
TURN THE PAGE

The Next Chapter for Educational Measurement

1 CALL FOR PROPOSALS

The past year and a half did not take it easy on anyone. Each of us has been affected professionally and some of us personally by the pandemic, school closures, racism, a contested election and, for a brief moment, the prospect of civil war. Add to this uncommon brew the now common suspicion that standardized testing does less to expose inequality than it does to worsen it, and it is no surprise that many in our profession have spent the last 18 months in survival mode.

Now as the end of this traumatic chapter of our history draws near, let's seize this opportunity to reboot. Let's give serious thought to who we are and how we came to be that way. From our founding thinkers to the new voices who will lead the next chapter of educational measurement, how are we showing up in 2021? Given who we represent in our work, who represents us? If we don't like the answers, let's take comfort in the fact that uncertainty has been thrust upon us. We no longer need to worry about disrupting established practice; that's already happened. Now we decide what's next, and we do so with diversity and inclusivity as our animating goal. Foremost that means increasing the number of black and brown scholars in our ranks. It also means reopening dormant lines of communication with our colleagues in other disciplines—such as psychology, statistics and the learning sciences—who share common interests and goals.

And turning the page goes in both directions. It means revisiting our foundations, not running from them. There is a great deal about our past that is worth celebrating and building upon; ideas and methods that have advanced the science and practice of assessment and measurement. But we must also conduct a fearless moral inventory of the often problematic history of standardized testing, take ownership of it, and make amends. To sift through our history and do all these things at once requires maturity, humility, and courage. We are up to this task. Let's start moving forward again.

Visit the NCME Annual Conference landing page to learn more about our plans for 2022 in San Diego

<https://www.ncme.org/meetings/annual-meeting>

2 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Proposals are due **AUGUST 13, 2021**.

The Program Committee will consider proposals for five presentation formats:

- 1) Demonstrations (new for 2022)
- 2) Individual paper presentations
- 3) Coordinated paper sessions
- 4) Organized discussions
- 5) Training sessions

2.1 DEMONSTRATIONS

NEW FOR 2022 • NO PAPER REQUIRED • FOCUSED ON INSTRUMENTS, APPS, CLASSROOM LESSONS, AND OTHER NOVEL TOOLS • FEW RESTRICTIONS ON FORMAT

SOMEWHERE OUT THERE IS THE NEXT SIRI, SEDA, OR SGP. WHAT ARE YOU MAKING?

The Program Committee in 2021 welcomes proposals to conduct 15-minute demonstrations of an innovation – something creative, innovative, or novel that you would like to share with our membership. You may want to demonstrate an RShiny Package or a thought experiment you use in your teaching. Perhaps you've developed an instrument that classroom teachers need to see or a macro that researchers need to see. If you've discovered or created a resource that would benefit the measurement community but that doesn't quite fit the research manuscript orthodoxy, please consider submitting a demonstration proposal. There is no paper required, and you may propose either an individual 15-minute presentation or a 60-minute group of four related demonstrations.

We intend for the demonstrations to provide a forum where new ideas can be shared and stress-tested. We want participants to walk away with an idea, an app, or some other solution they can use. As such, **proposed innovations must be free for participants, no strings attached. Proposals that aim to sell commercial products at the conference will be rejected.** We will, however, welcome proposals that introduce free innovations that run on commercial software (e.g., SAS macros).

To encourage participation, friendly competition, and a bit of fun, the Program Committee (with the assistance of volunteer judges) will recognize outstanding achievement in the demonstration of a measurement innovation. Award categories will include (1) the William of Ockham Award recognizing an elegant solution to a vexing problem; (2) the Rube Goldberg Award for an innovation that summons uncommon complexity to solve a simple problem; and (3) best in show for demonstration by a graduate student. The demonstration proposal review criteria, which these award categories reflect, are provided on pp. 7-8.

2.1.1 Specific Guidelines for Demonstrations

Proposals for demonstration presentations must identify all contributors in the proposal. Proposals must consist of (a) an abstract of no more than 50 words for individual, 100 words for group (for inclusion in the final program), (b) a summary of the demonstration in no more than 500 words for individual, 1000 words for group, (c) any software packages required (if applicable), and (d) references, tables, and figures as appropriate. The Program Committee will reject proposals that exceed these word limits. The summary should accomplish two things:

