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Models for Framework Development and Update Processes

Overview
This joint ADC/COSDAM briefing and discussion will provide information on NAEP framework development processes, NCES' Future of NAEP recommendations on dynamic frameworks, and related activities from the international assessment arena.

According to the NAEP statute (P.L. 107-279), the Board is responsible for developing assessment objectives and test specifications for each NAEP subject area. Since 1989 the Governing Board has developed assessment frameworks and specifications in more than 10 subjects through comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative framework projects. The Board’s Framework Development Policy can be found here.

Three models have been used in the Board’s framework development process over time:

1. **New Framework/Start New Trend**
   In some cases, the Board has determined through research, outreach, content and policy input, and other means that a new framework is warranted in a subject area. In these subject area assessments, the new assessment framework defines a new construct, includes different content and skills, adds new item types, changes the assessment delivery mode (i.e., DBA), and other modifications. Examples of this model include 2009 Science and 2011 Writing. In these cases, the trend line was broken and results cannot be compared to previous years.

2. **New Framework/Maintain Trend**
   In this model, the new framework is designed to be different in many ways from the previous framework; however, empirical investigation reveals that the construct does not differ substantially. The interest in maintaining trend prompts linking studies and other research to try to ensure trend lines can be maintained. The 2009 Reading Framework is an example, which resulted in trend remaining intact from 1992.

3. **Updated Framework/Maintain Trend**
   This model is defined by gradual changes to a framework over time so that trend is maintained. For mathematics, the framework has been "tweaked" over time to more clearly define the objectives, shift content emphases, and refine the process dimension while not redefining the construct. NAEP has been able to maintain the mathematics trend line for grades 4 and 8 since 1990.

The Board's Strategic Vision, scheduled for action at the November 2016 quarterly meeting, includes the statement:

- Develop new approaches to update NAEP subject area frameworks to support the Board's responsibility to measure evolving expectations for students, while maintaining rigorous methods that support reporting student achievement trends.

The November 18th COSDAM and ADC discussion will provide the groundwork for further activities to address this Strategic Vision priority. One major challenge will be determining how much framework content can be changed and how quickly that can occur, without compromising the ability to maintain trend.
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NCES Initiative on the Future of NAEP

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has undergone a series of notable changes in the past decade. The NAEP program has expanded to meet new demands. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense schools, and (on a trial basis) 21 urban districts are now participating in the mathematics and reading assessments at grades 4 and 8. In addition, thirteen states are participating in trial state 12th-grade assessments in reading and mathematics. NAEP is also reporting in record time to ensure that the findings are highly relevant upon release. Technology has taken on a bigger role in the development and administration of NAEP, including computer-based tasks in the science and writing assessments. These are just a few of the major developments; the program has grown and matured in almost all respects.

There is also growing interest in linking NAEP to international assessments so that NAEP scores can also show how our nation’s students measure up to their peers globally. Additionally, there is increasing interest in broadening assessments in the subject areas to incorporate college and career readiness, as well as what are often called “21st-century skills” (communication, collaboration, and problem-solving).

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which administers NAEP, is dedicated to moving the program forward with its upcoming procurement cycle which will take the program to 2017. Under the leadership of NCES Commissioner Jack Buckley, NCES convened a diverse group of experts in assessment, measurement, and technology for a summit in August 2011. These experts discussed and debated ideas for the future of NAEP. NCES convened a second summit of state and local stakeholders in January 2012. Participants at both gatherings were encouraged to “think big” about the role that NAEP should play in the decades ahead.

NCES assembled a panel of experts from the first summit, chaired by Edward Haertel, an expert in educational assessment, to consider and further develop the ideas from the two discussions and make recommendations on the role of NAEP in the future—10 years ahead and beyond. Based on summit deliberations and their own extensive expertise, the panel developed a high-level vision for the future of the NAEP program, as well as a plan for moving toward that vision.

This paper contains the panel’s recommendations to the NCES Commissioner. NCES will consider these recommendations in their mid- and long-range planning for the program.
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3. NAEP’s Assessment Frameworks and Learning Outcomes

3.1 Background and History

Assessment frameworks are conceptual, overview documents that lay out the basic structure and content of a domain of knowledge and thereby serve as a blueprint for assessment development. Typically, assessment frameworks, for NAEP and for other large-scale assessments, are constructed as two-dimensional matrices of content strands and cognitive processes. For example, the current NAEP mathematics framework includes five content areas: number properties and operations; measurement; geometry; algebra; and data analysis, statistics and probability. These are assessed at different levels of cognitive complexity, which include mathematical abilities such as conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge, and problem-solving. In geography, the content areas include: space and Earth places; environment and society; and spatial dynamics and connections. The levels of the cognitive dimension consist of knowing, understanding, and applying.

NAEP Assessment Frameworks are developed under the auspices of the Governing Board through an extensive process involving subject matter experts, who consider how research in the discipline and curricular reforms may have shifted the conceptualization of proficiency in a given knowledge domain. The development process also requires multiple rounds of reviews by educators, policy leaders, members of the public, and scholars. It is expected that assessment frameworks will need to be changed over time. However, the decision to develop new frameworks is approached with great caution because measuring change requires holding the instrument constant. Introducing new frameworks—while providing a more valid basis for the assessment—could threaten one core purpose of NAEP, which is to monitor “progress.” In the past, when relatively minor changes have been made in assessment frameworks, as judged by content experts, trend comparisons over time have been continued and bridge validity studies have been conducted to verify that conclusions about gains have not been conflated with changes in the measuring instrument or redefinition of the construct being assessed.

When more profound changes occur in the conceptualization of an achievement domain, then a new framework is essential, and correspondingly the beginning of a new trend line. The adoption by nearly all states of the CCSS in English language arts and literacy and mathematics and the new Science Education Framework developed by the National Research Council (NRC) could be the occasion for a substantial enough change in conceptualization of these domains that new NAEP frameworks and new trend comparisons are warranted. Still, the future of NAEP—as a statistical indicator and as an exemplar of leading-edge assessment technology—requires great care and attention to the implications of new trend comparisons rather than merely acceding to the hoopla surrounding the new standards.

In the history of NAEP, few changes have been made in the assessment frameworks for reading and for mathematics. The old frameworks in these two core subjects, begun in 1971 and 1973 respectively, were replaced in the early 1990s, and then again in 2009 for reading. The old assessments have been continued on a less frequent cycle and are referred to as long-term trend NAEP. The 1990’s mathematics framework and 2009 reading framework guide the present-day assessments, referred to as main NAEP. The 1990’s mathematics framework and 2009 reading framework guide the present-day assessments, referred to as main NAEP. While NCES has been careful to insist that the old and new frameworks measure different things and therefore cannot be compared, the existence of the two trends provides a critically important example to illustrate how changing the measure can change interpretations about educational progress (e.g., see Beaton & Chromy, 2010). The earlier assessments focused much more on basic skills. Reading passages were generally shorter compared to today’s NAEP and did not require students to demonstrate so wide a range of reading skills or answer extended-response questions. In mathematics, long-term trend NAEP had a greater proportion of computational questions and items asking for recall of definitions, and no problems where students had to show or explain their work. In a 2003 study, researcher Tom Loveless complained that the new NAEP mathematics assessment exaggerated progress in mathematics during the 1990s because gains on the basic skills test over the same period were much
smaller (when compared in standard deviation units of the respective tests). Because the two assessments are administered entirely separately, Loveless then had to rely on comparisons based on the less than satisfactory item-percent-correct metric to try to track progress in subdomains of the test. A more recent study using more sophisticated methods has largely confirmed his general conclusions, but that same study has highlighted the technical challenges of comparing trends for two assessments administered under such different conditions (Beaton & Chromy, 2010).

3.2 New Approaches for Assessment Frameworks

3.2.1 Designing frameworks and assessments to evaluate directly the effects of changing domain definitions

NAEP cannot be a research program and in particular cannot be structured to investigate the effectiveness of various instructional interventions. However, it can and should be attentive to the ways that shifting definitions of subject matter competence can affect claims about progress or lack of progress (cf. Section 3.2.3). In the CCSS context, it will be especially important to pay attention directly to potential differences between consortium-based conclusions and NAEP trends. Taking this on as a role for NAEP continues its important function as a kind of monitoring instrument. For example, when some state assessment results have shown remarkable achievement gains and closing of achievement gaps, achievement trends for the same states on NAEP have helped to identify inflated claims. These disparities might exist because of teaching-the-test practices on state tests (Klein, Hamilton, McCaffrey, & Stecher, 2000; Koretz & Barron, 1998), state content or achievement standards that do not rise to NAEP levels (Bandeira de Mello, Blankenship, & McLaughlin, 2009), exclusion of low-performing students on NAEP, or lower motivation on NAEP. More direct linking by carefully accounting for the consortium frameworks within new NAEP frameworks, would allow NAEP to act somewhat like an external monitor for CCSS assessment results. While the current NAEP frameworks do cover many of the same skills as the CCSS, they can be enhanced with some shifts in content.

“21st-century skills” aren’t actually new in this century, but it is a relatively new idea (beginning in the 1990s) that these reasoning skills should be more broadly attained and expected of all students. More importantly, it is indeed new that policy leaders would move toward a view of learning that calls for reasoning and explaining one’s thinking from the earliest grades, in contrast to outmoded theories of learning predominant in the 20th century that postponed thinking until after the “basics” had been mastered by rote. In addition, the CCSS firmly ground reasoning, problem-solving, and modeling in relation to specific content, not as nebulous generalized abilities. While there is widespread enthusiasm for designing new assessments that capture these more rigorous learning goals, we should note that promises like this have been made before. In the case of the current NAEP mathematics assessment, item developers acknowledge that the proportion of high complexity items actually surviving to the operational assessment is much smaller than is called for in the NAEP Mathematics Framework, and a validity study at both grades 4 and 8 found that the representation of high-complexity problems was seriously inadequate at grade 8, especially in the Algebra and Measurement strands (Daro, Stancavage, Ortega, DeStefano, & Linn, 2007).

Good intentions to measure “higher order thinking skills” are often undermined for three interrelated reasons. First, test questions at higher levels of cognitive complexity are inherently more difficult to develop. Because the dimensions of the task are intended to be ill-specified, such problems are often perceived to be ambiguous. But as soon as the item developer provides clarifying parameters, the challenge of the problem is diminished. Second, because “21st-century skills” involve applying one’s knowledge in real world contexts, prior experience with particular contexts (or lack thereof) can create very large differences in performance simply because students unfamiliar with the context are unable to demonstrate the intended content and reasoning skills. In fact, application or generalization can only be defined in relation to what is known to have been taught. This is the curriculum problem that haunts large-scale assessments like NAEP that seek to be curriculum independent. Finally, well
designed items can fail on statistical criteria if too few students can do them.

These are all cautionary tales. They do not imply that NAEP should be less ambitious in developing new assessment frameworks that reach as far as possible in representing these higher levels of subject matter proficiency. But they do suggest a hedging-one’s-bets approach that does not discard old frameworks wholesale in favor of the new. Rather, as mentioned previously, some conscious combination of old and new would create an assessment better equipped to track progress over time. Later we discuss Innovations Laboratory studies like those NAEP has used historically to explore the feasibility of new assessment strategies. However, we should emphasize that studies of innovative assessment strategies that tap complex skills should not merely be new assessment formats administered to random samples of students. Rather, in recognition of the fact that opportunities to learn particular content and skills may affect whether an assessment looks psychometrically sound, studies should be undertaken with carefully selected populations where relevant opportunities to learn can be established. This will help determine whether more advanced performance can be accurately documented to exist within the parameters of the new standards.

3.2.2 Standing subject-matter panels

To aid in this process, provide substantive oversight, and ensure meaningful interpretation of trends, we elaborate a recommendation for the future of NAEP previously made by a National Academy of Education Panel, which called for standing subject-matter committees. We recommend an expanded role whereby standing committees of subject matter specialists would review field test data, for example, and call attention to instances when after-the-fact distortions of the intended domain occur because more ambitious item types fail to meet statistical criteria. These committees would also have a role in ongoing incremental updates to content frameworks. They might include at least one member with psychometric expertise to aid in formulating technical specifications. The role of these committees is further described in Section 6.1.3.

3.2.3 Dynamic assessment frameworks and reporting scales

As just explained in Section 3.1, NAEP assessment frameworks have historically been held fixed for a period of years and then changed. It might be added that historically, NAEP item pools have been constructed according to test specifications derived from assessment frameworks. NAEP reporting scales, in turn, have reflected the resulting mix of NAEP items. Periodic small revisions to assessment frameworks have been made while maintaining trend lines; major breaks requiring new trend lines have occurred only rarely. With standing subject-matter panels, assessment frameworks for each subject-grade combination might be adjusted more frequently, defining a gradually changing mix of knowledge and skills, analogous to the Consumer Price Index (cf. Section 5.3). At the same time, item pools might be expanded somewhat, including everything in the assessment framework but also covering some additional material. Assessment frameworks would still define the intended construct underlying NAEP reporting scales, but not all items in the NAEP exercise pool would be included in the NAEP reporting scales. For example, content required to maintain long-term trend NAEP, to assure sufficient representation of the CCSS, or to improve the linkage to some other assessment could be introduced into the pool without affecting NAEP reporting scales. With somewhat broader exercise pools, alternative construct definitions could be investigated in special studies. The panel assumes that broader exercise pools, supporting modestly different construct definitions, will increase the value of NAEP by highlighting distinctions among achievement patterns under different construct definitions. Of course, there would still be one main NAEP reporting scale for each subject/grade combination. Clarity in communicating NAEP findings would remain a priority.

Different assessment frameworks may imply different definitions of the same broad subject area achievement construct (e.g., “reading” or “mathematics”), and achievement trends may differ depending on the construct definition chosen. Incremental changes in assessment frameworks and the corresponding set of items on which NAEP reporting scales were based would afford local (i.e., near-term) continuity in the meaning of those scales, but over a period of decades, constructs...
might change substantially. This was seen by the panel as a potential strength, but also a potential risk. Policymakers and the public should be aware of how and when the construct NAEP defines as "reading," for example, is changed. Not every small, incremental change would need to be announced, but it would be important to establish and to enforce clear policies concerning the reporting of significant changes in assessment frameworks, so as to alert stakeholders when constructs change and to reinforce the crucially important message that not all tests with the same broad content label are measuring the same thing. As small content framework adjustments accumulate over time, standing committees, using empirical studies, would need to determine when the constructs measured have changed enough to require establishing new trend lines.

Dynamic frameworks would balance dual priorities of trend integrity and trend relevance. As an analogy, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) tracks inflation by deliberately conflating two concepts: change in the cost of a fixed basket of goods and change in the composition of the basket itself. As time passes, an increase in the cost of a product that is no longer relevant should contribute less to estimated inflation. By adopting dynamic frameworks, NAEP would similarly conflate increases in student proficiency with a change in the definition of proficiency itself. Although this conflation may seem undesirable, it may be the best way to balance desires for both an interpretable trend and a relevant trend.

3.2.4 Learning progressions as possible guides to assessment frameworks

Learning progressions or trajectories represent descriptions of how students’ knowledge, skills, and beliefs about the domain evolve from naive conceptions through gradual transformations to reach proficiency with target ideas at high levels of expertise over a period of years (Heritage, 2008). They entail the articulation of intermediate proficiency levels that students are likely to pass through, obstacles and misconceptions, and landmarks, of predictable importance as students’ knowledge evolves over time. Empirical study of learning progressions highlights the key roles of instruction, use of tools, and peer interactions in supporting learning. Because the process of evolving understanding can take multiple years, learning progressions bridge formative and summative assessment.

A learning progression can provide much more information than a typical assessment framework. A learning progression ideally specifies both what is to be learned as well as how that learning can take place developmentally over time. It often integrates content and cognition. It includes not only the learning targets but also common less-than-ideal states that many students pass through. It is ordered developmentally. It provides a domain-based interpretation of development or growth that is useful to educators. The 2009 NAEP Science Framework already contains a section on learning progressions; however, learning progressions may offer guidance for the development of future NAEP assessment frameworks, especially in mathematics.

Learning progressions are closely entwined with instructional decisions regarding the sequencing of key concepts and skills. In the Netherlands, for example, the related constructions are referred to as "learning-teaching trajectories." However, few empirically supported "learning progressions" as yet exist, and developing more has proven challenging. In addition, because of NAEP’s role as a curriculum-independent monitor, it may be more difficult to develop assessment frameworks that are entirely built as a collection of learning progressions. More likely some particular sequences, if proven to be valid across curricula, could be embedded within more general assessment frameworks.
Alignment between NAEP items and the CCSS and student performance in 2015 grade 4 and grade 8 Mathematics assessments

In 2015, Daro, Hughes, and Stancavage of the NAEP Validity Studies Panel conducted a study to evaluate the degree of alignment between 2015 NAEP grade 4 and grade 8 mathematics assessments and the CCSS in mathematics. They had a panel of experts classify these items into one of three categories: “in the standards at or below the NAEP grade level,” “not in the standards at or below the NAEP grade level,” and “uncertain.” Seventy-nine percent of the grade 4 and 87% of the grade 8 items were classified as “in the standards”. The degree of alignment was uneven across the subscales. At both grades, lowest level of alignment was observed in data analysis, statistics, and probability subscale with 47% and 74% alignment at grade 4 and 8, respectively.

In this study we use the classification of the items from the abovementioned study to investigate the student performance in 2015 NAEP grade 4 and grade 8 mathematics assessments in relation to the alignment of the items to the CCSS. The research questions are as follows:

1. Are there differences in student performance at the item level according to items’ coverage in the CCSS?
2. Are there differences in psychometric properties of items according to items’ coverage in the CCSS?
3. How would state mean scores change if items student achievement is estimated using only the items that are covered in the CCSS?

In relation to the first research question, we examined the changes in average p+ values for trend items at state level by item alignment. In addition, we computed an item residual for each item for each state based on the difficulty of the given item across states and based on the performance of the given state across all items. In answering the second research question, we first compared the estimates for the discrimination parameter between CCSS-aligned and other items. Next, we conducted differential item functioning (DIF) analyses to examine whether items function differently in CCSS states versus other states.

In order to answer the final research question, mean state scores were recomputed based on only the items judged to be aligned to the CCSS. Dependent sample t-tests were run to compare the reported and re-estimated means for 2015 for each state separately, one scale at a time. We also investigated if the directionality (i.e. increase, no change, decrease) of the trend results between 2013 and 2015 would have changed with the re-estimated state means. Independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare the reported mean for 2013 to the 2015 reported and the 2015 re-estimated means for the composite scale and subscales for each state separately.

This session will be closed because the study results have not yet been released.

Attachment C
History and Overview of NAEP Long-Term Trend Assessments in Reading and Mathematics

Overview

As stated in the NAEP statute (P.L. 107-279), the Commissioner for Education Statistics shall “continue to conduct the trend assessment of academic achievement at ages 9, 13, and 17 for the purpose of maintaining data on long-term trends in reading and mathematics.”

The Governing Board has been exploring issues related to NAEP Long-Term Trend (LTT) assessments for several decades. The Board’s draft Strategic Vision, slated for action at this November 2016 Board meeting, includes a specific reference to the NAEP LTT calling for the Board to:

Research policy and technical implications related to the future of NAEP Long-Term Trend in reading and mathematics.

The purpose of this closed ADC briefing and discussion is to familiarize the Committee with details of the LTT history, design, and content. The session will focus in particular on the LTT content, including secure reading and math test items. The content of the LTT assessments is an important consideration in the upcoming discussions on how to implement the Board’s Strategic Vision for LTT. These discussions will include the Board’s planned LTT symposium in March 2017. The ADC will be providing content guidance in these upcoming Board deliberations on the future of the LTT assessments.

Reference materials:

- Long-Term Trend history and next steps
- Table of Long-Term Trend assessments
- Comparison chart of Long-Term Trend and Main NAEP
- Executive summary from the 2012 Long-Term Trend report
Long-Term Trend Overview and Update

Background
NAEP includes two national assessment programs—Long-Term Trend (LTT) NAEP and Main NAEP. While both assessments enable NAEP to measure student progress over time, there are similarities and differences between the two assessments. Both assessments measure reading and mathematics. The NAEP LLT assessment measures national educational performance in the United States at ages 9, 13 and 17. In contrast, the Main NAEP assessments focus on populations of students defined by grade, rather than age, and go beyond the national level to provide results at the state and district level. LTT trend lines date back to the early 1970s and Main NAEP trend lines start in the early 1990s. The content differs as well—for example, LTT math measures more “traditional” mathematics than the current Main NAEP math content.

The Main NAEP assessments in reading and mathematics are administered every two years, as required by law. The administration of NAEP LTT assessments in reading and mathematics at ages 9, 13, and 17 is also required by law, but the periodicity is not specified. The NAEP LTT assessments had been administered approximately every four years over the past two decades (and more frequently prior to that), but were last administered in 2012. The Governing Board postponed the NAEP LTT planned administration for 2016 to 2020, and then to 2024 due to budgetary constraints. Some stakeholders have expressed concern with the gap of 12 years between assessment administrations, which represents a cohort’s entire length of schooling. Other stakeholders argue that the NAEP LTT is not very useful now that Main NAEP provides trend information back to the early 1990s, and that it should be eliminated altogether.

Next Steps
In 2012, the Future of NAEP panel recommended exploring ways of consolidating or combining Long-Term Trend and Main NAEP data collections. This is a complex challenge due to the many differences in content, sampling, and administration of the assessments. To explore the feasibility of combining the data collection efforts, and to debate the relative merits of NAEP LTT, the Governing Board is organizing a symposium on the future of NAEP Long-Term Trend. The symposium will take place on the morning of March 2, 2017, immediately preceding the quarterly Governing Board meeting.

In advance of the symposium, Edward Haertel of Stanford University (who previously served as Chair of the Future of NAEP panel and Chair of COSDAM) is preparing a white paper of approximately 30 pages on the history of NAEP Long-Term Trend and a consideration of current issues. The white paper will be distributed to four additional participants, who will each prepare a shorter response (8-10 pages) on their perspective of the future of NAEP LTT. The papers will be disseminated in advance of the symposium and will serve as the basis for discussion during the March 2nd event. In addition, the participants will also discuss their perspectives and solicit external input at a planned session during the annual American Educational Research Association (AERA) conference in April, 2017.

During the May 2017 quarterly meeting, the Governing Board will discuss key takeaways and potential next steps regarding the future of the NAEP Long-Term Trend assessments.
NAEP Long Term Trend Assessments over the Years

The longest running NAEP LTT assessments are the LTT Reading and Mathematics assessments, followed by the LTT Science and Writing assessments. The LTT Science and Writing assessments were discontinued after 1996 (Writing for technical reasons and Science for outdated content). Administration years for each of these subject areas are shaded below, showing the years for which trends over time were reported.
What Are the Differences Between Long-Term Trend NAEP and Main NAEP?

Although long-term trend and main NAEP both assess mathematics and reading, there are several differences, particularly in the content assessed, how often the assessment is administered, and how the results are reported. These and other differences mean that results from long-term trend and main NAEP cannot be compared directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long-Term Trend Assessment</th>
<th>Main NAEP Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Since 2004, long-term trend NAEP has measured student performance in mathematics and reading every four years. Last reported for 2008, it will be reported next for 2012.</td>
<td>Main NAEP assessments measure student performance in mathematics and reading every two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Assessed</strong></td>
<td>Long-term trend NAEP has remained relatively unchanged since 1990. In the 1970s and '80s, the assessments changed to reflect changes in curriculum in the nation's schools. Continuity of assessment content was sufficient not to require a break in trends. Mathematics focuses on numbers and numeration, variables and relationships, shape and size and position, measurement, and probability and statistics. Basic skills and recall of definitions are assessed. Reading features short narrative, expository, or document passages, and focuses on locating specific information, making inferences, and identifying the main idea of a passage. On average, passages are shorter in long-term trend reading than in main NAEP reading.</td>
<td>Main NAEP assessments change about every decade to reflect changes in curriculum in the nation’s schools; new frameworks reflect these changes. Continuity of assessment content was sufficient not to require a break in trends, except in grade 12 mathematics in 2005. Mathematics focuses on numbers, measurement, geometry, probability and statistics, and algebra. In addition to basic skills and recall of definitions, students are assessed on problem solving and reasoning in all topic areas. Reading features fiction, literary nonfiction, poetry, exposition, document, and procedural texts or pairs of texts, and focuses on identifying explicitly stated information, making complex inferences about themes, and comparing multiple texts on a variety of dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question formats</strong></td>
<td>Students respond to questions in multiple-choice format; there are also a few short answer questions (scored on a two-point scale). In reading, there are also a few questions requiring an extended answer (usually scored on a five-point scale).</td>
<td>Students respond to questions of several possible types: multiple choice, short answer, and extended answer. Constructed-response questions may be scored as correct or incorrect, or they may be scored on a multi-level scale that awards partial credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Sampled</strong></td>
<td>Long-Term Trend Assessment</td>
<td>Main NAEP Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are selected by age (9, 13, and 17) to represent the nation and to provide results for student groups such as Black, Hispanic, White, and sometimes others, by gender, family income, school location, and school type (public or private).</td>
<td>Students are selected by grade (4, 8, and 12). Students represent the nation and provide results for student groups such as Black, Hispanic, White, and sometimes others, by gender, family income, and school location and school type.</td>
<td>In some assessments, samples are chosen to report on states or selected large urban districts and as a result, more students must participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities (SD) and English language learner (ELL) students are included using the same participation guidelines and with the same accommodations (as needed) in main NAEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The inclusion and accommodation treatment is the same for main and for long-term trend assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2004, accommodations have been provided to enable participation of more SD and ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Administration</strong> | Long-term trend is assessed every four years, throughout the school year: in October through December for 13-year-olds, January through March for 9-year-olds, and March through May for 17-year-olds. See the schedule for all assessments (long-term trend as well as main NAEP). Test booklets contain three 15-minute blocks of questions, plus one section of student questions concerning academic experiences and demographics. There are no ancillary materials, such as calculators or manipulatives, provided. | Main NAEP mathematics and reading are assessed every two years (the odd-numbered years) at grades 4, 8, and 12. The administration takes place from late January through early March. Test booklets contain two 25-minute blocks, plus student questions concerning academic experiences and demographics. There may be ancillary materials provided with the test booklets. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Reported</th>
<th>Long-Term Trend Assessment</th>
<th>Main NAEP Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National-level performance and how it has changed since the 1970s is reported using scores on a 0-500 scale. Long-term trend also reports descriptive performance levels (150, 200, 250, 300, and 350) that have the same meaning across the three age levels. There are no achievement levels to correspond with those used in main NAEP. There are student questionnaires, but no teacher or school questionnaires.</td>
<td>Main NAEP has been reported since the 1990s for the nation and participating states and other jurisdictions, and since 2002 for selected urban districts. Performance and how it has changed over the past several years is reported using scale scores and achievement levels. Scores are reported using either a 0-300 or 0-500 scale, depending on the subject. The achievement levels reported are Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Student results are reported in the context of the questionnaires given to the students’ teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** [https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/ltt_main_diff.aspx](https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/ltt_main_diff.aspx)
Executive Summary

Since the 1970s, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has monitored the academic performance of 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old students with what have become known as the long-term trend assessments. Four decades of results offer an extended view of student achievement in reading and mathematics. Results in this report are based on the most recent performance of more than 50,000 public and private school students who, by their participation, have contributed to our understanding of the nation’s academic achievement.

