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In 1990, then-President George Bush and a group of governors adopted the National Education Goals, which were ratified by Congress in 1994. These goals reflected a broad national consensus about what Americans should know and be able to do in the coming millennium. Goal 6 was the only one focused on adults: “By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.”

In order to reach this goal, the President and governors set the following objective: “The proportion of college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems will increase substantially.” For several years after the National Goals were developed, discussions about this objective focused on how to define and measure critical thinking, communication, and problem solving. But no nationwide attempt was made to establish a baseline against which the desired improvements might be measured.

The question of what educated people should know and be able to do was raised in other contexts as well during the nineties. In 1990, for instance, then–Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin brought together corporate, labor, and education leaders to form the Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). Their work led to the report, What Work Requires of Schools. The National Skills Standards Board continues to identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities students need to perform well in a growing range of professions in the global economy. Meanwhile, many states interested in improving higher-education performance have been grappling with how to assess student learning: six now have some form of testing program to examine student learning in their public institutions.

Participants in the National Forum on College-Level Learning will determine whether this is the time to begin producing systematic, comparable data on collegiate learning that would permit state-by-state comparisons.
Last year *Measuring Up 2000: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education* focused national attention once again on higher education’s performance. *Measuring Up* evaluated each state on the effectiveness of its higher education system, with separate grades for preparation, participation, affordability, completion, and benefits. But because we have no comparable state-by-state information on learning, the report card was unable to assign a grade for the most important result, learning. Consequently, all states received an “incomplete” in this category. This does not mean that states are paying no attention to this question. Many have campus-based assessment programs in place, and some have instituted statewide testing, at least for their public institutions. But giving grades on learning in subsequent editions of *Measuring Up*, which is scheduled to be published biennially, will require comparable information across states about what college students know and can do.

Participants in the National Forum on College-Level Learning will determine whether this is the time to begin producing systematic, comparable data on collegiate learning that would permit state-by-state comparisons. If they think that the time for this has arrived, their task will be to recommend the next steps toward that goal. To do this, they will need to settle on the questions that should be answered about college-level learning, which will drive decisions on

- **Whose** learning should be measured,
- **What** learning should be measured, and
- **How** the results should be used to shape public policy.

Those decisions in turn will shape the answer to the question,

- **What strategies** should be pursued to measure college-level learning?

**What is the question?**

In interviews conducted in preparation for the National Forum on College-Level Learning, higher-education and policy leaders identified two questions as most important for state policy makers to answer:

1. What do the state’s residents know and what can they do that contributes to the social good? That is, what kind of educational capital do they represent?
2. How well do the state’s public and private colleges collectively contribute to that educational capital? That is, what do those whom they educate know and what can they do?

Although questions about how individual students and institutions perform are also important, those interviewed agreed that individual student or institutional performance should not drive an effort to inform state-level policy.

The two questions above determine who should be tested or surveyed, and on what kinds of learning. Depending on the answers to the “who” and “what” questions, different state policies could be affected.

Whose learning should be measured?

Since the college-educated are a highly mobile population, a state’s residents may have been educated anywhere. Some states are net importers of college graduates, others net exporters. If the goal is to know about the skills and knowledge that college-educated people in a state have, we should measure learning in a representative sample of the entire state population. If, instead, the interest is in the performance of a state’s public and private postsecondary education system in developing its students’ intellectual capacities, college students and alumni must be the groups assessed or surveyed.

What learning should be measured?

States have an interest in determining the kinds of social capital that their residents contribute to the public good. The value added to that social capital by education is referred to here as “educational capital.” Determining a state’s educational capital requires information about residents’ preparedness for life, work, and citizenship. This suggests that in assessing the educational capital represented by the college-educated in particular, workplace-related skills and preparation for further education should be assessed, as well as the more fundamental critical-thinking, problem-solving, and communication abilities (as identified in Goal 6) that will enable high-level contributions to the social good over a lifetime.
Currently, a number of states want to know how well their colleges and universities collectively are increasing these workforce-related and fundamental kinds of learning, and these states have various strategies for collecting this information. They may also want to know how well their colleges and universities are performing with respect to more academic subject matters. Their efforts in all of these areas could be enhanced by information about comparative performance across states.

