To determine members' satisfaction with the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME), a survey of NCME members was developed and administered to obtain members' judgments about: (1) the purposes of the NCME as an organization; (2) NCME's major activities; (3) members' personal involvement in NCME activities; (4) the NCME Annual Meeting; (5) NCME's professional development activities; (6) NCME publications; (7) member interest in participating in the governing of the NCME; (8) the organizational structure, election procedures, and committee activities of the NCME; and (9) financial operations of the NCME. A mailed survey was sent during the fall and winter of 1989 to 484 randomly selected members, for a usable response rate of 71.5% (346 members). Members were generally satisfied with the organization's purposes and activities, but relatively few members were active participants in annual meetings. Members were satisfied with the quality of NCME publications, although other resources of the organization were not used as often. Members were somewhat pleased with organizational structure and practices and the existing budget allocations. Thirty-two graphs and two tables illustrate member response. Four appendices contain the questionnaire and follow-up material. (SLD)
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Introduction

The viability of any professional organization depends on its members' continued satisfaction with its purposes, activities, and operations. Although it is possible to infer members' satisfaction with these organizational characteristics by reviewing their rates of continuation and defection, such summative data are of little value in guiding organizational development or redirection. Information useful for formative evaluation (Scriven, 1967) must be secured by asking members directly, how satisfied they are with any and all characteristics of an organization that might be modified.

To secure direct information concerning members' satisfaction with NCME as an organization, a survey of the NCME membership was developed and conducted under the auspices of the NCME Committee of Past Presidents. The survey was conducted by mail during the fall and winter of 1989, and sought members' judgments concerning (1) the purposes of NCME as an organization, (2) NCME's major activities, (3) members' personal involvement in NCME activities, (4) the NCME Annual Meeting, (5) NCME's professional development activities, (6) NCME's publications, (7) members' interest in participating in the governance of NCME, (8) NCME's organizational structure, election, appointment procedures, and committee activities and (9) NCME's financial operations.

This paper contains a review of the principal findings of the survey. A summary of the methods used in conducting the survey is provided first. Following a discussion of survey methodology, the report of survey findings
is organized around the topic areas listed above. A final section contains a
discussion of the implications of survey findings.

Methodology

Sampling

Data were collected through a mailed survey sent to 484 randomly-
selected NCME members. A linear systematic sample of one in four of the
1936 NCME members who resided in the continental United States at the
time of sample selection received a questionnaire. The sample was
restricted to NCME members residing in the United States so as to
minimize mailing expenses and to avoid inordinate delays in receiving
survey responses. A sample size of 484 ensured that population proportions
could be estimated within ± 0.05 with 95 percent confidence, allowing for a
70 percent response rate. Selection of the sample was completed by a data
processing specialist at NCME headquarters.

Mailing and Follow-up Procedures

A packet containing a questionnaire (see Appendix A) a cover letter
(see Appendix B) and a stamped, addressed return envelope were sent to all
sampled NCME members on November 3rd, 1989. To minimize mailing
costs, survey packets were presorted by zip code and sent at the third-class
postal rate. Return envelopes were also stamped and marked for third-class
mailing. Mailing envelopes with the NCME letterhead were used to
emphasize the "official" character of the mailing, even though packets were
sent from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). For the
same reason, return envelopes were addressed to the NCME headquarters office in Washington, D.C. Completed questionnaires were sent by the NCME headquarters office to the Center for Educational Research and Evaluation at UNCG for data processing and analysis.

NCME members who had not returned completed questionnaires by December 1, 1990 were sent a reminder postcard (see Appendix C), encouraging them to complete their questionnaires. The 209 members who had not returned completed questionnaires by December 20, 1990 were sent another full survey packet containing a modified cover letter (see Appendix D), a second questionnaire, and a second stamped return envelope addressed to the NCME headquarters office.

Response Rate

Three hundred seventy-seven of the 484 NCME members who were sent questionnaires responded to the survey. The overall rate of response was therefore 77.9 percent. However, 31 of the 377 respondents did not provide useable data. Analyses of survey data were therefore based on the responses of 346 sampled members, producing a useable response rate of 71.5 percent. This response rate compares favorably with that of Coleman's 1966 Survey on Equality of Educational Opportunity. The 31 respondents who did not provide useable data listed a variety of reasons for their decision not to participate in the survey. Among frequently-mentioned reasons were having dropped NCME membership prior to receipt of the survey questionnaire, and recency of NCME membership. The latter group felt
they had limited knowledge of NCME and were therefore unqualified to respond to the survey.

Representativeness of the Sample

The NCME membership application contains three optional questions that can be used to develop a demographic profile of the organization's membership. One question asks the applicant's gender, a second asks applicants to classify themselves into one of six race/ethnicity categories, and a third asks applicants to classify themselves into one of eight current employment categories. The responses of 2249 NCME applicants on file as of March 2, 1990 were used to construct distributions for comparison with those produced from responses to similar questions by the 346 members who provided usable survey data. These comparisons provide evidence on the degree to which survey respondents are representative of the entire NCME membership, at least on the gender, race/ethnicity, and current employment variables.

The results shown in Figure A suggest that the gender distributions of survey respondents and NCME members are quite similar. However, the sample of respondents contained about three percent more males, and three percent fewer females, than does the NCME membership. These differences are minor, and would bias survey results only if the responses of female NCME members differed markedly from those male members.

The distributions shown in Figure B indicate that survey respondents overrepresented non-Hispanic Caucasians by about four percent.
Figure A. Distributions of Respondents and NCME Membership, by Gender

[Graph showing distributions of respondents and NCME membership by gender.]
Figure B. Distributions of Respondents and NCME Membership, by Ethnicity

- **Caucasian (non-Hispanic)**: 87.9% (92.1% in Total NCME Membership)
- **Hispanic**: 12.1%
- **Black or Afro-American**: 2.5%
- **Oriental or Asian**: 4.6%
- **American Indian**: 0.6%
- **Other**: 0.9%

The chart compares the distribution of respondents to the total NCME membership by ethnicity.
underrepresented Hispanics by about one percent, underrepresented Black or Afro-American members by about two percent, and underrepresented Oriental or Asian members by about one percent. Again, these distributional differences are small, and are unlikely to produce appreciable biases since minority representation among the NCME membership is unfortunately small.

NCME members who are employed in school systems or testing organizations were slightly overrepresented in the sample of respondents, and members employed in colleges or universities were slightly underrepresented (see Figure C). Since one percent of the sample is composed of four members, and the largest within-category difference between the sample and the entire membership was about four percent, the sample is unlikely to be seriously unrepresentative. This question could be illuminated by completing separate analyses of the responses of members employed in colleges or universities and members employed in school systems.

In summary, it appears that the sample of respondents is reasonably representative of the entire NCME membership in its gender composition, its racial and ethnic composition, and its distribution by type of employment organization.

**Estimation Precision**

As noted earlier, the sample size of 484 members was designed to ensure estimation of population proportions within ± 0.05 with 95 percent
Figure C. Distributions of Respondents and NCME Membership, by Current Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Employment</th>
<th>Total NCME Membership</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Organization</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Organization</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent

Percent

0 1 2 3 4 5
confidence, provide the survey response rate was at least 70 percent. This desired estimation precision was realized with the final sample size of 346 useable responses. Evaluation of Equations (3.23), p. 58 of Jaeger (1984) with an estimated proportion of 0.5 produces a 95 percent confidence interval on a population proportion ranging from 0.45002 to 0.54998. Estimated proportions that differ from 0.5 will result in narrower confidence intervals.

**Data Reduction and Analysis**

Numerical data were entered into a Reflex data base management file on a Macintosh microcomputer and were transmitted electronically to a VAX 7800 mainframe computer. Prior to analysis, data entered from several questionnaires were visually verified for data-entry accuracy, and all data were visually scanned for accuracy of field location and magnitude. Frequency distributions for each variable were checked for out-of-range data entries. All questionable entries were verified against original questionnaires and were corrected if necessary, prior to final data analysis. The SPSSX statistical package was used to analyze data and various graphical presentation programs for the Macintosh, including Statview 512 and Cricket Graph, were used to produce graphical displays.
Results

As noted earlier, the survey of NCME members included a wide range of topics ranging from the purposes of the organization to its financial operations. The results of the survey are summarized below in ten subsections entitled (1) Purposes of NCME, (2) Activities of NCME, (3) Personal Involvement of NCME Members, (4) The NCME Annual Meeting, (5) NCME's Professional Development Activities, (6) NCME's Publications, (7) The Governance of NCME, (8) NCME's Membership Recruitment Activities, (9) NCME's Financial Operations, and (10) the Demographics of NCME's Membership.

Purposes of NCME

The first section of the survey questionnaire focused on the underlying purposes of NCME. Survey respondents were asked to consider the appropriateness of various organizational purposes, the importance of those purposes, and the success of NCME in achieving those purposes. In response to each of 14 stated purposes of NCME, respondents were asked to indicate whether the stated purpose was "inappropriate" or "appropriate," to rate the importance of the purpose on a six-point scale ranging from "not at all important" to "very important," and to rate how successfully NCME had achieved the purposes on a six-point scale ranging from "not successful" to "very successful." Ten of the fourteen stated purposes were derived directly from the NCME bylaws. Four additional purposes were developed to reflect recent NCME activities or purposes that had been considered by the NCME.
Board in recent years. These latter purposes included "NCME should promote standards for teacher preparation in the field of educational measurement," "NCME should promote standards for the accreditation and certification of professionals in educational measurement," "NCME should promote adherence to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing by assuming appropriate public policy positions," and "NCME should promote adherence to standards of professional conduct among those in the field of educational testing and measurement."

