

ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA



August 8, 2024
2:45 – 5:15 pm EDT
Kenmore Room

2:45 – 3:45 pm	Review of SBT Concept Sketches for 2028 NAEP Science Assessment at Grades 4 and 8 (CLOSED) <i>Patrick Kelly, Chair</i> <i>Christine Cunningham, Vice Chair</i>	<i>Secure materials will be sent separately</i>
3:45 – 3:50 pm	Transition to Open Session	
3:50 – 4:35 pm	Proposed Changes to Assessment Framework Development Policy <i>Patrick Kelly</i> <i>Sharyn Rosenberg</i>	Attachment A
4:35 – 4:50 pm	Update on Social Studies Content Advisory Group <i>Sharyn Rosenberg</i>	Attachment B
4:50 – 5:00 pm	Update on NAEP Long-Term Trend <i>Sharyn Rosenberg</i>	Attachment C
5:00 – 5:15 pm	Initial Discussion of Strategic Vision Activities for ADC <i>Christine Cunningham</i>	<i>See Strategic Vision tab</i>

Proposed Revisions to the Assessment Framework Development Policy

August 8, 2024

Goals

The goals of this session are to: (1) discuss proposed draft edits to the Assessment Framework Development Policy intended to reflect a nimbler process for monitoring important developments in a field and implementing minor updates to frameworks; and (2) determine next steps and additional information needed to advance this work with the goal of adopting a revised policy no later than spring 2025.

Overview

In March 2022, the Board adopted an updated policy on [Assessment Framework Development](#) for NAEP. One important aspect of the framework update process that has not yet been incorporated is the idea of a nimbler process that could be used to monitor a field on an ongoing basis and implement smaller changes to frameworks when necessary.

During the August ADC meeting, Sharyn Rosenberg will review proposed revisions to the current policy and request Committee feedback. The proposed revisions are included as attachments both in tracked changes and in a clean document.

Key proposed changes to the current policy:

- Establishment of a new principle to formalize the framework monitoring process via a standing group of NAEP content advisors in each subject area (called a “Content Advisory Group”)
- A distinction between “minor changes” and “moderate or major changes” to frameworks
- Establishment of a new principle to describe guidelines for implementing minor changes to frameworks
- Elimination of references to a Steering Panel (even for moderate and major changes to frameworks) given the proposal that the Content Advisory Group would instead work with a Development Panel to implement framework updates
- Addition of explicit reference to a panel leadership team for facilitating Development Panel meetings for moderate and major changes (this is unrelated to the issues of ongoing monitoring and minor updates but is a lesson learned from implementing the current policy with the most recent update of the 2028 NAEP Science Assessment Framework)

The proposed edits are meant to be an initial “straw man” draft to stimulate discussion and the need for additional changes. It is important to note that the intended purpose of convening Content Advisory Groups at least once per year is to engage in ongoing

monitoring of a field to better understand emerging issues that may have implications for NAEP assessment frameworks, whether in the short-term or long-term. There is no expectation that frameworks would be updated anywhere near as frequently as every year. However, understanding emerging issues could help inform whether additional research or information should be gathered. It is anticipated that many of the Content Advisory Group meetings would result in no immediate action.

Background

The Assessment Development Committee has done significant groundwork to inform this work.

The [Pragmatic Future for NAEP report](#) by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2022) included the following recommendation about NAEP frameworks:

Recommendation 3-2: The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) should work both independently and collaboratively to implement smaller and more frequent framework updates. This work should include consideration of the possibility of broadening the remit of the standing subject matter committees that already exist to include responsibility for gradual framework updates, participation in item model development, and working directly with both NAGB and NCES (page 3-4).

Sharyn Rosenberg prepared a thought paper in response to this recommendation that was discussed by ADC during the [May 2022 Committee meeting](#). Following that discussion, papers on this topic were commissioned from six consultants:

- Alicia Alonzo, former member of the NAEP Science Standing Committee, and the committee that recently updated the 2023 TIMSS Science Framework using a process similar to what was proposed for updating NAEP frameworks
- Jessica Baghian, former state leader in Louisiana
- Andrew Ho, former Governing Board member and Chair of the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM)
- Carol Jago, former Governing Board member and ADC Chair
- Stanley Rabinowitz, psychometrician with extensive experience working on state assessments and the national exams in Australia
- Ada Woo, psychometrician with extensive experience working on certification exams

Independent of the papers commissioned by Board staff, Lorrie Shepard of the NAEP Validity Studies (NVS) Panel had been working on a [comprehensive white paper](#) on the same topic, published on the NVS website.

These papers were included in the [November 2022 ADC materials](#) and discussed by the Committee during that meeting. In January 2023, a virtual panel discussion took

place with the seven paper authors; key takeaways from this meeting were discussed during the [March 2023 ADC meeting](#) and formal minutes were included in the May 2023 ADC materials. One of many outcomes from these discussions was the idea of reconceptualizing the original recommendation to use existing NAEP standing committees (whose current scope is strictly to review NAEP items and are constituted under contract to the NCES item development contractor) as content advisory groups, new standing groups which would have (or acquire) expertise about NAEP frameworks in addition to the given content area.