Nine- and 13-year-olds make gains

Both 9- and 13-year-olds scored higher in reading and mathematics in 2012 than students their age in the early 1970s (figure A). Scores were 8 to 25 points higher in 2012 than in the first assessment year. Seventeen-year-olds, however, did not show similar gains. Average reading and mathematics scores in 2012 for 17-year-olds were not significantly different from scores in the first assessment year.

Since the last administration of the assessments in 2008, only 13-year-olds made gains—and they did so in both reading and mathematics.
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

* Figure A. Trend in NAEP reading and mathematics average scores for 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old students

**Reading**

![Scale score graph for reading showing average scores from 1971 to 2012 for age 9, 13, and 17.](image)

* Significantly different (p < .05) from 2012.

**Mathematics**

![Scale score graph for mathematics showing average scores from 1973 to 2012 for age 9, 13, and 17.](image)

* Significantly different (p < .05) from 2012.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1971–2012 Long-Term Trend Reading and Mathematics Assessments.
Racial/ethnic and gender gaps narrow

Closing achievement gaps is a goal of both national and state education policy. The results from the 2012 NAEP long-term trend assessments show some progress toward meeting that goal. The narrowing of the White – Black and White – Hispanic score gaps in reading and mathematics from the 1970s is the result of larger gains by Black and Hispanic students than White students. Only the White – Hispanic gap in mathematics at age 9 has not shown a significant change from the early 1970s.

Female students scored higher in reading than male students at all three ages. The 2012 results show 9-year-old males making larger score gains than females. This has led to a narrowing of the gender gap at age 9 as compared to 1971.

In mathematics, male 17-year-old students scored higher than female students. The gender gap at age 17 narrowed because female students made gains from 1971 to 2012, but 17-year-old male students did not.

### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Score changes from 1971</th>
<th>Score changes from 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 9</td>
<td>Age 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic¹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Black</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Hispanic</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female – Male</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Reading results for Hispanic students were first available in 1975. Therefore, the results shown in the 1971 section for Hispanic students are from the 1975 assessment.

### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Score changes from 1973</th>
<th>Score changes from 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 9</td>
<td>Age 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Black</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Hispanic</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male – Female²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Score differences between male and female students in mathematics were not found to be statistically significant (p < .05) at age 9 in 1973, 2008, or 2012, and at age 13 in 1973 and 2008.

Notes:
- Black includes African American, and Hispanic includes Latino. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin.

## Assessment Development Committee

### Item Review Schedule
**November 2016 - April 2017**

**October 13, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Package to Board</th>
<th>Board Comments to NCES</th>
<th>Survey/ Cognitive</th>
<th>Review Task</th>
<th>Approx. Number Items</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/9/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>2019 Math (12) Pilot (SBT) Draft builds</td>
<td>2 tasks</td>
<td>For review at November Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/16</td>
<td>11/29/16</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>2019 Reading (12) Pilot</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/17</td>
<td>1/26/17</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>2019 Reading (12) Pilot (SBT) Draft Builds</td>
<td>2 tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/17</td>
<td>05/02/17</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>2019 Science (4, 8, 12) Pilot</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** “SBT” indicates Scenario-Based Task  
“DI” indicates Discrete Item
# National Assessment Governing Board
## Executive Committee
### November 17, 2016
#### 4:30–6:00 pm

## AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:30 – 4:35 pm</td>
<td>Welcome and Agenda Overview</td>
<td><em>Terry Mazany, Chair</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35 – 4:45 pm</td>
<td>Governing Board &amp; Policy Updates</td>
<td><em>Bill Bushaw, Executive Director</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lily Clark, Assistant Director for Policy and Research</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 – 5:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Strategic Vision</td>
<td><em>Lucille Davy, Vice Chair</em></td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 5:20 pm</td>
<td>Evaluation of NAEP Achievement Levels</td>
<td><em>Mary Crovo, Deputy Executive Director</em></td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sharyn Rosenberg, Assistant Director for Psychometrics</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Request for Delegation of Authority for Response to</td>
<td><em>Andrew Ho, COSDAM Chair</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Levels Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20 – 5:35 pm</td>
<td>Long-Term Trend Overview and Update</td>
<td><em>Joe Willhoft</em></td>
<td>Attachment C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35 – 6:00 pm</td>
<td>NAEP Research Grants <em>(CLOSED)</em></td>
<td><em>Peggy Carr, NCES Acting Commissioner</em></td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the National Assessment Governing Board’s Development of the Strategic Vision Draft —November 2016—

The National Assessment Governing Board began its Strategic Planning Initiative (Initiative) in 2014 by developing a framework to set priorities and goals. The Strategic Planning Framework development was led by the Executive Committee and was unanimously approved by the Board on August 8, 2015, concluding Phase I of the Initiative. At the August 2015 meeting, the Board met in small cross-committee groups to develop an initial list of activities that could be accomplished within five years to achieve the priorities specified in the Strategic Planning Framework. These conversations formed the basis for the first draft of the Strategic Plan.

Upon approval of the Framework, Chair Mazany asked Vice Chair Lucille Davy to lead Phase II of the Initiative to guide the Board’s development of its Strategic Plan. At the Board’s November 2015 meeting, Vice Chair Davy led the Governing Board in its first plenary discussion of the draft Strategic Plan.

The Board’s plan for Phase II included soliciting feedback from external education stakeholders to inform the Strategic Plan. The Board hired a consultant, Jim Kohlmoos, to conduct conversations with 22 individuals who are respected education leaders, familiar with NAEP, and represent a diverse range of perspectives to generate ideas for the Strategic Plan. In addition, the staff discussed the draft Strategic Plan priorities and activities with the Board’s joint Policy Task Force with the Council of Chief State School Officers, representing state assessment experts. The external feedback was prepared for the Board’s consideration at its March 2016 meeting and was discussed in a plenary session with Mr. Kohlmoos.

At the May 2016 meeting, the Governing Board engaged in a detailed discussion of the revised draft Strategic Plan. The Board met first in small, cross-committee groups and then as the full Board in a plenary session. What emerged from the May 2016 meeting was a call for a significantly revised strategic document that would focus purely on the Board’s work and be an inspiring, succinct, and effective public communications tool. Chair Mazany tasked the Executive Committee to revise the draft for discussion at the August 2016 Board meeting. The Executive Committee members were highly engaged in its June and July teleconference meetings. As a result, the May 2016 draft transformed into the now-called “Strategic Vision” draft. In addition to the Executive Committee’s work, the draft Strategic Vision also went through numerous rounds of Board staff review and incorporated feedback from NCES.

At the August 2016 Board meeting, the Board discussed the Strategic Vision in small cross-committee groups and then as the full Board in a plenary session. In its discussions, the Governing Board affirmed its desire to impact student achievement through its activities in the Strategic Vision. The Board also made recommendations to refine the draft and indicated readiness for the Board to take action on the Strategic Vision at the November 2016 meeting. Following the August meeting, the Executive Committee considered final changes to the Strategic Vision to reflect the Board’s discussions.

**ACTION:** The proposed Strategic Vision is attached for Executive Committee and full Board action at the November 2016 meeting.

Upon approval, the Board will conclude Phase II of the Initiative. Phase III—the final stage—is to implement the Strategic Vision.

---


2 A summary of the feedback provided for the March 2016 meeting is available here: [https://www.nagb.org/content/members/assets/documents/meetings/board-meetings/2016/2016-03/10-strategic-planning-initiative.pdf](https://www.nagb.org/content/members/assets/documents/meetings/board-meetings/2016/2016-03/10-strategic-planning-initiative.pdf)

3 Refer to the August 2016 meeting minutes included in the November 2016 Board materials for the discussion summary.
The Nation’s Report Card, also known as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), was developed in 1969 to answer the important question: “How are our nation’s students doing?” The National Assessment Governing Board established this Strategic Vision to not only answer the first question, but also to expand NAEP’s impact by addressing a second question: “How can NAEP provide information about how our students are doing in the most innovative, informative, and impactful ways?”

Congress created the independent, bipartisan Governing Board in 1988 to set policy guidelines for The Nation’s Report Card, which is the largest nationally representative, continuing evaluation of the condition of education in the United States. The Governing Board identifies NAEP subjects to be tested, determines the content and achievement levels for each assessment, approves all test questions, and takes steps to improve the form, reporting, and use of results.

The Governing Board partners with the National Center for Education Statistics, which administers the NAEP program, to inform a wide range of stakeholders—including policymakers, educators, researchers, business leaders, the media, and the general public—about what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas, and compare achievement data over time and among student demographic groups. This allows the nation to understand where more work must be done to improve learning among all students.

The Governing Board fulfills its statutory mission by continuously reviewing and revising its policies and practices to ensure The Nation’s Report Card measures and reports meaningful information to the public.

The educational landscape of the 21st century demands increased academic ambition, greater technological sophistication, improved civic participation, and expanded global perspectives for all students. In this time of rapid and accelerating change, it is essential for The Nation’s Report Card to support innovation and address the need to improve student achievement, while maintaining its timeless promise to serve as the constant and unassailable measure of student achievement for our nation.

To increase the value of The Nation’s Report Card as a resource to impact student achievement, the Governing Board adopted this Strategic Vision with a dual focus on innovating to enhance NAEP’s form and content and informing stakeholders to expand NAEP’s dissemination and use.
The National Assessment Governing Board will promote The Nation’s Report Card’s wealth of information to facilitate the awareness and uses of NAEP in appropriate, timely, new, and meaningful ways. Examples of NAEP resources include: results; trends; test questions and tasks; studies; measurement innovations; frameworks that specify the content and design of NAEP assessments; and contextual variables about student demographics and educational experiences collected from students, teachers, and schools. The Governing Board will:

- Strengthen and expand partnerships by broadening stakeholders’ awareness of NAEP and facilitating their use of NAEP resources.
- Increase opportunities to connect NAEP to administrative data and state, national, and international student assessments.
- Expand the availability, utility, and use of NAEP resources, in part by creating new resources to inform education policy and practice.
- Promote sustained dissemination and use of NAEP information beyond Report Card releases with consideration for multiple audiences and ever-changing multi-media technologies.

The National Assessment Governing Board will revise the design, form, and content of The Nation’s Report Card using advances in technology to keep NAEP at the forefront of measuring and reporting student achievement. The Governing Board will:

- Develop new approaches to update NAEP subject area frameworks to support the Board’s responsibility to measure evolving expectations for students, while maintaining rigorous methods that support reporting student achievement trends.
- Continue improving the content, analysis, and reporting of NAEP contextual variables by considering the questions’ relevance, sensitivity, and potential to provide meaningful context and insights for policy and practice.
- Research policy and technical implications related to the future of NAEP Long-Term Trend assessments in reading and mathematics.
- Research assessments used in other countries to identify new possibilities to innovate the content, design, and reporting of NAEP.
- Develop policy approaches to revise the NAEP assessment subjects and schedule based on the nation’s evolving needs, the Board’s priorities, and NAEP funding.
- Develop new approaches to measure the complex skills required for transition to postsecondary education and career.

This Strategic Vision will focus the work of the Governing Board through the year 2020. By pursuing these priorities, the Governing Board will ensure that The Nation’s Report Card provides the country with valuable data that measure and contribute to the improvement of student progress in achieving important knowledge and skills necessary for success as citizens in our democratic society.
Evaluation of NAEP Achievement Levels

Background
Public Law 107-279 states:

The achievement levels shall be used on a trial basis until the Commissioner for Education Statistics determines, as a result of an evaluation under subsection (f), that such levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public.

Even after being in use for about 25 years and undergoing previous evaluations (1993, 1998, 2009), the NAEP achievement levels are still considered to be on a trial basis. During his tenure as NCES Commissioner, Jack Buckley initiated a new evaluation to determine whether the trial status could be resolved.

About the Evaluation
The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), part of the Institute for Education Sciences (IES), is administering the current evaluation of the NAEP achievement levels. On September 29, 2014, NCEE awarded a contract to The National Academy of Sciences to perform this work.

Objectives for the evaluation include the following:

- Determine how "reasonable, valid, reliable and informative to the public" will be operationalized in this study.
- Identify the kinds of objective data and research findings that will be examined.
- Review and analyze extant information related to the study's purpose.
- Gather other objective information from relevant experts and stakeholders, without creating burden for the public through new, large-scale data collection.
- Organize, summarize, and present the findings from the evaluation in a written report, including a summary that is accessible for nontechnical audiences, discussing the strengths/weaknesses and gaps in knowledge in relation to the evaluation criteria.
- Provide, prior to release of the study report, for an independent external review of that report for comprehensiveness, objectivity, and freedom from bias.
- Plan and conduct dissemination events to communicate the conclusions of the final report to different audiences of stakeholders.
Design
This study focuses on the achievement levels used in reporting NAEP results for the reading and mathematics assessments in grades 4, 8, and 12. Specifically, the study is reviewing developments over the past decade in the ways achievement levels for NAEP are set and used and will evaluate whether the resulting achievement levels are "reasonable, valid, reliable, and informative to the public." The study relies on an independent committee of experts with a broad range of expertise related to assessment, statistics, social science, and education policy. The project receives oversight from the Board on Testing and Assessment (BOTA) and the Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) of the National Research Council.

Members of the interdisciplinary review committee were selected in early 2015 (see below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christopher F. Edley, Jr. (Chair)</td>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Peter Afflerbach</td>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sybilla Beckmann</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. H. Russell Bernard</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karla Egan</td>
<td>EdMetric LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David J. Francis</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Margaret E. Goertz</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Laura Hamilton</td>
<td>The RAND Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brian W. Junker</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Suzanne Lane</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sharon J. Lewis</td>
<td>Retired (formerly with the Council of the Great City Schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bernard L. Madison</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Scott Norton</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sharon Vaughn</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lauress L. Wise</td>
<td>HumRRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information about the Committee and project activities is available at: http://www8.nationalacademies.org/cp/projectview.aspx?key=49677. The first Committee meeting took place in Washington, DC on February 19-20, 2015. Governing Board staff attended the open session and made a presentation to the Committee on the history of the NAEP achievement levels setting activities. The second meeting of the Committee took place in Washington, DC on May 27-28, 2015. Governing Board staff attended the open session on the afternoon of May 27th to listen to panel discussions involving representatives of the media, state and local policymakers, advocacy organizations, and the Common Core State Standards assessment consortia, about interpretations and uses of NAEP achievement levels. Several additional meetings were conducted in the latter half of 2015 in closed session. The final report is expected to be released in late 2016.
Next steps
The final report is expected to be available soon. Governing Board members will be briefed on
the findings from the evaluation on Saturday morning, November 19th.

As stated in the NAEP legislation, the Commissioner of NCES will use the findings from the
evaluation to decide whether the achievement levels should continue to be used on a “trial basis”
or whether that designation can be removed. In addition, the final report may include conclusions
and recommendations that have implications for future Governing Board achievement levels-
setting activities. Public Law 107-279 also specifies that the Governing Board must prepare a
formal response to the evaluation:

Not later than 90 days after an evaluation of the student achievement levels under
section 303(e), the Assessment Board shall make a report to the Secretary, the
Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and
the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate
describing the steps the Assessment Board is taking to respond to each of the
recommendations contained in such evaluation.

COSDAM will lead the process of responding to the evaluation and considering any potential
implications for future achievement levels-setting work, with input from the Executive
Committee and the full Board. COSDAM will begin discussing a draft response via webinar in
early December.

Due to the expected timing of the evaluation report release, it is likely that the 90 day window
will conclude prior to the March 2017 Governing Board meeting.

Therefore, we are requesting a joint delegation of authority to COSDAM and the Executive
Committee for formal approval of the report to the Secretary, the Committee on Education and
the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor,
and Pensions of the Senate describing the steps the Governing Board is taking to respond to each
of the recommendations contained in the evaluation.
Long-Term Trend Overview and Update

Background:
NAEP includes two national assessment programs—Long-Term Trend (LTT) NAEP and Main NAEP. While both assessments enable NAEP to measure student progress over time, there are similarities and differences between the two assessments. Both assessments measure reading and mathematics. The NAEP LLT assessment measures national educational performance in the United States at ages 9, 13 and 17. In contrast, the Main NAEP assessments focus on populations of students defined by grade, rather than age, and go beyond the national level to provide results at the state and district level. LTT trend lines date back to the early 1970s and Main NAEP trend lines start in the early 1990s. The content differs as well—for example, LTT math measures more “traditional” mathematics than the current Main NAEP math content.

The Main NAEP assessments in reading and mathematics are administered every two years, as required by law. The administration of NAEP LTT assessments in reading and mathematics at ages 9, 13, and 17 is also required by law, but the periodicity is not specified. The NAEP LTT assessments had been administered approximately every four years over the past two decades (and more frequently prior to that), but were last administered in 2012. The Governing Board postponed the NAEP LTT planned administration for 2016 to 2020, and then to 2024 due to budgetary constraints. Some stakeholders have expressed concern with the gap of 12 years between assessment administrations, which represents a cohort’s entire length of schooling. Other stakeholders argue that the NAEP LTT is not very useful now that Main NAEP provides trend information back to the early 1990s, and that it should be eliminated altogether.

Next Steps:
In 2012, the Future of NAEP panel recommended exploring ways of consolidating or combining Long-Term Trend and Main NAEP data collections. This is a complex challenge due to the many differences in content, sampling, and administration of the assessments. To explore the feasibility of combining the data collection efforts, and to debate the relative merits of NAEP LTT, the Governing Board is organizing a symposium on the future of NAEP Long-Term Trend. The symposium will take place on the morning of March 2, 2017, immediately preceding the quarterly Governing Board meeting.

In advance of the symposium, Edward Haertel of Stanford University (who previously served as Chair of the Future of NAEP panel and Chair of COSDAM) is preparing a white paper of approximately 30 pages on the history of NAEP Long-Term Trend and a consideration of current issues. The white paper will be distributed to four additional participants, who will each prepare a shorter response (8-10 pages) on their perspective of the future of NAEP LTT. The papers will be disseminated in advance of the symposium and will serve as the basis for discussion during the March 2nd event. In addition, the participants will also discuss their perspectives and solicit external input at a planned session during the annual American Educational Research Association (AERA) conference in April, 2017.

During the May 2017 quarterly meeting, the Governing Board will discuss key takeaways and potential next steps regarding the future of the NAEP Long-Term Trend assessments.
What Are the Differences Between Long-Term Trend NAEP and Main NAEP?

Although long-term trend and main NAEP both assess mathematics and reading, there are several differences, particularly in the content assessed, how often the assessment is administered, and how the results are reported. These and other differences mean that results from long-term trend and main NAEP cannot be compared directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Long-Term Trend Assessment</th>
<th>Main NAEP Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Since 2004, long-term trend NAEP has measured student performance in mathematics and reading every four years. Last reported for 2008, it will be reported next for 2012.</td>
<td>Main NAEP assessments measure student performance in mathematics and reading every two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Assessed</strong></td>
<td>Long-term trend NAEP has remained relatively unchanged since 1990. In the 1970s and '80s, the assessments changed to reflect changes in curriculum in the nation's schools. Continuity of assessment content was sufficient not to require a break in trends. Mathematics focuses on numbers and numeration, variables and relationships, shape and size and position, measurement, and probability and statistics. Basic skills and recall of definitions are assessed. Reading features short narrative, expository, or document passages, and focuses on locating specific information, making inferences, and identifying the main idea of a passage. On average, passages are shorter in long-term trend reading than in main NAEP reading.</td>
<td>Main NAEP assessments change about every decade to reflect changes in curriculum in the nation’s schools; new frameworks reflect these changes. Continuity of assessment content was sufficient not to require a break in trends, except in grade 12 mathematics in 2005. Mathematics focuses on numbers, measurement, geometry, probability and statistics, and algebra. In addition to basic skills and recall of definitions, students are assessed on problem solving and reasoning in all topic areas. Reading features fiction, literary nonfiction, poetry, exposition, document, and procedural texts or pairs of texts, and focuses on identifying explicitly stated information, making complex inferences about themes, and comparing multiple texts on a variety of dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question formats</strong></td>
<td>Students respond to questions in multiple-choice format; there are also a few short answer questions (scored on a two-point scale). In reading, there are also a few questions requiring an extended answer (usually scored on a five-point scale).</td>
<td>Students respond to questions of several possible types: multiple choice, short answer, and extended answer. Constructed-response questions may be scored as correct or incorrect, or they may be scored on a multi-level scale that awards partial credit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Students Sampled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Trend Assessment</th>
<th>Main NAEP Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are selected by age (9, 13, and 17) to represent the nation and to provide results for student groups such as Black, Hispanic, White, and sometimes others, by gender, family income, school location, and school type (public or private). Students with disabilities (SD) and English language learner (ELL) students are included using the same participation guidelines and with the same accommodations (as needed) in main NAEP. Since 2004, accommodations have been provided to enable participation of more SD and ELL students.</td>
<td>Students are selected by grade (4, 8, and 12). Students represent the nation and provide results for student groups such as Black, Hispanic, White, and sometimes others, by gender, family income, and school location and school type. In some assessments, samples are chosen to report on states or selected large urban districts and as a result, more students must participate. The inclusion and accommodation treatment is the same for main and for long-term trend assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Trend Assessment</th>
<th>Main NAEP Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term trend is assessed every four years, throughout the school year: in October through December for 13-year-olds, January through March for 9-year-olds, and March through May for 17-year-olds. See the schedule for all assessments (long-term trend as well as main NAEP). Test booklets contain three 15-minute blocks of questions, plus one section of student questions concerning academic experiences and demographics. There are no ancillary materials, such as calculators or manipulatives, provided.</td>
<td>Main NAEP mathematics and reading are assessed every two years (the odd-numbered years) at grades 4, 8, and 12. The administration takes place from late January through early March. Test booklets contain two 25-minute blocks, plus student questions concerning academic experiences and demographics. There may be ancillary materials provided with the test booklets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Reported</td>
<td>Long-Term Trend Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National-level performance and how it has changed since the 1970s is reported using scores on a 0-500 scale. Long-term trend also reports descriptive performance levels (150, 200, 250, 300, and 350) that have the same meaning across the three age levels. There are no achievement levels to correspond with those used in main NAEP. There are student questionnaires, but no teacher or school questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/ltt_main_diff.aspx](https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/ltt_main_diff.aspx)
NAEP Research Grants Program—Summary & Update Provided by NCES

NCES is developing a new research grants program to encourage and advance secondary analysis and methodological developments using NAEP data. The funded research proposals will be expected to align with the top current priorities of the NAEP program, as expressed by NCES and the Governing Board.

The Requests for Awards (RFAs) are currently in development, but the proposed major components of the NAEP Analysis Research Grants Program are as follows:

1. **Individual research grants** to be awarded in two categories¹:
   a. Secondary analysis of NAEP data to address specific, substantive educational research and policy questions (such as investigating the relationships between a set of survey variables and NAEP scores).
   b. Statistical and psychometric methodology research to advance the science and analysis of NAEP data (such as tools that aid in the analysis and interpretation of NAEP data).

2. **Institutional grants** for developing NAEP data training workshops to instruct researchers and potential analysts of NAEP data on the proper procedures and tools to analyze NAEP.

3. **Pre-doctoral dissertation grants** to encourage the training, methodological development, and use of NAEP data for innovative early career scholars.²

4. **Internship programs** primarily for graduate students in statistics and educational measurement to support shorter analyses and research projects (though additional internships for high-school or undergraduate students may be included).³

An expert advisory panel was convened by NCES in October, 2016 to provide recommendations for the specific focus areas and suggestions for the structure of competitive grants program (but not the internship program). Representatives from NCES and the Governing Board staff presented goals and visions to the panel prior to the panel’s main discussion. The advisory panel’s synthesized recommendations for the high-priority areas of research will be reflected in the RFAs to ensure that the research proposals align with the interests of the NAEP program and best practices in the research community. NCES expects to award the research projects during Fiscal Year 2017.

---

**NOTES REGARDING AWARD VEHICLES:**

¹ The *individual research grants* are generally modeled after the original NAEP Secondary Analysis Grants programs (which were awarded until 2007) with two similar areas of focus. However, the awards made through this new program concerning individual or institutional grants will likely be administered through competitive cooperative agreements, which differ from traditional grants in that they allow for “substantial involvement” from the government.

² As the Institute of Education Sciences does not traditionally award funding directly to students, the *pre-doctoral dissertation grants* may be awarded through the institution accepting the cooperative agreement for the training programs.

³ The *internship program* will be developed in collaboration with a NAEP contractor.
2015 National Indian Education Study (NIES)

The National Indian Education Study (NIES) is administered as part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to allow more in-depth reporting on the reading and mathematics achievement and the experiences of American Indian / Alaska Native (AI/AN) students in grades 4 and 8.

The study is funded by the Office of Indian Education (OIE) and was first administered in 2005. NIES began in response to Executive Order 13336 to assist AI/AN students in meeting academic standards. The order also called for a study and report on the current status of AI/AN students, including a compilation of comprehensive data on the academic achievement and progress of AI/AN students.

Historically, statistical agencies have struggled to report AI/AN specific data due to reporting standards. AI/AN students comprise only about one percent of fourth- and eighth-graders nationally. A central aim of NIES is to provide more disaggregated data for this student population. This includes producing results for select states with a relatively high concentration of AI/AN students and analyzing the AI/AN data by contextual variables such as gender or school type (e.g., Bureau of Indian Education schools).

The 2015 NIES report is embargoed; the 2011 NIES report is available via: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/studies/2012466.asp. The Executive Summary from the 2011 NIES report accompanies this overview.

During this closed session, NCES will:

1. Provide an overview of the study’s history;
2. Review AI/AN sample sizes and the availability of state-level and other disaggregated data with a focus on 2015 reading and mathematics results;
3. Provide information regarding the contextual questionnaires designed specifically for this special study, which were created in collaboration with OIE and a panel of American Indian and Alaska Native educators and researchers from across the country;
The National Indian Education Study (NIES) is designed to describe the condition of education for American Indian and Alaska Native students in the United States. NIES is authorized under Executive Order 13592, Improving American Indian and Alaska Native Educational Opportunities and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities, which was issued in 2011 to improve education efforts for American Indian and Alaska Native students nationwide. NIES is conducted under the direction of the National Center for Education Statistics on behalf of the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Indian Education.

NIES is conducted through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and provides information on the academic performance of fourth- and eighth-grade American Indian/Alaska Native students in reading and mathematics, and on their educational experiences.

