Assessment Development Committee

November 15, 2019

Fitzgerald B

AGENDA

9:45 – 10:05 am	**Framework Development Policy: Review of Principles and Implementation (SV5)**	*Attachment A*
	Dana Boyd, Chair	
	Michelle Blair, Assistant Director for Assessment Development	
10:05 – 10:35 am	**Action: 2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework (SV5)**	*Attachment B*
	Dana Boyd	
	Michelle Blair	
	Ann Edwards, WestEd	
10:35 – 11:20 am	**Update: 2025 NAEP Reading Framework (SV5)**	*Attachment C*
	Mark Loveland and Cynthia Greenleaf, WestEd	
11:20 – 11:45 am	**Strategic Vision: Review of Priorities**	*Attachment D*
	Dana Boyd	

Framework Development Policy:
Review of Principles and Implementation

In the August 2019 meeting of the Governing Board Assessment Development Committee (ADC), members asked for a review of the Framework Development Policy to ensure that project and Board activities for framework updates are aligned. At the November 2019 ADC meeting, Governing Board Assistant Director for Assessment Development Michelle Blair will provide a briefing regarding how the policy has been implemented.

The Governing Board Framework Development Policy is attached for reference.

National Assessment Governing Board

Framework Development

Policy Statement

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

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

Introduction

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

Under provisions of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-279), Congress authorized the Governing Board to continue its mandate for determining the content and format of valid and reliable assessments based on widely accepted professional testing standards and active participation of stakeholders. This mandate

aligns with the purpose of NAEP, which is to provide fair and accurate measurement of student academic achievement.

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

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

To develop the recommended framework for Board adoption, the Governing Board convenes stakeholders to identify the content and design for each NAEP assessment.

In this process, involved stakeholders include:

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

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

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

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

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

Principles for Framework Development

Principle 1:   Elements of Frameworks

Principle 2:   Development and Update Process

Principle 3:   Framework Review

Principle 4:   Resources for the Process

Principle 5:   Elements of Specifications

Principle 6:   Role of the Governing Board

Guidelines for the Principles

Principle 1:   Elements of Frameworks

The Governing Board is responsible for developing a framework for each NAEP assessment. The framework shall define the scope of the domain to be measured by delineating the knowledge and skills to be tested at each grade, the format of the NAEP assessment, and the achievement levels.

Guidelines

a) The framework shall determine the extent of the domain and the scope of the construct to be measured for each grade level in a NAEP assessment. The framework shall provide information to the public and test developers on three key aspects of the assessment:

- *What* is to be measured, including definitions of the constructs being assessed and reported upon and descriptions of the purpose(s) of the assessment;
- *How* that domain of content is most appropriately measured in a large-scale assessment, including the format requirements of the items and the assessment, the content and skills to be tested at each grade, sample items for each grade to be tested, the weighting of the item pool in terms of content and cognitive process dimensions, and any additional requirements for the assessment administration unique to a given subject area, such as provision of ancillary materials and uses of technology; and
- *How much* of the content domain, in terms of knowledge and skills, should students know and be able to do at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels in achievement level descriptions for each grade to be tested. The achievement level descriptions shall be based on the Governing Board's policy definitions for basic, proficient, and advanced achievement and shall incorporate the content and process dimensions of the assessment at each grade.

b) The framework shall determine the construction of items for each NAEP assessment. The achievement level descriptions in each framework shall also be used in the level-setting process.

c) The framework shall focus on important, measurable indicators of student achievement to inform the nation about what students know and are able to do without endorsing or advocating a particular instructional approach.

d) Content coverage in each subject and grade shall be broad, inclusive of content valued by the public as important to measure, and reflect high aspirations for student achievement. (See *Principle 4* for more detail on the factors balanced in content coverage.)

e) Frameworks shall be written to be clear and accessible to educators and the general public. The framework shall contain sufficient information to inform all stakeholders about the nature and scope of the given assessment. Following Governing Board adoption, the framework shall be widely disseminated.

Principle 2:   Development and Update Process

The Governing Board shall develop and update frameworks through a comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative process that involves active participation of stakeholders.

Guidelines

a) In accordance with the NAEP statute, framework development and update processes shall be fair and open through active participation of stakeholders representing all major constituents in the various NAEP audiences, as listed in the introduction above.

- *Framework panels* shall reflect diversity in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, region of the country, and viewpoints regarding the content of the assessment under development.
- *Public comment* shall be sought from various segments of the population to reflect many different views, as well as those employed in the specific content area under consideration.

b) Framework development and update processes shall be executed primarily via two panels: a Visioning Panel with a subset of members continuing as the Development Panel. This process shall result in three documents: a recommended framework, assessment and item specifications, and recommendations for contextual variables that relate to the subject being assessed. For each framework,

- *The Framework Visioning Panel* shall formulate high-level guidance about the state of the field to inform the process, providing these in the form of guidelines. The major part of the Visioning Panel work will be at the beginning to provide initial guidance for developing a recommended framework. The Visioning Panel shall be comprised of the stakeholders referenced in the introduction above. At least 20 percent of this panel shall have classroom teaching experience in the subject areas under consideration. This panel may include up to 30 members with additional members as needed.
- *The Framework Development Panel* shall develop drafts of the three project documents and engage in the detailed deliberations about how issues outlined in the Visioning Panel discussion should be reflected in a recommended framework. As a subset of the Visioning Panel, the Development Panel shall have a proportionally higher representation of content experts and educators, whose expertise collectively addresses all grade levels designated for the assessment under development. Educators shall be drawn from schools across the nation, including individuals who work with students from high-poverty and low-performing schools, as well as public and private schools. This panel may include up to 15 members, with additional members as needed.

c) In addition to a recommended framework, the framework development or update process shall result in assessment and item specifications (see *Principle 5*) and recommendations on

related contextual variables to be collected from students, teachers, and school administrators. Recommendations shall take into account burden, cost, quality of the data to be obtained, and other factors. (See the Governing Board Policy on Collecting and Reporting Contextual Data.)

d) The scope and size of a framework development project shall determine the size of framework panels and the number of panel meetings needed. A framework update project may require smaller panels and fewer meetings if a smaller scope is anticipated for recommended revisions.   Each project shall begin with a review of major issues in the content area. For a framework update, the project shall also begin with an extensive review of the current framework, and the Visioning Panel shall discuss the potential risk of changing frameworks to trends and assessment of educational progress. (See *4.b*).

e) Framework development and updating shall be comprehensive in approach and conducted in an environment that is open, balanced, and even-handed. Panels shall consider all viewpoints and debate all pertinent issues in formulating the content and design of a NAEP assessment, including findings from research. Reference materials shall represent multiple views.

f) For each project, protocols shall be established to support panel deliberations and to develop a unified proposal for the content and design of the assessment. Written summaries of all hearings, forums, surveys, and panel meetings shall be made available in a timely manner to inform deliberations.

Principle 3:   Framework Review

Reviews of existing frameworks shall determine whether an update is needed to continue valid and reliable measurement of the content and cognitive processes reflected in evolving expectations of students.

Guidelines

a) At least once every 10 years, the Governing Board, through its Assessment Development Committee (ADC), shall review the relevance of assessments and their underlying frameworks. In the review, the ADC shall solicit input from experts to determine if changes are warranted, making clear the potential risk of changing frameworks to trends and assessment of educational progress. The Board may decide based on the input that the framework does not require revision, or that the framework may require minor or major updates. To initiate updates, the ADC shall prepare a recommendation for full Board approval. Minor updates include clarifications or corrections that do not affect the construct defined for the assessment. Major updates shall include the convening of a Visioning Panel (see *Principle 2*). Framework revisions shall also be subject to full Board approval.

b) Within the 10 year period for an ADC review, major changes in the states' or nation's educational system may occur that relate to one or more NAEP frameworks. In this instance, the ADC will determine whether and how changing conditions warrant an update

6 of 9

and the Governing Board via recommendation may convene a Visioning Panel to revise or replace the framework. Before framework panels are convened, special research and analysis may also be commissioned to inform the updates to be considered.

c) If the Visioning Panel recommends major updates, then a subset of panel members shall continue as the Development Panel to develop the draft framework and assessment and item specifications, in accordance with *Principle 2*. Regular reports will be provided to the ADC and the recommended framework update shall be subject to full Board approval.

d) When a framework update is conducted, framework Visioning and Development Panel recommendations shall describe the extent to which adjustments in the achievement level descriptors (see *1.a*) and contextual variables (see *2.c*) are needed. (See the Governing Board Policy on Achievement Levels and the Governing Board Policy on Collecting and Reporting Contextual Data for additional details.)

Principle 4:   Resources for the Process

Framework development and update processes shall take into account state and local curricula and assessments, widely accepted professional standards, exemplary research, international standards and assessments, and other pertinent factors and information.

