OPA

OFFICE OF PEOPLE ANALYTICS

Update on Committee Recommendations

Mary Pommerich

Defense Testing & Assessment Center

Briefing presented to the DACMPT

January 22, 2025

Accession Policy Briefing

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. Because of so many new members to the DACMPT, the Committee found the overview particularly helpful and would like to be regularly updated on Accession Policy's activities, including the challenges it faces in accomplishing its mission.

AP Response

1. Concur. Accession Policy (AP) provides a routine briefing to the DACMPT members, updating them on the current challenges and efforts to overcome challenges and continue process improvements, modernization, and innovation.

New Member Briefing

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT appreciated the detailed information and wishes to be updated on changes to the testing programs as well as the results of the research efforts being conducted.

DTAC Response

1. DTAC will work with AP to continue to keep the DACMPT apprised of relevant changes and research efforts.

Major ASVAB R&D Efforts: Milestones and Project Schedules

DAC Recommendations (12/22, 08/23)

1. [12/22] The DACMPT appreciated the scope of research on the ASVAB and other cognitive and non-cognitive measures and the efforts to improve the Career Exploration Program and delivery of tests. The Committee supported the ongoing review of current high school course content, curriculum, standards, and instructional methods to ensure that the next-generation ASVAB is aligned to high school content, particularly with respect to courses likely to be taken by individuals inclined to join the Services. The Committee requests a curated list of technical reports (and access to them as appropriate) and updates regarding progress on this research.

2. [08/23] The DACMPT appreciated the detailed information Dr. Pommerich provided and wishes to be updated on the results of the research efforts being conducted and the plans for new research. The DACMPT also recommends that DTAC monitor developments in GAI to determine if it will be a useful tool at some point in the future. DTAC should also stay up to date on innovations in virtual proctoring and continue to research other countries' positions to determine what input to give to policymakers who will make decisions regarding the use of virtual proctoring.

DTAC Response

1. DTAC believes the best resources for a "curated list of technical reports" for the DACMPT are the ASVAB, AFQT, and TAPAS validity frameworks. DTAC can work with AP (as allowed per FACA guidelines) to provide the most current documentation, and updates to the validity frameworks will be provided as they are completed (anticipated to be on a biennial basis).

2. Agree. DTAC will continue to keep the DACMPT apprised of research efforts. DTAC has recently begun a new effort to review AI, generative AI, and technology capabilities for testing and will plan to brief the DACMPT on the effort at a future meeting. DTAC continues to monitor trends in virtual proctoring and investigate new virtual proctoring technologies as they arise.

Major ASVAB R&D Efforts: Milestones and Project Schedules (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

3. [06/24] The DACMPT remains impressed by both the number of projects OPA/DTAC manages and the quality of the research produced. The Committee voiced a potential concern about the high workload of this group. Dr. Pommerich pointed out that her team intends to create standard operating procedures so that they can move more quickly to deliver new test items in the future. The DACMPT applauds the careful development of items and encourages procedures that will facilitate that process.

DTAC Response

3. Thank you. The entire DTAC team (civilians and contractors alike, working on all aspects of our R&D efforts) is dedicated to maintaining the highest quality testing program. We are continually looking to investigate and refine our products and practices, standardize procedures, and introduce efficiencies, so we can alleviate workloads for our small but mighty team!

ASVAB/AFQT Validity Framework

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The Committee agreed that Theory of Action [TOA] was applied very successfully in the AFQT selection context presented in developing, justifying, and empirically supporting the claims that were tested. Committee members appreciated how TOA-based validation efforts can usefully evolve over time. No validity evidence is static, and the TOA approach allows the body of validation work to be revised as the literature changes, and in light of different stakeholder purposes. ASVAB for classification may be more useful when average scores are higher because scores are less correlated (Legree, et al., 1961). The DACMPT recommends continued use of the TOA as an organizing framework for validity.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC has continued to use the Theory of Action as an organizing framework for validity. DTAC is continually updating its AFQT, ASVAB, and TAPAS validity arguments based on their respective TOAs.

Device Expansion Plans

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT asked about research on the interaction of item features and device variability to determine if different performance was observed for different items and tests when delivered on different devices, taking into account interactions among familiarity with the device, the task to be performed, response action, and device. Another question was raised about mode comparability research and the studies that were done or planned to ensure comparability of results across devices, operating systems, and browsers.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC did take into account the interaction of item features and device variability and determined that these were not drivers of performance and response time differences. Familiarity of device was the only significant factor that sometimes (depending on device and subtest) resulted in significant response time and performance differences. Likewise, the past device evaluation efforts did address various device, operating system, and browser conditions. Again, familiarity was the only factor with any significant interactions.

Device Expansion Plans (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

2. The DACMPT made several recommendations regarding future research into alternate devices and their effects on test scores. Continuing research in this area should focus on differential analyses, as well as interaction effects that may impact dropping items from tests and/or evolving technologies (hardware and software). Data on the nature of the task, information on how the content is displayed, and the test taker's knowledge of moving around the screen should be collected and incorporated into the research.

DTAC Response

2. Agree. DTAC has developed a device expansion maintenance plan. This plan includes the collection of data from examinees regarding their test-taking experience, including how familiar they are with the device used. Examinees are encouraged to use a device they are familiar with before beginning the APT or PiCAT. DTAC plans to continue to research the impact of device expansion on performance differences, especially for new subtests added to the ASVAB battery.

ASVAB Adverse Impact

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT recommends regular analyses of adverse impact and exploration of potential reasons for differences in test performance to aid in promoting diverse accessions into the Military Services. Future assessments of adverse impact should also consider whether English is the examinee's first language.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC is developing a standardized analytic tool to evaluate adverse impact on an annual basis. DTAC does not currently have access to a standardized demographic question on language proficiency or English as the applicant's first language but can explore potential proxy variables.

AFQT Differential Prediction Study

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. Dr. Putka requested input from the DACMPT in three areas: the modified Cleary approach to assess differential prediction, other factors that may explain overprediction and underprediction, and approaches for dealing with limited power for analyses involving occupations with small sample sizes. Committee members noted that overprediction was expected and asked questions regarding combinations of outcome measures, the effect of the scores of individuals who did not make it into the study, the use of multilevel modeling for these multi-group analyses, other ways to probe differential prediction, (e.g., using the Johnson-Neyman regions of significance approach; Preacher, Curran & Bauer, 2006), and the use of multilevel modeling to address selection artifacts and comparisons involving technical and non-technical occupations.

