

# A HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LARGE-SCALE ASSESSMENT

February 2006

Edward Roeber  
Michigan Department of Education

## Introduction

---

Over thirty-five years ago, a small group of individuals interested in then a new large-scale assessment program called the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) first gathered to learn more about this innovative approach to assessment on a national basis. At the time, relatively few states had invested in their own large-scale assessment programs. These included California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Maine, Michigan, and Minnesota.

The NAEP assessments were quite innovative for their time: a substantial number of individually-administered and constructed-response items were used, and the assessments were administered via paced-tape to students at three age-levels as well as to young adults ages 26 to 35. Because the NAEP assessments were made available to states, states were interested in learning more about the opportunity of “piggy-backing” on the national sample with assessments drawn from NAEP. The first conferences drew between 50 to 100 attendees.

Since those early days, the conference has grown substantially, with 2005 attendance topping 1,300. As the importance and pervasiveness of large-scale assessment has grown in American education, thanks to Federal laws such as the Improving America’s Schools Act (1994), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997, and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, this conference has increased its influence on the practice of student assessment across the United States and in other countries. Therefore, it is fitting in its thirty-fifth anniversary to pause to reflect on the influence of this conference as well as to document its history from its early days to today. The goal of this summary is to help readers who have not had the benefit of years of attendance to gain perspective on an interesting contributor to the dialogue on student assessment in the United States.

## Conference History

---

### Pre-History

---

In the late 1960’s, NAEP developed a broad-based consensus process to determine the goals for assessment as well as the suitability of the assessments to be used. The NAEP assessments consisted of group-administered (via paced tape) and individually-administered assessments of 9-, 13-, 17-year olds, plus young adults (ages 26-35) in a number of content areas: visual art, citizenship, career and occupational development, literature, mathematics, music, reading, science, social studies, and writing.

The NAEP assessment processes represented a radical departure from typical state testing programs of the time that utilized off-the-shelf, norm-referenced tests. NAEP goals for assessment were purposely chosen to illustrate the types of outcomes that many, some, and few students were thought to be able accomplish at the target age levels. The goals were written by expert panels, with reviews conducted by a broadly representative panel of American citizens. In addition, NAEP created a new genre of assessment – objective-referenced assessments based on these goals. Rather than compare students on total test performance, student performance was to be reported on each individual test item to highlight regional and demographic differences in performance, as well as to track trends over time as the content areas were re-assessed.

Interest in the NAEP assessments led a number of states to consider how the NAEP assessment methodologies and/or materials might be used at the state level. Could states embark on the development of expectations for student knowledge and skills, develop tests of these, and use them to indicate to parents, educators, and other members of the public what students should be learning and the extent of their accomplishment? At that time (in the early 1970’s), states were required to conduct needs assessments of student performance statewide, and many states had chosen to use available instruments for this purpose. Would the NAEP assessments be suitable for such state-level needs assessments?

At the time when these questions were being asked, the Education Commission of the States (ECS), located in Denver, CO, was the grantee for the NAEP project. ECS received funding to operate the NAEP, including funds for exercise (item) development, assessment administration, analysis of the NAEP results, and dissemination and reporting. ECS assumed responsibility for the NAEP project in July 1969, and moved the project to Denver from Ann Arbor, Michigan in spring 1971. Because knowledge about NAEP was quite limited at the time, one key audience for dissemination of information about NAEP was the directors of state assessment programs. Hence, it was natural to gather these individuals together in order to inform them about this new type of assessment program. Hence, providing information about NAEP to spark interest in the project was viewed as a key dissemination objective for NAEP staff.

The initial conferences that were held focused exclusively on the NAEP project. These sessions dealt with how NAEP put together the sets of skills that would form the basis of the assessments, the process for developing these, the nature of the assessments used (or planned for future use), the methods used to assure that the assessment exercises were bias-free and measured important content, the sampling plans to assure a nationally-representative sample, the manner in which the assessments would be administered and scored (for example, the use of constructed-response items was quite controversial at the time and debates raged among curriculum and assessment specialists about the suitability of these items for use in large-scale assessment programs), and the initial results from the national assessments conducted in the late 60's and early 70's.

---

### The Conference That Didn't Count

In 1970, NAEP staff located in Ann Arbor, Michigan held a two-day conference to explain to states the methodologies used by NAEP. These included the manner in which the assessment goals were developed, using a national panel of subject-matter experts and other citizens, the exercise development process, the manner in which the assessments were administered and scored, and plans for reporting the assessment results (by individual exercise), and analyzing the assessment results.

While the format of this conference mirrored that used in subsequent conferences in the early years of the LSAC, curiously, this conference is not counted among the 35 that are recorded. Hence, this conference is included here as the initial conference held in year 0.

---

### The Early Years

The first official conference was held in 1971 in Boulder, Colorado, near the Denver headquarters of ECS. According to Irv Lehmann, who along with Frank Womer, co-directed the conference planning as well as the conference itself, the initial conference was held at the University of Colorado School of Engineering, which was near the Harvest House hotel. Approximately twenty individuals attended the first conference, which as mentioned above, focused exclusively on NAEP. Attendees were housed at the Harvest House, which was a short walking distance from the CU School of Engineering.

The conference continued to be held at the university in the second and third year, but by the fourth year, had switched locations to the Harvest House itself. By 1974, the conference was attracting almost 100 attendees and lasted for three days. The program still focused almost exclusively on NAEP, although by this time, several states (for example, Connecticut, Maine, and Minnesota) had administered NAEP packages or items either following a NAEP assessment or concurrently with a national administration. The program began to include these states as an interesting way in which to show the utility of the NAEP assessments and data to a broader audience.

The focus on NAEP continued into the mid to late 1970's. By this time, a group of assessment directors from a number of states and Canadian provinces were gathering once or twice a year to begin discussing common assessment issues and ideas. The group (the Association of State Assessment Programs) focused on their assessment programs rather than NAEP, but used the annual conference as an opportunity to get together.

