

**National Assessment Governing Board  
Reporting and Dissemination Committee  
Joint Session with Assessment and Development Committee  
March 6, 2015, 10:00am – 10:45am**

**Attendees:**

**Assessment Development Committee (ADC) Members:** Chair Shannon Garrison, Vice Chair Cary Sneider, Frank Fernandes, Dale Nowlin, Chasidy White

**Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee Members:** Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon, Tonya Matthews, Tonya Miles, Ronnie Musgrove, Anitere Flores

**Other Board Members:** Board Chair Terry Mazany

**Governing Board Staff:** Mary Crovo, Michelle Blair, Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Anthony White

**NCES:** Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr, Gina Broxterman, Samantha Burg, Jamie Deaton, Arnold Goldstein, Emmanuel Sikali, Holly Spurlock, Ebony Walton, Bill Ward, Grady Wilburn

**Contractors:** Fen Chou (Council of Chief State School Officers); Jonas Bertling, Jay Campbell, Robert Finnegan, Rebecca Moran, Lisa Ward (ETS); Valerie Marrapodi, Amy Buckley (Reingold); Brian Cramer (Optimal); Alka Arora, Markus Broer, Cadelle Hemphill, Fran Stancavage (American Institutes for Research); David Hoff, Joanne Lim (Hager Sharp); Monica Gribben, Steve Sellman (HumRRO); Connie Smith (Pearson); Edward Wofford (CRP)

---

The Reporting and Dissemination Committee and Assessment Development Committee met to review and discuss reporting plans for the NAEP 2014 Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Assessment. Reporting and Dissemination Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon assumed the role of acting chair for the Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee, because R&D Committee Chair Alonso could not attend the Board Meeting.

**Joint Session with ADC on TEL Reporting**

Acting R&D Chair Rebecca Gagnon welcomed Assessment Development Committee (ADC) members to the joint session, and ADC Chair Shannon Garrison invited ADC Committee Vice Chair Cary Sneider to introduce the TEL assessment, which was administered in Winter 2014 to a national sample of eighth-graders and is planned for release in October 2015.

Mr. Sneider extolled the innovative items in the TEL assessment, especially the digital tasks and the Scenario-Based Tasks (SBT), and the exciting opportunities for rich and innovative reporting therein. He recommended that the R&D Committee collaborate with ADC on reporting and that the 2009 Science Assessment's Interactive Computing Tasks (ICTs) reporting should serve as a model: [http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/science\\_2009/ict\\_indepth.asp](http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/science_2009/ict_indepth.asp)

He explained that, like in the ICT reporting, the TEL reporting website should guide the audience first to complete a sample released item to learn the nature, scope, and meaning of the TEL assessment. Without this direct interaction with the SBTs and the TEL itself, the audience will find the report difficult to understand; reporting a scale score of 150 will not engage visitors. Mr. Sneider also urged members to consider how to facilitate teachers' use of the TEL assessment results and how to extend the report's dissemination beyond the initial release.

Following Mr. Sneider, NCES staff member Emmanuel Sikali presented the draft TEL reporting plan. The current NCES plans offer site visitors an option "...to experience the task as students did..." as the third step in the proposed website. Committee members, led by ADC Committee Chair Garrison, urged NCES to revise this strategy. Echoing Mr. Sneider's concerns, Ms. Garrison and several members noted that if this interactive activity comes too late during users' journey through the report, and TEL Framework information is presented too early, users will fail to perceive the rich and important data from this exciting new assessment.

Thus, the joint committees' preferred structure for the TEL release website is:

- 1) Lead users through completing an item, with visuals;
- 2) Show what skill the item is assessing, the user's score, and students' scores;
- 3) Present student responses and performance (through percent correct, etc.); and
- 4) Highlight links to the TEL Framework and more in-depth data on the assessment

R&D member Tonya Matthews suggested that NCES rework the current plans for the click paths stemming from the release website's landing page. The site instead should offer tailored paths through the website for various audiences, such as those interested in assessment development data, those interested in examining achievement gaps, those interested in trying out the test items, and other perspectives.

After Mr. Sikali outlined the general strategy for TEL reporting, Jonas Bertling of ETS shared information on the new indices from the contextual variables. Relating the TEL assessment results to the contextual variables intrigued the Committee members, who emphatically encouraged a more prominent placement for these analyses in the reporting plans. The TEL assessment aligns well with the new indices on:

- 1) Student self-efficacy;

- 2) In-school learning opportunities for activities in Design and Systems;
- 3) Out-of-school learning opportunities for activities in Design and Systems;
- 4) In-school learning opportunities for activities in Technology and Society;
- 5) Out-of-school learning opportunities for activities in Technology and Society; and
- 6) Information and Communication Technology

The Committee members universally welcomed the bubble charts for each of these six indices and urged Mr. Bertling to present similar charts based on correlational analyses between these indices and subgroup data, especially gender and race/ethnicity. Mr. Bertling expressed concern that these indices are not ready for such reporting. However, the Committee strongly encouraged him to find a reliable and valid means to present correlations between the contextual variable indices and demographic characteristics. Especially considering the focus of TEL, questions about the gender gap as well as differences by race/ethnicity on indices of self-efficacy and interest in technology and society should be spotlighted. Breaking down indices by subgroup is critical to include, as are clearer instructions to accompany the richly informative bubble charts.