**Appropriateness**

As shown in Figure 1, twelve of the fourteen stated purposes were endorsed as appropriate for NCME by at least 94 percent of survey respondents. The two stated purposes endorsed by smaller percentages of respondents were among those not derived from the organization's bylaws: "NCME should promote standards for teacher preparation in the field of educational measurement" was endorsed as appropriate by 87 percent of respondents, and "NCME should promote standards for the accreditation and certification of professionals in educational measurement" was endorsed as appropriate by 74 percent of respondents. In summary, survey respondents overwhelmingly verified the appropriateness of all organizational purposes derived from NCME's bylaws, endorsed two potential purposes with equal enthusiasm, and endorsed two more potential purposes by a substantial majority.
Fig. 1 Percent Endorsing Various Purposes as Appropriate for NCME

- Improve Measurement Procedures: 99.7%
- Disseminate Meas. Procedures: 99.7%
- Disseminate Improve. Instrument: 99.7%
- Disseminate Measurement Theory: 99.7%
- Improve Measurement Instruments: 99.7%
- Develop Theory Measurement: 99.7%
- Apply to Program Evaluation: 99.7%
- Promote Test Standards: 95.1%
- Dissem. Program Evaluation: 95.1%
- Promote Profess. Standards: 95.1%
- Apply to Individual Assessment: 94.5%
- Dissem. Individual Assessment: 94.2%
- Promote Teacher Standards: 87.2%
- Promote Profess. Certification: 74.5%
Importance

Respondents rated the importance of each of 14 purposes of NCME on a scale that ranged from zero (Not at All Important) to five (Very Important). Although the end points of this scale were verbally anchored, intermediate points were not. If we infer a verbal anchor of "Moderately Important" for the midpoint of the scale (2.5), we can conclude that the average ratings survey respondents assigned to these 14 purposes ranged from just above "Moderately Important" to just below "Very Important." It is not surprising that the purpose endorsed as appropriate by the smallest percentage of respondents, "NCME should promote standards for the accreditation and certification of professionals in educational measurement," received the lowest mean importance rating (2.94). Every other purpose of NCME received a mean importance rating of at least 3.5 on the zero-to-five scale. The mean importance ratings summarized in Figure 2 are grouped; purposes with mean importance ratings in the same half-scale-value interval (e.g., 5.00 to 4.50, 4.49 to 4.00, etc.) are grouped together. With the exception of the "promote standards for accreditation and certification..." purpose, survey respondents considered proposed purposes of NCME to be at least one scale-point above the "Moderately Important" midpoint. Promoting the improvement of measurement procedures and instruments and promoting the development of measurement theory, and disseminating the results of these improvements and developments, were judged by respondents to be most important. The only other proposed purpose that received a mean rating above 4.0 was "promoting adherence to the Standards ... ." Purposes that involved applications of measurement to individual assessment and program evaluation, dissemination of application
Fig. 2 Mean Importance Attributed to Various NCME Purposes

- MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN: 4.71
- Improve Measurement Procedures: 4.36
- Improve Measurement Instruments: 4.33
- Develop Theory Measurement: 4.29
- Disseminate Meas. Procedures: 4.23
- Disseminate Measurement Theory: 4.06
- Promote Test Standards: 3.95
- Promote Profess. Standards: 3.92
- Apply to Individual Assessment: 3.86
- Apply to Program Evaluation: 3.79
- Dissem. Individual Assessment: 3.73
- Dissem. Program Evaluation: 3.57
- Promote Teacher Standards: 2.94

Not at All

Very
knowledge, and promotion of professional standards and standards for measurement preparation of teachers received somewhat lower mean ratings, in the range 3.50 to 3.99.

Success

Respondents also rated the success of NCME in achieving each of 14 purposes on a scale that ranged from zero (Not at All Successful) to five (Very Successful). Again, although the end points of this scale were verbally anchored, intermediate points were not. If we infer a verbal anchor of "Moderately Successful" for the midpoint of the scale (2.5), we can conclude that the average ratings survey respondents assigned these 14 purposes ranged from just above "Barely Successful" (1.68) to just below "Quite Successful" (3.62). Comparison of the rank order of purposes rated on the importance scale in Figure 2 and the success scale in Figure 3 reveals substantial consistency. In general, respondents judged NCME to be most successful in achieving objectives that were judged most important.

Respondents judged NCME's success in achieving particular purposes to average about one point lower on the six-point scale than their corresponding mean ratings of the importance of those purposes. It is not unexpected that average judgments of NCME's success in achieving purposes derived from its bylaws were higher than average judgments of NCME's success in achieving the four purposes that were derived from recent Council activities or minutes of NCME Board meetings.
Fig. 3. Mean Success Attributed to Achievement of Various NCME Purposes

- MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN: 3.62
- Develop Theory Measurement: 3.51
- Disseminate Measurement Theory: 3.43
- Improve Measurement Procedures: 3.38
- Disseminate Meas. Procedures: 3.09
- Disseminate Improve. Instrument: 2.96
- Improve Measurement Instruments: 2.85
- Apply to Program Evaluation: 2.84
- Dissem. Individual Assessment: 2.81
- Dissem. Program Evaluation: 2.79
- Apply to Individual Assessment: 2.78
- Promote Test Standards: 2.78
- Promote Profess. Standards: 2.45
- Promote Teacher Standards: 1.82
- Promote Profess. Certification: 1.68
NCME was judged to be most successful in promoting the development and dissemination of measurement theory (perhaps through the *Journal of Educational Measurement*). NCME was judged to be slightly less successful in achieving purposes linked to improvement and dissemination of measurement procedures and dissemination of improvements in educational measurement instruments. NCME was judged to be decidedly less successful in achieving purposes related to applications of educational measurement to individual assessment or program evaluation; judgments of NCME's success in achieving these purposes hovered just under three on a six-point scale with a maximum value of five. Thus NCME's success in achieving these purposes was judged to be slightly higher than "Moderately Successful."

As noted earlier, NCME was judged to be least successful in achieving the four purposes that were not derived from its bylaws. Although NCME was judged to be moderately successful in promoting adherence to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, the organization was judged to be decidedly less successful in (1) promoting adherence to professional standards among measurement specialists, (2) promoting standards for the preparation of teachers, and (3) promoting standards for accreditation and certification of professionals in the measurement field.
Summary

Respondents' ratings of the 14 current and proposed purposes of NCME suggest that the NCME membership judged these purposes to be appropriate, and "moderately important" to "very important" to the organization. On a six-point scale of importance where 5 was the maximum score, mean importance ratings ranged from 2.94 to 4.71. However, NCME was judged by respondents to be markedly less successful in promoting the achievement of these purposes (with means on the same scale ranging from 1.68 to 3.62). Perhaps the message for the NCME Board of Directors is to resist modification of the organization's purposes, and concentrate instead on building more-effective strategies for achieving the core purposes of the organization that were derived from its bylaws.

NCME's Activities

Survey respondents were asked to consider 23 current and proposed activities of NCME. Respondents stated whether NCME should or should not continue to engage in each activity, and judged the importance of each activity "for NCME as an organization" by rating it on a six-point scale that ranged from "Not at All Important" (0) to "Very Important" (5). For purposes of analysis, the 23 activities were classified as "Internal;" i.e., principally designed to serve the NCME membership, and "External;" i.e., principally designed to serve the larger measurement community, the field of education, or the public. This classification is admittedly arbitrary and arguable. For example, NCME's publications were placed in the "Internal"
category although many would argue that their readership extends well beyond the NCME membership. Nonetheless, the two-category classification provided a convenient way of organizing the 23 activities.

**Continuation of Internal Activities**

As shown in Figure 4, internal activities of NCME were divided into those related to the Annual Meeting, those related to NCME's publications, and those related to recruitment. Nearly all respondents endorsed the continuation of annual meetings and the presessions and workshops held at the annual meetings. Likewise, continued publication of NCME's two journals was endorsed by 99 percent of the respondents.

Continued publication of the *Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement* modules was endorsed by 95 percent of respondents, while continuation of special publications received a respectable 91 percent endorsement. Surprisingly, continued publication of the *Resource Bank*, one of NCME's best-kept secrets, was endorsed by more than four in five respondents. Only half the respondents felt that NCME should add publications or increase the size of its existing publications.

Continuation of recruitment activities, including recruitment of minorities to the field of educational measurement or to NCME, and assisting colleges and universities in recruiting students to the field of educational measurement, were endorsed by three-fourths to four-fifths of responding members.
Fig 4. Percent Endorsing Continuation of Various Internal NCME Activities

- Hold Annual Meetings: 99.4%
- Hold Preseession/Workshops: 97.7%
- Publish JEM: 98.8%
- Publish EM:IP: 99.4%
- Publish ITEMS: 95.0%
- Special Publications: 91.2%
- Publish Resource Bank: 82.1%
- Increase Publication Volume: 50.3%
- Recruit Students to Field: 74.5%
- Recruit Minorities to Field: 79.3%
- Recruit Minorities to NCME: 77.6%
Importance of Internal Activities

Mean importance ratings assigned to internal NCME activities are shown in Figure 5. Comparison of the percentages of respondents endorsing continuation of various internal activities (Figure 4) and mean importance ratings assigned these activities (Figure 5) suggests that the results shown in Figure 5 provide little additional information. Were mean importance ratings to be shown as percents of maximum scale value, they would be almost identical to the endorsement percentages shown in Figure 4. NCME's annual meetings and journals were judged to be very important, workshops and other publication activities were judged to be well above "moderately important," recruitment activities were judged to be more than "moderately important," and increasing publication volume was judged to be relatively least important.

In summary, respondents uniformly endorsed continuation of NCME's annual meeting and publication activities, were mixed in their endorsement of increases in NCME's publication volume, and rated recruitment activities a distant second behind annual meeting and publication activities. As noted above, judged publication of JEM, holding annual meetings, and publication of EM:IP to be most important. Training activities and other NCME publication activities were judged to be of somewhat lesser importance, and recruitment of students and minorities to the field of educational measurement were judged to be relatively least important. However, all mean importance ratings assigned to these activities were higher than the "moderately important" midpoint of the importance scale.
Fig. 5 Mean Importance Attributed to Various NCME Activities

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN
- Hold Annual Meetings: 4.54
- Hold Presessions/Workshops: 3.97
- Publish JEM: 4.61
- Publish EM:IP: 4.5
- Publish ITEMS: 3.81
- Special Publications: 3.43
- Publish Resource Bank: 2.7
- Increase Publication Volume: 2.35
- Recruit Students to Field: 2.91
- Recruit Minorities to Field: 3.02
- Recruit Minorities to NCME: 3.09

Not at All
Very
Continuation of External Activities

External activities were classified into four subcategories: those concerned with professional standards and certification, those concerned with professional development and training, those concerned with measurement legislation, and those concerned with cooperative engagement with other organizations. Activities in the first subcategory received continuation endorsements ranging from 74 percent to 93 percent. Working with other organizations to develop procedures for accreditation and certification of measurement professionals was endorsed by only 74 percent of respondents, monitoring adherence to the Code of Fair Testing Practices was endorsed by 83 percent of respondents, and working with other organizations to develop curriculum standards for the measurement preparation of teachers was endorsed by 88 percent of respondents. Most popular (with endorsement by 93 percent of respondents) was working with other organizations to set standards of professional conduct in measurement. This activity would constitute a new endeavor for NCME; it should receive serious consideration by the Board.