During the [May 2023 ADC meeting](#), Committee members discussed key changes that would need to be made to current policy and procedures in order to make it possible to implement smaller updates to NAEP assessment frameworks. The key takeaway from the May 2023 ADC discussion was to consider convening a Social Studies Content Advisory Group to serve as a proof of concept for content advisory groups, in a limited capacity, by focusing on the "pre-work" to the launch of the planned updates to the 2030 NAEP U.S. History and Civics Frameworks. This work is necessary, but not sufficient, for informing potential updates to the policy more broadly.

During the [May 2024 ADC meeting](#), Committee members provided initial input on the broader question of what policy revisions are necessary to enable an ongoing process for framework monitoring and the implementation of minor updates to frameworks when necessary. That input has been incorporated in the proposed edits to the policy.

**Adopted: TBD**

National Assessment Governing Board

Assessment Framework Development

Policy Statement

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

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

Introduction

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

Under provisions of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act of 2002 ([P.L. 107-279](#)), Congress authorized the Governing Board to continue its mandate for determining the content and format of valid and reliable assessments based on widely accepted technical and professional standards for test development and active participation of stakeholders. This mandate aligns with the purpose of NAEP, which is to provide fair and

accurate measurement of student academic achievement.

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

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

NAEP framework development shall be informed by a broad, balanced, and inclusive set of factors. Frameworks shall reflect current curricula and instruction, research regarding cognitive development and instruction, and the nation’s future needs and desirable levels of achievement. This delicate balance between “what is” and “what should be” is at the core of the NAEP framework development process.

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

In this process, involved stakeholders shall include:

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

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

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

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

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

Principles for Framework Development

Principle 1: Elements of Frameworks

~~Principle 2: Development and Update Process~~

Principle ~~23~~: ~~Periodic~~ Framework Monitoring Process and Initial Decision to Proceed with Framework Updates~~Review~~

Principle 3: Development and Update Process for Minor Changes

Principle 4: Development and Update Process for Moderate and Major Changes

Principle ~~54~~: Elements of Specifications

Principle ~~65~~: Role of the Governing Board

Guidelines for the Principles

Principle 1: Elements of Frameworks

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

Guidelines

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

Governing Board adoption, the framework shall be widely disseminated.

~~the~~

Principle 23: ~~Periodic Framework Monitoring Process and Initial Decision to Proceed with Framework Updates~~Review

Regular monitoring of the NAEP subject areas and implications for NAEP assessment frameworks shall be considered to~~Reviews of existing frameworks shall determine~~inform whether ~~framework~~an updates ~~are~~is needed to continue valid and reliable measurement of the content and cognitive processes reflected in evolving expectations of students.

Guidelines

- a) A Content Advisory Group in each NAEP subject area shall be convened at least once per year to reflect on current issues in the field (e.g., changes in the states' or nation's educational systems or new research) and potential implications (if any) for relevant NAEP assessment frameworks. Each Content Advisory Group shall be comprised of 10 content and policy experts, including educators with experience at the NAEP grade levels.
- b) When significant issues in a field are identified as having potential implications for a NAEP assessment framework, thea Content Advisory Group may recommend research studies and other relevant information to be collected and/or synthesized for further consideration by the ADC.
- When a Content Advisory Group recommends that changes to a NAEP framework are needed, the ADC will deliberate on whether and when to recommend that the Governing Board proceed with updates to that framework.
- c)
- d) If a Content Advisory Group does not identify any issues in the field with potential implications for a NAEP framework within 10 years of previous updates to a framework, the Governing Board will consider seeking public comment on whether any changes are needed.
- e) With consideration of the policy and assessment issues in thea content area, the Board shall develop a charge to articulate the need for an update to thea framework and to specify policy guidance, constraints (including but not limited to those imposed by the NAEP legislation), and any specific tensions to resolve in the development of framework recommendations. The Board charge shall explicitly address whether maintaining trends with assessment results from the previous framework should be prioritized above other factors. For NAEP Reading and Mathematics in particular, maintaining trends is expected to be highly prioritized in framework updates in the absence of exceptional circumstances.

~~f) At least once every 10 years, the Governing Board, through its ADC, shall review the relevance of assessments and their underlying frameworks. In the review, the ADC shall solicit input from experts to determine if changes are warranted, making clear the potential risk to trends and assessment of educational progress posed by changing frameworks. (The Board may decide based on the input that the framework does not require revision, or that the framework may require minor or substantive updates. To initiate updates, the ADC shall prepare a recommendation recommended charge for full Board approval. The Board charge also should explicitly indicate whether framework updates are intended to be minor, moderate, or major. The determination of the scope of the recommended updates shall be made in consultation with NCES with consideration to the operational impact of the intended changes.~~

~~—Minor updates shall have no or minimal impact to most assessment items or should address necessary revisions to accurately reflect how the framework has been operationalized in the assessment. It is assumed that minor updates should not pose significant threats to current trendlines.~~

