NCME national council on measurement in education

VOLUME 21, NUMBER 2 NEWSLETTER June 2013

FROM THE PRESIDENT

Wim J. van der Linden, CTB/McGraw-Hill

Let me begin with thanking our leaving officers and Board members for having kept NCME in such a good shape during their terms. We will miss Linda Cook for her wisdom, but keep profiting from it through her continued contributions to NCME as a member of several of our committees. It is heartwarming to have such generous colleagues. We are grateful to Greg Cizek for the leadership during his presidency, including his many contributions to the momentous celebration of our 75th anniversary in San Francisco. Although he now has some time left to return to his most favorite hobby (figure skating), he will keep serving as our current Past President. Deb Harris has left the Board of Directors, but will remain active as a member of the Fund Development Committee and through her contributions to one of our new initiatives (see below). Bruno Zumbo's term as a Board member has also ended. Our future meetings will definitively be duller without his keen contributions and sense of humor. At the same time, we welcome Lauress Wise as our incoming Vice President and Amy Hendrickson and Cindy Walker as new Board members. We look forward to the opportunity to work with each of them.

Our annual meeting in San Francisco has been well received, not in the least through the numerous hours spent on its preparation by Kimberley O'Malley, Elaine Rodeck, Leslie Keng, Ye Tong, and Neal Kingston, along with all the good work by the Rees Group.

Since this is my first column as your president, I'd like to use the opportunity to highlight a few new developments. After careful preparatory work, we now have a Fund Development Committee (FDG) in charge of the development of a charitable giving arm for NCME. Its founding members are Linda Hargrove (chair), Wayne Camara, Linda Cook, Deb Harris, Suzanne Lane, Cathy Wendler, and Seohong Pak (student representative). Also, after several years of leaving them untouched, it has become clear that our bylaws need a revision. Our new Bylaws Revision Committee consists of Linda Cook (chair), Anne Fitzpatrick, David Frisbie, and Joseph Martineau. It is already clear that the revision must be coordinated with a revision of our Handbook as well. All proposed changes will be subject to a membership vote later this year.

It has always struck me that the only opportunity to meet with other NCME members is during our annual meeting in March-April; hence, our initiative to look into the possibilities of organizing a Fall Meeting to fill the void between the annual meetings. The current idea is a one- or two-day meeting consisting of a major lecture or debate in combination with a few training sessions in October. Ideally, the lecture or debate would develop into a distinguished, sponsored activity organized by NCME but attracting a wider audience as well. Deb Harris has offered to take the lead on our further explorations of the idea. Realistically, if the Board decides to implement a plan, our first Fall Meeting will have to be in 2014.

You are already aware of the attempts to increase the number of time slots available for presentations at our 2014 Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. In addition, NCME will simplify the proposal submission and review system, partly through the introduction of a new software system. We will also use the annual meeting to try a few other innovations. The 2014 Program Chairs (Paul De Boeck and Kathleen Scalise) and Training Chair (William Skorupski) have made excellent progress designing the new program and implementing the changes in the proposal submission and review system, along with indispensable help from the Rees Group. For more details, I refer to their Call for Proposals on our website. In addition, you will receive regular email messages highlighting the changes in the program from Susan Loomis, who has generously offered to serve as communications liaison for the 2014 Annual Meeting.

I'll keep you informed of our progress on all these issues, as well as a few other new developments, through my next messages. Meanwhile, please accept my best wishes for a relaxing summer and—if you teach—for another academic year.

GREETINGS FROM THE EDITOR

Susan Davis-Becker, Alpine Testing Solutions

In this issue, we have our first presidential column from Wim van der Linden, who discusses some of the changes in the NCME Leadership and initiatives within the organization including planning for the 2013 conference. Melinda Montgomery shares her second graduate student column and discusses the role of mentors for developing professionals. Patrick Meyer from the University of Virginia is our Spotlight member. This issue also includes some information about NCME including the psychometric software database, the *Testing in the Movies* documentary, photos from the 2013 Fun Run, and a summary of the "Future of NCME" columns published over the past year in the Newsletter. Looking forward to the 2014 conference, our program co-chairs provide some great information to consider when preparing your proposals. (It's that time again!)

Reading through all of these great contributions, I keep going back to this theme of "staying connected". Starting with our President's idea for an additional point of in-person contact, I reflected on the number of ways that we can all stay connected with NCME as an organization but also with each other. At an organization level, we have the NCME Website, this Newsletter, the NCME Journals, and the annual conference, just to name a few. On a more personal level, Melinda Montgomery discusses reaching out and making connections with potential mentors. I think this level of connection is very important, and one can easily find mentors by getting involved within NCME. Therefore, I encourage everyone to think about how they can get connected and stay connected with NCME throughout the year and take advantage of everything this organization has to offer.

