



FROM THE PRESIDENT

Gregory J. Cizek, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Dear Colleagues:

As most members know, the revision of the AERA/APA/NCME *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* is in its final stages. The NCME Standards and Test Use Committee (STUC, chaired by Randy Penfield, rdpenfie@uncg.edu) has worked diligently to review a final draft of the revised *Standards*. That committee conducted a comprehensive review of all changes to the previous draft that were recommended to the Joint Committee to ensure that NCME's concerns were addressed. In addition, the committee produced a set of endorsement recommendations that the full board will review at the upcoming Board of Directors meeting at the end of January. A final board vote on endorsement of the new *Standards* will occur at the April 2013 board meeting. Speaking of which...



It's remarkable that the 2013 annual meeting is now right around the corner. All proposals have been evaluated, acceptance/rejection letters have been sent, and final contacts are being made to arrange for session chairs and discussants. I'd first like to thank the 2013 Annual Meeting Program Chairs, Kimberly O'Malley (kimberly.omalley@pearson.com) and Elaine Rodeck (erodeck@mcc.ca), for putting together an outstanding program. I'd also like to thank all of the members of NCME who prepared and submitted proposals, and to those who gave so generously of their time reviewing and evaluating the proposals. The program is better for the broad participation that our annual meeting enjoys.

In the remainder of this column, I'd like to feature two other aspects of the annual meeting.

First, the training and professional development aspect of the annual meeting is sometimes overlooked. This year, Training and Professional Development co-chairs Leslie Keng (leslie.keng@pearson.com) and Ye Tong (ye.tong@pearson.com) have developed an exceptional slate of professional development opportunities, including some innovative session formats.

Overall, 28 proposals were submitted for training or professional development sessions. A total of 19 (68%) sessions were accepted; eight of the sessions that were well received last year were chosen for presentation again in 2013. The sessions will be held at the beginning of the annual meeting, on Friday (April 26th) and Saturday (April 27th).

I'd like to make special mention of three innovative sessions that are likely to be of great interest. First is a session entitled, *NCME's Got Talent! How to Write, Present, and Tweet Like a Star*. This session will help participants with a responsibility that, I believe, all NCME members must assume: public dissemination of our good work. This session will help participants develop a comprehensive plan for communicating their measurement-related work through presentations, publications, social media, and working with reporters.

A second session I'd like to highlight is a new idea for helping those of us who are specialists to broaden our knowledge of other areas, or those of us who are generalists who just want to catch up on current developments in testing. This session, tentatively titled, *Crash Course in Hot Psychometric Topics*, will provide an amped-up, "Cliff's Notes" professional development to four selected, contemporary areas in testing: Performance Assessment, Automated Scoring, College and Career Readiness, and Growth and Value Added Modeling. Experts in these four areas will be providing high-level information, direction, and research summaries on these topics.

Third, graphical displays of information are—I believe—underutilized in contemporary assessment. To address that concern and to stimulate new ideas for how best to visually communicate important results is a session entitled, *Using Visual Displays to Inform Assessment Design and Development*.

Of course, the three sessions just mentioned are only a small sampling from a broad slate of outstanding professional development opportunities. A list of descriptive titles for the other sessions follows:

- * A Unified Introduction to Item Response Theory and Structural Equation Modeling
- * An Overview of Psychometric Work at Testing Organizations
 - * Multidimensional Item Response Theory: Theory and Applications Using BMIRT, LinkMIRT, and SimuMIRT Software
 - * Language in Assessment—Approaches for Distinguishing Between and Addressing Construct- Irrelevant and Construct-Relevant Language
- * IRT-Based Test Linking in R
- * Diagnostic Measurement: Theory, Methods, and Applications
- * Generalizability Theory and Applications
- * Vertical Scaling Methodologies, Applications, and Research
- * Setting Cut Scores on 21st Century Tests
- * Bayesian Networks in Educational Assessment
- * Advice for Graduate Students: Making the Most of Grad School, Obtaining a Job, and Starting a Career
 - * Introduction to the Multidimensional Adaptive Testing Environment: Test Specification, Simulation Studies, and Operational Testing
- * A Practitioner's Guide to Growth Models
- * An Introduction to the Measurement and Analysis of Video Game Interaction Data
- * Item Response Theory Linking and Equating with jMetrik
- * Applications of Evidence-centered Design (ECD) in Large-scale Assessment