It was not long before assessment directors began to complain that the conference was too focused on NAEP, not their states' assessment programs. They felt that by now, states were developing more interesting approaches to student assessment different than NAEP, and because they typically reported data on an every-pupil basis at one or more grades, faced a different and more varied set of challenges than did NAEP. In addition, they felt that knowledge about the NAEP project was widespread and that little new information was being presented at each conference. This discontent was expressed to the ECS staff person assigned to plan the annual conference, and the result was that a state assessment director was added to the planning team in 1978.

ECS continued to sponsor the conference during the early 1980's. By now the conference, now fondly called the "Boulder Conference," was becoming quite popular. Attendance had soared to the 300-500 range and sessions were focusing much more on the assessments states were planning, developing, and implementing, and far less on NAEP. The conference had matured to the point where it had become a prime vehicle for the sharing of innovations, for the discussion of serious cross-state issues, both of a technical and policy nature. By this time, the conference was being held starting on Sunday afternoon and continuing through Tuesday. Time was allocated during the program for some "down time," which some participants used for meetings with vendors or one another, while others used this time for sight-seeing in the Rockies.

---

### The Middle Years

In the early 1980's, ECS lost the grant for the NAEP project. The Federal government decided that NAEP would be run by contract rather than a grant, and that the program would be competitively bid. Educational Testing Service won the contract for NAEP, and conference attendees were quite fearful that ETS would also assume leadership of the conference. The primary fear was not that some other organization would plan the conference but that the location of the conference would be shifted from the mountains of Colorado to an

east coast location in or near a big city. Conference attendees prevailed upon ECS to maintain the conference in Boulder, and to the relief of many attendees, ECS agreed to do so.

ECS continued its leadership of the conference during the entire decade of the 1980's through 1991. During this time, the conference continued to grow in size, and clearly, outgrew the Harvest House Hotel. The hotel itself underwent several name changes, as it first became a Hilton property, and then a Clarion one. This hotel was beloved for its garden area behind the hotel that provided such a good location where the small group and conference-wide social activities could take place. Attendees valued especially the time for one-on-one or small group discussions about topics of mutual interest. There were some who felt that the program was merely an excuse to come to the conference, believing that the value of the conference was the opportunities provided for individual conversations. For long-time attendees, the conference provided an annual time to catch up with other attendees, to check in on their careers, their family, and life in general. Thus, the conference became an annual "life-check" for more than one attendee. The result was that close camaraderie grew up among the relatively small number of state staff and contractors that worked in large-scale assessment and attended the conference annually. The Boulder site was beloved for permitting these sorts of interactions.

However, the hotel had only a small number of rooms (less than 200) that could be devoted to the conference. This meant that attendees would need to stay at other hotels in the Boulder area, many of which were of dubious quality. The City of Boulder never really desired to have much conference business and due to highly restrictive building codes, had a much greater share of poor quality hotels. For example, one hotel that advertised itself as "air conditioned" meant that it had a ceiling fan; "chilled" air conditioning, meant that the air would actually be cooled. This distinction proved to be most pertinent when the temperatures for the conference one year rose to more than 90 degrees in the afternoon, and the indoor temperature in some motel rooms nearly matched that of the outdoor temperature.

During the 1980's, so many attendees were coming to the conference that as many as 20 hotels in Boulder had to be used in order to handle the total number of attendees. This required the use of a number of shuttle buses and private cars in order to transport the attendees to the conference site (the Harvest House). This proved increasingly unpopular, since attendees not staying at the Harvest House were unable to participate in many of the informal social activities that sprung up around the conference – breakfast with a colleague, a drink in the garden with a client or vendor, social activities such as a swim in the Harvest House pool, or changing from conference dress to informal dress for evenings out.

### The 90's

---

The result of this growing dissatisfaction with the quality of the housing at the Harvest House led to a decision to move the conference to Breckenridge, Colorado for the 1991 conference. The conference facility used was able to house all attendees at one site, although several buildings were used for the conference itself so that it was only at the social activities that all attendees were able to run into each other. The major issue with Breckenridge, though, was the altitude – over 9,000 feet. A number of conference attendees complained of headaches or other symptoms of the thin air. Hence, plans were set to return to Boulder.

ECS returned the conference to Boulder in 1992. This was the most difficult conference to be held at the Harvest House. Attendance was so high that the rooms were crowded way beyond the limits set by the Fire Marshall. Passage in the hallways of the Harvest House was virtually impossible at breaks, since the hallways were absolutely packed and passage from a session room to the refreshments or restrooms was next to impossible. The full range of off-site hotels was used, since on-site, the hotel could only provide about 175 rooms for the 900 attendees. The conference had clearly run out of space at the Harvest House, and since the Harvest House was the best and largest hotel in Boulder, run out of room in the city as well. It was no longer viable to hold the conference in Boulder.

Later that year, ECS made a major decision that planning and running the conference was no longer a goal for the organization. Jane Armstrong of ECS contacted Ed Roeber and asked if CCSSO wanted to take over planning and running the conference. After some consideration, the answer was yes. Looking back on the decision, arrived at in early fall, it might have been foolhardy. The time for sending out call for proposals was at hand, and a new set of staff needed to "learn the ropes." However, fear that the conference might end or be carried out poorly, as well as the fit of the conference with the growing mission of CCSSO to foster improved large-scale assessments, ultimately drove the decision. Therefore, the task of planning the 1993 conference was transferred to CCSSO. CCSSO planned to keep the conference in Boulder.

However, the plans to remain in Boulder were cut short by an important citizen referendum in Colorado in November 1992. Voters in the state passed a controversial referendum to restrict the gay rights. As a result, a number of national organizations planning to hold conferences or conventions in Colorado threatened to boycott the state. The decision about what to do was given much consideration by CCSSO. The Colorado Department of Education was a good member of CCSSO and therefore to pull the conference from the state could cause strained relationships with a valued member. On the other hand, several past attendees threatened to boycott the conference if CCSSO proceeded to hold the conference in Boulder.