What policies might be affected?

One issue that has been highlighted by *Measuring Up* is the degree to which state policies in any one arena cannot be effective in isolation from those in others. The attempt to grade states on learning reinforced this point. The question about the kind of educational capital a state’s college-educated residents represent has ramifications beyond higher education policy. For example, decisions of baccalaureate recipients to stay in the state in which they were educated or to move depend to a great extent on how well the state’s economic conditions compare to those of its peers.

Obviously, many factors affect a state’s capacity to improve its economic conditions: history, geography, and culture, among them. But some states have capitalized on their assets and faced their challenges more effectively than others, using various policy strategies. In order to increase a state’s educational capital, for instance, policy makers might not only build a strong system of higher education but also lure the college-educated from other places with good jobs and high wages, or attack the problem through adult literacy programs. Thus, a state’s response to information about its educational capital might take the form of higher education policy, economic development policy, or adult literacy policy—or all three.

The question of how well each state’s colleges and universities, taken collectively, are doing their job has implications not just for higher education policy but also for policy across the educational spectrum. How a state’s college-student performance compares to that of other states will to some extent depend on how effectively it has educated its children in primary and secondary schools.

Over the past several decades, states have learned a lot about what schoolchildren know and can do—for instance, through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) examination system. Since 1969, NAEP has been assessing the academic performance of nationally representative samples of schoolchildren in reading, writing,
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science, and mathematics (periodically it also measures learning in other areas such as civics, history, and geography). Presently, 44 states participate in the state-level NAEP, which gives a representative view at the state level of schoolchildren’s performance.

If a state’s knowledge about student performance were extended through the college years, it would provide policy makers with a diagnostic tool. It would do what state-level NAEP information has done for schools: alert a state to a potential problem concerning the collective performance of its colleges and universities. By itself, though, it could not point to the solution to that problem. For that next step, states would have to rely on their own state- and institution-specific assessment procedures, now widespread in higher education.

What strategies might be used to measure learning?

Direct Strategies

There are four types of direct strategies that might be considered as alternative or complementary approaches to measuring college-level learning across states. Two exist now and two would have to be developed. Their value should be judged based on whether they answer the right questions about the right people for the right policy purposes.

Some are focused on academic skills and knowledge, some on general intellectual skills, and some on workforce and civic preparation. Some would examine college-educated adults in the state and others would focus on college students. Some could lead to alterations in higher-education policies, while others might suggest adult literacy or economic development interventions.

They are presented in descending order of implementation ease and ascending order of ultimate desirability.

- The first strategy would be to summarize what we know about college-level learning through tests of academic skills and knowledge that are already administered to college graduates. These tests would need only further analysis to yield state-level data.

- The second would be to use an instrument designed to measure general literacy—the National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL)—that will be administered both to the general population and to a national sample of college students in 2002. In this case further analysis would be necessary, and a wider
administration of the survey would be required to obtain information for more than a small group of states.

- The third and fourth strategies would be either to combine elements from existing tests or create a counterpart to NAEP at the college level designed to capture information on the kinds of learning that prepare college-educated citizens for life and work. Either test could be administered to samples of college students or of the college-educated population, or both, in each state.

**Strategy 1: Using what we now know about college-level learning**

*Who and what is measured, and what information does this strategy yield?*

Many top-performing college graduates try to demonstrate the aptitudes and knowledge necessary to pursue further education by taking professional and graduate admissions tests. These measure both general intellectual skills and the academic knowledge requisite for graduate education in the arts and sciences, law, medicine, and business. For instance, the general Graduate Record Exam (GRE) and some sections of exams such as the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) and Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT) gauge core intellectual abilities (verbal, quantitative, and analytic). Graduate tests in specific subjects, meanwhile, measure academic skills and knowledge.

Many other graduates are tested as a condition of licensure or certification. These exams certify mastery of the skills and knowledge essential to graduates entering such professions as engineering, architecture, nursing, and teaching.

