

Executive Committee

August 4, 2022

8:30 am – 10:00 am ET

Location: Grand Magnolia C



AGENDA

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--------------|
| 8:30 – 8:35 am | Agenda Overview and Opening Remarks
<i>Beverly Perdue, Chair</i> | |
| 8:35 – 8:45 am | 2022-2023 Vice Chair Nomination
<i>Beverly Perdue</i> | |
| 8:45 – 8:55 am | Policy and FY 23 Budget Update
<i>Matthew Stern, Assistant Director for Policy and Intergovernmental Affairs</i> | |
| 8:55 – 9:15 am | Final Urban District Assessment (TUDA) Participation Update and Discussion
<i>Matthew Stern</i>
<i>Lesley Muldoon, Executive Director</i> | Attachment A |
| 9:15 – 10:00 am | Preliminary Cost Estimates for NAEP Innovation Priorities (CLOSED)
<i>Peggy Carr, Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics</i>
<i>Dan McGrath, Acting Associate Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics</i> | Attachment B |
| 10:00 am | Adjourn | |

Eligible Districts identified by NCES (updated - March 2022)

	STATE	DISTRICT NAME	Percent of All Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	Percent of Minority Students	Number of 4th Graders	Number of 8th Graders
1	AZ	MESA UNIFIED DISTRICT (4235)	55.29	57.67	4,836	4,929
2	CA	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	68.43	87.59	5,347	5,497
3	FL	ORANGE	52.09	74.74	15,757	15,553
4	FL	OSCEOLA	44.40	77.36	5,131	5,348
5	NC	WAKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	32.82	54.23	12,637	12,270
6	TN	DAVIDSON COUNTY	69.90	71.91	6,636	6,005
7	TX	ALDINE ISD	87.19	97.65	5,379	4,690
8	TX	CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD	54.44	75.81	8,913	8,880
9	TX	FORT BEND ISD	43.21	83.85	5,713	6,006
10	TX	FRISCO ISD	12.53	58.31	4,656	4,859
11	TX	NORTH EAST ISD	48.40	74.76	4,775	4,954
12	TX	NORTHSIDE ISD	49.27	81.07	8,050	7,954
13	VA	VA BEACH CITY PBLC SCHS	39.27	51.79	5,220	5,320



Adopted: March 3, 2007
Revised: August 4, 2012

National Assessment Governing Board

Eligibility Criteria and Procedures for Selecting Districts for Participation in the National Assessment of Educational Progress

Trial Urban District Assessment

Policy Statement

Purpose

To define the eligibility criteria and selection procedures for participation of urban school districts in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA).

Guiding Principles

Principle 1

Participation in TUDA shall be voluntary.

Principle 2

A primary goal of TUDA is to support the improvement of student achievement in the nation's large urban school districts and to focus attention on the specific challenges and accomplishments associated with urban education.

Principle 3

Districts participating in TUDA shall have the characteristics of large urban areas.

Principle 4

All districts that have participated in TUDA without interruption once included shall be deemed eligible and permitted to continue to participate.

Principle 5

The eligibility criteria for participation in TUDA shall promote (1) inter-district comparability, so that participating districts are reasonably similar with respect to key demographics and (2) efficiency in resources required of the NAEP program.

Principle 6

Increasing the total number of districts participating in TUDA shall be contingent on additional funding from Congress.

Principle 7

The Governing Board implements the selection procedures used to consider districts for participation in TUDA.

Principle 8

Districts applying for participation in TUDA should be committed to long-term participation.

Eligibility Criteria

1. Only cities having 250,000 or more population shall be represented in TUDA.
2. Districts participating in TUDA shall have a student enrollment large enough to support NAEP assessments in three subjects in each grade assessed. The enrollment requirement is a minimum of approximately 1,500 students per subject per grade level assessed.
3. Districts participating in TUDA shall have an enrollment district-wide or in the grade levels assessed that meets at least one of the following criteria:
 - a. 50% or more are minority students (i.e., African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and/or multi-racial).
 - b. 50% or more are eligible for participation in the free and reduced-price lunch program (or other appropriate indicator of poverty status).

Districts that are very near to meeting a particular eligibility requirement may be considered eligible if they request to participate in the program and if funds are sufficient to permit participation. Eligibility data shall be updated and verified periodically.

Application and Selection Process/Procedures

To provide time for consultation, notification, and operational planning for the conduct of the Trial Urban District Assessments, the steps described below should be sequenced to conclude approximately 14 months prior to the start of testing.