In the end, a decision was made based on whether conference attendance would suffer and therefore cause a financial loss to CCSSO; the decision was not based on political or philosophical reasons. The decision was made to move the conference to another state. In late fall, 1992, staff of CCSSO (Cadelie Hemphill and Ed Roeber) had to locate a suitable city that could handle a conference of the size of the Large-Scale Assessment Conference (up to 900 sleeping rooms, a room capable of handling an opening session that large, along with 8 or more breakout rooms) in a city that attendees would want to visit.

Very quickly, the focus of the search came down to Albuquerque, New Mexico. Fortunately, the city had three hotels within a block of one another, had a conference hotel (the Hyatt) where the conference itself could be housed, and where various social activities could take place. CCSSO signed a two-year agreement to hold the conference in Albuquerque.

As a result, the 1993 conference was held at the Hyatt in downtown Albuquerque. Attendees were quite disappointed by the location. They dearly missed the informal garden of the Harvest House, the scenery of Boulder, Colorado, and the ambiance of the cooler weather of the mountain west. Albuquerque was a city, with noise and traffic, and not as much fun. There was no garden area where attendees could gather for informal conversations. Staff of CCSSO tried to compensate for this by planning social activities such as a box lunch in the plaza across the street from the Hyatt and an afternoon social activity at the La Posada Hotel near the Hyatt. While the conference went well, there were many complaints about the location and much reminiscing about the "old days" of Boulder.

During the period between the 1993 and 1994 conferences, CCSSO staff went on a search for a location for the 1995 and 1999 conferences. A number of sites were suggested, most of which proved to be too small or suitable due to inaccessibility of the site or weather. The goal was to maintain the mountain west ambiance of the conference. A list of criteria for future sites was drawn up. The list of criteria is given in the table below.

### ASCON Meeting Site Criteria

The following are criteria for selecting the sites for future CCSSO National Conferences on Large-Scale Assessment (ASCON). They are not listed in order of importance, but are to be used to collectively to judge the suitability of sites for the conference.

#### Location

- A. Ideally, site should be located in the Mountain time zone; some sites in the Pacific time zone may also work. Can participants leave the site at noon on the final day, get to the airport and return to the east coast (e.g., Washington, DC) the same day?
- B. Site should be located near or in mountainous areas. Big cities are a last choice.
- C. Daytime temperature should not normally exceed 90 degrees.
- D. Site should be near a major airport, served with jet service non-stop from the major seven airline company's main hubs (American: Chicago/Dallas; Continental: Cleveland/Newark/ Houston; Delta: Cincinnati/Dallas /Salt Lake City; Northwest: Detroit/Memphis/ Minneapolis; TWA: St. Louis; United: Chicago/Denver; U.S. Air: Pittsburgh/Charlotte/ Indianapolis). Service by a discount airline such as Southwest, Kiwi, Western Pacific, and so forth is an added plus. Six non-stop connections from two or more airline companies (not their commuter affiliates or subsidiaries) is a minimum.
- E. The site should be no more than a one-hour drive from the airport, with frequent shuttle service (twice an hour minimum) at reasonable cost (\$25 per person round trip). Return service, when many participants may be leaving at the same time, is also important.

#### Hotel (s)

- A. Ideally, all sleeping rooms should be located in one hotel or hotels no more than 2 blocks away.
- B. The hotel should have space for an opening session (700 persons classroom or luncheon), four-five large-group sessions (200 each classroom), and eight-ten small group sessions (100 persons each classroom).
- C. The vast majority (90%) of rooms should not exceed the Federal rate of \$120/night; the rooms should be good quality and quiet.

- D. Catering costs should be reasonable: under \$10 (++) for buffet breakfast, under \$15 (++) for catered lunch, and under \$25 (++) for catered dinner.
- E. There should be at least two restaurants on-site, and they should offer reasonably priced lunches and dinners; “reasonable” is defined as the Federal travel rate for the city. Fast service for lunch is a plus.
- F. The hotel should provide good inside and outside fitness opportunities.
- G. Conference registration area should be near the sessions, adjacent to the office. On-site audio-visual service is a plus.
- H. There should be plenty of space near the opening and large-group sessions for the group to gather and meet informally.

#### Community

- A. There should be restaurants not connected with the hotel(s) within walking distance of the hotel. Ideally, some of these should be high quality ones.
- B. There should be one or more interesting places to hold off-site functions to be sponsored by vendors.
- C. There should be high quality/unique places for vendors to take their clients.
- D. There should be interesting sightseeing opportunities for adults and for families in the area of the conference.

It is interesting to note that several of the airlines and airline hubs mentioned in this document that was prepared over ten years ago no longer exist. However, these were the criteria that were used when the conference was transferred to CCSSO. One additional criterion that came to be used was that the state in which the conference was to be held should be a member of the CCSSO, a criterion needed by the selection of the site for the 1995 and 1996 conferences. CCSSO decided that Phoenix, Arizona was to be the site used for the 1995 and 1996 conferences. The decision was made several months before Arizona dropped out of CCSSO; hence the conference was held in a state that was not a member of CCSSO.

The conference returned to Albuquerque for the 1994 conference. At the end of the conference, CCSSO staff announced that the conference was moving to Phoenix, AZ for 1995 and 1996. The reaction was negative – attendees declared that Albuquerque was the site where the conference should remain, that attendees did not want to go to Phoenix where the weather was warmer, where there was less to do, and so forth. The change in attitude was 180 degrees. That notwithstanding, the 1994 conference was another success.

However, since the contracts with the two Hilton properties in Phoenix were already signed, the conference went to Phoenix for both 1995 and 1996. In the first year, the attendees’ fears were realized. The weather was extremely hot. While the weather was extremely dry, as one attendee put it, an oven is extremely dry, too. Attendees basically stayed inside and groused about the weather outside.