Activities related to professional development and training of teachers in educational measurement were also popular. Working with other organizations to identify educational measurement skills and information needed by education professionals was endorsed by 95 percent of respondents, and sponsoring measurement training programs for teachers was endorsed by 83 percent of respondents. Both of these activities would constitute new endeavors by NCME. Although their cost implications are
significant, they should be considered by the Board. Appropriately developed, they might prove to be sources of additional revenue for NCME.

Four proposed activities concerned working with or informing legislatures on measurement-related issues. Keeping the membership informed about pertinent legislation and disseminating information to legislators were almost universally endorsed by respondents. Working with legislatures was a bit less popular (91 percent endorsement), and respondents were a bit more wary about NCME's working with other organizations to take advocacy positions on legislation or public policy issues pertinent to educational measurement (endorsed by 86 percent). Respondents clearly expressed the view that NCME should not be an insular organization on issues dealing with new measurement legislation. Endorsed with equal enthusiasm were activities involving work with other organizations composed of professionals in educational measurement (99 percent) and professionals outside the field of educational measurement (93 percent).

Importance of External Activities

The mean importance ratings assigned to "external" NCME activities parallel the percentages of respondents endorsing continuation of these activities to the extent that additional discussion would be totally redundant (compare Figures 6 and 7).
Fig. 6  Percent Endorsing Continuation of Various External NCME Activities

- Standards Profess. Conduct: 93.0%
- Standards for Teacher Prep.: 87.6%
- Monitor Adherence to Code: 83.3%
- Certification Measurement Prof.: 73.7%
- Identify Needed Profess. Skills: 95.3%
- Training Prog. for Teachers: 83.2%
- Disseminate Info Legislators: 96.5%
- Monitor Testing Legislation: 96.5%
- Work Measurement Legislation: 90.8%
- Take Advocacy on Legislation: 85.8%
- Work Other Research Organiz.: 98.8%
- Work Non-Research Organizations: 93.5%
Fig. 7 Mean Importance Attributed to Various External NCME Activities

- Maximum Possible Mean
- Standards Prof. Conduct: 3.77
- Monitor Adherence to Code: 3.57
- Standards for Teacher Prep.: 3.37
- Certification Measurement Prof.: 2.89
- Identify Needed Profess. Skills: 3.74
- Training Prog. for Teachers: 3.45
- Monitor Testing Legislation: 4.07
- Disseminate Info Legislators: 4.01
- Work Measurement Legislation: 3.89
- Take Advocacy on Legislation: 3.5
- Work Other Research Organiz.: 4.04
- Work Non-Research Organizations: 3.37

Not at All to Very
Summary

None of NCME's current activities was endorsed by so few respondents that the Board should seriously consider its discontinuation. However, three potential activities were endorsed by such large percentages of respondents that the Board should, within obvious budget constraints, consider their initiation. These three are: (1) Working with other organizations to set standards of professional conduct in measurement, (2) working with other organizations to identify educational measurement skills and information needed by education professionals, and (3) sponsoring measurement training programs for teachers. In the long term, the last two activities might be developed as sources of additional revenue for NCME.

The NCME Annual Meeting

The survey contained questions that addressed respondents' participation in NCME's annual meeting and their perceptions of certain features of the annual meeting. These latter questions sought members' evaluations of these features. Responses to questions concerning NCME members' attendance at annual meetings; participation as a paper or symposium presenter; participation as a session chair, discussant, or reactor; and attendance at training sessions are summarized in Figures 8 and 8.1.

Perhaps most interesting are the findings that more than a fourth of the membership has not attended an NCME annual meeting in the last five
Fig. 8 Participation in the Five Most Recent NCME Annual Meetings

- Attend Training Session
- Chair/Discuss/React
- Present Paper/Symposium
- Attend Annual Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Meetings</th>
<th>Attend Training Session</th>
<th>Chair/Discuss/React</th>
<th>Present Paper/Symposium</th>
<th>Attend Annual Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 8.1 Distribution of Attendance (Five Most Recent Annual Meetings)

- Five: 18.40%
- Four: 11.70%
- Three: 12.00%
- Two: 16.70%
- One: 12.30%
- None: 28.90%
years, and that well over half the membership has attended fewer than half the annual meetings held during the last five years. Although most NCME members consider the annual meeting to be among the organization's most important activities, many are either unable or choose not to participate in these meetings.

Also revealing are the findings that more than two-thirds of the respondents have not presented a paper at NCME annual meetings held during the last five years, and that fewer than 12 percent of respondents have presented papers at a majority of the annual meetings held during the last five years. Even fewer members participate in the annual meetings as session chairs, discussants, or reactors. Participation in training sessions was likewise reported by relatively few members (only 18 percent attended a training session at one annual meeting during the last five years, and only four percent attended a training session at two annual meetings during the last five years).

These findings suggest that active participation in NCME's annual meetings is restricted to relatively few members. If the Board judged it to be worthwhile, the Annual Meeting Program Committee could very likely broaden the memberships' participation as session chairs or discussants.

Table 1 contains a summary of respondents' mean evaluative ratings of various features of the NCME annual meetings, ranging from their organization to their timing. The highest marks were earned by the organization of the annual meeting (with a mean of 4.2 on a five-point scale) and convenience of meeting locations (with a mean of 4.1). Questions concerned with expense, meeting length, relevance of content, and
Table 1. Members' Perceptions of Features of the NCME Annual Meeting

(Mean Response by Subscale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poorly Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held in Very Inconvenient Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Expensive to Attend (in Terms of Travel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Expensive to Attend (in Terms of Registration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Lengthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Content is Not Relevant to My Current Professional Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held at a Very Inconvenient Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Well Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held in Very Convenient Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Inexpensive to Attend (in Terms of Travel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Inexpensive to Attend (in Terms of Registration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Content is Very Relevant to My Current Professional Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held at a Very Convenient Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent No Opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poorly Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held in Very Inconvenient Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Expensive to Attend (in Terms of Travel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Expensive to Attend (in Terms of Registration)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Lengthy</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Content is Not Relevant to My Current Professional Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held at a Very Inconvenient Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
convenience of timing resulted in mean ratings that were consistently above the neutral point, but not overwhelmingly positive.

Respondents' perceptions of various features of NCME's professional development activities are summarized in Table 2. A majority of respondents had no opinion concerning NCME's professional development activities, a finding that is not surprising since so few members participate in these activities. The organization of NCME's professional development activities was awarded the highest mean rating assigned by those expressing an opinion (3.8 on a five-point scale). Other features of NCME's professional development activities, including scheduling, expense, length, and content relevance, were assigned mean ratings that were barely above the neutral point.

In summary, relatively few NCME members are active participants in the organization's annual meetings, and more than a fourth are either unable to attend or choose not to attend at all. Those attending annual meetings gave high marks to the organization of the meetings and the convenience of the locations where they are held. Other aspects of the annual meetings were judged, on average, to be more positive than negative. Those expressing an opinion about NCME's professional development activities also judged them to be more positive than negative, but average judgments of their scheduling, expense, length, and content relevance were only marginally above the neutral point.
Table 2. Members' Perceptions of Features of NCME's Professional Development Activities

(Mean Response by Subscale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poorly Organized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Very</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconveniently Within the Annual Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Expensive to Attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Lengthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Content is Not Relevant to My Professional Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent No Opinion

Very Well Organized

Scheduled Very Conveniently Within the Annual Meeting

Very Inexpensive to Attend

Too Short

The Content is Very Relevant to My Professional Needs
The Journal of Educational Measurement

Respondents were presented with questions concerning their use of and contribution to the *Journal of Educational Measurement* (JEM), and with questions concerning their satisfaction with various characteristics of the *Journal of Educational Measurement*. Summaries of responses to the first set of questions are shown in the two distributions in Figure 9.

*JEM* enjoys a local and active readership. Over 30 percent of survey respondents reported that they read every issue of *JEM*, and 42 percent more reported that they read *JEM* "regularly." Only six percent of respondents reported that they read *JEM* "seldom" or "never." The high utility of *JEM* to the readership's work is reflected in the report of 32 percent of the respondents that they "use *JEM* in their work regularly." An additional 50 percent reported that they use *JEM* in their work "occasionally."

As might be expected, far more NCME members read *JEM* regularly than use it as a vehicle for publication of their measurement research findings. Over three-fourths of the respondents reported never having published a paper in *JEM*, and another 15 percent reported having had one or two papers published in the twenty-five-year history of the journal.

On a six-point scale ranging from "Not at All Satisfied" (0) to "Very Satisfied" (5), respondents assigned a mean rating of 3.94 to the quality of the research described in *JEM*, and nearly identical ratings of 3.74 and 3.73, respectively, to timeliness of articles and the quality of writing in *JEM* (see Figure 10). If we assign the definition "Moderately Satisfied" to the
Fig. 9 Distribution of Frequency of Members' Reading, Use of, and Contribution to JEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Read JEM</th>
<th>Use JEM in Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Read JEM
- Use JEM in Work

Number Papers Published in JEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Papers Published in JEM</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Members' Mean Satisfaction with Selected Characteristics of JEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of JEM</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Mean</th>
<th>Percent No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Research</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of Articles</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Writing</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Policies</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Content</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Content</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
midpoint of the six-point scale (2.5), we might conclude that, on average, respondents are "quite satisfied" with these characteristics of JEM.

Although 28 percent of respondents had no opinion about JEM's editorial policies, those who expressed an opinion assigned a mean rating of 3.6, well above the "Moderately Satisfied" midpoint of the scale. Respondents' mean satisfaction with the scope of content presented in JEM was somewhat closer to the scale's midpoint (3.11), a finding that might warrant a more detailed follow-up study.

Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice

As was true of questions concerning the Journal of Educational Measurement, respondents were presented with questions concerning their use of and contribution to Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice (EM:IP) and with questions concerning their satisfaction with various characteristics of Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice. Summaries of responses to the first set of questions are shown in the two distributions in Figure 11.

Like JEM, EM:IP is widely read by the NCME membership. More than 31 percent of respondents reported reading every issue, and another 32 percent reported reading EM:IP "regularly." However, 13 percent of respondents reported that they "seldom" or "never" read EM:IP, a value that is twice as large as the corresponding percentage for JEM. The utility of EM:IP to the work of survey respondents was also somewhat lower than that of JEM. About a fourth of the respondents reported using EM:IP "regularly" in their work, and 43 percent reported that they use it "occasionally."
Figure 11. Distribution of Frequency of Members' Reading, Use of, and Contribution to EM:IP

- **Every Issue**: 1.2 Read EMIP, 31.2 Use EMIP in Work
- **Regularly**: 24.5 Read EMIP, 32.4 Use EMIP in Work
- **Occasionally**: 23 Read EMIP, 43.1 Use EMIP in Work
- **Seldom**: 8.2 Read EMIP, 20.4 Use EMIP in Work
- **Never**: 10.8 Read EMIP, 10.5 Use EMIP in Work

**Frequency**

**Percent**

**Number Papers Published in EM:IP**

- None: 89.8
- 1 or 2: 7.3
- 3 to 5: 2
- 6 to 9: 0.3
- 10 or more: 0.3
However, over 30 percent reported that they "seldom" or "never" use EM:IP in their work.