Finally, Ms. Matthews urged the R&D Committee as well as NCES to strategize now on how to shape the associations most of the audience will draw between the TEL findings and STEM pipeline issues. In addition, members from both Committees encouraged NCES to tap the reporting potential of the data on students' click streams, time spent on each task, and performance on each of the SBT elements, which especially will benefit educators.

NCES staff discussed next steps, including building a timeline within the context of the provided recommendations. This concluded the joint committee meeting, and the ADC members returned to their conference room. After a brief break, R&D Committee members reconvened to address the rest of their agenda.

---

**National Assessment Governing Board  
Reporting and Dissemination Committee  
March 6, 2015, 10:50am – 12:30pm**

**Attendees:**

Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee Members: Vice Chair Rebecca Gagnon, Tonya Matthews, Tonya Miles, Ronnie Musgrove, Anitere Flores

Other Board Members: Board Chair Terry Mazany

Governing Board Staff: Stephaan Harris, Laura LoGerfo, Anthony White

NCES: Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr, Gina Broxterman, Jamie Deaton, Arnold Goldstein, Dan McGrath, Emmanuel Sikali, Ebony Walton, Grady Wilburn

Contractors: Jonas Bertling, Lisa Ward (ETS); Valerie Marrapodi, Amy Buckley (Reingold); Cadelle Hemphill (American Institutes for Research); David Hoff (Hager Sharp); Steve Sellman (HumRRO); Edward Wofford (CRP)

**Release of Civics, U.S. History, and Geography Report Cards**

The Committee reviewed a release plan for the upcoming 2014 NAEP grade 8 national results in U.S. history, civics, and geography, slated to be released in April 2015. Stephaan Harris, Governing Board staff, provided an overview of the plan. The plan calls for all three reports to be released via webinar with results issued live simultaneously on one report site with separate sections for each subject.

The webinar will feature a panel with results presented by Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr and statements from a Governing Board member and at least one expert in social studies.

Mr. Harris explained the plans for three separate subject-focused post-release events, which could include a webinar or a presentation at a national conference, in order to provide more attention and opportunity for collaboration with the strong communities in each subject area.

Arnold Goldstein, NCES staff, said that a draft report site should be available for Committee review sometime in the next week (week of March 9, 2015).

**ACTION: Acting Chair Gagnon made a motion for approval of the plan, which the Committee unanimously approved and moved to send to the full Board for action on Saturday, March 7, 2015.**

## **Focused Reports**

Over the last several years, Board members and staff have called for or suggested papers on various topics to inform Board policy decisions. Board staff member Laura LoGerfo presented a list of these topics to R&D Committee members to elicit feedback on what topics may warrant further pursuit. There are two primary goals for these Focused Reports: (1) To harness NAEP's unique capacity as a nationally representative assessment of academic achievement that can produce high-impact special reports on critical educational issues and practices; (2) To highlight the potential for rich analysis of NAEP data, including available contextual variables.

The Committee offered feedback on the presented topics and suggested additional topics for consideration. Ms. Miles responded first by describing a question that has piqued her interest: What would NAEP results—and achievement gaps—look like if all facets of students' and schools' experiences were “peeled back like an onion?” More complete contextual information about schools and their communities could help citizens more fully understand test results and more accurately interpret assessment data.

Ms. Matthews endorsed the idea of fostering cross-state collaborations through producing regional analyses to which Mr. Mazany added that the Federal Reserve Board could prove an interesting resource to supplement or complement analyses by region, because the Federal Reserve System operates in twelve regions. Ms. Flores suggested that these regional analyses could be merged with the “spotlight” report to highlight what high-performing states are doing by region and thus bolster the work's relevance and import. Mr. Musgrove demurred on the regional analysis concept and asked others to justify the regional emphasis. He explained that his “region loves to regionalize,” which allows his state to rationalize a lower standard because their regional neighbors are at a lower standard. Ms. Matthews understood Mr. Musgrove's caution and posited an alternate view, in that some regions consider themselves exceptions due to region-based challenges, when they should be striving to attain higher goals. In sum, any pursuit of a regional analysis must avoid promoting provincialism and exceptionalism.

Ms. Flores wondered whether ‘typical’ schools still exist, considering the widely different approaches taken by different schools, sectors, and regions. The Committee also discussed how changes in school systems' organizational designs—including the rising prominence of school choice generally and charter schools specifically—may map onto NAEP results. Peggy Carr noted that though NAEP includes a representative sample of charter schools in grades 4 and 8, such schools are clustered, so the weighting becomes more complex. But the data can be analyzed by charter and non-charter schools.