Between the 1995 and 1996 conferences, staff of CCSSO signed contracts with two hotels in Colorado Springs, assuming that now attendees would be happy that the conference was returning to Colorado and to a site near the Rockies with a number of interesting sites for conference receptions. At the 1996 conference, CCSSO staff announced that the conference was moving to Colorado Springs. Instead of expressions of pleasure, once again conference attendees expressed negative thoughts about moving the conference from Phoenix, since they had found the Hilton Tapatio Cliffs property seemed so much like Boulder. Attendees had found the pool area that is in the center of the main building of the hotel property to be a great location for informal gatherings. Attendees did not want to change.

The 1997 and 1998 conferences were again successfully held at the Sheraton and Doubletree Hotels in Colorado Springs. The search for the next two-year site for the conference took CCSSO staff on several field trips. Staff went to San Antonio, Reno, Seattle, and Palm Springs. None of these met the various criteria. The hotel in San Antonio was too small, Reno hotels were too smoky, the Seattle site’s hotels were too spread out, and Palm Springs was way too warm. Staff was stuck. They had visited Snowbird Resort outside of Salt Lake City several years previously but had not found it a suitable site at that point. However, staff needed to find a site, so revisited Snowbird. This time, the hotel staff made a more impressive impression on the CCSSO staff, so that they agreed to a two-year contract for the 1999 and 2000 conferences. And, once again, attendees had grown to like the Colorado Springs location and did not want to leave.

The conference at Snowbird Resort did bring back some of the altitude issues for some conference attendees. That aside, however, the conference went well and attendees liked the location – it had the informal mountain

resort feel that Boulder had had. The major negative about this location was that conference sessions were spread over several parts of the resort and on different floors. This meant hiking from one building to another and from one floor of the main hotel to another, but attendees liked the resort-like atmosphere of the conference site. However, by the second year, attendees had decided that they wanted to stay put. CCSSO had other plans, however.

In the years following Colorado Springs, new staff took over leadership of the assessment conference. The criteria that had guided conference site selection were modified. A site with a view of mountains was not a criterion, partly because the conference had grown so large that suitable sites could not be found that could house 1200+ attendees in a resort site. Hence, the 2001 conference was held in Houston (which won the title for least popular and least-like-Boulder award), the 2002 conference was held in Palm Desert (which won the title for hottest location for an assessment conference), the 2003 conference was held in San Antonio, the 2004 conference was held in Boston (which won the award for the conference furthest from the Boulder roots of the conference, but otherwise a popular location for the conference), the 2005 conference was held in San Antonio again, and the 2006 conference is scheduled to be in San Francisco.

## Conference Sites

Over the 35-year history of the conference, the site for the conference did not change substantially until recent years.

Location of the Annual Conference			
Number	Year	Location	Venue
0	(1970)	Ann Arbor, MI	Local Ann Arbor hotel
1	1971	Boulder, CO	University of Colorado
2	1972	Boulder, CO	University of Colorado
3	1973	Boulder, CO	University of Colorado
4	1974	Boulder, CO	Harvest House
5	1975	Boulder, CO	Harvest House
6	1976	Boulder, CO	Harvest House
7	1977	Denver, CO	Writer's Manor
8	1978	Boulder, CO	Hilton Harvest House
9	1979	Boulder, CO	Hilton Harvest House
10	1980	Boulder, CO	Hilton Harvest House
11	1981	Boulder, CO	Hilton Harvest House
12	1982	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
13	1983	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
14	1984	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
15	1985	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
16	1986	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
17	1987	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
18	1988	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
19	1989	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
20	1990	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
21	1991	Breckenridge, CO	Breckenridge Village
22	1992	Boulder, CO	Clarion Harvest House
23	1993	Albuquerque, NM	Hyatt Regency
24	1994	Albuquerque, NM	Hyatt Regency
25	1995	Phoenix, AZ	Hilton Tapitio Cliffs Resort
26	1996	Phoenix, AZ	Hilton Tapitio Cliffs Resort
27	1997	Colorado Springs, CO	Sheraton
28	1998	Colorado Springs, CO	Sheraton
29	1999	Salt Lake City, UT	Snowbird Resort
30	2000	Salt Lake City, UT	Snowbird Resort
31	2001	Houston, TX	The Westin Galleria and Westin Oaks
32	2002	Palm Desert, CA	Dessert Springs Marriott
33	2003	San Antonio, TX	Marriott Rivercenter
34	2004	Boston, MA	Boston Marriott Copley Place
35	2005	San Antonio, TX	Marriott Rivercenter
36	2006	San Francisco, CA	Westin St. Francis

## Planning Directors

During the course of the 35-year history of the conference, only a handful of individuals have served as conference directors. Their job has been to select the site for the conference, determine the planning process used to solicit ideas for programs, lead the selection of the programs, develop the conference program, make the arrangements for registering attendees, and running the conference on site. While the conference has grown in size, and some functions have now been out-sourced, such as conference registration, the nature of the tasks that need to be carried out has not varied much over the years.

In the early days, conference planning was pretty much a one-person activity. These days, as the conference has expanded in size, a team of individuals from the conference planning organization is involved. However, each year, someone has to take responsibility for putting all of the pieces together in a coherent manner. Thus, no history of the conference would be complete without a tribute to the individuals who have worked over the years to put together such a marvelous conference experience for the attendees.

Conference Directors – 1971 to 2005		
Conference Years	Organization	Conference Directors
1971-1976	ECS	Frank Womer & Irv Lehman
1977-1986	ECS	Jack Schmidt
1987-1992	ECS	Jane Armstrong
1993-1996	CCSSO	Cadelle Hemphill & Ed Roeber
1997-1998	CCSSO	Ed and Deb Roeber
1999-2000	CCSSO	Julie Macmillan
2001-2003	CCSSO	Carl Andrews
2004-2006	CCSSO	Frank Philip

## Conference Planning Process

The process for planning the annual Large-Scale Assessment Conference has certainly changed over the 35-year history of the conference. In the very early days, when the conference focused primarily on the NAEP project, conference planning was relatively simple. The variety of NAEP topics to be presented was decided, and speakers on these topics were determined. The logistical arrangements for the conference were much easier as well, since attendance at the conference was much smaller than in recent years. As mentioned earlier, though, the primary focus of the conference on the NAEP project led to some criticism of the conference topics, and this in turn opened up the conference planning process to an increasingly wider group of advisors.