DTAC Response

1. DTAC appreciates the input received from the DACMPT.

AFQT Differential Prediction Study (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

2. After discussion of the approach taken and the available data for such analyses, the DACMPT made several suggestions regarding modifications to this research that might be considered: using performance measures that are broader and more direct than job knowledge tests, clustering related jobs or sorting jobs into technical and non-technical positions, using multilevel modeling as an analytic approach be considered going forward, and evaluating the effect of the test taker's native language. Despite these suggestions, the DACMPT is aware that the data needed for these initiatives may not exist at all, may not be reliably collected, or may not be available for a sufficient sample of test takers.

DTAC Response

2. Agree. The use of broader and more direct job performance measures rather than job knowledge tests is being looked into by the Services, particularly the Army in terms of military fitness and suitability. However, for criterion measures intended to be predicted by outcomes appropriate for ASVAB and other cognitive ability tests, it will require extensive planning and execution that would take a lengthy amount of time to run through the course of development. Clustering related jobs or sorting jobs into technical and non-technical positions is something that could and should be done. We are looking into this as a possible extension on previous studies. Using multilevel modeling as an analytical approach is something that could be explored and utilized in the next study, such as differential prediction. It would be interesting to know which multilevel techniques (e.g., HLM) the DACMPT has in mind, and DTAC would appreciate further elaboration. Evaluating the effect of a test-taker's native language would be an interesting application for DLI Foreign Language Center students or English Language Center students. As of yet, this has not gone past the conceptualization stage. Also, it could be a challenge gaining cooperation with DLI as these students are engaged in rigorous courses of study in language acquisition involving full-immersion learning.

DTAC appreciates the DACMPT's acknowledgment of limitations to their recommendations:
1) Data may not exist
2) Data may not be reliably collectible
3) Data may not be available for a sufficient sample of test takers

Non-Native English Speakers Analysis

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The DACMPT recommends considering how this report informs the development of the NextGen ASVAB. In addition, it may be useful to determine what level of proficiency is needed for Military Service. For example, how do work-relevant language and technical language lead to effective learning? What idioms might be important to functioning in an MOS that is not included in formal assessments (e.g., due to work culture, due to geographic assignment)? How might job redesign and technology (e.g., AI tools, translators) be used to improve language facility for ELL or all enlistees? Given these and other considerations, appropriate MOS-relevant levels of language proficiency and criteria for measuring those levels should be revisited for the benefit of expanding recruitment and enlistment efforts.

AP Response

1. Concur. Military training and operations are conducted in English. DoD supports programs such as Foreign Language Recruiting Initiative (FLRI) for non-native English speakers (NNES) to improve their English skills. To ensure all requirements are considered and to provide for the maximum ability to affiliate with the military, work on NextGen ASVAB will take into account the needs of the NNES within the constraints of the training and operational requirements. Furthermore, when developing classification standards, Military Services take into account training and job requirements to include minimum level of English proficiency required for all servicemembers, to include both NNES and Native English Speakers. Finally, the Department has developed additional non-verbal assessment of cognitive ability, which should aid with identifying individuals who have the potential to benefit from immersive English proficiency training provided by the DoD. DTAC/AP will share this recommendation with the MAPWG Service representatives for consideration by their respective Military Services when designing enlistment programs and developing classification standards.

Complex Reasoning

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT valued the development of a complex reasoning measure because such a measure is lacking in the ASVAB, and virtually all jobs in the military require complex reasoning. Complex reasoning measures require very little verbal ability and therefore may be fairer to applicants, so long as they are familiar with this type of test. The DACMPT suggested that future research consider including non-English speakers in the pilot study to increase the potential to validate the test for those populations.

DTAC Response

1. DoD policy currently requires applicants to speak, read, and write English fluently. Military training and operations are conducted in English. Communication is a core requirement for training and job performance. Non-verbal assessment of cognitive ability should aid with identifying individuals who have the potential to benefit from immersive English proficiency training provided by the DoD. Recruiting non-English speakers for pilot studies poses some exceptional challenges as general information about the studies and instructions are presented in English. Nevertheless, DTAC has included demographic questions about English proficiency in subsequent pilot studies in an attempt to address this recommendation. Very few (less than 1%) of participants report that they do not speak English well or not at all, which limits analysis. DTAC will continue to work to increase representation of non-English speakers in research and development efforts but must acknowledge logistical obstacles.

Complex Reasoning (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

2. Measure development: Determine why CR [Complex Reasoning] scores were "spiked" at a score of 11 across the three forms (this is unlikely to be coincidence). Continue expanding the item bank: Given that only 24 items were developed here, the item content might be leaked to examinees who then cheat. Fortunately, this can be remedied, because the quick generation of thousands of items is a virtue of the item format.
3. Nomological net: Correlate CR with ASVAB subtests to understand the nature of CR, where shared and unique sources of variance occur between the measures.
4. Validation: Support the CR measure further with validity evidence drawn from sources such as past military studies involving similar CR measures, or research literature when the results are generalizable to the military setting, as well as from new studies with the current CR measure.

DTAC Response

2. Agree. Histograms presented at the August 2023 DACMPT were based on incomplete results. This "spike" at raw score of 11 appears to have smoothed out somewhat in the final sample that is twice as large as what was included in the DACMPT presentation. Follow-on work includes additional item development efforts to expand the item bank.
3. Agree. These analyses will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT.
4. Agree. DTAC has task orders in place for continued development and validation of CR and Computational Thinking composites to include plans for construct validation and criterion-related validation work.

Complex Reasoning (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

5. Locate existing military data with CR-related data, in addition to conducting new validation work on the current CR measure (both selection- and classification-oriented validation). Although some military tests involving CR have not demonstrated incremental validity (see Besetsny et al., 1993), there is clearly more work to be done under a broader research framework. To this end, job analyses, O*NET data, and other resources may speak clearly to the need for an agenda for CR research across a wide range of MOS's.
6. Profile-driven analyses: Future research might consider how CR might work in tandem with a recruit or enlistee's profile of ASVAB scores. For example, specific ability tests are known to be more correlated (less differentiated) for those with lower general cognitive ability (see Detterman & Daniel, 1989), and those with higher cognitive ability may be more trainable for MOSs that do not fit their ASVAB subtest profile. These points have implications for classification that considers each enlistees' current interests and future goals alongside broader recruiting and labor demands.

