

## **National Assessment Governing Board**

Meeting of August 2–4, 2023

Westin Arlington  
801 North Glebe Road  
Arlington, VA 22203 & Virtual

### **OFFICIAL SUMMARY OF GOVERNING BOARD MEETING**

#### **Complete Transcript Available**

#### **National Assessment Governing Board Members Present**

Beverly Perdue, *Chair*  
Alice Peisch, *Vice Chair*  
Tyler Cramer  
Christine Cunningham  
Viola García  
Eric Hanushek  
Patrick Kelly  
Anna King  
Suzanne Lane  
Scott Marion  
Reginald McGregor  
Michael Pope  
Julia Rafal-Baer  
Ron Reynolds  
Nardi Routten  
Dilhani Uswatte  
Mark White  
Carey Wright  
Mark Schneider, *Ex-officio*

#### **National Assessment Governing Board Members Absent**

Haley Barbour  
Alberto Carvalho  
Frank Edelblut  
Marty West

#### **National Assessment Governing Board Staff**

Lesley Muldoon, *Executive Director*  
Elizabeth Schneider, *Deputy Executive Director*  
Rebecca Dvorak  
Stephaan Harris  
Donnetta Kennedy  
Laura LoGerfo  
Munira Mwalimu  
Tessa Regis

Sharyn Rosenberg  
Angela Scott  
Anthony White

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)**

Peggy Carr, *Commissioner*  
Daniel McGrath, *Acting Associate Commissioner*  
Tammie Adams  
Gina Broxterman  
Jing Chen  
Brian Cramer  
Jamie Deaton  
Allison Deigan  
Veda Edwards  
Pat Etienne  
Eunice Greer  
Dana Kelly  
Shawn Kline  
Tina Love  
Nadia McLaughlin  
Stephanie Melville  
Emmanuel Sikali  
Michael Slattery  
Holly Spurlock  
Ebony Walton  
Bill Ward  
Grady Wilburn  
Angela Woodard  
Bobbi Woods

**American Institutes for Research (AIR)**

Yifan Bai  
David Bamat  
Brittany Boyd  
Markus Broer  
Ruhan Circi  
Christina Davis  
Kim Gattis  
Cadelle Hemphill  
Juanita Hicks  
Martin Hooper  
Young Yee Kim  
Gabrielle Merken  
Amanda Mickus  
Jasmine Park  
Amy Trauth  
Kerry Vieth  
Sinan Yavuz

Xiaying Zheng

**Council of the Great City Schools**

Brian Garcia  
Akisha Osei Sarfo

**CRP, Inc.**

Monica Duda  
Renee Palmer  
Anthony Velez  
Edward Wofford

**Educational Testing Service (ETS)**

Jeff Ackley  
Christopher Agard  
Terran Brown  
Anna Cabrera  
Jay Campbell  
Peter Ciemins  
Gloria Dion  
Patricia Donahue  
Kadriye Ercikan  
Robert Finnegan  
David Freund  
Helena Yue Jia  
Daniel McCaffrey  
Marticia Moore  
Jaime Rice-Napolitano  
Juliette Lyons-Thomas  
Ranu Palta-Upreti  
Rupal Patel  
Hilary Persky  
Shannon Richards  
Luis Saldivia  
Lisa Ward  
Karen Wixson  
Sarah Wood  
Frank Wong

**Hager Sharp**

Melissa Cristler  
Joanne Lim  
Kathleen Manzo  
Debra Silimeo  
Chelsea Spring

**The Hatcher Group**

Jenny Beard

Sami Ghani  
Sophia Handel  
Melissa Mellor  
Isabel Rassel  
Mallory Werthamer

**Management Strategies**

Micajah Anderson  
Brandon Dart  
Rachel Koether  
Zach Rosensteel

**Manhattan Strategy Group**

Tara Donahue  
Lori Meyer

**Optimal Solutions Group**

Imer Arnautovic  
Sadaf Asrar  
Andrea Johnson

**Pearson**

Scott Becker  
Joy Heitland  
Paula Rios  
Pat Stearns  
Llana Williams

**Westat**

Margaret Bartz  
Greg Binzer  
Lauren Byrne  
Marcie Hickman  
Lloyd Hicks  
Tom Krenzke  
Kavemuii Murangi  
Lisa Rodriguez  
Rick Rogers  
Leslie Wallace

**WestEd**

Taunya Nesin  
Marianne Perie  
Megan Schneider  
Jennifer Self  
Jill Wertheim

## **Other Attendees**

Aneesha Badrinarayan, Learning Policy Institute  
Vickie Baker, West Virginia Department of Education  
Stephane Baldi, RTI International  
Myra Best, digiLEARN  
Brittany Beth, U.S. Department of Education  
Tamika Brinson, Florida Department of Education  
Amanda Bruno, Lewis-Burke Associates LLC  
Jacob Burger, Neal Gross Court Reporters  
Jenny Christian, Dallas Independent School District  
Jacqueline Denlinger, Neal Gross Court Reporter  
Will Donkersgoed, Wyoming Department of Education  
Jeremy Ellis, Missouri Department of Education  
Lauren Empson, Empson Communications  
Terri Ferende, Collaborative Communications  
Nancy Hopkins-Evans, BSCS Science Learning  
Carol Jago, National Council of Teachers of English  
Hong Jiao, University of Maryland  
Christopher Johnston, Cambium Assessment  
Otto Katt, Lewis-Burke Associates LLC  
Andrew Kolstad, P20 Strategies LLC  
Matthew Kopfer, Lewis-Burke Associates LLC  
Joseph Krajcik, Michigan State University  
Beth LaDuca, Oregon Department of Education  
Regina Lewis, Maine Department of Education  
Brian Lloyd, Michigan Department of Education  
Emersen Mackenzie, Boston College  
Terry Mazany, Collaboratory  
Janet Mee, National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME)  
Jonathan Moore, Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)  
Gale Morrison, American Education  
Raina Mouljian, Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
Corey Palermo, JCM Analytics  
Dan Pratt, RTI International  
Kevin Price, HII  
Philip Reed, Old Dominion University  
Renee Savoie, Connecticut State Department of Education  
Michael Slattery, HII Director  
Colleen Spagnardi, RTI International  
Kristin Tyler, Vantage Labs LLC  
Courtney Waterman, RTI International

### **Call to Order and Welcome from Governing Board Chair**

Beverly Perdue, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and welcomed attendees to the August meeting of the National Assessment Governing Board (Board or Governing Board). Perdue began by emphasizing the important decisions the Board will make during this meeting and in the near future. Due to the pandemic, students have lost ground academically, which will have significant global economic consequences. To address this issue, the Governing Board will discuss how to improve the utility, value, and relevance of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), including how to modernize NAEP. The Board also will make decisions about the assessment schedule and set realistic priorities in economically challenging times.

### **Approval of the August 2023 Agenda and May 2023 Minutes**

Perdue requested a motion for approval of the August 2023 meeting agenda. Alice Peisch moved to approve the agenda, and Tyler Cramer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Peisch requested a motion for approval of the May 2023 meeting minutes. Carey Wright moved to approve the minutes, the motion was seconded, and it passed unanimously.

### **ACTION: Nomination of Vice Chair for 2023–24**

Wright said that the Executive Committee recommended the nomination of Peisch to continue to serve as Vice Chair for the term beginning October 1, 2023, and ending September 30, 2024. Scott Marion moved to approve the nomination, and Cramer seconded it. The nomination passed unanimously. Peisch thanked the Board for their support.

### **Executive Director Remarks**

Lesley Muldoon, Executive Director of the Governing Board, presented on the Board's past and future. Emerging from the pandemic, the Board shifted its approach to disseminating results from a reactive to a proactive one, building an intentional communications strategy that reasserts and amplifies NAEP's critical value to the nation. The four release events over the last year exemplify this shift. Over the past few months, the Governing Board also laid the groundwork for reimagining the future of NAEP through an innovation agenda. The innovation agenda, along with an increase in research and development funding for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), will support the creation of enhanced socioeconomic status (SES) indicators, the use of adaptive testing, and the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in item development and scoring.