The 1975 and the 1980 conferences were planned by two individuals – Jack Schmidt on the National Assessment (Education Commission of the States) staff, and Frank Womer, who had served as a consultant and planner for the conference since its inception in 1971. These two individuals chose the topics and selected the speakers, with minimal input from attendees past or present.

By 1985, the conference planning direction had shifted to a planning committee comprised of seven individuals selected by Jack Schmidt. The planning committee served to plan the annual conference. These individuals were drawn from ECS, states, universities, and a regional educational laboratory.

In 1990, the conference planning fell to Jane Armstrong, ECS, with the assistance of Judy Byrnes, Colorado. However, only two program advisors are listed in the program that year (Frank Womer, University of Michigan, and Ed Roeber, Michigan). A larger program planning committee was not used this year.

By 1995, the conference had shifted from ECS to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Conference direction was provided by CCSSO staff (Cadelle Hemphill and Ed Roeber), and a substantially larger and more representative planning group was used. Ten individuals, drawn from CCSSO, states, non-profit organizations, and the Federal government served to plan the conference this year. However, half of this team of ten was drawn from the CCSSO.

As the conference moved into the new century, an even more elaborate system for choosing members of the planning committee was devised. Both to mollify some of the assessment vendors who helped to support the conference, as well as to permit fresh perspectives to be represented on the planning committee, membership on the planning committee was placed on a three-year term basis, with pre-specified membership categories (e.g., assessment vendor, state education agency, and so forth).



The function of the planning committee has remained relatively unchanged over the history of the conference. While different strategies have been used to generate ideas for conference format, conference sessions, plenary sessions, social activities, and speakers, the planning committee has served the function of sorting through the myriad of session and format ideas and helping the sponsoring organization to determine the annual conference program. Using a broad-based planning group has helped to assure that the session topics are timely, that well-qualified presenters are selected, and that the topics selected for inclusion are of interest to attendees.

For at least the last 25 years, session ideas have been solicited from past years' attendees. A "call for proposals" is typically sent out in the early fall, and previous attendees are encouraged to submit ideas for sessions, along with potential speakers. These ideas were reviewed by a small group of past attendees (a sort of steering committee), and then these ratings were reviewed by the planning committee, which made the final selections and often served to contact the session organizers to make any needed program adjustments.

One thing that has changed, especially over the past decade, has been the role played by assessment organizations in submitting ideas for conference sessions. Up until about ten years ago, conference session ideas came primarily from individual attendees, whether they were from a state education agency, a university, or a contractor. However, in recent years, vendors have competed with each other on how many sessions they submit and how many are selected for presentation. It is not uncommon for vendor staff to brag about how many sessions each staff member "placed," and how many the vendor had selected over rival assessment companies. This has added a commercial side to the conference that had not existed in earlier times, since it restricts sessions to states and/or districts that use one vendor. Less cross-state collaboration on session presentations has been the result, as has been several sessions on a common theme (e.g., alternate assessment for students with disabilities) each featuring the states that use a single vendor.

---

## Conference Format

---

The Large-Scale Assessment Conference has been held in the month of June since its inception in 1971. The June dates for the conference has caused attendees several types of conflicts over the years. First, the conference has started on Father's Day a number of times. Second, each year, a few regular attendees would not be able to participate due to children graduating from high school or college. Finally, some attendees could not participate because the end of June represented the end of their state's fiscal year and either funding was not available or their legislature was still in session, or both.

The length of the conference has varied somewhat over the years, varying from three or four days. In recent years, it has most typically been four days in length, and typically straddles a weekend –either starting on Sunday and ending on Tuesday or Wednesday, or starting mid-week and ending on Saturday. This format has permitted more attendees to participate, since it means less time away from the office. The conference typically began in the afternoon, featuring an opening session and a conference-wide social activity the initial evening. The conference would then run all day Monday, and part of the day on Tuesday, with some time off on Tuesday afternoon, and finishing on Wednesday around noon.

The time off on Tuesday was a purposeful time set aside for small group interaction and/or sightseeing (so that attendees would not take time off from conference sessions to see the sights). Because the conference was set in scenic Boulder, Colorado for a number of years, a break in the conference was set aside for attendees to get out of the conference hotel, work with vendors or travel to one of the more interesting sights surrounding Boulder. These included the Rocky Mountain Park, Leadville, and the Coors Beer Brewery. Often, groups of attendees would travel together, thus permitting "business" to be conducting in a more informal manner. The rationale for this is that attendees had given up at least one weekend day for the conference, the sessions were intense, and by giving all attendees a sightseeing opportunity, they would remain in the conference sessions rather than duck out to do sightseeing.

Unfortunately, including the wording about the break in the conference program was not always popular with the bean counters who would scrutinize whether the attendees had used their time wisely at the conference. Hence, when CCSSO began running the conference, this official break was disguised by running extended seminars on special topics on Tuesday afternoon, but eventually, the program filled in on Tuesday afternoons and now, there is no break in the conference program even hinted at in the program. Now, however, it is not uncommon for attendees to be drawn into project and other meetings while sessions are taking place, and thus miss part of the conference conducting assessment-related business.

Another special feature of this conference is that within a few years of its inception, virtually everyone associated with large-scale assessment was attending. This made the conference a magnet for ancillary meetings. The longest standing of these is the annual get-together of the state assessment directors. These directors met under the banner of the Association of State Assessment Programs from 1977 until the early 2000's, when CCSSO chose to "disband" this virtual group. Although the directors still meet on the Sunday

morning just before the conference begins, the group does not meet at other times during the year as it has in the past.