Guidelines

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

b) An initial compilation of resources shall summarize relevant research, advantages and disadvantages of the latest developments, and trends in state standards and assessments for the content area. This compilation shall also summarize how stakeholders have used previous NAEP student achievement trends in the assessment area. The compilation may include public comment. Using this compilation as a springboard, framework panel deliberations shall begin by thoroughly identifying major policy and assessment issues in the content area.

c) The framework panels shall also consider a wide variety of resources as deliberations proceed, including but not limited to curriculum guides and assessments developed by states and local districts, widely accepted professional standards, scientific research, other types of research studies in the literature, key reports having significant national and international interest, international standards and assessments, other assessment instruments in the content area, and prior NAEP frameworks, if available.

d) Technical experts shall be involved to uphold the highest technical standards for development of the NAEP framework and specifications. As a resource to the framework

panels, these experts shall respond to technical issues raised during panel deliberations.

e) In balancing the relative importance of various sources of information, framework panels shall consider direction from the Governing Board, the role and purpose of NAEP in informing the public about student achievement, the legislative parameters for NAEP, constraints of a large-scale assessment, technical assessment standards, issues of burden and cost-effectiveness in designing the assessment, and other factors unique to the content area.

Principle 5:   Elements of Specifications

The specifications document shall be developed for use by NCES as the blueprint for constructing the NAEP assessment and items.

Guidelines

a) The assessment and item specifications shall produce an assessment that is valid, reliable, and based on relevant widely accepted professional standards. The specifications shall also be consistent with Governing Board policies regarding NAEP design, such as groupings of items, test administration conditions, and accommodations for students with disabilities and English language learners (see the Governing Board Policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners). The specifications shall be reviewed by technical experts involved in the process, prior to submission to the Governing Board.

b) The primary audience for the specifications, or assessment blueprint, shall be NCES and the contractor(s) responsible for developing the assessment and the test questions.

c) The specifications shall evolve from the framework and shall be written in sufficient detail so that item writers can develop high-quality questions based on the framework objectives for grades 4, 8, and 12, where applicable. The specifications shall include, but not be limited to detailed descriptions of:
  • the content and process dimensions, including the weighting of those dimensions in the pool of questions at each grade;
  • types of items;
  • guidelines for stimulus material;
  • types of response formats;
  • scoring procedures;
  • achievement level descriptions;
  • administration conditions;
  • ancillary or additional materials, if any;
  • considerations for special populations;
  • sample items, including a substantial number and range of sample items with scoring guidelines for each grade level; and
  • any unique requirements for the given assessment.

d) Special studies, if any, to be conducted as part of the assessment shall be described in the

8 of 9

specifications. This description shall provide an overview of the purpose and rationale for the study, the nature of the student sample(s), and a discussion of the instrument and administration procedures.

Principle 6: Role of the Governing Board

The Governing Board, through its Assessment Development Committee, shall monitor all framework development and updates. The result of this process shall be recommendations for Governing Board action in the form of three key documents: the framework; assessment and item specifications; and contextual variables that relate to the subject being assessed.

Guidelines

a) The Assessment Development Committee (ADC) shall be responsible for monitoring framework development and updates that result in recommendations to the Governing Board on the content and format of each NAEP assessment. The ADC will provide direction to the framework panels, via Governing Board staff. This guidance shall ensure compliance with the NAEP law, Governing Board policies, Department of Education and government-wide regulations, and requirements of the contract(s) used to implement the framework project.

b) When a framework Visioning Panel is to be convened, the ADC shall develop a charge for the panel, and the charge shall be subject to full Board approval. The charge will outline any special considerations for an assessment area.

c) The ADC shall receive regular reports on the progress of framework development and updates.

d) In initiating a framework update, the Governing Board shall balance needs for stable reporting of student achievement trends. Regarding when and how an adopted framework update will be implemented, the Board may consider the NAEP Assessment Schedule, cost and technical issues, and research and innovations to support possibilities for continuous trend reporting.

e) At the conclusion of the framework development or update process, the Governing Board shall take final action on the recommended framework, specifications, and contextual variables. The Governing Board shall make the final decision on the content and format of NAEP assessments.

f) Following adoption by the Governing Board, the final framework, specifications, and contextual variables shall be provided to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). These documents, which include the achievement level descriptions for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance definitions, are provided to NCES to guide development of NAEP test questions and questionnaires.

Action: 2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework

At the August 2019 Board meeting, the Assessment Development Committee (ADC) and, later, the full Board discussed policy issues arising from the public comments submitted on the draft 2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework. Based on these discussions, Board staff prepared a summary of the Board's guidance for the Framework Development Panel (attached).

In September 2019, the Framework Development Panel met in person and via webinar, using the Board's policy guidance to revise the draft for Board review. In October 2019, the ADC met via teleconference to discuss remaining policy issues. November 2019 Board action on the 2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework will ensure that NCES has sufficient time to conduct assessment and item development, preparing for the updated assessment to be administered in 2025.

In this session, the ADC will review how policy issues have been addressed in the latest draft framework (sent under separate cover). Deliberation will support Committee and full Board action on the framework, slated for this November 2019 Board meeting.

2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework Guidance from the Board

The Board met in August 2019 and reached several decisions regarding the NAEP Mathematics Framework. Board deliberation on each major issue is summarized below, followed by additional background on the Board's deliberations. The Development Panel prepared an October 2019 draft that responds to this Guidance, in preparation for November 2019 Board action on the 2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework.

Issues

[1] Percentages of items for each newly proposed NAEP Mathematical Practice

Board decision: For each NAEP Mathematical Practice, the framework will specify the percentage ranges for the item pool rather than exact percentages, with a higher percentage range designated for "no practice assessed" to support the likelihood that trend will be maintained. NCES has noted exact percentages over-specify the assessment, e.g., the more requirements placed on the item pool, the less likely it is that all requirements can be achieved. All NAEP frameworks specify content and process percentages for transparency to NAEP's partners and audiences.
Response from the Panel: The Panel has updated the draft accordingly with appropriate percentage ranges for the item pool to devote to each NAEP Mathematical Practice. The panel has also clarified the purpose of the portion of the assessment that is not devoted to the five NAEP Mathematical Practices articulated in the draft 2025 framework.

[2] States' mathematics content coverage

Board decision: The Board-commissioned Review of State Standards will be used to ensure that every NAEP framework objective is covered in one or more states. For objectives covered by only a few states, standards research will be used relative to leading states and countries to justify the inclusion of this content. **Compelling evidence is needed.** The framework must support NAEP's relevance, support our nation's diversity of students, and be forward-looking. The framework will be "informed by but not determined by" what states are doing.
Response from the Panel: The Panel has documented compelling rationales for all low coverage NAEP assessment objectives. In instances where compelling evidence was not available, the content has been removed from the assessment.

[3] States' assessment emphasis of mathematics content areas

Board decision: Accommodating the decreased number of grade 4 Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability objectives and the lower emphasis of this content across states, the NAEP balance will be decreased from 10 percent to 5 percent. Number Properties and Operations or Algebra will be increased accordingly. Given states' emphasis on Data and Algebra areas at grade 8, the balance for Algebra will remain at 30 percent, and the balance for Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability will be increased from 15 percent to 20 percent. Geometry, Measurement, or Number Properties and Operations will be reduced accordingly by 5 percent. No other content area balance changes will be made.
Response from the Panel: The Panel used NAEP Validity Studies (NVS) research, publicly available state assessment balance information, and other sources to support rationales for the overall content area balance for the 2025 framework across grades 4, 8, and 12. The Panel determined that the most appropriate grade 4 area to receive increased emphasis was Number Properties and Operations, and the most appropriate grade 8 area to receive reduced emphasis was Measurement.

[4] Percentage of scenario-based tasks (SBTs) in the framework

Board decision: The framework will state and affirm the value and importance of maximizing SBTs in the NAEP Mathematics Assessment without indicating a minimum percentage. The framework will state that SBTs will be included on the assessment. This supports SBTs as an important element of NAEP assessments and addresses the widening variety of item types and the high cost of SBTs.

Response from the Panel: The Panel has updated the framework with well-positioned affirmative statements about SBTs, instead of specifying an exact percentage of the assessment that would include SBTs.

[5] Using language familiar to states

Board decision: The framework will use the term **NAEP Mathematical Practices** to clarify that these mathematical practices address large-scale assessment and are specifically for NAEP. Using language familiar to states and NAEP's key audiences is important; introducing new terms will be problematic. This also supports the use of parallel terminology across STEM subject areas and aligns with recent Board policy decisions, i.e., clarifying NAEP achievement levels by labeling them as NAEP Basic, NAEP Proficient, and NAEP Advanced.

Response from the Panel: The Panel has updated the framework with the term NAEP Mathematical Practices in response to public comment.

[6] NAEP's position on community and civic engagement with mathematical knowledge and skills

Board decision: The framework will affirm the importance of the mathematics knowledge and skills needed beyond what is needed for careers. The mathematics needed to function in society is the value of mathematical literacy. Mathematical Literacy as part of the NAEP Mathematics Framework has the potential to positively encourage mathematics education to support students beyond those pursuing STEM fields. Mathematical literacy will represent one of the forward-looking aspects of the framework, allowing the Board and NAEP to be forward-looking in terms of the mission of mathematics education and in terms of mathematics assessment. Accordingly, the presentation of mathematical literacy will be clarified in the document and a glossary will be added.

