

A MESSAGE FROM YOUR PRESIDENT – JOHN FREMER

My Last Message

Even though I realize that time accelerates as you grow older, it still seems hardly possible that this is my last message as NCME President, but by the time you receive this issue of our fine *Newsletter* we will be closing in on our Annual Meeting in Seattle. I have the privilege of giving my presidential address and then H.D. Hoover assumes the Presidency of our organization. I wish him the very best in his role. I will try very hard to meet the high standard of helpfulness that Michael Kolen has lived up to as Past-President.



In this message, I want to address three topics: (1) Acknowledging Bill Russell; (2) Coping with criticism of tests and testing; and (3) Personal comments.

Acknowledging Bill Russell

Bill Russell is preparing to leave his role as Executive Director of NCME and AERA as soon as a replacement can be identified. He has been such a wonderful support to our organization that we will all miss him a great deal. He has been the guy who has helped the officers, directors, committee chairs, and others to function effectively over the past 29 years. With his good humor and good sense, he has brightened up meetings and spotted connections and land mines across countless plans and developments.

I know that I speak for all of our members in wishing Bill the best in this next phase of his life. We would rather he stay with us, but since he has concluded that it's time to move on, we hope he finds whatever he seeks and gets the respect and regard that we know he deserves.

Coping with Criticism of Tests and Testing

Expansions Elicit Criticism – Whenever there is a proposal to expand the use of tests, you can expect a wave of criticism. The intensity of the criticism will vary with the significance of the proposed use in the lives of people. Where there are major consequences — such as whether a student will graduate or be promoted to the next grade, whether a person will be able to practice in the field for which he or she has trained, or whether those in charge of a school retain their autonomy — substantial criticism will follow. This is predictable regardless of the quality of the testing plan, the instruments to be used, and the process that will be employed to develop and implement the program. Part of the planning for any program needs to be devoted to anticipating the criticisms that will be leveled and knowing who will be responding and how.

Listen and Learn – I don't like receiving criticism, whether it is directed at me personally or at any aspect of my work or place of employment. It is my impression that most people feel the same way. When you work in testing, though, you can expect to encounter criticism, sometimes of a very harsh variety. As unpleasant as this experience is, my recommendation is to listen carefully to all critics. It does make sense to "consider the source," as one of my family members likes to remind all of the rest of us, and to give special attention to thoughtful and well-informed critics. Even critics who condemn virtually all testing, though, may have insights in a particular setting that can be valuable. Don't be dismissive if the person misuses our measurement language or reveals incomplete knowledge of the facts about tests or test use. Look for the underlying basis for the concern. Why does this parent see a test use as unfair to their child? Why does another test-taker complain that a test covers inappropriate material or is inaccurate?

Sometimes collecting and analyzing criticisms will lead you to recognize flaws in your test or the way it is being used that do indeed require corrective action. In my experience, the sooner you realize that you have a testing problem the better able you will be to deal with it.

Acknowledge Limitations – Be sure not to "oversell" what tests or testing programs can accomplish. Tests are ways of collecting information. If we collect useful information about the skills and learning of people and then present it in understandable ways, we can make a powerful contribution to education and society. The growth of testing over the years is testimony to the ability of our field to accomplish this important objective in many contexts. But we need to be very forthright about the limitations of the information that we provide. Often it represents a person's performance at a single point in time. If measured at another time, would significantly different results have been obtained? Also, tests are "samples" from a larger universe of particular domains. Might another sample have led to different conclusions about the person's competence? We need to be especially attentive to such possibilities when the sample of questions or exercises is small, as is often the case in performance testing settings. It is critical that those responsible for

continued

Fremer continued

testing programs point out the limitations of results as well as their strengths. Only in this way can users be properly prepared to use the results judiciously and not give them unwarranted weight.