Other groups taking advantage of the gathering of large-scale assessors included Federal groups such as the National Assessment Governing Board, the National Center for Educational Statistics, and the National Science Foundation, as well as their contractors such as ETS, various vendors which wanted to display new products or services, various groups of states who were participating in projects run by organizations such as CCSSO or the Southern Regional Education Board, and meetings convened by Federally-funded centers and projects, for training and/or informational purposes.

In addition, some states added contractor meetings prior to or after the conference. It was quite possible some years to spend 10 or more days at the conference site, only four of which was in actually attending conference sessions. In fact, it has been difficult some years to juggle the different meetings, since many occur on the Friday or Saturday prior to the start of the conference, meaning that two or more sessions might be occurring concurrently on the Saturday before the start of the conference.

---

## Highlights of the Conference Over the Years

---

As large-scale assessment evolved and expanded over the years, the Large-Scale Assessment Conference matched these changes and trends in conference content. The number of sessions has increased substantially, increasing from 38 in 1975 to near 100 for 2005. This growth in the number of sessions is not surprising given the vast increase in the number of attendees from 1975 to 2005.

<b>1971</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1972</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1973</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1974</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1975</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>1976</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>1977</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>1978</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>1979</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1980</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>1981</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1982</b>	<b>•</b>
<b>1983</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>1984</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>1985</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>1986</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>1987</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>1988</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>1989</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>1990</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>1991</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>1992</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>1993</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>1994</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>1995</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>1996</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>1997</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>1998</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>1999</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>2000</b>	<b>99</b>

<b>2001</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2002</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>97</b>

• - *Missing Data*

For information purposes, a full listing of the topics and speakers for the conferences held in 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005 are shown in Attachment A. It is interesting to peruse these and other conference brochures to see which topics were most popular during each year, where current attendees were employed in the past, and to observe trends in sessions such as the opening session. No matter what the theme, the conference has striven to remain relevant regarding the educational and assessment issues at the time and has changed as new ideas, such as national goals or voluntary national tests, have come and gone.

## History of Social Activities

As mentioned previously, in the early years of the conference, social activities played only a modest part of the conference. After a few years, as the conference grew in size, the conference planning team began to plan an opening night reception of some sort. For example, in the 1975 conference program, there was an opening night activity – a night out at a dude ranch in the Boulder, CO area. Attendees were bussed to the location. Costs for this activity were built into the registration fees and included a dinner, musical entertainment, and optional hayrides, horseback riding, or other “western” activities. This provided an opportunity for conference attendees to meet and greet one another, renew friendships from past years, and introduce new attendees to one another. This served as the only conference-wide social activity for the conference.

Other than this, conference-wide social activities were not actively encouraged in the early days of the conference. While Frank Womer, one of the conference co-planners, was a gourmet and would provide attendees with a list of his favorite restaurants in and around Boulder (many of which he had dined in, so could personally attest to their quality), receptions, planned meals, parties, and other social gatherings were held only on an ad hoc basis, did not involve all attendees, and usually were planned on a spontaneous basis. No conference-wide social activities were held. During this time, companies working in the assessment arena would take clients out to dinner, but if an attendee was not using one of these vendors, they were on their own for meals and entertainment.

Of course, vendors did not leave it to just this one conference for their clients. It was not uncommon for state agency staff to be invited out to a group dinner from a vendor that had their assessment business, or another one that wished to become their vendor. Dinners were typically held at a couple of locations. There was a tavern/restaurant in Gold Hill that became a traditional hangout for several years, until too many large groups descended on this restaurant in the out-of-the-way place for it to handle to provide a meal for so many people. There was another restaurant (the Red Lion Inn) that specialized in wild game that was located up Boulder Canyon from the city of Boulder. Finally, there was a restaurant on the top of a small mountain that had a fantastic view of Boulder and Denver.

Each restaurant was “staked out” by a vendor (e.g., CTB, Harcourt, MRC/Westinghouse/NCS) for a particular night so that one group would not run into another vendor’s group. Typically, breakfasts and lunch would be at the expense of attendees, unless a lunch was included in the program (which was a rare occurrence in the early years). As the conference grew and matured into the 1980’s, suddenly vendors began to assemble large groups to take to dinner. Large groups of 30, 40, 50 or more persons would go out together as a group, again to the three or four more popular and traditional locations.

The lack of other social activities conference-wide began to change in the late-1970’s, when one conference attendee challenged one of the vendors as to why that vendor did not sponsor an event at the conference for all attendees. The result was that two individuals from the vendor and two state representatives crossed a busy highway to visit a party store and purchase a couple of jugs of wine, a six-pack of beer, and a couple of bags of chips. Thus was born, in the most modest terms, social activities for all conference attendees.

From this extremely small and inexpensive start, social activities became quite competitive for the conference within just a couple of years. Irv Lehmann, a man known to pinch a penny, remarked that by the early 1980’s, it was quite possible to attend the conference from Sunday through Tuesday and not have to purchase a single meal, since lunch and “heavy” hors d’oeuvres or a dinner were served on the first day, with a buffet breakfast, lunch and receptions on the second and third day. Testing companies vied for key slots – the opening night

reception, the reception held on the second day, and luncheons on the opening and subsequent days. By the mid-1980's, a decision was made to add yet another day (the fourth day) to the conference primarily so as to accommodate the needs of vendors to sponsor social activities.

At the height of the social activities, it was necessary some years to schedule two or more social activities on a single evening. For example, one year there was a reception from 6 to 8 pm, followed by a dance sponsored by CTB complete with live DJ. Another year, a live band was used. In addition, some vendors would take their clients out to dinner after the reception but in time to return them for the dance. Another year, a reception was followed by an ice cream social. Party themes were common, too, and the vendors would scout out locations for their parties to try to "one up" the competition.