NAEP is a congressionally authorized project of the National Center for Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. The Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible for carrying out the NAEP project. The National Assessment Governing Board oversees and sets policy for NAEP.

NAEP is an integral part of our nation’s evaluation of the condition and progress of education. Only information related to academic achievement and relevant variables is collected. The privacy of individual students and their families is protected, and the identities of participating schools are not released.
Executive Summary

The National Indian Education Study (NIES) is administered as part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to allow more in-depth reporting on the achievement and experiences of American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) students in grades 4 and 8. The results presented in this report highlight some of the findings on the educational experiences of fourth- and eighth-grade AI/AN students based on responses to the NIES student, teacher, and school questionnaires, and on the performance of AI/AN students in the NAEP reading and mathematics assessments.
No significant change in average reading scores for AI/AN students compared to 2009 or 2005

Nationally representative samples of 5,500 AI/AN fourth-graders and 4,100 AI/AN eighth-graders participated in the 2011 NAEP reading assessment. At each grade, students responded to questions designed to measure their reading comprehension across literary and informational texts.

At both grades 4 and 8, average reading scores for AI/AN students in 2011 were not significantly different from the scores in 2009 or 2005 (figure A). AI/AN students scored 19 points lower on average in reading than non-AI/AN students in 2011 at grade 4, and 13 points lower at grade 8.

Forty-seven percent of AI/AN students at grade 4 and 63 percent at grade 8 performed at or above the Basic level in reading in 2011, demonstrating at least partial mastery of reading comprehension skills. At both grades 4 and 8, the percentages of AI/AN students performing at Basic, at Proficient, and at Advanced in 2011 were not significantly different from the percentages in previous assessment years.

AI/AN students’ performance in reading differs by some student characteristics

In 2011, average reading scores for AI/AN students were

- higher for female students than for male students at both grades 4 and 8;
- lower for students eligible for the National School Lunch Program (an indicator of lower family income) than for those who were not eligible at both grades 4 and 8;
- higher for students attending schools in suburban locations than for those in rural locations at both grades 4 and 8; and
- higher for students attending public schools than for those attending Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools at both grades 4 and 8.

In comparison to 2009, average reading scores were higher in 2011 for AI/AN eighth-graders who attended schools in city locations and for those in BIE schools.

Figure A. Trend in NAEP reading average scores and score gaps for fourth- and eighth-grade AI/AN and non-AI/AN students

![Graph showing trends in NAEP reading scores for AI/AN and non-AI/AN students at grades 4 and 8.](image)

* Significantly different (p < .05) from 2011.

NOTE: AI/AN = American Indian/Alaska Native. Score gaps are calculated based on differences between unrounded average scores.

No significant change in reading scores from 2009 for 12 reported states

Average reading scores for AI/AN fourth- and eighth-graders did not change significantly from 2009 to 2011 in any of the 12 states with samples large enough to report results for AI/AN students in both years. Among the seven states with samples large enough to report results in both 2005 and 2011, the average reading score for AI/AN eighth-graders in Montana was higher in 2011.

Mathematics score gap between non-AI/AN and AI/AN students larger than in 2005

Nationally representative samples of 5,400 AI/AN fourth-graders and 4,200 AI/AN eighth-graders participated in the 2011 NAEP mathematics assessment designed to measure what they know and can do across five mathematics content areas: number properties and operations; measurement; geometry; data analysis, statistics, and probability; and algebra.

In 2011, AI/AN students scored 16 points lower on average in mathematics than non-AI/AN students at grade 4, and 19 points lower at grade 8 (figure B). The score gaps for both grades in 2011 were not significantly different from the gaps in 2009, but were larger than the gaps in 2005. In comparison to 2009 and 2005, average scores for fourth- and eighth-grade AI/AN students did not change significantly in 2011 and scores for non-AI/AN students were higher in 2011.

In 2011, sixty-six percent of AI/AN students at grade 4 and 55 percent at grade 8 performed at or above the Basic level in mathematics. The percentages of AI/AN fourth- and eighth-graders performing at Basic and at Proficient in 2011 were not significantly different from the percentages in previous assessment years. At grade 8, the percentage of students at Advanced increased from 2 percent in 2005 to 3 percent in 2011.

Figure B. Trend in NAEP mathematics average scores and score gaps for fourth- and eighth-grade AI/AN and non-AI/AN students

AI/AN students’ performance in mathematics differs by some student characteristics

In 2011, average mathematics scores for AI/AN students were

- lower for students eligible for the National School Lunch Program than for those who were not eligible at both grades 4 and 8; 
- higher for students attending schools in suburban locations than for those in towns and rural locations at grade 4; and 
- higher for students attending public schools than for those attending BIE schools at both grades 4 and 8.

In comparison to 2009, the average mathematics score for AI/AN fourth-graders in BIE schools was higher in 2011.

Mathematics scores lower than in 2009 in one state at grade 4 and in two states at grade 8

Among the 12 states with samples large enough to report results for AI/AN students in both 2009 and 2011, average mathematics scores were lower in 2011 in Montana at grade 4 and in Minnesota and Utah at grade 8. Among the seven states with samples large enough to report results in both 2005 and 2011, average mathematics scores were lower in 2011 in Alaska at grades 4 and 8, and higher in 2011 in Oklahoma at grades 4 and 8 and in South Dakota at grade 8.
Results from the NIES survey describe AI/AN students, their teachers and schools, and the integration of AI/AN culture in their education

About 10,200 AI/AN students at grade 4 and 10,300 AI/AN students at grade 8 participated in the 2011 NIES survey. Also responding to the survey were about 3,000 teachers and 1,900 school administrators at grade 4, and about 4,600 teachers and 2,000 school administrators at grade 8. Data collected from the NIES student, teacher, and school questionnaires provide information about the students themselves, their communities, teachers’ background and instructional practices, and how schools address the needs of AI/AN students.

Overall survey results reported for the nation include AI/AN students attending public, private, BIES and Department of Defense schools. Results are also reported separately for three mutually exclusive categories based on the type of school and proportion of AI/AN students: low density public schools where less than 25 percent of the student body is AI/AN; high density public schools where 25 percent or more of the students are AI/AN; and BIE schools that serve AI/AN students almost exclusively. In summarizing the NIES survey results by school type/density, data for response categories were sometimes collapsed to better illustrate how response patterns differed for students attending different schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected survey topics</th>
<th>Percentage of students</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students report knowing some or a lot about their AI/AN history</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low density public schools</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High density public schools</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIE schools</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ teachers report acquiring information about their AI/AN students to at least a small extent from living and working in an AI/AN community</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low density public schools</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High density public schools</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIE schools</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students attend school where administrators report members of the AI/AN community visit to discuss education issues one or more times a year</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low density public schools</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High density public schools</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIE schools</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Results are not shown separately for Department of Defense and private schools.
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Models for Framework Development and Update Processes

Overview
This joint ADC/COSDAM briefing and discussion will provide information on NAEP framework development processes, NCES' Future of NAEP recommendations on dynamic frameworks, and related activities from the international assessment arena.

According to the NAEP statute (P.L. 107-279), the Board is responsible for developing assessment objectives and test specifications for each NAEP subject area. Since 1989 the Governing Board has developed assessment frameworks and specifications in more than 10 subjects through comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative framework projects. The Board’s Framework Development Policy can be found here.

Three models have been used in the Board’s framework development process over time:

1. **New Framework/Start New Trend**
   In some cases, the Board has determined through research, outreach, content and policy input, and other means that a new framework is warranted in a subject area. In these subject area assessments, the new assessment framework defines a new construct, includes different content and skills, adds new item types, changes the assessment delivery mode (i.e., DBA), and other modifications. Examples of this model include 2009 Science and 2011 Writing. In these cases, the trend line was broken and results cannot be compared to previous years.

2. **New Framework/Maintain Trend**
   In this model, the new framework is designed to be different in many ways from the previous framework; however, empirical investigation reveals that the construct does not differ substantially. The interest in maintaining trend prompts linking studies and other research to try to ensure trend lines can be maintained. The 2009 Reading Framework is an example, which resulted in trend remaining intact from 1992.

3. **Updated Framework/Maintain Trend**
   This model is defined by gradual changes to a framework over time so that trend is maintained. For mathematics, the framework has been "tweaked" over time to more clearly define the objectives, shift content emphases, and refine the process dimension while not redefining the construct. NAEP has been able to maintain the mathematics trend line for grades 4 and 8 since 1990.

The Board’s Strategic Vision, scheduled for action at the November 2016 quarterly meeting, includes the statement:
- Develop new approaches to update NAEP subject area frameworks to support the Board’s responsibility to measure evolving expectations for students, while maintaining rigorous methods that support reporting student achievement trends.

The November 18th COSDAM and ADC discussion will provide the groundwork for further activities to address this Strategic Vision priority. One major challenge will be determining how much framework content can be changed and how quickly that can occur, without compromising the ability to maintain trend.
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The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has undergone a series of notable changes in the past decade. The NAEP program has expanded to meet new demands. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense schools, and (on a trial basis) 21 urban districts are now participating in the mathematics and reading assessments at grades 4 and 8. In addition, thirteen states are participating in trial state 12th-grade assessments in reading and mathematics. NAEP is also reporting in record time to ensure that the findings are highly relevant upon release. Technology has taken on a bigger role in the development and administration of NAEP, including computer-based tasks in the science and writing assessments. These are just a few of the major developments; the program has grown and matured in almost all respects.

There is also growing interest in linking NAEP to international assessments so that NAEP scores can also show how our nation’s students measure up to their peers globally. Additionally, there is increasing interest in broadening assessments in the subject areas to incorporate college and career readiness, as well as what are often called “21st-century skills” (communication, collaboration, and problem-solving).

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which administers NAEP, is dedicated to moving the program forward with its upcoming procurement cycle which will take the program to 2017. Under the leadership of NCES Commissioner Jack Buckley, NCES convened a diverse group of experts in assessment, measurement, and technology for a summit in August 2011. These experts discussed and debated ideas for the future of NAEP. NCES convened a second summit of state and local stakeholders in January 2012. Participants at both gatherings were encouraged to “think big” about the role that NAEP should play in the decades ahead.

NCES assembled a panel of experts from the first summit, chaired by Edward Haertel, an expert in educational assessment, to consider and further develop the ideas from the two discussions and make recommendations on the role of NAEP in the future—10 years ahead and beyond. Based on summit deliberations and their own extensive expertise, the panel developed a high-level vision for the future of the NAEP program, as well as a plan for moving toward that vision.

This paper contains the panel’s recommendations to the NCES Commissioner. NCES will consider these recommendations in their mid- and long-range planning for the program.
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3. NAEP’s Assessment Frameworks and Learning Outcomes

3.1 Background and History

Assessment frameworks are conceptual, overview documents that lay out the basic structure and content of a domain of knowledge and thereby serve as a blueprint for assessment development. Typically, assessment frameworks, for NAEP and for other large-scale assessments, are constructed as two-dimensional matrices of content strands and cognitive processes. For example, the current NAEP mathematics framework includes five content areas: number properties and operations; measurement; geometry; algebra; and data analysis, statistics and probability. These are assessed at different levels of cognitive complexity, which include mathematical abilities such as conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge, and problem-solving. In geography, the content areas include: space and Earth places; environment and society; and spatial dynamics and connections. The levels of the cognitive dimension consist of knowing, understanding, and applying.

NAEP Assessment Frameworks are developed under the auspices of the Governing Board through an extensive process involving subject matter experts, who consider how research in the discipline and curricular reforms may have shifted the conceptualization of proficiency in a given knowledge domain. The development process also requires multiple rounds of reviews by educators, policy leaders, members of the public, and scholars. It is expected that assessment frameworks will need to be changed over time. However, the decision to develop new frameworks is approached with great caution because measuring change requires holding the instrument constant. Introducing new frameworks—while providing a more valid basis for the assessment—could threaten one core purpose of NAEP, which is to monitor “progress.” In the past, when relatively minor changes have been made in assessment frameworks, as judged by content experts, trend comparisons over time have been continued and bridge validity studies have been conducted to verify that conclusions about gains have not been conflated with changes in the measuring instrument or redefinition of the construct being assessed.

When more profound changes occur in the conceptualization of an achievement domain, then a new framework is essential, and correspondingly the beginning of a new trend line. The adoption by nearly all states of the CCSS in English language arts and literacy and mathematics and the new Science Education Framework developed by the National Research Council (NRC) could be the occasion for a substantial enough change in conceptualization of these domains that new NAEP frameworks and new trend comparisons are warranted. Still, the future of NAEP—as a statistical indicator and as an exemplar of leading-edge assessment technology—requires great care and attention to the implications of new trend comparisons rather than merely acceding to the hoopla surrounding the new standards.

In the history of NAEP, few changes have been made in the assessment frameworks for reading and for mathematics. The old frameworks in these two core subjects, begun in 1971 and 1973 respectively, were replaced in the early 1990s, and then again in 2009 for reading. The old assessments have been continued on a less frequent cycle and are referred to as long-term trend NAEP. The 1990’s mathematics framework and 2009 reading framework guide the present-day assessments, referred to as main NAEP. The earlier assessments focused much more on basic skills. Reading passages were generally shorter compared to today’s NAEP and did not require students to demonstrate so wide a range of reading skills or answer extended-response questions. In mathematics, long-term trend NAEP had a greater proportion of computational questions and items asking for recall of definitions, and no problems where students had to show or explain their work. In a 2003 study, researcher Tom Loveless complained that the new NAEP mathematics assessment exaggerated progress in mathematics during the 1990s because gains on the basic skills test over the same period were much
smaller (when compared in standard deviation units of the respective tests). Because the two assessments are administered entirely separately, Loveless then had to rely on comparisons based on the less than satisfactory item-percent-correct metric to try to track progress in subdomains of the test. A more recent study using more sophisticated methods has largely confirmed his general conclusions, but that same study has highlighted the technical challenges of comparing trends for two assessments administered under such different conditions (Beaton & Chromy, 2010).

3.2 New Approaches for Assessment Frameworks

3.2.1 Designing frameworks and assessments to evaluate directly the effects of changing domain definitions

NAEP cannot be a research program and in particular cannot be structured to investigate the effectiveness of various instructional interventions. However, it can and should be attentive to the ways that shifting definitions of subject matter competence can affect claims about progress or lack of progress (cf. Section 3.2.3). In the CCSS context, it will be especially important to pay attention directly to potential differences between consortium-based conclusions and NAEP trends. Taking this on as a role for NAEP continues its important function as a kind of monitoring instrument. For example, when some state assessment results have shown remarkable achievement gains and closing of achievement gaps, achievement trends for the same states on NAEP have helped to identify inflated claims. These disparities might exist because of teaching-the-test practices on state tests (Klein, Hamilton, McCaffrey, & Stecher, 2000; Koretz & Barron, 1998), state content or achievement standards that do not rise to NAEP levels (Bandeira de Mello, Blankenship, & McLaughlin, 2009), exclusion of low-performing students on NAEP, or lower motivation on NAEP. More direct linking by carefully accounting for the consortium frameworks within new NAEP frameworks, would allow NAEP to act somewhat like an external monitor for CCSS assessment results. While the current NAEP frameworks do cover many of the same skills as the CCSS, they can be enhanced with some shifts in content.

“21st-century skills” aren’t actually new in this century, but it is a relatively new idea (beginning in the 1990s) that these reasoning skills should be more broadly attained and expected of all students. More importantly, it is indeed new that policy leaders would move toward a view of learning that calls for reasoning and explaining one’s thinking from the earliest grades, in contrast to outmoded theories of learning predominant in the 20th century that postponed thinking until after the “basics” had been mastered by rote. In addition, the CCSS firmly ground reasoning, problem-solving, and modeling in relation to specific content, not as nebulous generalized abilities. While there is widespread enthusiasm for designing new assessments that capture these more rigorous learning goals, we should note that promises like this have been made before. In the case of the current NAEP mathematics assessment, item developers acknowledge that the proportion of high complexity items actually surviving to the operational assessment is much smaller than is called for in the NAEP Mathematics Framework, and a validity study at both grades 4 and 8 found that the representation of high-complexity problems was seriously inadequate at grade 8, especially in the Algebra and Measurement strands (Daro, Stancavage, Ortega, DeStefano, & Linn, 2007).

Good intentions to measure “higher order thinking skills” are often undermined for three interrelated reasons. First, test questions at higher levels of cognitive complexity are inherently more difficult to develop. Because the dimensions of the task are intended to be ill-specified, such problems are often perceived to be ambiguous. But as soon as the item developer provides clarifying parameters, the challenge of the problem is diminished. Second, because “21st-century skills” involve applying one’s knowledge in real world contexts, prior experience with particular contexts (or lack thereof) can create very large differences in performance simply because students unfamiliar with the context are unable to demonstrate the intended content and reasoning skills. In fact, application or generalization can only be defined in relation to what is known to have been taught. This is the curriculum problem that haunts large-scale assessments like NAEP that seek to be curriculum independent. Finally, well...
designed items can fail on statistical criteria if too few students can do them.

These are all cautionary tales. They do not imply that NAEP should be less ambitious in developing new assessment frameworks that reach as far as possible in representing these higher levels of subject matter proficiency. But they do suggest a hedging-one’s-bets approach that does not discard old frameworks wholesale in favor of the new. Rather, as mentioned previously, some conscious combination of old and new would create an assessment better equipped to track progress over time. Later we discuss Innovations Laboratory studies like those NAEP has used historically to explore the feasibility of new assessment strategies. However, we should emphasize that studies of innovative assessment strategies that tap complex skills should not merely be new assessment formats administered to random samples of students. Rather, in recognition of the fact that opportunities to learn particular content and skills may affect whether an assessment looks psychometrically sound, studies should be undertaken with carefully selected populations where relevant opportunities to learn can be established. This will help determine whether more advanced performance can be accurately documented to exist within the parameters of the new standards.

3.2.2 Standing subject-matter panels

To aid in this process, provide substantive oversight, and ensure meaningful interpretation of trends, we elaborate a recommendation for the future of NAEP previously made by a National Academy of Education Panel, which called for standing subject-matter committees. We recommend an expanded role whereby standing committees of subject matter specialists would review field test data, for example, and call attention to instances when after-the-fact distortions of the intended domain occur because more ambitious item types fail to meet statistical criteria. These committees would also have a role in ongoing incremental updates to content frameworks. They might include at least one member with psychometric expertise to aid in formulating technical specifications. The role of these committees is further described in Section 6.1.3.

3.2.3 Dynamic assessment frameworks and reporting scales

As just explained in Section 3.1, NAEP assessment frameworks have historically been held fixed for a period of years and then changed. It might be added that historically, NAEP item pools have been constructed according to test specifications derived from assessment frameworks. NAEP reporting scales, in turn, have reflected the resulting mix of NAEP items. Periodic small revisions to assessment frameworks have been made while maintaining trend lines; major breaks requiring new trend lines have occurred only rarely. With standing subject-matter panels, assessment frameworks for each subject-grade combination might be adjusted more frequently, defining a gradually changing mix of knowledge and skills, analogous to the Consumer Price Index (cf. Section 5.3). At the same time, item pools might be expanded somewhat, including everything in the assessment framework but also covering some additional material. Assessment frameworks would still define the intended construct underlying NAEP reporting scales, but not all items in the NAEP exercise pool would be included in the NAEP reporting scales. For example, content required to maintain long-term trend NAEP, to assure sufficient representation of the CCSS, or to improve the linkage to some other assessment could be introduced into the pool without affecting NAEP reporting scales. With somewhat broader exercise pools, alternative construct definitions could be investigated in special studies. The panel assumes that broader exercise pools, supporting modestly different construct definitions, will increase the value of NAEP by highlighting distinctions among achievement patterns under different construct definitions. Of course, there would still be one main NAEP reporting scale for each subject/grade combination. Clarity in communicating NAEP findings would remain a priority.

Different assessment frameworks may imply different definitions of the same broad subject area achievement construct (e.g., "reading" or "mathematics"), and achievement trends may differ depending on the construct definition chosen. Incremental changes in assessment frameworks and the corresponding set of items on which NAEP reporting scales were based would afford local (i.e., near-term) continuity in the meaning of those scales, but over a period of decades, constructs
might change substantially. This was seen by the panel as a potential strength, but also a potential risk. Policymakers and the public should be aware of how and when the construct NAEP defines as "reading," for example, is changed. Not every small, incremental change would need to be announced, but it would be important to establish and to enforce clear policies concerning the reporting of significant changes in assessment frameworks, so as to alert stakeholders when constructs change and to reinforce the crucially important message that not all tests with the same broad content label are measuring the same thing. As small content framework adjustments accumulate over time, standing committees, using empirical studies, would need to determine when the constructs measured have changed enough to require establishing new trend lines.

Dynamic frameworks would balance dual priorities of trend integrity and trend relevance. As an analogy, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) tracks inflation by deliberately conflating two concepts: change in the cost of a fixed basket of goods and change in the composition of the basket itself. As time passes, an increase in the cost of a product that is no longer relevant should contribute less to estimated inflation. By adopting dynamic frameworks, NAEP would similarly conflate increases in student proficiency with a change in the definition of proficiency itself. Although this conflation may seem undesirable, it may be the best way to balance desires for both an interpretable trend and a relevant trend.

### 3.2.4 Learning progressions as possible guides to assessment frameworks

Learning progressions or trajectories represent descriptions of how students’ knowledge, skills, and beliefs about the domain evolve from naive conceptions through gradual transformations to reach proficiency with target ideas at high levels of expertise over a period of years (Heritage, 2008). They entail the articulation of intermediate proficiency levels that students are likely to pass through, obstacles and misconceptions, and landmarks, of predictable importance as students’ knowledge evolves over time. Empirical study of learning progressions highlights the key roles of instruction, use of tools, and peer interactions in supporting learning. Because the process of evolving understanding can take multiple years, learning progressions bridge formative and summative assessment.

A learning progression can provide much more information than a typical assessment framework. A learning progression ideally specifies both what is to be learned as well as how that learning can take place developmentally over time. It often integrates content and cognition. It includes not only the learning targets but also common less-than-ideal states that many students pass through. It is ordered developmentally. It provides a domain-based interpretation of development or growth that is useful to educators. The 2009 NAEP Science Framework already contains a section on learning progressions; however, learning progressions may offer guidance for the development of future NAEP assessment frameworks, especially in mathematics.

Learning progressions are closely entwined with instructional decisions regarding the sequencing of key concepts and skills. In the Netherlands, for example, the related constructions are referred to as “learning-teaching trajectories.” However, few empirically supported “learning progressions” as yet exist, and developing more has proven challenging. In addition, because of NAEP’s role as a curriculum-independent monitor, it may be more difficult to develop assessment frameworks that are entirely built as a collection of learning progressions. More likely some particular sequences, if proven to be valid across curricula, could be embedded within more general assessment frameworks.
Alignment between NAEP items and the CCSS and student performance in 2015 grade 4 and grade 8 Mathematics assessments

In 2015, Daro, Hughes, and Stancavage of the NAEP Validity Studies Panel conducted a study to evaluate the degree of alignment between 2015 NAEP grade 4 and grade 8 mathematics assessments and the CCSS in mathematics. They had a panel of experts classify these items into one of three categories: “in the standards at or below the NAEP grade level,” “not in the standards at or below the NAEP grade level,” and “uncertain.” Seventy-nine percent of the grade 4 and 87% of the grade 8 items were classified as “in the standards”. The degree of alignment was uneven across the subscales. At both grades, lowest level of alignment was observed in data analysis, statistics, and probability subscale with 47% and 74% alignment at grade 4 and 8, respectively.

In this study we use the classification of the items from the abovementioned study to investigate the student performance in 2015 NAEP grade 4 and grade 8 mathematics assessments in relation to the alignment of the items to the CCSS. The research questions are as follows:

1. Are there differences in student performance at the item level according to items’ coverage in the CCSS?
2. Are there differences in psychometric properties of items according to items’ coverage in the CCSS?
3. How would state mean scores change if items student achievement is estimated using only the items that are covered in the CCSS?

In relation to the first research question, we examined the changes in average p+ values for trend items at state level by item alignment. In addition, we computed an item residual for each item for each state based on the difficulty of the given item across states and based on the performance of the given state across all items. In answering the second research question, we first compared the estimates for the discrimination parameter between CCSS-aligned and other items. Next, we conducted differential item functioning (DIF) analyses to examine whether items function differently in CCSS states versus other states.

In order to answer the final research question, mean state scores were recomputed based on only the items judged to be aligned to the CCSS. Dependent sample t-tests were run to compare the reported and re-estimated means for 2015 for each state separately, one scale at a time. We also investigated if the directionality (i.e. increase, no change, decrease) of the trend results between 2013 and 2015 would have changed with the re-estimated state means. Independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare the reported mean for 2013 to the 2015 reported and the 2015 re-estimated means for the composite scale and subscales for each state separately.

This session will be closed because the study results have not yet been released.
Developing Achievement Levels for the National Assessment of Educational Progress Writing at Grade 4

Purpose: The purpose of this session is to provide an update to the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) regarding the development of achievement levels for the 2017 NAEP Grade 4 Writing and to present the plans for implementing the body of work standard setting methodology. In this session, Tim O’Neil, NAEP Grade 4 Writing Achievement Levels-Setting (ALS) Project Director for Pearson, will provide an update on the project and an overview of the Design Document.
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**Purpose:** The purpose of this session is to provide an update to the Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM) regarding the development of achievement levels for 2017 NAEP Grade 4 Writing and to present the plans for implementing the body of work standard setting methodology. In this session, Dr. Tim O’Neil, NAEP Grade 4 Writing Achievement Levels-Setting (ALS) Project Director for Pearson, will provide an update on the project and an overview of the Design Document.

**Project Overview:** On August 3, 2016, the National Assessment Governing Board (Governing Board) awarded a contract to Pearson (as a result of a competitive bidding process) for developing achievement levels for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for grade 4 writing. The 2017 Grade 4 NAEP Writing assessment is the first administration of the grade 4 assessment developed to meet the design specifications described in the current computer-based Writing Framework. The assessment is a digital-based assessment, comprised of constructed response items, for which students compose and construct their responses using word processing software on a tablet. The assessment is to be administered to a nationally representative sample of approximately 22,000 grade 4 students in the spring of 2017.¹

Dr. Tim O’Neil is the grade 4 writing ALS project director at Pearson and Dr. Marc Johnson is the assistant project director at Pearson. Pearson will conduct a field trial, a pilot study, and an achievement levels-setting (ALS) meeting and produce a set of recommendations for the Governing Board to consider in establishing achievement levels for the grade 4 NAEP writing assessment. The Governing Board is expected to take action on the writing grade 4 achievement levels during the May 2018 meeting. Pearson will utilize a body of work methodology using Moodle software to collect panelist ratings and present feedback. Dr. Lori Nebelsick-Gullet will serve as the process facilitator for the pilot and operational ALS meetings; Victoria Young will serve as the content facilitator for the pilot and operational ALS meetings; and Drs. Susan Cooper Loomis and Steven Fitzpatrick will serve as consultants.