Personal Comments

Keep Asking Me to Help – One of our former NCME Presidents has warned me that I might experience a steep drop-off in requests to participate in professional activities at the end of my term: “Once you have served as president, people think you would not be interested in committee assignments, advisory panel appointments, and the like. You will still get papers to review, but that is about it.”

My request to my NCME colleagues is to keep me on their “active” list. I hope that I will continue to be busy with interesting professional challenges for the indefinite future.

Thanks All Around – I want to thank everyone who has been contributing to NCME work during my term. I definitely want to cite my fellow Board members, our Annual Meeting Program Chairs, our editors, and our committee chairs and members. I would also like to thank the people who helped me via e-mail and other methods. You called my attention to important developments and proposed steps that NCME might take. This was terrific and I am very appreciative.

I must also recognize and thank Bill Russell, Becky Snowden, and the NCME Central Office staff for their fine support. They provide the continuity and consistency of presence that is so valuable to someone in a relatively short-term role. I realize now that serving as President is like being a parent: Just when you sort of think that you are getting the hang of it, the kids move on. (Of course, they may come back, but that is another story.)

Finally, I want to thank the many people who offered their support as I underwent disk removal surgery in December followed by a disability leave. To give an update, I am now in the physical torture (therapy) stage and may be in it for a year. I have many exercises (17 at this juncture) to do 10 times each twice a day. I can feel lost functions coming back in my left arm, so my motivation is very high, and I am optimistic about my prospects for a near-complete return to my pre-problem state.

I look forward to seeing many of you in Seattle.

FIELD TRIALS ANNOUNCED

Donald B. Yarbrough

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation invites field trials of the *Student Evaluation Standards*.

The 29 *Student Evaluation Standards* are grouped into four categories (Propriety, Utility, Feasibility, and Accuracy). Each standard contains a statement, overview, rationale, caveats, guidelines, common errors, and two case descriptions and analyses. The national and international reviewers have now provided their suggestions, which have been integrated into a

draft suitable for field testing. These standards are now ready to be used and tried out by the intended audiences: teachers, administrators, parents, students, school psychologists, professors, and psychometricians—anyone who conducts or has an interest in student evaluation.

The complete draft of the *Student Evaluation Standards* is available at the website: <http://jc.wmich.edu/>.

The purpose of the field trials is to see if the standards help practitioners review, improve, understand, or otherwise have an effect on any aspect of student evaluation (e.g., informal in-class feedback, grading, etc.). Similarly, the standards could be tested for their applicability to an evaluation of district or state student evaluation policy. There are more examples of study topics and studies actually under way on the website.

Potential field testers will need to apply on the website, fill out some paper work, and turn in a simple report. The form is available on the website. Everyone who turns in a field trial report will be recognized as a field tester in the final publication of the standards. Field trials need to be completed by June 1, 2001, if possible.

The easiest way to look over the *Student Evaluation Standards* or to inform yourself further about the field trials is to enter the website, click on the Student Evaluation Standards, and then page through the overviews, Q&As, etc.

NEWSLETTER ADVISORY BOARD

BETTY BERGSTROM, Computer Adaptive Technologies, Inc.
GREGORY CIZEK, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
JOAN HERMANN, CRESST/UCLA
SHARON LEWIS, Council of the Great City Schools
DUNCAN MACQUARRIE, Tacoma Public Schools
KAREN MITCHELL, National Academy of Sciences
LORA MONFILS, Graduate Student – Rutgers University
S.E. PHILLIPS, Consultant
NAMBURY RAJU, Illinois Institute of Technology
LAWRENCE RUDNER, ERIC/University of Maryland
STEVE SIRECI, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
LISA F. SMITH, Kean University
JON TWING, NCS Pearson
DENNY WAY, Educational Testing Service

DOUGLAS F. BECKER, EDITOR, Riverside Publishing

Send articles or information for this newsletter to:

Douglas F. Becker Phone: (800) 767-8420, Ext. 7006
Riverside Publishing Fax: (630) 467-7126
425 Spring Lake Drive e-mail: douglas_becker@hmco.com
Itasca, IL 60143

The *NCME Newsletter* is published quarterly. The *Newsletter* is not copyrighted; readers are invited to copy any articles that have not been previously copyrighted. Credit should be given in accordance with accepted publishing standards.

**NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MEASUREMENT IN EDUCATION
2001 ANNUAL MEETING
SELECTED PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS**

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Top Ten Things that Parents Want to Know about Testing: How NCME Can Help — *John Fremer, ETS*

CAREER AWARD ADDRESS

Problems, Pitfalls, and Paradoxes in Educational Measurement — *Robert L. Brennan, University of Iowa*

- Moderator: *Linda Cook, ETS*
- Discussants: *Paul Holland, ETS; Wendy Yen, K-12 Works*

COMMITTEE SPONSORED SYMPOSIA

From the Printing Press to the World Wide Web: Implications for Knowledge Acquisition and Assessment

Graduate Student Issues Committee; Organizer & Moderator: Lora Monfils, Rutgers University

- Tempered Enthusiasm: The Promise and Pitfalls of On-Line Education and Assessment — *Andrew S. Latham, Teacher Universe*
- Challenges of Web-based Assessments — *Richard M. Luecht, UNC-Greensboro*
- Assessment in the 21st Century: Issues in the Validation of Assessments in Technology-based Distance/Distributed Learning — *Valerie Ruhe, University of British Columbia*
- Assessment in the New Millennium: New Directions from the School District Perspective — *Mary E. Yakimowski-Srebnick, Hampton (VA) Public Schools*

Fairness in Testing: Applying the New Standards

Joint Committee on Testing Practice; Organizer & Moderator: Julie Noble, ACT

- Panelists: *Carole Perlman, Chicago Public Schools; Doug Smith, University of Wisconsin, River Falls; Janet Helms, Boston College; William "Gee" Harris, Association of Test Publishers; John Fremer, ETS; Janet Wall, ACT*
- Discussants: *Bert Green, Johns Hopkins University; Cyndie Schmeiser, ACT*

Minority Issues and Selective Admissions in Higher Education

Minority Issues and Testing Committee; Organizer & Moderator: María Pennock-Román, Pennsylvania State University

- Panelists: *Eugene Garcia, UC Berkeley; Patricia Gandára, UC Davis; Gwyneth Boodoo, ETS; Brent Bridgeman, ETS; Howard Everson, The College Board*

Test Security in a High Stakes Environment: Myth or Reality?

National Association of Testing Directors; Organizer: Mary E. Yakimowski-Srebnick, Hampton (VA) Public Schools; Moderator: Carole Perlman, Chicago Public Schools

- Panelists: *Gregory Cizek, UNC-Chapel Hill; Michael Kean, CTB/McGraw Hill; Douglas Rindone, Connecticut State Department of Education; Mary E. Yakimowski-Srebnick, Hampton (VA) Public Schools*
- Discussants: *Joseph O'Reilly, Mesa (AZ) Public Schools; Zollie Stevenson, U.S. Department of Education*

Five Years of Classroom Assessment Development: A Washington State Assessment Showcase

Annual Teachers' Classroom Assessment Recognition Program; Organizer & Moderator: Rick Stiggins, Assessment Training Institute

- Facing the Political Realities of Balancing Classroom and Standardized Assessment – *Terry Bergeson, Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction*
- The Washington Education Association's Cadre of Classroom Assessment Trainers – *Pat Raichel, Washington Education Association*
- Learning Teams for Classroom Assessment Literacy Development – *Rick Stiggins, Assessment Training Institute*
- Assembling Toolkits of Classroom Assessment Examples – *Linda Gohlke, Shoreline School District*
- Productive Assessment Literacy Training in Teacher Preparation – *John Woodward, University of Puget Sound*
- Discussants: *Joe Willhoft, Tacoma Schools; Judy Arter, Assessment Training Institute*

A demonstration showcase directly following this symposium will include poster and technology-based presentations of Washington teachers' classroom assessment accomplishments.