DTAC Response

5. Agree. Criterion related validity evidence is typically the purview of the Services. DTAC will provide support with proposed research designs to facilitate cross-Service comparisons.
6. Agree. Classification composites are the purview of the Services. DTAC will assist as needed with composite or profile development efforts.

Complex Reasoning (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

7. Members of the DACMPT commented on several aspects of the results of this work, including the difficulty of single-layer CR items, double-layer CR items, and items that are based on the diagonal of the matrix instead of the horizontal or vertical. The DACMPT agrees with the research team that appropriate methods of evaluating difficulty should be evaluated. The DACMPT also voiced concern about the need for practice items for test takers who are not experienced with this item type. Aware of the time limitations for any individual test, the DACMPT recommends careful consideration of the impact of practice on the difficulty of the items.

DTAC Response

7. Agree. DTAC is evaluating the impact of practice in the context of item presentation order and potential impacts on a Computerized Adaptive Test (CAT) version of CR. CR items are traditionally presented in order of increasing difficulty, which provides additional opportunity for experience and learning with these novel stimuli. This may necessitate a constrained CAT algorithm to accommodate for such impacts.

Computational Thinking

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT supports the development of the Computational Thinking [CT] measure via a composite and the plans for doing so. Many jobs in the military have increased requirements to develop, engage in, and solve technological problems. Consequently, the development and implementation of a computational thinking measure will likely improve military classification. More specifically, the Committee suggested increasing the representation of non-English speakers in the pilot study sample and reviewing the work of Zach Hambrick, who has developed a similar measure.

DTAC Response

1. DoD policy currently requires applicants to speak, read, and write English fluently. Military training and operations are conducted in English. Communication is a core requirement for training and job performance. Non-verbal assessment of cognitive ability should aid with identifying individuals who have the potential to benefit from immersive English proficiency training provided by the DoD. Recruiting non-English speakers for pilot studies poses some exceptional challenges as general information about the studies and instructions are presented in English. Nevertheless, DTAC has included demographic questions about English proficiency in subsequent pilot studies in an attempt to address this recommendation. Very few (less than 1%) of participants report that they do not speak English well or not at all, which limits analysis. DTAC will continue to work to increase representation of non-English speakers in research and development efforts but must acknowledge logistical obstacles.

Computational Thinking (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

2. Validation: Given that a new measure solely designed to assess CT is not being developed, it could be useful in the time allowed to consider approaches that might refine the validation of CT composite further. For example, in a two-stage process, you might find the weights that estimate the six components of CT separately in stage 1; in stage 2, you create a composite of the six CT predicted scores depending on the MOS (SMEs rate the importance of CT components for each MOS).
3. Fairness: A question that is important to the Services is, "Will selection/classification outcomes based on CT be fair to race/ethnicity and gender subgroups, in terms of minimal adverse impact?" This information was not provided, but given that there are some subgroup mean differences on ASVAB and other cognitive tests examined here, subtest composites can increase these mean differences.
4. EDPT: Given that components of EDPT [Electronic Data Processing Test] look like ASVAB + CR subtests, and given that EDPT will not be given to all enlistees, consider removing EDPT from further research.

DTAC Response

2. Agree. Construct validation analysis results will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT meeting. These will not include MOS-specific results. Nevertheless, DTAC will incorporate similar strategies in research design templates developed to assist the Services in further validation work.
3. Agree. Fairness evaluation is part of planned analyses.
4. Agree. EDPT is not part of future DTAC research plans.

Computational Thinking (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (06/24)	DTAC Response
5. The Committee appreciated the time-urgent need for developing the CT test and recommended that additional work should investigate subgroup differences and other fairness issues and conduct further validation research.	5. Agree. Updates on subgroup differences and construct validation plans will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT meeting.

ASVAB Item Development Process—Item Analysis

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The DACMPT acknowledged the challenge of identifying suitable methods for evaluating dimensionality of ASVAB tryout items under sparse data conditions and proposed the potential use of basic CTT-based statistics, such as item-total correlations, as a viable option. The Committee also noted that planned missingness can be acceptable when researching the overall dimensionality (correlational structure) of measures; however, planned missingness is definitely not recommended when using scores for estimating individual scores in operational settings. Suggested solutions included the potential use of machine learning and inspection of the content of items to identify themes.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC uses item-total correlations to evaluate item characteristics and quality. Tryout items administered under the planned missingness design do not contribute to operational scores.

CAT-ASVAB Pool and P&P—ASVAB Form Development

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT inquired about the transformation steps taken in terms of equating to understand better the processes used and to ensure that variability was not being introduced as a consequence of methodology. More information regarding these steps and the results is requested. Additional information on the efforts to detect and manage multidimensionality in data from CAT-ASVAB forms is also requested. The DACMPT also requests more information about the nature of the PC Test stimuli (length, content focus on informational vs. literary reading), given the research to meet operational constraints and ensure comparability between P&P and CAT.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. A comprehensive briefing of CAT-ASVAB equating methodology and rationale was presented to the DACMPT on August 16, 2023 (Reeder; 2023a). The equipercentile objective of producing equivalent composite distributions across alternate forms was discussed. The August 2023 briefing included a comparison between relying solely on IRT invariance property vs. application of the standard score post-equating methodology to illustrate impact of the equipercentile objective on qualification rates. A briefing specifically targeted toward addressing DACMPT concerns over potential of the equating procedure to produce biased or more variable scores at the individual level was presented on June 12, 2024 (Dahlke, 2024). Simulation analyses suggest the equating procedure is responsible for a very small proportion of observed-score variance and does not systematically bias estimated scores. Analysis results presented in both the 2023 and 2024 briefings indicate that the equating process serves its intended purpose without detrimental impacts on examinees' scores. The DACMPT was briefed on analytic methods for evaluating and managing multidimensionality in CAT-ASVAB tests on August 16, 2023 (Reeder, 2023b). Further investigation into dimensionality of the Assembling Objects test will be briefed at a future DACMPT. A briefing on the comparability of P&P-ASVAB to CAT-ASVAB is planned for the January 2025 DACMPT.