For setting standards, Pearson will use a body of work approach in which panelists will make content-based cut score recommendations. The body of work methodology is a holistic standard setting method for which panelists evaluate sets of examinee work (i.e., bodies of work) and provide a holistic judgment about each student set. These content-based judgments will be made over three rounds. The process to be implemented for the standard setting meeting follows body of work procedures used in previous NAEP standard setting studies. In addition, a field trial will be conducted prior to the pilot study which will provide an opportunity to try out a number of key aspects of the ALS plan, including the logistical design of the ALS studies such as the use of tablets and laptop computers, the ease with which the panelists can enter judgments and questionnaire responses, and the arrangement of tables and panelists.

The Governing Board policy on Developing Student Performance Levels for NAEP (https://www.nagb.org/content/nagb/assets/documents/policies/developing-student-performance.pdf) requires appointment of a committee of technical advisors who have expertise in standard setting and psychometrics in general, as well as issues specific to NAEP. These

¹ Achievement levels were set for Writing grades 8 and 12 with the 2011 administration of those assessments. The grade 4 assessment initially was scheduled to be administered in 2013 but the Governing Board postponed it to 2017 due to budgetary constraints.
advisors will be convened for 8 in-person meetings and up to 6 webinars to provide advice at every key point in the process. They provide feedback on plans and materials before activities are implemented and review results of the process and analyses. Six external experts in standard setting are serving on the Technical Advisory Committee on Standard Setting (TACSS):

**Dr. Gregory Cizek**  
Professor of Educational Measurement, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Dr. Barbara Dodd**  
Professor of Professor of Quantitative Methods, University of Texas at Austin

**Dr. Steve Ferrara**  
Independent Consultant

**Dr. Matthew Johnson**  
Associate Professor of Statistics and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

**Dr. Vaughn G. Rhudy**  
Executive Director, Office of Assessment, West Virginia Department of Education

**Dr. Mary Pitoniak**  
Senior Strategic Advisor for Statistical Analysis, Data Analysis, and Psychometric Research, Educational Testing Service (NAEP Design, Analysis, and Reporting Contractor)

**November 2016 Update:**

**Kickoff Meeting**

On Monday, August 8, 2016, Pearson staff met with members of the Governing Board staff to initiate work on the grade 4 writing ALS project. The purposes of the meeting were to identify the roles and responsibilities of Governing Board staff and contractor staff, to review and discuss proposed contract work, to discuss aspects of contract management, such as submission of reports, deliverables, and invoices, and to establish communication procedures.

**Planning Document**

On September 9, 2016, Pearson submitted the Planning Document to the Governing Board that provides details and timelines for each task conducted as part of the ALS process, to enable the Board and Board staff to complete long-range planning for the grade 4 writing ALS. The Planning Document included a Gantt chart project schedule, for use in monitoring contract deliverables.

**Technical Advisory Committee on Standard Setting (TACSS) webinar**

On September 22, 2016 the first webinar meeting of the TACSS for the 2017 Grade 4 writing ALS was convened. Topics of discussion included an introduction to the Grade 4 NAEP Writing
Framework, an overview of the Planning Document (to include high level plans for the field trial, pilot study, and operational ALS meeting, panelist recruitment and external validity studies), consideration of the inclusion of a borderline achievement level descriptors task (which had been part of Pearson’s initial proposal), and a description of computers and software to be used in the ALS.

The overall body of work design closely follows the design implemented for the 2011 Grade 8 and 12 NAEP Writing ALS in that the third round of panelist ratings is conducted with a new/comparable set of bodies of work instead of a pinpointing round. This had been vetted through the 2011 TACSS and recommended as the best course. Additionally, one TACSS member noted that the ordering of booklets for the classification by panelists using the body of work method was an important issue for the 2011 ALS. He recalled that the booklets were originally presented in order from lowest performance to highest, but the decision was made to change the ordering to be from highest performance to lowest for the ALS. The current TACSS requested further information on these points which will be discussed at the first TACSS meeting on November 2nd and 3rd.

_External Validity Study Design Meeting_

On October 5, 2016 Tim O’Neil, and Marc Johnson (Assistant Project Director) met with Victoria Young (content facilitator) to discuss the viability of proposed data sources and design of external validity studies in support of the ALS outcome. Details will be included in the Design Document and discussed at the first TACSS meeting on November 2nd and 3rd.

_Design Document_

The first draft of the Design Document was submitted to Governing Board staff on October 4, 2016. The Design Document is intended to provide the foundation for all achievement levels-setting activities. The Design Document for the grade 4 achievement levels-setting process includes discussion of the methodology, procedures, and documentation of the entire project. During the November 2016 COSDAM session, ALS Project Director Tim O’Neil will provide an overview of the Design Document. A draft of the Design Document will be sent to COSDAM members by email no later than Friday, November 11th.
Appropriate uses of NAEP data

Since its inception, the NAEP Validity Study (NVS) Panel has been engaged in research on various aspects of the validity of the NAEP assessment program. The choice of topics was informed by the judgments of both panel members and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) regarding the most pressing validity research needs at any given point in time. In October 2002, NCES asked the panel to put together a framework for their work and also asked the panel to be more forward looking in generating possible research topics to be studied. As a result of this request, in 2002, the panel developed a research agenda that was based on a framework defined by categories:

1. The constructs measured within each of NAEP’s subject domains
2. The manner in which these constructs are measured
3. The representation of the population to be assessed
4. The analysis of data
5. The reporting and use of NAEP results
6. The assessment of trends

This framework, which was published as an NVS report, continued to be used as an organizing tool for the panel for several subsequent annual updates to the validity research agenda until the recent past.

However, by the start of the current five-year contract (2013-2018), it was time to update the NVS framework in light of more recent developments. The most notable of these was criticism from a Congressionally-mandated evaluation of the NAEP program that was completed in 2009 by of scholars from the Buros Center for Testing at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln and the Center for Educational Assessment at the University of Massachusetts–Amherst. The evaluators argued that the then-current approach to NAEP validity research seemed to imply that the validity of NAEP was in the instrument rather than in the uses to which NAEP has been put. Instead, validity must be established for each purpose or use. More specifically the evaluation said: “Validation is an ongoing process because it is the interpretation or use of assessment results that are supported (validated), not the assessment instrument itself.” (Buckendahl, Davis, Plake, Sireci, Hambleton, Zenisky and Wells, 2009, p.xvii). They also noted that, in their view, much of the validity research that NCES had done to this point in time was piecemeal and without the benefit of a comprehensive framework. The specific language the evaluators used is: “NAEP has not had the benefit of a comprehensive framework to guide the systematic accumulation of evidence in order to substantiate the ways in which its assessment results may be reasonably interpreted and applied.” (Buckendahl et al., p .xi).
Finally, they argued that “there is a need for an ongoing, systematic appraisal of the validity of the interpretations and uses being built on the NAEP assessments.” (Buckendahl et al., p.14).

In response to the criticism of Buckendahl et al. (2009), NCES requested AIR’s NAEP Statistical Services Institute (NESSI) to construct a comprehensive NAEP validity framework based on the uses to which NAEP is put. In order to keep the task a manageable one, the NESSI team decided to focus only on uses designated by the federal government. That is, the framework does not include the various non-official uses to which stakeholders might employ NAEP.

The NESSI staff identified five such official uses:

1. Monitoring student performance at a given point in time in mathematics, reading and other subjects at grades 4 and 8 (and at grade 12) at the national, state and selected district levels using both scale scores and achievement levels
2. Monitoring trends in mathematics, reading and other subjects (and at grade 12) at the national, state and district levels and reported both by scale scores and achievement levels
3. Comparing the performance of achievement across states and districts as well as internationally
4. Disaggregating and reporting results by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability and limited English proficiency
5. Using NAEP results to inform and evaluate federal educational policies

The team then asked what validity questions would have to be answered to be able to assess the validity of a particular use. The crossing of the various uses of NAEP by its related validity questions resulted in the validity framework.

By agreement with NCES, NVS used the NESSI framework as a starting point for the new framework, which was primarily intended to provide structure for an NVS review of prior research on NAEP validity and to guide the choice of topics for future NVS validity studies.

After conversations with NCES and NAGB, the framework will be expanded to include a general discussion of how test scores and NAEP data are intended to be interpreted and used. This discussion will include evidence as to why specific uses and analyses are not an appropriate use of these data.
Comparing NAEP with State Assessments

The NAEP Validity Studies (NVS) panel is undertaking a suite of three interrelated studies to examine the alignment between current-generation state assessments and NAEP, with the goal of informing the following validity question:

- At grades 4 and 8, does NAEP remain sufficiently aligned with what students are learning in the classroom to continue to serve as a valid measure of what students know and can do across the nation?

Given the move by the vast majority of states to adopt either the Common Core or other college- and career-ready standards, it is important for policymakers and practitioners to understand the degree to which NAEP’s assessments continue to measure what is in the various curricula being taught by the states. Three previous NVS studies explored the same validity question by comparing NAEP frameworks, and then NAEP 2015 math items, to the Common Core Standards. These studies found substantial overlap, but also some major areas of difference. The 2015 study also found some correspondence between NAEP subscale results and the extent to which NAEP content within subscales was aligned with CCSS content standards at or below the grade tested by NAEP.

The three new studies, each led by different NVS panel members are:

- Math item comparison study
  - PIs: Phil Daro and Gerunda Hughes
- English Language Arts (ELA) item comparison study
  - PIs: Sheila Valencia and Karen Wixson (former panel member)
- Linking/joint scaling study
  - PI: David Thissen

The research studies plan on using items and test data from the 2017 assessments. Working with the Council of Chief State School Officers, NVS has identified several states interested in participating. State affiliation includes Smarter Balanced, PARCC, and states using other assessments not affiliated with these two Consortia.

The item comparison studies will use expert panels to compare the content and skills addressed by NAEP to those covered in each of the state assessments.

The linking/joint scaling study will place NAEP items on a common scale with each of the other assessments in order to examine, empirically, the relationship of NAEP items and other assessment items. (The resulting displays will be similar to those obtained from NAEP item mapping exercises.)

We plan to conduct the item comparison studies in spring 2017; the linking/joint scaling study will start when 2017 assessment data are available.
**National Assessment Governing Board**  
**Reporting and Dissemination Committee**  

**November 18, 2016**  
**10:15 am – 12:30 pm**

**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:15 – 10:20 am | Welcome and Introduction of New Committee Members                        | Rebecca Gagnon, Chair  
  Fielding Rolston  
  Jeanette Nuñez | Attachment A |
| 10:20 – 10:35 am | **ACTION:** Release Plan for 2016 NAEP Arts Assessment                  | Stephaan Harris, Assistant Director for Communications                      | Attachment B |
| 10:35 – 11:05 am | Progress Updates                                                          | Stephaan Harris  
  Laura LoGerfo, Assistant Director for Reporting & Analysis                 |             |
| 11:05 – 11:25 am | Potential Opportunities for Outreach                                       | Rebecca Gagnon                                                            | Attachment C |
| 11:25 – 11:40 am | Update on Reporting Policy Statement and Feedback                          | Laura LoGerfo                                                             |             |
| 11:40 am – 12:30 pm | Seeing the Future: The Strategic Vision and Next Generation Reporting | Laura LoGerfo  
  Dan McGrath, National Center for Education Statistics                  | Attachment D |
RELEASE PLAN FOR THE
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)

The Nation’s Report Card: 2016 Arts

The 2016 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Arts Report Card will be released to the general public through an interactive in-person release event based in Washington, D.C. in April 2017.

The event, to be webcast for a national audience, will involve the initial release of report results at a venue that reflects the various disciplines represented by the assessment. The event would also involve a creative use of technology to represent different parts of the country, such as an “electronic town hall meeting” style that would allow simultaneous broadcasts from other venues in arts-related locations outside of the Washington, DC area, where Board members and other arts community representatives could discuss the findings live from their remote locations.

The event will include a data presentation by the Acting Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES); moderation and comments by at least one Governing Board member; and comments from other panelists involved in arts education and assessment, which could include representatives from the arts community, an educator, and a student. The event, slated to be 60-90 minutes, will also include a conversational Q&A session that would include questions submitted via livestream. Full accompanying data will be posted on the Internet at the scheduled time of release.

The 2016 NAEP Arts Report Card will present findings from a representative sample of 8th-graders nationwide. Approximately 4,400 students were assessed each in visual arts and music. The report will include results of the assessments, as well as student and school survey responses about students’ experiences and their opportunities to learn in the arts.
DATE AND LOCATION

The release event will occur in April 2017. 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.

ACTIVITIES BEFORE RELEASE

In the weeks and months before the release events, the Governing Board will work to inform various audiences and stakeholder groups about the Arts assessment to provide important context and information before results are public. The efforts could include data-free presentation for the assessment for stakeholders in arts education, a full-color abridged version of the NAEP Arts Framework, one-pagers, social media campaigns, and webinars.

In the days preceding the release, the Governing Board and NCES will offer a conference call for appropriate media as defined by the Governing Board’s Embargo Policy; and an embargoed data website available to Congressional staff, approved senior representatives of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers, and approved media. The goal of these activities is to provide these stakeholders with a comprehensive overview of findings and data to help ensure accurate reporting to the public and deeper understanding of results.

REPORT RELEASE

The Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics will publicly release the report at the NAEP website—http://nationsreportcard.gov—and at the scheduled time of the release event. An online copy of the report, along with data tools, questions, and other resources, will also be available at the time of release on the NAEP site. The Governing Board press release, the full and abridged versions of the Arts Framework, and related materials will be posted on the Board’s web site at 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 will work with Board staff to coordinate an event on Capitol Hill to discuss the findings and their ramifications to a policy and assessment-oriented audience. Additional post-release communications efforts—which could include such strategies as an online chat, major presentation, webinar, or social media campaign—could also be developed to target communities and audiences with an interest in the arts. The goal of these activities is to further extend the life of the results and provide value and relevance to stakeholders with an interest in student achievement and assessment in these areas.
The Nation’s Report Card: 2015 Science
Release Activities and Highlights

Release Event and Stakeholder Outreach

- On October 28, the National Assessment Governing Board hosted an in-person release event at the Smithsonian’s National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C. More than 150 people attended, including leaders of think tanks, education groups, universities, advocacy organizations, and others — making it the most largely attended in-person release to date. More than 200 people joined the live webcast.
- The program included a presentation of the results and a lively panel discussion. Panelists/speakers included NCES Acting Commissioner Peggy Carr; Gen. John R. Dailey, the John and Adrienne Mars director of the museum; Susan German, an 8th-grade teacher at Hallsville Middle School in Missouri; Marty Kelsey, the education specialist for digital learning and host of “STEM in 30” at the museum; Dejah Wright, a 12th-grade student at Anacostia High School; and Governing Board member Linda Rosen.

Media

- Media pitching reached more than 400 reporters from national education, state education, education trade, STEM, military, and Washington, D.C., outlets.
- Within the first 36 hours of the release on October 28 at 12 a.m. EDT, 59 pieces were published, eight of which appeared in national outlets. Both The Wall Street Journal and The Washington Post pieces appeared online and in print.

Social Media

- A robust social media campaign — including Facebook posts and tweets distributed across the platforms of the Governing Board, partners/priority organizations, and the museum — widely promoted details about the release event.
- #NAEP trended on Twitter during the event. The Governing Board’s live tweets during the webcast were retweeted 55 times, garnering nearly 25,000 impressions.
- Coverage included Amy Poehler’s Smart Girls, which created an original video about the results that was posted on Facebook and tweeted, tagging the Governing Board and garnering more than 100,000 views, 2,800 reactions, and 520 shares.
Materials


On November 16, the Governing Board is slated to conduct an Internet media tour, with Governing Board member Cary Sneider and Deputy Executive Director Mary Crovo discussing issues related to STEM subjects in school, calling attention to the science assessment results as well as data from the most recent math and technology and engineering literacy assessments. (More details will be available soon.)
## Upcoming NAEP Reports as of October 2016

### Initial NAEP Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Science Report Card</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 National Indian Education Study</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Arts Report Card</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other NAEP Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on NAEP: Sampling</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on NAEP: Simpsons Paradox</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on NAEP: 12th Grade Participation &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on NAEP: English Language Learners</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017 NCES Assessment Data Release Timeline

LEGEND

- NAEP Report Cards
- Other NAEP Reports

Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr

2016 Arts Report Card
Releases in 2016

- 2015 Science Report Card
- 2015 National Indian Education Study
- Focus on NAEP: Sampling
- Focus on NAEP: Simpson’s Paradox
- Focus on NAEP: 12th Grade Participation & Engagement
- Focus on NAEP: English Language Learners

Releases in 2017

- 2016 Arts Report Card
Potential Opportunities for Outreach

Given the Governing Board’s role in communication and outreach regarding NAEP and its development of a Strategic Vision that will significantly expand that role, Reporting and Dissemination Chair Rebecca Gagnon seeks feedback from Committee members on opportunities for expanded outreach over the course of the next year. Numerous areas that would involve the Board expanding current strategies or developing new strategies could include:

- Post-Report Card Release Activities: A variety of strategies to prolong the life of NAEP reports, which could include a variety of efforts such as infographics, webinars, seminars, online chats, and presentations
- Development of Resources: Examples include the creation of materials such as infographics and one-pagers, multimedia such as videos, online tools such as apps and electronic press kits
- Development of Partnerships: One-on-one meetings with key stakeholder groups to establish connections with their directors and key staff
- Conferences and Seminars: Presentations at annual and regional gatherings of major organizations in education, policy, and assessment
- Social Media Strategies: Development of campaigns, online chats and other methods to promote NAEP and the Governing Board through social media channels.
- Roundtables and Task Forces: Assembling influential experts and NAEP users to elicit ideas on making NAEP data more accessible and relevant
- Website Development: Redesigning the Governing Board’s website to improve accessibility to viewers, modernize its look and feel, and better showcase social media

To facilitate the discussion, two charts are displayed in the attachment. The first chart contains the results of a survey of Governing Board members to collect professional organizations with which they are affiliated. The second chart is a list of annual conferences and summits of some leading national education and policy groups, which are accepting or will soon accept proposals for presentations. Please note that major conferences whose deadline submissions have already passed were not included on this list. Additionally, there are some major 2017 annual conferences, such as those sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the American Educational Research Association, where Governing Board staff or members have already submitted proposals for NAEP presentations.
# National Assessment Governing Board
## Affiliated Organizations
### Information Collected January 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Affiliated Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Alliance of Museums</td>
<td>Tonya Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for School Administrators</td>
<td>Alberto Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council on Education</td>
<td>Ronnie Musgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
<td>Andrew Ho, Joe O'Keefe, Joe Willhoft, Jim Popham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Engineering Education</td>
<td>Cary Sneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Institute</td>
<td>Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Doris Hicks, Carol Jago, Jim Popham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Latino Administrators and Superintendents</td>
<td>Alberto Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Metro School Districts</td>
<td>Rebecca Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barter Theatre</td>
<td>Fielding Rolston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Association of Teachers of English</td>
<td>Carol Jago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Reading and Literature Project at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Sciences</td>
<td>Carol Jago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Teacher's Association</td>
<td>Shannon Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the Equation</td>
<td>Linda Rosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Public Schools</td>
<td>Terry Mazany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Promise Advisory Board</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer School Development Program at Yale University Medical School</td>
<td>Doris Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete College America</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for American Private Education</td>
<td>Joe O'Keefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
<td>Andrew Ho, Mitchell Chester, Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Great City Schools</td>
<td>Rebecca Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of State Governments</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Governors' Association</td>
<td>Ronnie Musgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DigiLearn</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman Credit Union</td>
<td>Fielding Rolston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Commission of the States</td>
<td>Mitchell Chester, Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory and Henry College (Emory)</td>
<td>Fielding Rolston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Association of District School Superintendents</td>
<td>Alberto Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Andrew Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Affiliated Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Lucille Davy, Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State Department of Education</td>
<td>Terry Mazany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Technology and Engineering Education Association</td>
<td>Cary Sneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milken Family Foundation</td>
<td>Shannon Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota School Board Association</td>
<td>Rebecca Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Economic Council</td>
<td>Ronnie Musgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Professional Educators</td>
<td>Ronnie Musgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine, National Research Council Strategic Education Research Partnership</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Assessment Directors</td>
<td>Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</td>
<td>Shannon Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Catholic Educational Association</td>
<td>Joe O'Keefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Alliance for Public Charter Schools</td>
<td>Doris Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Teaching and America's Future</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of State Legislatures</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council for Social Studies</td>
<td>Chasidy White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Teachers of English</td>
<td>Carol Jago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Teachers of Mathematics</td>
<td>Dale Nowlin, Linda Rosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council on Measurement in Education</td>
<td>Andrew Ho, Joe Willhoft, Jim Popham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Education Association</td>
<td>Shannon Garrison, Chasidy White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governors Association</td>
<td>Mitchell Chester, Ronnie Musgrove, Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National PTA</td>
<td>Tonya Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Teachers Association</td>
<td>Linda Rosen, Cary Sneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Writing Project</td>
<td>Carol Jago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network for Public Education</td>
<td>Rebecca Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents United for Public Schools</td>
<td>Rebecca Gagnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary International</td>
<td>Fielding Rolston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium</td>
<td>Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Governors' Association</td>
<td>Ronnie Musgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Foundation</td>
<td>Terry Mazany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee State Board of Education</td>
<td>Fielding Rolston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Council for Educational Administration</td>
<td>Joe O'Keefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Consortium on School Research</td>
<td>Terry Mazany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Business Roundtable</td>
<td>Joe Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Governors University</td>
<td>Jim Geringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Latino Elected Officials</td>
<td>Annual Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National PTA</td>
<td>National Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Conference on Teaching Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Teachers Association</td>
<td>STEM Forum and Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of State Legislatures</td>
<td>Legislative Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Latino Administrators and Superintendents</td>
<td>Education Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Teachers of English</td>
<td>Annual Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council on Education</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Science Teachers</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seeing the Future: The Strategic Vision and Next Generation Reporting

At the May 2016 meeting of the National Assessment Governing Board, members of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee discussed in broad terms potential innovations to present findings from the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The conversation ranged widely, which leads to this discussion at the November 2016 meeting to elaborate on the ideas elicited at the May meeting and to set priorities for future work.

The setting of priorities should consider how these ideas align with the goals outlined in the Governing Board’s Strategic Vision, soon to be adopted and implemented. The Strategic Vision encompasses two broad categories of goals: Inform and Innovate. Many of the intended outcomes in the Strategic Vision fall to the responsibility of the Reporting and Dissemination (R&D) Committee, specifically:

Under Inform, the Governing Board will:

- Strengthen and expand partnerships by broadening stakeholders’ awareness of NAEP and facilitating their use of NAEP resources.
- Increase opportunities to connect NAEP to administrative data and state, national, and international student assessments.
- Expand the availability, utility, and use of NAEP resources, in part by creating new resources to inform education policy and practice.
- Promote sustained dissemination and use of NAEP information beyond Report Card releases with consideration for multiple audiences and ever-changing multi-media technologies.

Under Innovate, the Governing Board will:

- Continue improving the content, analysis, and reporting of NAEP contextual variables by considering the questions’ relevance, sensitivity, and potential to provide meaningful context and insights for policy and practice.
- Research assessments used in other countries to identify new possibilities to innovate the content, design, and reporting of NAEP.

Considering these specific responsibilities, the ideas produced at the May 2016 R&D Committee meeting align well with the Board’s Strategic Vision. The ideas suggested by the R&D members at the May meeting follow and are annotated based on subsequent discussions:

1. Presenting NAEP findings with other approved, valid, well-considered, relevant data for a given Report Card site to develop a deeper, broader conversation with stakeholders;
   - Incorporating other data into a NAEP release may raise issues considering the quality and relevance of the other data source(s). In addition, drowning out NAEP’s message
amidst the cacophony of other released findings may run counter to R&D members’ goals.

- However, other federal, nationally-representative education data could provide depth and breadth to NAEP results, as long as such data sets prove relevant to NAEP and reflect best practices of data collection and analysis. Plus, hooking NAEP into the attention paid to the release of other data may help boost NAEP’s media profile.

2. Staggering the release of results, with some findings presented initially, then other results reserved for later release and dissemination;
   - For example, the national and state results for the reading and mathematics Report Cards must be released within six months of the conclusion of data collection. The TUDA findings, which garner sufficient attention from the media and stakeholders on their own, have been released in special TUDA release events in past years, which could be replicated in the future.
   - Alternatively, with the collection of new, richer contextual data in 2017, these findings could warrant their own release event subsequent to the release of the Report Card.

3. Constructing portals for accessing NAEP Report Card data, tailored to parents, educators, school district administrators, state education personnel, and policymakers;
   - A website featuring portals convenes information from a diverse array of data sources but presents them in a consistent and uniform manner. The portals provide multiple entry points to the information, and each of the portals offers customized information and tools to address diverse interests or needs, e.g., a portal for media, for researchers, for parents, et al.
   - The multiple portals use natural language to help people know what they need to access based on their interests and how to use the data to facilitate decision-making.
   - Examples of web portals:
     - [https://www.uabmedicine.org/](https://www.uabmedicine.org/)
     - [https://axess.sahr.stanford.edu/](https://axess.sahr.stanford.edu/)
     - [http://fivethirtyeight.com/](http://fivethirtyeight.com/)

4. Linking NAEP Report Card data by topic or across years may provide a new perspective on old data and enrich the reporting of new data;
   - For example, the NAEP grade 12 results could have been displayed as part of a “Class of 2015” presentation—adjacent to results from NAEP grade 8 four years ago and NAEP grade 4 eight years ago. That presentation would have suggested that the Class of ’15, as eighth-graders four years ago, had posted the highest scores for NAEP grade 8, as had the fourth-graders eight years ago (again, today’s twelfth-graders). Such an aligned presentation may have sparked new questions about what may be driving these results.

5. Building a very simple, easy-to-use data tool (similar to what R&D saw at the August 2016 presentation by David Stewart of TEMBO) with only the most recent data available and simple
frequency distributions. The Reporting and Dissemination Committee reacted very positively to David Stewart’s compelling presentation. However, in investigating this proposed tool, Board staff learned of numerous challenges which would hobble, if not completely prevent, the successful implementation of such a proposal. First, it would be problematic if that data tool provided results that differed from those on the Nation’s Report Card or found through the NAEP Data Explorer. Second, there is a significant legal question about where such data would reside securely for easy and quick access.

- Instead, perhaps, efforts could be focused on constructing an optional explanatory overlay for pages on the Nation’s Report Card website, or preparing a 30-second video tutorial to accompany a release that facilitates interpretation of the data presentations.
  - For example, the 2014 Technology and Engineering Literacy Assessment website could have included a toggle button to provide text boxes with examples of how to interpret ‘bubble’ charts, how to explain achievement levels, how to find specific information on subgroup score differences, or the like.