SELECTED PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS, *continued*

INVITED SYMPOSIA

Artificial Intelligence: A ‘Smart’ Choice for Educational Measurement?

Organizer & Moderator: David M. Williamson, ETS

- Artificial Neural Network-Based Performance Assessments Using Simulations – *Ron Stevens, Adrian Casillas, Terry Vendlinski, UCLA*
- A Sensitivity Analysis of the Andes Bayesian Student Modeler — *Kurt VanLehn, University of Pittsburgh*
- Model Criticism of Bayesian Networks with Latent Variables — *David M. Williamson, Robert J. Mislevy, Russell G. Almond, ETS*
- Attention, Engagement, Competency and Confusion: Leveraging Bayesian Reasoning in Educational Systems — *Eric Horvitz, Microsoft*
- Discussants: *Brian Junker, Carnegie Mellon University; Alan Lesgold, University of Pittsburgh*

The “Three W’s” Meet the “Three R’s”: Computer-Based Testing in the Schools —Why, What, and How

Organizer & Moderator: Randy Bennett, ETS

- Creating a Computerized World Class Test — *Diane Shorrocks-Taylor, University of Leeds*
- Using New Technology in NAEP: The NAEP Technology Based Assessment Studies — *Randy Bennett, ETS*
- On-Line Student Assessment: A State Perspective – *Wayne Neuburger, Oregon Department of Education*
- On-Line Standards Based Instruction to Guide Assessment – *Timothy Vansickle, Riverside Publishing*
- Discussant: *Eva Baker, UCLA/CRESST*

Important Topics in K–12 Large-Scale Assessment: A Measurement and Policy Perspective on Each

Organizer & Moderator: Gary A. Schaeffer, CTB/McGraw Hill

- Field Test and Operational Test Design Issues — *Marc W. Julian, CTB/McGraw Hill; Shu Jing Yen, Maryland State Department of Education*
- Scoring and Scaling Open-Ended Items — *James E. Carlson, NAGB; Peggy G. Carr, National Center for Educational Statistics*
- Standardization and Accommodation in Student Testing — *Richard J. Patz, CTB/McGraw Hill; Martha L. Thurlow, National Center on Educational Outcomes*
- High-Stakes Testing and Legal Considerations – *S. E. Phillips, Consultant; Robert C. Sykes, CTB/McGraw Hill*

Meet the Press

Organizer & Moderator, Gene Maeroff, Columbia University

- *Matthew Franck, St. Louis Post-Dispatch*
- *Martha Groves, Los Angeles Times*
- *Eric Hubler, Denver Post*
- *Mike Jackson, Dallas Morning News*
- NCME members will have an opportunity to speak with education reporters from major newspapers on issues related to reporting on measurement issues.

HIGHLIGHTED SESSIONS

Automated Essay Graders: Performance Assessment in the New Millennium

Organizer & Moderator: Mark D. Shermis, IUPUI Testing Center

- Progress in E-rater scoring: New Methods Toward Scoring and Essay-Based Feedback — *Jill Burstein, ETS Technologies*
- Automatic Scoring and Annotation of Essays with the Intelligent Essay Assessor – *Darrell Latham, Knowledge Analysis Technologies*
- Project Essay Grade (PEG) — *Ellis B. Page, TruJudge, Inc.*
- IntelliMetric™: Technical Characteristics and Selected Study Results – *Scott Elliot, Vantage Technologies, Inc.*
- Discussants: *Pamela Moss, University of Michigan; & John Fremer, ETS*

NCME FITNESS RUN/WALK

Co-Directors: Ronald A Berk, Johns Hopkins University, Jon Atherton, AA Sports, Ltd.