GRADUATE STUDENT CORNER
THE BEST PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE: A MENTOR

Melinda Montgomery, University of Kansas

I really enjoyed the NCME conference in San Francisco. I took advantage of the opportunity to attend several events directed toward graduate students. I came away from the conference with a renewed desire to developing mentor relationships, probably because I am nearing the end of my graduate work and thinking more and more about my professional future. I was inspired by the NCME presidential address where Professor Cizek spoke at length of the various people who had positively influenced his career. Some were true mentors and others were colleagues that offered valuable advice along the way.

This started me thinking: how can I get the most out of the mentor relationships that I currently have and how do I go about developing more? I want to start with a basic definition of a mentor. *Forbes Magazine* defined a mentor as a more experienced professional in the field that offers career guidance, advice, and assistance from a real world point of view. The mentor should be someone we respect professionally, someone whose career we would like to emulate to some extent, and someone that we like personally. Marianne Perie, one of the individuals I interviewed for this article, said that a really good mentorship relationship is a friendship.

I thought it would be interesting to interview several professionals in our field and ask them about the role mentors have had in their careers. I am defining the term "mentor" loosely here. I am thinking of a mentor as informal, professional friendships as well as professionals that serve as role models. I chose to interview my advisor Dr. Billy Skorupski, Dr. Bruce Frey, Dr. Neal Kingston, Dr. Marianne Perie, and Dr. Laura Kramer.

I chose Billy because, as my advisor, he has had a great influence on my research interests and professional goals. Bruce is a faculty member in our department whose teaching and relationship with students I have long admired. Neal is the director of the center where I work and a faculty member. He is the visionary I know I will never be. Marianne joined our organization a few months ago. I particularly admire her leadership and management style and look forward to learning more from her. I chose Laura because she has spent much of her career on the operational side of state testing and I thought she might have a slightly different perspective.

Billy, Bruce, Laura, Neal, and Marianne mentioned so many people who influenced their careers that it is simply not possible to list all of them in this article. I will mention a few but it will only be a small sample of the true number of people who served as mentors and role models in their collective careers.

Graduate School Mentors

Faculty members in our individual programs are usually the mentors that first define our career direction. For example, Bruce Frey began his academic career as a school psychology major but that career path just was not appealing to him. His advisor, Nona Tollefson, suggested that he switch to what he enjoyed – educational measurement. Bruce said, "She pointed out the obvious."

Billy Skorupski credited Jane Rogers, who taught him computer programming, as having a big influence in his career. The programming knowledge he gained is invaluable in the simulation studies he does today. He also mentioned Eric Bradlow, who taught one of his courses, as having helped him to understand what he needed to get from a graduate program in order to reach his professional goals. Neal Kingston credited Marvin Sontag as helping him make the transition from a first generation college student to a doctoral student and helping him to achieve academic success. Marianne Perie mentioned her advisor Brenda Loyd, Brenda's friend Barbara Plake, and many others that influenced her graduate and early professional years. Faculty members really do shape our futures and the future of our field.

Internship and Early Mentors

Some mentorships and professional relationships can point out what we do not want to do and can help to narrow our career focus. Billy's internships at testing companies helped him to realize that he really wanted an academic position. It is not that he had a bad experience; in fact, he was able to work with Howard Wainer at NBME, who shaped his research interests and goals including his interest in Bayesian methods. It is just that he realized that the testing company world was not where he saw himself.

Neal had a similar experience after having the opportunity to work with Fred Lord in an internship. While it was a great experience, he realized that he probably could never do the theoretical work Fred Lord did and would not enjoy it even if he could. Bruce was recommended by the department chair to work on a grant project at a non-profit organization. He also had the opportunity to have an adjunct position. Having those opportunities helped him to realize that teaching was becoming a part of his professional identity.

Laura worked at a consulting position that grew out of an internship. It was that position that helped her to realize that she did not really want to do the kind of contract work she might find at a testing company. I would classify her boss, Graham Burkheimer, as a mentor because when she did not get an academic position she had applied for he encouraged her to keep looking for a position that would be the right fit.

Professional Mentors

In terms of professional mentors, Marianne credited Steve Ferrara with influencing her management style. She observed how he focused on finding solutions and that inspired her to take a similar stance in her management style. She also mentioned Gregory Cizek who took time to help her with standards setting when she was suddenly put in a role to lead a project on a topic she knew nothing about. For Bruce, Nona Tollefson continued to provide valuable professional mentorship by helping him navigate the political climate of his new academic position. Other faculty helped him realize that he needed to develop a research agenda if he wanted a tenure track position. Billy said that the group mentoring environment he is trying to create in our graduate program is inspired by Ron Hambleton from his graduate program.