Response from the Panel: The Panel has updated and clarified the articulation of Mathematical Literacy in the framework in response to public comment.

[7] Definitions and priorities of new contextual variables

Board decision: The framework will not include a contextual questionnaire focus on family engagement in mathematics. This is likely to be considered intrusive and may contribute to misuse and misinterpretation of NAEP data. NCES has noted that several of the newly proposed contextual questionnaire items in the May 2019 draft are intrusive in nature, relative to NAEP standards and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines.

Response from the Panel: The Panel has reviewed the topics proposed for the mathematics subject-specific contextual questionnaire and removed topics likely to be considered intrusive.

Background

Each NAEP Assessment is guided by a framework that defines the knowledge and skills to be assessed at each grade. Through active participation of NAEP stakeholders, each framework is developed through a comprehensive process that considers various factors, such as state and local curricula and assessments, widely accepted professional standards, international standards, and exemplary research.

Framework development and update processes are overseen by the Assessment Development Committee (ADC). The ADC conducted a review of the 2017 NAEP Mathematics Framework (last updated in 2006), which included a discussion with external experts as well as a Board-commissioned inventory of state standards. Based on the ADC review, the Governing Board initiated an update of the framework. The Board awarded a contract to WestEd for implementation of the update project. WestEd has convened subject matter experts, practitioners, policy makers, administrators, researchers, business representatives, and members of the general public – serving as the Visioning and Development Panels in accordance with their Board-adopted Charge (attached). The Charge calls for recommendations that balance necessary changes with the Board's desire for stable trend reporting, continued breadth of content coverage, and innovation.

Determining the content and format of each NAEP assessment is one of the Governing Board's Congressionally-mandated responsibilities. Using recommendations that reflect Visioning and Development Panel deliberations and public comment, the framework process concludes when the Governing Board adopts a framework that also reflects its concerns and priorities.

The Development Panel has submitted a draft responsive to Board deliberations. Board staff have annotated the draft to show how Board feedback has been addressed. Following a progress update on the project, the Board will be asked to take action on the 2025 NAEP Mathematics Framework at the November 2019 Board meeting, allowing for NCES assessment development in time for 2025.

Milestones

Board Review of State Standards	August 2017 – May 2018
ADC Framework Review	May 2018
Board Adoption of Charge to Framework Panels	August 2018
Board Contract Award to Launch Project	September 2018
Visioning and Development Panel Meetings	November 2018 – September 2019
Public Comment Period	April – June 2019
Board Review and Discussion	May 2019 Board Meeting August 2019 Board Meeting
Board Action	November 2019 Board Meeting

The National Assessment Governing Board Charge to the Visioning and Development Panels For the 2025 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Mathematics Framework

Whereas, The Nation's Report Card—also known as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)—is mandated by Congress to conduct national assessments and report data on student academic achievement and trends in public and private elementary schools and secondary schools, and is prohibited from using any assessment to "evaluate individual students or teachers" or "to establish, require, or influence the standards, assessments, curriculum, … or instructional practices of states or local education agencies" (Public Law 107-279);

Whereas, Congress specifically assigned the National Assessment Governing Board responsibilities to "develop assessment objectives consistent with the requirements of this [law] and test specifications that produce an assessment that is valid and reliable, and are based on relevant widely accepted professional standards";

Whereas, the Governing Board's Strategic Vision adopted in November 2016 established that the 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";

Whereas, the Governing Board established in its Framework Development Policy that the Board shall conduct "a comprehensive, inclusive, and deliberative process" to determine and update the content and format of all NAEP assessments;

Whereas, in accordance with the Governing Board's Framework Development Policy, the Board's Assessment Development Committee conducted a review of the current NAEP Mathematics Framework, which included papers from leading mathematics educators and a comprehensive analysis of current mathematics standards in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity;

Whereas, based on the review of the NAEP Mathematics Framework conducted by the Assessment Development Committee, the Committee concludes that much of the framework remains relevant, observes that digital platforms and new research encourage innovation in the content and format of future NAEP Mathematics Assessments, and recommends that the Board update the NAEP Mathematics Framework last updated in 2001 "to be informed by a broad, balanced, and inclusive set of factors" balancing "current curricula and instruction, research regarding cognitive development and instruction, and the nation's future needs and desirable levels of achievement, " in accordance with the Framework Development Policy;

Therefore,

- The National Assessment Governing Board staff, with appropriate contractor support and oversight by the Governing Board's Assessment Development Committee, shall conduct a framework update by establishing a Visioning Panel with a subset of members continuing as the Development Panel, in accordance with the Governing Board Framework Development Policy;

- All processes and procedures identified in the Governing Board Framework Development Policy shall be followed;

- The Visioning and Development Panels will recommend to the Board how best to balance necessary changes in the NAEP Mathematics Framework at grades 4, 8, and 12, with the Board's desire for stable reporting of student achievement trends and assessment of a broad range of knowledge and skills, so as to maximize the value of NAEP to the nation; and the Panels are also tasked with considering opportunities to extend the depth of measurement and reporting given the affordances of digital based assessment;

- The update process shall result in three documents: a recommended framework, assessment and item specifications, and recommendations for contextual variables that relate to student achievement in mathematics;

- At the conclusion of the NAEP Mathematics Framework update process, the National Assessment Governing Board shall review recommendations from the Visioning and Development Panels, and take final action on recommended updates to the mathematics framework, assessment specifications, and subject-specific contextual variables; and

- The framework update adopted by the Board will guide development of the 2025 NAEP Mathematics Assessment.

Attachment C

Quarterly Progress Report

2025 NAEP READING FRAMEWORK UPDATE

Project Overview

In September 2018, the Governing Board awarded a contract to WestEd to conduct an update of the NAEP Mathematics and Reading Assessment Frameworks, Assessment and Item Specifications, and Contextual Variables. Year 1 of the project was focused on the updating of the Mathematics Framework documents, with Year 2 focused on Reading. The goal of the Reading Framework project is to update the NAEP Reading Framework documents through the work of a 32-person Visioning Panel, a 17-person Development Panel, and an 8-person Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). This will be accomplished through an initial Visioning Panel meeting, five subsequent Development Panel meetings, conducting outreach efforts to gather public comment on draft versions of the documents, and production of a final updated Reading Assessment Framework, Assessment and Item Specifications, and Contextual Variables for Reading to submit to the Governing Board by October 2020.

The Reading Framework update is to be conducted using a combination of external experts and reading specialists within WestEd. WestEd's considerable experience with NAEP comes from having led previous NAEP framework projects (the 2009 NAEP Science Framework and the 2014 NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Framework). To complete this work, WestEd is partnering with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), who will assist in compiling resources for the Framework panels and in securing feedback on the updated framework, assessment and item specifications, and contextual variables. Input into the framework document update will also come from project collaborators: the Literacy Research Association (LRA), the International Literacy Association (ILA), and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).

Project Team

The Project Management Team consists of Steve Schneider, Mark Loveland, Cynthia Greenleaf, Matt Gaertner, and Kellie Kim. As project director, Steve Schneider provides day-to-day leadership, guidance, and liaising with the Governing Board. Dr. Schneider has over 40 years of science, mathematics, and technology education experience and led WestEd's three previous Framework development projects. Project co-director, Mark Loveland, and Reading Content Lead, Cynthia Greenleaf (bio attached), have oversight for all programmatic activities. Dr. Loveland was project coordinator for the TEL Framework development project and project co-director for the Mathematics Framework update. P. David Pearson

(bio attached), Professor Emeritus and former Dean of the University of California, Berkeley Graduate School of Education will serve as the Reading Panel Chair. Together, he and Dr. Greenleaf will lead the Visioning and Development Panel activities. Measurement Lead, Dr. Gaertner will coordinate the TAC. Dr. Kim will serve as Process Manager, documenting all project activities. In addition to the project leaders, the broader project team includes two additional reading subject matter experts, three project coordinators, and research assistants.

Project Plan

The project plan describes WestEd's project management and coordination of panel and TAC activities to update the NAEP Reading Assessment Framework, Assessment and Item Specifications, and Contextual Variables. The bulk of the framework update work will be carried out by the Framework Visioning and Development Panels. Comprised of 32 individuals representing various stakeholder groups, the Framework Visioning Panel will formulate guidelines for developing a recommended framework, based on the state of the field. Seventeen members of the Visioning Panel will constitute the Framework Development Panel. The Development Panel is charged with developing the drafts of the three project documents and engaging in the detailed deliberations to determine how to reflect the Visioning Panel guidelines in an updated framework. Dates for the Visioning Panel meeting and the five Development Panel meetings have been finalized.

Preparatory work for the Framework Panel activities has been extensive. WestEd has prepared a Project Plan, which describes the process and schedule for updating the framework documents, and a project Design Document, which serves as the blueprint for the project processes, describing outcomes and metrics, and as the touchstone for quality assurance monitoring. Additionally, a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of eight technical experts will respond to technical issues raised during panel deliberations.