Since EM:IP is a far younger journal than JEM, it is not surprising that a larger percentage of the NCME membership (almost 90 percent) has never published in EM:IP. Another seven percent has had one or two papers published in EM:IP.

Somewhat higher percentages of respondents had no opinion about various characteristics of EM:IP than was true of the same characteristics of JEM (compare Figures 10 and 12). However, those who expressed an opinion assigned higher mean satisfaction ratings to the characteristics of EM:IP than they assigned to corresponding characteristics of JEM. On a six-point scale with 5 representing "Very Satisfied" and 0 representing "Not at All Satisfied," respondents' mean ratings ranged between 3.51 (for relevance of content) to 3.95 (for timeliness of articles). Clearly, those who read EM:IP are quite well pleased with its content, timeliness, use as a vehicle for disseminating information about NCME, quality of writing, and editorial policies. Characteristics on which respondents were, on average, slightly less satisfied, included the scope and relevance of the content of EM:IP. However, as has been noted, EM:IP received marks that were substantially above the "Moderately Satisfied" midpoint of the satisfaction scale on these characteristics as well.
FIG. 12 Members' Mean Satisfaction With Selected Characteristics of EM:IP

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN

Timeliness of Articles 3.95 15.3
Information Concerning HCME 3.84 19.9
Quality of Writing 3.84 12.7
Editorial Policies 3.81 32.4
Quality of Research 3.68 13.9
Scope of Content 3.56 14.2
Relevance of Content 3.51 12.1

Not at All Satisfied Very Satisfied
In summary, NCME members appear to be well satisfied with the quality of the organization's two principal publications -- the Journal of Educational Measurement and Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice. Both journals are widely and regularly read, both are relevant to the work of substantial portions of the NCME membership, and both received mean satisfaction ratings on most characteristics that were well above the "Moderately Satisfied" level. Although these results suggest that the scope of content of JEM might be examined through a more intensive study of the desires of the JEM readership, its mean rating was above the "Moderately Satisfied" level.

Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement

Five questions sought information on respondents' use of and satisfaction with various characteristics of the Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement (ITEMS) modules that have appeared in a number of issues of Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice. Responses to these questions are summarized in two distributions, shown in Figure 13. Although a majority of survey respondents reported that they have never used the ITEMS modules, more than a fourth reported that they have used the modules "occasionally." When rates of even-more-frequent use area added to that of "occasional" use, more than a third of the survey respondents use the ITEMS modules at least "occasionally."
Fig. 13 Members' Mean Satisfaction With, and Frequency of Use of ITEMS

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN

- Dissem. Through EM:IP 3.78 52.0
- Timeliness of Topics 3.76 51.4
- Appropriateness of Level 3.73 50.9
- Relevance of Topics 3.37 49.1
Slightly more than half the survey respondents had no opinion about various characteristics of the ITEMS modules (presumably those with no opinion are the non-users). Those who expressed an opinion on the six-point satisfaction scale ranging from "Not at All Satisfied" (0) to "Very Satisfied" (5), assigned mean ratings between 3.7 and 3.8, just below the "Quite Satisfied" level, to dissemination of the ITEMS modules through EM:IP, the timeliness of topics treated in the ITEMS modules, and the appropriateness of the level of discourse used in the ITEMS modules. The relevance of topics treated in the ITEMS modules received a somewhat lower mean satisfaction rating of 3.4, still well above the midpoint of the satisfaction scale.

The Resource Bank

As noted earlier, the Resource Bank might be NCME's best kept secret. When asked about their satisfaction with its characteristics, about 85 percent of survey respondents had no opinion, and nearly 80 percent of respondents responded "Never" to a question on the frequency of their use of the Resource Bank. It is likely that most NCME members have never heard about the availability of the Resource Bank, since the mean satisfaction rating assigned "Effectiveness of advertisements announcing the Resource Bank" was 1.58 on the six-point satisfaction scale. The relatively few respondents who were familiar with the Resource Bank assigned in mean ratings just above the "Moderately Satisfied" midpoint of the satisfaction scale on such characteristics as quality of selections (3.2), timeliness of sources (3.0), and relevance of topics (2.9). These results are summarized in Figure 14.
Fig. 14 Members' Mean Satisfaction With, and Frequency of Use of Resource Bank

**Regularly**

- Quality of Selections: 0.3

**Occasionally**

- Timeliness of Resources: 6.7
- Relevance of Topics: 12.9

**Seldom**

- Effectiveness of Advertisment: 79.8

**Never**

- Percent No Opinion: 74.3
- Percent Very Satisfied: 86.1
- Percent Satisfied: 85.8
- Percent Somewhat Satisfied: 84.7
- Percent Not at All Satisfied: 74.3

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN

- Quality of Selections: 3.23
- Timeliness of Resources: 2.95
- Relevance of Topics: 2.89
- Effectiveness of Advertisment: 1.58

Percent No Opinion: 74.3

Not at All Satisfied

Very Satisfied
In summary, the ITEMS modules appear to serve a sizeable minority of the NCME membership, and that minority appears to be reasonably well satisfied with their content, timeliness, and dissemination. In contrast, the Resource Bank is used by very few NCME members, presumably because it has not been advertised effectively. Another factor that might explain the difference between use of the Resource Bank and the ITEMS modules is the no-cost distribution of the ITEMS modules through EM:IP and the small charge for obtaining copies of the Resource Bank. Those who have used the Resource Bank appear to be moderately satisfied with its quality, timeliness, and relevance.

NCME Members' Interest in Organizational Participation

The principal resource of any professional organization is the willingness of its members to sustain the activities of the organization by participating in its governance structure and serving on its working committees. To determine NCME members' willingness to serve the organization, survey respondents were asked to consider three types of NCME service: membership on NCME committees, membership on NCME's Board of Directors, and becoming an NCME officer.

The results summarized in Figure 15 suggest that NCME enjoys a membership that is rich in potential committee members, Board members,
Fig. 15 Members' Interest in Serving NCME in Various Capacities

- Very Interested
  - Committee Member: 9.2%
  - Board Member: 12.8%
  - Officer: 21%

- Fairly Interested
  - Committee Member: 32.3%
  - Board Member: 25.2%
  - Officer: 41.7%

- Not at All Interested
  - Committee Member: 54.9%
  - Board Member: 65.6%
  - Officer: 60.0%
and officers. More than one in five respondents indicated that they were "Very Interested" in serving as a member of an NCME committee, and an additional two in five indicated that they were "Fairly Interested." Almost 13 percent of respondents were "Very Interested" in serving on the NCME Board of Directors, and an additional 32 percent were "Fairly Interested." At least a third of the respondents were either "Very Interested" (9 percent) or "Fairly Interested" (25 percent) in becoming an NCME officer (Vice President and then President).

In summary, many members are interested in serving NCME through its committees, as Board members, and as officers. Perhaps the Board can develop strategies for broadening members' opportunities to serve NCME by seeking nominations (including self-nominations) for committee chairs and members, and by suggesting (or mandating) that the Nominations Committee routinely seek suggestions from the membership (perhaps through announcements published in EM:IP) prior to finalizing its recommended slate.

**NCME's Governance Procedures**

A number of survey questions sought information on respondents' satisfaction with NCME's governance structure, including the procedures
used to elect officers and Board members and to appoint committee members. Respondents were also asked to report their satisfaction with the cooperative management agreement under which the American Educational Research Association provides central office services for NCME, and to rate the quality of functioning of each of NCME's ad-hoc, joint, and standing committees.

Respondents' satisfaction with NCME's election and committee appointment procedures is summarized in Figure 16. Results indicate that a majority of respondents are "Very Satisfied" with procedures used to elect NCME's Board members and officers, and that another third are "Fairly Satisfied." However, slightly more than a third of respondents are "Very Satisfied" and about 40 percent are "Fairly Satisfied" with procedures used to appoint chairs and members of NCME's ad hoc and standing committees. No more than five percent of respondents stated that they are "Not at All Satisfied" with NCME's election or appointment procedures.

The cooperative management agreement under which the American Educational Research Association provides central office services for NCME is highly regarded by NCME members. More than 55 percent of respondents stated that they were "Very Satisfied" with this arrangement, and another 27 percent were fairly satisfied. It is probably safe to conclude that most of those who marked "Uncertain" did so because they did not know the terms of the cooperative management agreement; an "Uncertain" response should not be interpreted as indicating disapproval. These results are shown in Figure 16.1.
Fig. 16 Members' Satisfaction with NCME's Election/Appointment Procedures

- **Very satisfied**
  - Elect Board: 37.2%
  - Elect Officers: 38.1%
  - Appoint Standing Committees: 52.9%
  - Appoint Ad Hoc Committees: 54.5%

- **Fairly satisfied**
  - Elect Board: 33.2%
  - Elect Officers: 32%
  - Appoint Standing Committees: 42.2%
  - Appoint Ad Hoc Committees: 42.5%

- **Uncertain**
  - Elect Board: 11.2%
  - Elect Officers: 11.7%
  - Appoint Standing Committees: 15.5%
  - Appoint Ad Hoc Committees: 15.5%

- **Not at all satisfied**
  - Elect Board: 2.6%
  - Elect Officers: 1.8%
  - Appoint Standing Committees: 5%
  - Appoint Ad Hoc Committees: 3.8%
Fig. 16.1 Members' Satisfaction with the AERA Cooperative Management Agreement

- Very Satisfied: 55.3%
- Fairly Satisfied: 27.1%
- Uncertain: 15.9%
- Not at All Satisfied: 1.5%
Figures 17, 18, and 19 summarize respondents' ratings of NCME's ad hoc, joint, and standing committees, respectively. Respondents were asked to rate the functioning of each committee on a four-point scale ranging from "Poor" (0) to "Excellent" (3). They were also permitted to indicate that they had insufficient information to render a judgment by marking "Don't Know."