6. Developing a coherent set of indicators. In 2014, Alan Ginsburg and Marshall S. Smith wrote a white paper suggesting that NAEP should develop ten to 15 Key Education Indicators (KEIs) that could be reported along with NAEP achievement results. This approach would take advantage of NAEP’s unique value as the only dataset in which contextual data are regularly collected from students, teachers, and principals in the same schools.
  - For example, a KEI for school quality could include composite indicators for teacher quality, school climate, resources, and effective use of technology at the school. Each of these indicators would include data from several variables already collected by NAEP.

7. Setting predictable dates for each Nation’s Report Card release. This predictability would notify media, external partners, and stakeholders well in advance when to expect results, so the release could be publicized and reported on widely. With the transition to digital-based assessment (DBA) in 2017, the desire to set October as NAEP Report Card month is thwarted; the data will not be ready to release until Winter 2018. Other ideas to consume that time slot as a means to establish the October Report Card tradition are underway, but this goal will be easier to fulfill in 2019 when the transition to DBA in reading and math is complete.

All of these proposals work well within the framework outlined by the Strategic Vision. They match goals to increase opportunities to connect NAEP to other student assessments, to expand the availability, utility, and use of NAEP resources by broader groups of stakeholders, and to promote sustained dissemination and use of NAEP beyond Report Card releases.

The upcoming Committee conversation should focus on which of these ideas seem most promising to pursue first. And note that before commencing the pursuit of any proposal, the Board staff would discuss the ideas with NCES first and among our stakeholders to determine what need this might fulfill and how the final product or outcome should look and work.
Summary of the National Assessment Governing Board’s Development of the Strategic Vision Draft
——November 2016——

The National Assessment Governing Board began its Strategic Planning Initiative (Initiative) in 2014 by developing a framework to set priorities and goals. The Strategic Planning Framework development was led by the Executive Committee and was unanimously approved by the Board on August 8, 2015, concluding Phase I of the Initiative. At the August 2015 meeting, the Board met in small cross-committee groups to develop an initial list of activities that could be accomplished within five years to achieve the priorities specified in the Strategic Planning Framework. These conversations formed the basis for the first draft of the Strategic Plan.1

Upon approval of the Framework, Chair Mazany asked Vice Chair Lucille Davy to lead Phase II of the Initiative to guide the Board’s development of its Strategic Plan. At the Board’s November 2015 meeting, Vice Chair Davy led the Governing Board in its first plenary discussion of the draft Strategic Plan.

The Board’s plan for Phase II included soliciting feedback from external education stakeholders to inform the Strategic Plan. The Board hired a consultant, Jim Kohlmoos, to conduct conversations with 22 individuals who are respected education leaders, familiar with NAEP, and represent a diverse range of perspectives to generate ideas for the Strategic Plan. In addition, the staff discussed the draft Strategic Plan priorities and activities with the Board’s joint Policy Task Force with the Council of Chief State School Officers, representing state assessment experts. The external feedback was prepared for the Board’s consideration at its March 2016 meeting and was discussed in a plenary session with Mr. Kohlmoos.2

At the May 2016 meeting, the Governing Board engaged in a detailed discussion of the revised draft Strategic Plan. The Board met first in small, cross-committee groups and then as the full Board in a plenary session. What emerged from the May 2016 meeting was a call for a significantly revised strategic document that would focus purely on the Board’s work and be an inspiring, succinct, and effective public communications tool. Chair Mazany tasked the Executive Committee to revise the draft for discussion at the August 2016 Board meeting. The Executive Committee members were highly engaged in its June and July teleconference meetings. As a result, the May 2016 draft transformed into the now-called “Strategic Vision” draft. In addition to the Executive Committee’s work, the draft Strategic Vision also went through numerous rounds of Board staff review and incorporated feedback from NCES.

At the August 2016 Board meeting, the Board discussed the Strategic Vision in small cross-committee groups and then as the full Board in a plenary session. In its discussions, the Governing Board affirmed its desire to impact student achievement through its activities in the Strategic Vision. The Board also made recommendations to refine the draft and indicated readiness for the Board to take action on the Strategic Vision at the November 2016 meeting.3 Following the August meeting, the Executive Committee considered final changes to the Strategic Vision to reflect the Board’s discussions.

ACTION: The proposed Strategic Vision is attached for Executive Committee and full Board action at the November 2016 meeting.

Upon approval, the Board will conclude Phase II of the Initiative. Phase III—the final stage—is to implement the Strategic Vision.


2 A summary of the feedback provided for the March 2016 meeting is available here: https://www.nagb.org/content/members/assets/documents/meetings/board-meetings/2016/2016-03/10-strategic-planning-initiative.pdf

3 Refer to the August 2016 meeting minutes included in the November 2016 Board materials for the discussion summary.
The Nation’s Report Card, also known as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), was developed in 1969 to answer the important question: “How are our nation’s students doing?” The National Assessment Governing Board established this Strategic Vision to not only answer the first question, but also to expand NAEP’s impact by addressing a second question: “How can NAEP provide information about how our students are doing in the most innovative, informative, and impactful ways?"

Congress created the independent, bipartisan Governing Board in 1988 to set policy guidelines for The Nation’s Report Card, which is the largest nationally representative, continuing evaluation of the condition of education in the United States. The Governing Board identifies NAEP subjects to be tested, determines the content and achievement levels for each assessment, approves all test questions, and takes steps to improve the form, reporting, and use of results.

The Governing Board partners with the National Center for Education Statistics, which administers the NAEP program, to inform a wide range of stakeholders—including policymakers, educators, researchers, business leaders, the media, and the general public—about what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas, and compare achievement data over time and among student demographic groups. This allows the nation to understand where more work must be done to improve learning among all students.

The educational landscape of the 21st century demands increased academic ambition, greater technological sophistication, improved civic participation, and expanded global perspectives for all students. In this time of rapid and accelerating change, it is essential for The Nation’s Report Card to support innovation and address the need to improve student achievement, while maintaining its timeless promise to serve as the constant and unassailable measure of student achievement for our nation.

To increase the value of The Nation’s Report Card as a resource to impact student achievement, the Governing Board adopted this Strategic Vision with a dual focus on innovating to enhance NAEP’s form and content and informing stakeholders to expand NAEP’s dissemination and use.
The National Assessment Governing Board will promote The Nation’s Report Card’s wealth of information to facilitate the awareness and uses of NAEP in appropriate, timely, new, and meaningful ways. Examples of NAEP resources include: results; trends; test questions and tasks; studies; measurement innovations; frameworks that specify the content and design of NAEP assessments; and contextual variables about student demographics and educational experiences collected from students, teachers, and schools. The Governing Board will:

- Strengthen and expand partnerships by broadening stakeholders’ awareness of NAEP and facilitating their use of NAEP resources.
- Increase opportunities to connect NAEP to administrative data and state, national, and international student assessments.
- Expand the availability, utility, and use of NAEP resources, in part by creating new resources to inform education policy and practice.
- Promote sustained dissemination and use of NAEP information beyond Report Card releases with consideration for multiple audiences and ever-changing multi-media technologies.

The National Assessment Governing Board will revise the design, form, and content of The Nation’s Report Card using advances in technology to keep NAEP at the forefront of measuring and reporting student achievement. The Governing Board will:

- Develop new approaches to update NAEP subject area frameworks to support the Board’s responsibility to measure evolving expectations for students, while maintaining rigorous methods that support reporting student achievement trends.
- Continue improving the content, analysis, and reporting of NAEP contextual variables by considering the questions’ relevance, sensitivity, and potential to provide meaningful context and insights for policy and practice.
- Research policy and technical implications related to the future of NAEP Long-Term Trend assessments in reading and mathematics.
- Research assessments used in other countries to identify new possibilities to innovate the content, design, and reporting of NAEP.
- Develop policy approaches to revise the NAEP assessment subjects and schedule based on the nation’s evolving needs, the Board’s priorities, and NAEP funding.
- Develop new approaches to measure the complex skills required for transition to postsecondary education and career.

This Strategic Vision will focus the work of the Governing Board through the year 2020. By pursuing these priorities, the Governing Board will ensure that The Nation’s Report Card provides the country with valuable data that measure and contribute to the improvement of student progress in achieving important knowledge and skills necessary for success as citizens in our democratic society.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Now that you are a member of the National Assessment Governing Board (“NAGB”) you need to know what ethics laws and rules apply to you. The following is a very brief summary of these rules. For a more detailed discussion of how these rules apply to you, please refer to the attached summary entitled “Ethics Laws and Rules Applicable to SGEs.”

Your Status as a Special Government Employee

You are considered an SGE and not a regular federal employee because NAGB anticipates that you will be serving the federal government through your position for only 130 days or less during any period of 365 consecutive days. Whether or not you are paid by the Board for your service is irrelevant. This summary discusses how the ethics rules apply to SGEs.

Criminal Statutes Apply to Your Activities

Some of the ethics laws that apply to you carry criminal penalties. Below is a brief summary of the most important of these laws.

- The chief conflict of interest law bars you from participating personally and substantially in your capacity as a member of NAGB in any particular matter before the federal government that has a direct and predictable effect on your own financial interests or the financial interests of others with whom you have certain relationships. See 18 U.S.C. Section 208.

- If you find yourself with a financial conflict of interest, you have four options: (1) disqualify yourself (you don’t participate in any way in the matter); (2) resign from the outside entity that is the basis for the conflict; (3) sell or divest the stock or other financial interest that is the basis for the conflict; or (4) request and obtain a statutory waiver.\footnote{In rare circumstances, with the concurrence of the U.S. Office of Government Ethics, you may obtain a waiver of the conflict of interest.}

- Two other laws prohibit you from representing a third party, with or without compensation, before any court or agency in connection with any particular matter involving specific parties in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest and in which you have participated personally and substantially as an SGE. In addition, if you serve the federal government for more than 60 days during the immediately preceding period of 365 consecutive days, these restrictions apply to any matter that is pending with NAGB. But remember that these restrictions do not apply to particular matters of general applicability, such as broadly applicable policies, rulemaking proceedings or legislation, that do not involve specific parties. See 18 U.S.C. Sections 203 and 205.
• Another criminal law limits some of your activities after your service on NAGB ends. This law prohibits you from representing others in connection with the same particular matter involving specific parties in which you participated personally and substantially during your service to NAGB. This prohibition lasts for your lifetime. See 18 U.S.C. Section 207.

Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch

The Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (Standards), 5 C.F.R. Part 2635, are regulations that apply both to regular federal government employees and to SGEs. However, a few exceptions exist in the Standards in recognition of the fact that SGEs are working for the government only in a very limited way. A brief synopsis of some these rules and their exceptions follow.

• **Fundraising:** You may not use your official title, position and authority to engage in fundraising.

• **Gifts:** You may not accept gifts from a “prohibited source” or offered to you because of your official position on NAGB. A prohibited source includes any person: seeking official action from NAGB; doing or seeking to do business with NAGB; conducting activities regulated by NAGB; or having interests that may be substantially affected by your official duties. There are many exceptions to this rule that are discussed in more detail in the accompanying memorandum.

• **Lobbying:** In your role as a member of NAGB, you may not urge others to contact Congress or a state legislature to urge the passage or defeat of legislation. Additional restrictions exist regarding lobbying. You should contact Department of Education’s Ethics Division before engaging in any type of lobbying.

• **Misuse of Position:** You may not use your position on NAGB or nonpublic information gained through your service on NAGB to seek advantage for yourself or others. In addition, you may not use your NAGB title in a manner that makes it appear that NAGB is sanctioning your views, products, services or personal enterprises.

• **Political Activities:** You may not engage in political activity when you are on duty or in a federal government building or car, and you may never use your official title as a member of NAGB in connection with political activities.

• **Teaching, Speaking and Writing:** You may not receive compensation for teaching, speaking or writing if: (1) the invitation was offered to you because of your position on NAGB; (2) the information conveyed by you draws substantially on nonpublic information that you obtained by working on NAGB; (3) the invitation was extended to you by an organization or person who has interests that may be substantially affected by your performance on NAGB; or (4) the subject of your work deals in a significant way
with a matter involving specific parties that you worked on while on NAGB. Again, there are some exceptions to this rule that are outlined in more detail in the accompanying memorandum.

**Required Filing of a Financial Disclosure Report By SGEs**

As a member of the NAGB, you are required to file a confidential financial disclosure report (also referred to as a “450” Report) when you are first appointed, and annually thereafter if you are reappointed. The purpose of the financial disclosure form is to protect you from inadvertently violating any of the criminal conflict of interest statutes and so that NAGB can know that your advice is free from any real or perceived conflicts of interest.

Please do not rely solely on this “Executive Summary” before undertaking your duties. There are many subtle nuances that are not discussed in this summary that may apply to your specific situation. The attached expanded summary provides additional detail that will help you better understand the ethics rules. Please feel free to call or e-mail Marcella Goodridge in the Ethics Division of the Office of the General Counsel at the U.S. Department of Education at (202) 401-8309, or Marcella.Keiller@ed.gov, for answers to any specific ethics questions that may arise in the course of your service on NAGB.
ETHICS LAWS AND RULES APPLICABLE TO SGES

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the ethics rules are numerous and detailed, a single, simple principle underlies these rules: You should never use your public office for private gain, either for yourself, or for any third party. In addition, you must refrain not only from engaging in any activity that violates the ethics rules, but you must also refrain from any activity that creates the appearance of a violation of any of these rules. The summary below is designed to help you avoid violating any ethics rules covering your activities as a member of NAGB.

II. YOUR STATUS AS A SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE

A. What is a “special Government employee”?

Because you have been appointed to be a member of the NAGB and you are expected to perform your duties for not more than 130 days during the 365 days subsequent to the date of your appointment, you are, by law, a “special Government employee” (SGE). As an SGE, you are a federal government employee. This means that upon appointment, you assume the responsibilities, obligations, and restrictions that are part of public service. Because SGEs are not full-time employees, several of these restrictions apply only in limited circumstances.

B. Do the ethics restrictions apply when I am not working for NAGB?

Yes, any restrictions concerning your private activities (representational services, expert witness activities, etc.) apply equally on days when you serve the federal government through your position on NAGB and on days when you do not, except with respect to political activity. If you have not provided any services for the federal government for some time, but have not received a termination date for your appointment, you must seek a formal resolution of the matter before engaging in conduct prohibited by the ethics rules.

III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A. What criminal conflict of interest statutes apply to SGES?

While you are employed as an SGE, you need to pay particular attention to four criminal conflict of interest laws found in Chapter 11, Title 18 of the United States Code: 18 U.S.C. Sections 203, 205, 207 and 208. These criminal laws include some special provisions for the treatment of SGEs. A discussion of these laws and certain related requirements found in other laws and regulations follows.
B. What financial conflicts of interest may arise for SGEs under section 208?

Section 208 prohibits you from participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that has a direct and predictable effect on your financial interests, including certain interests of others that are imputed to you under the statute. This means that you may not work on NAGB matters if you have certain connections – through the ownership of stock, through employment, or by virtue of other circumstances – with an organization that has a financial interest in the matter. For example, you may not work at all on a contract competition if you own stock valued at a certain amount in a company competing for the contract. You may not participate in a discussion of whether to modify an existing contract with a company if you work for that company. And, you may not assist in the development of a scope of work for a contract competition if you know that an organization on which you serve on the Board of Directors plans to compete for that contract.

In addition to your own personal financial interests, the financial interests of the following persons or organizations are imputed to you and also disqualify you from participating in a particular matter:

(1) your spouse;
(2) your minor child;
(3) your general partner;
(4) an organization for which you serve as an officer, director, trustee, general partner or employee; and
(5) any prospective employer.

Example 1 You are on the governing board of ABC, a nonprofit organization. ABC’s financial interests are imputed to you under the statute. This means that for the purpose of determining whether you have a conflict of interest, ABC’s financial interests are treated as if they were your own. Accordingly, you may not participate in any NAGB matter in which ABC has a financial interest. Similarly, if you were in the process of discussing employment with ABC, you would be barred from participating in any NAGB matter affecting the financial interests of ABC.

Example 2 You are on the governing board of ABC (or employed by ABC, own stock in ABC, seeking employment with ABC, etc). You are asked to participate in the process of reviewing and scoring contract proposals for a contract competition for a NAGB project. Fifteen organizations have submitted a bid. When you open the proposal from one organization, you note that ABC’s name is one of the organizations that has submitted a bid. Or, perhaps ABC is listed as a subcontractor in one of the proposals. This contract competition is a “particular
matter” that will have a “direct and predictable effect” upon the financial interests of ABC. In other words, as a result of the contract competition, ABC will either gain business or not, and this decision will affect ABC financially – either negatively or positively. The amount of financial interest is not relevant – as long as ABC’s finances will be affected, unless a regulatory exemption or waiver permits you to do so, you may not work on this competition. And, because each proposal is competing against all of the others, your evaluation of competing proposals will affect the chances ABC has of winning the contract. Accordingly, you may not review any of the proposals.

You must recuse yourself from a matter as soon as you realize that you have a conflict. If, for example, you notice that you have a conflict when you are in the middle of reviewing contract proposals, you put the proposal back in its envelope and call up an NAGB staff member and let that person know that you think that you are disqualified from working on the competition. If there is any question, you should contact the U.S. Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division for guidance. Once you have determined that you may not work on this matter, send the proposal back to NAGB staff.

You are permitted to participate in a particular matter affecting one campus of a multi-campus institution of higher education, where the disqualifying interest arises from your employment with a separate campus of the same institution, provided that you have no multi-campus responsibilities at the institution. If you are employed with a large university with multiple campuses and you do not have any multi-campus responsibilities, you may participate in official matters—such as grants, contracts, applications, and other particular matters—that affect the financial interests of another campus in the same university system where you are employed. Below are some examples of how section 208 may apply to your activities.

**Example 3** You are employed as a professor at the University of California-Berkeley. NAGB is planning to evaluate the impact of computer-based testing on students with disabilities and English language learners. UC-Berkeley’s science and technology department has submitted a bid. NAGB’s actions will have a direct and predictable effect on the university’s financial interest. Therefore, you may not participate in any way on this matter.

**Example 4** You are employed as a researcher at the University of California-Berkeley. NAGB is planning to evaluate the impact of computer-based testing on students with disabilities and English language learners. The University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA) has submitted a bid to be the contractor for NAGB’s evaluation. You may participate in this matter because it will not have a direct and predictable effect on either your financial interests or UC-Berkeley’s.
C. How do I resolve a conflict of interest?

1. Disqualification

A common method of resolving a conflict of interest is to disqualify yourself from participating in the matter.

*Example 5* You are serving on NAGB’s Ad Hoc Committee that will examine issues related to computer-based testing for students with disabilities and English language learners, including developing a study of computer-based testing methodologies. The Request for Proposals has been disseminated. One of the bids submitted is from ABC Corporation (ABC). You own $20,000 worth of stock in ABC. You must advise the U.S. Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division that you own stock in ABC and you will not be able to participate in any way in the entire contract competition. If ABC is awarded the contract, you will also need to disqualify yourself from the entire matter.

2. Divestiture

Divestiture of a disqualifying interest (usually through the sale of stock) is another remedy available to avoid a potential violation of section 208. SGEs are not eligible for a Certificate of Divestiture (CD). A CD is a tax benefit that allows the deferral or nonrecognition of capital gain where an employee divests a financial interest in order to comply with conflict of interest requirements. Unfortunately, Congress specifically excluded SGEs from eligibility to receive CDs. 26 U.S.C. § 1043(b)(1)(A).

3. Resignation

On some very rare occasions when none of the aforementioned options are available or feasible, an SGE may need to resign from participating in an outside activity with an entity if his or her official activities as an SGE have a direct and predictable effect on the financial interest of that entity creating an irreconcilable conflict.

4. Waiver or Authorization

Another remedy to avoid a conflicting financial interest is to request and obtain a statutory waiver by contacting the Department of Education’s Ethics Division (an authorization is similar to a waiver, but only applies to non-statutory conflicts of interest - what are often referred to as “appearances of a conflict”). You may be granted a waiver only if your financial interest is not so substantial as to be deemed to be likely to affect the integrity of your services.

*Example 6* In the scenario described in Examples 1 and 2 above, you are granted a waiver permitting you to participate in a general policy matter that affects ABC’s financial interests as following ...
long as the matter affects all similarly situated entities in the same manner. But you would remain disqualified from participating in a matter that specifically involves ABC, which in this case means the entire contract competition.

D. What restrictions apply to my representation of third parties under sections 203 and 205?

With regard to particular matters in which you have participated personally and substantially while serving NAGB, you are prohibited from representing a third party on those particular matters, with or without compensation, before any court or agency, when the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest in the matter. See 18 U.S.C. Sections 203 and 205.

In addition, if you serve the federal government for more than 60 days during the immediately preceding period of 365 consecutive days, you are prohibited from representing a third party on any matter involving specific parties pending before NAGB, even if your work at NAGB did not involve these matters. These restrictions do not apply to particular matters of general applicability, such as broadly applicable policies, rulemaking procedures or legislation that does not involve specific parties.

IV. POST-EMPLOYMENT

After your appointment terminates at NAGB, you need to pay particular attention to one more criminal statute that subjects you to restrictions regarding certain matters that you may have worked on as a member of NAGB. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 207, you may never represent any third party, other than in the performance of your official government duties, in connection with the same particular matter involving specific parties in which you participated personally and substantially as a member of NAGB. This is a lifetime prohibition. For example, if you participated in a NAGB discussion concerning a contract to State University, you may never represent State University with respect to that same contract before any official of the Executive Branch of the federal government and you may never represent State University with respect to that contract in any federal court.

Further, if you serve on NAGB more than sixty days and are compensated above a certain level, you may be subject to a one-year “cooling-off” period during which you would be barred from representing before NAGB certain third parties in connection with any matter. There are some exceptions to this law as well, and you should contact the Department of Education’s Ethics Division for guidance.

V. STANDARDS OF ETHICAL CONDUCT AND OTHER ETHICS RULES

The Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (Standards), 5 C.F.R. Part 2635, are regulations that apply both to regular federal government employees and to SGEs. Although you are treated generally the same as regular employees under the Standards, a few
exceptions do exist for SGEs in recognition of the fact that SGEs are working for the government only in a very limited way. In addition, there are other rules that govern your conduct as an SGE, including the Hatch Act, anti-lobbying rules, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and rules about accepting gifts and compensation from foreign governments. A brief synopsis of some of these rules follows.

A. What restrictions apply if I want to engage in fundraising?

You may not use your NAGB title, position or authority to solicit funds for any organization. In addition, you may not personally solicit funds or other support from persons whose interests may be affected substantially by the performance or nonperformance of your official duties.

B. What restrictions are there on my acceptance of gifts?

You are prohibited from accepting gifts (almost anything of monetary value) from a “prohibited source” or gifts given because of your official position as a member of NAGB, unless a specific exception applies. The definition of “prohibited source” includes any person:

- seeking official action from NAGB;
- doing or seeking to do business with NAGB; or
- having interests that may be substantially affected by your official duties at NAGB.

The definition also includes organizations the majority of whose members fall within any of these categories. You may accept various benefits resulting from your outside business or employment activities, if a reasonable person would conclude that such benefits are not offered or enhanced because of your official position. The most commonly applicable exceptions to the gift rule allow you to accept:

- Modest items of food other than a meal, such as coffee, soft drinks, or donuts;
- Most plaques, certificates and trophies;
- Discounts available to all Government employees;
- Anything for which you pay market value;
- Gifts valued at $20 or less per occasion, totaling no more than $50 in a calendar year from any one source;
- Gifts clearly motivated by friendship or family relationship;
- Gifts resulting from your outside business activities, including those of your spouse; and
- Free attendance or meal which is provided by:

1. the sponsor of the event for the day on which you are speaking at the event, or for a widely-attended gathering of mutual interest to a number of parties when the necessary determination of agency interest has been made; or

2. someone other than the sponsor of a widely-attended gathering of mutual interest to a number of parties when more than 100 people are expected to attend, the
aggregate value of the gift is under $335, and the necessary determination of agency interest has been made.

C. What restrictions apply if I want to “lobby” Congress?

NAGB and its members are permitted to communicate directly with Congress in their official capacity on matters that are related to legislation or appropriations deemed necessary to conduct NAGB’s “public business” (i.e., the NAGB’s statutory functions and responsibilities). However, the Anti-Lobbying Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 1913, prohibits you, in your official capacity at NAGB, from engaging in “grass-roots lobbying” (i.e., directly or indirectly suggesting or requesting that others contact Congress or a state legislature to urge the passage or defeat of proposed or pending legislation), even if it is related to the NAGB’s public business. The Anti-Lobbying Act also requires that any permissible direct communications with Congress in your official capacity at NAGB be made only through official channels.

None of these restrictions prohibit you from lobbying members of Congress or state legislatures, or urging others to do so, on your own time in your personal capacity. If you lobby Congress or state legislatures in your personal capacity, and the issue is related to NAGB’s business, you should make it clear that you are not representing NAGB and not acting in your official capacity as a member. Also, please note that when you are lobbying as a private citizen, you are not permitted to use government resources or equipment (including, but not limited to, computers, telephones, fax machines, copy machines, stationery), or seek assistance from NAGB staff.

D. What does “misuse of position” mean?

You may not use your position on NAGB to seek advantage for yourself or others. You also may not use nonpublic information gained through your service at NAGB to seek advantage for yourself or others. Finally, you may not use your NAGB title in a manner that makes it appear that the NAGB is sanctioning your views, products, services or personal enterprises. Of course, you may list your membership on NAGB on your curriculum vitae, but you may never use your status as an NAGB member to advertise or promote your personal activities. Please seek advice from the Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division if you have any questions in this area.

E. May I keep my day job and still serve on NAGB?

Yes, you may continue to collect your regular salary from an outside employer for days on which you are providing services to the federal government (whether your federal government service is paid or unpaid). However, if you have another consultant or advisory position with NAGB or any other federal department or agency, you may not receive per diem or salary from NAGB for the same day for services performed for the two positions.

F. Are there any restrictions on my political activities?

You may not engage in any political activities while you are on duty (i.e., performing
government services) or when you are in a government building or vehicle. Although you are not subject to any restrictions on your political activities when you are not performing government services, you may never use your official title as a member of NAGB in connection with any political activities.

G. What restrictions do I face if I want to teach, speak, or write on matters that are related to the duties I perform for NAGB?

You may not receive compensation for teaching, speaking, or writing if:

- the activity is performed as part of your official duties (e.g., a speech on behalf of NAGB);
- the invitation to engage in the activity was extended primarily because of your official position at NAGB, rather than expertise in the subject matter;
- the invitation or offer of compensation was extended to you by someone with interests that may be affected substantially by your duties;
- the information conveyed through the activity draws substantially on nonpublic information obtained through your service at NAGB; or
- the activity deals, in significant part, with a matter involving specific parties to which you are currently assigned or had been assigned during your current NAGB appointment.