- ~~• Minor updates may be carried out directly by the Content Advisory Group with additional contributors if desirable (see Principle 3).~~
- ~~• Moderate updates shall keep constant a significant portion of the current framework and assessment but may require that several existing items be discontinued and/or new items be created, such as to reflect important changes in the field. The extent to which maintaining trendlines is a primary goal for a moderate revision should be clearly articulated in the Board charge. Moderate updates shall be carried out by convening a Development Panel (see Principle 4).~~
- ~~• Major updates may retain some aspects of the current framework and assessment but will likely require extensive changes to some or most elements of the current framework and assessment items. Maintaining trendlines would not likely be a realistic priority for major updates. Major updates shall be carried out by convening a Development Panel (see Principle 4).~~

~~a) All frameworks and specification documents shall be subject to full Board approval regardless of the scope of the changes. With consideration of the policy and assessment issues in the content area, the Board shall develop a charge to articulate the need for an update to the framework and to specify policy guidance, constraints (including but not limited to those imposed by the NAEP legislation), and any specific tensions to resolve in the development of framework recommendations. The Board charge shall explicitly address whether maintaining trends with assessment results from the previous framework should be prioritized above other factors.~~

~~b) Within the 10-year period for an ADC review, major changes in the states' or nation's educational system may occur that relate to one or more NAEP frameworks. In this instance, the ADC will deliberate on whether such changes warrant an accelerated schedule of updates to a framework and may recommend that the Governing Board convene a Steering Panel to revise or replace the framework. Before framework panels are convened, special research and analysis may also be commissioned to inform the updates to be considered.~~

e)g) _____

- ~~If the Board charge directs a Steering Panel to recommend framework updates, then a subset of Steering Panel members shall continue as the Development Panel to develop the draft framework and assessment and item specifications, in accordance with *Principle 2*. Regular reports will be provided to the ADC and the recommended framework update shall be subject to full Board approval.~~
- ~~When a framework update is conducted, framework Steering and Development Panel recommendations shall describe the extent to which adjustments in the achievement level descriptions (see *I.a*) and contextual variables (see *I.b*) are needed. (See the Governing Board Policy on Achievement Levels and the Governing Board Policy on Collecting and Reporting Contextual Data for additional details.)~~

Principle 32: Development and Update Process for Minor Changes

The Governing Board shall carry out minor updates to frameworks in an efficient expedited manner while ensuring that the stakeholders listed in the Introduction section are engaged and informed of any minor impacts to the resulting assessments.

Guidelines

- Minor updates to a recommended framework and recommended assessment and item specifications (if necessary depending on the changes) shall be executed through a Content Advisory Group. The Governing Board will determine whether it is necessary to augment the Content Advisory Group with a few additional members, if specific expertise or viewpoints are needed to carry out the Board charge.
- The specific nature of the minor updates will determine the timeline and number of meetings necessary to prepare recommendations but it is anticipated that the full process for conducting most minor updates would be completed in no more than 6 months.
- External experts will be consulted throughout the revision process as appropriate.
- Outreach shall be undertaken to ensure that stakeholders understand any minor impacts to the assessments resulting from minor changes to frameworks. Outreach efforts shall directly engage all stakeholder groups identified in the Introduction section. The timing and form of the outreach will be determined by the specific nature of the intended updates.

Principle 4: Development and Update Process for Moderate and Major Changes

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

Guidelines

- a) ~~When the Board reviews a framework for potential updates (see *Principle 3*), Board deliberations shall begin by discussing Board discussion of a recommendation from a Content Advisory Group on whether to proceed with no change, minor updates, or major updates to a NAEP assessment framework should include major policy and assessment issues in the content area. Such issues shall be identified through the guidelines described in Principles 2a and 2b). may be identified through seeking and collecting public comment, as well as through engaging relevant content experts.~~
- b) ~~After considering policy and assessment issues in the content area, the Board shall develop a charge to articulate the need for an update to the framework and to specify policy guidance, constraints (including but not limited to those imposed by the NAEP legislation), and any specific tensions to resolve in the development of framework recommendations. The Board charge shall explicitly address whether maintaining trends with assessment results from the previous framework should be prioritized above other factors.~~
- e)a) Framework development and update processes shall be executed primarily via two panels: a Steering Panel with a subset of members continuing as the a Development Panel. This process shall result in two documents for Board consideration: a recommended framework and recommended assessment and item specifications. ~~For each framework,~~
- ~~*The Framework Steering Panel* shall formulate high-level guidance about the state of the field and how to implement the Board charge to inform the process. The major part of the Steering Panel work will be at the beginning to provide initial guidance for developing a recommended framework. The Steering Panel shall be comprised of the stakeholders referenced in the Introduction section. Twenty percent of this panel (6 members) shall be current classroom teachers in the subject areas under consideration. This panel may include up to 30 members with additional members as needed.~~
 - *The Framework Development Panel* shall develop drafts of the two project documents and engage in the detailed deliberations about how issues outlined in the Board charge and Steering Panel discussion guidance from the Content Advisory Group should be reflected in a recommended framework. ~~As a subset of the Steering Panel, the Development Panel shall have a proportionally higher representation of content experts and educators, whose expertise collectively addresses all grade levels designated for the assessment under development.~~ Fifteen percent of this panel (3 members) shall be current classroom teachers in the subject areas under consideration. Educators shall be drawn from schools across the nation, including individuals who work with students from high-poverty and low-performing schools, as well as public and private schools. This panel may include up to 20 members, with additional members as needed.
- d)b) The scope and size of a framework development project shall determine the size of framework panels~~the Development Panel~~ and the number of panel meetings needed. A framework update project may require a smaller panels and fewer meetings if a smaller

scope is anticipated for recommended revisions. Moderate updates are expected to require fewer meetings than major updates.