Between 75 percent and 86 percent of respondents indicated that they had insufficient information to rate the quality of NCME's ad hoc committees (see Figure 17). These statistics suggest that the Board might take actions to better inform the membership about NCME's committees and their activities. Respondents who evaluated NCME's ad hoc committees generally gave them average ratings in the upper portion of the "Fair" to "Good" range. Exceptions were the Committee on Past Presidents (the mean rating of this committee was 2.04 -- a value just above "Good" and the Committee on Participation of Minorities in Education (the mean rating of this committee was 1.22 -- a value that is marginally above "Fair").

Together with several other professional organizations, NCME contributes to the activities of two joint committees: The Committee on Standards for Program Evaluation and the Committee on Testing Practices. The functioning of both of these committees was well regarded by survey respondents who rated them (mean ratings of both committees were above "Good"). However, over 60 percent of respondents had insufficient information to rate the Committee on Standards for Program Evaluation and a majority had insufficient information to rate the Committee on Testing Practices (see Figure 18). In general, NCME's standing committees were judged more favorably than were its ad hoc committees. Mean ratings of these committees ranged from just below "Good" (for the Membership
Fig. 17 Members' Mean Ratings of NCME Ad Hoc Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Hoc Committees</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Mean</th>
<th>Percent Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Past Presidents</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certif. of Meas. Professionals</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Materials</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCME-NATD Relationship</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Guidelines</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Monitoring</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit. Ed. Meas. Specialists</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Partic. Minorities in Ed.</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 18 Members' Mean Ratings of NCME Joint Committees

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN

Stand. Prog. Eval.

Testing Practices

Percent

Don't Know

2.14

61.6

2.21

54.0
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Excellent
Fig. 19 Members' Mean Ratings of NCME Standing Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Committees</th>
<th>MAXIMUM POSSIBLE MEAN</th>
<th>Percent Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Award</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educat. Testing</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Devel./Training</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee) to Just above "Good" (for the Committee on NCME's Career Award for Contributions to Educational Measurement). Although a higher percentage of respondents provided ratings of NCME's standing committees than of its ad hoc committees, between half and three-fourths of respondents had insufficient information to judge the functioning of these committees (see Figure 19).

In summary, NCME members appear to be generally satisfied with the organization's election and committee appointment procedures, and with the cooperative management agreement under which AERA provides central office operations for NCME. Most NCME members are insufficiently informed about the organization's ad hoc, joint, and standing committees to rate their functioning. Members who rated NCME's ad hoc committees generally gave them average grades ranging from "C+" to "B." NCME's joint and standing committees fared a bit better, receiving average grades in the "B-" to "B+" range. These findings do not indicate the need for radical revision of NCME's election and appointment procedures, although results summarized in the previous section suggest that a broader cross-section of the membership should be provided with opportunities to serve as Board members and officers. However, it is noteworthy that most survey respondents are uninformed about the functioning of NCME's committees. Opportunities to learn about these committees could be provided through descriptive articles in EM:IP or through open meetings of committees during the NCME annual meeting.
Expanding NCME's Membership

Ninety-two percent of survey respondents agreed with the statement "NCME should try to expand its membership" (see Figure 20). Strategies for attracting new members that were at least as widely supported included providing a booth at the AERA/NCME annual meeting, sending contact letters to members of related organizations, and seeking members of related organizations through other (unspecified) means. Attracting members of racial minority groups to NCME was endorsed by 85 percent of respondents, and attracting more female members was endorsed by 80 percent. Almost half the respondents felt that NCME should take additional measures to attract new members. In the eyes of the membership, the goals of the NCME Membership Committee will not soon disappear.

NCME's Financial Operations

Two sections of the survey questionnaire posed questions concerning NCME's income distribution and expenditure distribution. In the income-distribution section, respondents were shown a pie chart indicating that 38 percent of NCME's current revenues are generated through members' dues payments, 23 percent are generated through subscriptions to JEM, 19 percent are generated through the annual meeting, six percent are generated through subscriptions to EM:IP, and 19 percent are generated through other sources. Respondents were asked to recommend either decreasing, maintaining, or increasing the portion of NCME's total income generated through each of these revenue sources.
Fig. 20 Percent Endorsing Various Strategies for Increasing NCME's Membership

- Provide Booth at AERA/NCME: 93.1%
- Send Contact Letters: 93.1%
- Expand Membership: 92.3%
- From Related Organizations: 90.4%
- Attract Racial Minorities: 84.9%
- Attract Female Members: 80.4%
- Additional Measures: 45.3%

Percent Agree vs Membership Strategy
Results summarized in Figure 21 indicate that very few respondents would recommend decreasing proportionate revenues generated from any current NCME source. About three-fourths recommended holding the line on membership dues and prices of subscriptions to both major journals. About two-thirds gave the same recommendation for annual meeting charges and the costs of other revenue-generating activities, such as special publications. Between 16 and 18 percent of respondents recommended increases between 5% and 10% in membership dues and costs of journal subscriptions, and a fourth recommended increases in this range for annual meeting registration and other revenue-generating activities. Increases exceeding 10% were recommended by very few respondents.

In the expenditure section of the survey, respondents were shown a pie chart indicating that 39 percent of NCME's budget was allocated to publication of JEM, 28 percent was allocated to administration and governance of the organization, 20 percent was allocated to publication of EM:IP, 10 percent was allocated to the annual meeting, and three percent was allocated to special projects. Respondents were asked to recommend either decreasing, maintaining, or increasing the portion of NCME's total budget allocated to each of these categories of expenditure.

As was true of recommendations on revenue generation, the vast majority of survey respondents recommended no changes in NCME's expenditure allocation. As shown in Figure 22, about three-fourths of respondents recommended no change in the portion of NCME's budget allocated to the annual meeting and publication of EM:IP; just over seventy percent made the same recommendation for publication of JEM and
Fig. 21 Distribution of Recommended Budget Adjustments by NCME Income Category

- **Increase > 10%**: 7.1%
- **Increase 5% to 10%**: 18%
- **Keep the Same**: 67.5%
- **Decrease 5% to 10%**: 4%
- **Decrease > 10%**: 2.5%

**Sources of Income Adjustments**:
- Other Sources
- Annual Meeting
- Ed. Meas: Issues & Practice
- Membership Dues

**Percent Distribution**
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Fig. 22 Distribution of Recommended Budget Adjustments by Expenditure Category

- Increase > 10%:
  - Special Projects: 1.3
  - Annual Meeting: 1.3
  - Publication of EM:IP: 4.7
  - Publication of JEM: 11.8
  - Administration: 24.3

- Increase 5% to 10%:
  - Special Projects: 6.9
  - Annual Meeting: 13
  - Publication of EM:IP: 14.4
  - Publication of JEM: 11.8
  - Administration: 22

- Keep the Same:
  - Special Projects: 4.9
  - Annual Meeting: 11
  - Publication of EM:IP: 14.4
  - Publication of JEM: 11.8
  - Administration: 66

- Decrease 5% to 10%:
  - Special Projects: 3.9
  - Annual Meeting: 4.5
  - Publication of EM:IP: 6.9
  - Publication of JEM: 13.1
  - Administration: 18.6

- Decrease > 10%:
  - Special Projects: 1
  - Annual Meeting: 1.9
  - Publication of EM:IP: 2.6
  - Publication of JEM: 3.3
  - Administration: 6.9

Percentages:
- Special Projects: 78.2
- Annual Meeting: 75.8
- Publication of EM:IP: 71.2
- Publication of JEM: 72.1
- Administration: 66
NCME's administration and governance, and two-thirds recommended holding the line on spending for special projects. Hardly any respondents recommended budget changes exceeding 10% for any category of expenditure. However, about a fourth recommended a 5% to 10% increase in expenditures for special projects, and twelve to fourteen percent recommended similar increases for NCME's publications and the annual meeting. Expenditures for administration and governance were the prime target for increased fiscal control; just over 18 percent recommended a 5% to 10% reduction in expenditures.

In summary, a substantial minority of the membership (up to a fourth) would support increases in registration charges for the annual meeting and increased costs associated with the products of NCME's special projects. Very few members recommended reductions in the costs of membership, journal subscriptions, or annual meeting registration.

On the expenditure side of the ledger, most members favor no changes in budget allocation, and for most categories of expenditure, those favoring modest increases or decreases are evenly balanced. The exceptions are special projects, where a fourth of the membership favors increased expenditures in the 5% to 10% range, and administration and governance, where almost one in five members favor reduced expenditures in the same range.
Composition of the NCME Membership

Although NCME's membership application provides some information on the demographic characteristics of the organization's membership, this information is limited to gender, race/ethnic background, and type of organization in which an applicant is employed. The survey sought additional information through which could characterize its membership.

As shown in Figure 23, more than three-fourths of NCME's members hold doctorates, and an additional 20 percent hold master's degrees. Ours is a highly educated membership.

Educational measurement was the most frequently listed academic major in the highest-degree programs of survey respondents (almost 30 percent), followed by educational psychology (16 percent) and education (15 percent). Psychology was the only other academic major identified by more than 10 percent of survey respondents (see Figure 24).

Figure 25 contains a summary of the current employment roles and status of survey respondents. The most frequently identified role was that of university faculty member (23 percent), followed by measurement researcher (13 percent), test developer (10 percent), and public school administrator (10 percent). However, 21 percent of survey respondents selected "Other" when answering the question "Which of the following best describes your current employment role and status?".

Almost a fourth of NCME's members are relative newcomers to the field of educational measurement (employed in the field no more than five years), and 29 percent are relative "old timers" (with over 20 years of
Fig. 23 Distribution of Survey Respondents by Highest Degree

Highest Degree

- Bachelors
- Masters
- Specialist
- Doctorate

Percent

- 0.9
- 21.0
- 2.0
- 75.8
Fig. 24 Distribution of Survey Respondents by Academic Major in Highest Degree

- Educ. Measurement: 29.9%
- Educ. Psych.: 15.7%
- Education: 14.8%
- Psychology: 11.8%
- Other Major: 11.2%
- Statistics: 5%
- Ed. Meas. & Stat.: 4.1%
- Counseling: 3.3%
- Sociology: 0.6%
- Combined Major: 3.6%
Fig. 25 Distribution of Survey Respondents by Current Employment Role or Status

- University Faculty: 22.8%
- Other Role: 21.3%
- Measurement Research: 12.7%
- Test Developer: 10.4%
- Public School Admin.: 9.8%
- University Administrator: 8.6%
- University Researcher: 4.1%
- Retired: 3.8%
- Test Administrator: 3.6%
- Combined Roles: 3%
employment in the field). The rest are spread almost evenly across five-year-employment categories (see Figure 26).