Form Equating Methodology

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The DACMPT acknowledged the outstanding technical work and comprehensive information provided. The committee recognized the importance of using the pool-specific scale transformation, in addition to relying on the IRT measurement invariance property, for the purpose of improving the congruity of composite distributions and qualification rates across different pools at a group level. However, the Committee recommended examining the potential bias that could arise from the pool-specific scale transformation when estimating applicants' abilities at the individual level. The committee suggested that a simulation study relevant to the question be designed to explore this issue. The DACMPT also raised a question regarding the consistency of using the same operational IRT scoring method that is used in scaling, equating, and other psychometric analyses. Additional rationale may be necessary if consistency was not maintained. The Committee also highlighted the importance of contemplating the implications of the project's outcomes that align with potential developments of NextGen ASVAB.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. A briefing specifically targeted toward addressing DACMPT concerns over potential of the equating procedure to produce biased or more variable scores at the individual level was presented on June 12, 2024 (Dahlke, 2024). Simulation analyses suggest the equating procedure is responsible for a very small proportion of observed-score variance and does not systematically bias estimated scores. Analysis results presented in both the 2023 and 2024 briefings indicate that the equating process serves its intended purpose without detrimental impacts on examinees' scores. DTAC does not understand the questions regarding consistency of scoring methods and believe those questions to be a misunderstanding of the materials presented. DTAC uses Bayes modal estimation consistently in scoring.

Form Equating Simulation Study

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The DACMPT praised the thoroughness of the simulation study, viewing it as a valuable confirmation that the two-stage equating process works effectively at both the group and individual levels. The Committee recommended examining whether the results without the second stage produced similar outcomes. If the procedures with and without the second stage yielded comparable results, the possibility of simplifying the entire equating process in the future, if desired, could be contemplated.

DTAC Response

1. DTAC has previously presented results indicating that relying solely on the IRT invariance property (i.e., without the second stage) does not produce similar outcomes with respect to the equipercentile objective of qualification rates (Reeder; 2023a). Follow-up analyses will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT to illustrate these impacts within the same simulation framework as the June 2024 presentation.

Form Development Methodology: Calibration Sample Size

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The DACMPT acknowledged the outstanding work and recognized the importance of examining alternative calibration methods with smaller sample sizes. The differences in calibration results between flexMIRT and BILOG-MG were generally small, suggesting that the calibration program could be suitably replaced. The Committee raised a question about whether these differences could be further minimized by aligning the calibration settings of the two programs as closely as possible. In addition, the Committee recommended that DTAC consider the implications of switching the calibration program, including the need for recalibration of the current pools with the new program.
2. Regarding the use of a smaller sample size, the study showed that the psychometric properties, particularly reliability, did not change substantially across different sample sizes ranging from 700 to 1,200, supporting the use of a smaller sample size in the future. The practical benefit is clear, in the sense that a calibration sample size of about 970 would reduce the current data collection period by 8.3%. However, the Committee believes it is prudent to examine the impact of a smaller sample size on other aspects of the test, such as examinees' scores, DIF analysis, and more.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. Although there is not an immediate need to replace the current operational calibration procedure, DTAC is poised to replace BILOG-MG if and when circumstances dictate it is necessary. DTAC does not believe recalibration of the current pools is necessary given current robust scaling and equating procedures.
2. Agree. DTAC is currently engaged in research to evaluate impacts of smaller calibration sample sizes for DIF and other item-level analyses that are part of the pool development process.

Form Development Methodology: Use of Machine Learning and Natural Language Processing

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. Following the overview, the DACMPT praised the proposed system's use of modern technology and its potential to streamline ASVAB form development. There were no specific recommendations from the Committee on this topic. However, Committee members inquired whether generative artificial intelligence had been considered or used in this process. Dr. Pommerich responded that it is being considered as a multi-year project.
2. The DACMPT praised the thoroughness of the simulation study, viewing it as a valuable confirmation that the two-stage equating process works effectively at both the group and individual levels. The Committee recommended examining whether the results without the second stage produced similar outcomes. If the procedures with and without the second stage yielded comparable results, the possibility of simplifying the entire equating process in the future, if desired, could be contemplated.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC is currently evaluating the security-related implications of incorporating generative models into this process but believes they can add value if content and process security can be assured.
2. DTAC has previously presented results indicating that relying solely on the IRT invariance property (i.e., without the second stage) does not produce similar outcomes with respect to the equipercentile objective of qualification rates (Reeder; 2023a). Follow-up analyses will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT to illustrate these impacts within the same simulation framework as the June 2024 presentation.

Norming Requirements/Plans

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. One Committee member asked for a plot of trend results for AFQT scores.
2. The Committee discussed the possible effects of COVID on test scores, noting that some groups were more affected than others. The DACMPT recommends that efforts to re-norm should be deferred until the effects of COVID on propensity to serve have abated.
3. The DACMPT recommended that DTAC be sensitive to changes resulting from more vulnerable groups being differentially affected and wait until more time has elapsed before initiating a major re-norming effort. In addition, the methodology used for re-norming the ACT and SAT should be considered as plans to re-norm the ASVAB are developed.
4. The Committee also explored the development of norms based on the applicant pool instead of the customary approach of using the entire population. The DACMPT recommends that the DTAC consider the relative advantages and disadvantages of each approach before deciding which approach to use.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. Select AFQT trends were presented during the June 2024 DACMPT (McCloy, 2024). DTAC has developed a template analysis to monitor AFQT and other ASVAB score trends over time.
2. Agree. The technical working group (TWG) noted post-pandemic drops in student scores on NAEP, MAP, and other standardized tests. They noted the effects of school closures and remote learning could take a decade or more to rectify as most K–12 students were affected.
3. Agree. DTAC presented a summary of re-norming options and contingencies during the June DACMPT (McCloy, 2024) that include considerations for (a) the disruption to schooling that took place during the COVID pandemic, (b) differential impact of disruption to schooling, and (c) multiple methodological approaches to potential re-norming. DTAC agrees that waiting for the full impact of schooling disruptions is understood.
4. Agree. The TWG considered five options for renorming the ASVAB, including applicant-based norms. DTAC will consider the arguments for and against each approach as summarized in the June 2024 DACMPT (McCloy, 2024) briefing.

