

**EIMAC Assessment Task Force**  
**October 6, 2008**  
**Washington Marriott**  
**1221 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, NW**  
**Washington, DC 20037**

- 7:30 a.m. Continental Breakfast
- 8:30 **Welcome and Introductions**  
Teri Siskind, Chair
- 9:00 **Pre-release Review of State Inclusion Report (Closed)**  
Chris Averett, (NAEP State Service Center) Facilitator
- **Overview of the Study and Methodology**  
Andy Kolstad, NCES
  - **Overview and Distribution of Technical Report**  
Chris Averett, NCES
  - **Individual State Review of Data**
  - **Small Group Discussion of Results**
  - **Large Group Discussion and Feedback to NCES**
  - **Next Steps**  
Peggy Carr, NCES
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch
- NCES and NAGB Updates**  
Mary Crovo, Interim Executive Director, NAGB  
Peggy Carr, Associate Commissioner, NCES
- Discussion: EIMAC Recommendations to the Commissioner on NAEP's  
Trial State 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Assessments in Reading and Mathematics and on the  
NAEP Science Interactive Computer Tasks**  
Teri Siskind, Peggy Carr, and Mary Crovo
- 1:30 **Discussion: SD Reporting in NAEP**  
Arnold Goldstein, NCES
- 2:00 Break
- 2:30 **Working Session: Race/Ethnicity Data Collection and Reporting: State  
Assessments and NAEP**  
William Ward, NCES
- 4:00 **Overview of the Re-engineered NAEP Data Explorer**  
Steve Szyszkiewicz, ETS
- 5:00 Adjourn

## **An Overview of the Meeting**

Participants will be seated around tables in groups of 6-7 to encourage discussion with one another and to develop group comments and recommendations for NCES. There are no breaks scheduled on the morning agenda, but participants may take advantage of drinks and snacks that will be available around 10:30.

**9:00**

### **Pre-release Review of State Inclusion Report (Closed)**

In 2005, the U.S Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report recommending that the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) collaborate with states to find ways to increase inclusion rates of students with disabilities on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NCES worked with states to increase NAEP participation in several ways, including improved training for staff who administer NAEP and a simpler process for determining whether students could participate in NAEP assessments. NCES also conducted research to develop a way to measure state inclusion rates taking into account the differing demographics and policies in each state.

*Measuring Improvement in NAEP Inclusion Rates* is the result of that research. It provides an estimate of what proportion of disabled students could *reasonably be expected to be included* in NAEP in each state given:

- the prevalence of students with different types of disabilities and severities
- the accommodations that states permit in their own testing programs compared with those allowed for NAEP.

Using a sophisticated methodology that takes into account the differing conditions in each state, the study shows how a state's inclusiveness compares to other states, and to itself over time.

The study reports results for 50 states and the District of Columbia and uses data from the 2005 and 2007 NAEP fourth- and eighth-grade mathematics and reading assessments.

### **Introduction to the Session**

Sami Kitmitto from AIR discussed the methodology for the study on three separate occasions over the last two years. Many of your suggestions have been incorporated into the research. For example, you recommended dropping re-centering state results relative the states with the highest inclusion rates, a component of an earlier model. That component of the study was dropped.

(Note: The reports are still in draft form awaiting final approval from NCES. You will be asked to sign a standard NAEP confidentiality form acknowledging that you are receiving embargoed data that may not be shared or discussed outside of your agency and that all of those within your agency being briefed before the release will sign the form. The reports will be collected at the end of the session.)

Andy Kolstad, the Assessment Division's Senior Technical Advisor, will review the current model and provide information for interpreting the results and answer questions about the study. At the end of his discussion, the technical report will be distributed and the relevant state data tables will be highlighted.

### **Review of Data**

The review of the report will occur in three steps. In step one, individual states will be provided time to review their own state data. In step two, states will discuss their results at their tables with their colleagues from other states identifying issues and concerns. In step three, the small groups will report out to the total group focusing on strategies for using the information to improve inclusion in future NAEP assessments and on suggestions for how NCES can assist states before, during and after the release.

(Note: Taslima Rahman, Andy, Sami, and Jonathan Beard will be available to answer questions about the study and the reports.)

### **Next Steps**

Peggy Carr, Associate Commissioner, NCES, will describe the next steps for the report including a WebEx to be held with the State Coordinators two days prior to the release on the Web. As always, testing directors are invited to sit in on that session.

### **12:00**

#### **NCES and NAGB Updates**

Peggy Carr and Mary Crovo, Interim Executive Director, NAGB, will provide their usual update on current issues coming out of NCES and NAGB of particular relevance to states.

#### **EIMAC Recommendations to the Commissioner on NAEP's Trial State 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Assessments in Reading and Mathematics and on the NAEP Science Interactive Computer Tasks**

Immediately after their updates, Peggy and Mary joined by Teri Siskind will take questions and comments regarding the EIMAC recommendations to Commissioner Mark Schneider (September 2, 2008).

### **1:30**

#### **SD Reporting in NAEP**

Arnold Goldstein, NCES, will provide a short history of reporting in NAEP on students with disabilities and will lead a discussion of the implications for states and possible changes in NAEP reporting as new frameworks are implemented.

### **2:00**

#### **Race/Ethnicity Data Collection and Reporting: State Assessments and NAEP**

Race/ethnicity is a major reporting variable for NAEP. Using the format of small group discussion followed by reports out to the total group, William Ward from NCES will lead a discussion on how changes in state data collection and reporting will impact NAEP trend reporting. These changes will significantly impact NAEP data collection and reporting activities, and require active planning and collaboration among all key NAEP players including

Coordinators to ensure a successful transition to the new data collection and reporting requirements. NAEP needs to get ahead of the challenges prior to the 2010-2011 school year and determine where states are regarding the transition to multiracial reporting, what data they are collecting, whether and how data are being updated, how the data are reported from schools to districts to states, etc.

Any information you can share about your state, however preliminary, will be greatly appreciated. To help you gather information about your state's transition and implementation process, here are some broad, general categories to think about:

**How race/ethnicity information is currently collected in the state**

- Are students currently given the option to select more than one race?
- Does the state currently report results for students who identify with more than one race?

**Mechanism and timeframe for implementing the guidance**

- Will the new procedures for collecting and reporting race and ethnicity data be in place prior to 2010-2011?
- Will students already enrolled in schools be allowed/required to re-identify according to the new guidance? What is the timeframe for completing the reclassification?
- When is race/ethnicity information currently collected? How will this information be collected in the future? Will schools be required to obtain information at the beginning of every school year, at the time of enrollment in a school, etc.?

**Race and ethnicity categories used to collect and report data**

- Does the state currently collect race and ethnicity using categories that are not included in the two-part question (e.g., Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Puerto Rican, Mexican, etc.)? Will states continue to collect information on these sub-categories for state-level purposes?
- Will the state continue to use the same major race and ethnicity groups for the purpose of AYP reporting?

**4:00**

**Overview of the Re-engineered NAEP Data Explorer (NDE)**

Steve Szyszkiewicz, ETS, will demonstrate some of the powerful, new analysis and reporting functionalities of a re-engineered NDE. The new tool, built using .net, will provide states with a model of a flexible, user-friendly interface for data analysis.