As shown in Figure 27, more than a third of NCME's members joined the organization within the past five years. The balance of the membership is uniformly distributed across five-year intervals, including more than 20 years of membership. This distribution of length of membership might either be a cause for rejoicing (the Membership Committee has been doing an outstanding job during the past five years) or a cause for alarm (there is relatively high turnover among new recruits). A correct interpretation could be informed by an analysis of the length of membership at time of non-renewal for those who have failed to maintain their NCME membership during the past few years.

In summary, NCME's members are highly educated; tended to major in educational measurement or a closely related field in their terminal academic programs; more often are employed as university faculty members than in any other single role although their role positions are quite diverse; are slightly more likely to be "old timers" in the measurement field than "newcomers," although both groups are well represented; and are more likely to be in their first five years of NCME membership than in any other length-of-membership category.
Fig. 26 Distribution of Survey Respondents by Length of Employment in Field

- 0 to 5 Years: 23.7%
- 6 to 10 Years: 14.5%
- 11 to 15 Years: 19.6%
- 16 to 20 Years: 13.1%
- Over 20 Years: 29.1%
Fig. 27 Distribution of Survey Respondents by Length of NCME Membership

- 0 to 5 Years: 36.7%
- 6 to 10 Years: 18.1%
- 11 to 15 Years: 15.2%
- 16 to 20 Years: 13.4%
- Over 20 Years: 16.6%
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Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire
Section I

Section I of this questionnaire concerns the underlying purposes of NCME. You are asked to consider the appropriateness of various organizational purposes, the importance of these purposes, and how successful NCME has been in achieving these purposes. Some of the stated purposes were derived from NCME's Bylaws, and others have been suggested more recently by the NCME Committee on Past Presidents. It is important that you consider each stated purpose independently and that you respond to all three questions -- concerning appropriateness, importance, and success -- for each stated purpose.

DIRECTIONS

An organizational purpose for NCME is stated in each of Items 1 through 14. For each stated purpose:

I. Circle INAPPROPRIATE or APPROPRIATE to indicate your judgment of the appropriateness of this purpose for NCME as an organization.

II. Circle a number from 0 (NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT) to 5 (VERY IMPORTANT) on the left-hand scale to indicate your judgment of the importance of this purpose for NCME as an organization.

III. Circle a number from 0 (NOT AT ALL SUCCESSFUL) to 5 (TOTALLY SUCCESSFUL) on the right-hand scale to indicate your judgment of how successful NCME has been in achieving this purpose.

EXAMPLE

Consider the fictitious purpose: “NCME should become the principal teacher assessment and licensing agency in the United States” Suppose you judged this purpose to be (a) inappropriate for NCME, (b) not at all important as an organizational purpose, and (c) judged NCME to have experienced very limited success in achieving this purpose. You would then answer the three questions posed for this purpose as follows:

PURPOSE
NCME should become the principal teacher assessment and licensing agency in the United States.

APPROPRIATENESS
Circle one:

INAPPROPRIATE
(Appropriate purpose for NCME.)

APPROPRIATE
(This is not an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

IMPORTANCE
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
(NCME should not pursue this purpose.)

VERY IMPORTANT
(NCME definitely should pursue this purpose.)

SUCCESS
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has not been successful in achieving this purpose.)

SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has been very successful in achieving this purpose.)
PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING APPROPRIATENESS, IMPORTANCE, AND SUCCESS FOR EACH OF THE PURPOSES STATED IN ITEMS 1 THROUGH 14

PURPOSE
1. NCME should promote scholarly activity aimed at developing the theory of educational measurement.

APPROPRIATENESS
Circle one:

INAPPROPRIATE (This is not an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

APPROPRIATE (This is an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

IMPORTANCE
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
(NCME should not pursue this purpose.)

VERY IMPORTANT
(NCME definitely should pursue this purpose.)

SUCCESS
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has not been successful at this.)

VERY SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has been very successful at this.)

PURPOSE
2. NCME should promote scholarly activity aimed at improving measurement procedures in education.

APPROPRIATENESS
Circle one:

INAPPROPRIATE (This is not an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

APPROPRIATE (This is an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

IMPORTANCE
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
(NCME should not pursue this purpose.)

VERY IMPORTANT
(NCME definitely should pursue this purpose.)

SUCCESS
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has not been successful at this.)

VERY SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has been very successful at this.)

PURPOSE
3. NCME should promote scholarly efforts aimed at improving the instruments used in educational measurement.

APPROPRIATENESS
Circle one:

INAPPROPRIATE (This is not an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

APPROPRIATE (This is an appropriate purpose for NCME.)

IMPORTANCE
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
(NCME should not pursue this purpose.)

VERY IMPORTANT
(NCME definitely should pursue this purpose.)

SUCCESS
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has not been successful at this.)

VERY SUCCESSFUL
(NCME has been very successful at this.)
PURPOSE
4. NCME should promote scholarly efforts to apply what is known about educational measurement to the assessment of individuals.

PURPOSE
5. NCME should promote scholarly efforts to apply what is known about educational measurement to program evaluation.

PURPOSE
6. NCME should disseminate knowledge related to the theory of educational measurement.

PURPOSE
7. NCME should disseminate knowledge related to procedures used in educational measurement.
PURPOSE
8. NCME should disseminate knowledge related to the improvement of instruments used in educational measurement.

PURPOSE
9. NCME should disseminate knowledge related to educational assessment and evaluation of individuals.

PURPOSE
10. NCME should disseminate knowledge related to educational assessment and the evaluation of programs.

PURPOSE
11. NCME should promote standards for teacher preparation in the field of educational measurement.
12. NCME should promote standards for the accreditation and certification of professionals in educational measurement.

13. NCME should promote adherence to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing by assuming appropriate public policy positions.

14. NCME should promote adherence to standards of professional conduct among those in the field of educational testing and measurement.
15. Are there any additional purposes that you feel NCME should adopt?  ...Yes □  ...No □. If you answered "Yes," please list additional purposes below and indicate how important you think they are. Also, use the space below to elaborate on any of your responses concerning the appropriateness or importance of NCME's purposes, or NCME's success in achieving its purposes.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Section II

Section II of this questionnaire is concerned with the activities of NCME. You are asked to consider whether NCME should continue with the activities in which it has been involved, and if so, how much emphasis should be given to them.

DIRECTIONS

An organizational activity of NCME is stated in each of items 16 through 38.

For each stated activity:

I. Circle AGREE or DISAGREE to indicate whether you think NCME should or should not continue the activity stated.

II. Circle a number from 0 (NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT) to 5 (VERY IMPORTANT) on the scale to the right to indicate your judgment of the importance of this activity for NCME as an organization.
PLEASE ANSWER THE "CONTINUATION" QUESTION AND THE QUESTION CONCERNING IMPORTANCE FOR EACH OF THE ACTIVITIES IN ITEMS 16 THROUGH 38.

ACTIVITY

16. NCME should hold annual meetings.

CONTINUATION
Circle one:

AGREE (NCME should continue this activity.)
DISAGREE (NCME should not continue this activity.)

IMPORTANCE
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT | VERY IMPORTANT

17. NCME should provide presessions and workshops at its annual meetings.

AGREE (NCME should continue this activity.)
DISAGREE (NCME should not continue this activity.)

18. NCME should publish the Journal of Educational Measurement

AGREE (NCME should continue this activity.)
DISAGREE (NCME should not continue this activity.)


AGREE (NCME should continue this activity.)
DISAGREE (NCME should not continue this activity.)

20. NCME should publish Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement (ITEMS).

AGREE (NCME should continue this activity.)
DISAGREE (NCME should not continue this activity.)
### ACTIVITY

21. NCME should continue its other publication activities, such as the *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*.

22. NCME should increase the volume of its publication activities; e.g., by adding publications or by increasing the size of its existing publications.

23. NCME should continue to publish the *Resource Bank*.

24. NCME should monitor the adherence of the testing and measurement industry to the *Code of Fair Testing Practices*.

25. NCME should sponsor measurement training programs for teachers.

26. NCME should assist colleges and universities in recruiting students to the field of educational measurement.

27. NCME should recruit minorities to the field of educational measurement.

28. NCME should increase its efforts to recruit minorities to NCME.

### CONTINUATION

**Circle one:**

**AGREE** (NCME should continue this activity.)

**DISAGREE** (NCME should not continue this activity.)

### IMPORTANCE

**Circle a number on the scale below:**

[0 1 2 3 4 5]

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT VERY IMPORTANT

89
ACTIVITY

29. NCME should monitor legislation that is pertinent to educational testing and measurement.

30. NCME should disseminate information to legislators and policy makers.

31. NCME should work with other research organizations interested in testing and measurement in education.

32. NCME should work with legislatures on legislation pertinent to educational testing and measurement.

33. NCME should work with professional non-research organizations; e.g., the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Association of School Administrators, etc.

34. NCME should work with other organizations to take advocacy positions on legislation or public policy issues that are pertinent to educational testing and measurement.

35. NCME should work with other organizations to identify educational measurement skills and information needed by professionals in education.

36. NCME should work with other organizations to set standards for professional conduct in educational measurement.

CONTINUATION

Circle one:

AGREE (NCME should continue this activity.)

DISAGREE (NCME should not continue this activity.)

IMPORTANCE

Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT

VERY IMPORTANT
ACTIVITY

37. NCME should work with other organizations to develop procedures for accreditation and certification of professionals in the field of educational measurement.

38. NCME should work with other organizations to develop curriculum standards for teacher preparation in the field of educational measurement.

39. What suggestions do you have for ways in which NCME should work with other organizations? Please list your suggestions in the space provided. If you have no suggestions, check this box: None

40. Are there any additional activities that you feel NCME should pursue? Yes ... No. If you answered "Yes," please list the activities below and indicate how much emphasis you think they should be given.
Section III

Section III of this questionnaire seeks information on your personal involvement in the activities of NCME. Recall that all information you provide will be held in strict confidence, and that the results of this survey will be reported only for aggregates of NCME members. The information sought in this section is essential for planning future NCME activities, and for evaluating the effectiveness of NCME's past and current activities.

DIRECTIONS

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 41 THROUGH 52 BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION THAT IS MOST APPLICABLE TO YOU.