- e)c) A nominations process shall be used to seek broad input on recommendations for well-qualified individuals who represent diverse demographic characteristics, stakeholder groups, and perspectives on the key issues identified in the Board charge to the panels.
- d) From the pool of nominees, the Board will select those with the most outstanding content and education credentials to represent multiple perspectives on the key issues identified in the Board charge to the panels. The ADC shall review panelist nomination materials and recommend a slate of panelists, which shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.
- e) To ensure continuity of the process, ADC will carefully consider applications from individuals who have served on the Content Advisory Group, with the goal of having at least two individuals serve on both groups.
- f) The Development Panel will shall be led by a Panel Leadership Team consisting of three to four panelists who reflect a variety of roles, experiences, and viewpoints in the subject area. The Panel Leadership Team will facilitate Development Panel discussions and serve as panel representatives to the Governing Board.
- g) The process that the Development Ppanels employs to develop recommendations for new or updated frameworks shall be comprehensive in approach and conducted in an environment that is open, balanced, and even-handed. The Development Panels shall consider all viewpoints and debate all pertinent issues in formulating consensus recommendations on the content and design of a NAEP assessment, including findings from research. Reference materials shall represent multiple views.
- h) For each new or updated framework, protocols shall be established to support panel deliberations and to develop a unified proposal for the content and design of the assessment. Written summaries of all hearings, forums, surveys, and panel meetings—shall be made available in a timely manner to inform Board deliberations.
- i) The framework panelsDevelopment Panel shall consider a wide variety of resources during deliberations, including but not limited to relevant research, trends in state and local standards and assessments, use of previous NAEP results, curriculum guides, widely accepted professional standards, scientific research, other types of research studies in the literature, key reports having significant national and international interest, international standards and assessments, other assessment instruments in the content area, and prior NAEP frameworks, if available.
- h)i) A Technical Advisory Committee shall be convened to uphold the highest technical standards for development of the NAEP framework and specifications. As a resource to the framework panels, these experts shall respond to technical issues raised during panel deliberations.

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

~~j)l)~~ The Content Advisory Group in the relevant subject area shall be convened to provide feedback to the Development Panel throughout the process, including prior to seeking public comment, on how the initial recommendations are being implemented.

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

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

~~m)~~ _____

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

~~o)n)~~ _____

Principle **54**: Elements of Specifications

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

Guidelines

- a) The assessment and item specifications shall produce an assessment that is valid, reliable, and based on relevant widely accepted professional standards. The specifications shall also be consistent with Governing Board policies regarding NAEP design, such as groupings of items, test administration conditions, and accommodations for students with disabilities and English language learners. (See the Governing Board [Policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners](#)). The specifications shall be reviewed by technical experts involved in the process, prior to submission to the Governing Board.
- b) The primary audience for the specifications, or assessment blueprint, shall be NCES and the contractor(s) responsible for developing the assessment and the test questions.
- c) The specifications shall evolve from the framework and shall be written in sufficient detail so that item writers can develop high-quality questions based on the framework objectives for grades 4, 8, and 12, where applicable. The specifications shall include, but not be limited to detailed descriptions of:

- the content and process dimensions, including the weighting of those dimensions in the pool of questions at each grade;
 - types of items;
 - guidelines for stimulus material;
 - types of response formats;
 - scoring procedures;
 - achievement level descriptions;
 - administration conditions;
 - ancillary or additional materials, if any;
 - considerations for special populations;
 - sample items, including a substantial number and range of sample items with scoring guidelines for each grade level; and
 - any unique requirements for the given assessment.
- d) Special studies, if any, to be recommended in support of the framework shall be described in the specifications. This description shall provide an overview of the purpose and rationale for the study.

Principle **65**: Role of the Governing Board

The Governing Board, through its ADC, shall monitor all framework development and updates. The result of this process shall be recommendations for Governing Board action in the form of two key documents: the framework and assessment and item specifications.

Guidelines

- a) The ADC shall be responsible for monitoring framework development and updates that result in recommendations to the Governing Board on the content and format of each NAEP assessment. The ADC will provide direction to the ~~framework panels~~Development Panel, via Governing Board staff. This guidance shall ensure compliance with the NAEP law, Governing Board policies, Department of Education and government-wide regulations, and requirements of the contract(s) used to implement the framework project.
- b) In initiating a framework update, the Governing Board shall balance needs for stable reporting of student achievement trends against other Board priorities and requirements. Regarding when and how an adopted framework update will be implemented, the Board may consider the NAEP Assessment Schedule, cost and technical issues, and research and innovations to support possibilities for continuous trend reporting.
- c) When ~~the Board decides to launch a minor or moderate/major framework update~~a framework Steering Panel is to be convened, the ADC shall develop a charge for the ~~update panel~~, and the charge shall be subject to full Board approval ~~(See 2.b.)~~.
- d) The ADC shall review candidates for the Content Advisory Group and develop a recommended slate of advisors, and the recommendations shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.