Finally, I'd like to again remind all members that the 2013 annual meeting will be an occasion for commemorating NCME's 75th anniversary. A number of special events, sessions, and a gala evening celebration are planned that will surely make for a memorable conference. As always, it will be a special time to renew existing friendships and to make new connections and develop new relationships. I look forward to seeing you in San Francisco.....G>

GRADUATE STUDENT CORNER: BUILDING PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS FOR 2013 AND BEYOND

Jerome Clauser, University of Massachusetts - Amherst

As the 2012 calendar year draws to a close, it is a good time for graduate students to give some thought to their academic new year's resolutions. Many graduate students define success in terms of course grades, conference presentations, and journal publications. Although this approach is quite reasonable, not all measures of academic success are so quantifiable. As the new year approaches, it is an ideal time to reflect on how your professional relationships will help you achieve both your academic and long-term career goals. Many of the most successful members of our field can point to specific mentors who have shared in their success. These sorts of professional relationships are not only mutually beneficial but may be the most enduring experience from your academic career.



Students and Faculty

Most graduate students' first professional relationships will be with the faculty and other students at their university. Although these relationships have the potential to be extremely rewarding, at times they can be difficult to develop. I have found that it is often appropriate to take a proactive role in engaging with professors and the broader academic community. Soliciting advice from a faculty member can be intimidating, but these interactions can be made easier by preparing in advance. Before approaching a faculty member for the first time, consider familiarizing yourself with his or her research interests and publications. Graduate school is the ideal time to explore a wide array of research topics, so be open to working with diverse faculty members and developing new research interests. After meeting with members of your faculty you may discover that each of them has interests you find compelling. These shared research interests often serve as the cornerstone of productive academic relationships.

Although it is reasonable for graduate students to focus on their relationships with faculty members, this attention should not come at the expense of developing lasting relationships with other graduate students. Developing trusting and respectful relationships with your peers can enrich your own academic development because students collaborate on research and at times challenge each other to submit more of their research to conferences and journals. Although these relationships can be extremely rewarding, it is often difficult for students to find time away from class to interact and work together. One way my

colleagues and I have engaged outside of class is through a reading or research group in which students read a journal article and meet to discuss how it applies to their own research. These meetings are an excellent way to find shared interests and to begin collaborating across students. Relationships with your peers are not only rewarding during your time in school, but can develop into lasting productive research relationships as you transition from classmates to colleagues.

Employers and Colleagues

As graduate students work towards completing their dissertations and begin to search for jobs it is often tempting to imagine that this transition marks the completion of their education. Although it is true that this may represent the end of formal schooling, this transition can more properly be viewed as the beginning of your scholarly development. Therefore, graduate students who aspire to contribute original research to the field must consider what sorts of professional contacts will be available to them upon completing school. When evaluating job offers, consider who would be your colleagues and supervisors. These people will be your primary source for research partnerships and mentorship upon leaving school and can be extremely influential in your scholarly development. This does not mean that it is important to seek out organizations with high-profile employees; instead, try to find organizations with employees who could be appropriate role models. Look for colleagues whose approach to thinking, writing, and presenting you truly respect. Furthermore, look at the scholarly development of other early career professionals at the organization. Considering these factors will help to ensure your continued academic growth throughout your early career.

NCME Community

Although professional relationships with colleagues at your university or testing organization can be extremely influential in your professional development, at times it may be appropriate to elicit guidance from elsewhere in the field. Many preeminent psychometric scholars routinely provide comments to researchers working in their area of interest. Although graduate students are often reluctant to reach out to established professionals, learning to submit your research to the review of honest critics is an excellent way to grow as a researcher. Established psychometricians will often identify limitations in your research that you had not previously considered. Graciously accepting critical comments and learning from this feedback is a vital skill for a developing researcher. Over the course of a long career, these sorts of relationships will continue to be important as you exchange perspectives with researchers across the field. One day you may even discover that you are serving as the mentor to the next generation of developing scholars.