Notwithstanding the restrictions in bold you may accept compensation for teaching a course requiring multiple presentations offered as part of: (a) the regularly established curriculum of various specified types of educational institutions; or (b) educational or training programs sponsored and funded by federal, State, or local government. However, if you teach at an educational institution, you must not participate in any NAGB matters that involve that institution.

H. What restrictions apply if my government duties involve the awarding of contracts?

If you are involved in the awarding of any contracts, please seek advice from the Ethics Division. There are special provisions that cover your involvement in the awarding of contracts. For example, you may not accept compensation as an employee, officer, director, or consultant of a contractor within the one-year period after leaving Government service where you participated in certain procurement matters pertaining to that contractor. In addition, if you disclose certain information pertaining to Federal procurements that you obtained during your service on a committee, you may face sanctions, including criminal penalties.
I. What restrictions apply to my interaction with foreign entities?

The emoluments clause of the U.S. Constitution prohibits you from receiving any emolument, office or title of any kind from a foreign government, including political subdivisions of a foreign government. An emolument is compensation received by virtue of holding an office or having employment with a foreign government and includes, for example, salary, honoraria, transportation, per diem allowances, household goods, shipment costs, and housing allowances. This clause has been interpreted to be broader than the traditional notion of employment and includes, for example, income received through a partnership when an identifiable portion of the partnership draw can be attributed to the partnership’s fees from such foreign government. This provision has particular relevance to positions with foreign universities that are government-operated, as opposed to private institutions. United States Constitution, art. I § 9, cl. 8. There are also statutory provisions restricting acceptance of gifts from foreign governments. 5 U.S.C. § 7342. You should seek advice from the Ethics Division regarding the details about these restrictions. Additionally, a criminal statute bars employment or consultation with a foreign entity for the purpose of providing foreign agent representation or lobbying. 18 U.S.C. § 219.

The ban on participating in foreign agent activities covered by the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) prohibits representation of foreign governments or foreign political parties before the United States Government, as well as a number of other activities conducted within the United States on behalf of such entities. There are certain FARA exceptions related to trade or commerce, legal representation, humanitarian fundraising, and religious, scholastic, or scientific pursuits. The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 requires certain covered Federal officials who serve as agents of foreign principals (other than foreign governments or foreign political parties) to register if they work on behalf of foreign corporations, associations, or other organizations.

Finally, certain restrictions apply after your position with NAGB terminates. Specifically, 18 U.S.C. § 207 includes restrictions on former employees who participated in trade or treaty negotiations on behalf of the United States (18 U.S.C. § 207(b)) and on former senior employees who wish to represent, or aid or advise in the representation of, a foreign entity with the intent to influence a decision of a Federal employee or agency (18 U.S.C. § 207(f)).

J. What do I do if I am called to be an expert witness?

Government employees generally may not participate as an expert witness, with or without compensation, other than on behalf of the United States, in any proceeding before a federal court or agency in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest. This restriction applies to most SGEs only if the SGE actually participated officially in the same proceeding or in the particular matter that is the subject of the proceeding. If you are appointed by the President, serve on a commission established by statute, or serve (or are expected to serve) for more than 60 days in a period of 365 days, the restriction on expert service also applies to any proceeding in which NAGB is a party or has a direct and substantial interest.
K. May I keep and use frequent flyer miles that I earn when I am on official NAGB travel?

Yes, you may use frequent flyer miles or other airline awards or promotions accumulated on official NAGB travel for your own personal use.

VI. CONCLUSION

We understand that these laws are complex and may not be intuitive. Again, we caution you that this summary is merely an introduction to the ethics laws and rules that apply to you. You should always feel free to contact the Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division with any questions or concerns.

Marcella Goodridge Keiller, Attorney
U.S. Department of Education
Office of the General Counsel
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 6E237
Washington, D.C. 20202-2110
(202) 401-8309
(202) 260-5104 (fax)

Marcella.Keiller@ed.gov
National Assessment Governing Board  
Nominations Committee  
November 19, 2016  
7:30 – 8:15 am  

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closed Session 7:30 – 8:15 am</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7:30 – 7:35 am | Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview  
Tonya Miles, Chair |
| 7:35 – 8:15 am | Update and Discussion of Nominations Received for 2016-2017  
Mary Crovo, Governing Board Staff Committee Members |
Evaluation of the NAEP Achievement Levels for Mathematics and Reading

Background
Public Law 107-279 states:

The achievement levels shall be used on a trial basis until the Commissioner for Education Statistics determines, as a result of an evaluation under subsection (f), that such levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public.

Even after being in use for about 25 years and undergoing previous evaluations (1993, 1998, 2009), the NAEP achievement levels are still considered to be on a trial basis. During his tenure as National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Commissioner, Jack Buckley initiated a new evaluation to determine whether the trial status could be resolved.

About the Evaluation
The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), part of the Institute for Education Sciences (IES), is administering the current evaluation of the NAEP achievement levels. On September 29, 2014, NCEE awarded a contract to The National Academy of Sciences to perform this work.

Objectives for the evaluation include the following:

- Determine how "reasonable, valid, reliable and informative to the public" will be operationalized in this study.
- Identify the kinds of objective data and research findings that will be examined.
- Review and analyze extant information related to the study's purpose.
- Gather other objective information from relevant experts and stakeholders, without creating burden for the public through new, large-scale data collection.
- Organize, summarize, and present the findings from the evaluation in a written report, including a summary that is accessible for nontechnical audiences, discussing the strengths/weaknesses and gaps in knowledge in relation to the evaluation criteria.
- Provide, prior to release of the study report, for an independent external review of that report for comprehensiveness, objectivity, and freedom from bias.
- Plan and conduct dissemination events to communicate the conclusions of the final report to different audiences of stakeholders.
Design
This study focuses on the achievement levels used in reporting NAEP results for the reading and mathematics assessments in grades 4, 8, and 12. Specifically, the study is reviewing developments over the past decade in the ways achievement levels for NAEP are set and used and will evaluate whether the resulting achievement levels are "reasonable, valid, reliable, and informative to the public." The study relies on an independent committee of experts with a broad range of expertise related to assessment, statistics, social science, and education policy. The project receives oversight from the Board on Testing and Assessment (BOTA) and the Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) of the National Research Council.

Members of the interdisciplinary review committee were selected in early 2015 (see below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christopher F. Edley, Jr. (Chair)</td>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Peter Afflerbach</td>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sybilla Beckmann</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. H. Russell Bernard</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karla Egan</td>
<td>EdMetric LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David J. Francis</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Margaret E. Goertz</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Laura Hamilton</td>
<td>The RAND Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brian W. Junker</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Suzanne Lane</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sharon J. Lewis</td>
<td>Retired (formerly with the Council of the Great City Schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bernard L. Madison</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Scott Norton</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sharon Vaughn</td>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lauress L. Wise</td>
<td>HumRRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information about the Committee and project activities is available at: [http://www8.nationalacademies.org/cp/projectview.aspx?key=49677](http://www8.nationalacademies.org/cp/projectview.aspx?key=49677). The first Committee meeting took place in Washington, DC on February 19-20, 2015. Governing Board staff attended the open session and made a presentation to the Committee on the history of the NAEP achievement levels setting activities. The second meeting of the Committee took place in Washington, DC on May 27-28, 2015. Governing Board staff attended the open session on the afternoon of May 27th to listen to panel discussions involving representatives of the media, state and local policymakers, advocacy organizations, and the Common Core State Standards assessment consortia, about interpretations and uses of NAEP achievement levels. Several
additional meetings were conducted in the latter half of 2015 in closed session. The final report is expected to be released in late 2016.

**Presentation to the Governing Board**

Governing Board members will be briefed on the findings from the evaluation on Saturday morning, November 19th. If the final report has not yet been made public, then the briefing will occur in closed session. The presenters are members of the interdisciplinary review committee: Dr. Christopher Edley (Chair), Dr. Suzanne Lane, and Dr. Laauress Wise.

**CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR. (Chair)** is the honorable William H. Orrick, Jr., distinguished professor and faculty director at the Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy at the School of Law of the University of California at Berkeley, where he previously served as dean. Earlier, he was a professor at Harvard Law School. His academic work is in administrative law, civil rights, education policy, and, generally, domestic public policy. His public policy work has included policy and budget positions under Presidents Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton. He also served as a senior policy adviser in the presidential campaign of Barack Obama and on the transition board, with responsibility for education, immigration, and health. More recently, he co-chaired the congressionally chartered National Commission on Education Equity and Excellence, which was charged to revisit the 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, and recommend future directions for reform. He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Public Administration, the Council of Foreign Relations, and the Gates Foundation’s National Programs Advisory Panel. He has a B.A. in mathematics from Swarthmore College, an M.A. from the Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a J.D. from Harvard Law School.

**SUZANNE LANE** is a professor in the research methodology program at the University of Pittsburgh. Her research and professional interests are in educational measurement and testing, with a focus on technical and validity issues in large-scale assessment programs and the effectiveness of education and accountability programs. She has served as president of the National Council on Measurement in Education and on its Joint Committee for the Revision of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. She also served on the Management Committee for the next revision of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing published in 2014. She has also served as vice president of the measurement and research methodology division of the American Educational Research Association. She has been on a number of technical advisory committees for the College Board, ETS, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, the U.S. Department of Education’s evaluation of the National Assessment of Educational Progress and its technical review panel for the Race to the Top, and the National Center for Educational Outcomes. She has a Ph.D. in educational psychology from the University of Arizona.
LAURESS WISE is a principal scientist at the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), where he previously served as president. At HumRRO, he currently directs a project to provide quality assurance for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). His work has ranged broadly in educational research and educational policy and assessment. He serves on technical advisory committees for the Hawaii, Oklahoma, and Rhode Island departments of education, and is currently directing the independent evaluation of California’s new high school exit exam. He recently served as co-chair for the committee that revised the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing of the American Education Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education, and he is currently serving as president of the National Council of Measurement in Education. He previously served on the Panel for the Evaluation of the NAEP Trial State Assessment of the National Academy of Education. He has a Ph.D. in mathematical psychology from the University of California, Berkeley.
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Reporting, Release, and Dissemination of NAEP Results Policy Statement

Introduction

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) collects data through representative-sample surveys and reports fair and accurate information on academic achievement to the American public. By law (P.L. 107-110, as amended by P.L. 107-279), NAEP is administered by the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) with the advice of the National Assessment Governing Board (“the Governing Board”), a bipartisan, independent policymaking body. Among the statutory responsibilities specifically delegated to the Governing Board are: (1) “develop guidelines for reporting and disseminating [NAEP] results”; (2) “take appropriate actions needed to improve the form, content, use, and reporting of [NAEP] results”; and (3) “plan and execute the initial public release of [NAEP] reports.”

The primary means for the initial reporting of NAEP results is a report website. The report website presents key findings as well as composite and disaggregated results in a clear, jargon-free style with charts, tables, and graphics that are easily accessible, understandable, and attractive. This format is used to report key results for the nation, for the states, and for participating districts in the NAEP Trial Urban District Assessments.

To carry out its Congressionally-mandated responsibilities, the Governing Board provides input during both the development and review processes about the overall structure, accessibility, and content of report websites that present initial public releases of NAEP data. The policy principles described here and adopted by the Governing Board address the general requirements for report websites that present initial public releases of NAEP data. Content in this Policy Statement is subject to periodic review necessitated by technological advances, innovations in reporting, feedback from releases, and input from the Governing Board and NCES.

Delineation of NAEP Reporting, Release, and Dissemination Responsibilities

The NCES Commissioner, with the advice of the Governing Board, is responsible for administering the assessment, ensuring the technical soundness and accuracy of all released data, preparing NAEP reports, and presenting NAEP results.

In addition to setting policy, the Governing Board is responsible for improving the form, content, use, and reporting of NAEP results, determining dates of initial public release of NAEP results, and planning and executing these initial public releases.
Part I: Report Preparation and Content Policy

1. The primary means for the initial public release of NAEP results is a dedicated website. Each of the websites that launch the initial release of NAEP results is accessed through an overarching ‘umbrella’ website known as *The Nation’s Report Card* at nationsreportcard.gov as well as directly from the Governing Board website and from the NCES website.

   a. All current, previous, and archived subject-specific NAEP report sites will be available through the overarching *Nation’s Report Card* site.

2. The primary audience for initial releases of NAEP results is the American public, including, but not limited, to policymakers, educational administrators, educators, researchers, business leaders, parents, and the media. Thus, all reports will be written in language appropriate for this diverse array of stakeholders, the majority of whom may not have a technical understanding of education statistics or assessment.

3. Initial release websites report NAEP results concisely, objectively, accurately, clearly, fairly, in accordance with NCES data quality standards, and are insulated from ideological and special interests.

   a. Reports and any disseminated materials may present correlations but not suggest or imply causal relationships.

4. In accordance with the law, all initial releases include results for the nation; states and school districts; locality (both geographic region and urban/city); school types (i.e., public and non-public), all disaggregated by subgroup whenever reliable. Subgroup results are prominently positioned to facilitate public review but are not used to adjust findings.

   a. Disaggregated subgroup data are accompanied by information about demographic changes in the student population assessed.

   b. Results for states and school districts are accompanied by appropriate language to alert the public to any data comparison limitations.

   c. Data on inclusion and accommodation rates for all NAEP samples, including national, state, district, and school type, are publicly released. Results for students with disabilities and English language learners are presented separately.

5. Initial release websites of NAEP results report results by Governing Board-adopted achievement levels, average scale scores, and percentile distributions. Trend information is an important component to reports unless comparable and reliable data are not available.
6. Initial release websites include:

   a. A home page with concise text, explaining key findings upfront, along with visual artifacts, including videos, graphics, charts, pictorial representations, etc. illustrating those key findings.

   b. Highlighted information important to the audience and (1) a summary of student performance; (2) a look at how results are changing over time; (3) details of achievement overall and by student subgroups; (4) findings from both core and subject-specific contextual variables; (5) information about what NAEP is and why it is conducted; (6) background information about NAEP design and methodology; (7) links to the Governing Board and NCES websites; and (8) emergent innovative additions, as discussed by the Board and NCES.

   c. Results accompanied by (1) a description of the type of results presented; (2) a concise summary of key findings; and (3) charts, figures, or tables to depict the findings visually.

   d. Brief, clear explanations of NAEP achievement levels, including item maps and sample test questions and answers to illustrate what students in each grade assessed should know and be able to do at each achievement level.

   e. Concise footnotes, caveats, technical definitions, and background information (e.g., NAEP history, methodology, and sampling), presented as secondary to the key findings.

7. When new and/or innovative reporting strategies develop, staff from NCES and the Governing Board will discuss and coordinate how to incorporate new developments into initial NAEP release websites.

8. All NAEP data determined by the NCES Commissioner to be valid and reliable are made available through NAEP data tool(s) at the time of initial public release, except for data from limited special purpose samples and pilot studies.

   a. At least one block of released NAEP questions is posted for each subject and grade for which results have been collected. Special exceptions may be made to protect item security and/or for technical and/or policy considerations as approved by the Governing Board.

   b. Concise information on assessment design, methodology, content, performance standards, and scoring are readily accessible on the website.
9. The Governing Board reviews, in accordance with policy, the format and content of initial release websites. To do so, the Governing Board will provide timely feedback on an embargoed, draft website presenting the results as early in the development process as feasible.

   a. The Governing Board will receive communication from NCES about what feedback may be incorporated into the initial release site.
   
   b. The Governing Board and NCES will coordinate to reach agreement on how to resolve the Board’s feedback and how that feedback may be addressed in the initial release site.

   c. The Governing Board acknowledges that the final arbiter of feedback disposition on statistical issues is the NCES Chief Statistician.

10. The Governing Board will provide feedback to NCES periodically to inform the development of the initial release websites of NAEP results and will receive comments back from NCES in a timely manner.

**Part II: Public Release of NAEP Results Policy**

1. Initial release activities are planned and executed by the Governing Board, which determines the release date, time, and manner for initial public releases. NCES sets embargo policies in collaboration with the Governing Board.

   a. As stated in Part I, Principle 9, the Governing Board reviews the draft initial release website as early in the development process as possible. Preliminary approval of the website may be granted by the Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee based on these early reviews of the website to allow for advanced planning of a comprehensive public release. The Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee, on behalf of the Governing Board and in consultation with the Chair and Executive Director of the Governing Board and the NCES Commissioner, sets a tentative date for initial release so the Board may plan release-related events. The Reporting and Dissemination Chair affirms that date upon Board review of the final release site.

   b. The results will be released within 30 days of the final version of initial release website. In setting that release date, attention will be paid to balancing the priorities of an expeditious release with provision for adequate planning time, given the scheduling circumstances of the various parties involved.

2. The Governing Board is responsible for organizing and conducting the initial release event and other related events.
a. An initial release plan will be adopted by the Governing Board for each report. Elements of the plan may include issuance of a press release, a press conference, a release event, distribution of summary findings and graphics, time period for the initial public release phase, and other related activities.

b. The official press release announcing NAEP results will be issued by the Governing Board. Additional statements from the Governing Board Executive Director or Board members may be issued.

c. At the initial release event for NAEP results, the NCES Commissioner or his/her designee will present major data findings. The Governing Board may select members as well as invite other officials or experts to comment on the meaning and significance of the results.

d. At initial release events, the Governing Board will moderate and allow appropriate questions raised by members of the online or in-person audience, including accredited media.

e. The Governing Board will make every effort to widely disseminate information about initial release activities to a variety of audiences, encouraging interest in and attention to NAEP results, through e-mail invitations, social media campaigns, media advisories, partnerships with major groups and conferences, and promotion in e-newsletters, blogs, wire services, and other online sources.

f. The Governing Board will conduct additional activities to extend the life of NAEP reports beyond the initial release and encourage discussion of NAEP data in context of relevant issues and trends.

3. All initial releases of NAEP results encourage wide public attention to NAEP results and clear understanding of their meaning and significance.

   a. Materials such as videos, infographics, and podcasts may be prepared to accompany the release. NAEP data in statements and such materials will be checked for accuracy by NCES.

   b. Every website to present initial releases of NAEP results will be comprehensible and easy to use across different devices (i.e., mobile devices) and different operating systems.

4. The Governing Board will cooperate with the NCES Commissioner in the release of technical reports, working papers, and secondary analyses not covered by the policy.
Part III: Dissemination and Outreach Policy

1. Information from and about initial releases are disseminated through traditional and social media, through a wide network of national, state, and local education, government, business, labor, and civic organizations as well as to policymakers and practitioners. This is intended to develop widespread public awareness of NAEP data and their meaning.
   
a. Schools and school districts participating in NAEP will be instructed on how to access reports.

   b. Talking points on key data findings will be developed for each release and distributed to Governing Board members who are encouraged to increase awareness of NAEP.

2. Key findings and graphics will be amenable to posting by media representatives and to social media. Graphics with clear branding of NAEP and/or The Nation’s Report Card that can be exported easily for inclusion in online media, blog posts, web articles, and other media will be readily accessible.

3. Relatively brief reports of key results will be prepared for individual states, as well as for urban districts participating in the Trial Urban District Assessment. All reports will contain composite and disaggregated data along with clear, compelling graphic representations of the data.

4. Detailed data on cognitive results, Governing Board-approved contextual data will be accessible online to all those wishing to analyze NAEP findings, subject to privacy restrictions. Additional restricted data will be available for scholarly research, subject to NCES licensing procedures.
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Composition

The Board is non-partisan, with 26 members representing gender, geographic, and racial-ethnic diversity. Specific categories of members specified in the NAEP law:

- **Policymakers**: governors or former governors (2), state legislators (2), chief state school officers (2), local school district superintendent (1), state (1) and local (1) school board members, nonpublic school administrator or policymaker (1)
- **Educators**: classroom teachers (3), principals (2), curriculum specialists (2)
- **Public**: general public representatives (2), parents (2), business representative (1)
- **Technical experts**: testing and measurement experts (3)

*The director of the Institute of Education Sciences serves as an ex-officio 26th member.*

Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Board are mandated by Congress, and include:

- **Test Development**
  - Select subject areas to assess
  - Develop assessment objectives and test specifications
  - Ensure all items are free from bias
  - Have final authority on appropriateness of all items

- **Technical Methodology**
  - Develop appropriate student achievement levels
  - Design the methodology of the assessment to ensure that assessment items are valid and reliable

- **Reporting and Dissemination**
  - Develop guidelines for reporting and disseminating results
  - Plan and execute the initial public release of NAEP reports
  - Take appropriate actions needed to improve the form, content, use, and reporting of results
# National Assessment Governing Board

## Members and Categories by Term Expiration Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucille Davy</strong></td>
<td>General Public Representative</td>
<td>Mitchell Chester</td>
<td>Alberto Carvalho</td>
<td>Rebecca Gagnon*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Geringer</strong></td>
<td>Governor (Republican)</td>
<td>Shannon Garrison*</td>
<td>Carol Jago</td>
<td>Andrew Ho*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doris Hicks</strong></td>
<td>Elementary School Principal</td>
<td>Frank Fernandes</td>
<td>Dale Nowlin*</td>
<td>Terry Mazany*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tonya Miles</strong></td>
<td>General Public Representative</td>
<td>Tonya Matthews</td>
<td>Fielding Rolston*</td>
<td>Jeanette Nuñez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ronnie Musgrove</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chasidy White</td>
<td>Linda Rosen</td>
<td>Joseph O'Keefe*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W. James Popham</strong></td>
<td>Testing &amp; Measurement Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cary Sneider*</td>
<td>Alice Peisch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Member currently serving 2nd term; not eligible for reappointment.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Now that you are a member of the National Assessment Governing Board (“NAGB”) you need to know what ethics laws and rules apply to you. The following is a very brief summary of these rules. For a more detailed discussion of how these rules apply to you, please refer to the attached summary entitled “Ethics Laws and Rules Applicable to SGEs.”

Your Status as a Special Government Employee

You are considered an SGE and not a regular federal employee because NAGB anticipates that you will be serving the federal government through your position for only 130 days or less during any period of 365 consecutive days. Whether or not you are paid by the Board for your service is irrelevant. This summary discusses how the ethics rules apply to SGEs.

Criminal Statutes Apply to Your Activities

Some of the ethics laws that apply to you carry criminal penalties. Below is a brief summary of the most important of these laws.

- The chief conflict of interest law bars you from participating personally and substantially in your capacity as a member of NAGB in any particular matter before the federal government that has a direct and predictable effect on your own financial interests or the financial interests of others with whom you have certain relationships. See 18 U.S.C. Section 208.

- If you find yourself with a financial conflict of interest, you have four options: (1) disqualify yourself (you don’t participate in any way in the matter); (2) resign from the outside entity that is the basis for the conflict; (3) sell or divest the stock or other financial interest that is the basis for the conflict; or (4) request and obtain a statutory waiver.¹

- Two other laws prohibit you from representing a third party, with or without compensation, before any court or agency in connection with any particular matter involving specific parties in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest and in which you have participated personally and substantially as an SGE. In addition, if you serve the federal government for more than 60 days during the immediately preceding period of 365 consecutive days, these restrictions apply to any matter that is pending with NAGB. But remember that these restrictions do not apply to particular matters of general applicability, such as broadly applicable policies, rulemaking proceedings or legislation, that do not involve specific parties. See 18 U.S.C. Sections 203 and 205.

¹ In rare circumstances, with the concurrence of the U.S. Office of Government Ethics, you may obtain a waiver of the conflict of interest.
Another criminal law limits some of your activities after your service on NAGB ends. This law prohibits you from representing others in connection with the same particular matter involving specific parties in which you participated personally and substantially during your service to NAGB. This prohibition lasts for your lifetime. See 18 U.S.C. Section 207.

Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch

The Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (Standards), 5 C.F.R. Part 2635, are regulations that apply both to regular federal government employees and to SGEs. However, a few exceptions exist in the Standards in recognition of the fact that SGEs are working for the government only in a very limited way. A brief synopsis of some these rules and their exceptions follow.

- **Fundraising:** You may not use your official title, position and authority to engage in fundraising.

- **Gifts:** You may not accept gifts from a “prohibited source” or offered to you because of your official position on NAGB. A prohibited source includes any person: seeking official action from NAGB; doing or seeking to do business with NAGB; conducting activities regulated by NAGB; or having interests that may be substantially affected by your official duties. There are many exceptions to this rule that are discussed in more detail in the accompanying memorandum.

- **Lobbying:** In your role as a member of NAGB, you may not urge others to contact Congress or a state legislature to urge the passage or defeat of legislation. Additional restrictions exist regarding lobbying. You should contact Department of Education’s Ethics Division before engaging in any type of lobbying.

- **Misuse of Position:** You may not use your position on NAGB or nonpublic information gained through your service on NAGB to seek advantage for yourself or others. In addition, you may not use your NAGB title in a manner that makes it appear that NAGB is sanctioning your views, products, services or personal enterprises.

- **Political Activities:** You may not engage in political activity when you are on duty or in a federal government building or car, and you may never use your official title as a member of NAGB in connection with political activities.

- **Teaching, Speaking and Writing:** You may not receive compensation for teaching, speaking or writing if: (1) the invitation was offered to you because of your position on NAGB; (2) the information conveyed by you draws substantially on nonpublic information that you obtained by working on NAGB; (3) the invitation was extended to you by an organization or person who has interests that may be substantially affected by your performance on NAGB; or (4) the subject of your work deals in a significant way
with a matter involving specific parties that you worked on while on NAGB. Again, there are some exceptions to this rule that are outlined in more detail in the accompanying memorandum.

**Required Filing of a Financial Disclosure Report By SGEs**

As a member of the NAGB, you are required to file a confidential financial disclosure report (also referred to as a “450” Report) when you are first appointed, and annually thereafter if you are reappointed. The purpose of the financial disclosure form is to protect you from inadvertently violating any of the criminal conflict of interest statutes and so that NAGB can know that your advice is free from any real or perceived conflicts of interest.

Please do not rely solely on this “Executive Summary” before undertaking your duties. There are many subtle nuances that are not discussed in this summary that may apply to your specific situation. The attached expanded summary provides additional detail that will help you better understand the ethics rules. Please feel free to call or e-mail Marcella Goodridge in the Ethics Division of the Office of the General Counsel at the U.S. Department of Education at (202) 401-8309, or Marcella.Keiller@ed.gov, for answers to any specific ethics questions that may arise in the course of your service on NAGB.
ETHICS LAWS AND RULES APPLICABLE TO SGES

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the ethics rules are numerous and detailed, a single, simple principle underlies these rules: *You should never use your public office for private gain, either for yourself, or for any third party.* In addition, you must refrain not only from engaging in any activity that violates the ethics rules, but you must also refrain from any activity that creates the appearance of a violation of any of these rules. The summary below is designed to help you avoid violating any ethics rules covering your activities as a member of NAGB.

