

# **National Assessment Governing Board**

## **Reporting and Dissemination Committee**

### **Report of February 28, 2014**

**Attendees:** Committee Members – Chairman Andres Alonso, Vice Chair Terry Mazany, Aniterre Flores, Rebecca Gagnon, Tonya Miles, and Father Joseph O’Keefe; Governing Board Staff – Larry Feinberg, Stephaan Harris, and Tisha Phillips; NCES – Gina Broxterman, James Deaton, Arnold Goldstein, Michael Moles, Stephen Provasnik, and Emmanuel Sikali; AIR – Brittany Cunningham and Cadelle Hamphill; ETS – Debby Almonte, Jonas Bertling, Amy Drescher and Lisa Ward; Pearson – Connie Smith; HagerSharp – Debra Silimeo, David Hoff and James Elias; Fulcrum Co. – Saira Brenner; Reingold – Amy Buckley, Erin Fenn, Sarah Johnson, and Valerie Marrapodi; Westat – Chris Averett; HumRRO – Steve Sellman; CRP – Shawnell Bailey and Jasmine Fletcher; Texas Education Agency – Lizzette Reynolds; Consultant – Alan Ginsburg; Former Board Member – Mark Musick

#### **1. Board Input into 2014 NAEP Reports: U.S. History, Civics, and Geography**

The committee continued its discussion on having earlier, big-picture input into NAEP reports in order to provide a more meaningful role for the Governing Board in report development. Stephaan Harris, of the NAGB staff, said one method suggested by NCES and NAGB staff for achieving this goal would be a pre-data discussion of upcoming reports to get ideas from committee members on areas and topics that should be highlighted. Mr. Harris said the three 2014 NAEP social science reports—Geography, Civics, and U.S. History—were on the agenda as a starting point for this type of discussion. Mr. Harris added that this feedback endeavor was illustrated when the committee participated in a conference call with NAGB and NCES staff the previous week on an outline of the upcoming NAEP Black Male report. Members gave feedback on the outline, prepared by NCES, of the report to be released this fall

Members discussed overall concerns and ideas for reports and release strategies, rather than specific reports. Committee Chair Andres Alonso said it would be important to see iterations of data earlier in the development of various reports as numbers trigger questions on report content and the messages to be communicated. Mr. Alonso said making linkages between contextual variables and achievement data should be an important part of NAEP reporting. Larry Feinberg, of the NAGB staff, suggested there could be secondary reports focusing on specific contextual variables of interest.

Vice Chair Terry Mazany said the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary event underscored the idea that NAEP reports should be more impactful and innovative, which the current report structure does not necessarily achieve. He said the methods of feedback suggested by NAGB and NCES staff were not sufficient, and that conceptual framing is needed to elevate NAEP in a dense media landscape. He cited the example of the NAEP finding that average black student performance now equals that of

white students 20 years ago. Mr. Mazany said it is important to use such data to spark conversation and action.

Member Joseph O’Keefe said a lot much of the Board’s responsibility will be thinking about the “so what?” when it comes to NAEP, adding that the Board has to heighten interest in reports and battle public skepticism of government. Member Rebecca Gagnon said it is important to talk about progress as well as constructively on the negative. She added that the question becomes does NAEP reporting mask the real stories.

Member Tonya Miles said the Board could benefit from a crash course on how to report data to provoke stimulating discussion, instead of shutting down that discussion.

Chair Alonso recommended that over the next three months, members have conversations on individual reports, like its conference call on the outline of the upcoming NAEP Black Male report, and ascertain decision points where members can weigh in. He also proposed developing a hierarchal timeline on report feedback and release, and thinking about such things as linking to other publications that are telling a relevant story. Mr. Alonso said NCES should provide the Board with an outline of each upcoming report.