In 2020, the Governing Board changed the NAEP assessment schedule due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Board requested and Congress agreed to postpone the mandated main NAEP assessments (in reading and mathematics for Grades 4 and 8) from 2021 to 2022. Also, administrations of Long-Term Trend (LTT) for 9- and 13-year-olds were added to the schedule in 2022 to capture student learning as soon after COVID as possible. In May 2023, the Governing Board approved a resolution requesting Congress to allow the Governing Board to restore the schedule for main NAEP to odd years. Administering NAEP in years without a federal election is a long-standing practice that helps protect NAEP as an independent, nonpartisan measure of educational progress in the United States.

During the next two meetings, the Board will set the most critical priorities for determining the assessment schedule over the next decade. This will put NAEP in the best position possible to

(a) communicate with Congress about the program’s future and (b) allow NCES to prepare for its next round of contracts.

Muldoon also mentioned upcoming events. First, in September, more than 2,500 of the nation’s stakeholders in mathematics education will convene at the 2023 IES Math Summit, a free virtual conference. The goal of the Summit is to share current research and effective strategies to engage students and to address gaps in learning exacerbated by the pandemic. NCES is collaborating with four organizations to prepare for the Summit—the Governing Board, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Science Foundation, and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Current and former members of the Governing Board and Muldoon will participate in plenary presentations, panel discussions, and breakout sessions. Board members will receive an email with a link to register online, or they may view the sessions after the Summit. Findings will be summarized and published for circulation.

Second, Muldoon explained that the Board will welcome at least eight new members in October 2023. Because important decisions will be made at the November meeting, the staff is working to ensure that the new members are prepared to participate fully in the discussions and are armed with sufficient information to contribute to decision-making.

Third, Muldoon announced that to underscore the value of NAEP data to state-level policymakers, the March 2024 quarterly Board meeting will be held in Nashville, Tennessee, the home of Board member and state legislator Mark White. The August 2024 meeting will be held in Boston, Massachusetts, near the district that Peisch represents in the Massachusetts Legislature.

Finally, Muldoon reminded Board members that the Board’s longtime External Officer Munira Mwalimu is retiring at the end of 2023 and outlined the process for hiring a replacement by November 2023. The successful candidate is projected to start in the position in January 2024.

At the end of the session, Cramer clarified that data interoperability and the use of linking studies (the linking of NAEP data to external data sources) remain part of the innovation agenda, which Muldoon confirmed, pending the availability of research and development funding.

The session recessed at 9:03 a.m.

### **NAEP Budget (CLOSED)**

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Governing Board met in closed session on Thursday, August 2, 2023, from 9:15 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. to receive a briefing from Peggy Carr and Daniel McGrath of NCES.

Carr and McGrath provided an overview of the NAEP budget and funding flows through 2030 under different potential scenarios, including whether Congress provides a waiver to move the mandated NAEP assessments back to an odd-year cycle. Board members asked questions and engaged in discussion of the information provided.

### **NAEP Modernization and Budget Implications (CLOSED)**

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of 552b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Governing Board met in closed session on Thursday, August 2, 2023, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. to receive an update on NAEP modernization efforts and budget implications by Carr and McGrath of NCES.

Carr and McGrath summarized progress toward planned NAEP modernization efforts and expected impacts of these efforts on the budget. They noted NCES is moving to the use of Chromebooks instead of Surface Pros for NAEP administration, followed by use of school-based equipment for schools that meet minimum technology requirements. NAEP is also shifting to adaptive testing for reading and mathematics and automated scoring beginning with reading. NCES is no longer pursuing reduced-contact administration that would require support from school staff based on lessons learned through a field trial.

### **Working Lunch: Governing Board Priorities for NAEP Assessment Schedule**

The session reconvened at 12:00 p.m. with Muldoon introducing the session and guest speakers, former Board members Andrew Ho and Terry Mazany, both of whom served from 2012–20. Ho is the Charles William Eliot Professor of Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Mazany was until recently the Chief Collaboration Officer for Collaboratory and served as the Board Chair from 2014–17.

Muldoon recounted that, in May 2019, the Board, under the leadership of Ho and Mazany, established an assessment schedule that reflected policy priorities for the Board. However, there were insufficient funds to implement the Board’s approved schedule, so the Board relied on a set of 2018 policy priorities to make cuts to the schedule. Based on lessons learned from 2019, Muldoon wants the Board to be more proactive in reviewing the schedule and making appropriate decisions about what assessments should remain or be removed from the schedule as well as when the schedule would require additional congressional funding to implement fully.

Muldoon invited Ho and Mazany to speak at the Board meeting about their experiences in 2018 and 2019 to help current Board members prepare to make similar decisions in the coming months. Mazany emphasized the importance of innovation while weighing and balancing innovation against time, cost, and scope. Ho explained that in 2018, the Board passed a resolution which specified three priorities to guide the setting of the assessment schedule while also considering budgetary constraints: utility, frequency, and efficiency. These priorities were codified in the Board’s Strategic Vision 2025.

Additionally, Ho offered three recommendations. First, adopt a three-step cycle for developing an assessment schedule: innovate, advocate, and decide. Ho advised that the Board needs to focus on innovation and advocacy prior to making any decisions. Second, he recommended debating over guidelines, such as utility, frequency, and efficiency, rather than arguing over individual assessments. Lastly, he recommended protecting trend. Ho said that “assessing once is symbolism. Assessing twice is impact.” Trend will continue to be valuable nationally.

Patrick Kelly asked Mazany and Ho what actions they recommend when utility, frequency, and efficiency are in conflict. Mazany suggested joint optimization while Ho said it would vary by the stage in the three-step cycle. Ho suggested deciding what the Board would do if funding were not an issue, which would allow Board members to consider all options before eliminating anything.



Cramer asked Ho how NAEP could be enhanced to ensure trend. Ho answered that conducting more quasi-longitudinal or longitudinal studies increases the strength of NAEP. Cramer asked Mazany how he would redesign NAEP. Mazany replied that the strength of NAEP is its bipartisan/nonpartisan design, which must be protected. The Board has fostered and developed champions in the House and Senate, and those relationships must be protected. The Board also should continue investing in the core infrastructure of NAEP and its innovative edge.

Discussion continued with members asking questions about how to define utility. Rick Hanushek raised concerns about compromising trend if NAEP is kept up-to-date and frameworks are changed every two years or so.

Dil Uswatte asked if any lessons could be learned from international assessments. Carr said that the Programme for International Student Assessment debated for two years before deciding to change the assessment schedule periodicity from three to four years.

More discussion followed about defining utility as use and benefits accruing from use, including among practitioners. However, Marion raised a concern that there could be potential consequences from misuses of data. Muldoon summarized the discussion in two points: (a) the Governing Board needs to evaluate and revise (possibly) the definition of utility and potential unintended consequences, and (b) the Board needs to think about frequency and whether each subject remaining on the schedule must be assessed every four years.

### **Framing Small Group Discussions on Assessment Schedule**

Muldoon framed the small group discussions by explaining that the groups should discuss policy priorities and how those should be refined. The groups also would review a straw-person set of recommendations to kick off the conversation about extending the schedule through 2034. The groups addressed additional questions, including: (a) what assessments should be removed or deprioritized and why, (b) what assessments still need discussion and deliberation and why, and (c) what additional information is needed for deliberation in November and why.

The session recessed at 1:24 p.m. and reconvened at 3:38 p.m.

### **Small Group Debrief**

The small group facilitators, Michael Pope, Ron Reynolds, and Nardi Routten, summarized the major discussion points from each of their groups. All three groups agreed that the definition of utility needed to be explored further. Specifically, the Governing Board needs to consider how utility can be misused and take unintended consequences under consideration.

Each small group also agreed that the NAEP Reading and Mathematics assessments should be prioritized and that the Technology and Engineering Literacy Assessment be suspended. The groups encouraged the Governing Board to prioritize Trial Urban District Assessment data and the grade 8 Civics/U.S. History assessments. The groups facilitated by Pope and Routten suggested removing, or at least discussing, the value of the Long-Term Trend (LTT) assessments and transcript studies. The groups disagreed on the Science assessment, especially in grade 4.

Other highlights from the small group conversations included resurrecting assessments that have been suspended, such as the Arts assessment. One group asked for more information about costs so they could make better decisions about innovation once they better understand the short- and long-term

benefits. Reynolds’s group also suggested adding credibility as a fourth priority for decision-making. Credibility would include NAEP quality, timeliness, nonpartisan attributes, and the integrity of the subject matter to maintain a high level of public trust.