Indicators could be developed for each state on the percentage of recent college graduates (in relevant fields, if they are identifiable) with a passing score or scoring above the 50th percentile on each test. Results would then be compared to determine how well any given state was doing relative to the highest-performing states in preparing its residents for further education or work.

*What limitations and advantages does this strategy have?*

Because only the most high-achieving students generally take graduate admissions tests, these exams do not represent the full range of college graduates’ skills and knowledge. Further complicating their use are the variable (and sometimes small) numbers of people taking them from state to state and the fact that the exams do not represent the disciplines
equally. Licensing tests cover only a few domains of knowledge and are unrepresentative of the total college-educated population, although in situations where they are required they are representative of those entering the particular field. This approach will therefore always provide an unrepresentative look at college-level learning.

But admissions and licensing tests are credible with the academic communities and practitioners in the professions that require them, and a large and highly motivated group of test-takers take them. The general availability and low cost of obtaining these data make this a strategy that could be quickly implemented. For these reasons, information about performance on these exams is a reasonable, although not sufficient, first look at the learning of college graduates.

**How could the strategy be improved?**

Over time a composite measure of this sort could be improved and extended by further analysis of some of the test results. Now, results are analyzed by the state in which the test-taker resides. But for those exams that measure academic skills and knowledge, it would be useful to have the results by the state in which the test-takers received their college degrees, in order to assess system effectiveness. The inclusion of teacher-education test results would also increase the extent to which the sample is representative. Currently, the raw and percentile results on teacher-education tests are not available by state. The release of that information would improve the usefulness of this measure.

**Strategy 2: The National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL)**

*Who and what is measured, and what information does this strategy yield?*

The National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS) was first administered in 1992. Its new version, the National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL), will be administered to a nationally representative sample of 13,000 adults in 2002. The NALS was the basis of the international literacy survey recently done by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Europe. Interviewers who administer these surveys ask a sample of people in the general population to perform a set of literacy tasks, such as reading prose and charts and doing math, in a variety of real-life situations.

Performance levels for the NAAL have been set and described. By revealing the number of college-educated citizens who perform at NAAL levels 4 or 5 (the highest), the
2002 survey should tell us the proportion of the college-educated population that can perform the most challenging tasks in prose and document literacy.

The NAAL is designed to provide a national, rather than state-by-state, look at the literacy of adult Americans. But the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) will also obtain representative state samples for six states that have asked to be oversampled. As a result, state-level information on literacy by educational level should soon be available at least in those states, assuming that enough people are surveyed to distinguish between respondents with and without a college education.

At the time of the 2002 NAAL administration, The Pew Charitable Trusts will be sponsoring a simultaneous administration of the NAAL to 1,000 two-year and 1,000 four-year college students in the country. This will provide nationally representative information about the performance of currently enrolled college students but will not provide state-by-state information.

**What limitations and advantages does this strategy have?**

Except in the six oversampled states, the 2002 NAAL will reflect national rather than state-level performance. As a household survey administered face to face, the NAAL avoids to some degree the problem of test-taker motivation that plagues Strategies 3 and 4. But it is also a labor-intensive and hence expensive option. Obtaining state-level samples can cost as much as a million dollars per state.

The NAAL is scheduled to be re-administered in 2012. Re-administering the NAAL before then would require federal cooperation and investment, as well as a change in administrative strategy in order to capture additional state-level samples. On the other hand, the decision-making structure governing NAAL is not as complicated as the one for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which measures the learning of schoolchildren.

The NAAL is as close as we now come to a measure of educational capital, since it assesses key aspects of life and workforce readiness in the general population. By analyzing the scores of college-educated respondents and comparing them to those of people without a college education, we should better understand the value added by higher education, as well as how well college-educated people perform nationwide. It does not cover the core domains of knowledge identified in Goal 6 (critical thinking, communication, and problem solving). But if it were administered in sufficient numbers within each state, it could provide a solid indicator of the state’s educational capital.
Since the NAAL will be administered in 2002, next year it would be possible to obtain information about the functional skills of college-educated adults, both nationwide and in the oversampled states. Although further analysis and reporting would require some additional resources, this could be done at relatively low marginal cost. The additional analysis would help to determine whether the information that NAAL provides will be useful enough to push for its wider administration.