Norming Efforts

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The DACMPT agrees with the presented results and does not believe that the age of the scale alone is a reason to renorm, noting that there may be public resistance to changing the long-standing interpretations of the scale. The DACMPT felt that the TWG had carefully considered a number of different advantages and disadvantages and had no suggestions for further work to inform the decision regarding renorming. The costs and common interpretations of scores further limit interest in renorming.
2. The DACMPT agrees with the TWG that renorming is not needed at this time; however, the Committee recommends continued monitoring of ability and demographic changes in the population.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC is aligned with the DACMPT and TWG in believing there are few if any substantive reasons to renorm at this time.
2. Agree. DTAC is working with a data monitoring/visualization tool to assist in evaluating NAEP, SAT, ACT and Census data trends in relation to ASVAB/AFQT scores and demographics.

Use of Calculators on the ASVAB

DAC Recommendations (12/23)

1. Continue with the planned research approach presented by DTAC. Research and subsequent transition plan should incorporate:
    - Clear articulation of the problem
    - Planned needs analysis
    - Impact on psychometric properties
    - Thoroughly designed transition including potential need for training of test administrators and applicants on calculator use and standardized roll out across the Military Services
    - Continuous program monitoring
    - Carefully defining and collecting appropriate outcome data

DTAC Response

1. Agree. Substantive updates on the research plan, including empirical impact analyses and needs analysis, will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT meeting.

Use of Calculators on the ASVAB (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

2. Committee members and other participants asked a number of questions, including concerns about adverse impact and individual differences when a calculator was used, the responsibility for bringing calculators to the test administration session, the need for training on the use of a calculator, the process of equating all applicable forms, and the potential need to examine calculator use and score differences by MEPS location. Committee members also raised questions about the relationship between the nature of Arithmetic Reasoning (AR) items and the effects of calculator use, the introduction of test anxiety when calculators are allowed, alternative analytic approaches (e.g., correlational studies), and the impact of calculators when the ASVAB is administered on tablets.
3. Overall, the research presented was well done and informative. The DACMPT looks forward to seeing the full result from Study 2 and Study 3. Given the study results and logistical concerns, the DACMPT does not find value in allowing the use of calculators on the ASVAB and does not anticipate that this effort would increase the number of qualified applicants.

DTAC Response

2. Agree. DTAC shares these concerns and will present further detail at the January 2025 DACMPT meeting.
3. Agree. More comprehensive findings from the empirical impact study and needs analysis will be presented at the January 2025 DACMPT meeting to address many of the DACMPT's concerns, which are shared by DTAC. Given the ambiguity of the problem definition, arbitrary timeline, administrative barriers, and potential scope of the impact, DTAC's capacity to address emerging issues revealed by these studies may be limited.

Next Generation ASVAB/Testing—Evaluation Plan

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT asked how DTAC defined improvements in selection (e.g., increases in validity or satisfaction). The answer will require another look at the philosophy or purpose of the ASVAB. The DACMPT recommends careful consideration of the criteria for "improvement."
2. Committee members recognized the diversity of needs among stakeholders. For example, military trainers are generally pleased with the current tests because new recruits succeed during training. At the same time, recruiters want a test that will qualify more people and allow them to meet their recruiting missions. Although a completely shared vision for the ASVAB is likely impossible, there are no major complaints, and DTAC is hoping to meet most of the stakeholders' goals. The DACMPT encourages continued efforts to evaluate stakeholder perceptions and to educate them on the compromises that must be made.

DTAC Response

1. DTAC agrees that careful consideration of the criteria for improvement in selection is needed. DTAC has actively been considering the criteria and process for making changes to the ASVAB since 2011. A detailed plan for NextGen ASVAB was presented to the DACMPT in 2020. Regarding the philosophy of the ASVAB question, DTAC completed a thorough review in 2023 of all the ASVAB philosophy discussions that took place over the past several decades and concluded that the DACMPT's 2011 recommendation to articulate the ASVAB philosophy might have unintentionally led to an impasse between DTAC and the Services regarding ASVAB content decisions due to competing philosophies. As such, current thinking is to remove references to a specific philosophy and reframe ASVAB content discussions to focus on guidelines and evaluation processes that have been mapped out. DTAC continues to solicit input from stakeholders to ensure that the different purposes for which they use the ASVAB continue to be met.
2. Agree. DTAC continues to communicate with stakeholders to learn their differing needs and perspectives, build a shared understanding, and help identify a way forward for Next Generation Testing. Most recently, DTAC held a 3-day workshop with a variety of ASVAB stakeholders in November 2024, as well as conducted interviews with additional stakeholders not participating in the workshop.

Next Generation ASVAB/Testing—Evaluation Plan (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

3. The primary concern about testing time does not come from applicants but comes from MEPCOM, which prefers to complete all testing in a single day to avoid overnight stays. Committee members discussed the issue of the length of the tests and briefly explored alternatives such as changing the CAT stop rules, moving item seeding requirements from proctored testing to VTest administrations, employing psychometric refinements, using a multidimensional approach (e.g., multidimensional IRT), and initiating a taxonomy content review to identify redundancies. Although the tests are already short, the DACMPT recommends that DTAC continue to explore various ways to shorten the length of time required for administering the ASVAB and special tests.
4. The Committee also discussed applicant perceptions of the ASVAB. The available data were collected from individuals who had taken the ASVAB but had not yet completed training and did not include high school students taking the CEP or applicants who were not accepted. The DACMPT encourages efforts to understand a broader range of applicant reactions to the ASVAB.

DTAC Response

3. Agree. DTAC continues to consider avenues to reducing testing time to alleviate the burden on MEPCOM resources. Testing time was a focus of one of the exercises conducted at the November 2024 ASVAB stakeholder workshop.
4. DTAC agrees that it would be useful to get the perspectives of CEP participants and applicants that do not qualify for entry into the military, but also notes that these are difficult populations to get access to. In focus groups that were conducted with qualifying applicants, a number discussed taking the ASVAB via the CEP. If there are future focus group efforts, we will make every effort to speak with as broad of a swath of the test-taking population as is practically feasible.