As 2013 begins, consider a different kind of New Year's resolution. Take the time to thank your mentors, colleagues, and advocates who have shared in your success. Appreciate the way these relationships have helped you achieve your academic and professional goals. Finally, consider how you can develop this network of supportive scholars to ensure your continued success for 2013 and for many years to come.

On a personal note, this will be the final column in my one-year term as columnist for the Graduate Student Corner. These columns have been a joy to write, and the feedback from around the field has been overwhelming. I would like to thank my family, our editor Susan Davis-Becker, my advisor Ron Hambleton, and the rest of my colleagues and friends at UMass for their help and feedback in putting these columns together. I could not have done it without you.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE PEOPLE WHO MAKE OUR ORGANIZATION GREAT – THANOS PATELIS, THE COLLEGE BOARD

This month our member spotlight features Thanos Patelis, Vice President of Research and Analysis in the College Board's Research and Development department.

How did you get into the field?

Like many folks in our field, I was lucky enough to stumble into it. After college while at Fordham University pursuing my degree in experimental psychology, my friends in the psychometrics program (Steve Sireci, Kevin Sweeney, Matthew Schultz, Paul Rubenstein, Scott Hershberger, among others) were taking some interesting courses, talking about some very cool ideas and experiences, and got me involved. Then, I took two courses in particular from Kurt Geisinger that changed my life: Test Construction and Program Evaluation. While Kurt Geisinger was always supportive of me by even offering me my first job as a full-time instructor at Fordham University, he also inspired me to pursue psychometrics. Additionally, Warren Tryon (another faculty member at Fordham), who advised me on my master's thesis involving a quantitative approach to modeling longitudinal data, turned me on to the quantitative study of behavior. Finally, my initial dissertation mentor, Soonmook Lee, encouraged me to pursue some research in the field. So,



these experiences, friendships, and mentoring introduced me to this wonderful life of measurement and applied research that I pursue today.

If you weren't doing this, what would you do?

I love teaching and sports. So, I think I would be a coach – probably football, but it could have been in rugby and/or weightlifting. I coached my high school football team and at Fordham University while in graduate school and loved it. Because of former coaches, I've experienced a life-long, positive impact both on and off the athletic field that I think as a coach I could have done the same while having lots of fun. Alternatively, my first research study and my initial interest involved sports psychology, which could have been another option somehow for me.

What advice would you have for graduate students who want to get into this field?

Get involved in EVERYTHING that you can (related to the field) and take as many courses as you can manage. At the very least, go to regional and national conferences and make sure you attend presentations, and talk and socialize with as many people as you find. I've learned so much by having conversations with folks at conferences – in both technical and professional areas. Take advantage of your time in graduate school and take as many courses as you can. Every so often, I lament the fact that I didn't take more courses. There's nothing like the opportunity to dig deep into an area with the advice, leadership, and support of an instructor. After graduate school, you won't have the same opportunity.

When selecting these courses, in addition to methodologically oriented courses, take substantive courses involving learning theory, developmental psychology, personality theory, physiological psychology, sociology of education, economics, etc. Make sure you get good training in using analytical software, working with large data files, communicating orally, basic budgeting, and project management fundamentals.

Finally, try to get into more than one internship experience. There are many opportunities and there's nothing like getting insight into how things get done on a day-to-day basis. Try to select internships that are consistent with your interests, but also try to experience diverse settings. You will meet a lot of people and learn a lot.

What do you like to do for fun outside of work?