Run or walk a 5K/2.5K course in scenic Myrtle Edwards Park. PREREGISTRATION IS REQUIRED. Meet in the Lobby of the Sheraton at 5:50 a.m. Buses will leave promptly at 6:00 a.m. for the Park. The last bus will return to the Sheraton by 7:30 a.m. Commemorative T-shirts and canvass bags will be given to all participants.

SELECTED PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS, *continued*

Increasing the Usefulness of Achievement Test Scores

Organizer: Judith A. Koenig, National Research Council; Moderator: Pasquale J. DeVito, National Research Council

- Increasing the Usefulness of NAEP Data — *Mary Lyn Bourque, National Assessment Governing Board*
- Studies to Improve the way State and National Test Scores are Reported — *Ronald K. Hambleton, April Zenisky, University of Massachusetts, Amherst*
- Reporting District-Level NAEP Data — *LeAnn Gamache, Littleton Public Schools*
- Designing a Market Basket for NAEP — *Mark D. Reckase, Michigan State University*
- Discussants: *John Poggio, University of Kansas; Joseph O'Reilly, Mesa (AR) Public Schools*

On-the-Fly Generative Adaptive Assessment of Quantitative Reasoning: Content, Psychometric, and Technological Perspectives

Organizer & Moderator: Isaac I. Bejar

- Item Models as an Approach to Capture Content Expertise — *Mary E. Morley, ETS*
- A System for On-The-Fly Adaptive Testing — *Michael E. Wagner, ETS*
- A Monte Carlo Study of the Feasibility of the On-the-Fly Assessment — *Javier Revuelta, Isaac I. Bejar, Martha Stocking, ETS*
- Isomorphism as a Criterion for Evaluation Item Models Taking Response Time into Consideration: A Generalizability Approach — *Christopher W. T. Chiu, University of Pittsburgh; Isaac I. Bejar, ETS*
- An Empirical Study of the Equivalence of Operational and Generative GRE Quantitative Scores — *Isaac I. Bejar, Rene R. Lawless, ETS*
- Discussants: *Michael Kolen, University of Iowa; Harry O'Neil, University of Southern California*

Testing Accommodations: Raising a White Flag or Waving a Checkered One?

Organizer & Moderator: Gregory J. Cizek, UNC-Chapel Hill

- Presenters: *Kurt F. Geisinger, LeMoyne College; Diana Pullin, Boston College; Rina Sjolund, ACT; Gerald Tindal, University of Oregon*
- Audience Survey Coordinator: *Douglas Becker, Riverside Publishing*

SEATTLE — THE EMERALD CITY

DUNCAN MACQUARRIE, Tacoma Public Schools

Seattle is known for rain, Pike Place Public Market, the Space Needle, salmon, and sports teams. But you also can look forward to eating out in Seattle. Just how much salmon and Dungeness crab can you eat in a week? Quite a lot actually, and there other fine choices.

Before describing restaurants, here are a couple of suggestions for other destinations. No visit to Seattle is complete without a trip to the **Pike Place Public Market**, if only to watch the “salmon throwing show.” For a quick escape from the maddening AERA/NCME crowd, take in the **Seattle Center**, site of the 1962 World’s Fair. The Center is reached by way of the Monorail Train that runs from the Westlake Center. Prime attractions at the Center include the **Pacific Northwest Science Center, Seattle Repertory and Intiman Theaters**, and Paul Allan’s (co-founder of Microsoft) **Experience Music Project (EMP)**. The EMP is an extravagant multimedia (what else) and hands-on “rock-and-roll” museum. You will actually pass through the structure as the monorail enters the Center. The Seattle Center is also home for the NBA Sonics, and they have games on Sunday, April 8 and Wednesday, April 11. (The Mariners are out of town during the conference.) There is no finer view of the city, lakes, Puget Sound, and Olympic and Cascade mountains than from the top of the *Space Needle*. Also, note that the restaurant at the Needle is recommended below.