Neal said that he benefited from observation of those more advanced in his field and took opportunities to work with them as they arose. He said that sometimes we learn from negative role models by noticing what is not working and choosing to go a different way. On the positive side, Neal admired the deep and long-term professional relationships that Ron Hambleton and Mark Reckase had with their graduate students and how they mentored them. That became a model for his mentoring relationship in his current academic position.

Laura had more of a colleague and best friend, Kris Kaase, who was one of the biggest influences in her career by encouraging her to apply for positions and supporting her throughout her career. She also mentioned Phoebe Winter as a person she would cite as a mentor. Phoebe told her she was "right" in the way she envisioned content and testing working in concert. Phoebe's encouragement helped her, in her words, to get "the content people and the testing people working cooperatively to ask the right questions in the right way." Marianne also mentioned Phoebe as a mentor in her career.

Advice from These Mentors

I asked Billy, Bruce, Marianne, and Neal what advice they would give us as graduate students entering the field. Billy said try to get an internship for the experience and the possibility of interacting with advanced professionals in the field. He also recommended contacting people who are working on interesting projects. Billy suggests saying ”yes” to things that are interesting, and we want to work on, but not necessarily everything that comes along.

Bruce had similar advice. He said to be open to a variety of careers and to get as much experience as possible. I also really liked Bruce’s suggestion to “work backward.” He said, “[I]f you have a job in mind, find out what skills are required for that job and work on getting them”.

Marianne said to look for people with similar interests and to take a chance. She reached out to many people in the field who had similar interests or whose articles she had read. That seemed a little intimidating to me, but she told me that she just thought, “[W]hat is the worst thing that could happen – they could say they do not have the time.” She went on to say that most people are very willing to help. Billy, Bruce, and Neal echoed that sentiment. People like it when you take an interest in their work. Neal’s advice was similar to Marianne's. He said, “Don’t be shy.” As a young graduate student, he made a point of staying after a presentation and asking the presenters questions.

Laura said to have confidence in yourself and to trust your instincts with the data in spite of what the books might tell you. There may come a time when you get a result you may never have predicted.

Concluding Thoughts

I found the interviews to be enlightening and encouraging. So I would encourage you, if you have not done so, to sit down with faculty in your department and ask them about their careers. Reach out to presenters you saw at the conference. Get a copy of their paper and begin a dialog about their research. Look for people in the field whose research is interesting and begin a professional mentorship/friendship relationship. Even if a long-term relationship does not develop, they can serve as role models; people whose research and practice you can emulate.

According to the United States Office of Personnel Management in Best Practices – Mentoring, there are many benefits from a mentoring relationship. I think that the following subset applies to us as graduate students preparing to enter the professional world.

Benefits to a mentee:

- Makes a smoother transition into the workforce;
- Furthers his/her development as a professional;
- Complements ongoing formal study and/or training and development activities;
- Gains some career development opportunities;
- Develops new and/or different perspectives;
- Gets assistance with ideas;
- Demonstrates strengths and explores potential, and;
- Increases career networks.

These are just a few of the things to look for in choosing a mentor. With these mentoring goals in mind, we can look to our advisor and other faculty in our department to begin with. Maybe your advisor has a career network that he/she can introduce you to but maybe another faculty member can help you develop some new perspectives or introduce you to an area of research that you know little about. Beyond our own departments, I think that reaching out to professionals in the field whose work we admire, as Marianne and Neal did, can further our development as professionals and complement our ongoing study. It can be a little scary to put yourself out there and reach out to someone who you only know from reading their work or hearing a presentation. But what is the worst thing that could happen? If one person does not have time, chances are that another one will.

The type of advice or guidance that we will get from mentors will vary. Our advisor and the other faculty in our department who have seen our performance in course work will be more likely to help point us in the right career direction. Sometimes other people can help us to better identify our strength and weaknesses and choose a career path that is aligned with those strengths. Professionals outside our departments can help us to build a career network and expand our research ideas and interests. They can also be a great resource if we find ourselves faced with a project that requires knowledge of a specific area. There will certainly be people in the field with expertise in that area who would be happy to help. The responsibility then is on us, to reach out and look for individuals who can help us build our professional identity.

Billy, Bruce, Laura, Neal, and Marianne mentioned so many people who influenced their lives it was a who's who in NCME. Today each of them is in a job they enjoy and it is clear that they each benefited from the advice and counsel of mentors and professionals in the field. Someday soon, I want to be in a job that I truly enjoy. To get there, I know I need to continue to seek the advice of mentors and look for opportunities to work with professionals in the field.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE PEOPLE WHO MAKE OUR ORGANIZATION GREAT – DR. PATRICK MEYER, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

For this issue, our spotlight is on Dr. Patrick Meyer, Associate Professor of Education at The University of Virginia.