First, I teach. As I indicated, I love teaching and have been an adjunct continuously since I received my master's in 1987. Second, although in the last few years hampered by injuries and ineffective time management I've not done these, but I love being involved in sports and physical activities. I used to play rugby and study Aikido and whenever possible dabbled in marathons and ultra-marathons. Now, I try to practice chi kung, lift weights, ride a bike, and for the most part I am an enthusiastic sports fan. I tried to be more active in football as a statistician for about 20 years for the NY Jets and the NFL. Third, and probably the most important to me is spending time with my wife enjoying our time together and experiencing our homes in the beautiful Catskill Mountains of Windham, NY and the beaches of the Corinthian sea in Greece.

What would you say has been one of the biggest innovations in psychometrics in the last decade or two?

While there have been many new methods and approaches in psychometrics, from my perspective, one of the biggest innovations has been computers – not computer-based testing, but the analytical capacity of computers, the capacity of the digital world and their integration into psychometric methodologies. These advances have made the application of so many psychometric methods more readily and powerful. We wouldn't be considering empirical Bayes approaches, multidimensional IRT, diagnostic classification models, or structural equation modeling without the capability offered by today's computers.

Along with the analytical capacity of computers, the evolution of digital media has permitted us to develop a larger, more involved community of psychometricians, researchers, and colleagues. This is evidenced by the strength of the user community of open-source and shareable applications (e.g., R), e-journals, live webinars, and powerful search engines.

While automated scoring is an important innovation, the current digital environment permits distributed scoring to people across the world offering a great contribution to the operational constraints of today. With the increased bandwidth and speeds, the social, interactive components of scoring constructed response questions can be realized and made operational. Additionally, innovations in capturing, scoring, storing, and reporting more complex forms of responses (e.g., demonstrations, speeches, or other performances) via digital methods have been realized or can be.

When you go to conferences, how do you pick what sessions to attend?

When I started going to conferences, I went to everything literally from dusk to dawn. I went to back-to-back sessions skipping lunch trying to understand and maybe absorb what was being presented; I went to as many socials as I could to meet all the great people in our field; I tried to participate in as much of the experience as I could to learn and develop. I sure was exhausted after conferences, but I felt enlightened, inspired to work harder, and equally important established life-long friendships and colleagues.

Now, after over 20 years of conference-going, I've slowed down and select sessions based on (a) issues that I'm grappling with at work, and (b) the people presenting. I don't just select the presenters that are the most renowned, but I look for those that I have heard are good presenters or offer different points of view. I look for sessions that offer multiple/differing perspectives that may help me organize my thinking and knowledge. I always go to sessions honoring or recognizing our members. I make sure I take advantage of at least one training session, because it's so important to keep learning and refreshing skills and insights.

Finally, I go to presidential addresses, business meetings, and/or meetings related to membership. These are important. The reason I feel that it is important to go to these is not only to socialize or to even learn something, but to offer support and appreciation for our community of colleagues and leaders. I think the business meetings are where we give back to the organization in addition to learning about it.

Who has been a significant influence in your professional life?

Everyone I meet has an influence on my professional life in one way or another. This is a testament to the brilliance, generosity, and collegiality of our community. There have been a few individuals, however, that have significantly influenced my professional life. First, a group of us have become best friends over the last 25 years or so. We have come to be known as the Fordham Five – almost like the Seven Blocks of Granite. They inspired me to be and continue to grow in this field, encouraged me to continue to do quality work (as they never miss a chance to point out my flaws) and have fun along the way focusing on the important things in life. Next, Kurt Geisinger was a major factor in my being in this field and his breadth and depth of knowledge in so many areas along with his integrity inspired me to always look at things in a comprehensive, thorough, and ethical manner. Also, my boss, Wayne Camara, permitted me the opportunity to work on and explore a variety of things. There are a couple of scholars who have inspired me professionally to emulate them, although I never come close. They have influenced me not only because of their brilliance in multiple areas, but because of their ability to communicate very technical information in an understandable way to diverse audiences – Bob Brennan and Ron Hambleton. Additionally, my academic experiences and training since high school have instilled in me the value of *cura personalis*, which professionally influences me to pay attention, study, and research the whole person or context. As a result of this, Patrick Kyllonen's and Rich Roberts' work is a model for me in undertaking and translating research about the more comprehensive nature of people into useful assessment and information products. Finally, my wife – because if she wasn't cool, understanding, and supportive, I would not be involved in half of the things I do professionally.