## **Recommendation on the Future of NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL)**

### **Assessment**

Peisch led the discussion on the future of TEL by starting with the history of the assessment. The National Academies recommended in 2006 that NAEP develop an assessment of technological literacy, and the TEL Framework was adopted in 2010. TEL represented an innovative leap forward for NAEP, measuring whether students can apply technology and engineering skills to real-life scenarios.

These skills are not measured elsewhere within NAEP and typically are not measured by state or local assessments, making TEL a uniquely valuable potential source of information.

The Governing Board and NCES staff have jointly recommended that the 2028 TEL administration be removed from the assessment schedule and that TEL not be considered a high-priority assessment for the future. The Executive Committee met on August 2, 2023, and voted unanimously to move that recommendation to the full Board for consideration.

There are several reasons for the joint staff recommendation, including that the NAEP TEL Framework includes content that does not neatly align to most state standards or instruction, making it difficult to use the results in actionable ways. Some of the content overlaps with other subject areas including science, writing, and reading. Given rapid changes in technology, it is very difficult to keep the framework and items up to date with the current processes for NAEP item and platform development. Because the devices used for the previous TEL administrations are now defunct, it is not possible to report score trends. Additionally, analyses of how NAEP results are used found limited utility for the two administrations of the TEL assessment conducted in 2014 and 2018. The 2024 assessment was canceled in 2021 due to technical challenges and budget concerns. TEL is the most expensive NAEP assessment to develop and administer, and these factors together raised questions about the cost-benefit analysis.

Peisch noted that given that the proposed 2028 NAEP Science Assessment Framework includes limited aspects of technology and engineering, the Executive Committee also requests that NCES wait to release the TEL item pool to the public until it can be determined whether some of the existing items can be adapted for use in the new Science assessment.

The motion approved by the Executive Committee for full Board consideration indicated two points:

- that the Board amend the NAEP assessment schedule to remove the TEL assessment in 2028, and
- that the Board not prioritize the TEL assessment for inclusion in the schedule in the future.

During discussion, Marion encouraged the Governing Board to think about using the term “suspend” rather than “eliminate” or “cancel” and to emphasize that elements of the TEL will be absorbed into the new Science assessment. Peisch and Kelly reiterated that the decision was made because it is not feasible to administer TEL in 2028 despite the importance of technological literacy.

Kelly moved that the Board adopt the motion to remove the 2028 NAEP TEL assessment from the assessment schedule and not prioritize TEL for inclusion on the future schedule. Cramer seconded it, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Committee Meeting Updates**

Peisch provided the Executive Committee update. The Governing Board already acted on the TEL Board action. She also provided an update on the Governing Board Financial Audit and Internal Controls Review. The Governing Board received a “clean” audit and was found a “prudent steward of public resources.” The audit covered the period of October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2021. The Governing Board also requested inclusion in the U.S. Department of Education’s annual internal controls review. The review found “evidence of effectiveness for each component of five entity-level internal controls.”

For the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) update, Kelly said that the Science Framework panel will present to the Board on August 3, 2023, about their progress and about finalizing the proposed framework for action at the November 2023 quarterly Board meeting. ADC will recommend that the Board postpone the NAEP Writing Framework update, largely due to uncertainty about how AI may impact the future of writing education and assessment. During the ADC meeting on August 3, 2023, NCES will share information about the feasibility of administering the Writing assessment based on the existing framework. ADC also is reviewing a number of items for the 2026 Reading assessment and grade 12 subject-specific questionnaires for math and reading.

Suzanne Lane provided an update for the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM). During this committee meeting, NCES will share results from a study that examined device-agnostic administrations. Regardless of the device used, results need to be comparable and lead to valid score interpretations and uses. COSDAM also will review the utility of effect sizes, which will provide more meaning to the differences in scores over time and help interpret differences in scores across states. The committee also will review achievement level communication efforts. Members will outline the inferences and what evidence is needed to support the inferences. This should result in a document that provides evidence for proper interpretation and use for achievement levels across different stakeholder uses.

McGregor provided the Nominations Committee update. There are six upcoming vacancies with five of them eligible for reappointment. These vacancies include General Public Representative (Parent Leader), Local School Board Member, Nonpublic School Administrator, State Legislator (Democrat), State Legislator (Republican), and Testing and Measurement Expert. Nominations will be accepted September 5 through October 31, 2023.

Cramer provided the Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee update. Since September 2022, NAEP had four releases, beginning with the Age-9 LTT (September 2022), main NAEP for grades 4 and 8 Reading and Mathematics assessments (October 2022), Civics/U.S. History (May 2023), and Age-13 LTT (June 2023). To prepare for these releases, the R&D Committee spent the last year reviewing and approving release plans, debriefing the releases, and preparing and reading various op-eds and other media publications to highlight NAEP nationally. R&D Committee members also have delved into learning about improving the measure of socioeconomic status, an essential core contextual variable, and reviewed other contextual items. R&D plans to anticipate dissemination and communications needs for the next 18 months, which include no NAEP releases. They will be

addressing the question of how the committee can optimize that time and reshape communications after releases for consistent and sustained impact.

### **Member Discussion**

Board members complimented the Governing Board staff for putting together a productive meeting. Recommendations from the member discussion are summarized below.

- New members should be given a glossary as part of the onboarding process to define NAEP nomenclature. New members would benefit from receiving and reviewing other important foundational materials prior to the November meeting to help them become engaged and active early in their terms.
- The small group discussions were informative and highlighted issues of both agreement and conflict. Follow-up should be provided to address the priorities and the points raised during the discussions.
- The Governing Board needs to continue to develop champions for NAEP, on the Hill and with other stakeholder groups.
- The Governing Board must remain the gold standard for how civil, thoughtful discourse can work in the education sector.
- Board members would like to learn more about AI and modernization efforts (e.g., benefits of multistage testing and drawbacks of coordinated scoring and generative item development).

The August 2, 2023, meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

The August 3, 2023, meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

### **Discussion of Proposed 2028 NAEP Science Assessment Framework**

Kelly introduced the session and explained that at the November 2023 quarterly Board meeting, the Board will vote on the 2028 NAEP Science Assessment Framework, so this session affords a final opportunity for the Board to discuss any remaining questions or concerns. Kelly reviewed the changes to the framework revision process that were implemented with this update, which included: (a) offering multiple opportunities for input from science experts and the public at the beginning of the process, (b) focusing the panel primarily on drafting a substantive outline rather than a narrative text, (c) gathering public comments on a working draft of the framework relatively early in the process, (d) working with both a strategic communications contractor and framework development contractor, and (e) creating a panel leadership team rather than a panel chair. The goal of the work has been to balance validity/quality and feasibility/cost so the end result is an assessment that measures the intended construct at a reasonable cost. Kelly then turned the discussion over to the panel leadership team: Aneesha Badrinarayan, Jenny Christian, Nancy Hopkins-Evans, and Joseph Krajcik.

Since the May 2023 quarterly Board meeting, the panel: (a) reduced the amount of content, (b) updated the complexity framework from its last version a few months ago, (c) added more sample items and details about assessment design, (d) added draft achievement level descriptions (ALDs), (e) added recommendations for subject-specific contextual variables, (f) provided additional clarification and guidance on a variety of topics, and (g) made the text more descriptive and cohesive. The panel also prioritized that the assessment content be:

- useful in understanding the world and informing decisions in everyday life,
- central to the discipline,
- likely to endure after instruction,

- able to be measured meaningfully with items that engage students in sensemaking about a variety of phenomena and finding solutions to problems, and
- critical to measure and monitor to understand large-scale trends in students' science learning.

For assessment design, the panel had three primary recommendations: (a) balance validity and feasibility, with item sets being a prominent part of the assessment; (b) a sufficient number of discrete items should be retained for breadth of coverage; and (c) hands-on tasks should be replaced with the limited use of scenario-based tasks, which will be used only for concepts that are otherwise difficult to assess through other item types.

Other recommendations made by the panel included updating the science Achievement Level Descriptions (ALDs). The 2028 NAEP science ALDs describe in greater detail the performance expected at each achievement level, reflecting the multidimensional construct described in the framework. New reporting ALDs will be created after the assessment is administered to specify how students have demonstrated competency at each achievement level based on the characteristics of the items that map to each achievement level. Panel members also shared recommendations for contextual questionnaires in the following order of priority: (a) science content, (b) teacher factors, (c) student science identity, (d) instructional resources, and (e) instructional organization and strategies.