## **2. Contextual Questionnaire Modules**

Jamie Deaton, of NCES, and Jonas Bertling, of ETS, briefed the Committee on efforts underway to prepare groups of contextual questions called modules that can be summarized into indices on important factors related to academic achievement. This approach is consistent with Governing Board policy expressed in the resolution on NAEP background questions, adopted in August 2012, and in the *NAEP Contextual Information Framework* that was updated by the Board at its last meeting in December 2013. It also makes use of the approach recommended to the Board by consultants Marshall Smith and Alan Ginsburg in their report on using NAEP to produce key education indicators that was presented at the December meeting.

Mr. Deaton said having multiple questions on the same topic would create broader, more meaningful indicators than the single items on which NAEP has reported in the past. Aggregating questions into an index also would minimize the effect of the wording of any single question. He said modules and indices are widely used in reporting on contextual factors in international assessments, such as TIMSS and PISA, and on the Gallup student poll.

The following topics are under consideration for modules in the core contextual questionnaires to be used in all subjects:

- Socio-economic status (SES)—a composite of parent education, occupation, and income or wealth. The factor now used for poverty status, eligibility for free- or reduced-priced lunch, has become problematic because of program expansions, providing subsidized meals to all students in high-poverty schools and districts.
- School climate, which may include safety, discipline, absenteeism, and students' feelings toward their school.

- Grit, which may include perseverance and self-control. This factor might be measured through responses to vignettes and self-reported behavior in different situations.
- Need for cognition, which seeks to measure student curiosity and motivation to learn.
- Technology use, including access, familiarity, and interest in computers or other information technology equipment.

Other modules will be developed on subject-specific questionnaires. Data on out-of-school learning activities may be collected in both the core and subject-specific contextual questionnaires but no module focused on this topic is planned.

Mr. Deaton said considerable work has already been done on socio-economic status, including a study by an expert panel and additional questions on household composition and possessions in the home that were administered in 2013. He said there would be a special study of about 4,000 fourth-graders in 2015 comparing student responses on a supplemental NAEP questionnaire to data from their parents gathered through the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, another NCES survey. A module for creating an SES index would probably be added to NAEP in 2017.

Mr. Deaton said a module on technology use probably would be administered in 2015 to a limited sample as part of preparations for the transition to computer-delivered assessments in reading and mathematics in 2017. A third module may also be added in 2017. Mr. Deaton said NCES believes the highest priority among the remaining three topics should be school climate but choosing which to include in the 2017 assessment may be a decision for the Governing Board.

Vice Chair Terry Mazany said it would be important to develop a framework showing the research evidence that supports the relationship to student achievement of any topic being considered. Mr. Alonso said there also should be a larger framework of topics associated with student achievement that the Board could use to judge any topic proposed in relation to what else could be reported.

Member Anitere Flores said creating the modules would be an important development for NAEP. But she cautioned that in dealing with non-cognitive factors it would be better to ask specific questions about behavior rather than attitudes, which are subject to exaggeration and to having respondents give the expected "right" answer.

Mr. Bertling said some of the questions used to create various indices in PISA might be used in NAEP. Alan Ginsburg, a Board consultant, said consideration should be given to creating indices on a broader range of topics, such as teacher quality and curriculum, as recommended in the report to the board he prepared with Marshall Smith.

Committee chair Alonso asked NCES to provide a timeline with decision points for Board and committee action. He said development of the modules should be a topic on the agenda of a committee teleconference before the next regular meeting in May. Holly Spurlock, of NCES, said

the committee would be able to review three iterations of specific modules and their questions: in late spring of this year before cognitive labs, next fall before piloting in 2015, and during 2016 before the operational assessments of 2017.

### **3. Release Plans for NAEP Reports: Grade 4 Computer-Based Writing and Grade 12 Reading and Mathematics**

Mr. Harris reviewed release plans for two upcoming reports: Grade 4 Writing Pilot 2012 and NAEP 2013 Grade 12 Reading and Mathematics Report Card, which will feature academic preparedness findings from the Board's research program. He said the plan for Grade 4 Writing involved a webinar release that would not be as high-profile as NAEP Report Card releases because the pilot had limited results on performance and focused on the use of the computer for writing by fourth graders and thus had a more specialized audience. Mr. Harris also reviewed the Grade 12 release plan, which also called for a webinar release that would feature a panelist with expertise in college preparedness and a post-release event.