Panelist Selection

Using processes outlined in the Design Document, WestEd has worked in consultation with Governing Board staff and Governing Board members to identify a final list of 32 members of the Visioning and Development Panels. To inform the development of a final list of prospective members, Reading subject matter experts constructed a matrix of potential panelists, arranged according to key stakeholder group representation and issues/areas of expertise, along with bios of each proposed panelist. Consideration was also given to organizational representation, variables of interest for panelist expertise or background including grade band, teaching experience, geographic region, locale (i.e. urban, suburban, rural), and gender.

Panelist Deliberation

The work of the panels and TAC will be informed by an Issues Review paper (attached) and a compilation of resources. The Issues Review is intended to serve as a springboard for discussion by the Framework panels and will address issues that are likely to arise in the update of the NAEP Reading Framework. The Issues Review and Resource Compilation draw from the current NAEP Reading

Framework, specifications, and contextual variables documents, national and international standards, state frameworks and standards, extant assessments, reports, research on reading education and assessment, and other resources. These resources highlight reports, high-level presentations, and associated academic research papers, including a comparison study of NAEP Reading and NAEP Writing Assessments with current generation state assessments in English Language Arts. In preparation for the Visioning Panel meeting, WestEd project staff have conducted an initial orientation of the panelists to their responsibilities in updating the NAEP Reading Framework. A successful Visioning Panel meeting was held on October 21-22, 2019. Project Co-Director Mark Loveland and Reading Content Lead Cynthia Greenleaf will brief the Governing Board Assessment Development Committee on November 15, 2019.

Next Steps

Over the course of the first four Development Panel meetings, WestEd will facilitate the updating of the Reading framework documents, producing draft versions of the Assessment Framework, Assessment and Item Specifications, and recommended Contextual Variables. Outreach will be conducted primarily by WestEd and CCSSO, with assistance from collaborating organizations. Feedback on the draft documents will come from member organizations represented on the two panels, other organizations, and the public. Organizations may choose to convene meetings or gather feedback via a web-based portal. In all instances, stakeholder groups will follow procedures for securing input and ensuring representation of diverse views. WestEd staff will tabulate feedback, make recommendations for revisions addressing the feedback, and coordinate the development of final versions of the framework documents to be submitted to the Governing Board.

Milestones

The major milestones of the project are summarized below.

Milestone	Dates
Project Kickoff Meetings	June – July 2019
Project Plan Development	June – September 2019
Design Document Development	July – September 2019
Identification of Visioning and Development Panelists and TAC Members	August – September 2019
Issues Paper and Resource Compilation Development	September – October 2019
Visioning Panel Meeting	October 2019
Development Panel Meetings	November 2019 – September 2020
Convene TAC	2-3 weeks after each panel meeting and prior to submission of draft framework documents
Draft Versions of Framework Documents	November 2019 – May 2020
Gather Public Comment	June 2020 – July 2020
Develop Final Versions of Framework Documents	July 2020 – October 2020
Submit Final Process Report	November 2020

Biographies for Reading Framework Update Leadership

P. David Pearson (Panel Chair) is the Evelyn Lois Corey Emeritus Chair in Instructional Science within the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley, where he served as Dean from 2001-2010. His current research focuses on literacy history and policy, including assessment work on statewide assessment in Minnesota and Illinois, the New Standards movement in the 1990s, Smarter Balanced in 2010-2015, and NAEP (continuously since 1973).

Prior to coming to Berkeley in 2001, he served as the John A. Hannah Distinguished Professor of Education in the College of Education at Michigan State and as Co-Director of the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Even earlier, he was Dean of the College of Education, Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Reading, and Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Illinois. His initial professorial appointment was at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis from 1969-1978.

He has been active in a range of leadership roles in professional organizations, most notably the International Literacy Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the American Educational Research Association, the Literacy Research Association, and the National Academy of Education.

He has written and co-edited several books about research and practice, most notably the Handbook of Reading Research. He has served on the boards of many educational research journals. His 300+ books, articles and chapters, written with over 200 co-authors, appear in a range of outlets for a wide range of audiences—teachers, scholars, and policy makers.

Cynthia Greenleaf (WestEd) has helped students become more successful readers, writers and learners for three decades. As Senior Research Scientist and cofounder of the Strategic Literacy Initiative (SLI) at WestEd, Dr. Greenleaf has helped increase access to higher-level literacy learning for secondary and college students, particularly those who have not yet met their academic potential. Dr. Greenleaf is principally responsible for SLI's innovative inquiry-based instructional framework and professional learning model, Reading Apprenticeship. To design and innovate on this model, Dr. Greenleaf has worked in collaboration with teachers, LEAs, SEAs, education support agencies, professional organizations, and education policy specialists throughout her 30-year career in the reading and literacy field. Dr. Greenleaf has conducted multiple studies of the impact of Reading Apprenticeship professional development on student learning, including collaborative design-based research and rigorous randomized controlled studies.

Dr. Greenleaf has contributed to several books on literacy and education, including *Leading for Literacy: A Reading Apprenticeship Approach; Reading for Understanding: How Reading Apprenticeship Improves Disciplinary Learning in Secondary and College Classrooms*, *The Handbook of Adolescent Literacy Research, Best Practices in Adolescent Literacy Instruction*, and *Improving Reading Achievement through Professional Development*. She has co-authored numerous articles appearing in such publications as the *American Educational Research Journal, Education Psychologist, Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Journal of the Learning Sciences, Harvard Educational Review, Phi Delta Kappan* and *Science*.

Greenleaf received a PhD in language and literacy education from the University of California, Berkeley, and a BA in linguistics from the University of California at Berkeley.

WestEd.org

Issues Review

2025 NAEP READING FRAMEWORK UPDATE

Cynthia L. Greenleaf, WestEd

Mira-Lisa Katz, WestEd, Prof. Emerita, Sonoma State University

Georgia Earnest García, Prof. Emerita, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Contract #91995918C0001

Introduction

This paper, which is intended to serve as a springboard for discussion in the 2025 NAEP Reading Update Project, outlines the issues that are likely to surface in the update of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading Framework. While this review is intentionally limited in scope, it is supplemented by an annotated Resource Compilation containing much more information pertinent to the task. Together, this Issues Review and the Resource Compilation provide the central library for the panel in the work of updating the NAEP Reading Framework.

Background and History

The purpose of NAEP is to provide fair and accurate measurement of student academic achievement. Also known as "The Nation's Report Card," NAEP collects and reports information on student performance based on samples of students in grades 4, 8, and 12. At grades 4 and 8, the NAEP Reading Assessment provides results for the nation, states, and 27 large districts that volunteer to participate in the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA). NAEP is critically important in the nation's evaluation of the condition and progress of education. The NAEP Reading Assessment has served as a measure of trends in academic achievement of U.S. elementary and secondary students. Each NAEP Assessment is guided by a framework and associated documents that specify the knowledge and skills to be tested at the 4th, 8th, and 12th grade, the format of the assessment, the definition of NAEP achievement levels, and the contextual

> THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP) is authorized by Congress and funded by the federal government. It is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do. For more than 40 years, NAEP has been charged with collecting and reporting information on student achievement in mathematics, reading, science, U.S. history, writing, and other subjects. Originally, assessments were given to students at ages 9, 13, and 17. With the establishment of the National Assessment Governing Board in 1988, NAEP began assessing students at grades 4, 8, and 12. State-level reporting began with the 1990 reading assessment for grades 4 and 8. The NAEP Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) began in 2003, reporting results for 27 districts as of 2017.
>
> NAEP reports provide descriptive information about student performance in various subjects, including basic and higher order skills, and comparisons of performance by race/ethnicity, gender, type of community, and geographic region. They also show relationships between achievement and certain background variables, such as time spent on homework or educational level of parents.

variables for examining and presenting the results. As part of overseeing NAEP, the National Assessment Governing Board (the Board) oversees development of these frameworks. Each framework update takes into account factors such as state standards and assessments, international standards and assessments, exemplary research, and widely accepted professional standards (e.g., from AERA, APA, ILA, LRA, NCTE).

The comprehensive process for the 2025 NAEP Reading Update project involves a Visioning Panel dedicated to crafting a set of guidelines for areas of focus in the update. These guidelines direct the Development Panel in its work to produce updates to assessment objectives, specifications, achievement level descriptions, and contextual variables. Each panel includes researchers, educators, business leaders, and policymakers.

The National Assessment Governing Board was established in 1988 to oversee the ongoing process of NAEP framework development, test specification, administration, and reporting. The first NAEP Reading Assessment framework was completed in 1990 and remained in place from 1992 to 2007. In 2007, the Board revisited the core of the framework to examine whether an update was needed. The new framework, developed through a deliberative process of panel and public engagement, was completed in 2004. Since the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and continuing with the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, NAEP has assessed reading in grades 4 and 8 every two years and in grade 12 every four years.

Distinct Features of NAEP Assessments

An assessment framework differs from a set of curricular standards. An assessment framework offers a blueprint specifying what to measure and how to measure accomplishment in a domain such as reading or mathematics. It makes clear statements about what should be assessed on NAEP, representing what students should know and be able to do at different stages of their development and about the types of texts and tasks (questions or items) best suited to measuring this knowing and doing. By contrast, standards documents offer more explicit and specific statements about the scope and sequence for instruction—what content is covered and when.