Next Generation Testing

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The DACMPT supports the systematic approach to considering future changes to the ASVAB and has no substantive comments to make, other than that the focus groups of panelists should consider the needs of the Services in the future, as they make their judgments on which tests should be included.

DTAC Response

1. Duly noted. DTAC has recently conducted a Next Generation ASVAB workshop with various stakeholder groups, including technical representatives, policy representatives, recruiters, classifiers, and trainers from the Services. DTAC plans to keep the Services involved as Next Generation ASVAB efforts unfold.

Next Generation Testing Stakeholder Focus Group Study

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT asked about the representation of the study participants relative to the populations. Demographic information about the participants was limited. Consequently, the sample did not meet strict sampling conditions. The DACMPT recommends that future focus groups ensure adequate representation of all critical groups.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. If there are future focus group efforts, we will make every effort to speak as broad a representation of relevant subgroups as is practically feasible.

High School Curriculum Study

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The DACMPT would like to hear more about this research and understand how the NextGen ASVAB and the Critical Thinking and Complex Reasoning Tests support alignment with common high school curricula. The DACMPT also suggested that researchers consider multilevel analyses on variables like school and state to test the hypothesis that schools with more resources provide more courses. Another suggestion was to consider the extent to which such information could be used to assess schools from a workforce development perspective. Another possibility to investigate was whether or not schools offering curricula aligned with ASVAB subtests and better resources offered better recruiting environments and produced more eligible students with a propensity for Military Service.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. For clarification, DTAC is using the common high school curricula study as a separate source of information to support the NextGen ASVAB work. That is, we are not looking for the high school curricula study to support the inclusion of Complex Reasoning and Computational Thinking. While the data collection plan has already been established and implemented, DTAC will take a multilevel approach, to the extent possible, with the existing data to explore the hypothesis that schools with more resources provide more courses. Likewise, DTAC will consider an extension of the work to assessing schools from a workforce development perspective but would like to hear more from the DACMPT on what they envision and how this work could improve the composition of the ASVAB for selection and classification purposes. Another follow-up effort DTAC will consider is collaborating with other DPAC teams to determine whether schools with better resources that offer curricula aligned with ASVAB subtests offer better recruiting environments and thereby also produce more eligible students with a propensity for military service.

ASVAB CEP

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT suggested that the “Bring ASVAB CEP to your school” program be looked at closely to determine if the scheduling forum has pushed people away since 2019 and if the demographic questions on the forum should be revised.
2. The DACMPT also suggested that students be assigned an identification code (e.g., pseudo name or number) to reduce the concerns about Military Service.
3. Other suggestions included using social media to facilitate a culture of interest in schools, emphasizing the focus on exploring jobs and work as opposed to college and stressing the “whole-person” nature of the assessment.
4. The Committee also felt that strong student testimonies placed on the homepage might engage more users and should be considered.
5. Other efforts to engage more users include working jointly with programs like Upward Bound and offering the program to undeclared freshmen in college and those in the TRIO program.
6. YouTube videos that are aligned with the topics in the “Student Articles” would also be helpful.
7. Understanding other programs in high school that compete with the ASVAB-CEP could help direct marketing efforts, and the use of social media tools such as Kahoot could enable better connections among educators, students, and the military.

DTAC Response

1. Agree—form was revised to allow the user to input only critical information to allow for ESS follow-up.
2. Agree—collaboration with USMEPCOM is required to modify the score sheet.
3. Agree—launched social listening activities and social campaigns tailored to educator sharing and promotion among the educator community.
4. Agree—this information is gathered when possible (challenge: multiple layers of approval required to contact students but ESSs can and do encourage student self-posting).
5. Agree—a new business strategy was activated in 2023 to engage underserved populations and broaden efforts in community colleges and other organizations with relevant populations.
6. Agree—relevant videos have been created and are being developed that align with this suggestion.
7. Agree—an in-depth Competitor Analysis is underway. A white paper was provided to Accession Policy that outlined specific comparisons between ASVAB CEP and SchoolLinks.

ASVAB CEP (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

8. No major concerns were uncovered; however, the DACMPT would like to see more information regarding the Army's success in using CEP scores for enlistment. The DACMPT also requests that the following questions be addressed in future meetings:
    - Should ASVAB-CEP be mandatory for high school students, and what will be the ramifications for the military services?
    - What methods will best persuade students to take the ASVAB-CEP and take it seriously?
    - How can the military promote, "Do you know people like you who took the ASVAB-CEP"?
    - How should non-cognitive measures be incorporated into the selection and classification programs?
    - How does the content in high school curricula align with the ASVAB, and what are implication for changes to either or both?
9. Finally, the Committee endorses the idea of the Committee members working through the website to better understand the program.

DTAC Response

8. Agree—Where not yet briefed to the DACMPT, recommend adding to the agenda for future meetings.
9. Agree—A walkthrough was provided at the 08/23 DACMPT meetings, and login credentials have been provided to Committee members.

ASVAB CEP (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23, 06/24)

1. [08/23] Following the overview, the DACMPT complimented the tool and made a recommendation to identify ways to evaluate user engagement that goes beyond merely counts of accessing the website, such as by measuring frequency of return users.
2. [08/23] The Committee also endorsed the idea of better explaining the program, so that more participants take advantage of the Post-Test Interpretation service.
3. [06/24] The DACMPT continues to believe that the ASVAB CEP is an important tool for identifying potential recruits for the Services and provides a public service to youth in America. The biggest shortfall in this program appears to be its limited use. Consequently, the DACMPT encourages continued marketing efforts to inform the public in general and high school leadership specifically.

DTAC Response

1. Agree—return user has been added to the Key Performance Indicators on website analytics. The team is also exploring a pop-up survey to be administered to gather more specific feedback.
2. Agree—this correlates closely with ongoing efforts to standardize training and program delivery, disseminate marketing communications, and introducing the Ambassador Program.
3. Agree—expanded and refined marketing efforts to reach targeted audiences including school board members, community colleges, superintendents, and state- and district-level decision makers.