- 1) **Introduce the innovation itself.** Describe the problem it addresses, the typical users (e.g., classroom teachers, researchers), and, if available, evidence of the innovation being put to use. One way to do this quickly and clearly is through a value proposition statement ("This helps X do Y by doing Z"). Regardless of the structure proposers adopt, the summary **should** clarify the practical utility and implications of the innovation and **should not** be written as a business case, a product roadmap, or marketing collateral. Moreover, proposers should not assume that their innovation must rely on or have anything to do with technology. We are interested in the modified eyeglasses that let you observe the counterfactual even in low-light conditions, but we are also interested in the paradox you have identified and/or resolved or the song you wrote to teach the assumptions of ANOVA. Advances in the science of measurement have depended at least as much on creativity, logic, and argumentation as they have on technology; we see no need for that to change in 2022.
- 2) **Describe the format of the demonstration** (e.g., lecture, brief hands-on training). The Program Committee is interested in novel, interactive presentation formats, but proposers' first order of business should be describing a demonstration that is well-aligned with the innovation itself and that is feasible given time and technology constraints. For example, it is reasonable to expect that some innovations are best introduced through a lecture and guided tour rather than a hands-on activity requiring nonstandard technology (any technology needs above and beyond the equipment that is standard at conventional paper sessions must be supplied by the presenters).

The Program Committee expects that the demonstration format will be distinguished by its immediate payoff, among other things. Participants should walk away with a concrete new skill, insight, or technological support that they can leverage in their work without much additional research or training. Therefore, the Program Committee strongly recommends that proposers use the summary to briefly explain what participants will be able to do after the demonstration that they likely could not have done before it. Finally, it bears repeating that we want to showcase some innovations where technology is instrumental and some where it is incidental. Both varieties will receive due consideration during proposal review.

2.2 INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS

15-MINUTE PAPER PRESENTATIONS • RESEARCH BLITZ SESSIONS • 90-MINUTE ELECTRONIC BOARD SESSIONS • PAPERS, CHAIR, DISCUSSANT ARE IDENTIFIED BY NCME

For those that are new to the Annual Conference, the individual presentation format is the most common submission format for a researcher or research team seeking to share their work with other NCME members. Proposals should describe a single paper written by one or more authors. The first author should be the primary presenter, although authors may present together. Individual presentations at the Annual Conference in Spring of 2022 will be in one of three formats: (i) a traditional lecture-style presentation of approximately 12-15 minutes, to be presented in a multiple-paper session with related papers grouped by topic by the Program Committee; (ii) Research Blitz session where the authors will have 5 minutes to summarize the critical aspects of their research, and will remain in the session for group discussions with session attendees, or (iii) a poster-style presentation using an electronic board in a 60- or 90-minute session. Authors must indicate their preference for (i), (ii), or (iii), although the Program Committee may override these preferences to resolve scheduling constraints in the final program. Authors will be notified of presentation format as part of the proposal notification communication.

2.2.1 Specific Guidelines for Individual Presentations

Proposals for individual presentations **must** be prepared for blind review – author names should not be included in the document. Proposals must consist of (a) a title of no more than 12 words, (b) an abstract of no more than 50 words (for inclusion in the final program), (c) a summary of research of no more than 800 words, and (d) references, tables, and figures as appropriate. The Program Committee will reject individual presentations proposals whose titles, abstracts, or summaries exceed the word limits or are not blind. References, tables, and figures do not count toward the word limits. The summary should include research questions, methods, and findings. The Program Committee also strongly recommends that authors include the practical implications of their research (see the Evaluation and Review Criteria below).

2.3 COORDINATED PAPER SESSIONS

90-MINUTE SESSIONS • LECTURE STYLE PRESENTATIONS ON A COMMON THEME • PAPERS, CHAIR, DISCUSSANT ARE IDENTIFIED BY PROPOSERS

The program committee defines a coordinated paper session as a set of papers organized around a central theme or topic. The session will be lecture-style presentation with 3 – 5 papers and a discussant. The session proposal should meet the following guidelines.

2.3.1 Specific Guidelines for Coordinated Paper Sessions

Proposals for coordinated paper sessions must identify all contributors – up to ten authors' and presenters' names should be included, not blinded. Proposals must consist of (a) a title for the session of no more than 12 words, (b) an abstract of no more than 200 words (for inclusion in the final program), (c) a summary of the coordinated paper session (in addition to the abstract) of no more than 1600 words, and (d) references, tables, and figures as appropriate. After entering this information, the next page will require you to submit specific descriptions for each participate in the coordinate paper session. We will reject proposals whose titles, abstracts, or summaries exceed the word limit (references, tables, and figures do not count toward the word limit). Organizers may use the 1600 words however they wish, for example, a conventional 4-paper symposium may have a 400-word introduction with four 300-word paper descriptions. Proposals should also identify a discussant/moderator where appropriate.