How could the strategy be improved and used in the future?

More states could be encouraged to participate in the oversample. Those that are now committed to participate could make sure that the oversample is large enough for analysis by educational level. If questions about where college-educated respondents went to college were added to the background questionnaire, the analysis could cover both the capacities of the college-educated residents of the state and the performance of higher education in the states that provided the education. The National Center for Education Statistics should therefore be encouraged to add that question.

If the 2002 NAAL yields information that proves useful, one of the following could happen in the near future:

- a request could be made of the federal government to re-administer it two or four years later, with state-level representative samples;
- a NAAL-like instrument could be administered at the state level (see Strategy 3, below);
- the survey of college students could be administered more widely to yield state-level representative samples; or
- some NAAL tasks could be incorporated into Strategy 4 (see below).

Strategy 3: A combination instrument

Who and what would be measured, and what information would this strategy yield?

The development of a more broad-based instrument measuring general intellectual skills is another strategy to consider. If this test were administered to college students in the state, it would indicate the collective effectiveness of higher education in the state in developing core
intellectual abilities. It could also be administered to a representative sample of the states’
college-educated population, to capture the educational capital they represent.

One way to implement this strategy would be to administer several existing
examinations to samples of students and then construct an indicator from their combined
scores. Another would be to combine items from existing examinations into one composite
instrument to test preparedness for life, work, and citizenship. For many years the major
testing companies have administered tests of general intellectual skills on a large number of
campuses. The Academic Profile, developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), and
the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP), developed by the American
College Testing Service (ACT), measure proficiency in reading, writing, math, and critical
thinking in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Elements of either or both
might be used as part of a new combination or composite measure.

More components might be drawn from other, differently constructed, instruments.
The NAAL is one possibility. Other likely candidates include ETS’ Tasks in Critical
Thinking, which assess students’ capacities to reason about problems in the humanities, the
sciences, and the social sciences. The Tasks are performance based and test a kind of
intellectual ability likely to be prized beyond the academy (once described as “intellectual
broken-field running”). Another candidate is ACT’s Work Keys, which has defined
workforce needs across thousands of jobs and quantified the minimum skill levels required
for each in applied mathematics, applied technology, listening, locating information,
observation, reading for information, teamwork, and writing.

**What limitations and advantages would this strategy have?**

Elements from these exams would be chosen for their capacity to measure the general
intellectual skills described in Goal 6. However, all except Work Keys and NAAL are geared
toward academic content, which might make them more suited to college students than to
the general college-educated population. If a sample of college students were tested and
results compared across states, this would yield information about the performance of higher
education but would shed less light on overall educational capital.

Administration of this instrument to college students would require cooperation, both
from students and institutions. It is difficult to motivate students to take—much less do
their best on—a test that means little to them, a problem the NAEP exam at the 12th-grade
level has encountered. Moreover, if the test were administered on college campuses,
institutional cooperation would be necessary, and it is not clear that the academic world
would embrace such a measure.
Were we to assemble a measure by giving one test to some students and another to others, and constructing an indicator from their combined scores, administration to a sample of 1,000 students per state would cost about $50,000 per state, or $2.5 million for all 50 states. If the instrument consisted of a collection of items chosen from tests of established reliability, its creation and field-testing would add a million dollars to that figure (although the testing companies might be willing to absorb some of the developmental costs). A household survey would be about five times as expensive as a college-based sample.

This strategy goes further than Strategy 1 in testing those domains of knowledge that are crucial elements of a state’s educational capital. Although neither quick nor cheap, it would be less expensive and time-consuming than Strategy 4 or a household survey of the general population such as Strategy 2.

**Strategy 4: A new instrument**

*Who and what would be measured, and what information would this strategy yield?*

The final strategy would be to develop an entirely new test on the right domains of knowledge for the right population. The obvious model for this option is the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Although a collegiate NAEP has been under discussion for years, and the creation of its framework was begun, no one has yet provided the impetus for its further development or deployment.