41. How many NCME Annual Meetings have you attended in the last 5 years?
   a) 0   b) 1   c) 2   d) 3   e) 4   f) 5

42. At how many NCME Annual Meetings in the last 5 years have you presented a paper or been a presenter in a symposium?
   a) 0   b) 1   c) 2   d) 3   e) 4   f) 5

43. At how many NCME Annual Meetings in the last 5 years have you participated as a session chair, a discussant or a reactor?
   a) 0   b) 1   c) 2   d) 3   e) 4   f) 5

44. At how many NCME Annual Meetings in the last 5 years have you attended a training session sponsored by NCME?
   a) 0   b) 1   c) 2   d) 3   e) 4   f) 5

45. How frequently do you read the Journal of Educational Measurement (JEM)?
   a) never   b) seldom   c) occasionally   d) regularly   e) every issue
46. How frequently have you used the *Journal of Educational Measurement* (JEM) in your scholarly or professional activities?
   
   a) never b) seldom c) occasionally d) regularly e) every issue

47. How many papers that you authored or co-authored have been published in the *Journal of Educational Measurement* (JEM)?
   
   a) 0 b) 1 or 2 c) 3 to 5 d) 6 to 9 e) 10 or more

   
   a) never b) seldom c) occasionally d) regularly e) every issue

49. How frequently have you used *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* (EM:IP) in your scholarly or professional activities?
   
   a) never b) seldom c) occasionally d) regularly e) every issue

50. How many papers that you authored or co-authored have been published in *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* (EM:IP)?
   
   a) 0 b) 1 or 2 c) 3 to 5 d) 6 to 9 e) 10 or more

51. How frequently have you used the *Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement* (ITEMS) instructional modules published in *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* (EM:IP)?
   
   a) never b) seldom c) occasionally d) regularly e) every module published

52. How frequently have you used the *NCME Resource Bank* of references to educational measurement literature?
   
   a) never b) seldom c) occasionally d) regularly
Section IV

Section IV of this questionnaire seeks your judgement on the QUALITY of major activities sponsored by NCME, including the Annual Meeting, the *Journal of Educational Measurement* (JEM), *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* (EM:IP), the *Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement* (ITEMS) instructional modules, and the *Resource Bank* of references to educational measurement literature. Responses to these questions will guide the formative evaluation of NCME activities.

The NCME Annual Meeting

consists of paper sessions and symposia, in addition to a breakfast meeting and various training activities. The meeting is held during the middle three days of the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

**DIRECTIONS**

Each scale is anchored by phrases that might be used to describe the NCME Annual Meeting. Circle the position on each scale that best describes your judgment of a characteristic of the NCME Annual Meeting, or check the "No Opinion" box.

53. The NCME Annual Meeting is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53.1</th>
<th>Very poorly organized</th>
<th></th>
<th>Very well organized</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53.2</th>
<th>Held in very inconvenient locations</th>
<th>Held in very convenient locations</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53.3</th>
<th>Very expensive to attend (in terms of travel expenses)</th>
<th>Very inexpensive to attend (in terms of travel expenses)</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53.4</th>
<th>Very expensive to attend (in terms of registration)</th>
<th>Very inexpensive to attend (in terms of registration)</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NCME Annual Meeting (continued)

53.5  Too lengthy  |__|   |   |   |   | Too short  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

53.6  The content is not relevant to my current professional activities  |__|   |   |   |   | The content is very relevant to my current professional activities  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

53.7  Held at a very inconvenient time  |__|   |   |   |   | Held at a very convenient time  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

NCME Professional Development Activities

The following phrases anchor scales that might be used to describe the professional development activities (pre-sessions and workshops) held at the NCME annual meeting. Circle the position on each scale that best describes your judgment of a characteristic of these activities, or check the "No Opinion" box.

54.  The professional development activities held at the NCME annual meeting are:

54.1  Very poorly organized  |__|   |   |   |   | Very well organized  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

54.2  Scheduled very inconveniently within the annual meeting  |__|   |   |   |   | Scheduled very conveniently within the annual meeting  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

54.3  Very expensive to attend  |__|   |   |   |   | Very inexpensive to attend  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

54.4  Too lengthy  |__|   |   |   |   | Too short  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

54.5  The content is not relevant to my professional needs  |__|   |   |   |   | The content is very relevant to my professional needs  | No Opinion  
1 2 3 4 5

99 100
Are there any additions or changes to its annual meeting that should be made by NCME?
...Yes ☐ ... No ☐. If you marked "Yes," please describe the additions or changes you would suggest. Attach additional sheets of paper if necessary.

NCME Publications

include the quarterly publications *JEM* and *EM*:*IP*, *ITEMS*, which is published in *EM*:*IP* and the Resource Bank, which provides references to materials on various measurement topics. The following section seeks information about how you evaluate these publications. The information sought is essential to planning the NCME publications program.

**DIRECTIONS**

Following are characteristics of the *Journal of Educational Measurement* (*JEM*). You are asked to describe how satisfied you are with these characteristics of this publication. Circle a number from 0 (*NOT AT ALL SATISFIED*) to 5 (*VERY SATISFIED*), or check the "No Opinion" box.

**PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSES TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 56.1 THROUGH 56.6.**

56. *JEM*

56.1 Editorial policies

Circle a number on the scale below:

| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 0 1 2 3 4 5 |

NOT AT ALL SATISFIED  

VERY SATISFIED  

No Opinion ☐
56.2 Timeliness of articles
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISIFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion

56.3 Relevance of content
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISIFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion

56.4 Quality of writing
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISIFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion

56.5 Quality of research
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISIFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion

56.6 Scope of content
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISIFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion

DIRECTIONS

Following are characteristics of Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice (EM: IP).
You are asked to describe how satisfied you are with these characteristics of this publication. Circle a number from 0 (NOT AT ALL SATISFIED) to 5 (VERY SATISFIED), or check the "No Opinion" box.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSES TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 57.1 THROUGH 57.7

57. EM: IP

57.1 Editorial policies
Circle a number on the scale below:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISIFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion
EM: IP (continued)

57.2 Timeliness of articles
Circle a number on the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57.3 Relevance of content to my current professional interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57.4 Quality of writing presented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57.5 Quality of research presented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57.6 Scope of content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57.7 Information concerning NCME actions and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL SATISFIED</td>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Opinion
DIRECTIONS

Following are characteristics of the Instructional Topics in Educational Measurement (ITEMS) modules. You are asked to describe how satisfied you are with these characteristics of these modules. Circle a number from 0 (NOT AT ALL SATISFIED) to 5 (VERY SATISFIED), or check the "No Opinion" box.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSES TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 58.1 THROUGH 58.4

58. ITEMS

58.1 Timeliness of topics
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL SATISFIED

VERY SATISFIED

No Opinion

58.2 Relevance of topics to my current professional interests
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL SATISFIED

VERY SATISFIED

No Opinion

58.3 Appropriateness of level of discourse
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL SATISFIED

VERY SATISFIED

No Opinion

58.4 Dissemination through EM: IP
Circle a number on the scale below:

0 1 2 3 4 5

NOT AT ALL SATISFIED

VERY SATISFIED

No Opinion
DIRECTIONS

Following are characteristics of the NCME Resource Bank. You are asked to describe how satisfied you are with these characteristics of this publication. Circle a number from 0 (NOT AT ALL SATISFIED) to 5 (VERY SATISFIED), or check the "No Opinion" box.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSES TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 59.1 THROUGH 59.4

59. The Resource Bank:

59.1 Effectiveness of advertisements announcing the Resource Bank

59.2 Timeliness of resources in the Resource Bank

59.3 Relevance of topics to my current professional interests

59.4 Quality of selections in the Resource Bank

No Opinion
60. Are there any additions or changes to its publications (JEM, EM: IP, ITEMS, Resource Bank) that NCME should make? **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]. If you marked "Yes," please describe the additions or changes you would suggest. Attach additional sheets of paper if necessary.

61. Should NCME increase the volume or scope of its publications activities? **Yes** [ ]  **No** [ ]. If you marked "Yes", please describe your suggestions.
Section V

Section V of this questionnaire seeks information concerning your interest in participating in the governance of NCME. Please circle the response to each question which best describes your level of interest.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 62 THROUGH 64

62. The NCME Board of Directors consists of at least nine members, including the president, vice-president, immediate past president, and at least six other persons elected for a three-year term by mailed ballots of the active and emeritus members.

How interested are you in participating as a Board member of NCME?

a) very interested          b) fairly interested          c) not at all interested

63. The officers of NCME (Pres., Vice-Pres.) are elected to a three-year term by mailed ballots of the active and emeritus members.

How interested are you in serving as an officer of NCME?

a) very interested          b) fairly interested          c) not at all interested

64. Traditionally, members of committees are appointed by the President of NCME upon recommendation of the Chair.

How interested are you in participating as a member of an NCME committee?

a) very interested          b) fairly interested          c) not at all interested
Section VI

Section VI of this questionnaire is related to NCME's organizational structure. NCME is served by a Board of Directors and by the following types of committees -- Ad Hoc, Standing and Joint committees. You are asked to express your satisfaction with the procedures used in forming these committees and to rate the functioning of each of the committees listed. This information will be used in future organizational planning.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH OF QUESTIONS
65 THROUGH 70C.12

65. NCME Board members are elected for a three-year term by mailed ballot.

How satisfied are you with this procedure?

a) very satisfied  b) fairly satisfied  c) not at all satisfied  d) uncertain

66. NCME officers are elected for a three-year term by written ballot of the active and emeritus members.

How satisfied are you with this procedure?

a) very satisfied  b) fairly satisfied  c) not at all satisfied  d) uncertain

67. Traditionally, Ad Hoc committees are chaired by an NCME member who is appointed by the President of NCME, other committee members are appointed upon recommendation of the Chair.

How satisfied are you with this procedure?

a) very satisfied  b) fairly satisfied  c) not at all satisfied  d) uncertain

68. Traditionally, NCME's standing committees are chaired by a member of the Board who is appointed by the President of NCME. Other committee members are appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Chair of the committee.

How satisfied are you with this procedure?

a) very satisfied  b) fairly satisfied  c) not at all satisfied  d) uncertain
69. NCME currently has a cooperative management agreement with the American Educational Research Association (AERA).