Panel members concluded by explaining their next steps to the Board:

- complete outstanding information for the framework, including additional sample items and scoring guides for constructed response items;
- continue to refine existing sample items, the complexity framework, and ALDs;
- address iterative feedback and input from NCES, the Development Panel, and the Technical Advisory Committee; and
- gradually shift the focus toward development and refinement of the Assessment and Item Specifications document.

Perdue kicked off the discussion by claiming that she would have been more interested in science as a student if she had experienced it as described by the framework. She asked about the extent to which students are currently learning about science in a manner similar to what the framework is proposing for the NAEP assessment. Panelists reported that based on their observations in classrooms, students are now experiencing science instruction in ways that make it more meaningful and valuable to their lives.

Board members expressed great appreciation to the panel for their responsiveness to previous feedback and highly praised both the framework document and the improvements to the development process for this update, including having a panel leadership team present regularly to the full Board.

Board members asked questions about contextual items. These variables focus both on student opportunities to learn and the learning resources and supports teachers provide students. Uswatte commented that she appreciated questions that use everyday language and active voices so English learners can demonstrate their thinking power more readily. Discussion ensued about efforts to make the items more culturally relevant.

Questions about complexity were raised. The panelists explained that the framework had been intentional about learning progressions so there is a connection between what is assessed at grades 4, 8,

and 12. The items are static and designed for a specific level of complexity rather than becoming increasingly complex in an adaptive fashion as students demonstrate their knowledge and skills.

Board members also suggested that the NAEP Science Assessment Framework may serve as a resource for states as they consider their own testing frameworks. A request was made for the R&D Committee to strategize how to disseminate messaging about the new framework once it is complete.

In closing, Kelly thanked the panel leadership team, WestEd, and Board staff for all of their work and said that he looks forward to bringing the framework to a successful conclusion in November.

The session recessed at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

### **Working Lunch: Opportunities and Challenges for Artificial Intelligence and Large-Scale Assessment**

During this session, the Board listened to and responded to three presentations regarding AI. Susan Lottridge, Chief Scientist, Natural Language Applications at Cambium Assessments, spoke about automated scoring in large-scale assessment and implications for NAEP. She recommended the Governing Board consider how well AI scoring engines perform, the ability to explain AI scoring, evaluations of AI fairness/bias, how to minimize scoring surprises, impacts on ability estimation, and timeline cost/impacts. Her four recommendations for NAEP as the program moves forward with exploring use of AI for automated scoring were: (a) be rigorous in examining automated scoring to minimize issues, (b) increase the use of automated scoring over time, (c) communicate to internal and external stakeholders, and (d) expect some issues with unique student responses.

Matthias von Davier, Moran Professor in Education and Executive Director of the TIMMS & PIRLS International Study Center at Boston College, presented on the application of AI and natural language processing for the TIMMS and PIRLS international assessments. Von Davier explained that AI is not a tool to replace human expertise, but rather to support experts in their work. He predicted that generative AI will replace Word and Excel as we know them.

International assessments, such as TIMSS and PIRLS, have begun to use and explore AI for automated scoring of open-ended responses and automated item generation. The AI supports human scoring of open-ended graphical and written responses and human item writing by drafting items using generative language models and image generators.

Carr and Emmanuel Sikali, Reporting and acting Dissemination Branch Chief for the Assessment Division at NCES, concluded by describing a vision for a more automated and AI-empowered NAEP assessment ecosystem. Risks to security and quality must be monitored constantly; however, AI has the potential to enhance efficiency and quality and expand capabilities.

NCES is exploring how to leverage AI for NAEP most effectively and investigating: (a) how to ensure that AI algorithms are designed and validated for fair and unbiased NAEP assessment results; (b) how to demonstrate accountability to NAEP's stakeholders for program quality and commitment to equity in AI applications; (c) what steps are necessary to ensure that NAEP's applications of AI are understandable and interpretable to all stakeholders; and (d) what potential risks should be anticipated and how should they be addressed, e.g., data privacy and student well-being.

During the discussion, Board members asked about using AI with other NCES data. Sikali confirmed that NCES is exploring these options. Marion asked how cautious individuals should be in using AI and whether it is something that will take years of research to understand fully. Lottridge confirmed that the AI system she uses at Cambium has its shortcomings, including not allowing for different scores and being challenged by misspellings and other variations in responses. Lottridge added that she is cautious and always transparent about the strengths and weaknesses of AI programs. Von Davier noted that researchers are already studying the impact of AI. Finally, Muldoon said she heard the presenters indicate there are no good models yet for evaluating bias in some of these engines, particularly scoring engines. Lottridge agreed that more thought about fairness and bias is necessary.

### **ACTION: Resolution on NAEP Linking Studies**

During the May meeting, the Board learned more about NAEP linking studies. Hanushek reminded Board members that by linking NAEP data to data from other statistical agencies, analysts can check or assess the validity of NAEP scores through comparisons to other outcomes.

This resolution represents the importance that the Board places on linking studies and encourages NCES, the Board, and researchers to develop ways to make linkages. Hanushek urged NCES and the Governing Board to determine where and how outside researchers can access data.

With this background explained, Hanushek read the resolution:

Therefore, the National Assessment Governing Board affirms the value of linking studies to leverage the value of NAEP with the strength of other datasets to benefit policy and research. The Governing Board encourages the National Center for Education Statistics to link NAEP data with data from other federal data sources in collaboration with the Board, share linked datasets with researchers in adherence with privacy and confidentiality protections, and disseminate information learned from linking studies to the public.

Marion moved to approve the resolution on NAEP linking studies, and Cramer seconded it. The resolution passed unanimously.

### **Departing Members' Farewell Remarks**

Wright thanked the Board and reiterated how much she had learned from her time on the Governing Board. She believes that the power and strength of the Board are its members. Each individual brings a wealth of experience, a unique opinion, a problem-solving attitude, and a commitment to focus on improving outcomes for all children across the country.

Hanushek's farewell remarks focused on the direction he thought NAEP should take in the future. He believes the Governing Board should focus on strategizing, prioritizing, and thinking bigger. Hanushek called for the Board to make results more meaningful, strategize ways to attract attention without the impact of a global pandemic, focus on what students know and can do, improve linkages, and continue to emphasize the apolitical nature of the Board.

Muldoon added that the collaborative culture is a result of intentional commitment and contributions that members have made to each other. She thanked Wright and Hanushek for their service. Perdue also thanked them and reminded them that they would be called upon in the future for their expertise. She concluded the meeting by reiterating how Board priorities are changing and for the Board

members to think about how they can continue to build the Governing Board brand and serve as national leaders in realms beyond education.

The meeting adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

Beverly E. Perdue

---

October 20, 2023



**National Assessment Governing Board**  
**Assessment Development Committee**  
**Report of August 4, 2023**

**OPEN SESSION**

**Assessment Development Committee Members:** Patrick Kelly (Chair), Christine Cunningham (Vice Chair), Viola Garcia, Reginald McGregor, Nardi Routten, Dil Uswatte.

**Assessment Development Committee Members Absent:** Frank Edelblut.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Sharyn Rosenberg, Elizabeth Schneider (Deputy Executive Director).

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES):** Jamie Deaton, Eunice Greer, Dana Kelly, Stephanie Melville, Holly Spurlock.

**Other attendees:**

American Institutes for Research (AIR): Brittany Boyd; Educational Testing Service (ETS): Jay Campbell, Hillary Persky, Jaime Rice-Napolitano; Hager Sharp: Melissa Cristler, Joanne Lim; Learning Policy Institute: Aneesha Badrinarayan; Optimal Solutions: Imer Arnautovic; Pearson: Joy Holland; Westat: Lauren Byrne, Kavemuii Murangi; WestEd: Taunya Negin.

The Assessment Development Committee met in open session on Friday, August 4, from 8:30 – 10:40 a.m. Chair Patrick Kelly called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**Review of Existing NAEP Reading and Mathematics Grade 12 Contextual Variables**

Kelly introduced the session and noted that 2028 will be the first year that the grade 12 Reading and Mathematics assessments and contextual questionnaires will reflect the updated assessment frameworks. ADC members then discussed the Committee comments on the student and administrator questionnaires, which had been sent to Sharyn Rosenberg and distributed to ADC members by email in advance of the meeting. Committee members provided input on questions that should be retained, dropped, and revised to reflect both the updated frameworks and other considerations such as current course offerings and changes in technology. Feedback was submitted to NCES following the discussion.