How did you get into the field?

My interest in measurement began during my undergraduate work at the University of Georgia. I took a course in educational and psychological measurement and was fascinated by the idea of measuring cognition and other psychological constructs. There were many other subjects in psychology that interested me at that time such as biopsychology and human factors psychology. It was not until studying for a master's degree in clinical psychology at August State University that I began to narrow my interest to measurement. After graduating, I took a job at the South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and spent several years administering psychological test batteries to children. We did so much testing there that I could recite the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children administration manual by heart. This exposure to the administration side of individual testing piqued my interest in reliability, validity, and the technical aspects of measurement. I decided on a career change and entered the doctoral program at the University of South Carolina. That is where I met my mentor, Huynh Huynh. He introduced me to large-scale assessment and showed me that there was an entire profession focused on educational measurement. It was then that I became certain I had chosen the right field of study.

If you weren't in this field, what would you do?

I would be a photographer, a really broke photographer. I enjoy portrait photography and photojournalism but I tend to spend more time thinking about pictures than I do actually making them. I am fortunate to live in a city that has an active community of photographers. Charlottesville also has an annual photography festival called Look3 that draws an international audience. It has really exposed me to photographers and work I would not have found on my own.

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

I would recommend that graduate students take every course in statistics and measurement offered by their university. Most degree requirements define the minimum needed for graduation, not the amount of study needed to stand out among other graduates. If you want to be competitive and make immediate contributions to the field, take every course that you can while you are in school. You will not have time for additional courses after you graduate. The extra time in school will cost extra money, but it is an investment with a high rate of return.

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

I enjoy spending time with my family. We are very active and spend time playing sports together and having dance parties in the living room. You can usually find one of us running, swimming, or cycling at some point during the day. My children and their activities are also a main subject of my photography. They have learned to accept that I am going to take scores of pictures of them, even when only one would do.

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

I think the biggest innovation is the focus on model-based measurement. It is no longer necessary to force tests to fit a particular paradigm. We can now apply models that better represent the cognitive phenomena of interest. Mixture item response models, cognitive diagnostic models, and multidimensional IRT are a few examples. Of course, there are many

innovations in estimation and computing that make this focus possible, but as a collection of work they are changing the way we approach measurement and model test data. It is an exciting time to be in educational measurement.

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

I typically start by reading the program to find sessions related to my own research. I also try to find sessions that I know will be enjoyable to watch even if it is unrelated to my work. There are some really good presenters at NCME and watching them in action is enjoyable. Recent additions to the NCME program such as the debate of the day have really made it easier to find and observe good speakers and entertaining sessions. Prior to those changes to the program, you needed to attend the annual meeting for a few years before knowing who would be good to watch.

Who has been a significant influence in your professional life?

Huynh has made the biggest impact on my professional life. He has also had a significant impact on my personal life. As any of his students can attest, Huynh has always been willing to step outside of the classroom and help people through challenging times. For example, I was at ETS for an internship the summer my wife was pregnant with our son. Huynh would keep her company while I was gone by taking her taking her for walks and inviting her to dinner with his wife. He continues to show his support and encouragement to this day. Another big influence on my professional life is Tim Konold. He is incredibly good at leadership in an academic environment. He has taught me how to navigate academia and delicately handle differences of opinion that can arise in a democratic work environment.

MEMBER PERSPECTIVES ON THE FUTURE OF NCME: WHAT DID WE LEARN?

Susan Davis-Becker, Alpine Testing Solutions & Diane Talley, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Over the past year, leading up to the 75th anniversary of NCME, several members have kindly contributed their thoughts and ideas to a special series of columns appearing in the Newsletter on the Future of NCME (see June 2012, September 2012, December 2012, and March 2013 issues). As the editor of the Newsletter, I want to personally thank Chad Buckendahl, Randy Penfield, Diane Henderson Montero, Leslie Keng, Laurie Davis, Dubravka Svetina, Karla Egan, Christina Schneider, Derek Briggs, and Marianne Perie for their contributions. In this column here, we have attempted to summarize the thoughts and perspectives captured in each of these columns and determine where this group is collectively suggesting as the future of our organization.