NAEP Reading Assessments are unique in that they are not reported by student, by school, or by district, with the exception of the 27 Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) districts. By law and by design, NAEP does not produce results for individual students or schools. Further, not all students in a district or school take the NAEP assessment, and no single student takes all of the assessment. Rather, a matrix sampling strategy ensures that enough students take each component of the test to provide a robust, composite portrait of reading attainment for the nation, for participating states, and for various demographic groups.

The Current NAEP Reading Framework and Assessment

As the background and history above suggests, NAEP frameworks and assessments are reviewed and updated periodically in accordance with the National Governing Board's Policy on Framework Development. This process ensures that NAEP keeps pace with what students are expected to know and be able to do and continues to play a critical role in the nation's evaluation of the condition and progress of education.

The current NAEP Reading Framework has been in place since the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, and empirical analyses have supported continued reporting of student achievement trends extending back

to 1992 for grades 4, 8, and 12. Compared to the previous framework, the 2009 Reading Framework increased the emphasis on informational texts, redefined reading cognitive processes (behaviors and skills), introduced a new systematic assessment of vocabulary knowledge and added poetry to grade 4.

Because the nature of texts affects comprehension, and different text types must be read and interpreted using different skills, the NAEP Reading Assessment includes two distinct types of texts: literary and informational. Since 2009, the NAEP Reading Assessment also addresses vocabulary in a systematic way, to assess the interpretation of words in the context of a passage. The vocabulary questions function both as a measure of passage comprehension and as a test of knowledge of the meanings of specific words.

The cognitive targets developed for the current (2009) Reading Framework identify the mental processes or kinds of thinking that underlie reading comprehension: locate and recall, integrate and interpret, and critique and evaluate. These targets, along with vocabulary, have shaped the test specifications for the types of tasks students have been asked to carry out. The framework has also established achievement levels at each of the tested grades, specifying what knowledge and skills are needed to attain the NAEP Basic, NAEP Proficient, and NAEP Advanced achievement levels.

NAEP Reading Framework and Assessments Respond to a Changing Education Context

In response to the increasing role of digital technology in students' learning, the NAEP Reading Assessment has been administered as a digital-based assessment at grades 4 and 8 beginning in 2017. The 2017 assessments at grades 4 and 8 were largely comprised of previous paper-based assessment questions, adapted to fit a tablet screen and to address the same content and measurement targets. New types of items aligned to the framework were also developed to take advantage of the digital delivery system; additionally, studies were conducted to ensure that the digital delivery system was comparable to the print based assessment.

The digitally administered reading assessments at grades 4 and 8 were designed to continue reporting trends in student performance dating back to 1992. The first digital-based NAEP Reading assessment at grade 12 was conducted in 2019. Going forward all NAEP Reading Assessments will be digitally based.

Given the recent national focus on ensuring students' college and career readiness, the most recent NAEP Reading Framework update included a new purpose for NAEP 12th grade testing: reporting on how well prepared 12th grade students are for postsecondary training and

> The Board has kept the NAEP Reading framework steady to support content stability and trend reporting during a time of sweeping changes in assessments across states. The 2017 assessment content was developed using the same frameworks used to develop the 2015 paper-based assessments and prior assessments since 2009.

education. This significant new purpose led to a shift for the 12th grade reading framework and some revisions in the reading processes assessed.

Moreover, changes are being considered for the administration of upcoming NAEP Assessments. NAEP Assessments are typically administered to each student in two 30-minute blocks focused on a single subject, such as Reading. Starting with the next schedule of assessments for NAEP 2021-2029, most students selected to participate in NAEP may take two-blocks of one subject, followed by a break, and then one-block of another subject. The schedule of assessments for 2021-2029 also indicates that the next NAEP Writing assessment will occur in 2029 and may reflect a new framework based on a framework review that will be conducted by the Governing Board's Assessment Development Committee.

Changes in the Context of Reading Research, Education and Assessment Relevant to the NAEP Reading Framework Update

As an independent, national monitor of student reading achievement, the NAEP Reading Framework must be both independent of particular curricula as well as inclusive of student learning across a range of curricula used in different states and school districts. The framework must also reflect best research and emerging themes in the field. Since the most recent revision of the NAEP Reading Framework in 2004, there have been shifts in both expectations for what students should know and be able to do and developments in assessment from consortia and states.

Most prominent in new standards is the call for readers to engage with complex text—not simply in terms of typical "text difficulty" but in terms of presentation of ideas that call for close, attentive reading and depth of understanding (Valencia, Wixson & Pearson, 2014). Writing from sources figures prominently in new standards, suggesting a role for considering how reading/writing relationships are handled in the framework (Lee, Hawley, Browder, Flowers & Wakeman, 2015; McDonald, Salomone, Gutierrez & Japtok, 2016; Mo & Troia, 2017; Peterson, 2017). New standards also uniformly emphasize the multimodal nature of reading, including using a variety of text types to conduct research, critique sources, and to communicate understanding through writing (Breakstone, McGrew, Smith, Ortega & Wineburg, 2018; Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, Castek & Henry, 2017; McGrew, Breakstone, Ortega, Smith & Wineburg, 2018).

As standards have been updated, a number of new reading assessments have been developed to assess them. PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers), Smarter Balanced, PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment), PIRLS (Progress in International Reading Literacy Study) and GISA (Global, Integrated Scenario-Based Assessment) (the last was developed under the Department of Education's Reading for Understanding Initiative) are examples of tests that made efforts to instantiate new standards. Unique features of this generation of new assessments include synthesis across multiple texts, technology enhanced items, items with multiple correct answers, and multimodal features.

A great deal of research attention over the past decade has focused on the nature of disciplinary texts and tasks that represent learning and understanding in disciplinary content areas (Goldman et al., 2016), along with the role of academic vocabulary in such literacy and learning (LaRusso, et al, 2016). Simultaneously, technological innovations have brought about changes in the format of texts as well as approaches to reading (Oranje, et al., 2015). Researchers are identifying the ways that online reading capability is both similar to, and distinct from, reading text printing on paper (Coiro, 2011; Coiro, Lankshear, Knobel & Leu, 2014; Singer & Alexander, 2017).

Additionally, over the past two decades, the population of students in U.S. schools has become increasingly diverse (Bryant, Triplett, Watson & Lewis, 2017). Students' reading proficiencies affect their economic and civic participation in life the nation (Business Roundtable, 2017; NCEE, 2013). At the same time, texts inevitably are cultural and political in nature, drawing on frames of reference that may not be universally shared (Lafontaine, Baye, Vieluf & Monseur, 2015; Wexler, 2018). Recent vocabulary studies demonstrate that readers draw on multiple dimensions of vocabulary knowledge, extending understandings of the role of vocabulary in meaning making (e.g. Larusso, et al., 2016). And new understandings of translanguaging have provided insight into how meaning making engages multiple linguistic and cultural processes for bilingual and biliterate readers (Pacheco & Miller, 2016; Pacheco & Smith, 2015).

Finally, affective and non-cognitive dimensions of reading and learning influence student performance on assessment tasks. Student interest and motivation are known to affect reading performance (Guthrie, Klauda & Ho, 2013), along with students' purposes for reading (Kendeou, Van den Broek, Helder & Karlsson, 2014; Larusso, et al., 2016). Recent work on socioemotional factors such as self-efficacy, growth mindsets, metacognition, and self-regulation impacting performance demonstrate that these factors may also be relevant and important to measure (Dweck & Molden, 2005; Farrington, et al., 2012; Hall, 2016; Taylor, Oberle, Durlak & Weissberg, 2017).

Given these advances in the field, in updating the NAEP Reading Framework for 2025 and beyond, it will be important to consider how the NAEP Reading Framework and test specifications present text types, topics, and tasks in light of changed expectations for student reading, new research, technological advances, and differences in students' backgrounds, experiences, motivations, and interests.

Updating the NAEP Reading Framework for the 2025 NAEP Reading Assessment

In preparation for updating the NAEP Reading Framework, the Governing Board commissioned white papers from content experts to inform deliberations and to shape the Governing Board's charge to the panels that will be convened as part of the framework update process.

The Board's Assessment Development Committee led a review of the current NAEP Reading Framework in Spring 2018. They solicited expert commentary to determine next steps for the NAEP Reading Framework. They recruited five experts in reading to review the 2017 NAEP Reading Framework and provide recommendations regarding revisions to reflect current research and knowledge in reading comprehension. These experts presented their recommendations in a panel discussion hosted by the Assessment Development Committee on March 2, 2018. The Board also invited papers from experts who drafted the current NAEP Reading Framework and then worked with item development for the NAEP Reading Assessment, to gather additional insights based on this more in-depth engagement with the assessment. The key documents are included, in full, in the Resource Compilation and have informed the issues put forward in this Issues Review.

> **Expert Reviews of the Current NAEP Reading Framework.** Experts examined the current NAEP Reading Framework and provided reviews in response to the questions, "Does the NAEP Reading Framework need to be revised? If so, why and how?" (Afflerbach, Allen, Alexander, Duke, Hoffman, McKeown, Wealdon).