Member Anitere Flores said the panel for the Grade 12 report should include a teacher, student, and a higher education representative. Ms. Gagnon thought the higher education community was important, especially in discussing the problem of remediation. Ms. Miles said using students would be a good focal point, especially to attract the attention of other students.

Chair Alonso said the release plan for grade 12 should be modified to be a live release event with a webcast. Vice Chair Mazany agreed with the proposal, saying that in the past there has not been a sense of the audience with webinars. Arnold Goldstein, NCEC staff, voiced concern that a focus on the academic preparedness aspect of the report might diminish the reading and math results. Chair Alonso said that because the Board has spent so much time discussing results in the context of preparedness, we should align the release with that goal as there is enormous potential in that work.

Mr. Harris said the release of Grade 4 Writing may be delayed from March until April because of changes in production timelines. In turn, this might delay release of the Grade 12 Report Card until May. Also, extra time will be required to make the Grade 12 release an in-person event. In response to a question, Mr. Goldstein said an early May release of the Grade 12 Report Card would not cause problems for NCEC.

**ACTION: The committee recommended Governing Board approval of the release plans as submitted by Board staff with two adjustments: (1) The Writing pilot report will be released in either March or April due to a change in report production timelines. (2) The Grade 12 Report Card will be released at an in-person event in April or early May. The release will be webcast live on the Internet. The release will include members of the higher education community and high school students and teachers. The revised release plans, as approved by the full Board, are appended in Attachments A and B to this report.**

#### **4. Communications Plan**

The committee discussed a communications plan prepared by Reingold, Inc., the Board's communications contractor. Mr. Harris said the plan was one of the tasks required in Reingold's new contract, issued in September 2013. It lays out a variety of communications and outreach strategies in eight focus areas:

- Report Card releases
- Audience prioritization and message development
- Content and materials development
- Stakeholder outreach
- Traditional media
- Website
- Social media
- Nominations

Chair Alonso said any plan would need a sense of prioritization, evaluation of strategies, and markers to measure effectiveness. He said it is most important for NAEP to be relevant in the conversations on how well students are achieving. He said the committee felt very comfortable and collaborative in developing ideas to achieve its communications goals.

Vice Chair Mazany said both resources and possible results must be considered, as well as evidence of impact and what effort would be required of NAGB and NCES staff.

Member O'Keefe said we seem to be expecting audiences to meet us but we need to meet them. He asked what kind of strategies would be most effective. Mr. Harris said the Board's outreach priorities, goals, and audiences should be decided upon first before particular strategies are developed. Members said the plan should establish a sequence of strategies, set markers to evaluate effectiveness, demonstrate the relevance of NAEP to various audiences, and show what things should matter from the data NAEP provides.

Chair Alonso recommended a conference call before the next regular committee meeting in May to consider a shorter, more focused plan to achieve communications goals. The plan should focus on extending the life of NAEP findings after the releases and on answering the "so what" and "why" questions people may have on whether NAEP should matter to them. The plan should concentrate on a few things to do well, rather than presenting many ideas that may only make a slight impact.

#### **5. Reporting on Puerto Rico NAEP**

Emmanuel Sikali, of NCES, reviewed efforts going back to 2003 to use NAEP to assess mathematics achievement in Puerto Rico at grades 4 and 8. Including Puerto Rico in NAEP is required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 as a condition for the commonwealth to receive federal education aid. Since the language of instruction in Puerto Rico is Spanish, the

NAEP math assessment has been translated into that language; NAEP Reading is not given in Puerto Rico because the assessment has been defined by the Board as a test of reading in English.

Mr. Sikali said no scores were reported when NAEP Math was first given in Puerto Rico in 2003 because of the very high proportion of test questions omitted or answered incorrectly. After a new translation, very low scores were reported for 2005. However, when the assessment was repeated in 2007 the trend estimates were deemed unreliable because most Puerto Rico students tested at the low-end of the scale where there were not enough items to give stable scale-score results. Performance was reported for individual test questions but not on the NAEP scale.