- ~~d)e)~~ For moderate and major updates, ~~t~~The ADC shall review panelist nomination materials and develop a recommended slate of panelists, and the panelist recommendations shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.
- ~~e)f)~~ The ADC shall receive regular reports on the progress of framework development.
- ~~f)g)~~ The full Board shall receive periodic updates about how the Board charge is being implemented and any additional policy considerations that arise during the development process, including from public comment.
- ~~g)h)~~ At the conclusion of the framework development or update process, the Governing Board shall take final action on the recommended framework and specifications. The Governing Board shall make the final decision on the content and format of NAEP assessments. In addition to the panel recommendations, the Board may take into account other pertinent considerations on the domain and scope of what should be assessed, such as the broader policy context of assessment in the subject area under consideration.
- ~~h)i)~~ Following adoption by the Governing Board, the final framework and specifications shall be provided to NCES. These documents, which include the achievement level descriptions for *NAEP Basic*, *NAEP Proficient*, and *NAEP Advanced* and recommendations for contextual variables in the subject area, are provided to NCES to guide development of NAEP test questions and questionnaires.



Adopted: TBD

National Assessment Governing Board

Assessment Framework Development

Policy Statement

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

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

Introduction

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

Under provisions of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act of 2002 ([P.L. 107-279](#)), Congress authorized the Governing Board to continue its mandate for determining the content and format of valid and reliable assessments based on widely accepted technical and professional standards for test development and active participation of stakeholders. This mandate aligns with the purpose of NAEP, which is to provide fair and

accurate measurement of student academic achievement.

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

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

NAEP framework development shall be informed by a broad, balanced, and inclusive set of factors. Frameworks shall reflect current curricula and instruction, research regarding cognitive development and instruction, and the nation’s future needs and desirable levels of achievement. This delicate balance between “what is” and “what should be” is at the core of the NAEP framework development process.

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

In this process, involved stakeholders shall include:

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

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

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

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

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

Principles for Framework Development

Principle 1: Elements of Frameworks

Principle 2: Framework Monitoring Process and Initial Decision to Proceed with Framework Updates

Principle 3: Development and Update Process for Minor Changes

Principle 4: Development and Update Process for Moderate and Major Changes

Principle 5: Elements of Specifications

Principle 6: Role of the Governing Board

Guidelines for the Principles

Principle 1: Elements of Frameworks

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

Guidelines

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

Governing Board adoption, the framework shall be widely disseminated.

Principle 2: Framework Monitoring Process and Initial Decision to Proceed with Framework Updates

Regular monitoring of the NAEP subject areas and implications for NAEP assessment frameworks shall inform whether framework updates are needed to continue valid and reliable measurement of the content and cognitive processes reflected in evolving expectations of students.

Guidelines

- a) A Content Advisory Group in each NAEP subject area shall be convened at least once per year to reflect on current issues in the field (e.g., changes in the states' or nation's educational systems or new research) and potential implications (if any) for relevant NAEP assessment frameworks. Each Content Advisory Group shall be comprised of 10 content and policy experts, including educators with experience at the NAEP grade levels.
- b) When significant issues in a field are identified as having potential implications for a NAEP assessment framework, a Content Advisory Group may recommend research studies and other relevant information to be collected and/or synthesized for further consideration by the ADC.
- c) When a Content Advisory Group recommends that changes to a NAEP framework are needed, the ADC will deliberate on whether and when to recommend that the Governing Board proceed with updates to that framework.
- d) If a Content Advisory Group does not identify any issues in the field with potential implications for a NAEP framework within 10 years of previous updates to a framework, the Governing Board will consider seeking public comment on whether any changes are needed.
- e) With consideration of the policy and assessment issues in a content area, the Board shall develop a charge to articulate the need for an update to a framework and to specify policy guidance, constraints (including but not limited to those imposed by the NAEP legislation), and any specific tensions to resolve in the development of framework recommendations. The Board charge shall explicitly address whether maintaining trends with assessment results from the previous framework should be prioritized above other factors. For NAEP Reading and Mathematics in particular, maintaining trends is expected to be highly prioritized in framework updates in the absence of exceptional circumstances.
- f) The Board charge also should explicitly indicate whether framework updates are intended to be minor, moderate, or major. The determination of the scope of the recommended updates shall be made in consultation with NCES with consideration to the operational impact of the intended changes.

- *Minor updates* shall have no or minimal impact to most assessment items or should address necessary revisions to accurately reflect how the framework has been operationalized in the assessment. It is assumed that minor updates should not pose significant threats to current trendlines. Minor updates may be carried out directly by the Content Advisory Group with additional contributors if desirable (*see Principle 3*).
 - *Moderate updates* shall keep constant a significant portion of the current framework and assessment but may require that several existing items be discontinued and/or new items be created, such as to reflect important changes in the field. The extent to which maintaining trendlines is a primary goal for a moderate revision should be clearly articulated in the Board charge. Moderate updates shall be carried out by convening a Development Panel (*see Principle 4*).
 - *Major updates* may retain some aspects of the current framework and assessment but will likely require extensive changes to some or most elements of the current framework and assessment items. Maintaining trendlines would not likely be a realistic priority for major updates. Major updates shall be carried out by convening a Development Panel (*see Principle 4*).
- g) All frameworks and specification documents shall be subject to full Board approval regardless of the scope of the changes.