This "bonanza" (for those on fixed state per diems and/or paying for the conference themselves) ended about as quickly as it arose when three vendors (Harcourt, Pearson, and Riverside) who had previously competed for prime social real estate decided to join forces and sponsor just one event. This removed the level of competition for the social slots. The rationale provided by one of the vendors for combining forces to sponsor one event was that too many of the conference sessions focused on bashing norm-referenced tests, which was the bread-and-butter for the three companies. Though the extravagance of the social activities had diminished, the size of the conference dictated that whatever events did occur were expensive propositions for companies sponsoring them. This meant that a company might spend \$50,000, \$75,000, or more on a reception that would provide entertainment for about 500-750 individuals, many of whom were competitors!

Some companies gave away materials or other goodies to attendees. Data Recognition gave away briefcases, pens, umbrellas, and other goods to all attendees. A hat of some sort was not an unusual gift, either. A paperclip holder was the gift from vendor. In addition, the conference sponsor (ECS or CCSSO) itself gave away premiums some years. These might be conference brief cases, cups or mugs, pens or other trinkets.

## Weather During the Conferences

---

The weather of Boulder, Colorado is quickly subject to change. This understatement proved to be correct during multiple occasions during the early history of the conference. The normal weather during the early summer in Colorado can include afternoon rain showers. However brief these showers may have been, they regularly played havoc with the plans to use the outdoor garden of the Hilton House for receptions. More than one of the receptions needed to be held indoors, or moved indoors, due to the weather. This proved to be one of the more challenging aspects of the conference – determining whether to set up for the reception indoors or outdoors, or both.

Then there were those years when the weather was not typical. In 1976, three inches of snow fell on Boulder the first night of the conference. Several very cold attendees, who were camping at the nearby KOA campground, came to the opening session to get warm, if not to be enlightened. Attendees soon discovered that the weather in Colorado is such that it can snow during any month of the year. Thank goodness that the hotels/motels had extra space for those individuals who needed to "bail out" of their camping experience due to the weather.

Another regular weather feature of Colorado is high winds and mountain rains. Several conferences attendees discovered these weather facts while camping in the mountains before or after the conference. One attendee was using a tent camper that was over-turned while camping in one of the canyons outside of Boulder. Again, more business for the local hotels and motels!

The weather in other locations proved to be much more predictable. Albuquerque was warm and dry. Phoenix was very hot and dry. Colorado Springs was temperate during the day and cool in the evening. Snowbird was cool and nice. Houston was hot and humid, while Palm Desert was extremely hot and dry.

## Reactions from Past Attendees

---

As part of this paper, a number of attendees were surveyed and asked to comment on the conference and what it meant to them and their career. Their comments appear in Attachment B. Comments from persons who attended the opening session for the 25th anniversary conference and who submitted comments on how the conference had affected them appear first. Then, comments from individuals who responded to a survey sent to them by this author appear. Finally, the survey used to elicit comments appears.

In each case, those who commented have given permission for their comments to be listed here in the paper. They provide insights into how the conference has had an impact on their career, their work, as well as on themselves personally. As the author "corners" others past attendees, their comments will be added to those that appear in this paper.

## Summary

---

Clearly, the National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment has come a long way from its Boulder, Colorado roots. From a conference that attracted a few participants to come together to learn about NAEP, the conference now draws over 1300 participants to learn about large-scale assessment programs at the state and district level, with NAEP sessions a mere vestige of the early conferences.

The number of sessions offered has tripled from the early days of the conference. However, now as in the past, sessions reflect the current and emerging trends in education and educational assessment. The conference, far more commercialized than in its early days, remains the definitive place for those interested in large-scale assessment to learn about it.

The location has moved, not only around the mountain west to sites that are far removed from mountains. The informality of the past has been lost, due in large part to the huge increases in numbers of attendees, as well as the number of new attendees who do not experience the conference when it was smaller and more intimate. Fewer old-timers attend each year, partly because the ranks of persons associated with large-scale assessment programs have swollen due to the pervasiveness of such programs as new staff come to state agencies, vendors. Some who worked in large-scale assessment have joined the ranks of consultants. Other staff who used to attend more than thirty years ago have retired or moved on. Even the number of attendees who remember "Boulder" are thinning each year.

Old-timers sense the loss of something that was valuable – more the camaraderie that came from sharing experiences with colleagues than the location of the hotel – yet, new staff are needed to sustain the breadth and depth of such assessment programs. When polled, these old timers miss the old days when the circle of those concerned with large-scale assessment was smaller and everyone knew each other. Some of these thoughts are expressed in the comments solicited from them.

However, change is inevitable and what sustains the old-timers is that they were part of something that had such a profound impact on them and their career, something that the "newbies" won't experience and perhaps can't quite understand.