It was interesting to re-read these columns as a collection and reflect on how they aligned with the current goals of NCME:

I. Encourage scholarly development in educational measurement
   a. Improve measurement instruments and procedures for their administration, scoring, interpretation, and use
   b. Improve applications of measurement in assessment of individuals, groups, and evaluation of educational programs

II. Disseminate knowledge about educational measurement, including
   a. Theory, techniques, and instrumentation for the measurement of educationally relevant human, institutional, and social characteristics
   b. Procedures appropriate to the interpretation and use of such techniques and instruments
   c. Applications of educational measurement with individuals and groups

III. Increase NCME's influence within the educational measurement community to ensure sound and ethical measurement practices

IV. Influence public policy and practice concerning educational measurement

V. Promote awareness of measurement in education as a field of study and work to encourage entry into the field and interdisciplinary collaboration

VI. Provide members with a strong professional identity and intellectual home in educational measurement and enhance the value of membership in NCME

VII. Increase the operating and financial capacity of the association to enhance its effectiveness and its national recognition

The perspectives on the future of NCME run the gamut from keeping to its current course to some broadening of its goals and audiences all the way to taking a stronger position in driving policy creation and adopting the role of industry enforcers.

Who is NCME's target membership and audience?

As you think of the individuals involved with/connected to NCME, your first thought may go to some of the most infamous members who have had significant influence on the field of educational measurement, or figures who have served in visible leadership roles, or personal friends/connections that you have made and maintained during your years as a member. However, it is not often that we pause to think about the breadth of NCME's membership and audience to the information and guidance that its members provide. Goals III, IV, and V discuss the potential reaches of the membership as including the educational measurement community, policy makers within educational measurement, and potential future professionals. As an organization, NCME has a strong and active membership who regularly engages in scholarly research and collaboration on a number of efforts. In addition, in line with the goals of the organization, NCME also seeks to educate others outside of their membership about the appropriate development and use of tests. Several contributors to this series provided thoughts for who should be considered as future members of NCME or part of the target audience for their outreach efforts.

Several authors reiterated the need for involvement with and connection to the community of measurement professionals. Following goal VI, it is important that NCME continue its tradition of providing members with a way to stay connected and continue their own professional development. Penfield and Svetina cite frequent use of the ITEMS modules, expending topics within the NCME workshops, and encouraging NCME to continue to grow their body of resources for measurement professionals by leveraging the technology available for access and dissemination to such information.

Buckendahl supported thinking of a broader community of measurement professionals by redefining the "E" in NCME. Specifically, he advocated for NCME to encourage involvement from measurement professionals working in personnel selection, certification and licensure, and certificate programs, and citizenship and immigration testing as well as a wider inclusion within k-12 and post-secondary assessment areas (i.e., early childhood assessments, college readiness, and teacher developed assessments) and identified the applicability of the *Standards* to each discipline as a connecting set of guidelines. He points to an important challenge that measurement professionals outside of the traditional field of education face with the assumption that the results of research conducted in education can be extrapolated to other fields. Broadening NCME's definition of education to include these fields could lead to increased scholarship specific to these areas, generalizability of standards across fields, and increased diversity, including international representation.

Penfield adds to this discussion the inclusion of assessment consumers, stating that "this population extends far beyond testing professionals, to include professionals working in schools and educational policy as well as the general public" (paragraph 1). When you think about it, assessment has become so far reaching that we are all touched by it in some way, whether it is the exam you have to take to get a driver's license or the exams your kids are taking in school and the taxes you paid to fund the development of those exams. His suggestion is not just focused on collecting and organizing this information, but more so on making it accessible, interesting, and relevant!

Egan and Schneider examined the gap between our measurement community and those who are utilizing, interpreting, and shaping their day-to-day practice based on the results of the assessments we construct. Their unique contribution is largely in the concept that we should have a reciprocal relationship, between teachers understanding more about what measurement is and measurement professionals understanding more about curriculum and instruction, what they refer to as instructionally sensitive assessments. Similarly, they suggest that NCME focus on creating and providing assessment literacy training for educators. By providing "engaging, free, and on-demand webinars" (paragraph 2), NCME can help improve the development, use, and interpretation of assessments in the classroom. They suggested the need for reciprocity between the teaching and measurement communities; those in the measurement field having a deeper understanding of curriculum and instruction as well as teachers having a better understanding of measurement procedures and practices. In addition, connecting this audience to NCME as a source for professional development might encourage such individuals to pursue more learning opportunities in this field and become contributors to our community.

What type of influence should NCME have?

With a defined broader audience, it is also important to think about the areas in which NCME should be an authoritative voice. Each of the NCME goals speaks to some element of NCME as an influence or monitor of the proper policy for educational measurement. In these columns, there were several perspectives as to where NCME should continue, or pursue, its influential role.