2.4 ORGANIZED DISCUSSIONS

PLANNED DEBATE • TOPICS WITH BROAD APPEAL • CLOSE ALIGNMENT WITH CONFERENCE THEME • FLEXIBLE FORMATS • LIMITED SLOTS AVAILABLE

The Program Committee defines an organized discussion as a planned conversation among researchers and/or practitioners around a theme or topic. We encourage debates, panel discussions, and other innovative formats, especially those involving interactivity with the audience. Preferences will be given to proposal that are in line with the conference theme. The session proposals should clearly describe the format of the proposed session and meet the following guidelines:

2.4.1 Specific Guidelines for Organized Discussions

Proposals for organized discussions must identify all contributors – up to five presenters' names should be included, not blinded. Proposals must consist of (a) a title for the session of no more than 12 words, (b) an abstract of no more than 200 words (for inclusion in the final program), and (c) a summary of the organized session (in addition to the abstract) of no more than 800 words that described the theme or topic of the discussion, the proposed format for the discussion, the significance or implications of the issues for discussion (including key questions that would be addressed), and the perspective (s) that each presenter would represent. The Program Committee will reject proposals who titles, abstracts, or summaries exceed the word limits. The proposed format should be clearly motivated and clearly described. Proposals should also identify a discussant/moderator where appropriate.

Two important notes on organized discussions at the 2022 Annual Conference

- 1) Given the relative scarcity of empirical data over the past year, organized discussions were the only way some projects could share their work in 2021. In 2022 we intend to shift the focus somewhat to the science of measurement, which implies a stronger emphasis on empirical research. The Program Committee therefore expects to schedule significantly fewer organized discussions in 2022 than were held in 2021.
- 2) Over the years, NCME's debates have been very popular and very valuable events – introducing our members to both the burning questions and the leading voices in our field. NCME also values a diversity of voices in these events, and in 2022 we hope to schedule panels featuring speakers who've not yet had the opportunity to take part in or lead NCME's organized debates.

2.5 TRAINING SESSIONS

SCHEDULED PRE-CONFERENCE • HALF-DAY OR FULL-DAY FORMAT • CLOSE ALIGNMENT WITH NCME MISSION AND CONFERENCE THEME

We invite proposals for training sessions addressing themes relevant to the mission of NCME. In 2022 we are particularly interested in novel training sessions focused on equity-oriented concepts such as fairness, anti-racism and social justice, and approaches for taking up such concepts in the context of both classroom and large-scale assessment. These sessions are scheduled to occur prior to the conference. Presenters must indicate their preference for length (four hours or full day) and preference for the mode of instruction (virtual vs. in-person). Please provide the target audience, three keywords, and if this training session has been offered previously.

2.5.1 Specific Guidelines for Training Sessions

Proposals for training sessions must include the name(s) of the presenter(s) and consist of (a) a title for the session of no more than 12 words, (B) an abstract of no more than 200 words (for inclusion in the final program), (c) a summary of no more than 500 words, and (d) a draft schedule of proposed activities and topics to be covered during the proposed session timeline, no more than 500 words (this is excluded from the 500 word limit in the summary). The title should be as descriptive as possible to give NCME members a clear sense of what will be covered. The abstract should provide an overview of the session content, method of instruction, learning objectives, the intended audience, and laptop/software use. The summary should highlight the goals of the session, expertise of the presenter(s), and the relevance/importance of the topic. The schedule of proposed activities and topics should focus on what presenter(s) and participants will be doing during the session. Note: presenters are responsible for bringing any handouts needed for the session or providing participants with information about how to obtain any suggested texts.

2.6 GRADUATE STUDENT ISSUES COMMITTEE RESEARCH SESSION.

All graduate students are invited to submit a proposal for the Graduate student research session at the NCME Annual Conference. All presenters will follow the individual presentation guidelines above. All presenters in the 2022 NCME graduate student research session will use **the electronic board format**. Graduate students submitting their work for consideration in this session may submit either completed research OR research-in-progress.

2.7 DIVERSITY ISSUES IN TESTING

The NCME Committee on Diversity Issues in Testing (CODIT) announces an opportunity for all organizers of and participants in coordinated sessions and organized discussions to nominate a session to be the NCME Diversity Issues in Testing Invited Session. We encourage any coordinated session or organized discussion that addresses or reflects diversity issues in testing, broadly conceived, to nominate their session by selecting the "I would like this session to be considered for the NCME Diversity Issues in Testing Invited Session" option during the regular submission process. All such proposals will be reviewed and selected under standard procedures regardless of nomination status. However, nominated proposals will also be reviewed by the CODIT for distinction as the NCME Diversity Issues in Testing Invited Session, and, if selected, will be given a prominent placement in the program. The NCME CODIT and the NCME Board hope that this encourages session proposals to incorporate and consider issues of diversity as they develop and present their research topics and findings.

3 REVIEW CRITERIA

Review panels consisting of members with experience in the topic areas will review the individual submissions, coordinated sessions, and organized discussions. Submitting authors will have an opportunity to submit additional recommended keywords as appropriate. These keywords are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive but serve to improve the likelihood that papers will be reviewed by appropriate raters. All coordinated paper sessions and organized discussions will be reviewed by reviewers with expertise in relevant topic areas.