No representative sample of Puerto Rico students was tested in 2009 but small cognitive labs were conducted to study in detail how students understand and answer particular questions. The translation was reviewed by Puerto Rico teachers and determined to be satisfactory. In 2011, a new set of test booklets was prepared, called KaSA, with items that match the content of the NAEP mathematics framework but are targeted at the low-end of the test score distribution. These were interspersed with regular test booklets both in Puerto Rico and in the national NAEP sample, providing a link to the NAEP scale. A high proportion of KaSA booklets were given in Puerto Rico, and the scaling of Puerto Rico results was deemed successful. However, the 2011 results were not publicly reported pending a replication of this arrangement in 2013.

Mr. Sikali said the assessment in Puerto Rico was successfully placed on the NAEP scale again in 2013 and that a reliable trend back to 2011 has been established.

Mr. Alonso expressed concern with communicating the nature of the NAEP assessment in Puerto Rico. He said he was concerned with the lack of clear input from other Governing Board committees about the technical components of using the special booklets and about what evidence of success meant in this case. Mr. Goldstein, of NCES, said the KaSA booklets were intended to give greater definition at the low-end of the performance distribution and thus permit NAEP to show more clearly any gains Puerto Rico students may make. Because regular test booklets and braided booklets (half regular and half KaSa) were also administered in Puerto Rico, students in its NAEP sample were exposed to the full range of test items. By allowing Puerto Rico results to be placed on the NAEP scale with a small margin of error, these arrangements permit meaningful comparisons with achievement in the mainland United States.

Mr. Sikali said NCES plans to release the Puerto Rico NAEP results for 2011 and 2013 in the summer or fall of this year. All reports and Internet presentations will be available in both English and Spanish. He said Puerto Rico would be part of the NAEP mathematics assessment in 2015 with the KaSA booklets and others used again as they had been in 2011 and 2013.

Mr. Alonso said the committee should be able to look at the questions and data in detail before a report on Puerto Rico is released to make sure the assessment was valid and consistent with the NAEP that is administered on the mainland of the United States. He said NAEP in Puerto would be discussed again at the committee's May meeting.

## 6. Embargo Guidelines for NAEP Reports

Because of insufficient time, consideration of possible clarifications in the embargo guidelines for NAEP reports was delayed until the May meeting of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Andrés Alonso, Chair

March 19, 2014

---

Date



**NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD  
RELEASE PLAN FOR THE  
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)**

***The Nation's Report Card:  
Grade 4 Computer-Based 2012 Pilot Assessment in Writing***

The computer-based Grade 4 NAEP Writing 2012 pilot will be released during March or April 2014 as an online webinar, following review and approval of the report's results by the Governing Board. The release event will include a data presentation by the Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics, with moderation and comments by at least one member of the National Assessment Governing Board and an additional panelist with expertise in computer-based assessments and the field of writing. Full accompanying data will be posted on the Internet at the scheduled time of release.

Approximately 10,400 fourth-graders from 510 schools (420 public and 90 private) participated in the 2012 NAEP Writing computer-based pilot assessment. Their performance on writing tasks overall and for the three writing purposes (to persuade, convey and explain) will be summarized on a data website. Additionally, information from the 2011 usability study will be shared as the study informed how to design the NAEP computer-based writing assessment platform for elementary students. Data from the 60 fourth-grade participants across five states from this study will be displayed and will describe their computer experiences in school, at home and during the assessment.

This is the first-ever, large scale computer-based writing assessment of young students. The pilot findings and "lessons learned" will be particularly valuable as states and districts move toward computer-based testing in elementary school.

**DATE AND LOCATION**

The release event for the media and the public will occur in March or April 2014. The release date will be determined by the Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee, in accordance with Governing Board policy, following acceptance of the final report.