Christine Cunningham proposed that the Board and NCES consider a more comprehensive process for soliciting feedback on contextual variables from researchers who are most likely to use the resulting data.

## **2028 NAEP Science Assessment Framework**

Kelly noted that the full Board would be discussing the proposed framework immediately following the committee meetings, and that Rosenberg would provide some additional background and context on the process in this session for ADC members.

Rosenberg provided a brief recap of key milestones in the framework development process and highlighted changes from previous framework updates. She explained how the process includes nearly 100 participants, including an Educator Advisory Committee (EAC), panel leadership team, and strategic communications contractor, which are new additions to the process. The timeline of activities began nearly two years ago and key changes to the process have included: seeking public comment upfront on whether and how the current framework should be changed; commissioning expert papers that were discussed with the full Board upfront; issuing a more specific Board charge to describe important factors for the panels to grapple with during the update; having an open call for panelist nominations overseen by the Governing Board; seeking public comment on a working draft of the framework relatively early in the development process; and having full Board presentations and discussions with the panel leadership team at every quarterly meeting during the development process.

Rosenberg reminded Committee members of the Board discussion in May, which focused on the need to pay more attention to issues of feasibility and cost without sacrificing validity and quality. The Board requested that the panel significantly cut down on the volume of content and provide more information to support measurement at the lower end of the scale but agreed that it was not necessary to assume that most of the items from the current assessment should carry forward even if that led to a break in trend.

Rosenberg summarized key changes that have taken place since May in response to the Board's policy guidance and noted that next steps include working through additional drafts of the framework and specifications document in response to feedback from NCES, panel members, and technical advisory committee members.

ADC members expressed support and appreciation for the changes made since May and asked clarifying questions about how to balance language load. WestEd content lead Taunya Nesin and panel leadership team member Aneesha Badrinarayan addressed questions and noted that the goal was for students to be engaged by the material but not scared off by it, which can be accomplished by providing information that is necessary and intentional without going too far. Kelly requested that ADC members send any specific edits to Rosenberg by the end of the following week.

## **Options for Next Administration of the NAEP Writing Assessment**

Kelly introduced the next session by noting that the Committee had discussed potential updates to the NAEP Writing Assessment Framework at recent meetings, given that the NAEP Assessment Schedule indicates that updates to this framework should be

considered for the 2030 administration of the assessment. After conducting public comment and commissioning expert papers on whether and how the current framework should be changed, ADC recommended in May that this was not the right time to proceed with updating the NAEP Writing Framework given uncertainty around how artificial intelligence will change writing instruction and assessment. The Committee did request additional information on the feasibility of re-administering the current assessment prior to updating the framework.

Holly Spurlock of NCES prepared a presentation on operational considerations of re-administering the current writing assessment. She began by explaining the challenges encountered with the 2017 administration of the writing assessment, when results could not be reported because it was impossible to disentangle true change in performance from differences caused by changes to the device and platform for the assessment. She explained that it would not be possible to report trend results from a new administration to either 2017 or the first administration under this framework in 2011. In terms of the content, Spurlock noted that the existing prompts were sufficient for re-administration but that the assessment would need to be reprogrammed for a new platform. Finally, she explained that funds for such work have not been budgeted and would need to be diverted from another source if there was a desire to administer the assessment sooner than originally planned.

ADC members indicated that writing is important but that it does not seem worth the cost to re-administer the current assessment if trend data cannot be reported; if a new trendline is established based on the existing assessment, it would be unlikely to continue to future administrations once the framework is updated to incorporate advances in artificial intelligence. ADC recommended that the Board postpone both the framework update and the next administration of the NAEP writing assessment a few years later than 2030 and revisit this discussion once more information is available about the impact of artificial intelligence on writing instruction and assessment.

## **CLOSED SESSION**

**Assessment Development Committee Members:** Patrick Kelly (Chair), Christine Cunningham (Vice Chair), Viola Garcia, Reginald McGregor, Nardi Routten, Dil Uswatte.

**Assessment Development Committee Members Absent:** Frank Edelblut.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Lesley Muldoon (Executive Director), Sharyn Rosenberg, Elizabeth Schneider (Deputy Executive Director).

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES):** Jamie Deaton, Eunice Greer, Dana Kelly, Holly Spurlock.

The Assessment Development Committee met in closed session from 10:40 – 11:00 a.m. This session was closed because it contained contractual information that is not publicly available.

## Discussion of Draft Statement of Work for Social Studies Content Advisory Group

Cunningham noted that at the May ADC meeting, the Committee endorsed the idea of convening a social studies content advisory group to serve two purposes: 1) provide advice on the “pre-work” in advance of launching updates to the 2030 NAEP U.S. History and Civics Assessment Frameworks; and 2) try out the idea of using a content advisory group to monitor updates to frameworks and inform potential revisions to the Board policy for NAEP Assessment Framework Development. She indicated that Rosenberg had sent a draft statement of work to ADC members in advance of the meeting.

Rosenberg briefly presented key highlights from the proposed statement of work and addressed Committee member questions. She indicated that additional details related to implementation would be shared with the Committee for feedback once the contract task was awarded.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Patrick Kelly, Chair

September 21, 2013

---

Date

**National Assessment Governing Board**  
**Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology**  
**Report of August 4, 2023**

**CLOSED SESSION**

**Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) Members:** Suzanne Lane (Chair), Carey Wright (Vice Chair), Eric Hanushek, Scott Marion, Alice Peisch, Michael Pope.

**COSDAM Members Absent:** Russ Whitehurst.

**National Assessment Governing Board members:** Ron Reynolds.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Lesley Muldoon, Stephaan Harris.

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES):** Daniel McGrath (Delegated Authority of Associate Commissioner, Assessment Division), Gina Broxterman, Jing Chen, Alison Deigan, Emmanuel Sikali.

**Other attendees:** American Institutes for Research (AIR): Markus Broer; Educational Testing Service (ETS): Terran Brown, Jay Campbell, Peter Ciemins, Kadriye Ercikan, Robert Finnegan, Helena Jia, Daniel McCathey, Ranu Palta-Upeete; Hagar Sharp: Kathleen Manzo, Chelsea Spring; Optimal Solutions: Sadaf Asrar, Andrea Johnson; Pearson: Llana Williams; Hatcher Group: Sophia Handel; Westat: Marcie Hickman, Tom Krenzke, Lisa Rodriguez, Rick Rogers.

**NAEP Modernization: Plans for Device Agnostic Administration**

The Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) began in closed session on Friday, August 4, 2023. Chair Suzanne Lane (Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:00am ET.

Lane welcomed the COSDAM members and attendees, and thanked the three outgoing members – Carey Wright, Rick Hanushek, and Russ Whitehurst (not in attendance) for their contributions. She provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

Under the provisions of exemption 9(B) of 552b of Title 5 U.S.C., COSDAM began the meeting in closed session to allow discussion of preliminary data collected during a recent field test. Lane introduced Jing Chen of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and Helena Jia of the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to present plans for moving towards a device agnostic National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) administration.

Chen provided an overview for moving from the current administration of NAEP on Surface Pros towards use of Chromebooks and then school-based devices (i.e., device agnostic). Multiple studies are planned to ensure scores are comparable across devices and that trend can be maintained. She noted that international large-scale assessments have moved towards device agnostic administration, and have assumed comparability when minimum device specifications have been met. NAEP will require minimum specifications, and NCES is taking additional steps to ensure trend is not threatened by unanticipated impacts of device characteristics. Chen provided a high-level timeline for these studies and introduced Jia to provide details.

Jia presented planned activities for each year from 2023 through 2026. She began with findings from a recently completed 2023 field test that examined the use of Chromebooks and Surface Pros, and online administration. It is important to ensure a successful online administration as a first step towards device agnostic. She then moved into plans for a proof of concept (POC) study of school-based equipment planned for 2024, including the current minimum requirements for schools to participate using their own devices. NCES will continue to adjust and investigate device considerations in 2024 and 2025. Jia ended her presentation with study designs being considered for 2026.

COSDAM members inquired about the comparability of item displays across devices, and what impact differences might have on NAEP performance. Rick Hanushek noted a prior NAEP presentation when NCES reported the color of ink (black or blue) on a pencil and paper assessment could impact performance, and Scott Marion added that item order is also a known impact. Lane stated that some studies suggest there are bigger impacts on student performance between digital devices than between paper and pencil and digital administration. Dan McGrath expressed that NCES has studied, and continues to study, these concerns. He offered that if COSDAM members would like more information on studies on this issue NCES could prepare a future presentation.