3.1 INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS, COORDINATED SESSIONS, AND ORGANIZED DISCUSSIONS

For all except the demonstrations proposals, review ratings will be based on the degree to which:

- The research offers a novel and well-articulated contribution to measurement theory and/or practice.
- There is a sound conceptual basis articulating the measurement challenge to be addressed.

- The choice of research methods supports the desired conclusions.
- There is evidence that the work is well-defined in scope and will be completed by April 2021.

3.2 DEMONSTRATIONS

Demonstrations at the NCME Annual Conference are distinct from traditional research studies and will be evaluated according to familiar but not identical criteria. First, it is important to clarify what constitutes a sufficiently original product.

3.2.1 Minimum standards for originality

The innovation addresses the stated problem in a unique and novel way, which may build on prior research but should not be a newer version of an existing tool.

Moreover, a demonstration author does not need to have invented the subject of his or her presentation (it may be a website with resources for teaching); however, for such resources to be considered “something new,” they should be familiar to few measurement professionals and for the author to take any credit, he or she must be expert in their use. This is what separates a demonstration from a recommendation.

3.2.2 Review Criteria. The dimensions below are intended to be compensatory – promoting inclusivity through multiple paths rather than exclusivity through multiple checkpoints. For example, an innovation that resolves a major, growing concern (e.g., baked-in bias in human and automated scoring) would probably be complex, but high utility ratings would more than make up for low simplicity ratings.

- **Utility.** The combined depth and breadth of the problem the innovation addresses. High-utility innovations solve seemingly intractable problems, with severe consequences, with which just about everyone struggles.
- **Inventiveness and artistry.** We anticipate most proposed demonstrations will at least consider both of these dimensions but will not pursue both with equal vigor. Ratings will reflect the intended emphasis of the innovation (e.g., a new tool for choosing cut scores probably wouldn't be evaluated on its artistry, but for a new score reporting technique, artistry probably matters).
 - **Inventiveness:** The innovation addresses the stated problem with such ingenuity that it provides not just an answer or a workaround, but a new and productive way of conceptualizing the problem. The innovation introduces new technology to the profession, either with unfamiliar methods and equipment or by using familiar technology in unexpected, nonroutine ways.
 - **Artistry:** The innovation achieves form as well as function, making priorities of style, craftsmanship, wit, and aesthetic appeal.
- **Simplicity.** The innovation provides an elegant solution to the stated problem. Each component of the innovation takes the shortest path to the objective, accomplishing everything it has to and nothing it does not.

4 GENERAL CONFERENCE RULES

The following rules have been established to encourage a wide range of participation by NCME members and minimize schedule conflicts that arise when sessions are arranged in the final program schedule.

- 1) Both members and nonmembers may submit proposals.
- 2) Submission of the proposal represents an agreement that presenting authors will register for and attend the Annual Conference if their proposal is accepted. All presenting authors must register for the conference no later than February 1.
- 3) The first author of every paper should be the primary presenter for that paper. This aligns with the expectations of conference attendees reading the program. This should hold both for individual presentations and coordinated sessions with multiple papers.
- 4) Participants may have a maximum of three presenting roles. Roles that count toward this limit include presentation authors of individual papers, presenting authors of papers in coordinated sessions, speaking members of panels, and speaking members of debates. Discussants, moderators of debates, chairs of sessions who little more than introduce presenters and keep time, and invited speakers, do not count toward this limit. Presenters of demonstrations do not count toward this limit, but are limited to just one demonstration presentation. Participants who submit proposals in excess of these rules will be subject to having one or more of their proposals disqualified from consideration.

Furthermore, the following rules have been established to ensure a high quality of presentations that are maximally beneficial for audiences in different sessions:

- 1) Should you be unable to attend the Annual Conference due to unforeseen circumstances, it is your responsibility to inform NCME as early as possible. You must either arrange for someone else to assume your role in a session or withdraw your presentation.
- 2) The same presentation may not have been made previously at an NCME Annual Conference or any other academic conference.

5 CLOSING

On behalf of NCME, we are looking forward to the 84th Annual Conference. Submit your research, volunteer to be a discussant, plan for a stimulating and engaging conference, and get ready to take a few leaps forward as we turn the page together next year in San Diego. If we can help in any way, do not hesitate to contact us at NCMEProgramChairs@talley.com.

Sincerely,

MATT GAERTNER AND BRIAN LEVENTHAL
Co-Chairs, Annual Conference Program Committee

CHUN WANG
Training and Professional Development

SCOTT HOLCOMB AND SERGIO ARANEDA
Graduate Student Issues Committee

RAMAN GROVER
Chair, Committee on Diversity Issues in Testing