Principle 3: Development and Update Process for Minor Changes

The Governing Board shall carry out minor updates to frameworks in an expedited manner while ensuring that the stakeholders listed in the Introduction section are engaged and informed of any minor impacts to the resulting assessments.

Guidelines

- a) Minor updates to a recommended framework and recommended assessment and item specifications (if necessary depending on the changes) shall be executed through a Content Advisory Group. The Governing Board will determine whether it is necessary to augment the Content Advisory Group with a few additional members, if specific expertise or viewpoints are needed to carry out the Board charge.
- b) The specific nature of the minor updates will determine the timeline and number of meetings necessary to prepare recommendations but it is anticipated that the full process for conducting minor updates would be completed in no more than 6 months.
- c) External experts will be consulted throughout the revision process as appropriate.
- d) Outreach shall be undertaken to ensure that stakeholders understand any minor impacts to the assessments resulting from minor changes to frameworks. Outreach efforts shall directly engage all stakeholder groups identified in the Introduction section. The timing and form of the outreach will be determined by the specific nature of the intended updates.

Principle 4: Development and Update Process for Moderate and Major Changes

The Governing Board shall carry out moderate and major updates to frameworks through a comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative process that involves active participation of stakeholders listed in the Introduction section.

Guidelines

- a) Framework development and update processes shall be executed primarily via a Development Panel. This process shall result in two documents for Board consideration: a recommended framework and recommended assessment and item specifications.
 - *The Framework Development Panel* shall develop drafts of the two project documents and engage in the detailed deliberations about how issues outlined in the Board charge and guidance from the Content Advisory Group should be reflected in a recommended framework. Fifteen percent of this panel (3 members) shall be current classroom teachers in the subject areas under consideration. Educators shall be drawn from schools across the nation, including individuals who work with students from high-poverty and low-performing schools, as well as public and private schools. This panel may include up to 20 members, with additional members as needed.
- b) The scope and size of a framework development project shall determine the size of the Development Panel and the number of panel meetings needed. A framework update project may require a smaller panel and fewer meetings if a smaller scope is anticipated for recommended revisions. Moderate updates are expected to require fewer meetings than major updates.
- c) A nominations process shall be used to seek broad input on recommendations for well-qualified individuals who represent diverse demographic characteristics, stakeholder groups, and perspectives on the key issues identified in the Board charge to the panel.
- d) From the pool of nominees, the Board will select those with the most outstanding content and education credentials to represent multiple perspectives on the key issues identified in the Board charge to the panel. The ADC shall review panelist nomination materials and recommend a slate of panelists, which shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.
- e) To ensure continuity of the process, ADC will carefully consider applications from individuals who have served on the Content Advisory Group, with the goal of having at least two individuals serve on both groups.
- f) The Development Panel shall be led by a Panel Leadership Team consisting of three to four panelists who reflect a variety of roles, experiences, and viewpoints in the subject area. The Panel Leadership Team will facilitate Development Panel discussions and serve as panel representatives to the Governing Board.
- g) The process that the Development Panel employs to develop recommendations for new or updated frameworks shall be comprehensive in approach and conducted in an environment

that is open, balanced, and even-handed. The Development Panel shall consider all viewpoints and debate all pertinent issues in formulating consensus recommendations on the content and design of a NAEP assessment, including findings from research. Reference materials shall represent multiple views.

- h) For each new or updated framework, protocols shall be established to support panel deliberations and to develop a unified proposal for the content and design of the assessment. Written summaries of all hearings, forums, surveys, and panel meetings shall be made available in a timely manner to inform Board deliberations.
- i) The Development Panel shall consider a wide variety of resources during deliberations, including but not limited to relevant research, trends in state and local standards and assessments, use of previous NAEP results, curriculum guides, widely accepted professional standards, scientific research, other types of research studies in the literature, key reports having significant national and international interest, international standards and assessments, other assessment instruments in the content area, and prior NAEP frameworks, if available.
- j) A Technical Advisory Committee shall be convened to uphold the highest technical standards for development of the NAEP framework and specifications. As a resource to the framework panels, these experts shall respond to technical issues raised during panel deliberations.
- k) An Educator Advisory Committee shall be convened to include additional practitioners in the framework development process. As a resource to the framework panels, these practitioners shall provide meaningful consultation on issues raised during panel deliberations that need input from those in the field teaching the subjects being assessed.
- l) The Content Advisory Group in the relevant subject area shall be convened to provide feedback to the Development Panel throughout the process, including prior to seeking public comment, on how the initial recommendations are being implemented.
- m) Public comment shall be sought from a broad array of stakeholders and interested members of the public to reflect multiple perspectives on the draft framework recommendations that have been developed. Outreach efforts should directly engage all stakeholder groups identified in the Introduction section.
- n) If the Development Panel or the Board cannot reach consensus on key issues in the framework, the Board may decide to seek further stakeholder input such as through additional public comment and/or independent reviews by content experts on a framework that has been significantly revised following an earlier public comment period. The Board shall determine whether and how any further revisions to a framework shall be made.