The following restaurant recommendations come from colleagues who are regular visitors to Seattle eateries. The *Seattle Times* also has an extensive list of restaurants on their website (www.seattletimes.com) under Arts and Entertainment and Datebook. A search for “City of Seattle, Downtown/Belltown/Waterfront, and Dinner” returned 155 entries, many included reviews. The restaurants described in the following guide are generally within 15 blocks of the convention site. Some will be a 10–20 minute cab ride, indicated below with an asterisk (*). Most require reservations.



SEATTLE DINING GUIDE

Andaluca	NW Seafood – Mediterranean Influence; next to Oliver’s Bar in Mayflower Hotel. Voted best martini in town.	407 Olive Way (4 th and Olive)	382-6999	\$\$
*Anthony’s Pier 66 (upstairs)	Local fish house chain, fine reputation, great Elliott Bay view	2201 Alaskan Way	448-6688	\$\$\$
Avenue One	French	1921 1 st Avenue	441-6139	\$\$
Belltown Pub	Pub	2322 1 st Avenue	728-4311	\$
Brasa	Mediterranean	2107 3 rd Avenue	728-4220	\$\$\$
Café Campange	French country — bistro atmosphere	1600 Post Alley (in Public Market)	728-2233	\$\$
*Café Hue	Vietnamese — spring rolls are the best in town	312 2 nd Ave S. (Pioneer Square)	625-9833	\$
Campange	French country – more upscale than above – “Food is simply GREAT”	86 Pine Street (In Public Market)	728-2800	\$\$\$
*China Gate	Chinese (International District)	516 7 th Avenue S.	624-1730	\$\$
Dahlia Lounge	NW seafood — not to be missed	2001 4 th Avenue	682-4142	\$\$-\$\$\$
El Gaucho	Steak place	2505 1 st Avenue	728-1337	\$\$\$
*Elliott’s Oyster House	Seafood on the waterfront	1201 Alaskan Way, Pier 56	623-4340	\$\$-\$\$\$
Fandangos	Latin American	2313 1 st Avenue	441-1188	\$\$
Flying Fish	Seafood – outstanding, innovative	2234 1 st Avenue	728-8595	\$\$\$
*Four Seas	Chinese (International District)	714 S. King Street	682-4900	\$\$
*House of Hong	Chinese (International District)	409 8 th Avenue S.	622-7997	\$\$
Icon Grill	American	1933 5 th Avenue	441-6330	\$\$
Jazz Alley	Dinner club, top jazz venue for the big names; it’s the music, not the food; cover charge \$18–\$20	2033 6 th Avenue	441-9729	\$\$\$
Le Pichet	French	1933 1 st Avenue	256-1499	\$\$
Leo Melina Ristorante	Italian, seafood focus	96 Union Street (adjacent to Pike Place Market)	623-3783	\$\$\$
Maximiliens-In-The-Market	French	81 Pine Street #A (in Pike Place Market)	682-7270	\$\$
McCormick & Schmick’s	Seafood and meats	1103 1 st Avenue	623-5500	\$\$
Metropolitan Grill	Steak place, favorite of Seattle’s professional athletes	820 2 nd Avenue	624-3287	\$\$\$
Mistral	French	113 Blanchard Street	770-7799	\$\$\$
Morton’s of Chicago	Steak place	1511 6 th Avenue	223-0550	\$\$\$
*New Orleans Restaurant	Southern; food is fine, local jazz is great	114 1 st Avenue S. (Pioneer Square district)	622-2563	\$\$
Nikko	Japanese, more upscale	1900 5 th Avenue (in the Westin Hotel)	322-4641	\$\$\$-\$\$\$
Palace Kitchen	American, European	2030 5 th Avenue	448-2001	\$\$
*Palisade	NW Seafood – great view back towards Seattle skyline	2601 W. Marina Place (Elliott Bay Marina)	285-1000	\$\$\$
*Ponti Seafood Grill	Wonderful Italian/Thai fusion with local fish; on inter-bay canal	3014 3 rd Avenue North	284-3000	\$\$\$
Queen City Grill	NW Seafood	2201 1 st Avenue	443-0975	\$\$-\$\$\$
*Ray’s Boathouse	NW Seafood on Puget Sound at the Shilshole Marina; great views	6049 Seaview Avenue NW (in the Ballard district)	789-3770	\$\$\$
*Rovers	French, “Absolutely topnotch with an international reputation.”	2808 E. Madison	325-7442	\$\$\$
*Sea Garden	Chinese (International District)	509 7 th Ave. S	623-2100	\$\$
*Shanghai Garden	Chinese (International District)	524 6 th Avenue S.	625-1689	\$\$
Shiro	Japanese, sushi	2401 2 nd Avenue	443-9844	\$\$-\$\$\$
*SkyCity	NW-inspired menu, recently remodeled; view you can’t beat, meals better than you would expect	Space Needle, Seattle Center (take the monorail from Westlake Center)	905-2100	\$\$\$
*Tsukushinbo	Japanese (International District)	515 S. Main Street	467-4004	\$\$
Tula’s	Mediterranean, local jazz venue; \$5–10 cover	2214 2 nd Avenue	443-4221	\$\$
Tulio’s	Italian	1100 5 th Avenue	624-5500	\$\$\$
Union Square Grill	Steak place	621 Union Street	224-4321	\$\$\$
*Waterfront	Seafood, on the waterfront	2801 Alaskan Way, Pier 70	956-9171	\$\$\$
Wild Ginger	Asian and Satay bar; a favorite for many of us locals, and if you like a martini, try their “Ginger Martini.”	1401 3 rd Avenue (3 rd & Union)	623-4450	\$\$
*Yoshinobo	Japanese (International District)	520 S. Jackson Street	405-4646	\$\$
Zoe’s	Mediterranean-NW	2 nd & Blanchard	256-2060	\$\$