1. Prior to the assessment year in which TUDA is to be conducted, the Governing Board Executive Director, in consultation with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), prepares a list of eligible districts and posts that list on the Governing Board website.
2. Prior to the assessment year in which TUDA is to be conducted, the Governing Board Executive Director sends a letter to each district that participated in the immediately preceding administration of TUDA to determine the district's interest in continuing as a participant in the upcoming administration of TUDA.
3. Based on funding from Congress and the decision of any previous TUDA participant not to continue, the Governing Board determines whether new districts can be considered for participation in the upcoming TUDA administration.
4. If the Governing Board determines that new districts can be considered for participation in the upcoming TUDA administration, the Governing Board Executive Director sends a letter notifying eligible districts of the opportunity to submit an application and the instructions for applying.
5. Eligible districts seeking to participate in TUDA submit an application to the Executive Director of the Governing Board. The application should be signed by the district superintendent or designee, include the most recent information documenting the district's enrollment and eligibility, and contain a commitment for long-term participation in TUDA if selected.
6. The Executive Director of the Governing Board and appropriate staff of the Governing Board shall review applications in consultation with the Chairman of the Governing Board, the Chairman of the Board's Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology, staff of the National Center for Education Statistics, and the Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools.
7. The Executive Director of the Governing Board shall recommend new districts for participation in TUDA to the Governing Board for final action.
8. The Executive Director of the Governing Board shall send notification of the Board's decision regarding district participation in TUDA to the district and to the Commissioner of Education Statistics.

Potential Pool of Eligible Districts

The list of eligible districts shall be posted on the website of the National Assessment Governing Board (www.nagb.org) and made publicly available through other appropriate means. The list of districts will change from time to time due to changes in the population of the district and the district setting.

Current List of Participating TUDA Districts

	District	State	Participating Since
1	Los Angeles	CA	2002
2	San Diego	CA	2003
3	Denver	CO	2017
4	District of Columbia	DC	2002
5	Duval County	FL	2015
6	Hillsborough County	FL	2011
7	Miami-Dade County	FL	2009
8	Atlanta	GA	2002
9	Chicago	IL	2002
10	Jefferson County	KY	2009
11	Boston	MA	2003
12	Baltimore City	MD	2009
13	Detroit	MI	2009
14	Charlotte-Mecklenburg	NC	2003
15	Guilford County	NC	2017
16	Albuquerque	NM	2011
17	Clark County	NV	2017
18	New York City	NY	2002
19	Cleveland Metropolitan	OH	2003
20	Philadelphia	PA	2009
21	Shelby County	TN	2017
22	Austin	TX	2005
23	Dallas	TX	2011
24	Houston	TX	2002
25	Fort Worth	TX	2017
26	Milwaukee	WI	2009

Reference Guide to Potential NAEP Innovations

Potential Innovation	Timeframe	Budget and Other
Data Innovations		
<p><i>Non-traditional NAEP Assessments</i> NAEP assessments in novel domains of emerging interest or that are cross-cutting/interdisciplinary (for example, spatial/mechanical reasoning, environmental science). Would provide a vehicle for NAEP to provide data on emergent assessment interests.</p>	3 to 5 years after framework development, depending on size of domain and prior development	<p>\$\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would also require development of frameworks (not included in cost estimate). • Additional 0.5 FTE NCES staff
<p><i>NAEP Market Basket</i> A set of items illustrative of a given assessment that can be released to the public to better communicate the meaning of NAEP scores and provide a tool for teachers to use with their students. Other potential uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess remote students before a secure solution is developed (see below) • NAEP for Schools (see below) 	A rough prototype for mathematics may be possible for 2024.	<p>\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R&D to determine feasibility, develop forms. • Probably would involve increased item development. • Moderate additional analysis and reporting for each administration.
<p><i>NAEP for Remote Students</i> Develop a secure means of assessing students who are learning remotely (i.e., in virtual schools), to be able to describe the performance of this population. (Market Basket instruments could be used before a full solution is in place.)</p>	5-7 years	<p>\$\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R&D to research approaches and pilot
<p><i>NAEP for Schools</i> School-level NAEP results based on voluntary administration of instrument aligned with NAEP frameworks and linked to NAEP scales; schools receive a report of their performance, including comparisons to nation, states, and other schools like them.</p>	3 years to develop and pilot instruments	<p>\$\$\$ to establish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instrument design, development, linkage to NAEP scales; development of procedures for implementation <p>\$ over long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes schools pay for service • Additional 0.5 FTE NCES staff
<p><i>A Stronger Long-Term Trend</i> Development of a framework to strengthen viability of long-term trend going forward. Past efforts to derive a framework based on the existing LTT items have not worked. This</p>	3 to 5 years after framework development	<p>\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instrument development and studies to determine feasibility and perform bridge.