There was strong support for NCME's continued role as disseminators of information and educators to both the measurement community and consumers of measurement products and outcomes (Henderson Montero, Penfield, Svetina, Briggs, Egan and Shneider, Perie). Henderson Montero identified the need for an "independent professional author actively educating the public, policymakers and users of educational assessments on the current state of the measurement science and the limitations associated with this science" (paragraph 3) and suggested that NCME could take a role in enforcing the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999) by evaluating tests that are out there (including custom tests) to help the public understand what meets the minimum expectations of the Standards. Perie also discussed the concept of validity evaluation of measures for particular uses. This has been a longstanding issue for discussion in the measurement community with entire editions of publications dedicated to this dialogue (see *Journal of Educational Measurement*, vol 50, issue 1). Perie expressed a concern that new validity issues will arise with the introduction of assessments developed by multi-state consortia in alignment with core curriculum where the goals of these assessments may be trying to meet too many purposes and each test use needs to be evaluated individually. This idea is well supported in the literature (Kane, 2006; Cizek, 2012). Perie views NCME's role in this issue as one of educator, needing to focus more of its education on the concept of validity as well as needing to take more of a leadership role in setting educational policy. Similarly, Keng and Davis highlight a few of the questions they believe will arise from end users of these new assessments that will likely encourage users to attempt to interpret the data in ways beyond what it was originally intended for.

This group of contributors was also very clear that NCME should play a role in the recruitment and education of the next generation of measurement professionals. The role of measurement professionals, particularly psychometricians, was addressed by Penfield, Henderson-Montero, Keng and Davis, Svetina, and Briggs. This is in alignment with NCME's current goals: educating measurement professionals and those preparing to become professionals and encouraging scholarly development. Keng and Davis presented the view of a "next generation psychometrician" who possesses additional skills including a broader view of assessment design, ability to educate others on psychometric principles, maintaining currency in the field (professional development), and ability to collaborate. Briggs juxtaposes this view with the idea that rather than expanding their abilities, psychometricians need to be more grounded in basic theory so that they understand why they are applying certain methodology rather than following a recipe. Perie also contributed to this theme in her discussion of the importance of measurement professionals contributing more to evidence of validity and ensuring that there is evidence of validity for each test use. Henderson Montero, in Part III of this series, took this influence over the measurement professional role a step further. She specifically suggested that NCME could play a role in defining and evaluating competence of measurement professionals as there is currently no standard for defining what it means to be a measurement professional.

Final Thoughts

Each of the perspectives represented in this series was very unique and we would encourage anyone to go back and read these individual columns and consider these thoughts on where or organization should go in the future. We have attempted to capture several of the major themes here. It is interesting that many of the perspectives on the future of NCME are in alignment with the current NCME goals with aspirations to broaden the organizations reach and increasing communications and education to its target audiences. Briggs reminds us of the wise words of NCME's President, Wim van der Linden, in stating that "for the next decade or so, I don't foresee any revolutionary or major change of paradigm." He later continues with "we need technical progress to find solutions to practical problems" (see vol 20, issue 3). This leads us back to NCME's first goal, which focuses on encouraging scholarly development. Looking introspectively, we as a measurement community need to continue our own professional development by taking advantage of the knowledge and resources that we as an organization can provide for one another. If we are able to expand our community to include measurement professionals from other areas, we could learn from different measurement practices employed in these areas.

NCME is still tasked with building awareness, disseminating information, educating the measurement community and its stakeholders, and advancing scholarship in the field. Penfield and Egan and Schneider remind us though that just making others aware of the science of educational measurement and providing information may not be enough. Rather, to succeed in reaching these external groups we need to make this information "interesting" (Penfield) and "engaging" (Egan and Schneider). We think this is an important reminder as not everyone (e.g., educators, policy makers) may find this field as fascinating as we do!

NCME WEBSITE TOOLS: THE PSYCHOMETRIC SOFTWARE DATABASE

Brett P. Foley, Alpine Testing Solutions [NCME Website Board Member]

Psychometric software is an essential tool in any measurement professional's tool box. In the quickly evolving field of educational measurement, it is difficult to remain abreast of advances in — and availability of — these resources. As a service to members and the general public, NCME hosts the Psychometric Software Database on its website.

Based on the award-winning work of Gary Skaggs at Virginia Tech, the database lists software, macros, scripts, and source code designed specifically for psychometrics. The database provides information about the price, compatibility, and intended uses of the software as well as contact information for the software's developers. The database is searchable by software name, description, keyword, and price and currently contains records for more than 80 programs.