In addition, in September of 2019 the Governing Board convened state, district, academia, policy, and assessment experts to obtain guidance on how states' integrated approaches to assessing reading and writing might inform NAEP frameworks and assessments. Experts shared trends in district, state, and international approaches to integrated assessment and reporting of reading and writing achievement and the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches. They were asked to offer guidance on what approaches the Governing Board might consider within existing constraints when revising the NAEP Reading and Writing Frameworks to blend and/or coordinate the two assessments. The expert panel deliberations and guidance have informed the issues articulated in this *Issues Review*.

> **Expert Panel Meeting on English Language Arts Assessment.** Experts were asked to offer guidance in response to the questions, "What approach to integrating the reading and writing assessments is most appropriate for NAEP, given NAEP's goals and related program legislation? What key issues should the Governing Board consider with the goal to integrate the NAEP Reading and Writing Frameworks while maintaining separate Reading and Writing assessments and scores?"

The Charge to the Visioning Panel

The Governing Board's newly revised Framework Policy calls for a Visioning Panel, which establishes broad guidelines for the modification of a framework that it has been asked to review. A subset of the members of that panel will participate in a Development Panel, which will implement the changes. In addition to developing a written set of guidelines for revising the NAEP Reading Framework, the Visioning Panel is also asked to provide guidelines for revision of the Specifications document that

> **The National Assessment Governing Board Charge to the Visioning Panel For the 2025 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading Framework**
>
> The Visioning and Development Panels will recommend to the Board necessary changes in the NAEP Reading Framework at grades 4, 8, and 12 that maximize the value of NAEP to the nation; and the Panels are also tasked with considering opportunities to extend the depth of measurement and reporting given the affordances of digital based assessment. The update process shall result in three documents: a recommended framework, assessment and item specifications, and recommendations for contextual variables that relate to student achievement in reading.

describe how the NAEP assessment items are to be developed and the reading-specific contextual questions that are asked of students, teachers, and school administrators.

The Issues

Given this history and the current policy and assessment landscape operating within and across states in the U.S., several issues are critical for the Visioning Panel to address.

Issue 1. How should the texts and reading tasks used in NAEP be updated to reflect contemporary aspirations and expectations for reading?

Issue 2. How should NAEP integrate reading and writing while maintaining NAEP Reading and NAEP Writing assessments and reporting?

Issue 3. How should NAEP account for the interplay between knowledge and reading comprehension?

Issue 4. How should NAEP take better advantage of the affordances of digitally-based assessments?

Issue 5. How should NAEP modify the content and structure of the Reading assessment and the reporting of results in order to more equitably represent students' reading achievement?

Issue 6. What new theoretical and research-based understandings about reading comprehension and its assessment need to be reflected in the framework?

We regard this list as provisional and expect the Visioning Panel to add others as relevant and appropriate.

Issue 1. How should the texts and reading tasks used in NAEP be updated to reflect contemporary aspirations and expectations for reading?

A key issue for the Visioning Panel will be to consider where and to what extent the current NAEP reading framework assesses what is expected of students in current instructional standards and in the broader contemporary context. Students are increasingly expected to read and integrate insights and information across multiple texts presented in varied modalities, both in print and online, in order to construct explanations and arguments and build and communicate knowledge. The proliferation of information sources requires students to exercise critical judgment about source relevance, trustworthiness and perspective. Similarly, in reading literature, students are expected to analyze and appreciate how authors use literary devices and elements of craft to achieve literary goals. National and state standards and assessments, international frameworks and assessments, and college and career standards press for student engagement with complex texts and tasks across academic disciplines. How should the texts, tasks, assessment objectives (including cognitive targets), and specifications in NAEP reading assessments be updated to keep pace with these developments?

Issue 2. How should NAEP integrate reading and writing while maintaining NAEP Reading and NAEP Writing assessments and reporting?

Since the last update of the NAEP Reading Framework, new standards in English Language Arts and new college and career readiness standards have moved toward the integration of reading and writing, both in curriculum and assessment. Writing with sources figures prominently in new standards, suggesting a role for considering how reading/writing relationships are handled in the NAEP Reading Framework. Currently separate Reading and Writing assessments (and score reporting) are legislatively mandated for NAEP; by contrast, states have adopted standards that support increasingly integrated approaches to the teaching and assessment of reading and writing. Further, states are required to participate in the NAEP Reading Assessment at grades 4 and 8 through the Every Student Succeeds Act, while state participation in the NAEP Writing Assessment is voluntary. How should this state-level context inform NAEP frameworks and assessments? This also relates to the definition of reading in the NAEP Reading Framework. For example, experts across English language arts were recently convened by the Governing Board, and they suggested that writing to sources may be an appropriate aspect of a reading construct that includes application of what has been read. When the NAEP Writing Framework is next updated, these experts noted that writing with sources could be addressed in the context of a writing construct that also includes writing without sources. The Visioning Panel is asked to consider whether this approach to integrating the NAEP Reading and Writing assessments is appropriate, while addressing NAEP's legislative mandates and constraints.

Issue 3. How should NAEP account for the interplay between knowledge and reading comprehension?

Understanding and accounting for the role of knowledge in reading comprehension has long plagued the field. In the past, knowledge was understood to fuel comprehension. More recently, knowledge is recognized as an outcome of comprehension as well. Currently, NAEP does not address the knowledge-comprehension relationship directly. Instead it "accounts for" knowledge by sampling passages across a wide range of topics in both literary and informational genres. As several experts have noted, the current approach is inadequate to ensure equitable assessment of the variations in knowledge, experience, and abilities that students bring to the task. Importantly, the background knowledge demands of reading include not only familiarity with the content or topics of texts, but also students' prior experience with particular types of texts, genres, and reading tasks. The Visioning Panel is asked to consider new approaches to level the background knowledge playing field or at the very least, to account for differential knowledge among students taking the assessment. Such approaches might include providing necessary background knowledge prior to a reading passage (for example through a video or text preface), building a knowledge onramp across multiple texts, providing feedback after each item to ensure that all students approach subsequent tasks with comparable knowledge resources, and/or measuring knowledge inputs and outcomes as part of the assessment.

Issue 4. How should NAEP take better advantage of the affordances of digitally-based assessments?

Several expert panelists noted that additional skills are required in order to read successfully in digital environments. Moreover, digitally based assessments offer new possibilities for the range of texts and the types of tasks used in reading assessment. Scenario-based assessments present purposeful tasks for student engagement in reading across multiple texts. New developments also include building avatar-enriched social contexts for reading as well as novel and more dynamic response formats. The Visioning Panel will be provided with a presentation by NCES of digitally-based assessments that have already been developed for the most recent NAEP reading administrations These examples illustrate the affordances of computer administration not only to present digital texts and graphic informational displays, but also to provide a rich context for purposeful reading and meaning making, and to engage and maintain students' motivation. The Visioning Panel is asked to consider how to update the framework to reflect the NAEP assessment as it is currently operationalized as well as how to exploit new opportunities offered by digital innovation when revising the assessment objectives, specifications document, and context questions.

Issue 5. How should NAEP modify the content and structure of the Reading assessment and the reporting of results in order to more equitably represent students' reading achievement?

Equity is a concern with any assessment, and arguably greater in the case of NAEP, because it is administered broadly across many different populations. Visioning Panel members are asked to bring their considerable backgrounds, experiences, and wisdom to the challenge of developing guidelines for

how the framework, specifications document, and surveys for students, teachers, and schools can be crafted to make the NAEP reading assessment as fair as possible to all populations. Specifically, panelists are asked to consider how NAEP can better acknowledge students' primary languages, cultural resources, and learning needs consistent with NAEP's definition of reading. Additionally, how can NAEP better measure and report students' opportunities to learn, as well as their motivation and engagement with assessment texts and tasks they encounter on the NAEP assessment? Efforts such as these may lead to a more equitable assessment for all children. Among the ideas offered in the resource compilation are those associated with cultural validity in assessment (Solano-Flores, 2011) and the assessment of English language learners (Pitoniak, Young, Martiniello, King, Buteux & Ginsburgh, 2009).

Issue 6. What new theoretical and research-based understandings about reading comprehension and its assessment need to be reflected in the framework?

The past decade has brought considerable change to our understanding of the nature, teaching, and assessment of reading comprehension. These changes include new understandings of the roles that key factors play in shaping and explaining reading comprehension; these include text, purpose and task, knowledge, and vocabulary. New forms of texts, multimodality, and multi-text comprehension create new targets for instruction and therefore assessment. Learning in academic disciplines now understood to require reading and learning with discipline-specific texts of varied genres to build valued types of knowledge specific to these fields. Thus, students read across and integrate information from multiple sources as they comprehend, critique, and construct arguments and explanations about the ideas and issues they encounter while reading. They engage in reasoning processes that reflect discipline-specific ways of thinking and building knowledge. Finally, new developments in the understanding of the nature of vocabulary provide an opportunity for NAEP to reshape the ways it assesses vocabulary in the Reading assessment. As several expert reviewers have noted, the current framework is not informed by these recent developments. In the process of grappling with these new developments in theory and research, the Visioning Panel will be required to address two fundamental but vexing questions: What is reading? What is text? The Visioning Panel is asked to develop guidelines that reflect our current understanding of reading comprehension and in the process address these fundamental questions.