This may be the time to revive the idea of a collegiate NAEP given to a representative sample of adults and/or college students in the states. Another option would be to develop a NAEP-like instrument outside the current NAEP framework designed to focus more on high-end workforce and civic readiness than on academic skills and knowledge.

*What limitations and advantages would this strategy have?*

The NAEP has name recognition and a public credibility that results from the extensive research and widely inclusive consensus-building process that accompanied its development and improvement. A test that is part of the NAEP system would presumably share in that credibility. The NAEP is also the chosen instrument of the National Goals panel to track success in reaching the nation’s goals for schoolchildren. The skills it measures are roughly consistent with the National Goal for college-educated adults, if writing is taken to address communication (which it only does partially), and reading, science and math comprise the core skills needed for problem solving and critical thinking. Finally, administration of a
collegiate test as part of an existing national system would keep costs relatively low: not counting development costs, approximately $725,000 per state.

But the processes by which current NAEP examinations are developed and administered are complicated, time-consuming, and involve several organizations. Coordinating agreements between the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)—which oversees the exams—and the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB)—which selects the subjects, approves the frameworks, and sets the guidelines for reporting—can add months to decision-making. And the NAEP is fundamentally a test of academic skills rather than applied, contextualized learning. As such, a collegiate NAEP would be more pertinent to what is taught in college than to the educational capital represented by those who are college educated.

Developing and implementing a NAEP-like instrument to test high-end workforce and civic readiness outside the framework of the current NAEP reverses these advantages and disadvantages. While it might not benefit from the same level of name recognition and public credibility currently enjoyed by the NAEP system, it would also not require a complicated decision-making process and could be designed to measure non-academic cognitive abilities directly.

The development of a totally new test is the most expensive option in terms of time and money, but it would create the right tool for the job. Like all options in which the test-taker has nothing to gain or lose, however, it shares the problem of low test-taker motivation.

Indirect Measures

All the strategies mentioned so far are direct measures of learning. Two indirect measures, however, could be co-administered with the NAAL or a newly developed test and might enrich the results substantially. They are the Collegiate Results Survey (CRS) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Strategy 1: The Collegiate Results Survey (CRS)

Who and what would be measured, and what information would this strategy yield?

The CRS is an alumni survey, developed by the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, that was originally administered to some 34,000 alumni from 80 widely
varying institutions. Now owned by Peterson’s, the survey asks graduates five to eight years past their undergraduate experience how confident they are in or committed they are to doing the things that a college education is supposed to prepare them for. It focuses on their commitment to certain personal values, their confidence in certain core abilities (to communicate and organize, to function quantitatively, and to find information), and their willingness to continue learning.

What limitations and advantages would this strategy have?

A measure that attempts to capture how useful graduates have found their college learning after they have tested it in their lives has powerful appeal, particularly since the self-evaluation of their ability to perform is based on “real-life” scenarios. With Peterson’s cooperation, the CRS might be co-administered with a direct measure that targets the general population rather than college students. And like all surveys that are short, clear, about recent experiences, not intrusive, and do not seem to have “right” answers, the CRS avoids the problem of respondent motivation.

This survey can be seen as a self-satisfaction measure, with no necessary connection to actual intellectual skills. But it could shed light at the very least on the intellectual self-confidence of the college-educated. And if graduates’ reports of how they use their learning correlate with the direct measures of it, the CRS might eventually be used as a relatively inexpensive proxy measure of learning.

Strategy 2: The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

Who and what would be measured, and what information would this strategy yield?

Any direct measure of learning that focuses on college students might be co-administered with the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE has been completed by about 135,000 randomly selected first-year and senior students from almost 500 four-year colleges and universities. It is a recently developed survey, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, that asks college students about experiences they have had during college that research and common sense suggest are correlated with learning. These include the degree to which students have been challenged academically, have spent time studying, have met with professors outside of class, and have participated in educationally purposeful activities. It then creates benchmarks for colleges on their level of academic challenge, the degree to which their students engage in active and collaborative learning, the extent of student-faculty
interaction, the richness of their educational experiences, and the supportiveness of the campus environment. A community-college version, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), is being piloted.