GREETINGS FROM THE EDITOR

Susan Davis-Becker, Alpine Testing Solutions

In this issue we feature the third column from NCME president, Gregory Cizek, who highlights several of the exciting events at our upcoming annual conference. In his fourth and final graduate student column, Jerome Clauser shares insights and ideas for graduate students on building professional relationships. I want to thank Jerome for his year of contributions and service to the Newsletter and NCME – his columns have included some wonderful information for our graduate student community. Our Member Spotlight features Thanos Patelis of The College Board. This is followed by some NCME presidential trivia created by Neal Kingston – see how many you answer correctly! We have also continued our member perspectives on the future of NCME in this issue with contributions from Karla Egan and Christina Schneider. This is followed by an updated version of a previously published article featuring advice for those members who are selected to serve as discussants for the upcoming conference.

Thank you to all who contributed to this issue!

NCME PRESIDENTIAL TRIVIA

Neal Kingston, University of Kansas

In honor of NCME's 75th anniversary, I have compiled some presidential trivia. Institutional affiliations are counted at the time of presidency.

1. Which organization has had the most NCME presidents?
2. Which organization has had the second most NCME presidents? (Hint: It is a University.)
3. Other than the answer to #1, which testing company (so far) has had more than one NCME president?
4. Which university has had the second most NCME presidents?
5. Which two NCME presidents served while they were with a state department of education?
6. Which state has the most different institutions with NCME presidents?
7. Which three NCME presidents served while they were with a school district?



Answers are provided at the end of the Newsletter.

THE FUTURE OF NCME: MEMBER PERSPECTIVES, PART 3

In the past two issues of the NCME Newsletter, we have included a series featuring member perspectives on future of NCME. In this issue, we present additional perspectives from Karla Egan and Christina Schneider.

Bridging the Gap Between Educators and Educational Measurement

Karla L. Egan & M. Christina Schneider, CTB/McGraw-Hill

K–12 educators tend to regard summative assessment (and those of us who create them!) with suspicion and mistrust. I, Karla, reached this conclusion early in my professional career when my job frequently involved designing and conducting standard settings for tests that kicked off No Child Left Behind requirements within various states. The teachers with whom I worked were dedicated and passionate; yet, they did not understand the utility of the test scores in helping them gauge the instructional and curricular needs of their students. Disseminating measurement training and information to a wider audience is a central component of NCME's stated goals. In the last two issues of this newsletter, Randy Penfield (2012) and Dubravka Svetina (2012) nicely articulated the central role that our organization should take in this regard. In this essay, we want to expand on this theme and discuss the need for members of our organization to advocate for and innovate in creating accountability tests that are instructionally relevant for teachers, parents, and students. To do this, we propose that we (a) improve educator assessment literacy, (b) make standards interpretation transparent for teachers, and (c) create instructionally sensitive summative assessments (Popham, 2009). To be clear, our focus in this essay is on summative K–12 high-stakes assessments.



Educator Assessment Literacy

For over 50 years, we in educational measurement have studied (and sometimes bemoaned) K-12 teachers' lack of knowledge of assessment procedures and practices (e.g., Goslin, 1967). Even though there appears to be a burgeoning amount of professional development for teachers in assessment literacy (Popham, 2009), schools and districts rarely hold sacred the 40–79 hours of professional development time necessary for teachers to change their current practices (Supovitz & Turner, 2000). As an organization, NCME can play a central role in improving assessment literacy among teachers by producing *engaging, free*, on-demand webinars focused at K-12 teachers. We can work with teacher organizations to redevelop the *Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students* (AFT, NCME, & NEA, 1990; see Brookhart [2011] for an excellent start in redrafting these standards) and work with state agencies of higher education to adopt the new standards. Finally, it seems fair that we in educational measurement give the same attention to our own knowledge of curriculum and instruction as we ask teachers to give to assessment literacy. Perhaps if our own professional development and our own coursework included time examining curriculum and instruction from the perspective of educators, it would improve our ability to assist teachers in utilizing test results.