II. YOUR STATUS AS A SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE

A. What is a “special Government employee”?

Because you have been appointed to be a member of the NAGB and you are expected to perform your duties for not more than 130 days during the 365 days subsequent to the date of your appointment, you are, by law, a “special Government employee” (SGE). As an SGE, you are a federal government employee. This means that upon appointment, you assume the responsibilities, obligations, and restrictions that are part of public service. Because SGEs are not full-time employees, several of these restrictions apply only in limited circumstances.

B. Do the ethics restrictions apply when I am not working for NAGB?

Yes, any restrictions concerning your private activities (representational services, expert witness activities, etc.) apply equally on days when you serve the federal government through your position on NAGB and on days when you do not, except with respect to political activity. If you have not provided any services for the federal government for some time, but have not received a termination date for your appointment, you must seek a formal resolution of the matter before engaging in conduct prohibited by the ethics rules.

III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A. What criminal conflict of interest statutes apply to SGES?

While you are employed as an SGE, you need to pay particular attention to four criminal conflict of interest laws found in Chapter 11, Title 18 of the United States Code: 18 U.S.C. Sections 203, 205, 207 and 208. These criminal laws include some special provisions for the treatment of SGES. A discussion of these laws and certain related requirements found in other laws and regulations follows.
B. What financial conflicts of interest may arise for SGEs under section 208?

Section 208 prohibits you from participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that has a direct and predictable effect on your financial interests, including certain interests of others that are imputed to you under the statute. This means that you may not work on NAGB matters if you have certain connections – through the ownership of stock, through employment, or by virtue of other circumstances – with an organization that has a financial interest in the matter. For example, you may not work at all on a contract competition if you own stock valued at a certain amount in a company competing for the contract. You may not participate in a discussion of whether to modify an existing contract with a company if you work for that company. And, you may not assist in the development of a scope of work for a contract competition if you know that an organization on which you serve on the Board of Directors plans to compete for that contract.

In addition to your own personal financial interests, the financial interests of the following persons or organizations are imputed to you and also disqualify you from participating in a particular matter:

1. your spouse;
2. your minor child;
3. your general partner;
4. an organization for which you serve as an officer, director, trustee, general partner or employee; and
5. any prospective employer.

Example 1 You are on the governing board of ABC, a nonprofit organization. ABC’s financial interests are imputed to you under the statute. This means that for the purpose of determining whether you have a conflict of interest, ABC’s financial interests are treated as if they were your own. Accordingly, you may not participate in any NAGB matter in which ABC has a financial interest. Similarly, if you were in the process of discussing employment with ABC, you would be barred from participating in any NAGB matter affecting the financial interests of ABC.

Example 2 You are on the governing board of ABC (or employed by ABC, own stock in ABC, seeking employment with ABC, etc). You are asked to participate in the process of reviewing and scoring contract proposals for a contract competition for a NAGB project. Fifteen organizations have submitted a bid. When you open the proposal from one organization, you note that ABC’s name is one of the organizations that has submitted a bid. Or, perhaps ABC is listed as a subcontractor in one of the proposals. This contract competition is a “particular

Keep in mind that when you are disqualified from a matter such as a contract competition, the particular matter that you must recuse yourself from is the entire competition for this contract. You are prohibited from doing anything at all with respect to this competition. This means, for example, that you may not review other proposals that are in competition with that of the organization in which you have a direct or imputed financial interest.
matter” that will have a “direct and predictable effect” upon the financial interests of ABC. In other words, as a result of the contract competition, ABC will either gain business or not, and this decision will affect ABC financially – either negatively or positively. The amount of financial interest is not relevant – as long as ABC’s finances will be affected, unless a regulatory exemption or waiver permits you to do so, you may not work on this competition. And, because each proposal is competing against all of the others, your evaluation of competing proposals will affect the chances ABC has of winning the contract. Accordingly, you may not review any of the proposals.

You must recuse yourself from a matter as soon as you realize that you have a conflict. If, for example, you notice that you have a conflict when you are in the middle of reviewing contract proposals, you put the proposal back in its envelope and call up an NAGB staff member and let that person know that you think that you are disqualified from working on the competition. If there is any question, you should contact the U.S. Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division for guidance. Once you have determined that you may not work on this matter, send the proposal back to NAGB staff.

You are permitted to participate in a particular matter affecting one campus of a multi-campus institution of higher education, where the disqualifying interest arises from your employment with a separate campus of the same institution, provided that you have no multi-campus responsibilities at the institution. If you are employed with a large university with multiple campuses and you do not have any multi-campus responsibilities, you may participate in official matters--such as grants, contracts, applications, and other particular matters--that affect the financial interests of another campus in the same university system where you are employed. Below are some examples of how section 208 may apply to your activities.

Example 3 You are employed as a professor at the University of California-Berkeley. NAGB is planning to evaluate the impact of computer-based testing on students with disabilities and English language learners. UC-Berkeley’s science and technology department has submitted a bid. NAGB’s actions will have a direct and predictable effect on the university’s financial interest. Therefore, you may not participate in any way on this matter.

Example 4 You are employed as a researcher at the University of California-Berkeley. NAGB is planning to evaluate the impact of computer-based testing on students with disabilities and English language learners. The University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA) has submitted a bid to be the contractor for NAGB’s evaluation. You may participate in this matter because it will not have a direct and predictable effect on either your financial interests or UC-Berkeley’s.
C. How do I resolve a conflict of interest?

1. Disqualification

A common method of resolving a conflict of interest is to disqualify yourself from participating in the matter.

Example 5 You are serving on NAGB’s Ad Hoc Committee that will examine issues related to computer-based testing for students with disabilities and English language learners, including developing a study of computer-based testing methodologies. The Request for Proposals has been disseminated. One of the bids submitted is from ABC Corporation (ABC). You own $20,000 worth of stock in ABC. You must advise the U.S. Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division that you own stock in ABC and you will not be able to participate in any way in the entire contract competition. If ABC is awarded the contract, you will also need to disqualify yourself from the entire matter.

2. Divestiture

Divestiture of a disqualifying interest (usually through the sale of stock) is another remedy available to avoid a potential violation of section 208. SGEs are not eligible for a Certificate of Divestiture (CD). A CD is a tax benefit that allows the deferral or nonrecognition of capital gain where an employee divests a financial interest in order to comply with conflict of interest requirements. Unfortunately, Congress specifically excluded SGEs from eligibility to receive CDs. 26 U.S.C. § 1043(b)(1)(A).

3. Resignation

On some very rare occasions when none of the aforementioned options are available or feasible, an SGE may need to resign from participating in an outside activity with an entity if his or her official activities as an SGE have a direct and predictable effect on the financial interest of that entity creating an irreconcilable conflict.

4. Waiver or Authorization

Another remedy to avoid a conflicting financial interest is to request and obtain a statutory waiver by contacting the Department of Education’s Ethics Division (an authorization is similar to a waiver, but only applies to non-statutory conflicts of interest - what are often referred to as “appearances of a conflict”). You may be granted a waiver only if your financial interest is not so substantial as to be deemed to be likely to affect the integrity of your services.

Example 6 In the scenario described in Examples 1 and 2 above, you are granted a waiver permitting you to participate in a general policy matter that affects ABC’s financial interests as
long as the matter affects all similarly situated entities in the same manner. But you would remain disqualified from participating in a matter that specifically involves ABC, which in this case means the entire contract competition.

D. What restrictions apply to my representation of third parties under sections 203 and 205?

With regard to particular matters in which you have participated personally and substantially while serving NAGB, you are prohibited from representing a third party on those particular matters, with or without compensation, before any court or agency, when the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest in the matter. See 18 U.S.C. Sections 203 and 205.

In addition, if you serve the federal government for more than 60 days during the immediately preceding period of 365 consecutive days, you are prohibited from representing a third party on any matter involving specific parties pending before NAGB, even if your work at NAGB did not involve these matters. These restrictions do not apply to particular matters of general applicability, such as broadly applicable policies, rulemaking procedures or legislation that does not involve specific parties.

IV. POST-EMPLOYMENT

After your appointment terminates at NAGB, you need to pay particular attention to one more criminal statute that subjects you to restrictions regarding certain matters that you may have worked on as a member of NAGB. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 207, you may never represent any third party, other than in the performance of your official government duties, in connection with the same particular matter involving specific parties in which you participated personally and substantially as a member of NAGB. This is a lifetime prohibition. For example, if you participated in a NAGB discussion concerning a contract to State University, you may never represent State University with respect to that same contract before any official of the Executive Branch of the federal government and you may never represent State University with respect to that contract in any federal court.

Further, if you serve on NAGB more than sixty days and are compensated above a certain level, you may be subject to a one-year “cooling-off” period during which you would be barred from representing before NAGB certain third parties in connection with any matter. There are some exceptions to this law as well, and you should contact the Department of Education’s Ethics Division for guidance.

V. STANDARDS OF ETHICAL CONDUCT AND OTHER ETHICS RULES

The Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (Standards), 5 C.F.R. Part 2635, are regulations that apply both to regular federal government employees and to SGEs. Although you are treated generally the same as regular employees under the Standards, a few
exceptions do exist for SGEs in recognition of the fact that SGEs are working for the government only in a very limited way. In addition, there are other rules that govern your conduct as an SGE, including the Hatch Act, anti-lobbying rules, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and rules about accepting gifts and compensation from foreign governments. A brief synopsis of some of these rules follows.

A. What restrictions apply if I want to engage in fundraising?

You may not use your NAGB title, position or authority to solicit funds for any organization. In addition, you may not personally solicit funds or other support from persons whose interests may be affected substantially by the performance or nonperformance of your official duties.

B. What restrictions are there on my acceptance of gifts?

You are prohibited from accepting gifts (almost anything of monetary value) from a “prohibited source” or gifts given because of your official position as a member of NAGB, unless a specific exception applies. The definition of “prohibited source” includes any person:

- seeking official action from NAGB;
- doing or seeking to do business with NAGB; or
- having interests that may be substantially affected by your official duties at NAGB.

The definition also includes organizations the majority of whose members fall within any of these categories. You may accept various benefits resulting from your outside business or employment activities, if a reasonable person would conclude that such benefits are not offered or enhanced because of your official position. The most commonly applicable exceptions to the gift rule allow you to accept:

- Modest items of food other than a meal, such as coffee, soft drinks, or donuts;
- Most plaques, certificates and trophies;
- Discounts available to all Government employees;
- Anything for which you pay market value;
- Gifts valued at $20 or less per occasion, totaling no more than $50 in a calendar year from any one source;
- Gifts clearly motivated by friendship or family relationship;
- Gifts resulting from your outside business activities, including those of your spouse; and
- Free attendance or meal which is provided by:

  1. the sponsor of the event for the day on which you are speaking at the event, or for a widely-attended gathering of mutual interest to a number of parties when the necessary determination of agency interest has been made; or

  2. someone other than the sponsor of a widely-attended gathering of mutual interest to a number of parties when more than 100 people are expected to attend, the
aggregate value of the gift is under $335, and the necessary determination of agency interest has been made.

C. What restrictions apply if I want to “lobby” Congress?

NAGB and its members are permitted to communicate directly with Congress in their official capacity on matters that are related to legislation or appropriations deemed necessary to conduct NAGB’s “public business” (i.e., the NAGB’s statutory functions and responsibilities). However, the Anti-Lobbying Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 1913, prohibits you, in your official capacity at NAGB, from engaging in “grass-roots lobbying” (i.e., directly or indirectly suggesting or requesting that others contact Congress or a state legislature to urge the passage or defeat of proposed or pending legislation), even if it is related to the NAGB’s public business. The Anti-Lobbying Act also requires that any permissible direct communications with Congress in your official capacity at NAGB be made only through official channels.

None of these restrictions prohibit you from lobbying members of Congress or state legislatures, or urging others to do so, on your own time in your personal capacity. If you lobby Congress or state legislatures in your personal capacity, and the issue is related to NAGB’s business, you should make it clear that you are not representing NAGB and not acting in your official capacity as a member. Also, please note that when you are lobbying as a private citizen, you are not permitted to use government resources or equipment (including, but not limited to, computers, telephones, fax machines, copy machines, stationery), or seek assistance from NAGB staff.

D. What does “misuse of position” mean?

You may not use your position on NAGB to seek advantage for yourself or others. You also may not use nonpublic information gained through your service at NAGB to seek advantage for yourself or others. Finally, you may not use your NAGB title in a manner that makes it appear that the NAGB is sanctioning your views, products, services or personal enterprises. Of course, you may list your membership on NAGB on your curriculum vitae, but you may never use your status as an NAGB member to advertise or promote your personal activities. Please seek advice from the Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division if you have any questions in this area.

E. May I keep my day job and still serve on NAGB?

Yes, you may continue to collect your regular salary from an outside employer for days on which you are providing services to the federal government (whether your federal government service is paid or unpaid). However, if you have another consultant or advisory position with NAGB or any other federal department or agency, you may not receive per diem or salary from NAGB for the same day for services performed for the two positions.

F. Are there any restrictions on my political activities?

You may not engage in any political activities while you are on duty (i.e., performing
government services) or when you are in a government building or vehicle. Although you are not subject to any restrictions on your political activities when you are not performing government services, you may never use your official title as a member of NAGB in connection with any political activities.

G. What restrictions do I face if I want to teach, speak, or write on matters that are related to the duties I perform for NAGB?

You may not receive compensation for teaching, speaking, or writing if:

- the activity is performed as part of your official duties (e.g., a speech on behalf of NAGB);
- the invitation to engage in the activity was extended primarily because of your official position at NAGB, rather than expertise in the subject matter;
- the invitation or offer of compensation was extended to you by someone with interests that may be affected substantially by your duties;
- the information conveyed through the activity draws substantially on nonpublic information obtained through your service at NAGB; or
- the activity deals, in significant part, with a matter involving specific parties to which you are currently assigned or had been assigned during your current NAGB appointment.

Notwithstanding the restrictions in bold type you may accept compensation for teaching a course requiring multiple presentations offered as part of: (a) the regularly established curriculum of various specified types of educational institutions; or (b) educational or training programs sponsored and funded by federal, State, or local government. However, if you teach at an educational institution, you must not participate in any NAGB matters that involve that institution.

H. What restrictions apply if my government duties involve the awarding of contracts?

If you are involved in the awarding of any contracts, please seek advice from the Ethics Division. There are special provisions that cover your involvement in the awarding of contracts. For example, you may not accept compensation as an employee, officer, director, or consultant of a contractor within the one-year period after leaving Government service where you participated in certain procurement matters pertaining to that contractor. In addition, if you disclose certain information pertaining to Federal procurements that you obtained during your service on a committee, you may face sanctions, including criminal penalties.
I. What restrictions apply to my interaction with foreign entities?

The emoluments clause of the U.S. Constitution prohibits you from receiving any emolument, office or title of any kind from a foreign government, including political subdivisions of a foreign government. An emolument is compensation received by virtue of holding an office or having employment with a foreign government and includes, for example, salary, honoraria, transportation, per diem allowances, household goods, shipment costs, and housing allowances. This clause has been interpreted to be broader than the traditional notion of employment and includes, for example, income received through a partnership when an identifiable portion of the partnership draw can be attributed to the partnership’s fees from such foreign government. This provision has particular relevance to positions with foreign universities that are government-operated, as opposed to private institutions. United States Constitution, art. I § 9, cl. 8. There are also statutory provisions restricting acceptance of gifts from foreign governments. 5 U.S.C. § 7342. You should seek advice from the Ethics Division regarding the details about these restrictions. Additionally, a criminal statute bars employment or consultation with a foreign entity for the purpose of providing foreign agent representation or lobbying. 18 U.S.C. § 219.

The ban on participating in foreign agent activities covered by the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) prohibits representation of foreign governments or foreign political parties before the United States Government, as well as a number of other activities conducted within the United States on behalf of such entities. There are certain FARA exceptions related to trade or commerce, legal representation, humanitarian fundraising, and religious, scholastic, or scientific pursuits. The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 requires certain covered Federal officials who serve as agents of foreign principals (other than foreign governments or foreign political parties) to register if they work on behalf of foreign corporations, associations, or other organizations.

Finally, certain restrictions apply after your position with NAGB terminates. Specifically, 18 U.S.C. § 207 includes restrictions on former employees who participated in trade or treaty negotiations on behalf of the United States (18 U.S.C. § 207(b)) and on former senior employees who wish to represent, or aid or advise in the representation of, a foreign entity with the intent to influence a decision of a Federal employee or agency (18 U.S.C. § 207(f)).

J. What do I do if I am called to be an expert witness?

Government employees generally may not participate as an expert witness, with or without compensation, other than on behalf of the United States, in any proceeding before a federal court or agency in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest. This restriction applies to most SGEs only if the SGE actually participated officially in the same proceeding or in the particular matter that is the subject of the proceeding. If you are appointed by the President, serve on a commission established by statute, or serve (or are expected to serve) for more than 60 days in a period of 365 days, the restriction on expert service also applies to any proceeding in which NAGB is a party or has a direct and substantial interest.
K. May I keep and use frequent flyer miles that I earn when I am on official NAGB travel?

Yes, you may use frequent flyer miles or other airline awards or promotions accumulated on official NAGB travel for your own personal use.

VI. CONCLUSION

We understand that these laws are complex and may not be intuitive. Again, we caution you that this summary is merely an introduction to the ethics laws and rules that apply to you. You should always feel free to contact the Department of Education Office of the General Counsel’s Ethics Division with any questions or concerns.

Marcella Goodridge Keiller, Attorney
U.S. Department of Education
Office of the General Counsel
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 6E237
Washington, D.C. 20202-2110
(202) 401-8309
(202) 260-5104 (fax)

Marcella.Keiller@ed.gov
## NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD
### CURRENT CONTRACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Committee &amp; Activity</th>
<th>Area of Work</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Staff Member(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (COSDAM)</strong></td>
<td>Statistical Linking Studies and Related Data Sharing Agreements</td>
<td>Via states and NAEP Alliance contractors ETS and Westat</td>
<td>Sharyn Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing Achievement Levels for the 2017 National Assessment of Educational Progress Grade 4 Writing Assessment</td>
<td>NCS Pearson, Inc. (Year 1 of 2 Years)</td>
<td>Sharyn Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting and Dissemination Committee</strong></td>
<td>Outreach and Dissemination</td>
<td>The District Communications Group (Year 2 of 3 Years)</td>
<td>Stephaan Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Wide Web Services</td>
<td>Quotient, Inc. (Year 2 of 3 Years)</td>
<td>Stephaan Harris Mary Crovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focused Reporting</td>
<td>CRP, Incorporated (Year 1 of 2 years)</td>
<td>Laura Logerfo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee</strong></td>
<td>NAGB/Council of Chief State School Officers: State Outreach</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
<td>Michelle Blair Mary Crovo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 2016
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD
2014 STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Approved August 2, 2014

In 2014 and beyond, the National Assessment Governing Board seeks to focus its communication efforts strategically and cost effectively to "Make Data Matter" for various target audiences. The Board is well-positioned to increase the impact of its outreach, but it must prioritize its audiences and identify its objectives for each, while integrating innovative strategies to elevate the Board’s work—and NAEP—as a thought leader in education.

Reingold proposes three goals the Board can pursue to amplify its outreach efforts.

I. Make a Connection With Target Audiences
II. Engage Audiences Between Report Card Releases
III. Maximize Impact Through Innovation

Reingold’s assumption in developing strategic priorities for the Board is that reporting and dissemination activities must support a vision to make an impact in education through engagement with NAEP that will enable the use, discussion, and sharing of NAEP data and information. A time-phased action plan, including specific outreach tactics and metrics, will be developed with Governing Board staff on the Board’s approval of this strategic communications plan.

The members of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee have identified three key audiences it believes the Board should focus on—parents; teachers and administrators; and policymakers—as each of these audiences is in a position to make an impact through NAEP data. Working with staff, we will identify the Board’s goals and expectations of each audience and the key messages needed to engage each one effectively.

Potential outcomes of the audience-focused outreach are listed below:

Parents
- Understand the value of NAEP and its implication for parents.
- Ask informed questions about their child’s education and the school system.
- Use NAEP to consider out-of-school factors that might affect their child’s education.
- Share NAEP information and messages with their parent peers.

Teachers and Administrators
- Understand the value of NAEP and its implication for teachers and administrators.
- Use NAEP to influence change within their classroom or school system.
- Educate parents about NAEP data and resources.
- Share and distribute NAEP information to their peers.
Policymakers

- Understand the value of NAEP and its implication for education policy.
- Use and cite NAEP data in policy decisions, public statements, and white papers.
- Distribute NAEP information and messages to constituents and peers to help advocate for change.

It is important to remember that messages and calls to action are intended to move the Board’s priority audiences along an engagement continuum, from awareness and education to trial, buy-in, and, ultimately, action. But creating the right messages is only the beginning. It is critical to know which information to deliver first, which should follow, and who are the most credible messengers. We will lay out a cohesive, practical, comprehensive roadmap for reaching the Board’s target audiences that identifies how to take advantage of existing opportunities, what new strategies to develop, and optimal methods of dissemination. The action plan will include a variety of opportunities to connect with each audience to maximize the reach and frequency of each message. The proposed strategies involve cultivating and leveraging partnerships that will include stakeholders or champions. There will also be collaboration with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to ensure efforts are not duplicated, with Board and NCES staff coordinating on roles, responsibilities, and resources on various strategies as needed.

To illustrate the strategies identified above, below we discuss what the execution of each one could involve for the Board’s three priority audiences.

I. Make a Connection With Target Audiences

The goal is personal and powerful: “Communicate the Value of NAEP.” This means going beyond the distribution of NAEP data to highlighting, developing, and sharing relevant messages, content, stories, and calls to action for key audiences. Communicating the “So what?” and “Why should we care?” can help the Board move beyond the scores and headlines to clarify the value of NAEP and its important role as an indicator of student achievement.

- **Develop key messages and calls to action for priority audiences.** The Governing Board’s audience is widely diverse—in their knowledge of and experience with NAEP, in their intended uses and consumption of data and information, and in their communications networks, favored channels, and approaches. With these differences in mind, it is imperative that the Governing Board tailor messages for each of its audiences to inspire deeper engagement with NAEP data. Instead of a one-size-fits-all approach, we will define and continually test and adjust the messages that are the most relevant to each audience.

**Example of the strategy in action for parents:** Include the tailored messages and calls to action on the website’s “Information For” parent pages. The parent landing page could have calls to action including “Learn about NAEP,” “Download NAEP resources,” or “Test yourself on NAEP questions.” The page could also have a section devoted to the Board’s assessment literacy efforts (including resources, information and questions to ask) once outreach strategies from the work group are finalized.
Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators: The American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association could include a NAEP toolkit with messages for teachers on its website in a resources section.

Example of the strategy in action for policymakers: Minneapolis Board of Education and Governing Board member Rebecca Gagnon could use and reference data from Science in Action: Hands-On and Interactive Computer Tasks From the 2009 Science Assessment in a discussion with the Minnesota Department of Education and the Minnesota Education Technology Task Force about the importance of science computer labs.

Impact metrics: The number of downloads of materials such as a PowerPoint or frequently asked questions PDF; number of clicks on links for calls to action (e.g., “Test yourself on NAEP questions”); number of champions—that is, advocates—who commit to using or distributing the NAEP messaging and toolkit.

- Expand communications beyond reporting on the scores. We need to get beyond the typical report presentations of the data and find meaningful ways to elevate the data (and their implications) through materials, messaging, and outreach activities. We will identify and highlight hidden gems of NAEP data, connecting the dots between data and practice and leveraging resources to reach specific audiences to deliver important messages in a meaningful and memorable way. The Governing Board must be a storyteller that educates its audiences about the relevancy of NAEP data and resources in a way that resonates with its audiences’ interests and needs in an actionable manner.

Example of the strategy in action for parents: Develop a parent leader discussion guide to assist parent leaders in using NAEP and other assessment data in their conversations with school administrators about improving student achievement for all children.

Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators: Develop an interactive Prezi presentation (a visually animated storytelling tool for presenting ideas and messages) on NAEP achievement gap data from the recent 2013 Mathematics and Reading, Grade 12 report card for New Leaders, a national nonprofit organization that develops transformational school leaders and designs effective leadership policies and practices for school systems across the country.

Example of the strategy in action for policymakers: Governing Board member Anitere Flores could host a Florida Senate session on parent involvement in education to highlight NAEP contextual variables data in reading from the 2013 Mathematics and Reading, Grade 12 report card. For example, when asked whether students discussed what they read, students who reported discussing their reading every day or almost every day had higher reading scores.
**Impact metrics:** The number of guides distributed at stakeholder conferences or downloaded from the website; number of groups posting the guide on their websites; number of Prezi and data downloads; parent-submitted testimonials and feedback on using the guide to speak with school and district leaders.

- **Tell the NAEP story through user testimonials.** NAEP data become more impactful when stakeholders learn how others use the data to fulfill their missions and advance their educational goals. Working through key groups, we will collect and disseminate real-life testimonials from the priority audiences to become an authentic author of the NAEP story.

  **Example of the strategy in action for parents:** Collaborate with National PTA to solicit testimonials from parents about how they use NAEP and other assessment data, and then promote the testimonials through the Board’s and PTA’s online networks. These testimonials and other NAEP information could also be featured on the websites of other national education groups, encouraging parents to learn about different assessments their children might take and how the data can be used.

  **Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators:** Coordinate with elementary school principal and Board member Doris Hicks and future Board member chosen for the secondary school principal slot to collaborate with the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals to solicit testimonials from principals and teachers within their districts about how they use NAEP and the importance of at-home and out-of-school activities that enhance learning, then promote testimonials through the school communication channels.

  **Example of the strategy in action for policymakers:** Collaborate with the National Association of State Boards of Education to collect testimonials from state board members on how data, including NAEP data, are used to inform policy-level decisions and improvements.

  **Impact metrics:** The number of NAEP user testimonials received; number of testimonial views online; number of social media shares and engagement; quality of the engagements and comments about parents using data.

  **Potential action taken by key audiences under this goal:** Using NAEP materials and resources on organization websites to inform questions of school and education leaders about school curriculum and district progress; downloading NAEP sample questions to test student knowledge or supplement classroom lessons;

II. Engage Audiences Between Report Card Releases

The goal is ongoing and impactful: “Continual Engagement.” This means building tangible connections—outside of report card release events—between NAEP and its stakeholders, and equipping them with the insight, information, and tools to make a difference in educational quality and student achievement. This important strategy cannot be executed by staff alone, and will require the contributions of Board members and the partnership of stakeholder groups and other NAEP champions, including former Board members.
- **Expand the report card release life cycle.** There is great opportunity for the Governing Board to enliven data and engage target audiences by taking a comprehensive, reimagined view of releasing and reporting on NAEP results that goes beyond the one-day release event. The entire life cycle of an assessment—from developing the framework to fielding assessments to disseminating results—offers content and commentary that, if shared more strategically, will powerfully support the NAEP brand and use of NAEP by target audiences. The Board can both enhance the report card releases and extend the life cycle to make meaningful connections with target audiences by developing pre- and post-release content, and recording and sharing video or audio which tease out and illuminate NAEP data.

