

# **National Assessment Governing Board**

## **Reporting and Dissemination Committee**

**Report of March 1, 2013**

### **JOINT MEETING WITH COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (COSDAM)**

**Attendees:** Committee Members – R&D Chair Andrés Alonso, COSDAM Chair Lou Fabrizio, COSDAM Vice Chair Fielding Rolston, Rebecca Gagnon, Andrew Ho, Terry Holliday, Terry Mazany, Tonya Miles, Father Joseph O’Keefe, James Popham, and Leticia Van de Putte; Governing Board Staff – Executive Director Cornelia Orr, Michelle Blair, Larry Feinberg, Ray Fields, and Stephaan Harris; NCES – Commissioner Jack Buckley, Associate Commissioner Peggy Carr, Janis Brown, Angela Glymph, Arnold Goldstein, Andrew Kolstad, and Grady Wilburn; AIR – Fran Stancavage; CCSSO – Kirtsen Taylor; CRP – Shaunece Bailey and Edward Wofford; Education Week – Christina Samuels; ETS – Amy Drescher, Steve Lazer, and Andreas Oranje; HagerSharp – David Hoff and Debra Silimeo; HumRRO – Laress Wise and Steve Sellman; MetaMetrics – Heather Koons; National Alliance of State Science and Mathematics Coalitions – Kenneth Heydrick; Optimal Solutions Group – Robin Marion; Pearson – Brad Thayer; Reingold – Amy Buckley, Erin Fenn, and Valerie Marrapodi; Westat – Chris Averett, Marcie Hickman, Keith Rust, and Dianne Walsh; Widmeyer – Jason Smith.

### **Implementation of Policy on Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners**

The two committees received a briefing from Grady Wilburn, of NCES, on difficulties in implementation of the Board policy on NAEP Testing and Reporting on Students with Disabilities (SD) and English Language Learners (ELL). The policy was adopted in March 2010, based on recommendations by two expert panels. It is aimed at increasing participation of SD and ELL students in NAEP and reducing the variations in exclusion rates among participating states and urban districts.

Mr. Wilburn said almost all aspects of the policy are being implemented fully in the 2013 National Assessment. These include new rules, codified in decision trees, for deciding how SD and ELL students will be tested. Under the policy only two limited groups of students may be excluded from NAEP by school personnel: (1) SD students with the most significant cognitive disabilities—expected to be about 1 percent who take alternate state assessments with alternate standards, and (2) ELL students who have been in United States schools for less than one year.

Mr. Wilburn focused on the SD aspects of the policy. Committee members said the aspects concerning ELLs should be thoroughly discussed at the next Board meeting in May 2013.

Mr. Wilburn said that for practical reasons NCES had decided that schools could also continue to exclude students with an individualized education program (IEP) or 504 plan requiring accommodations on state tests that NAEP does not allow because the accommodations are deemed to conflict with the skills and knowledge being tested by NAEP. In the past these non-allowable accommodations have mainly been read-aloud for the NAEP reading assessment and calculator use on all sections of NAEP math.

Calculators are not an issue in 2013 because NCES has decided to offer special calculator-active booklets to all SD students using this accommodation on state tests including those who would not be allowed calculators in the booklets they would normally receive through the random assignment of NAEP questions. Under the math assessment framework adopted by the Board, two-thirds of NAEP mathematics booklets do not permit a calculator to be used because math computation is regarded as a construct being tested.

Under the NAEP reading assessment framework, the assessment is a measure of reading comprehension in English; students are asked to read written text and answer questions about what they have read. The framework states that because the assessment is a test of reading comprehension, not listening, NAEP does not allow passages to be read aloud to students, an accommodation permitted on many state reading exams and on NAEP exams except for reading. Since by law student participation in NAEP is voluntary, students may refuse to take the assessment or their parents may refuse to let them participate. The Board policy states that "students refusing to take the assessment because a particular accommodation is not allowed should not be classified as exclusions, but placed in the category of refusals under NAEP data analysis procedures."

For several decades NAEP scores have, in effect, been imputed both to students who refuse to take NAEP and to absentees, a much larger group. This has been done by a non-response adjustment procedure under which the scores of students with similar characteristics, including age, gender, race/ethnicity and SD or ELL status, have been re-weighted or made to count for more to represent the students who were absent or refused to take NAEP in the same jurisdiction. However, no scores are imputed for SD and ELL students who are excluded. This tends to raise state and district averages since students outside these categories have higher average scores.