Interpretation of Standards

The interpretation of the state content standards plays a central role in how test content is developed on any large-scale K–12 assessment. Anyone who has conducted (or even reviewed) an alignment study knows that people interpret these content standards differently. A central interpretation of each standard is lacking. Some states, such as South Carolina, have carefully documented how each standard should be interpreted and assessed so that what is taught and measured in the classroom is consistent with what and how content is measured on the summative assessment. (See http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/se/Teacher-Effectiveness/Standards-and-Curriculum/Social_Studies.cfm.) As an organization, we could encourage the Smarter Balanced and PARCC testing consortiums to build support documents that make explicit what the targets of instruction and measurement are in regard to the Common Core State Standards.

Instructionally Sensitive Summative Assessments

Finally, state-level summative assessments are often used for evaluative purposes. As an organization, our focus is often on the use (and misuse) of test results for student, teacher, school, and/or district accountability. This focus must continue, especially as accountability systems continue to rely more and more on test scores. In addition, we should pay equal attention to the instructional sensitivity of our summative assessment (Popham, 2009). Developers of summative assessment must continue their focus on the alignment of items to standards and create items that more closely mirror instructional best practices. This will also mean creating dynamic, instructionally supportive score reports that have additional web-based resources for teachers and parents. It is our hope that these types of reports will help educators as they try to make sense of test results.

As we move into the next 75 years of NCME, we hope that we can bridge the divide between classroom educators and those of us in educational measurement. In the end, we all want the same thing: improved instruction and education for students.

References

- Brookhart, S. (2011). Educational assessment knowledge and skills for teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 30(1), 3-12.
- Goslin, D. A. (1967). *Teachers and testing*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Penfield, R. (2012). Extending our impact: Innovative dissemination for a broader audience. *NCME Newsletter*, 20(2), 11-12.
- Popham, J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory into Practice*, 48, 4-11.
- Supovitz, J., & Turner, H. M. (2000). The effects of professional development on science teaching practices and classroom culture. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37(9), 963-980.
- Svetina, D. (2012). The future of NCME: The role of the professional organization. *NCME Newsletter*, 20(3), 10-11.

HOW TO BE A DISCUSSANT

Samuel A. Livingston, *Educational Testing Service*

The original version of this article was published in the 1999 NCME Newsletter.

It's March 1st. You've agreed to be the discussant at an AERA session and, lo and behold, all the papers have arrived on time. It's time to begin planning your discussion, and the big question going through your mind is, "What can I possibly say or do in my allotted twelve minutes that will make the audience glad they stayed to hear me?"

The usual answer to this question is that you should relate the presentations to each other – find the "common thread". The problem with this advice is that, too often, either (1) there is no common thread, because the presentations are not meaningfully related to each other, or (2) the relationship between the presentations is so obvious that nobody in the audience who stayed awake could possibly miss it.

Let's face it; you are probably going to spend most of your time discussing the presentations individually. So now you ask yourself, for each individual paper, "What can I possibly say that will enhance the audience's understanding and appreciation of this presentation?" Here are some things you may be able to do:



You can call the audience's attention to points in the paper that you think are especially important or especially interesting. Explain why you think so. If the author leaves one of these points out of the oral presentation, you can refer to it as having been in the written paper.

You may be able to draw on your own knowledge or experience to provide additional illustrations or examples of points made or issues raised in the presentation. You may have encountered similar problems in your own work, or discussed similar issues with a colleague. Give the audience the benefit of your experience. It's OK to indulge in a bit of storytelling ("This reminds me of something that happened ..."). Just be sure the story has a relevant point, and tell it concisely.

You may have done, read, or heard about some research that either agrees or disagrees with the presenter's findings. Tell the audience about it. If the results were different from the presenter's results, speculate as to the reasons for the difference.

You may be able to think of alternative ways to display the presenter's results. Graphical displays are especially effective. Many presenters don't use graphs, and some presenters use them but do a poor job of it. Make your own graph from the data in the presenter's tables, put it in a PowerPoint slide, and show it to the audience. Sometimes an alternative presentation reinforces the presenter's conclusion. Sometimes it implies a different conclusion. Either way, it enhances the audience's understanding.