REPORT OF THE NCME AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SOFTWARE ISSUES IN EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT

Bradley A. Hanson

The NCME Ad Hoc Committee on Software Issues in Educational Measurement was appointed in July of 1999 by Michael Kolen. The members of the committee were Robert Brennan, Jim Carlson, Joe Crick, Brad Hanson (Chair), Eiji Muraki, and Cynthia Parshall. The charge of the committee was to recommend steps that could be taken by NCME to facilitate the availability of information about specialized software used in educational measurement, and the dissemination of such software. The full committee charge, including specific duties of the committee, is available on the committee web page at <http://www.b-a-h.com/ncmesoft/>.

The committee issued a draft report in March of 2000. A session at the 2000 NCME Annual Meeting was devoted to presenting the draft report and obtaining feedback from NCME members. The final committee report was issued in June of 2000 to the NCME Board of Directors for their consideration. A summary of the conclusions and recommendations presented in the committee report are given below. The full report is available on the committee web page.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

1. When a fee is involved in obtaining a license to use a piece of software, the authors or distributors of the software should be encouraged to make a discount available to students.
2. Software can be distributed in a proprietary or non-proprietary manner. In either case, the algorithms used by the software may be proprietary or nonproprietary. Research in educational measurement is best facilitated by the use of software distributed in a nonproprietary manner. Practice in educational measurement is best facilitated by the use of software with nonproprietary algorithms, regardless of whether the software is distributed in a proprietary or nonproprietary fashion.
3. If results reported in an article published in an NCME journal are based on proprietary software, then the article should contain sufficient information and references to allow readers to fully understand the algorithms used by the software.
4. Documentation should be included with all software. The documentation should clearly describe how to use the software and the meaning of the results produced by the software.
5. Documentation of the algorithms provided with the program, along with references in the documentation to other publicly available information, should describe the algorithms in enough detail that it would be feasible for an independent party to exactly replicate the functionality of the software. At a minimum, the documentation should contain general information about the algorithms used, and the authors of the software should be responsive to inquiries from users requesting more detail about the algorithms.