The information provided in the database should prove useful for many audiences. Graduate students and researchers can use it to identify free or low-cost software for conducting psychometric analyses. Developers can use the tool to find well-established tools suitable for validating new tools (e.g., R packages). Conspiracy theorists can use the database to test the theory that psychometric software is prohibitively expensive and intentionally user-unfriendly in order to prevent the casual use of IRT, thus ensuring prestige and high-paying jobs for psychometricians.

The database can be freely accessed online at http://ncme.org/resource-center/psychometric-software-database/. Type this link directly into your web browser's address bar. Alternatively, go to the NCME website and click the "Software Database" link in the "Resource Center" menu.

2014 NCME ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Kathleen Scalise, University of Oregon & Paul De Boeck, Ohio State University

The upcoming 2014 Annual NCME conference in Philadelphia will include a number of changes to the proposal submission format and the delivery of presentations. The co-chairs for the upcoming conference, Kathleen Scalise and Paul De Boeck, have provided some important information and links for preparing for the conference.

Submitting Proposals

The proposal submissions will be accepted between July 8th and August 1st. The Annual Meeting page on the NCME website (http://ncme.org/annual-meeting/next-meeting/) contains all the information you will need to prepare your proposals. Make sure to check out these resources as you prepare:

- 2014 Call for proposals
- Proposal Submission Instructions
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Graduate Student Call for Proposals

Paper Session Delivery Format Information

For either individual or coordinated session proposals, there are two types of paper presentation delivery formats in NCME 2014: oral (traditional format) or electronic board (technology-enhanced on large computer screen provided). Both are full paper presentations and should be represented as such in citations following the conference. Each requires the completion and submission of your full paper prior to the conference presentation. Also, each requires attendance at the entire session into which the presentation has been accepted (100 minutes for Oral Paper

presentations, 90 minutes for Electronic Board Paper presentations). Work of equally high rating by reviewers will be assigned to each paper delivery format option. Distinction between the two delivery settings is in the format of interaction with the audience and the multiple avenues of providing information in each type of session, as described below.

Note that presenters may suggest their desired delivery format between the two available options. See below for details. However, session types ultimately will be allocated based on balance over a strong and exciting NCME program. So please be aware that by submitting any paper presentation, Individual or Coordinated, authors express their willingness to be placed in either delivery format.

Oral Paper Presentation Delivery Option 1: Oral paper presentations will be organized in thematic sessions or belong to a coordinated session. Oral paper presentations are in a traditional delivery setting of projected display for a seated audience. The presentation time is 20 minutes, and the time for questions and answers (Q&A) is 5 minutes. There will be no formal discussant. Each session is assigned a Session Chair preparing a few questions based on the full paper that will be submitted. Session chairs and paper authors both are expected to facilitate the Q&A.

Electronic Board Paper Presentation Delivery Option 2: Electronic board paper presentations will be organized in thematic sessions or belong to a coordinated session. Each session has a Session Chair who will prepare a few questions based on the full paper that will be submitted. The time length of the presentation session is 90 minutes, divided into two portions for presentation and interaction. See details below in Description of the Electronic Presentation Format.

Description of the Electronic Presentation Format:
Electronic paper presentations are a new format for NCME. Electronic boards a large monitor screen provided for display. The purpose of this format is to create a fully paper-supported interactive forum for research in the measurement and assessment community.

For electronic board paper presentations, authors should keep in mind that the audience will not access information in a single way via this format but are intended to have multiple avenues to gather information. The full submitted paper is the longest format. Audience members who wish to obtain complete details of the work should download the paper, which must be posted in advance of the presentation. A one-page handout and electronic loop required for this format are the briefest avenues of access. These allow audience members to scan your information in momentary sampling as they move through a thematic arena. Finally, the various interactive opportunities with the scholar(s) allows for personalization of the information, and for networking to expand collaboration and cross-talk in the field.

Presenters are required to attend and interact during their entire 90-minute presentation session. For one-half of the session (45 minutes, as either Part A in the first half or Part B in the second half), they will serve as presenters on the Electronic Boards for their work. For the other half of the session, they will circulate and complete comments on a cluster of sessions, as well as remain available for more in-depth discussions on their own work.
Additionally, audience members will meet, question, and network with scholars in their thematic areas during the entire presentation time.

There are three specific requirements for what presenters need to supply. We are asking for:

1. a full paper in advance at least one week before the conference,
2. a one-page paper handout at the presentation, and
3. two minutes worth of Power Point slides or other electronic format with NO audio, fully complete without presenter comments and set to loop automatically, which can be uploaded to a repository before the presentation. (This is called an "Electronic Loop," which is expected to be approximately four slides.)

Presenters may have additional "pocket slides" stored on the Electronic Boards to bring up in response to questions and discussion that arise, but these should not display automatically in the two-minute electronic loops. Complete instructions, templates, and examples for these materials will be provided for accepted proposals. Presenters may choose to use the templates or design their own.