Carey Wright expressed the need to have solid communication around plans to move towards device agnostic administration, including sharing minimum device requirements for using school devices. Many NAEP Coordinators and selected NAEP schools are accustomed to receiving letters to inform of upcoming NAEP administrations, and they may assume the information is consistent with prior years without having fully read it. NCES may need to use highlighting, bolding, or colors to draw attention to the changes. Wright added that if NAEP can provide minimum device requirements enough in advance, it may help inform decisions about device purchases. Emmanuel Sikali reminded COSDAM members that they do not expect schools to make purchases based on NAEP participation and that NCES will continue to provide devices for those who need them. However, Wright noted, the number of devices NAEP requires will need to reduce significantly to realize the expected cost savings. If presented with them in a timely manner, some schools may voluntarily take the NAEP minimum requirements into consideration when making device decisions.

Lane noted the closed meeting had concluded and the meeting opened for the remaining topics.

## **OPEN SESSION**

**Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) Members:** Suzanne Lane (Chair), Carey Wright (Vice Chair), Eric Hanushek, Scott Marion, Alice Peisch, Michael Pope.

**COSDAM Members Absent:** Russ Whitehurst.

**Other National Assessment Governing Board members:** Ron Reynolds.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Lesley Muldoon; Stephaan Harris.

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES):** Peggy Carr (Commissioner), Gina Broxterman, Jing Chen.

**Other attendees:** American Institutes for Research (AIR): Markus Broer; Digital Learning Institute: Myra Best; Educational Testing Service (ETS): Terran Brown, Jay Campbell, Peter Ciemins, Kadriye Ercikan, Robert Finnegan, Helena Jia, Daniel McCathey; Hagar Sharp: Kathleen Manzo, Chelsea Spring; Hatcher Group: Sophia Handel; Optimal Solutions: Sadaf Asrar, Andrea Johnson; Pearson: Llana Williams; Westat: Marcie Hickman, Tom Krenzke, Lisa Rodriguez, Rick Rogers.

## **Utility of Effect Sizes**

COSDAM next met in open session beginning at 9:50 am ET.

Lane introduced the next topic as a follow-up to recent effect size discussions. During the May 2023 COSDAM meeting, Lane requested that Becky Dvorak, the Assistant Director for Psychometrics, prepare examples of using effect sizes with NAEP data for use in discussion. Lane reminded COSDAM members that effect sizes are different from significance testing because they provide practical meaning to the size of score changes or differences and are not sensitive to sample sizes. She asked members to think about the practical utility of the information as examples are presented, and to consider if this is something COSDAM believes should be provided in NAEP reporting. Through prior discussions with NCES and from the Board Reporting and Dissemination committee liaison, COSDAM learned effect size information is likely too technical to include in the NAEP Report Card; however, COSDAM members feel it is worthwhile to explore whether this information should be shared in some type of easily accessible supplement for data presented on the NAEP Report Card. The purpose of this discussion was to further consider whether COSDAM members believe this should be pursued.

Dvorak walked through examples of incorporating effect size data with NAEP results, beginning with national level NAEP Mathematics data included on the NAEP Report Card Highlights page for 2022. The page includes line graphs illustrating score changes from 1990 to 2002 for grades 4 and 8. The graphic includes comparisons for 2022 to 2019, 2003, and 1990, with asterisks to note statistically significant differences. There were differences presented of various sizes, from one-point to 23-points, and all were statistically significant. However, the effect size values varied and suggested some differences were not practically meaningful, while others represented moderate or large differences. Dvorak presented additional examples to illustrate effect size use for examining the size of change within states, and for differences across states.

COSDAM members generally felt effect sizes were useful for adding meaning to NAEP score changes and differences. Michael Pope stated he could see that effect sizes could add value to interpretations, and it could be useful to examine trends in effect sizes over time as another way to use NAEP data.

Marion suggested if NAEP reported effect size it may be important to include thresholds for interpretations of small, medium, or large. There is no consensus in the field of the minimum effect size required for interpreting a change or difference as meaningful, and it may be important to consider the context. Hanushek noted that early research suggesting an effect size must reach at least 0.2 to be considered meaningful is outdated, and it is generally rare to see values this large in education. The pandemic resulted in unusually large differences that NAEP may not see again. Marion suggested the NAEP Design and Analysis Committee (DAC) could assist with identifying thresholds.

Peggy Carr (NCES Commissioner) noted the DAC had addressed effect size at least twice in the past, the last time was approximately 10 years ago. Carr noted that their past investigations led to recommendations that NAEP not report out effect sizes; however, Carr acknowledged this was a long time ago and it may merit reconsideration. She stated NCES can provide the report DAC produced for COSDAM review.

Lane and Wright were cognizant of the importance of communications if effect sizes were to be incorporated in NAEP reporting. Wright suggested reaching out to state communications staff for input if we were to pursue reporting out effect size, and Lane recommended seeking input from various stakeholder groups for reaction. Hanushek noted that though effect sizes may not be intuitive, a five-point difference is also difficult to interpret so this should not be a deterrent. Lane offered it might be important to consult with experts in effect size to help consider appropriate thresholds for effect size interpretations, for NAEP in order to provide guidance for interpretations.

Hanushek suggested that if ultimately the decision is to continue to not report out effect sizes, it would be beneficial to at minimum provide standard deviations as a footnote. This would allow researchers to see score variability and to compute the effect sizes without having to go through the NAEP Data Explorer.



## Updates: Achievement Level Communications

Lastly, the COSDAM meeting included an update on NAEP Achievement Levels communications activities. Lane sought input on an outline for an Achievement Levels Validity Argument report, including a table of appropriate and inappropriate uses and interpretations. The appropriate and inappropriate uses are intended for inclusion in the validity argument report and select examples can be pulled for inclusion in communications briefs. The communications briefs are other documents included in the communications planning, though they were not the focus on the August meeting. Communications briefs are intended to provide a quick overview of important information targeted at specific stakeholder groups, and Board staff will be working towards preparing initial examples for COSDAM review in the coming months.

The communications documents are being developed to address recommendations by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAEM) in their 2016 evaluation of NAEP Achievement Levels. The intent of the Achievement Levels Validity Argument report is to synthesize NAEP Achievement Level validity evidence in one place. It will provide information on the policy and development of achievement levels, claims that can be made and research in support of these claims. In addition, the report may be used as one piece of evidence to support removal of the achievement level trial status.

Lane requested feedback on an initial outline of the validity argument report. The outline was included with meeting background materials and was also projected for review during the meeting.

Hanushek expressed his concern that NAEP does not include an official achievement level below *NAEP Basic*, noting it would be beneficial to understand what these students know. Lane acknowledged his concern and reminded him that NCES is currently working to develop more items at the low end of the scale, which is a good first step towards increasing information at this level. Dvorak added that NCES releases items and item map information across the NAEP scale, including those that fall below *NAEP Basic*.

COSDAM members generally agreed with the validity argument report outline. Marion recommended revising the first sub-bullet of the final chapter (i.e., IV.a) of the outline to focus first on the intent of NAEP Achievement Levels instead of on state achievement levels. The state achievement levels vary greatly, and so he noted it made sense to start with NAEP and then move into state information to help provide focus. Marion also recommended incorporating item maps into the report as an additional source of validity evidence. Carr expressed the need to incorporate external evidence to support validity, as most of the documents recommended in the outline are internal to NAEP.

COSDAM members agreed with the appropriate and inappropriate uses and interpretations of NAEP Achievement Levels, as presented with the outline. However,

they also noted it has been an ongoing challenge to address the misconceptions. Marion reported that some states think they must link their standards directly to NAEP, despite that the assessments have different purposes. Wright noted the tendency for people to incorrectly interpret *NAEP Proficient* as grade-level. Hanushek expressed that NAEP continually tries to correct misconceptions, but they continue to occur. It is particularly hard to combat misconceptions when they are driven by politicization. Lane expressed understanding that correcting these misconceptions is a challenge and expressed that it is worth making an effort.

Marion reminded the group that validity is an ongoing task. The validity argument will need ongoing updates.

COSDAM members were encouraged to provide feedback following the meeting if they had additional thoughts.