Conclusion

While no change in testing purpose is proposed for this update, the update needs to anticipate the nation's future needs (e.g., for the workplace and economic competitiveness, for civic participation, and for supporting individual aspirations) and the associated educational aspirations that are inscribed in desired levels of achievement we set for our students and our nation. This includes anticipating future content shifts by noting how states are adopting and adapting their standards.

Most of the questions in this Issues Review have no easy answers, but the collective knowledge and experience of panel members provide the nation in general, and the educational system in particular, an opportunity to guide the NAEP Framework revision process in ways that will allow NAEP to address the needs of future generations to become skillful, thoughtful and critical readers. Over the years, NAEP

assessment frameworks have provided a valuable resource to state and district educators in developing their content standards. We should expect no less of this update for the 2025 NAEP Reading Assessment.

Panelists face the challenging task of making choices that will shape the rich array of texts, tasks, processes, and abilities that define reading comprehension for the nation. The choices will be influenced by the experience, aspirations, and knowledge of what reading education should be. The panel has an opportunity to make important recommendations about what is reported in the Nations Report Card and to recommend that the Governing Board authorize special studies for questions that can only be resolved with additional empirical evidence. The best way to achieve these goals is to share ideas and aspirations with one another openly, to challenge and discuss these thoughts with one another, and—in the end—to collaboratively weave a tapestry of consensus for recommendations to the Governing Board for the next NAEP Reading Framework.

References

Afflerbach, P. (2018). Recommendations for revision of the Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Alexander, F. (2018). The Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: Preparing for another decade of reading assessment. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Allen, D. (2018). The Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: Recommendations. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Breakstone, J., McGrew, S., Smith, M., Ortega, T., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Why we need a new approach to teaching digital literacy. *Phi Delta Kappan 99*(6), 27-32.

Bryant, A. C., Triplett, N. P., Watson, M. J., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). The browning of American public schools: Evidence of increasing racial diversity and the implications for policy, practice, and student outcomes. *The Urban Review*, 49(2), 263-278.

Business Roundtable. (2017). *Work in progress: How CEOs are helping close America's skills gaps*. Retrieved May 2018, from https://www.businessroundtable.org/skills

Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting reading comprehension on the internet: Contributions of offline reading skills, online reading skills, and prior knowledge. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4), 352–392.

Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. J. (2014). *Handbook of research on new literacies*. Routledge.

Duke, N.K. (2018). Recommendations for revision of the Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Dweck, C., & Molden, D. (2005). Self-theories: Their impact on competence motivation and acquisition. In A. Elliot, and C. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 122-140). New York: Guilford Press.

Farrington, C. A., Roderick, M., Allensworth, E., Nagaoka, J., Keyes, T. S., Johnson, D. W., & Beechum, N. O. (2012). *Teaching adolescents to become learners: The role of noncognitive factors in shaping school performance*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Goldman, S., Britt, M. A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., Lee, C.D., Shanahan, C., & Project READI. (2016). Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: A conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 219-246. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1168741.

Guthrie, J. T., Klauda, S. L., & Ho, A. N. (2013). Modeling the relationships among reading instruction, motivation, engagement, and achievement for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *48*(1), 9-26

Hall, L. A. (2016). The role of identity in reading comprehension development. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *32*(1), 56-80.

Heid, M. K. (2018). Updating the NAEP Mathematics Framework. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Mathematics*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Hoffman, J. (2018). The Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: Challenges and opportunities moving forward. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Kendeou, P., Van den Broek, P., Helder, A., & Karlsson, J. (2014). A cognitive view of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *29*(1), 10-16.

Lafontaine, D., Baye, A., Vieluf, S., & Monseur, C. (2015). Equity in opportunity-to-learn and achievement in reading: A secondary analysis of PISA 2009 data. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 47, 1-11.

LaRusso, M., Kim, H. Y., Selman, R., Uccelli, P., Dawson, T., Jones, S., et al. (2016). Contributions of academic language, perspective taking, and complex reasoning to deep reading comprehension. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 9(2), 201-222.

LaRusso, M., Kim, H. Y., Selman, R., Uccelli, P., Dawson, T., Jones, S., et al. (2016). Contributions of academic language, perspective taking, and complex reasoning to deep reading comprehension. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 9(2), 201-222.

Lee, A., Hawley, K., Browder, D. M., Flowers, C., & Wakeman, S. (2016). Teaching writing in response to text to students with developmental disabilities who participate in alternate assessments. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 51(3), 238-251.

Leu, D. J., Kinzer, C. K., Coiro, J., Castek, J., & Henry, L. A. (2017). New literacies: A dual-level theory of the changing nature of literacy, instruction, and assessment. *Journal of Education*, 197(2), 1-18.

McDonald, S., Salomone, W., Gutierrez, S., & Japtok, M. (2016). *The Writer's Response: A Reading-based Approach to Writing*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Mcgrew, S., Breakstone, J., Ortega, T., Smith, M., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Can students evaluate online sources? Learning from assessments of Civic Online Reasoning. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 46(2), 165-193.

McKeown, M. (2018). Considerations for revisiting the NAEP Reading Framework. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Mo, Y. & Troia, G. A. (2017). Similarities and differences in constructs represented by U.S. States' middle school writing tests and the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress writing assessment. *Assessing Writing*, 33, 48-67.

National Center for Education and the Economy [NCEE]. (2013). *What does it really mean to be college and workforce ready? The English literacy required of first year community college students*. Washington, DC: NCEE. Retrieved June 20, 2018 from http://ncee.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/NCEE _EnglishReport_May2013.pdf.

Oranje, A., Moran, R., Campbell, J., Dresher, A., Persky, H., Dion, G., and Scalise, K. (2015). *NAEP's Transition to Digitally Based Assessment*. As cited in Behuniak (2015).

Pacheco, M. B., & Miller, M. E. (2016). Making meaning through translanguaging in the literacy classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, *69*(5), 533-537.

Pacheco, M. B., & Smith, B. E. (2015). Across languages, modes, and identities: Bilingual adolescents' multimodal codemeshing in the literacy classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *38*(3), 292-312.

Peterson, D. S. (2017). Engaging elementary students in higher order talk and writing about text. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1468798417690918

Pitoniak, M. J., Young, J. W., Martiniello, M., King, T. C., Buteux, A., & Ginsburgh, M. (2009). Guidelines for the assessment of English-language learners. Educational Testing Service (ETS). Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/s/about/pdf/ell_guidelines.pdf.

Singer, L. M., & Alexander, P. A. (2017). Reading across mediums: Effects of reading digital and print texts on comprehension and calibration. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 85(1), 155-172.

Solano-Flores, G. (2011). Assessing the cultural validity of assessment practices: An introduction. In M. del Rosario Basterra, E. Trumbull, and G. Solano-Flores (Eds.), *Cultural validity in assessment* (pp. 19-37). New York: Routledge.

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A. & Weissberg, R. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development*, *88*(4), 1156–1171.

Valencia, S. W., Wixson, K. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2014). Putting text complexity in context: Refocusing on comprehension of complex text. *Elementary School Journal*, 115(2), 270-289.

Wealdon, W. (2018). The Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress Feedback. In *2018 Expert Panel Discussion: NAEP Assessment of Reading*. Washington, D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

Wexler, N. (April 13, 2018). Why American students haven't gotten better at reading in 20 years. *The Atlantic.* Downloaded from https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/04/-american-students-reading/557915/

Strategic Vision: Review of Priorities

As the first Strategic Vision of the National Assessment Governing Board draws to a close, this Committee session affords an opportunity to reflect on what the Assessment Development Committee accomplished, what remains incomplete, and what should be prioritized over the next nine months. This also marks the first chance to consider what activities and efforts to undertake as part of the next Strategic Vision.

Summary of Notable Accomplishments to Date

- SV5: Revised Board policy on Framework Development (approved March 2018)
- SV5: Conducted framework reviews for NAEP Reading and Mathematics Frameworks
- SV5: Implemented a NAEP Mathematics Framework Update (to be presented for full Board action at the upcoming November 2019 Board meeting)
- SV5: Streamlined reviews of NAEP assessment items, paving the way for a portfolio of work devoted to NAEP frameworks

Remaining Priorities for the Current Strategic Vision

- SV3: Develop a set of principles to guide questionnaire revisions in ways that reflect the Board's expectations for how NAEP data should be used (in conjunction with the Reporting and Dissemination Committee)
- SV5: Implement a NAEP Reading Framework Update (to be presented in August 2020)
- SV5: Revise the Board Item Development and Review Policy with additional linkages to framework reviews
- SV8: Determine how a review other countries' assessment programs should inform frameworks, framework processes, contextual data, and reporting

The subsequent pages present the Committee's accomplishments and discussions from the inception of the Strategic Vision until now. In reviewing these, consider (1) what worked most effectively; (2) what led the Committee and the Board closest to its mission and goals; and (3) what should continue under the next Strategic Vision.