As a technology-enhanced affordance, the new electronic board paper format has three main purposes. First, we want to stimulate and encourage interaction in small groups, to build dialogue and conversations around themes of work. Secondly, some topics and kinds of material may lend themselves better to an interactive visual presentation, for example when technology enhanced material is used for the measurements, or when they are best accessed in multiple formats of varying length to inform a broad range of audience needs. Third, we want to increase the opportunity for a higher acceptance rate at NCME, broadening the representation of high-quality work that can be shared throughout the measurement community.

Individual electronic presentations will be grouped in thematic contributed clusters. It is possible to submit a proposal for a coordinated thematic cluster of electronic presentations, in the same way as for a coordinated verbal session and thus to include four presentations.

Electronic Board Paper presenters in either Individual or Coordinated Session proposals should expect to respond in flexible ways to meet the varying needs of audience members. This will range from eliciting casual or initial interest in your work from new viewers, who should be encouraged as potential future contributors, stakeholders, and participants, to detailed questions from scholars currently doing advanced working directly relevant to the presentation.

Electronic Board Paper presenters should practice fluently multitasking through their materials, including the ability to start and stop their electronic loops, distribute handouts, engage in questions, and fluidly move quickly from one audience member to another. Engaging at length with a single member when others are waiting, attempting to present the loop in a standing oral talk rather than allowing it to serve as an automated enhancement, or not providing introductions and supporting novice questions are discouraged. Audience members for their part can help to support efforts by flowing through presentations in good order, graciously attending even briefly for those presenters with lighter audiences, and asking reflective questions while not monopolizing conversations. More extensive engagements can take place with scholars during the time they have to roam the theme.

The Electronic Board Paper format will be evaluated and updated for use in future years. Both presenters and audience members are encouraged to be relaxed with hitches that will inevitably arise with innovations, and to be supportive of each other as we experiment with the potential strengths and weaknesses of this new format for the measurement community.

TESTING DOCUMENTARY PREMIERES AT ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Brett P. Foley, Alpine Testing Solutions

"Testing in the Movies and on Television" debuted on Sunday, April 28th, at a special session at NCME's 75th Annual Conference. Created for the occasion of the 75th Anniversary, the purpose of the documentary is to explore and identify broad themes about how testing is portrayed in movies and on television, and to provide specific illustrations from a variety of sources. The film features more than 300 clips from dozens of movies and television shows covering more than 40 years.

Footage for the film was collected and synthesized by a team of four testing professionals: Anita Rawls (who also coordinated the session) and David Chuah of the College Board, Andrew Dwyer of Castle Worldwide, Inc., and Brett Foley of Alpine Testing Solutions (who also served as editor and narrator). The film examines five major themes that emerged from the clips: testing consequences, criticisms of testing, test anxiety, studying and test prep, and cheating. The filmmakers also take time to poke fun at psychometricians and the SATs.

Following the premiere of the documentary, a panel of distinguished discussants shared their thoughts on the film with the audience. There was discussion among the panelists as to whether the generally negative view of testing evinced by the movie and television clips was simply an entertainment device or reflective of the public's true perception of testing. One area of agreement among the discussants was that the film highlights the need for the testing industry to improve how it communicates important assessment issues to the public. Ben Babcock noted that,

> "Students, educators, administrators, and test makers alike should watch this documentary and use the entertaining caricatures summarized therein as a springboard for a real discussion of Standard 13.7 [*In educational settings, a decision or characterization that will have major impacts on the student should not be made on the basis of a single test score.*]."

The film is distributed under a Creative Commons license, meaning it can be freely used and disseminated. Since its release, the film has received very positive reviews, has been a featured topic of discussion on multiple assessment-related blogs, and has been viewed in 18 countries.

The documentary is currently available on YouTube and can be found at http://goo.gl/e5QqR

NCME Fitness Walk/Run Corner

Brian French, Washington State University & Jill van den Heuvel, Alpine Testing Solutions

An excellent time was had by all walkers and runners on a gorgeous morning in San Francisco as we walked and ran to the base of the Golden Gate Bridge. Members reconnected with old friends and made new friends along the way. The smiling faces of NCME members captured in the photo say it all! Team University of Iowa led by Michael Kolen and Team Pacific Metrics led by Tia Sukin secured their team's place on the NCME fitness walk/run plaques. Congratulations!

Stay tuned for more information on the event in each newsletter. We wish you a restful and fun summer!

Test Company Division: Pacific Metrics
Captain Tia Sukin

University Division: University of Iowa
Captain Michael Kolen

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

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

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