**What limitations and advantages would this strategy have?**

The NSSE is an indirect measure of learning based on research about what experiences lead to learning, but it has not yet been directly verified that students who report better collegiate learning experiences actually learn more on average than those who do not. Two significant advantages of using the NSSE, though, is that it measures student engagement—an end in itself—and provides information that campuses can use to improve programs. And if its co-administration with a direct measure demonstrates that good campus practice does indeed correlate with learning, eventually this survey, like the CRS, could be administered alone as an indirect—and inexpensive (at $7 per person per survey)—measure of learning.

**General cautions and recommendations**

Some of the cautions that accompany the various strategies have already been discussed. Each strategy will meet with reasonable criticisms:

- Selection bias will be raised as an objection to using the results of tests now given for graduate admissions and licensing.
- The NAAL will be faulted for the disconnect between what is taught in college and what is measured.
- Test-taker and institutional motivation are real problems for Strategies 3 and 4.

In addition, an organizational home would have to be created to champion and administer any of the options mentioned. Strategies to measure college-level learning—particularly those that most directly assess the kinds of educational capital that college-educated residents contribute to a state—will take a long time to develop. Moreover, some of the strategies under consideration are expensive, and the issue is politically volatile. All of this suggests that the sponsoring agent should have some political independence and should command sufficient resources to do the job.
Some things are certain to happen in the short term. College graduates will continue to take admissions and licensure tests, and the 2002 National Assessment of Adult Literacy will be administered. These opportunities to learn something about college-level learning should be seized.

The longer term offers opportunities to embrace strategies that will offer a more comprehensive picture of the general intellectual skills and readiness that college-educated residents contribute to their states. Comparative information on college-level learning, benchmarked against the best-performing states, could tell a state just how rich in educational resources it is. Armed with this information, the state could develop policies to help its residents reach the level of learning that it knows is possible.

Questions for National Forum participants

The participants in the National Forum on College-Level Learning will be asked for their counsel on the following key questions of whether to move forward and, if so, how:

- Which question(s) should we be trying to answer: how well are the states’ systems of higher education working, or what are the skills and abilities of the states’ college-educated residents? Selecting the appropriate question(s) has implications for whose learning—and what kinds of learning—are to be measured.
- How close can we come to getting the desired information with existing measures?
- What new instruments should be developed?
- What support, both financial and political, is necessary—and from whom?
- What principles should guide the choice of who will champion and administer the effort?
- What should be the responsibilities of the possible parties to this effort: the sponsor, the states, and the federal government?
Abbreviations

Assessment Instruments

CAAP: Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress. This assessment, produced by ACT, measures proficiency in reading, writing, math, and critical thinking.
CCSSE: Community College Survey of Student Engagement. This community-college version of the NSSE (see below) is now being piloted.
CRS: Collegiate Results Survey. This alumni survey, developed by the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, is an indirect measure of learning that attempts to capture how useful graduates have found their college learning after they have tested it in their lives.
GRE: Graduate Record Exam, used for graduate admissions.
LSAT: Law School Admissions Test.
MCAT: Medical College Admissions Test.
NAAL: National Assessment of Adult Literacy. This survey instrument, first implemented as NALS (see below) in 1992, is scheduled to be administered in 2002. It measures general literacy skills in real-life situations (such as reading prose and charts, and doing math).
NAEP: National Assessment of Educational Progress. Since 1969, NAEP has been assessing the academic performance of nationally representative samples of schoolchildren in reading, writing, science, and mathematics (periodically it also measures learning in other areas such as civics, history, and geography).
NALS: National Adult Literacy Survey. This survey instrument, administered in 1992, measured general literacy skills in real-life situations. It will be re-administered as the NAAL (see above) in 2002.
NSSE: National Survey of Student Engagement. This indirect measure of learning asks college students about the experiences they have had during college that research and common sense suggest are correlated with learning.

Commissions and Organizations

ACT: American College Testing Service.
ETS: Educational Testing Service.
NAGB: National Assessment Governing Board.
NCES: National Center for Education Statistics.
OECD: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
SCANS: The Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. In the early 1990s, the work of this group of corporate, labor and education leaders led to the report, What Work Requires of Schools.