Mr. Mazany asked how any work undertaken with NAEP data can enrich the anticipated conversation that will emerge around Robert Putnam's new book, “Our Kids.” This research

synthesis issues a purple policy option (not red Republican or blue Democrat but truly bipartisan) to combat socioeconomic inequality through (1) high quality early childhood education; (2) stable and caring families; (3) mentoring programs; and (4) on-ramps to higher education. Several R&D Committee members agreed that delving more deeply into achievement gaps and crossing the subgroup data (i.e., gender and race/ethnicity) should be a persistent priority for the Board given the wealth of NAEP data.

Committee members Flores, Matthews, Miles, and Musgrove proposed a new research concept: an in-depth analysis of NAEP data with state, district, and school per-pupil-expenditure data, which Acting Commissioner Carr shared with the full Board during her NCES update. Members asked what resources absorb the expenditures, where the funding actually goes, and how those resources may be associated with achievement data.

The entire Committee agreed that many of the ten listed ideas are complementary and could be merged into fewer yet stronger, more robust papers. The productive discussion, which included emailed commentary from Committee Chair Alonso, yielded several distinct priorities to pursue as potential research topics:

1. An examination of NAEP results by region could be integrated with the potential spotlight report (highlighting practices common to high-performing or strong-growth districts), which could be examined within the context of understanding subgroup differences (the "crossing the gaps" topic).
2. The topics involving charter schools and private schools could be reorganized into a paper considering NAEP data within the context of school choice and opportunity.
3. Analyses centered on exploring NAEP data by multiple demographic factors ("crossing the gaps") could represent a recurring underlying theme through several papers. This theme could be the foundation for a paper analyzing in-school and out-of-school learning opportunities and the role of parent involvement in these opportunities as well as educational experiences conceived more broadly.
4. Analysis of district and school pupil expenditure data with NAEP data.

Board staff member Laura LoGerfo will elaborate the highest priority topics to support Committee members' decision-making on what should merit funding this year, a topic for the May meeting agenda. Towards the conclusion of the lively discussion, Tonya Matthews proposed highlighting the ten most interesting ways researchers have used NAEP data to draw attention to extant work and to remind stakeholders and the public that 'data is for thinking.' There was strong support among the Committee for Ms. Matthews' proposal.

### **Contextual Variables**

The meeting then turned to Board staff member Stephaan Harris, who sought R&D Committee members' preferences on how to begin reviewing findings from cognitive labs for contextual variables. These findings will be presented to the Committee for review April 30 to feed discussion at the May meeting of the R&D Committee. However, to allow for a rich discussion in person at the May meeting, R&D members should review the findings ahead of time. What is the best approach to facilitate this preliminary review?

The Committee concluded that meeting via a brief 30-minute phone call in the first week of May would help solidify members' initial reactions to the findings and help streamline the discussion at the May Committee meeting.

During the discussion of contextual data, Mr. Musgrove urged the R&D Committee to consider how to shape the narrative the Common Core assessments will bring to the public's attention. As Mr. Mazany noted, the conversation has shifted from anticipating that the PARCC and SBAC assessments will make NAEP redundant to even more firmly establishing NAEP as the essential benchmark with which all other assessments will be compared. Ms. Miles echoed ADC Vice Chair Sneider's urging that TEL reporting may be a lynchpin in the conversation about the advantages and disadvantages of testing, and it is critical to forecast how a report will be received and used; not preparing answers to anticipated questions may raise problems.

### **Governing Board Strategic Planning**

The remaining time in the Committee meeting centered on Mr. Mazany's call to consider R&D's mission within the strategic planning conversation. To this end, the Committee members tackled the critical questions R&D must face: (1) How can the Board extend the message from a report after an initial release? and (2) How can the Board use these data to create a conversation?

Rebecca Gagnon drew attention to the way in which Ms. Miles characterized R&D's engagement with the public, students, educators, and policymakers: awareness, access, accountability. To these three 'a' words, Ms. Gagnon added "action," so that the Board can clarify to the public why the Board focuses its resources in a given direction. Other members agreed and suggested a dissemination strategy after the debut release which would include sub-releases on specific subject areas or on particular subgroups and/or school contexts. Each report would be coupled with exemplars and spotlights to extend exposure in the public conversation.

Ms. Miles questioned how R&D could engage students, explaining to them what NAEP does and what NAEP tells them about their educational experiences. Ms. Gagnon concurred and elaborated that messaging to students is critically valuable and should not underestimate students' savvy. Many opt-out testing advocates use students by asking them to distribute opt-out forms to their peers. Students want their voices heard yet based on Ms. Gagnon's work with

schools and students, they seek deeper conversations that transcend negative messages about tests. Few students dislike low-stakes testing or opt out of taking the ACT, because they want to attend college, so their thinking does not dwell in starkly contrasted positions for or against testing. Mr. Mazany agreed with Ms. Gagnon and noted that the Frameworks Institute paper in the Board materials critiqued the traditional messaging in education which exacerbates extant polarizing conflict and tensions, a frame that NAEP reporting and dissemination strategies must avoid and prevent.

Ms. Miles concluded the discussion by highly praising the NCES staff for setting an ambitious release schedule.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rebecca Gagnon", enclosed within a thin black rectangular border.

---

Acting Chair Rebecca Gagnon