## **EVENT FORMAT**

- Introductions and opening statement by a National Assessment Governing Board representative
- Data presentation by the Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics
- Comments by one Governing Board member
- Comments by at least one expert in the field of education and assessment matters in large city school districts
- Questions from the webinar audience
- Program will last approximately 75 minutes
- Event will be broadcast live over the Internet, and viewers will be able to submit questions electronically for panelists. An archived version of the webinar, with closed captioning, will be posted on the Governing Board website at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org) along with other materials such as the press release and panelist statements.

## **EMBARGOED ACTIVITIES BEFORE RELEASE**

In the days preceding the release, the Governing Board and NCES will offer access to embargoed data via a special website to approved U.S. Congressional staff in Washington, DC; approved senior representatives of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers; and appropriate media as defined by the Governing Board's Embargo Policy. A conference call for journalists who signed embargo agreements will be held to give a brief overview of findings and data and to answer questions from the media.

## **REPORT RELEASE**

The Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics will publicly release the report at the NAEP website—<http://nationsreportcard.gov>—at the scheduled time of the release event. The interactive NAEP site will feature report data, a related usability study, and other resources. An interactive splash page with panelists' statements, a Governing Board press release, the NAEP Writing Framework, and related materials will be posted on the Board's web site at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org). The site will also feature links to social networking sites and audio and/or video material related to the event.



**NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD  
RELEASE PLAN FOR THE  
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)**

***The Nation's Report Card:  
Grade 12 Reading and Mathematics 2013***

The Grade 12 NAEP 2013 Reading and Mathematics Report Card, with findings on academic preparedness, will be released during April or early May 2014 at an event that is webcast live for a national audience, following review and approval of the report's results by the Governing Board. The release event will include a data presentation by the Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics, with moderation and comments by at least one member of the National Assessment Governing Board and a panel consisting of a teacher, a student, and a representative of the higher education community. Full accompanying data will be posted on the Internet at the scheduled time of release.

The Grade 12 NAEP Report Card will present the performance results of nationally representative samples of 12th graders in public and private schools: 46,500 in mathematics, and 45,900 in reading. In addition, results for math and reading will be available for 13 states, 11 of which also participated in the 2009 pilot study. Student performance is reported in two ways – average scale scores and as the percentage of students at or above three NAEP achievement levels.

And new in 2013, the report will include preliminary results of the Governing Board's academic preparedness research program, which will show how NAEP can be an indicator of the academic preparedness of grade 12 students.

**DATE AND LOCATION**

The release event for the media and the public will occur in April or May 2014. The release date will be determined by the Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee, in accordance with Governing Board policy, following acceptance of the final report.

## **EVENT FORMAT**

- Introductions and opening statement by a National Assessment Governing Board representative
- Data presentation by the Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics
- Comments by at least one Governing Board member
- Comments by a teacher, student, and member of the higher education community
- Questions from the audience
- Program will last approximately 75-90 minutes
- Event will be webcast live over the Internet. An archived version of the webinar, with closed captioning, will be posted on, or linked to from, the Governing Board website at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org) along with other materials such as the press release and panelist statements.

## **EMBARGOED ACTIVITIES BEFORE RELEASE**

In the days preceding the release, the Governing Board and NCES will offer access to embargoed data via a special website to approved U.S. Congressional staff in Washington, DC; approved senior representatives of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers; and appropriate media as defined by the Governing Board's Embargo Policy. A conference call for journalists who signed embargo agreements will be held to give a brief overview of findings and data and to answer questions from the media.

## **REPORT RELEASE**

The Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics will publicly release the report at the NAEP website—<http://nationsreportcard.gov>—at the scheduled time of the release event. The interactive NAEP site will feature graphics, charts, videos, and a report summary, along with data tools, questions, and other resources. An interactive splash page with panelists' statements, a Governing Board press release, subject frameworks, and related materials will be posted on the Board's web site at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org). The site will also feature links to social networking sites and audio and/or video material related to the event.

## **ACTIVITIES AFTER THE RELEASE**

The Governing Board's communications contractor, Reingold, will work with Board staff to coordinate a post-event communications effort to extend the life of the results and provide value and relevance to stakeholders with an interest in reading and mathematics achievement and grade 12 preparedness.