TAPAS Validity Framework and Joint Enlistment Composite

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The DACMPT suggested that the feasibility of a synthetic validity approach should be explored as a way to make the most of the available data given their variability and sparseness. A further suggestion was to consider strategies to collect validity data retrospectively (i.e., concurrent validity). The Committee also asked about the use of the TAPAS composite scores and the weights for its multiple components. For the purpose of the Joint Services Composite, the weights might be common across all Services, but individual Services might build additional composites and each assign unique weighting schemes. The DoD is tasked with producing the weightings. Another suggestion was to include other TAPAS facets for future research.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC has a plan in place to explore suitable criteria, which begins with reviewing past work by contractors to establish a common set of criterion measures. The goal is to map any existing measures within the existing framework to military compatibility efforts. Likewise, we are asking the Services to also offer their criterion measures and experiences. Finally, DTAC will propose additional avenues for validating the TAPAS military compatibility composite, including possible synthetic and concurrent validity approaches, as suggested. Included in the validity research will be a review of the facet weighting schemes applied. As TAPAS development evolves, facets will be refined, and new facets will be developed to better support the assessment of military compatibility. Refinement efforts are planned for FY25, and new development will begin in FY27. The Services have the flexibility to introduce new Service-specific facets within the Joint-Service TAPAS.

TAPAS for Military Compatibility

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The members of the DACMPT had a number of questions about this research and made several suggestions on overcoming the challenges inherent in it. One question involved the definition of military core values and the extent to which they are incompatible with counterproductive behaviors, which are also difficult to define and measure. Military core values vary across branches of the Services, but they generally refer to constructs such as honor, courage, commitment, sense of duty, and so forth. Another member of the Committee suggested that the challenge of measurement might be addressed by identifying a criterion more proximal to the actual counterproductive behaviors (if those were specifically elaborated), which would sacrifice generalizability for fidelity to specific trait identification/prediction. The committee also suggested considering the possibility of deconstructing counterproductive work behaviors into essential components (e.g., making verbal comments as a prelude to physical altercations) as a strategy to address the low base-rate issue. A great deal of variability has been found among the Services in terms of ratings of counterproductive work behaviors, and there is a general lack of consensus on the importance of specific negative behaviors (e.g., sedition, aggression, harassment). A further question was raised about the relative stability of the characteristics to be assessed and the extent to which pre-accession assessment of these constructs might be useful for the prediction of later behaviors. Multi-level unit of measuring these constructs over time was suggested as a possible alternative.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC has ongoing plans to explore suitable criteria, which begins with reviewing past work by contractors to establish a common set of criterion measures. The goal is to map any existing measures within the existing framework to military compatibility efforts. Likewise, we are asking the Services to also offer their criterion measures and experiences. There are 10 categories of misconduct that the military compatibility composite will address. It is these 10 categories for which we will focus on finding suitable criterion measures. Unfortunately, research shows that the military core values across Services are not correlated with (or a reverse measure of) the 10 categories of misconduct. DTAC plans to explore multi-level measurement models to address possible issues with stability.

TAPAS for Military Compatibility (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

2. The DACMPT expressed a great deal of concern about what is being measured at what specificity, and what level of reliance on the data is appropriate. At present, while the infrastructure for TAPAS exists in MEPS, making TAPAS a logical administrative choice as an instrument to measure these counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), there remain a number of significant questions outstanding about the extent to which TAPAS could defensibly predict CWBs, adherence to military core values, and military compatibility in the general case or at a more specific, granular level targeting more clearly articulated CWBs. The ongoing work to establish a validity argument for TAPAS for varied purposes and uses suggests that the outcomes associated with TAPAS use are variable, and considerable work will need to be done around construct definition (including specificity), the stability of the construct at pre-accession and over time for various examinee groups (such as enlisted vs. officers, and demographic considerations like male/female, race/ethnicity), the validity argument for the use of this measure for purposes such as disqualifying enlistment candidates or identifying potential issues, and interpretation and use generally. The DACMPT recommends that considerable attention be paid to determining what should be measured in a compatibility assessment for articulated specific purposes. In addition, Accession Policy should be open to instruments other than TAPAS that provide targeted information that could predict counterproductive work behaviors in general or specific counterproductive work behaviors, adherence to military core values, and military compatibility.

DTAC Response

2. Agree. The development of the military compatibility composite based on TAPAS facets is a phased approach. Phase 0 makes it possible to collect data across all Services on the Army Conduct Composite, which is our first military compatibility composite. With this data, we can begin to explore issues related to validity, subgroup differences, and stability. DTAC has developed a targeted definition of military compatibility that focuses on 10 categories of misconduct. DTAC's goal is not to assess adherence to military core values, as we found that these are not correlated with the 10 categories of misconduct defined by the Military Compatibility Research Group (MCRG). The Joint-Service TAPAS Military Compatibility Composite is not planned to be the sole source of evidence for disqualifying candidates from the Services. Instead, it will serve as a flagging tool that would invoke further investigation via a clinical psychological interview by a licensed clinician who would provide a Service eligibility recommendation. This two-stage approach is currently being refined and will undergo various levels of validity studies before implemented operationally. Phase 1 JS-TAPAS development will focus on refining the facet pools and the military compatibility composite. Phase 2 will focus on introducing new facets into the JS-TAPAS that support the increased validity for the military compatibility composite. Research in the area of military compatibility assessment is also ongoing for the Officer population where 13 existing assessments are being evaluated for their appropriateness. Findings from this research will inform the enlistment testing program. Accession Policy and DTAC are open to instruments other than TAPAS. DTAC also plans to develop and pilot its own Situational Judgment Test, intended to address the assessment of military compatibility defined by the 10 categories of misconduct.

TAPAS for Military Compatibility (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

3. One final suggestion involved the use of a clinical assessment to follow up on high scores on facets predictive of counterproductive work behaviors. This two-stage process could save money by limiting the clinical evaluation to high scorers only.

DTAC Response

3. Agree. The current plan is to structure the military compatibility assessment into two parts: 1) Use TAPAS Military Compatibility Composite (or equivalent composite for officers) to flag individuals at risk for deviant behaviors; and 2) Use the clinical assessment to obtain professional judgment on those flagged by the test in part 1.