Mr. Wilburn said that if students were converted from exclusions to refusals this would disrupt comparisons with past state and district results where exclusions have been substantial. A worst-case scenario of these score changes, based on 2011 data, was presented to the Board in August 2012 by Keith Rust, of Westat, the sampling and data collection contractor for NAEP. Data are being collected in 2013 on which students are excluded by their schools because NAEP does not allow their state-permitted accommodations.

Mr. Wilburn said increasing refusals would artificially increase inclusion rates. It would also lower student participation rates, which are defined as the percentage of students tested after excluded students are deducted from the population that might be assessed. In some cases, the participation rate might fall below 85 percent and raise concerns about the validity of test results. Mr. Wilburn said there could be alternative ways for reporting exclusions in each jurisdiction—a total figure and also the percentage excluded because NAEP does not allow an accommodation granted on state exams.

Chairman Andrés Alonso said he agreed that NAEP should be working for greater inclusion but he said an increase in refusals would disrupt state and district trends and make it more difficult to show improvement.

Member Leticia van de Putte said there have been major increases in the number students with 504 plans providing for test accommodations because parents ask for them since they do not want their children to be classified as disabled.

Member Terry Holliday said he tried to end the read-aloud accommodation on Kentucky's reading tests but lost in the state legislature because of opposition from teachers who want to keep local decision-making and parents who fight for accommodations.

NCES Commissioner Jack Buckley said there were three major issues to consider:

- What population should NAEP assess?
- What should be done with students who are missing? Should this be fixed through re-weighting or imputation, such as full-population estimates?
- How should exclusion and participation rates be reported?

Ms. van de Putte urged the Board to reconsider the policy of testing reading and writing only in English. She said there should be a study of testing these subjects in Spanish too because of the growth of the Spanish-speaking population.

The committees asked for additional information on the number and percentage of students not tested by NAEP because of absence, refusal, and exclusion for different reasons. The data should be disaggregated by race/ethnicity, poverty, and public and private schools. Members also expressed interest in reporting options for 2013 and subsequent years.

A full discussion of the policy on English language learners should be held at a joint session of the two committees in May 2013.

## **REGULAR MEETING OF REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION COMMITTEE**

**Attendees:** Committee Members – Chair Andrés Alonso, Rebecca Gagnon, Terry Mazany, and Father Joseph O’Keefe; Governing Board Staff – Larry Feinberg, Ray Fields, and Stephaan Harris; NCES – Commissioner Jack Buckley, Associate Commissioner Peggy Carr, Gina Broxterman, Ebony Walton Chester, Angela Glymph, Arnold Goldstein, and Grady Wilburn; AIR – Cadelle Hemphill; CCSSO – Kirtsen Taylor; CRP – Shaunece Bailey and Edward Wofford; ETS – Amy Dresher; HagerSharp – Debra Silimeo; HumRRO – Steve Sellman; Optimal Solutions Group – Robin Marion; Reingold – Amy Buckley, Erin Fenn, and Valerie Marrapodi; Westat – Chris Averett and Dianne Walsh.

### **1. Parent Outreach Activities**

Ray Fields, of the NAGB staff, updated the committee on plans for a parent summit to be held in Washington, DC. He said the event would probably be scheduled for late October or early

November 2013, following release of the NAEP 2013 Mathematics and Reading Report Cards. The summit would be about the time of the 25th anniversary of the Governing Board, but a conference marking the anniversary will be held meeting in late February 2014 just before the scheduled Board meeting. Committee member Terry Mazany, who sits on the Board’s 25th Anniversary Planning Committee, said a late fall date for the summit was designed to use the coverage and awareness of NAEP generated by the Report Cards to boost promotion of the event.

Stephaan Harris, of NAGB staff, briefly summarized the draft parental outreach plan made up of strategies that various Committee members deemed as priority activities the Board should pursue over the next six to 12 months. He added that while there were a few strategies that appeared to receive a consensus of high ranking, such as a parent leader discussion guide, members mostly seemed to have differing preferences. Amy Buckley, of Reingold Communications, said that some of the strategies were part of the overall communications plan the Board had approved several years ago and were re-packaged for emphasis on outreach to parent leaders.

Mr. Mazany said that all the strategies listed under the category of “audience”—which includes stakeholder database review, development of a list of key parent leaders and organizations, and development of a relationship map that links Board members and alumni to contacts in parent leadership—should be the underpinning of any efforts going forward. He added that since the goal of the Board’s Ad Hoc Committee on Parent Engagement was improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps, this objective should be the “north star” that guides presentations and other efforts to involve parent leaders and other parents. Member Rebecca Gagnon said the relevancy of NAEP data and materials to particular parent audiences should guide outreach efforts.