**Example of the strategy in action for parents:** For each report card release develop a highlight reel with panelist quotes, select data points, and facts on reading, mathematics, and science contextual variables to send to parent stakeholder groups to distribute to their networks and on the Web.

**Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators:** Governor Board member Terry Mazany could host a meeting with the executive director of the Chicago Principals & Administrators Association to discuss the value of NAEP state and TUDA achievement data.

**Example of the strategy in action for policymakers:** Host a briefing with the California State Board of Education on the performance of fourth-grade students in the NAEP 2012 Writing Grade 4 Pilot with a diverse panel to include California fourth-grade teacher and Governing Board member Shannon Garrison, the executive director of the National Writing Project, and authors Carol Bedard and Charles Fuhrken.

**Impact metrics:** The numbers of video views and shares; number of groups postin the video; quality of comments and conversations under the video; feedback from stakeholder groups about the impact of the video and parent engagement with the content; number of participants at the meeting or briefing.

- **Leverage partnerships with stakeholder organizations and champions.** As a trusted messenger of information to key audiences, the Governing Board needs to mobilize its existing networks, engaging stakeholder groups and champions to share and shape future outreach. Stakeholders and champions are diverse and can be from education associations or news outlets like NBC News. They could also be politicians, celebrities, athletes, or prominent individuals like First Lady Michelle Obama. We will help the Board identify key partnership opportunities for its priority audiences and develop specific recommendations for engagement, to put their distinct capabilities to work in promoting NAEP and extending the Governing Board’s reach. For example, we could keep working with the Alliance for Excellent Education to produce and promote post-release webinars, provide data infographics to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and collaborate with the National Council of La Raza in sponsoring Facebook chats in addition to consistently pursuing new opportunities with key stakeholder organizations.
**Example of the strategy in action for parents:** Collaborate with NBC News’ Education Nation and Pearson on their Parent Toolkit (www.parenttoolkit.com) including NAEP materials, graphics, and downloadable resources on the website that position the Governing Board as an authoritative source of information on student assessment data.

**Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators:** Collaborate with Danica McKellar, actress, author, and STEM education advocate, to submit an article to the National Science Teachers Association’s NSTA Express newsletter on the importance of STEM education and girls’ involvement in STEM, and include data from NAEP’s *Technology and Engineering Literacy* assessment.

**Example of the strategy in action for policymakers:** Arrange for James Geringer and/or Ronnie Musgrove, Board members and former governors, to present at the annual National Governors Association conference on an important policy issue affecting states in which NAEP data and contextual variables are relevant. Additionally, the Board and the governors can collaborate with the Center on Education Policy to include NAEP reading data and contextual variables (such as frequency of discussing what they read or finding reading enjoyable) in their research papers, publications and annual progress report.

**Impact metrics:** The number of clicks on the NAEP content; number of downloads of NAEP materials; use of presented NAEP data by governors and state policy leaders in media citations, state websites and other materials; volume of referral traffic from the Parent Toolkit site back to the Governing Board’s website; Education Nation engagement that identifies stories of the Toolkit in action; number of newsletter opens and clicks; number of research report downloads.

- **Equip, empower, and display thought leadership.** The Governing Board and NCES are well-positioned as thought leaders among researchers and many national policymakers but could expand their influence with other audiences, such as parents, local policymakers, and education practitioners. Governing Board members and staff should be seen by media representatives and stakeholders as valued spokespersons on educational assessment and achievement, including specific topics such as computerized assessments, achievement gap trends, 12th-grade academic preparedness, and the importance of technology, engineering, and literacy. The Board can also continually secure speaking engagements at a variety of events such as the International Reading Association’s annual conference or local PTA chapter meetings, or pitch quotes for inclusion in news articles and op-eds on relevant topics.

**Example of the strategy in action for parents:** Work with Board member and parent Tonya Miles and develop and pitch op-eds that connect NAEP data with important year-round education events, emphasizing the role parents can play in raising student achievement. During Black History Month, pitch a piece to HuffPost Parents that spotlights achievement gap success stories, or pitch a piece about technology and engineering skill-building beyond the classroom to *Sacramento Parent* magazine.
Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators: Co-host a webinar discussion on NAEP state achievement trends with the American Federation of School Administrators, with members weighing in on state-level changes and education initiatives that are aimed at increasing achievement.

Example of the strategy in action for policymakers: Submit a proposal to the National School Board Association’s annual conference for a Board member and NCES to co-host a breakout session to share and discuss the recent 2013 Mathematics and Reading, Grade 12 report card, academic preparedness data, and recent graduation rate research.

Impact metrics: The numbers of op-ed placements, shares, and comments; quality of user engagements and comments; number of follow-up questions from readers; number of new emails collected (from a “Subscribe to the Governing Board” call to action); number of webinar and conference participants and follow-up requests.

- Potential action taken by key audiences under this goal: Inspired by op-ed on racial achievement gaps, exploring gaps in their own districts and talking with school leaders about parity of resources; noting performance trends in subjects by state and/or urban district and then using that knowledge to inform state, local, or school district-level decisions regarding academic programs.

III. Maximize Impact Through Innovation

The goal is proactive and cutting-edge: “Lead the Way.” This means reaching and making meaningful connections with priority audiences, customizing events, fostering and driving online conversations, and creating tech-savvy materials with compelling content.

- Customize release event formats. Report cards are not one-size-fits-all; innovative release event strategies are needed to achieve the specific goals of each release. Each release event strategy should have distinct goals, audiences messages, materials, strategies, and tactics to Make Data Matter. The Governing Board has expanded the report card release event structure from physical events for every release to include webinars and live-streaming during events, a post-release social media Facebook chat, and an online town hall event. We will continue to refine this approach to customizing every release to maximize the immediate release impact and create a sustained conversation that continues to reach and engage key audiences.

Example of the strategy in action for parents: Host a Google Hangout for parents after a NAEP release that can feature panelists from the National Council of La Raza talking about the importance of parent involvement in education, and encourage parent participants to share how they use data to help their students achieve.
**Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators:** Develop a Twitter town hall guide (NAEP data points, question-and-answer content, best-practice tips, and facilitation instructions) for teachers and school administrators to host their own facilitated chats with parents and the school district on state-level NAEP data and areas for application.

**Example of the strategy in action for policymakers:** Host an in-person round-table discussion with members of the Massachusetts Mayors’ Association on the latest state-level NAEP reading and mathematics results and their state-based implications.

**Impact metrics:** The number of promotions of the online events and shares of the URL; numbers of event participants and total users viewing them or reached; numbers of comments or participants sharing their testimonials; number of follow-up testimonials received for inclusion in materials or on the website.

- **Engage in the online conversation.** It is important to be aware of the conversations on important education issues, but to influence and help shape public understanding and perceptions the Governing Board needs to participate in the conversation with key messages. We will help the Governing Board foster conversations through real-time engagement on social media platforms, develop content such as an article written by a Governing Board member to post on NAEP’s upcoming blog coordinated by NCES, and create a strategy to join or host online chat events, sponsor Q&A sessions, or solicit feedback. Champions are key to the success of this effort, providing greater reach and often a more powerful story than the Governing Board can tell alone.

**Example of the strategy in action for parents:** Hold a webinar with the Governing Board’s Education Summit for Parent Leaders attendees and parent leader champions to review the NAEP website workshop tutorial and obtain feedback through a moderated chat on how they have used NAEP data since the event. Compile feedback to create a one-pager and share it with participants.

**Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators:** Collaborate with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) on an online Q&A chat session based on the NAEP Mathematics Curriculum Study data, educating NCTM about the wide variance of content in mathematics courses and books with the same name. Board member and math teacher Dale Nowlin could be a participating panelist.

**Example of the strategy in action for policymakers:** Reach out to the National Governors Association (NGA) on Twitter and provide NGA with content and data about the 2013 Mathematics and Reading, Grade 12 report card.

**Impact metrics:** Numbers of campaign participants and user submissions; numbers of engagements (“likes,” comments, shares, retweets, views) for the multimedia submissions; quality of comments on the multimedia submissions; growth in the Governing Board social media audience and number of engaged users discussing assessment data.
• Create multimedia, digital content and materials. The Governing Board must present messages, graphics, and images that resonate with target audiences. A wealth of materials has been developed by the Governing Board and NCES, and the first step will be to audit and catalog resources that may be repurposed through outreach and promotional activities. For the materials gaps that are identified, it is imperative to develop interactive, multimedia content and materials that deliver key messages to target priority audiences and include a call to action. Examples include infographics that embellish key report card findings to facilitate understanding and encourage engagement with NAEP data among nonexperts; videos, Prezi, and other presentation tools allowing exploration of the relationships between ideas and numbers and visual presentations of NAEP; and an email newsletter with new content and specific calls to action.

Example of the strategy in action for parents: Create a “NAEP for Parents” email newsletter with information on the latest report card data and trends, multimedia content such as video clips or NAEP data user testimonials, and links to other resource or news content and the interactive data maps on the Board’s parent Web pages, to be distributed bimonthly or consistently throughout the year.

Example of the strategy in action for teachers and administrators: Create an infographic with “hidden data” gems from the NAEP Grade 8 Black Male Students report and accompanying language to share with the National Alliance of Black School Educators to post on social media.

Example of the strategy in action for policymakers: Work with Board member Terry Holliday to create an interactive presentation at CCSSO’s annual large-scale assessment conference on NAEP computer-based assessments, or work with Board member Tom Luna to distribute the dynamic 12th-grade preparedness video highlighting the new college preparedness data to Chiefs for Change members.

Impact metrics: Email open rate; numbers of email shares, clicks from email to website, and new email subscribers; number of release participants who list the email as their referral source; numbers of email replies or responses with inquiries about NAEP or acquiring NAEP materials and resources; number of video and infographic views and shares.

Potential action taken by key audiences under this goal: Using contextual data to influence out-of-school factors that have been shown to correlate with achievement; using curriculum study findings to investigate course rigor and influence change for exposure to challenging subject matter.

By pursuing these three fundamental communication goals and identifying priority strategies and tactics, the Governing Board can more effectively reach its target audiences to Make Data Matter and, ultimately, make an impact.
### National Assessment of Educational Progress

**Schedule of Assessments**  
Approved November 21, 2015

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Authorization Act established the National Assessment Governing Board to set policy for NAEP, including determining the schedule of assessments. (P.L. 107-279)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>National Grades Assessed</th>
<th>State Grades Assessed</th>
<th>TUDA Grades Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2014 | U.S. History*  
Civics*  
Geography* | 8  
8  
8 | 4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2015 | Reading*  
Mathematics*  
Science** | 4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2016 | Arts* | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2017 | Reading  
Mathematics  
Writing | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2018 | U.S. History  
Civics  
Geography  
Technology and Engineering Literacy | 8  
8  
8  
8 | 4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2019 | Reading  
Mathematics  
Science  
High School Transcript Study | 4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2020 | | | | |
| 2021 | Reading  
Mathematics  
Writing | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2022 | U.S. HISTORY  
CIVICS  
GEOGRAPHY  
Economics  
Technology and Engineering Literacy | 8, 12  
8, 12  
8, 12  
12  
8, 12 | 4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2023 | Reading  
Mathematics  
Science  
High School Transcript Study | 4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12  
4, 8, 12 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |
| 2024 | ARTS  
FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
Long-term Trend | 8  
12 | | 4, 8  
4, 8  
4, 8 |

**NOTES:**

*Assessments not administered by computer. Beginning in 2017 all operational assessments will be digitally based.

**Science in 2015 consisted of paper-and-pencil and digital-based components.

~Long-term Trend (LTT) assessments sample students at ages 9, 13, and 17 and are conducted in reading and mathematics.

Subjects in **BOLD ALL CAPS** indicate the year in which a new framework is implemented or assessment year for which the Governing Board will decide whether a new or updated framework is needed.
History of Changes to the NAEP Schedule of Assessments

Historical Schedule Changes
The major schedule changes adopted by the Board since 2000 are listed below:

1. Added grade 4 and 8 state-level Reading and Mathematics every two years. (2002) [Prior to the 2002 ESEA reauthorization (NCLB), state assessments at grades 4 and 8 were given every two years with reading and writing in one biennium and mathematics and science in the next, i.e., these subjects and grade 12 subjects were tested once every four years.]

2. Added the High School Transcript Study (HSTS) as a regularly scheduled study. (2005)


4. Added Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) to the NAEP subjects assessed. (2005)

5. Added grade 12 state-level Reading and Mathematics for volunteer states with a periodicity of every four years. (2008)

6. Adjusted the periodicity of science to correspond to the periodicity of TIMSS to conduct international benchmarking studies in mathematics and science. (2010)

7. Scheduled Writing as a technology based assessment, beginning with national data collections only and delaying fourth grade in order to complete a special study. (2010)

Other schedule changes and program adjustments from 2000 through 2015 have been due primarily to budget constraints and/or technical challenges, considering options such as:

- Assessing fewer grade levels in non-required subject areas (e.g., U.S. History, Civics, and Geography; Writing; TEL).
- Postponing a state-level assessment
- Postponing a full assessment/study (e.g., World History, Foreign Language, HSTS).
- Changing the sample size and reporting depth for jurisdictions (e.g., alternating subjects with a smaller sample size in a model called focal and non-focal).

Guiding Principles for Schedule Changes
Guiding principles and priorities that have been used to guide planned updates to the NAEP schedule of assessments include:

1. Follow the guidance in the NAEP Act (303(b)(2)),

2. Administer all assessments using technology beginning in 2017,

3. Continue to assess broad-based curricular areas with a priority for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM),

4. Providing state-level data in curricular areas beyond reading and mathematics,

5. Include more districts in the TUDA program.

Guidance for the schedule is found in Title 303 Sec. 303(b)(2) which addresses the use of random sampling (A), testing in reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 once every two years (B), and testing in reading and mathematics at grade 12 at regularly scheduled intervals (at least as often as prior to NCLB (C).

After this initial guidance, Sec. 303(b)(2)(D) provides guidance for including other subjects in grades 4, 8, and 12 to the extent time and resources allow. It says, including assessments “... in regularly scheduled intervals in additional subject matter, including writing, science, history, geography, civics, economics, foreign languages, and arts, and the trend assessment described in subparagraph (F)”.
Overview of NAEP Assessment Design

The content and format for each NAEP subject-area assessment is determined by a NAEP assessment framework, developed under the Governing Board’s direction. General details about the structure of NAEP assessments include:

Long Test, Short Student Test Booklet
- Each student gets a small part of the test
- No individual student scores

Common Block Structures Across Subjects
- Items are within blocks, blocks are within booklets
  Example:
  At grade 4:  Reading has 10 blocks and Math has 10 blocks

Test Question Types
- Multiple-choice
- Open-ended
- Computer-based tasks (Writing, Science, TEL)

Contextual Questions
- Student, teacher, administrator questionnaires

Student Booklet Block Design

While some NAEP assessments are conducted on a technology-based platform (TEL, Writing), for paper-based assessments NAEP uses a focused balanced incomplete block (BIB) or partially balanced incomplete block (pBIB) design to assign blocks or groups of cognitive items to student booklets. Because of the BIB and pBIB booklet designs and the way NAEP assigns booklets to students, NAEP can sample enough students to obtain precise results for each test question while generally consuming an average of about an hour and a half of each student's time.

The "focused" aspect of NAEP's booklet design requires that each student answer questions from only one subject area. The "BIB" or "pBIB" design ensures that students receive different interlocking sections of the assessment forms, enabling NAEP to check for any unusual interactions that may occur between different samples of students and different sets of assessment questions.

In a BIB design, the cognitive blocks are balanced; each cognitive block appears an equal number of times in every possible position. Each cognitive block is also paired with every other cognitive block in a test booklet exactly the same number of times. In a pBIB design, cognitive blocks may not appear an equal number of times in each position, or may not be paired with every other cognitive block an equal number of times. NAEP booklet design varies according to subject area (e.g., geography, mathematics, reading, science, U.S. history, writing).
Once the instrument developer has laid out the configuration of all blocks for each booklet in a booklet map shown here with the following column headings,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booklet number</th>
<th>Cognitive block 1</th>
<th>Cognitive block 2</th>
<th>Contextual question directions</th>
<th>General student contextual questions</th>
<th>Subject-specific contextual questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the number of rows (booklet numbers) provides the booklet spiral design information needed for the bundling of the student booklets.


**NAEP Assessment Sample Design**

Each assessment cycle, a sample of students in designated grades within both public and private schools throughout the United States (and sometimes specified territories and possessions) is selected for assessment. In addition, in state assessment years, of which 2007 is an example, the samples of public schools and their students in each state are large enough to support state-level estimates. In all cases, the selection process utilizes a probability sample design in which every school and student has a chance to be selected, and standard errors can be calculated for the derived estimates.

**Public School Selection in State Assessment Years**

The selection of a sample of public school students for state assessment involves a complex multistage sampling design with the following stages:

- Select public schools within the designated areas,
- Select students in the relevant grades within the designated schools, and
- Allocate selected students to assessment subjects.

The Common Core of Data (CCD) file, a comprehensive list of operating public schools in each jurisdiction that is compiled each school year by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), is used as the sampling frame for the selection of sample schools. The CCD also contains information about grades served, enrollment, and location of each school. In addition to the CCD list, a set of specially sampled jurisdictions is contacted to determine if there are any newly formed public schools that were not included in the lists used as sampling frames. Considerable effort is expended to increase the survey coverage by locating public schools not included in the most recent CCD file.

As part of the selection process, public schools are combined into groups known as strata on the basis of various school characteristics related to achievement. These characteristics include the physical location of the school, extent of minority enrollment, state-based achievement scores, and median income of the area in which the school is located. Stratification of public schools
occurs within each state. Grouping schools within strata by such selected characteristics provides a more ordered selection process with improved reliability of the assessment results.

On average, a sample of approximately 100 grade-eligible public schools is selected within each jurisdiction; within each school, about 60 students are selected for assessment. Both of these numbers may vary somewhat, depending on the number and enrollment size of the schools in a jurisdiction, and the scope of the assessment in the particular year. Students are sampled from a roster of individual names, not by whole classrooms. The total number of schools selected is a function of the number of grades to be assessed, the number of subjects to be assessed, and the number of states participating.

**Private School Selection in State Assessment Years**
In years in which state-level samples are drawn for public schools, private schools are classified by type (e.g., Roman Catholic, Lutheran, etc.), and are grouped for sampling by geography (Census region), degree of urbanization of location, and minority enrollment. About 700 private schools, on average, are included, with up to 60 students per school selected for assessment. These samples are not large enough to support state-level estimates for private schools. Thus, inferences for private schools are limited to the national level, even in years when public school assessments are state-specific.

A national sample of private schools in all grades is then drawn from a list compiled through the Private School Universe Survey (PSS), which is a mail survey of all U.S. private schools carried out biennially by the U.S. Census Bureau under contract to NCES. The PSS list is updated for new schools only for a sample of Roman Catholic dioceses.

**National-Only Assessment Years**
In years when the NAEP samples are intended only to provide representation at the national level and not for each individual state, the public and private school selection process is somewhat different. Rather than selecting schools directly from lists of schools, the first stage of sampling involves selecting a sample of some 50 to 100 geographic primary sampling units (PSUs). Each PSU is composed of one or more counties. They vary in size considerably, and generally about 1,000 PSUs are created in total, from which a sample is selected. Within the set of selected PSUs, public and private school samples are selected using similar procedures to those described above for the direct sampling of schools from lists. The samples are clustered geographically, which results in a more efficient data collection process. The selection of PSUs is not necessary when the sample sizes are large in each state, as in state assessment years.


**NAEP Alliance Contractors**
NAEP is conducted by the Assessment Division of NCES, which also works with a series of contractors. The following chart presents the structure of the collaboration between these contractors.
NAEP Alliance Contractors

To learn more about NAEP contractors in addition to the NAEP Alliance contractors, visit: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/contracts/history.aspx
# Glossary of Acronyms and Other Terms

The following acronyms and terms are commonly used in the work of the National Assessment Governing Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASA</td>
<td>American Association of School Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Formerly American College Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>Assessment Development Committee (Board Committee responsible for test development on all NAEP subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERA</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>American Federation of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDs</td>
<td>Achievement Level Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Achievement Levels Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA</td>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYP</td>
<td>Adequate Yearly Progress (From the No Child Left Behind Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTA</td>
<td>Board on Testing and Assessment, National Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSS</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGCS</td>
<td>Council of the Great City Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSDAM</td>
<td>Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology (Board committee responsible for technical issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESST</td>
<td>Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (Research Center at UCLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Design and Analysis Committee (Advisory panel to ETS on technical issues in NAEP operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Education Commission of the States (First NAEP contractor and organization supporting state policy leaders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIMAC</td>
<td>Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (Advisory committee to CCSSO, mostly state testing directors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELs or ELLs</td>
<td>English Learners or English Language Learner (Pronounced &quot;Ls&quot;; formerly called Limited English Proficient or LEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPA</td>
<td>English Language Proficiency Assessment (Also ELPA21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC</td>
<td>Education Policy Improvement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Educational Testing Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Federal Acquisition Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPO</td>
<td>Government Printing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTS</td>
<td>High School Transcript Study (A special NAEP data collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Education Plan (A required document under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which specifies learning objectives for an individual student found with a disability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES</td>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences (The Department of Education office in which NCES is located. The Director of IES is an ex-officio member of the Governing Board.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>International Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IRT | Item Response Theory  
*(A theory for design, analysis, and scoring of tests)* |
| KaSA | Knowledge and Skills Appropriate  
*(A series of NAEP research studies to improve measurement precision)* |
| KSA | Knowledge, Skill, and/or Ability  
*(A statement describing a subset of academic content)* |
| LEP | Limited English Proficient  
*(Term formerly used for an English Language Learner)* |
| LTT | Long Term Trend Assessment  
*(Series of NAEP tests that began in the early 1970’s)* |
| MST | Multi-stage Testing  
*(A testing format where subsets of test items are presented to students based on item difficulty and student performance)* |
| NAE | National Academy of Education |
| NAEP | National Assessment of Educational Progress  
*(Pronounced "nape")* |
| NAESP | National Association of Elementary School Principals |
| NAGB | National Assessment Governing Board  
*(Pronounced "nag bee")* |
| NAS | National Academy of Sciences |
| NASBE | National Association of State Boards of Education |
| NASSP | National Association of Secondary School Principals |
| The Nation’s Report Card | Alternate reference for NAEP assessments |
| NCES | National Center for Education Statistics  
*(Project office for NAEP in the U.S. Department of Education and IES)* |
| NCLB | No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 |
| NCME | National Council on Measurement in Education |
| NCTE | National Council of Teachers of English |
| NCTM | National Council of Teachers of Mathematics |
| NEA | National Education Association |
| NEA | National Endowment for the Arts |
| NEH | National Endowment for the Humanities |
| NGSS | Next Generation Science Standards |
| NRC | National Research Council |
| NSBA | National School Boards Association |
| NSLP | National School Lunch Program |
| NVS | NAEP Validity Studies Panel |
| OGC | Office of the General Counsel  
*(in the U.S. Department of Education)* |
| OMB | Office of Management and Budget |
| PARCC | Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers |
| PIRLS | Progress in International Reading Literacy Study |
| PISA | Program for International Student Assessment |
| POC | Principal Operating Components  
*(Divisions of the U.S. Department of Education)* |
<p>| PTA | Parent Teacher Association |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Reporting and Dissemination Committee <em>(Board Committee responsible for NAEP reporting issues)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Response probability <em>(probability of correct response on a test question)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT</td>
<td>Race to the Top <em>(also referred to as RTTT)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Technology-based Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEL</td>
<td>Technology and Engineering Literacy <em>(A content area assessed by NAEP)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department</td>
<td>United States Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Secretary</td>
<td>Secretary of Education <em>(Honorable Arne Duncan during the Obama administration)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMSS</td>
<td>Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUDA</td>
<td>Trial Urban District Assessment <em>(NAEP component that measures students in large urban districts)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE AND TIME</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, November 17</strong></td>
<td>Assessment Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 4:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, November 17</strong></td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 – 6:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, November 18</strong></td>
<td>Full Board Meeting General Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed Sessions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 – 1:45 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 3:15 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Session: 3:30 – 5:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, November 18</strong></td>
<td>Full Board Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 – 9:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, November 19</strong></td>
<td>Nominations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 8:15 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, November 19</strong></td>
<td>Full Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 11:45 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complimentary shuttle service from Ronald Reagan Airport

Sheraton Pentagon City Hotel offers complimentary hotel shuttle service to and from Ronald Reagan National Airport from 5:15 am until 12:15 am. The hotel shuttle picks up from Terminal A, Door 5 & 9 at 15 and 45 minutes past every hour. For return service to the airport, the shuttle departs the hotel every 30 minutes.

**Shuttle Service from BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport, Dulles International Airport and Ronald Reagan National Airport**

Super Shuttle provides shuttle service from BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI), Dulles International Airport (IAD) and Washington Reagan National Airport (DCA) to the hotel. For pick up, claim your luggage and proceed to Ground Transportation/Shared Ride Vans. Reservations are not required for transportation to the hotel. However, reservations are required for transportation to the airport. 24-hour notice is preferred, and reservations can be made on-line at www.supershuttle.com, or by calling toll free (800) 258-3826. The one-way fare is approximately $49 from BWI, $33 from Dulles and $21 from Reagan.

**Taxi Service**

**Arrivals and Departures via BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport and Ronald Reagan National Airport**

Several taxi companies provide service from BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI) and Ronald Reagan National Airport (DCA). The one-way trip from BWI takes approximately one hour and the fare is approximately $95-$120. The one-way fare from Reagan is approximately $25 and travel time is approximately 15 minutes. Taxi stands are located outside the airport and hotel.

**Arrivals and Departures via Dulles International Airport**

Washington Flyer Taxi Service (703) 661-6655 provides taxi service from Dulles International Airport. The one-way fare is approximately $70-$75 per person and travel time is approximately 45 minutes. Upon arrival at Dulles, proceed to the baggage claim/arrivals area on the lower level of the Main terminal and proceed to the Washington Flyer taxi stand. A curbside representative will assist you with coordinating service. A taxi cost from the hotel to IAD is approximately $60.

**Public Transportation-Metrorail**

Sheraton Pentagon City is accessible by Metrorail via the Blue/ Yellow Line. Take the Blue Line train marked “Largo Town Center/Greenbelt” and exit at the Pentagon City metro station via the “Fashion Centre” exit. The hotel shuttle stop is located just outside the metro station. Shuttle service is available from the hotel to the metro from 6:15 am until 11:15 pm on weekdays, and from 7:15 am until 11:15 pm on weekends at 15 and 45 of every hour. Service from the metro to the hotel runs from 6:30 am until 11:30 pm on the weekdays and 7:30 am -11:30 pm on the weekends at every 30 minutes on the hour and half hour.

**Parking**

Complimentary self-parking is available in the hotel's parking garage.