Principle 5: Elements of Specifications

The specifications document shall be developed for use by the National Center for

Education Statistics (NCES) as the blueprint for constructing the NAEP assessment and items.

Guidelines

- a) The assessment and item specifications shall produce an assessment that is valid, reliable, and based on relevant widely accepted professional standards. The specifications shall also be consistent with Governing Board policies regarding NAEP design, such as groupings of items, test administration conditions, and accommodations for students with disabilities and English language learners. (See the Governing Board [Policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners](#)). The specifications shall be reviewed by technical experts involved in the process, prior to submission to the Governing Board.
- b) The primary audience for the specifications, or assessment blueprint, shall be NCES and the contractor(s) responsible for developing the assessment and the test questions.
- c) The specifications shall evolve from the framework and shall be written in sufficient detail so that item writers can develop high-quality questions based on the framework objectives for grades 4, 8, and 12, where applicable. The specifications shall include, but not be limited to detailed descriptions of:
 - the content and process dimensions, including the weighting of those dimensions in the pool of questions at each grade;
 - types of items;
 - guidelines for stimulus material;
 - types of response formats;
 - scoring procedures;
 - achievement level descriptions;
 - administration conditions;
 - ancillary or additional materials, if any;
 - considerations for special populations;
 - sample items, including a substantial number and range of sample items with scoring guidelines for each grade level; and
 - any unique requirements for the given assessment.
- d) Special studies, if any, to be recommended in support of the framework shall be described in the specifications. This description shall provide an overview of the purpose and rationale for the study.

Principle 6: Role of the Governing Board

The Governing Board, through its ADC, shall monitor all framework development and updates. The result of this process shall be recommendations for Governing Board action in the form of two key documents: the framework and assessment and item

specifications.

Guidelines

- a) The ADC shall be responsible for monitoring framework development and updates that result in recommendations to the Governing Board on the content and format of each NAEP assessment. The ADC will provide direction to the Development Panel, via Governing Board staff. This guidance shall ensure compliance with the NAEP law, Governing Board policies, Department of Education and government-wide regulations, and requirements of the contract(s) used to implement the framework project.
- b) In initiating a framework update, the Governing Board shall balance needs for stable reporting of student achievement trends against other Board priorities and requirements. Regarding when and how an adopted framework update will be implemented, the Board may consider the NAEP Assessment Schedule, cost and technical issues, and research and innovations to support possibilities for continuous trend reporting.
- c) When the Board decides to launch a minor or moderate/major framework update, the ADC shall develop a charge for the update, and the charge shall be subject to full Board approval.
- d) The ADC shall review candidates for the Content Advisory Group and develop a recommended slate of advisors, and the recommendations shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.
- e) For moderate and major updates, the ADC shall review panelist nomination materials and develop a recommended slate of panelists, and the panelist recommendations shall be subject to Executive Committee approval.
- f) The ADC shall receive regular reports on the progress of framework development.
- g) The full Board shall receive periodic updates about how the Board charge is being implemented and any additional policy considerations that arise during the development process, including from public comment.
- h) At the conclusion of the framework development or update process, the Governing Board shall take final action on the recommended framework and specifications. The Governing Board shall make the final decision on the content and format of NAEP assessments. In addition to the panel recommendations, the Board may take into account other pertinent considerations on the domain and scope of what should be assessed, such as the broader policy context of assessment in the subject area under consideration.
- i) Following adoption by the Governing Board, the final framework and specifications shall be provided to NCES. These documents, which include the achievement level descriptions for *NAEP Basic*, *NAEP Proficient*, and *NAEP Advanced* and recommendations for contextual variables in the subject area, are provided to NCES to guide development of NAEP test questions and questionnaires.

Update on Social Studies Content Advisory Group

August 8, 2024

Goal

The goal of this session is to provide a brief update of the current status and next steps for the Social Studies Content Advisory Group.

Overview

Over the past several years, the Board has sought to make continuous improvements to the process of updating NAEP assessment frameworks. A revised policy for [Assessment Framework Development](#) was adopted in March 2022 and successfully implemented with the 2028 NAEP Science Assessment Framework.

The Board has continued to discuss potential improvements to the existing policy and procedures for updating NAEP frameworks, including a goal of making smaller, more frequent updates rather than occasional large changes. The Assessment Development Committee has discussed the idea of using a standing group of subject matter experts, known as a Content Advisory Group, to implement a nimbler process by monitoring the current state of research and practice in a field and potential implications for NAEP assessment frameworks.

Since the next NAEP frameworks scheduled to be updated are the 2030 NAEP U.S. History and Civics Assessment Frameworks, the Social Studies Content Advisory Group was created to serve as a proof of concept for potential changes to the framework development process generally. This group is intended to help synthesize current research and practice and make recommendations to inform the Board charges for the next two scheduled assessment framework updates in U.S. History and Civics.