Chairman Alonso said the definition of “parent leaders” should be expanded, as policymakers such as school board members and superintendents can be considered as such if they work directly with parents on educational issues. He also said that outreach efforts approved by the committee should have a basis for being able to measure success. He added that success does not just come from measuring the size of an audience but determining if members of that audience are using NAEP data. Chairman Alonso said the outreach effort would require further discussion.

## **2. Review of NAEP Releases: Reading Vocabulary and Mega-States Reports**

Ms. Buckley provided an overview of the details and media coverage of two recent NAEP releases organized by Board staff and Reingold: NAEP Reading Vocabulary Report Card (a webinar release on December 6, 2012) and the NAEP Mega-States Report (an in-person event with live webcast held in Sacramento, CA on February 21, 2013).

Ms. Buckley said the Reading Vocabulary release had 281 webinar attendees and a 200 percent increase in Facebook referrals to the NAGB web site. The report resulted in 59 original media stories with a total of 231 placements in 44 states and the District of Columbia. The Mega-States release had 157 in-person and online attendees and resulted in nearly 20 original stories. The release included panelists or statements from state education leaders in all five states in the report.

Expanding on the response to the Mega-States report, Ms. Gagnon said Board member Leticia Van de Putte had described attending meetings of three different groups in Texas where the

report was prominently discussed. Ms. Gagnon asked if background variables were prominent in the report since they are useful components. Arnold Goldstein, of NCES, answered in the affirmative, adding there was detailed information about English language learners, for example.

### **3. Projected Schedule for Future NAEP Reports**

Angela Glymph, of the NCES staff, presented a timeline of when NAEP reports are expected to be ready for release in 2013 and early 2014. The list included Economics 2012 (April 2013), NAEP-TIMMS 2011 Linking Study (June 2013), Long-Term Trend 2012 (June 2013), and Reading and Mathematics 2013 national/state and TUDA at grades 4 and 8 (fall 2013). Ms. Glymph said the NAEP Mathematics Curriculum Study would be released March 12, 2013 in Washington, DC with a seminar and live webcast that NCES is arranging. She said NCES has used ideas offered by Committee members at previous meetings on how to present this type of analysis effectively and make it relevant. The event will include video clips of parents and students responding to the findings and asking questions of the panel.

Ms. Glymph gave estimated dates when initial drafts of some of the reports would be submitted for Board review: Economics (second draft in the week of March 4), Long-Term Trend (March or April), and NAEP TIMMS (late April). Larry Feinberg, of the NAGB staff, noted that NCES has indicated that the grade 12 national and state results for NAEP reading and mathematics would be released in a combined report in the spring of 2014.

Chairman Alonso expressed concern that there wasn't much time between when the Board received drafts of reports for review and the release date. Ms. Gagnon suggested that the estimated date when reports are ready for Board review should be added to the NCES schedule of future reports so the committee can see a better overall picture of report production and can make sure the Governing Board can impact their content.

### **4. Configuration of Fall Releases: NAEP 2013 Reading and Mathematics Report Cards**

Under the schedule presented by NCES, two major reports will be ready for release in October 2013—the NAEP 2013 Mathematics and Reading Report Cards for the Nation and the States. In December two other reports will be ready—the 2013 Mathematics and Reading Report Cards for the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA). Larry Feinberg, of the NAGB staff, said how the releases are configured could have a substantial impact on how data are reported by the press and discussed by the public. The main alternatives are:

- Release the math and reading reports together (the usual practice since 2003), which emphasizes the comparisons between the states and districts participating.
- Release the report for each subject separately (the usual practice in the 1990s), which focuses attention on the subjects and patterns and trends in how they are taught and learned.

Mr. Feinberg noted that the Council of the Great City Schools, which initiated the NAEP assessments of urban districts, felt strongly that TUDA results should be released separately from those for the states. That puts the focus on comparisons between the TUDA districts (rather than

with their states), which is the purpose of the TUDA program. Mr. Feinberg said a combined release of the two subjects in TUDA is probably most practical and effective, and should not be changed. However, whether to combine or separate the two releases at the national and state level involved a number of competing considerations. If the subjects are released separately, the interval between them probably should be about two or three weeks.

Mr. Feinberg said separating the releases probably would generate more press attention for NAEP. Arnold Goldstein, of NCES, said two releases would be more costly in both funds and staff time. Several Committee members said that no matter how the reports are released, much of the press and public probably will be most interested in how their own state compares to others.