How satisfied are you with this agreement?

a) very satisfied  b) fairly satisfied  c) not at all satisfied  d) uncertain

If you are less than "very satisfied" with any aspect of NCME's organizational structure (Questions 65 - 69), use the following space to suggest modifications to NCME's structure:

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

DIRECTIONS

Listed below are some of the committees currently serving NCME. Please indicate, by circling the appropriate answer beside each named committee, how you would rate the functioning of each of these committees.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 70A.1 THROUGH 70C.8

70A. Ad Hoc Committees:

70A.1 NCME-NATD Relationship  a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know

70A.2 Legislative and Judicial Monitoring  a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know

70A.3 RFP Guidelines  a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know
### 70A.4 Certification of Measurement Professionals

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

### 70A.5 Instructional Materials

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

### 70A.6 Recruitment of Educational Measurement Specialists

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

### 70A.7 Committee on Participation of Minorities in Education

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

### 70A.8 Committee on Past Presidents

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

### 70B. Joint Committees

#### 70B.1 Standards for Program Evaluation

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

#### 70B.2 Committee on Testing Practices

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

### 70C. Standing Committees

#### 70C.1 Nominations Committee

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

#### 70C.2 Awards Committee

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

#### 70C.3 Membership Committee

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know

#### 70C.4 Budget & Finance Committee

- a) excellent
- b) good
- c) fair
- d) poor
- e) don't know
70C.5 Publications Committee
a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know

70C.6 Career Award for Contributions to Educational Measurement
a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know

70C.7 Training and Professional Development Committee
a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know

70C.8 Educational Testing
a) excellent  b) good  c) fair  d) poor  e) don't know

71. Do you think that any of NCME's Committees should be eliminated?  ...Yes  ...No  ...Uncertain
If you answered "Yes," please list the committees that you think should be eliminated and briefly indicate your rational

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

72. If you rated any committee FAIR or POOR on the scales used in Question 70, please provide a brief statement concerning the committee(s)' shortcomings.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Section VII of this questionnaire is concerned with NCME's membership. NCME has engaged in several activities designed to increase its membership. You are asked to evaluate these efforts.

**DIRECTIONS**

Circle AGREE or DISAGREE to indicate your judgement regarding NCME's membership practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle One</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73. NCME should try to expand its membership.  
74. NCME should seek to attract members of racial minorities.  
75. NCME should seek to attract more female members.  
76. NCME should seek to attract members from related organizations.  
77. NCME should continue sending contact letters to members of related organizations.  
78. NCME should continue to provide a booth at the AERA/NCME annual meeting.  
79. Should NCME take additional measures to attract new members?  
   ...Yes [□] ... No [□]. If you marked "Yes," please list the strategies NCME should use to attract new members.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Section VIII

Section VIII of this questionnaire is concerned with the finances of NCME. The following pie charts indicate the major sources of income and the major sources of expenditure for NCME. The proportions given below were calculated from the 1989 budget. You are asked to express your satisfaction with the proportion of income generated and expenses incurred in conducting various activities of NCME, as shown on the pie charts.

DIRECTIONS

Listed below are various sources of income. You are asked to evaluate the proportion of income that is generated by various sources shown in the pie chart to the right. For each source of income circle one and only one option to indicate how, if at all, you would change the proportion of NCME's income generated by each of these sources (Keep in mind that increases or decreases in prices would result from changes).

80.1 Membership Dues
($35/year, active $22/year, student) a) decrease by more than 10%
b) decrease by 5 to 10%
c) keep the same
d) increase by 5 to 10%
e) increase by more than 10%

80.2 JEM
($25, individual one-year subscription $30, institutional) a) decrease by more than 10%
b) decrease by 5 to 10%
c) keep the same
d) increase by 5 to 10%
e) increase by more than 10%

80.3 EM:IP
($15, individual one-year subscription $20, institutional) a) decrease by more than 10%
b) decrease by 5 to 10%
c) keep the same
d) increase by 5 to 10%
e) increase by more than 10%
80.4 Annual Meeting  
($25 - members  
$35 - nonmembers  
$10 - students)

a) decrease by more than 10%  
b) decrease by 5 to 10%  
c) keep the same  
d) increase by 5 to 10%  
e) increase by more than 10%

80.5 Other Sources  
(Special Publications, etc.)

a) decrease by more than 10%  
b) decrease by 5 to 10%  
c) keep the same  
d) increase by 5 to 10%  
e) increase by more than 10%

81. Do you think that NCME should attempt to secure funds from sources other than those listed above?  
...Yes [ ] ... No [ ]. If you answered "Yes," please list potential sources for these funds.
DIRECTIONS

Listed below are the major expenses NCME incurs. You are asked to evaluate the proportion of NCME's budget allocated to the activities listed in the pie chart. For each of the major expenses, circle one and only one option.

82.1 Administration
(Central Office management, Board Meetings, etc.)
- a) decrease by more than 10%
- b) decrease by 5 to 10%
- c) keep the same
- d) increase by 5 to 10%
- e) increase by more than 10%

82.2 Publication of JEM
(Printing, mailing, editorial staff)
- a) decrease by more than 10%
- b) decrease by 5 to 10%
- c) keep the same
- d) increase by 5 to 10%
- e) increase by more than 10%

82.3 Publication of EM:IP
(Printing, mailing, editorial staff)
- a) decrease by more than 10%
- b) decrease by 5 to 10%
- c) keep the same
- d) increase by 5 to 10%
- e) increase by more than 10%

82.4 Annual Meeting
(Space rental, breakfast, etc.)
- a) decrease by more than 10%
- b) decrease by 5 to 10%
- c) keep the same
- d) increase by 5 to 10%
- e) increase by more than 10%

82.5 Special Projects
(Special publications, joint committees, etc.)
- a) decrease by more than 10%
- b) decrease by 5 to 10%
- c) keep the same
- d) increase by 5 to 10%
- e) increase by more than 10%

NCME EXPENSES

(Annual Meeting) 10%
(JEM) 39%
(EM:IP) 20%
(Special Projects) 3%
(Admin & Gov.) 28%
83. Do you think NCME should make additions or changes in the way its budget is allocated?  
...Yes [ ] ... No [ ] If you answered "Yes," please list additions or changes you feel NCME should make in the way budgetary resources are allocated.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Section IX

Section IX of this questionnaire seeks some basic demographic information from the members of NCME who complete this survey. This information is needed to help determine the representativeness of this survey and to formulate meaningful conclusions from the data that are collected. Remember that your responses will be held in strict confidence.

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH OF QUESTIONS 84 THROUGH 91

84. What is your gender?  
a) Male 
b) Female

85. What is your ethnic background?  
a) Black or Afro-American 
b) Oriental or Asian 
c) American Indian/Native American  
d) Hispanic  
e) Caucasian (non-Hispanic)  
f) Other (specify) __________________________
86. What is the highest degree you have received?
   a) Bachelors
   b) Masters
   c) Specialist
   d) Doctorate

87. What was the specialty or major of your highest degree?
   a) Educational measurement
   b) Educational psychology
   c) Other areas in Education
   d) Counseling
   e) Psychology
   f) Sociology
   g) Statistics
   h) Other (specify) ____________________________

88. In what type of organization are you currently employed?
   a) College or University
   b) School system
   c) State agency
   d) Federal agency
   e) Industry
   f) Testing organization
   g) R & D organization
   h) Self-employed
   i) Other (specify) ____________________________
89. Which of the following best describes your current employment role and status?
   a) University faculty
   b) University researcher
   c) University administrator
   d) Public School administrator
   e) Test developer
   f) Test administrator
   g) Measurement research
   h) Retired
   i) Unemployed
   j) Other (specify) ____________________

90. How long have you been employed in the field of educational measurement?
   a) 0-5 years
   b) 6-10 years
   c) 11-15 years
   d) 16-20 years
   e) over 20 years

91. How long have you been a member of NCME?
   a) 0-5 years
   b) 6-10 years
   c) 11-15 years
   d) 16-20 years
   e) over 20 years

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Please return this completed questionnaire, in the envelope provided, to:
Dr. Richard M. Jaeger
NCME
1230 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Appendix B

Original Cover Letter
Dear Dr.:  

We are writing to seek your help in making NCME a more effective organization. We ask that you take 35 to 40 minutes (determined in a carefully-conducted pilot study) to complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and return your response to NCME Headquarters in the enclosed stamped, pre-addressed envelope.

We are sending this questionnaire to a representative sample of NCME members to obtain their judgments on the goals and activities of NCME -- what has been done in the past and what should be done in the future; the services NCME provides its members; the structure and administration of NCME; and the ways funds are obtained and expended by the organization. Data obtained through this survey will be carefully analyzed and reported to the NCME Board and to the membership. The information we seek will be invaluable in planning NCME's purposes, activities, services, and operations over the next decade so as to best meet the needs of the measurement community and, through NCME, the measurement needs of the larger public we serve.

We have numbered each questionnaire so as to make fiscally responsible use of NCME funds in sending follow-up letters to non-respondents. However, your responses will be held in strict confidence and will only be analyzed in aggregate. A rapid response on your part will help to minimize the cost of this survey.

So please, take a few minutes to help your Board make NCME a better organization. And help us make NCME a more effective advocate for sound educational measurement. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ronald K. Hambleton  
President, NCME

Richard M. Jaeger, Chair  
Committee of Past Presidents
Appendix C

Follow-Up Postcard
This is a friendly reminder! Your completed NCME membership survey has not yet been received at NCME headquarters in Washington. As a specialist in educational measurement, you know that a high response rate is essential if valid conclusions are to be drawn from sample surveys. The NCME Board has invested substantially in learning the views of the membership on a number of issues that are vital to the future of our organization. Please do your part by completing and returning your questionnaire TODAY. Your prompt response will also reduce survey costs by eliminating the need to send you a second questionnaire!

On behalf of the NCME Board, I thank you very much for your cooperation and response.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Jaeger, Chair
Committee of Past Presidents
(919) 334-5100
Appendix D

Follow-Up Cover Letter
Dear Dr.:

About a month ago, we wrote to seek your help in making NCME a more effective organization. We asked that you take 35 to 40 minutes to complete an enclosed survey questionnaire and that you return your response to NCME Headquarters. We are writing you once again to renew our request. On the chance that the original questionnaire was lost in the mail or inadvertently mislaid, we are enclosing another one, together with a stamped, pre-addressed envelope.

We have sent this questionnaire to a representative sample of NCME members to obtain their judgments on the goals and activities of NCME — what has been done in the past and what should be done in the future; the services NCME provides its members; the structure and administration of NCME; and the ways funds are obtained and expended by the organization. Data obtained through this survey will be carefully analyzed and reported to the NCME Board and to the membership at the 1990 Annual Meeting. The information we seek will be invaluable in planning NCME's purposes, activities, services, and operations over the next decade so as to best meet the needs of the measurement community and, through NCME, the measurement needs of the larger public we serve.

We have numbered each questionnaire so as to make fiscally responsible use of NCME funds in sending follow-up letters to non-respondents. However, your responses will be held in strict confidence and will only be analyzed in aggregate.

So please, take a few minutes to help your Board make NCME a better organization. And help us make NCME a more effective advocate for sound educational measurement. It is not too late to add your voice to those of several hundred NCME members who have already responded. We need your response and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ronald K. Hambleton
President, NCME

Richard M. Jaeger, Chair
Committee of Past Presidents