6. The NCME Board should consider the development of an area on the NCME website where supplemental material, such as data sets, software, color figures, video clips, etc., referenced in NCME journal articles, is made available.
7. Articles published in NCME journals should make clear what software was used to perform the analyses reported in the article, and provide a reference to that software. If the software is available on the web (e.g., freeware or shareware), the URL at which the software can be obtained should be provided.
8. Ways NCME could facilitate the availability of information about, and dissemination of, specialized software in educational measurement are: (1) a software exchange, (2) software reviews, and (3) reference data sets. A first step NCME could take in facilitating the availability of information about software would be to consider developing a software exchange section on the NCME website.

SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONS BASED ON THE REPORT OF THE NCME AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SOFTWARE ISSUES IN EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT

Michael J. Kolen, Immediate Past-President

Rebecca Zwick of the NCME Publications Committee, chaired by David Frisbie, led a review of the report of the NCME Ad Hoc Committee on Software Issues in Educational Measurement. As a result, the Publications Committee made recommendations to the NCME Board. The Publications Committee's recommendations were organized differently from those made by the Software Issues Committee. The recommendations that were adopted by the NCME Board at its December 2000 meeting are summarized below:

1. The NCME website will be used for posting of supplementary materials (e.g., software, reference data sets, graphs, and tables) associated with journal articles. Specific procedures for doing so will be worked out by the Publications Committee and the website editor.
2. NCME editorial policies will be modified to state that authors of articles should provide an adequate description of the computational procedures used by statistical software used in the article. Specific language will be developed by the Publications Committee.
3. NCME will develop a software resource for psychometric software on its website that provides a list with links to developers' software websites. The prototype website <http://www.b-a-h.com/ncmesoft/>, developed by the Ad Hoc Committee, will be used as the basis for developing this resource. Specific procedures will be worked out by the Publications Committee and the website editor.

I thank all of the members of the NCME Ad Hoc Committee on Software Issues in Educational Measurement for providing the Board with an excellent report. I also thank the NCME Publications Committee for making useful recommendations to the NCME Board for implementation of many of the ideas suggested by the Ad Hoc Committee.

ON THE WEB

Lawrence Rudner, ERIC

During his first week in office, President Bush issued his education plan, *No Child Left Behind*, which has major assessment components. You can read the full text of the President's proposal and track its progress at The House of Representatives Education and Workforce Committee website: <http://edworkforce.house.gov/>.

The U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights published *The Use of Tests as Part of High-Stakes Decision-Making for Students: A Resource Guide for Educators and Policy-Makers*. This guide provides information about the professional standards relating to the use of tests for high-stakes purposes, the relevant federal laws that apply to such practices, and references that can help shape educationally sound and legally appropriate practices.

See <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OCR/testing/>.

The U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration recently published *Testing and Assessment — An Employer's Guide to Good Practices*. It provides a good overview on test development and utilization standards. See the Uniform Guidelines website and click on *Testing and Assessment*: <http://www.uniformguidelines.com/>.

INTERACTIVE PANEL ANNOUNCEMENT

The NCME Recruitment of Educational Measurement Specialists Committee is sponsoring an interactive panel discussion "Strategies for Increasing and Diversifying the Educational Measurement Community" at the 2001 annual meeting. The NCME Minority Issues Committee cosponsors the session. The Committees would like to get your input in advance of the session. We are asking all NCME members to respond to the following three questions:

1. How can we make the public and potential colleagues (particularly undergraduates) more aware of our profession?
2. How can we recruit people of color into the profession?
3. What suggestions do you have for recruiting new professionals into our field?

Please send your responses to Stephen G. Sireci at <mailto:sireci@acad.umass.edu>. A report of all submitted responses will be distributed at the session. All responses will be confidential. Thank you for helping us in our recruitment efforts!

See you in Seattle!