You may be able to think of a simple but effective analysis of the presenter's data that the presenter did not include. Do the alternative analysis and present the results. (If the data you need aren't in the paper, it's perfectly OK to contact the presenter and ask for them.) In your discussion, explain what your analysis showed and how those results agreed or disagreed with the results of the presenter's analysis.

You may be able to think of an alternative explanation or interpretation of the presenter's findings – one that the presenter either did not mention or glossed quickly over. The findings may be attributable to the presenter's choice of a measuring instrument or to some feature of the experimental design or the data analysis. There may be something unusual about the particular sample of students or test questions that the presenter used. There may be some theoretical point of view that provides a different way of looking at the results. Or you may know something about the topic that the presenter did not take into account in interpreting the results.

Sometimes a paper does not include a clear explanation of some technical point that is necessary for the audience to understand the presentation fully. For example, presenters sometimes neglect to explain their reasons for designing a study in a particular way. Often, they neglect to explain the assumptions underlying their data analysis procedures. The presenter may have assumed too much knowledge on the part of the audience, or may have been unwilling to take the time, or may have attempted an explanation and done a poor job of it. Whatever the reason, you can provide the clear, concise explanation that the presenter did not. If a technical point is not explained in the written paper, it will probably not be explained in the oral presentation. If the point is explained poorly in the written paper, it will probably be explained poorly (or not at all) in the oral presentation.

It is possible that one of the papers you are going to discuss will include a procedure that you believe to be incorrect, and that the choice of this procedure made a difference in the presenter's results or conclusions. In this case, you should explain why you believe the procedure is incorrect and why it matters. Don't turn your discussion into an exercise in fault-finding. But if you believe that an analysis is invalid or that a conclusion is unjustified, you should say so.

What if you do not receive all of the papers on time? Can you prepare to discuss a paper you have not received? Of course, you have no obligation to discuss a paper that is not submitted on time. However, if the paper is on a subject you know something about, you may be able to discuss it without having the opportunity to read it in advance. Here's how. Imagine that you were going to write a paper on the same topic. If the paper describes a research study, imagine that you were going to design and conduct a study to investigate the same research question. Now list the points that you would be sure to include in the paper you would write. If the paper describes a research study, list the most important features of the research study you would conduct and what conclusions you would draw from the different results you might observe. Take this list with you to the NCME session and keep it in front of you while the presenter is speaking. Each time the presenter makes a point that is on your list, write "Yes" next to that point. When you discuss the paper, begin by calling the audience's attention to these points and explaining why they are important. ("I want to emphasize one or two points that the speaker made ...") Then move on to the points on your list that the presenter did not mention, and explain why they are important. ("But I was disappointed that the speaker said nothing about ...")

You should, of course, begin your discussion by thanking the presenters for getting their papers to you on time. If you received all the papers on time, you can just express your thanks to all of the presenters. If you received some papers on time but not others, make sure to mention by name each presenter who got the paper to you on time, pointedly omitting those who did not.

Once you have made your speaker's notes and your transparencies (if any), practice giving your discussion to an empty room, with no audience except your wristwatch. If your discussion takes too long (as it probably will), don't try to talk faster. Instead, start making cuts. It's better to say a few things well than to say many things poorly. Keep on practicing, timing, and cutting, until you have a discussion that you can give smoothly and comfortably in the time allowed. If you find that you can say everything you want to say without using all your allotted time, don't worry about trying to fill the time. It's not likely that the audience will be annoyed with you for giving too short a talk.

