be an emphasis on contextual data, data on subgroups often overlooked by reporting, and an understanding of equity as inextricably entwined with reporting. Individuals and organizations also provided more specific suggestions, which follow.

The [National Academies released a report](#) in mid-March 2022 which outlined several ways to create more innovative reporting of NAEP:

1. Make data available more quickly to a select pool of researchers to facilitate policy relevant analyses of the data as soon as possible
2. Make the NAEP Data Explorer easier to use and add more sophisticated analytic capabilities
3. Expand the availability and use of NAEP process data
4. Expand the availability and use of NAEP contextual data to help identify inequities across subgroups and develop plausible hypotheses about those inequities

At the Reporting and Dissemination Committee meeting in November 2021, Damian Betebenner of the Center for Assessment presented several ideas to improve the usability and relevance of NAEP reporting. In particular, he urged the Board to focus not only on average NAEP scores but on subgroup differences as well. Among the contextual variables available on NAEP, Betebenner suggested examining instructional supports associated with students in a specific group, noting that resources provided by states and districts vary widely.

Earlier, in March 2021, [Gerunda Hughes](#) asked the Governing Board to make each aspect of NAEP more equitable, including its reporting. Hughes encouraged the Board to:

1. Expand NAEP's subgroup comparisons to capture and report differences created by societal inequity, cultural inequity, familial inequity, staffing and instructional inequity, and assessment inequity

2. Report all comparisons between subgroups defined by race/ethnicity (as opposed to the current approach of using white students as the reference group)
3. Highlight subgroup differences in new ways to help improve student achievement, not highlight already known disparities
4. Broaden the set of contextual variables which NAEP reports
5. Facilitate secondary analyses with contextual data

In addition, members of the State Policy Task Force, part of the Board's work with the Council of Chief State School Officers, and members of the TUDA Task Force, a partnership with the Council of the Great City Schools comprising leaders of districts in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA), offered suggestions to improve NAEP reporting:

1. Design reporting for communications staffs, instead of the testing and data experts on whom current reporting ostensibly centers
    a. Invite cross-district offices to discuss results prior to a release
2. Distinguish what NAEP can say from what NAEP cannot
3. Release shorter reports for different stakeholders, focused on:
    a. Different student groups and/or achievement disparities as focus
    b. Contextual data at different performance levels
    c. Item-level data and distractor analyses
4. Communicate the "whys" of NAEP and use "real person" language in "real time," which means sooner than the traditional release schedule
5. Help states and districts build a coherent narrative around the results and relate NAEP results to results from other assessments
    a. Provide guidance on interpreting results in the context of the pandemic
    b. Publicize how states and districts use NAEP to focus on skills where students are improving and where they need additional support
6. Contextualize NAEP results; consider the impact of *changed learning opportunities*
7. Share comparative information on private schools
8. Designate regional NAEP experts to talk with local media about results
9. Provide overview materials or videos for principals, teachers, and parents (in multiple languages) on the relevance of NAEP

[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 sum, as the committee deliberates on how to innovate reporting, stakeholders from within and beyond the Board urge NAEP reporting to:

1. Highlight all subgroup comparisons
    a. Disaggregate data beyond monolithic categories of race/ethnicity and the limited NSLP-eligibility measure
2. Report on differences created by other types of inequity - societal, cultural, familial, financial (i.e., school resources, school instructional supports), etc.
    a. Link to federal datasets both at and outside of the U.S. Department of Education
    b. Connect NAEP data to school finance data and/or civil rights data
3. Make greater use of NAEP contextual data
    a. Consider how *changed learning opportunities* may shape results
    b. Help draw meaningful comparisons over time and across sectors
4. Release results as soon as possible in reports that are short, use plain language, and explain NAEP's relevance for various stakeholders
    a. Develop materials and/or videos that foster understanding of NAEP and its results
    b. Tap spokespeople expert at interpreting and translating NAEP data available
5. Spotlight NAEP's unique contributions, specifying what NAEP can and cannot do, to enable accurate interpretations of results

Peggy Carr and Lesley Muldoon unveiled an innovation agenda for NAEP at the March 2022 quarterly meeting. Their ideas echoed many of these recommendations, such as expanding the accessibility of NAEP data to audiences beyond researchers and assessment experts, specifically revamped state snapshots, data portals for different audiences to access the data in meaningful ways, and language about NAEP results translated into "governor-speak" and/or the language of legislators. They also presented that NAEP reports should delve into reasons behind the results, include process data, and develop a more accurate measure of socioeconomic status.

In the May 13th discussion, committee members will discuss these recommendations and determine in what order of priority they should be pursued as part of the Board's innovation agenda.