The meeting adjourned at 10:46 am ET.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Suzanne Lane, Chair

09/21/2023

Date

**National Assessment Governing Board**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Report of August 2, 2023**

**OPEN SESSION**

**Executive Committee Members:** The Honorable Beverly E. Perdue (Chair), Alice Peisch (Vice Chair), Christine Cunningham, Patrick Kelly, Suzanne Lane, Reginald McGregor, Martin West, Carey Wright.

**Executive Committee Members Absent:** Haley Barbour, Alberto Carvalho.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Lesley Muldoon (Executive Director), Elizabeth Schneider (Deputy Executive Director), Rebecca Dvorak, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Munira Mwalimu, Sharyn Rosenberg, Angela Scott, Anthony White.

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES):** Peggy Carr (Commissioner), Daniel McGrath (Delegated Authority of Associate Commissioner, Assessment Division).

**Other Attendees:**

**IBS Government Services:** Anthony Sung (President).

The Executive Committee met in open session on August 2, 2023, from 3:20 p.m. to 4:20 p.m. to consider the nomination of Vice Chair for the 2023-2024 term, to receive a report on an independent financial audit of the National Assessment Governing Board, and to take action on a recommendation regarding the Technology and Engineering Literacy Assessment.

The Honorable Beverly E. Perdue, Chair, presided over the meeting. She welcomed members and then turned to the nomination of the 2023-2024 Vice Chair. She asked for a member to nominate current Vice Chair Alice Peisch to serve as Vice Chair for another term and for additional nominees, if any. Carey Wright nominated Alice to serve as Vice Chair for another term. No other nominations were put forward. Carey Wright then made a motion for the Executive Committee to recommend that the full Board take action on the nomination of Alice Peisch to serve as Vice Chair for the term of 2023-2024. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Chair Perdue noted that the Board had engaged a financial auditing firm in FY 2022 to perform an independent financial audit pertaining to all aspects of the Governing Board's financial operations over a five-year period from FY17-FY21. She invited Anthony Sung, President of IBS Government Services, which conducted the audit, to share highlights of their findings. Mr. Sung shared that the Board received a clean audit.

Next Lesley Muldoon, Executive Director, shared a staff recommendation to remove from the NAEP Schedule of Assessments the Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Assessment planned for 2028 and to cancel it going forward. A motion was made in favor of the staff recommendation. It was seconded and unanimously approved.

At 4:20 p.m. Chair Perdue adjourned the meeting.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

*Beverly E. Perdue*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bev Perdue, Chair

November 3, 2023

Date

# **National Assessment Governing Board**

## **Nominations Committee**

### **Report of July 24, 2023**

**Nominations Committee Members:** Reginald McGregor (Chair), Alice Peisch (Vice Chair), Tyler Cramer, Viola Garcia, Scott Marion, Ron Reynolds, Nardi Routten.

**Members Absent:** Suzanne Lane.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Lesley Muldoon (Executive Director), Elizabeth Schneider (Deputy Executive Director), Stephaan Harris, Munira Mwalimu, Tessa Regis.

#### **CLOSED SESSION**

Under the provisions of exemptions 2 and 6 of § 552b (c) of Title 5 U.S.C., the Nominations Committee met in closed session on Monday, July 24, 2023, from 5:00 p.m. to 5:16 p.m. (ET) to discuss ongoing work.

Nominations Committee Chair Reginald McGregor called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. ET. Chairman McGregor reviewed the agenda and invited Elizabeth Schneider, Deputy Executive Director to provide a status update on the 2023 appointments from the Secretary's office.

Schneider reported that there were no official update or announcement on all vacancies; however, she shared an update on the status of the incumbent reappointments and their appointment terms. The Chair and members expressed their appreciation for the work of the staff in building relationships with and communicating effectively with the Secretary's office around appointments.

#### **OPEN SESSION**

##### **Outreach Plans for the 2024 Campaign Cycle**

Stephaan Harris provided an update on the outreach campaign and shared a timeline for the next cycle of appointments which will begin on October 1, 2024.

Harris reported that there are six vacancies as noted below; five positions are eligible for reappointment; the State Legislator, Democrat position is not eligible for reappointment.

- 1) General Public (Parent Leader)
- 2) Local School Board Member
- 3) Non-public school Administrator

- 4) State Legislator (Democrat)
- 5) State Legislator (Republican)
- 6) Testing and Measurement

Harris shared the campaign timeline which began in mid-July and concludes in late October. He highlighted the two phases of the campaign—the announcement phase and solicitation phase. Harris noted that for this cycle, more targeted outreach is planned together with greater strategic cultivation of relationships that members, alumni and staff have with key stakeholders. The campaign includes plans for posting op-eds and media pitching and placement.

Chairman McGregor provided a recap of the discussion and noted that the next committee meeting will be scheduled in person, November 2023.

The meeting adjourned at 5:39 p.m. ET.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Reginald McGregor, Chair

07/24/2023

Date

**National Assessment Governing Board**  
**Reporting and Dissemination Committee**  
**Report of July 21, 2023**

**OPEN SESSION**

**Reporting and Dissemination Committee Members:** Vice Chair Marty West, Tyler Cramer, Anna King, Julia Rafal-Baer, Ron Reynolds.

**Reporting and Dissemination Committee Members Absent:** Alberto Carvalho, Mark White.

**National Assessment Governing Board Staff:** Rebecca Dvorak, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Lesley Muldoon (Executive Director), Elizabeth Schneider (Deputy Executive Director), Angela Scott.

**National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Staff:** Samantha Burg, Jing Chen, Brian Cramer, Veda Edwards, Patricia Etienne, Dana Kelly, Dan McGrath, Nadia McLaughlin, Gabrielle Merken, Emmanuel Sikali, Holly Spurlock, William Tirre, Ebony Walton, William Ward.

**Other attendees:** American Institutes for Research (AIR): Markus Broer, Cadelle Hemphill, Kim Gattis, Young Yee Kim, Yan Wang; CRP, Inc: Renee Palmer; Educational Testing Service (ETS): Robert Finnegan, Linda Ward, Ryan Whorton; Forum One: Aki Jain, Tim Shaw; Hager Sharp: James Elias, Joanne Lim, Kathleen Manzo; Erik Robelen; Optimal Solutions Group: Andrea Johnson; Pearson: Scott Becker; Westat: Kavemuii Murangi.

---

The Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee convened in open session virtually via Zoom on Friday, July 21, two weeks prior to the quarterly board meeting. Chair Alberto Carvalho could not attend; Vice Chair Marty West assumed chair responsibilities. West called the meeting to order at 1:06 pm (ET), provided an overview of the meeting, and asked Laura LoGerfo, the Board’s Assistant Director for Reporting and Analysis, to lead the first item on the agenda.

**Debrief on the Release of the 2023 Long-Term Trend Results**

LoGerfo began by recounting how many releases the Governing Board and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) hosted over the last nine months—four. Each

event adopted a unique approach, inspired by the subject matter and varying the focus, theme, location, participants, and approach. She next shared specific information on attendance at the Long-Term Trend (LTT)-age 13 release event and on attention paid by media outlets to the results the week of the release.

The LTT-age 13 release event occurred on June 21 at a high school in Ijamsville, Maryland, roughly 60 minutes outside of Washington, DC, in an area straddling suburban and rural boundaries. The event was also live-streamed to an audience of over 350 people. The superintendent of Frederick County Public Schools graciously welcomed those gathered in person and online, after which Marty West offered opening remarks that framed the context of these results among previously released NAEP results. Dr. Carr presented the findings and answered questions from both the online and in-person audiences.

After the data portion of the release event concluded, West moderated a panel discussion with three teachers - a math teacher, the National Teacher of the Year who instructs social studies, and an English-Language Arts teacher (all subjects which NAEP assessed in the 2022 school year) - and three tenth-grade students. Rather than highlighting only the score declines, West's questions focused on what supports students and teachers need to accelerate learning. The insightful, frank, and often funny, conversation offered tangible advice to practitioners and policymakers, leading many to deem this panel the most engaging of the four release events this year.

Ron Reynolds very much appreciated hearing the students' voices at the LTT release event. He suggested that high school students may want to watch their peers on the panel, and the Board should consider including students in outreach efforts. Likewise, high school history classes may wish to attend future releases of the NAEP civics and U.S. history results. Anna King seconded Reynolds' suggestions, especially about inviting students to attend releases, particularly at release events like the LTT release where students shared a stage with policy leaders and conversed as equals. Students' honesty about what they need to succeed should compel their parents to become engaged; including students in events builds bridges to parents.