OTHER CONFERENCES OF INTEREST

Big Issues in Testing: Improving Admissions and Learning in Higher Education

The Buros Center for Testing is proud to celebrate UNL's addition to the Big 10 conference by sponsoring a conference on testing issues in higher education, March 28-29, 2013. The conference will highlight research and insights regarding the current state of admissions and learning assessment at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Issues to be discussed include the extent to which testing and assessment produces desired result or effect, influence of the context in which assessment occurs, implications for special and minority populations, lessons higher education can learn from K-12 assessment for accountability, and challenges to thinking about in the future of testing and assessment for admissions and learning. For more information, please visit the conference web site: <http://buros.org/big-issues-testing>

NCME PRESIDENTIAL TRIVIA - ANSWERS

1. Which organization has had the most NCME presidents?	ETS with 7. 2011-12, Linda Cook , Educational Testing Service 2007-08, Anne Fitzpatrick , Educational Testing Service 2006-07, Daniel Eignor , Educational Testing Service 2000-01, John Fremer , Educational Testing Service 1957-58, Robert L. Ebel , Educational Testing Service 1953-54, Warren G. Findley , Educational Testing Service 1952-53, J. R. Gerberich , Educational Testing Service
2. Which organization has had the second most NCME presidents? (Hint: It is a University.)	Michigan State with 6. 2008-09, Mark Reckase , Michigan State University 1988-89, Irvin J. Lehmann , Michigan State University 1985-86, William A. Mehrens , Michigan State University 1973-74, Willard G. Warrington , Michigan State University 1961-62, Paul L. Dressel , Michigan State University 1958-59, Victor H. Noll , Michigan State University
3. Other than the answer to #1, which testing company (so far) has had more than one NCME president?	Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich had 2. 1980-81, Roger T. Lennon , Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich 1975-76, Thomas J. Fitzgibbon , Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich
4. Which university has had the second most NCME presidents?	University of Iowa with 5. 2004-05, David Frisbie , University of Iowa 2001-02, H.D. Hoover , University of Iowa 1999-00, Michael Kolen , University of Iowa 1996-97, Robert L. Brennan , University of Iowa 1972-73, William E. Coffman , University of Iowa
5. Which two NCME presidents served while they were with a state department of education?	1990-91, Dale C. Carlson , California Department of Education 1948-49, Ray G. Woods , Ohio Department of Education
6. Which state has the most different institutions with NCME presidents?	No state comes close to New York with 8 institutions. 1949-50, Jacob S. Orleans , City College of New York 2010-11, Wayne Camara , College Board 1979-80, Jason Millman , Cornell University 1959-60, Arthur E. Traxler , Educational Records Bureau 1980-81, Roger T. Lennon , Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich

1975-76, **Thomas J. Fitzgibbon**, Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich
1938-40, **Earl Bennet South**, New York State College-Albany
1987-88, **Carol Kehr Tittle**, Queens College New York
1977-78, **Eric F. Gardner**, Syracuse University

7. Which three NCME presidents served while they were with a school district?
1976-77, **Joan Bollenbacher**, Cincinnati Public Schools
1960-61, **Max D. Engelhardt**, Chicago Public Schools
1967-68, **Howard A. Bowman**, Los Angeles Public Schools

To get the NCME Newsletter four times a year (March, June, September, and December) go to
<http://ncme.org/publications/newsletter/>

Newsletter Advisory Board

LANIE BRADSHAW, James Madison University
JEROME CLAUSER, University of Massachusetts – Amherst (Grad Student Rep)
JOHN DENBLEYKER, Minnesota Department of Education
ELLEN FORTE, edCount
JOANNA GORIN, Arizona State University
SARA HENNINGS, MetaMetrics, Inc.
JOAN HERMAN, CRESST/UCLA

ANDREW HO, Harvard Graduate School of Education
THEL KOCHER, Walden University
GERRY MELICAN, The College Board
THANOS PATELIS, The College Board
S.E. PHILLIPS, Consultant
CHRISTINA SCHNEIDER, CTB
XIAN (BO) WANG, The College Board

SUSAN DAVIS-BECKER, Editor, Alpine Testing Solutions
Send articles or information for this newsletter to:

Susan Davis-Becker
Alpine Testing Solutions
6120 Loma Circle
Lincoln, NE 68516

Phone: 402-483-5898
e-mail: susan.davisbecker@alpinetesting.com

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.