The Committee requested Board staff to prepare a list of pros and cons for separate versus consolidated releases for discussion and a decision at the Committee meeting in May 2013. Staff was also asked to present examples of press releases for past NAEP reports released in the different ways to see the difference in focus and emphasis.

#### **5. Release Plan for NAEP 2012 Economics Report Card**

Mr. Harris reviewed the proposed release plan for NAEP Economics 2012, which would be in the form of an Internet webinar in April. A nationally recognized expert in economics as well as an economics educator would be invited take part in the panel of commenters. Embargoed data would be made available before the release to Congressional staff, members of the media, and leaders of the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association.

**ACTION: After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend Governing Board approval of the release plan for NAEP Economics 2012, appended as Attachment A to this report. The full Board approved the plan on Saturday morning, March 2, 2013.**

#### **6. Future Agenda Topics**

Chairman Alonso said the Committee would hold a teleconference in late March for additional discussion of topics at this meeting as well as topics for future agendas and how future Committee meetings should be organized. The teleconference will include consideration of how the Committee should be most effectively engaged between its regular quarterly meetings.

I certify the accuracy of these minutes.



---

Andrés Alonso, Chair

March 22, 2013

---

Date

**NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD  
RELEASE PLAN FOR  
NAEP ECONOMICS 2012 REPORT**

***The Nation's Report Card in Economics 2012***

The Nation's Report Card in Economics 2012 will be released to the general public during April 2013. Following a review and approval of the report's results, the release will be arranged as an online webinar. The release event will include a data presentation by the Commissioner of Education Statistics, with moderation and comments by at least one member of the National Assessment Governing Board. Full accompanying data will be posted on the Internet at the scheduled time of release.

The 2012 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Report Card in Economics measures students' skills in economic literacy. Students responded to questions designed to measure their understanding of how economics and markets work and how people function in them; the benefits and costs of economic interaction and the interdependence among people and nations; and the fundamental constraints imposed by limited resources, the resulting choices people have to make, and the tradeoffs they face.

The NAEP Economics 2012 Report Card presents results from a representative sample of about 10,900 12th graders at the national level—the assessment is not administered to state-level samples. Results will be reported in terms of scale scores and percentages of students at or above achievement levels. Results are also presented by such demographic categories as gender, race/ethnicity, and free/reduced price lunch eligibility. Because the NAEP Economics Framework was used to develop both the 2012 and 2006 assessments, the 2012 results can be compared with initial assessment results from 2006—the previous assessment year for NAEP Economics.

**DATE AND LOCATION**

The release event for the media and the public will occur in April 2013. The exact date and location will be determined by the Chair of the Reporting and Dissemination Committee, in accordance with Governing Board policy, following acceptance of the final report.

**EVENT FORMAT**

- Introductions and opening statement by a National Assessment Governing Board member
- Data presentation by the Commissioner of Education Statistics
- Comments by at least one Governing Board member

- Comments by a representative of the economics community
- Questions from members of the press and then the general audience
- Program will last approximately 75 minutes
- Event will be broadcast live over the Internet, and viewers will be able to submit questions electronically for panelists. An archived version of the webinar, with closed captioning, will be posted on the Governing Board website at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org).

### **EMBARGOED ACTIVITIES BEFORE RELEASE**

In the days preceding the release, the Governing Board and NCES will offer access to embargoed data via a special website to approved U.S. Congressional staff in Washington, DC; representatives of governors and state education agencies; and appropriate media. A conference call for journalists who signed embargo agreements will be held to give a brief overview of findings and data and to answer questions.

### **REPORT RELEASE**

The Commissioner of Education Statistics will publicly release the report at the NAEP website—<http://nationsreportcard.gov>—at the scheduled time of the release event. An online copy of the report, along with data tools, questions, and various other resources, will be available at the time of release on the NAEP site. An interactive version of the release with panelists’ statements, a Governing Board press release, publications and related materials, including an abridged version of the 2012 NAEP Economics Framework, will be posted on the Board’s web site at [www.nagb.org](http://www.nagb.org). The site will also feature links to social networking sites, key graphics, and audio and/or video material related to the event.

### **ACTIVITIES AFTER THE RELEASE**

The Governing Board’s communications contractor, Reingold, will work with Board staff to coordinate a communications effort, which could include a webinar, seminar, or social media initiative, to extend the life of the NAEP Economics results. These initiatives should be of great value and relevance to stakeholders with an interest in student achievement as well as economics education and assessment.