The committee observed from the release event debrief report that just 3% of those in the outreach database attended the release event either on livestream or in person. Committee members asked if the Board wishes to increase the percentage of stakeholders directly engaged in release events, or if the attendance figures are secondary to media pick-up in priority for communication efforts. No consensus was reached.



Beyond the event, Tyler Cramer remarked that the media coverage struck him as even more extensive than the media analysis reported and praised journalists' accurate interpretations of the findings. He also considered the articles on LTT the most informed and insightful yet. Thus, whatever the Board and/or NCES did to prepare the press for this release worked.

West also expressed surprise at the extent of media coverage and asked what led to such successful pick-up of the results by the media. R&D committee members gave kudos to West both for his remarks and his moderation of the event and for his participation in media interviews. More broadly, negative results tend to elicit attention, which might explain the intense coverage, but the proactive approaches of media training for Board members, media placements of Board members' op-eds, and outreach throughout the year contributed to the success of the release.

West prompted the R&D committee members to think about the next 18 months, which will not feature a release of new NAEP data. How can this fallow time be leveraged as an opportunity to reevaluate and refocus what the Board wants to communicate and disseminate? Cramer cautioned his fellow committee members not to allow the results to fade from the spotlight over the upcoming year, underscoring how important these results continue to be. West agreed wholeheartedly and urged that the Board should encourage secondary research during this timeframe as a means to sustain attention. Cramer added parting advice: Don't forget communicating with Congress.

### **Review of Grade 12 Core Contextual Items**

The timing of the R&D Committee meeting coincided with the review period of the existing item pool for the Grade 12 core contextual questionnaire. Nadia McLaughlin of the National Center for Education Statistics introduced the session as the lead for NAEP content development, standing in for Jamie Deaton, the lead for the NAEP contextual questionnaires.

McLaughlin encouraged the committee members to evaluate each item both on its own merit and on its alignment with new variables about pandemic-related learning recovery. She also drew the members' attention to an improved, more inclusive family structure variable, which will be piloted for grades 4 and 8 in 2024. NCES flagged items for the committee members which were dropped from the questionnaires for grades 4 and 8, in case interest in the full cross-grade set would motivate retention of an item, though the unique nature of grade 12 may require unique contextual variables. To maintain trend, the questionnaires should retain 60% of the same items.

Before eliciting item-specific feedback, McLaughlin emphasized that this stage of the review process affords opportunities to convey grand ideas and wishful thinking for new items which can be piloted in 2026. However, if any variable is added, then a variable must be dropped to remain within time limits. With that, the committee members pored over each core contextual questionnaire item and provided the following feedback:

### *Student Core Contextual Questions*

#1 – Self-report of effort: Tyler Cramer asked what these responses tell analysts. Does this item capture how seriously participants apply themselves? Are lower performers less engaged than higher performers? Does variability on this measure explain differences in performance?

- NCES Response: The item is not perfect but does help understand assessment validity.

#7 – Frequency of internet use for homework at home: This was eliminated at grade 4, because space was needed for learning recovery items and because its creation preceded the ubiquity of the internet in daily lives.

- What is the correlation with NAEP scores?
- What unique information does this variable provide?
- Instead ask students *how* they use the internet and *where* they use the internet? School, library, home, friends' homes

#9 – Family influence: Please keep! Especially at grade 12.

- NCES Response: This item will be amended in the next administration to reflect more dynamic family structures and with a more interactive approach, i.e., drop-down menu for sibling, mother, father, guardian, etc.

#12, #13 – Does your father/mother work outside of the home: Telework makes this item messy, which led R&D to accept removing this item.

#15, #16 – The R&D Committee recommended combining these two items into one; the underlying construct should be about time on screens, not time on a particular device.

#20 – School belonging: Committee members urged not to eliminate this item or the affective disposition item. NCES dropped school belonging for grades 4 and 8, but R&D protested that decision. With the current emphasis on social-emotional learning and post-COVID social skills (or lack thereof), this item seems important generally, especially now, and specifically for grade 12.

#23 – Eliminate. The committee unanimously agreed to encourage dropping this item about high school tracking, because the item feels outdated and is no longer relevant.

The committee's review of these core contextual variables concluded with the student items, however, LoGerfo invited committee members to send her any further proposed amendments or questions on either the student questionnaire or the school administrator questionnaire. LoGerfo transmitted the compiled feedback to NCES on August 7.

### **User Experience Experience**

Ebony Walton of the National Center for Education Statistics introduced the next session, which resulted from a highly informative discussion at the March 2023 meeting of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee. At that meeting, Tim Shaw of Forum One, a firm which evaluates user experiences on NAEP websites and data tools, shared findings from focus groups and interviews.

The process through which Forum One collects these impressions and user feedback intrigued the committee members greatly and inspired this follow-up session. The committee members asked if they could participate; they represent stakeholders in NAEP, use the data tools, and are invested in improving the form and function of NAEP.

Ebony Walton and Tim Shaw agreed to return, and Ron Reynolds agreed to serve as the model participant. The user experience data collection process typically includes one interviewer or researcher (Tim) and one user, thus the set-up for this demonstration. Shaw noted that the focus would be on Reynolds, however Shaw would address the other committee members and solicit questions throughout the experience.

Shaw started the session by inquiring about Reynolds' professional work and his familiarity with NAEP and with NAEP data tools to give Shaw a sense of the person and their related experiences as well as to foster a personal connection which facilitates the conversation. He reassured Reynolds that the questions and activities test the website, not the participant. Shaw also set the stage about what would have happened up to this point in the user experience process. NCES and/or Forum One would have identified (1) something specific to test, e.g., a beta version of a data tool; and (2) a target audience. Shaw encouraged Reynolds to complete a requested task as he normally would, but to vocalize his thinking and navigating through the website.

To begin, Shaw wondered about Reynolds' usual motivation for exploring the Nation's Report Card site and data tools. Reynolds replied that the data releases inspired him to analyze the performance of private schools. Shaw asked if Reynolds had formulated any a priori hypotheses about private school scores and what tools he would use to check his hypotheses.

Reynolds typically visits the NAEP Data Explorer to generate a table comparing Catholic schools and public schools, crossed with the variable representing economic disadvantage, National School Lunch Program. Shaw directed Reynolds to open the Nation's Report Card home page, which Reynolds realized presents a surfeit of information, along with two entry points to the report cards. Reynolds considered all the information a welcome invitation to explore the data but could not find the actual Long-Term Trend report readily.

Shaw paused to explain to Reynolds and the committee that critical feedback is just as appreciated as positive feedback, because all feedback helps to improve the site. If Reynolds becomes lost or cannot complete a scenario with the information Shaw gives, Reynolds should notify Shaw so they can discuss. Shaw also confessed that he may respond to questions with another question or a vague hint, which is all part of testing the site.

Shaw opened the conversation to the entire committee and elicited reactions. It was noted that the NCES website differs in look and feel from the NAEP website, a distinction which Walton reported that NCES is already addressing. In coming months, the Nation's Report Card landing page will be populated with new statistics routinely to keep the site fresh.

Shaw then requested Reynolds to produce a table on California's performance by using the state profile tool. This scenario led Reynolds to the achievement level dashboard, which Reynolds was pleased to see. Reynolds generated the table efficiently but finding the access point and link quickly posed more challenging.

Walton remarked that all the content in the report cards populate the dashboards and the state data tool. A balance can be struck between too many entries to data, which should be streamlined, and multiple access points to suit various purposes and audiences. The lull prior to the next NAEP release allows the NCES team to re-evaluate the website and the data tools.

Walton recommended continuing these conversations outside review periods to improve the infrastructure in a proactive approach, not in reaction to an imminent release. She also noted that Optimal Solutions Group, a NAEP Alliance contractor, is examining if ChatGPT is reading interactive graphics with NAEP data accurately. Mark White followed that observation with a more general yet pressing inquiry about how AI interacts with online NAEP data. LoGerfo assured White that several sessions at the upcoming Board meeting would address this inquiry.

The meeting concluded at 3:00 pm (ET).

I hereby certify the accuracy of these minutes.

Marty West  
Vice Chair

August 14, 2023