Non-Cognitive Updates

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. Members of the DACMPT applauded the careful approach to developing these measures and encouraged future research to pay careful attention to the criteria used for deviant behaviors, particularly those that occur less frequently. The literature on honesty and integrity may be a useful source of information.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC has a plan in place to explore suitable criteria that begin with reviewing past work by contractors to establish a common set of criterion measures. The goal is to map any existing measures within the existing framework to military compatibility efforts. Likewise, we are asking the Services to also offer their criterion measures and experiences. Finally, DTAC will propose additional avenues for validating the TAPAS military compatibility composite, including possible synthetic and concurrent validity approaches, as suggested at the Aug 2023 meeting of the DACMPT. Literature on honesty and integrity is a key resource that DTAC has been reviewing within the Best Practices Project, as that team contains an expert researcher in the area.

Best Practices Project

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. Members of the DACMPT voiced similar concerns regarding the weaker prediction of extreme forms of counterproductive work behaviors and advised attention to the criterion used, given the implications of using such an instrument to reject potential officers. A second recommendation is to examine gender differences and race/ethnicity differences in future work, as well as the effects of providing warnings to keep respondents from minimizing or ignoring past misconduct.

DTAC Response

1. Agree. DTAC has a plan in place to explore suitable criteria, which begins with reviewing past work by contractors to establish a common set of criterion measures. The goal is to map any existing measures within the existing framework to military compatibility efforts. Likewise, we are asking the Services to also offer their criterion measures and experiences. Finally, DTAC will propose additional avenues for validating the military compatibility facets/scales administered for the officer population. Presently, DTAC is exploring various scales within 13 existing assessments for their utility with an officer population. Likewise, DTAC will begin development of a Situational Judgment Test aimed at addressing the 10 identified focus areas for military compatibility assessment. Validation research will include an exploration of gender differences and race/ethnicity differences.

Legislation/Policy Review

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The DACMPT has no comments on the law but noted that the legal requirements for minimum scores emphasize the importance of accurate equating of forms.

AP Response

1. Concur. This is the normal practice of the Department and will continue to be followed.

Resource Overview

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The Committee asked about the maintenance of current funding levels, cautioning that the description of levels as “healthy” may result in future reductions or future “leveraging” of funding for other purposes. Dr. Pommerich clarified that current levels of funding would be sufficient if cuts are not imposed, but that cloud costs could become an issue. In addition, Dr. Pommerich also said that if the ASVAB were to be re-normed, additional funding would be needed. Because current funding levels are adequate, no additional funding is needed at this time. This assumes cloud costs remain constant, and DTAC is not tasked with additional norming work or other unforeseen efforts. If major projects like ASVAB re-norming are directed, the DACMPT strongly recommends additional resources be provided to address these issues.

DTAC Response

1. DTAC continues to monitor funding levels and cloud costs, to ensure that an optimal level of funding is maintained or that steps could be taken to secure additional funding, if needed.

Future Topics

DAC Recommendations (12/22)

1. The DACMPT recommends future meetings incorporate briefings on the following topics:
    - Item development and equating methodology
    - Non-cognitive measures
    - The high school curriculum study
    - The TAPAS validity framework
    - Non-native English speakers and test performance
    - CEP website
    - Integrating measures into the master plan for selection and classification

DTAC Response

1. Duly noted. DTAC has and will continue to coordinate with AP to schedule briefings on suggested topics when applicable and feasible.
    - Item development processes briefed at the 8/23 DACMPT meeting
    - Equating methodology briefed at the 08/23, 06/24, and 01/25 DACMPT meetings
    - Non-cognitive measures briefed at the 08/23, 06/24, and 01/25 DACMPT meetings
    - High school curriculum study briefed at the 08/23 and 01/25 DACMPT meetings
    - TAPAS validity framework briefed at the 08/23 DACMPT meeting
    - The non-native English speakers study briefed at the 08/23 DACMPT meeting
    - CEP website demonstrated at the 08/23 DACMPT meeting
    - Next Generation Testing briefed at the 06/24 DACMPT meeting

Future Topics (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (08/23)

1. The DACMPT recommends future meetings incorporate briefings on the following topics:
    - Overview of the various tests that highlights similarities and differences among tests (e.g., Cyber test vs. EDTP)
    - Another review of the equating procedures
    - Overview of Next Generation ASVAB and how the pieces (e.g., Complex Reasoning) fit together
    - Overview of the process for planning that takes into account a rapidly changing testing landscape (especially important given the rapid influx of AI technologies that affect testing)
    - Norming procedures
    - Allowing the use of calculators
    - Reviewing the nature, pros, and cons of super-scoring

DTAC Response

1. Duly noted. DTAC has and will continue to coordinate with AP to schedule briefings on suggested topics when best applicable and feasible.
    - Next Generation Testing briefed at the 06/24 DACMPT meeting
    - Equating methodology briefed at the 06/24 and 01/25 DACMPT meetings
    - Next Generation Testing briefed at the 06/24 DACMPT meeting
    - DTAC is exploring AI/GAI/technology advancements and can report on the status of ASVAB and non-cognitive efforts in this realm at a future meeting
    - Norming efforts briefed at the 06/24 DACMPT meeting
    - Use of calculators on the ASVAB briefed at the 12/23 and 06/24 DACMPT meetings
    - DTAC is prepared to brief the DACMPT on super-scoring whenever it is scheduled

Future Topics (cont.)

DAC Recommendations (06/24)

1. The DACMPT believed that all the suggestions for future research were worthy of attention. The DACMPT recommended future meetings incorporate briefings on the following topics:
   - Adverse impact analyses
   - TAPAS
   - Calculator implementation efforts
   - Complex Reasoning test
   - Interest measures
   - Curriculum studies

DTAC Response

1. Duly noted. DTAC has and will continue to coordinate with AP to schedule briefings on suggested topics when best applicable and feasible.
   - Adverse impact will be briefed at the 01/25 DACMPT meeting
   - TAPAS will be briefed at the 01/25 DACMPT meeting
   - Calculator efforts will be briefed at the 01/25 DACMPT meeting
   - Complex Reasoning efforts will be briefed at the 01/25 DACMPT meeting
   - The Find Your Interests inventory will be briefed at the 01/25 DACMPT meeting
   - The high school curriculum study will be briefed at the 01/25 DACMPT meeting