Potential Innovation	Timeframe	Budget and Other
would build a broad framework (e.g., basic skills) in which existing LTT could fit and develop over time. This would increase likelihood of success in continuing to maintain the trends.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require framework development (not included in costs).
<p><i>A New Way to Implement Main NAEP Trend</i></p> <p>Development of new instruments/sample designs and analysis approaches to help ensure maintenance of main NAEP’s 30-year trends, while supporting greater flexibility for assessing constructs of current interest.</p>	1 to 2 years to develop approach; implementation 3-5 years after framework development	<p>\$\$ to research and develop \$\$ to \$\$\$ long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased sample to implement trend and current-interest domains. • Additional item development to assess new areas of frameworks.
<p><i>NAEP Pulse</i></p> <p>Quick turnaround surveys administered through NAEP’s data collection infrastructure to sampled NAEP schools, providing national, state, and TUDA-level data on emergent issues in education. As an example, the NAEP 2021 Monthly School Survey provided the White House and ED crucial information on schools’ reopening, as well as key contextual data for the 2022 NAEP results.</p>	As soon as funding available. The 2021 NAEP Monthly School Survey showed NAEP could implement surveys within a month of startup and report results two weeks after data collection, with intense effort.	<p>\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Places additional burden on schools, districts, and states • Most feasible/efficient during NAEP data collection year after samples are in place (implementation fall through spring) • Level of reporting dependent on response rates • Potentially risky for NAEP given burden
Leveraging Other Data to Strengthen NAEP		
<p><i>Geospatial-based Measure of Socio-economic Status (SES)</i></p> <p>Leverage Census data to provide average SES measures proximate to student addresses, to improve measures of student- and school-level SES.</p>	2 to 4 years (depending on internal Census processes)	<p>\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires additional R&D, outreach to states, districts, schools • Additional 0.5 FTE NCES staff
<p><i>Linking NAEP to State Assessments</i></p> <p>Development of a report and database using NAEP as a common yardstick for nationally comparable equity indicators at school and district levels by linking state assessments to NAEP.</p>	Prototype report based on 2019 data could be completed in 2023.	<p>\$\$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection and cleaning (at least in short term). • Analysis, reporting, and maintenance of data base and visualization tools.

Potential Innovation	Timeframe	Budget and Other
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional 0.5 FTE NCES staff
<p><i>Linking NAEP to Other Data Sources</i> Linking NAEP data to school, district, state or community-level data available from other assessments, surveys or databases to better contextualize NAEP achievement data (e.g., community socio-economic or health data, physical characteristics of the broader school environment based on geospatial data, state or district-level test results). Results would be used in NAEP reports and provided to researchers in datasets.</p>	2 to 4 years depending on specific activity and database	\$\$ to identify data sources of interest and explore linkages with NAEP data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional 0.5 FTE NCES staff
Easier Access to NAEP Data and Insights		
<p><i>Advanced Analytics</i> Innovations in NAEP analytic techniques and ways to improve access to NAEP data for researchers, such as tools to conduct data mining, data analytics, simulations, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM), IRT modeling.</p>	Varies depending on specific activity	Varies
<p><i>A Stable of Analysts for Hire</i> Establishing a training and accreditation system to set up a stable of analysts trained in NAEP data, who would offer services to researchers not trained in analyzing NAEP data. This would help expand researchers' access to NAEP data by lowering the NAEP knowledge threshold required for doing analysis on NAEP data.</p>	1 to 2 years	\$ to establish training and accreditation system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes researchers pay for analysis services
<p><i>Diagnostic Reporting</i> New tools for analyzing and reporting NAEP data to address more "how" and "why" questions. One example is a new tool to access and analyze NAEP process data showing how different groups of students vary in their approaches to specific NAEP items. Another is development of methods to combine data at the item level across years to allow topical analysis below the sub-domain level. NCES has successfully implemented this approach on TIMSS.</p>	Varies; the tool for analyzing and displaying process data is at the prototype stage and could be ready for wider use in 1 to 2 years; developing cross-year approaches for topical analysis would take about 1 year	Varies \$ for further development of process data tool \$ for topical analysis below subdomain level