ADC ACTIVITIES IN THE STRATEGIC VISION

The ADC develops recommendations for what NAEP should assess and exercises final authority over all NAEP items. Several activities in the Governing Board Strategic Vision call for ADC's leadership. These projects involve informing educators, updating policies, and exploring new approaches to framework updating, as well as projects to review and update frameworks as needed. A working draft of ADC's project plans is attached, along with a summary of common elements for each framework project.

Ongoing Committee Discussions

Recent ADC discussions have raised several issues for ongoing consideration as the Committee leads Strategic Vision activities and prepares content recommendations for Board deliberation and action (August 2019 addition highlighted):

- The optimal role of NAEP for each content area.
- How Board and Committee priorities should be reflected in upcoming framework updates.
- How to clarify the context of each framework and how the Board has chosen to navigate this context.
- Extent to which current frameworks are flexible enough to adapt as needed.
- The level of specificity in assessment results that is most useful to policymakers, researchers, and educators.
- How future NAEP items will be a resource for the field.
- Expected gains and losses to the field for each NAEP framework decision.
- How to ensure that Governing Board framework policies and procedures are followed.
- How to establish and maintain partnerships that highlight actionable aspects of results, e.g., teacher access to released NAEP items and contextual information.
- How to develop viable options for new configurations of NAEP assessment content in ways that balance expertise, outreach, research, and trends in curricular standards.
- How to incorporate how other countries think about changing what they assess.
- Whether to more deeply assess an existing content area or add new content areas.
- Whether streamlining of NAEP frameworks is an appropriate goal.
- How to be intentional about content overlap between different assessments, while fulfilling statutory requirements, e.g., biennial reading and mathematics assessment.

WORKING DRAFT* PLAN: ALL ADC STRATEGIC VISION (SV) ACTIVITIES
UPDATES SINCE AUGUST 2019 ARE HIGHLIGHTED

ACTIVITY	START	FINISH	STATUS
Identify NAEP Resources & Information for Educators (*SV #3 Expanding NAEP Resources* and *SV #6 Contextual Variables*)	May 2017	Nov 2021	ADC discussed NAEP Questions Tool and contextual variables in 2017. Suggestions for new or refined NAEP resources can be shared with R&D for Board outreach. In March 2019, the ADC discussed development of a set of principles to guide questionnaire revisions in ways that make them actionable, reflecting the Board's expectations for how NAEP data should be used. To be determined: when/how to develop ADC recommendations. In August 2019, the Committee discussed the Questions Tool and the NAEP Data Explorer as resources for educators.
Update Framework Development Policy	Jun 2017	Mar 2018	ADC began revising policy in Summer 2017. Board discussion continued in November 2017. Board adopted the revised policy in March 2018.
Review & Update **Mathematics** Framework for 2025 Assessment	Aug 2017	Mar 2025[1]	State math standards review began in August 2017. Results were shared in May 2018 ADC Framework Review, which also engaged external expert commentary. ADC prepared a framework recommendation for Board action, and it was unanimously adopted in August 2018. The framework contractor[2] for the Math Framework Update project was secured in Summer 2018. The Board reviewed a draft framework when public comment was collected in Spring 2019 and continued discussion in August 2019. Board action on the framework is slated for November 2019, allowing NCES to conduct development leading to a 2025 administration of the updated assessment.

---

* All timelines are estimated. This draft will be updated based on Board policy decisions. All activities address *Strategic Vision Priority #5 Updating Frameworks*, unless otherwise noted. Factors contributing to the sequencing of framework projects include how recently the last framework update was conducted, staff capacity, timing of the next administration on the NAEP Assessment Schedule, and urgency of the update.

[1] Timeline includes administering the assessment.

[2] The mathematics framework project will be implemented by the same contractor as the reading framework project, on staggered schedules so that most of the mathematics project is completed by the time the reading project begins.

WORKING DRAFT* PLAN: ALL ADC STRATEGIC VISION (SV) ACTIVITIES
UPDATES SINCE AUGUST 2019 ARE <mark>*HIGHLIGHTED*</mark>

ACTIVITY	START	FINISH	STATUS
Review & Update **Reading** Framework for 2025 Assessment	Oct 2017	Mar 2025[1]	ADC Framework Review was held in March 2018 to inform development of recommendations for a Fall 2019 framework update project launch. In August 2018, the ADC prepared a draft framework recommendation, which the Board adopted in March 2019. The Board will review a draft framework when public comment is being collected in Summer 2020. Board action on the framework is slated for November 2020, allowing NCES to conduct development leading to a 2025 administration of the updated assessment.
Explore New Approaches to Framework Update Processes (also *SV #8 International Assessments*)	Nov 2017	Aug 2023	The Board's Technical Services contractor is developing several resources to assist in exploring innovations in how NAEP assessment updates are implemented. Framework Update Projects will review other countries' assessment programs to inform frameworks, framework processes, contextual data, and reporting.
Update Item Development and Review Policy	Aug 2018	Aug 2020	The ADC began discussing goals for the policy revision in August 2018. In 2019, an expert panel was convened to gather insights regarding best practices in assessment development.
Review & Update **Civics** and **U.S. History** Frameworks	Mar 2018	TBD	Discussion of outreach began in March 2018, with suggestions to develop options for the ADC to consider. In August 2018, ADC review of the current NAEP item pools indicated that framework revisions did not need to be fast-tracked. Framework reviews will begin in 2019, which will include external expert commentary.
Review & Update **Science** and **Technology & Engineering Literacy (TEL)** Frameworks	TBD	TBD	Discussion of outreach began in March 2018, Tentative next steps: learn more about standards in NGSS non-adopter states and learn whether stakeholders view that some or all of the TEL subarea on Technology & Society addresses student achievement goals in Civics or U.S. History.
Review & Update **Writing** Framework	TBD	TBD	Initial discussion regarding the Writing Framework is slated for 2021.

WORKING DRAFT* PLAN: ALL ADC STRATEGIC VISION (SV) ACTIVITIES
UPDATES SINCE AUGUST 2019 ARE HIGHLIGHTED

ACTIVITY	START	FINISH	STATUS
Develop Content Descriptions for the Long-Term Trend (LTT) Mathematics and Reading Assessments (*SV #7 Long-Term Trend*)	TBD	TBD	March 2018 Executive Committee deliberations on LTT called for ADC to develop content descriptions of the assessments to support LTT item development, as well as updates to the Governing Board LTT policy and improved explanations of LTT assessment goals. ADC requested these descriptions also illuminate knowledge and skills of lower performing students, if possible. NCES has already developed a list of measurement objectives for LTT Mathematics, and similar work may be possible for Reading. Board staff is using these inputs to begin development of the LTT content descriptions.

Common Elements of Each Framework Update Project

Based on the revised Framework Development Policy, several milestones address all NAEP assessment framework projects. Framework update projects engage stakeholders and content experts to identify needed revisions, via subject-specific factors including:

- Evolution of discipline and implications for NAEP frameworks
- Relevance to students' postsecondary endeavors
- Student achievement trends in terms of contextual factors
- Digital-based assessment issues
- International content and measurement trends

MILESTONES: ALL FRAMEWORK PROJECTS

ADC Discussion with External Experts in the Subject Area(s)
ADC Recommendation for Updating Assessment
Board Action on Charge
Framework Contractor Selection
Trend Scan & Resource Compilation
Panel Meetings (3 to 6)
Full Board Review & Public Comment
Framework Draft Finalized
ADC Final Review of Framework
Board Action
Assessment Administered

As a first step, the ADC conducts a framework review, where content experts are invited to a Committee session to provide reflections on the state of the discipline and the extent to which the relevant NAEP framework should be updated. Studies and additional outreach is pursued, as needed, to inform the ADC's recommendation about the type of framework update that is required. Next, the ADC brings its recommendation to the full Board for approval. In the case of an anticipated framework update, the recommendation includes a charge to stakeholders who will serve on the panels convened to draft recommendations for the ADC's consideration.

After Board discussion of the ADC recommendation, the Board will take action on the charge. Concurrently, Board staff will identify a contractor to execute the framework update process.

The framework contractor will launch the project by identifying individuals to serve on the framework panels and by compiling and developing resources to support the meetings of these stakeholders. A subset of these resources will include the Governing Board's charge

to the framework panels as well as documents used to inform the Board's development of the charge. The first meeting of stakeholders will be for the *Visioning Panel* to discuss the major issues to be addressed in the framework. A subset of the Visioning Panel will continue on as the *Development Panel* to develop an updated framework. This panel will also develop the recommended updates to the Test and Item Specifications, as well as the Contextual Variables.

The ADC monitors the framework contractor's work via regular project updates. A draft of the panels' recommended framework will be shared for full Board review and public comment, as well as review by the Board's Committee on Standards, Design and Methodology. This feedback will allow the Development Panel to address concerns and finalize the draft framework, specifications, and contextual variables for the ADC's final review and Board action. The adopted framework, specifications, and contextual variables are given to NCES to begin assessment development, piloting, and finally administration of the operational assessment based on the new framework.