The NAEP Social Studies Content Advisory Group consists of the following individuals:

Paul Carrese, Arizona State University; The Jack Miller Center

Louise Dube, iCivics

LaGarrett King, University of Buffalo, Center for K-12 Black History and Racial Literacy Education

Peter Levine, Tufts University

Freda Lin, YURI Education Project; National Council for History Education Board of Directors

Connie López-Fink, University School of Nashville; Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History

Amber Northern, Thomas B. Fordham Institute; Virginia State Board of Education

Francis O'Malley, University of Delaware; CCSSO Social Studies Collaborative

Alex Red Corn, The University of Kansas; Kansas Association for Native American Education

Sharon Thorne-Green, Katy Independent School District; National Council for Social Studies Board of Directors

Planned activities for this phase of the work include an orientation session and four half-day meetings. The orientation took place in mid-June and the half-day meetings have been scheduled for: late August, mid-October, mid-December, and mid-January.

Background

During the last several Board meetings, the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) discussed the idea of reviewing NAEP assessment frameworks more regularly with the goal of making smaller changes on a more frequent basis. During the May 2023 ADC meeting, Sharyn Rosenberg noted that there is value in implementing a more systematic process for monitoring frameworks on a regular basis, including but not limited to the original goal of making smaller, more gradual changes to frameworks.

The work that precedes the official launch of a framework update has typically been done on an ad hoc basis; panels of experts are not convened until after the Board issues a formal charge and a contract is awarded. However, much of the initial work (e.g., research on how a NAEP framework compares to state standards, public comment on whether and how the current framework should be changed, consultant papers, panelist nomination process) could benefit from oversight by experts knowledgeable about a current NAEP framework and content and policy issues in a given subject. Content Advisory Groups could engage in a coherent and systematic process for monitoring changes to a field and potential implications for NAEP frameworks. These groups could help oversee and synthesize the “pre-work” that precedes an official framework launch and make initial recommendations to the Board about whether and how a framework should be updated.

ADC and Board leadership discussed and agreed to a staff proposal for convening a Social Studies Content Advisory Group beginning in spring 2024 to serve as a proof of concept and provide advice to Board members and staff on preparing for the next scheduled updates of the NAEP U.S. History and Civics Frameworks. This group will provide input on what information and research to gather to inform the framework updates and how to navigate content, policy, and other issues to inform the initial Board charge to framework panels for these subjects. Since the current Board policy is silent on how the pre-work is carried out, this will serve as an opportunity to try out a new approach for the initial stages of the work before fully committing to changing the policy to describe the role of Content Advisory Groups.

The Social Studies Content Advisory Group includes 10 consultants with expertise in United States history and/or civics, some of whom have previous experience working with NAEP frameworks and/or assessments in these subjects. Members represent a diverse range of policy and political perspectives, demographic characteristics, and experience at the elementary and secondary levels. Individuals were invited to participate in the Social Studies Content Advisory Group following review and discussion by the Assessment Development Committee and the Executive Committee.

Overview of NAEP Long-Term Trend

Goal

The goal for this brief agenda item is to inform Assessment Development Committee members about recent discussions related to the content of the NAEP Long-Term Trend (LTT) assessments.

Overview

Sharyn Rosenberg will provide a brief update of recent discussions between Governing Board and NCES staff, along with anticipated next steps.

Background

For over five decades, beginning in 1971, the Long-Term Trend (LTT) NAEP has assessed nationally representative cohorts of students age 9, 13, and 17 in reading and mathematics. LTT reading started in 1971, with mathematics following in 1973. The LTT assessments reflect mathematics and reading curricular expectations from an earlier era. While the assessments evolved in the 1970s and 1980s to reflect curriculum changes in the nation's schools, it is possible to report trends back to the early 1970s. In the 2022-23 school year, the National Center for Education Statistics and the National Assessment Governing Board released both [LTT results](#) and [Main NAEP results](#).

The LTT, a paper-based assessment, primarily uses multiple-choice questions with a few short answer questions. On the reading LTT assessment, a few questions require an extended answer. No ancillary materials, e.g., calculators or manipulatives, are provided for LTT. Students with disabilities (SD) and English language learners (EL) take the assessment and are included using the same participation guidelines and with the same accommodations (as needed) in Main NAEP. LTT results are reported at the national level only as average scores, score changes over time, and at five performance levels, i.e., 150 points vs. 200 points.

Main NAEP includes results that represent not only the nation but also 53 states/jurisdictions and 27 urban districts which volunteer to participate in the Trial Urban District Assessment program, or TUDA. Main NAEP is administered every two years to fourth- and eighth-graders in reading and mathematics and every four years (or less frequently) to the same grades in other academic subjects, such as civics, U.S. history, and science. Twelfth-graders take the reading and math assessments every four years, and their results are reported only at the national level. Main NAEP provides results in terms of average scores, score changes, and achievement levels, as set by

the Governing Board, i.e., *NAEP Proficient*. The table below presents high-level differences between the two programs, with a more detailed comparison [here](#).

Key Differences Between LTT and Main NAEP

	NAEP Long-Term Trend	Main NAEP
First assessment years	Mathematics: 1973 Reading: 1971	Mathematics: 1990 Reading: 1992
Content	Relatively unchanged over time	Changes about every decade to reflect curricular changes
Student groups	Ages 9, 13, 17	Grades 4, 8, 12
Reporting	National only	Nation, States, Urban Districts (Grades 4 & 8)
Delivery mode	Paper-based	Digitally-based since 2017