# ATTACHMENT A

## **Sample Conference Programs 1975-2005**

---

1975 National Assessment Conference June 9-12, 1975 Harvest House Hotel Boulder, Colorado			
<b>June 9, PM</b>	General Session	State Level Uses of Assessment Results: Needs, Barrier, Applications	Charles Nix, TX Jack Schmidt, NAEP
	Evening	Cookout, Hidden Valley Ranch, Boulder	
<b>June 10, AM</b>	Section A	Assessment and Accreditation	Alan Morgan, NM
	Section B	Assessment of Bilinguals	Rudolph Troike, CAL Hal Wilson, NAEP
	Section A	LEA Piggyback Assessments	John Adams, MN
	Section B	Defining Mastery Levels for Objectives	Judy Haynes, FL James Fulton, CA
<b>June 10, PM</b>	Discussion	Assessment/Accreditation	Alan Morgan, NM
	Discussion	LEA Piggybacks	John Adams, MN
	Discussion	Interpretation and Utilization: Curriculum	Rex Brown, NAEP
	Discussion	Reporting and Dissemination: Legislature	Gordon Ascher, NJ
	Discussion	Data Analysis: Statistical Balancing	Dave Bayless, RTI
	Discussion	Affective Outcomes: Obtrusive Measures	Dick Hulsart, NAEP
	Discussion	Defining Mastery Levels	James Fulton, CA
	Discussion	Interpretation and Utilization	Judy Haynes, FL
	Discussion	Reporting and Dissemination: LEA's	Bill Burson, CA
	Discussion	Sampling	Dave Bayless, RTI
	Discussion	Assessment Data: Implications for Program Evaluation	Ina Mullis, NAEP
	Discussion	Assessment of Bilinguals	Rudolph Troike, CAL
<b>June 11, AM</b>	Section A	Reporting Assessment Results Effectively	Lorrie Shepard, University of Colorado
	Section B	Assessors Rights: What Are They? (Family Rights and Privacy Act of 1975)	Thomas McFee, NCES Jim Impara, OR
	Section A	Toward the Development of Indices of Educational Effectiveness	Frank Corrigan, NCES Hal Wilson, NAEP
	Section B	Background factors in State Assessments: What Research is Needed?	Dan Horvitz, RTI
<b>June 11, PM</b>	Discussion	Effective Reporting	Lorrie Shepard, University of Colorado
	Discussion	Indices of Effectiveness	Frank Corrigan, NCES
	Discussion	Interpretation and Utilization: Allocating Funds	Ed Roeber, MI
	Discussion	Reporting and Dissemination: General Public	Helen Masterson, NAEP
	Discussion	Affective Outcomes: Unobtrusive Measures	Dick Hulsart, NAEP
	Discussion	Measuring Change	Bob Larson, NAEP Wayne Martin, NAEP
	Discussion	Assessing Minimal Skills: Definition and Measurement Problems	Hal Wilson, NAEP
	Discussion	Performance Measures of Minimal Skills: Availability of Materials	Dean Nafziger, Sachse Clearinghouse
	Discussion	Using Census Data	Gordon Ascher, NJ
	Discussion	Psychomotor Assessment	Tom Springer, IL
	Discussion	Computer Software	Carolyn Shamlin, NAEP
	Discussion	Assessors Rights	Dexter Magers, USOE
	Discussion	Background Factors	Dan Horvitz, RTI
	Discussion	Domain Referenced Testing	Sarah Knight, NARP
<b>June 12, AM</b>	Section A	Early School Assessment	Lorrie Shepard, University of Colorado Ed Roeber, MI
	Section B	Interpreting Statewide Assessment Results	Jim Impara, OR Brud Maxcy, ME
	Section A	Evaluating a State Assessment Program  Louisiana  Missouri	Carmen Finley, AIR John Adams, MN  Frank Womer, University of Michigan Dale Foreman, Consultant Bill Burson, CA
<b>Number of Sessions</b>			<b>39</b>

1980 Conference on Large-Scale Assessment June 9-12, 1980 Hilton Harvest House Hotel Boulder, CO			
Monday, June 9 PM	General Session	Searching for the Truth About "Truth in Testing"	Rex Brown, NAEP Bruce Krigman, US House Staff Al Sims, College Board
	Evening	Cookout	
Tuesday, June 10 AN	Large Group	Simple Procedures for Helping Principals and Teachers Use Assessment Results	Ed Roeber, MI Rebecca Christian, LA
	Large Group	Assessment of CBE Teachers and Administrators: Issues and Problems	Robert Blum, Jefferson County, CO Pat Evenson-Brady, NWREL
	Large Group	Attaining Affective Goals: Can (Should) Schools Play a Constructive Role	Dorothy Major, Denver Catherine Felkner, Boulder
	Small Group	Issues and Strategies in Item Banking: Update 1980	Michael Hiscox, NWREL Evelyn Brzeszinski, NWREL
	Small Group	Creative Alternatives to Standardized Testing: How Do Districts Who Wish to "Kick the Habit" Go About Assessing Student Performance?	Bernard Kenna, NEA
	Small Group	Synaptic Noise: Evaluation in a Policy Environment	Sherry Rubenstein, Nat'l Evaluation Systems
	Small Group	Testing and Evaluation within the New Department of Education	Judy Shoemaker, USED Joe Teresa, USED Robert Stonehill, USED
	Small Group	Assessing Listening and Speaking	Tracy Libros, MA Nancy Mead, ECS
	Small Group	State Programs for the Competency Based Assessment of Teachers: Contrasts in Georgia South Carolina	Chad Ellett, Univ of GA Briccia Prestridge, SC
Tuesday, June 10 PM	Large Group	A Look Into the Crystal Ball: Testing Needs for the 1980s	Howard Stoker, Univ FL Richard Hill, RMC Gerald Bracey, VA Walter Haney, Huron Institute
	Large Group	Competency Testing for Program Improvement versus Competency Testing for Promotion: Is There a Difference	Del Schalock, OR College of Education Walter Hathaway, Portland OR Schools
	Large Group	Performance Testing: Alternatives to Paper and Pencil Tests	Richard Stiggins, NWREL
	Small Group	NAEP Update: Findings and New Directions	Roy Forbes, NAEP
	Small Group	Using Test Results for Guiding Instruction and Curriculum Planning	Herb Rudman, Michigan State University
	Small Group	Helping School Districts Interpret and Use Assessment Data: In-Depth Look at the Pennsylvania EQA Assessment Strategies	Richard Kohr, PA James Hertzog, PA
	Small Group	Testing Teacher Competencies: A Tale of Two States	Ira Harvey, AL Thomas Fisher, FL Annie Ward, FL
	Small Group	Towards Excellence in Writing: The Role and Limitations of Minimum Competencies	JoAnne Eresh, Fichburg Public Schools
	Small Group	A Pioneer Competency Program with a Solid Data Base: How Remediation and Instructional Materials Have Paid Off	Walter Lansu, LA Public Schools
Wednesday June 11 AM	Large Group	Putting Rasch Modeling into Perspective: Its Advantages and Disadvantages for State Assessment Applications	Ron Hambleton, Univ of Massachusetts
	Large Group	School Improvement: Using State Assessment Results to Change School Achievement	Ellen Sushak, MN Thomas Fisher, FL
	Large Group	Preventive Law and Testing: A New Approach	Merle McClung, ECS
	Small Group	Use of Statewide Competency Test Data to Develop Individual and Group Profiles and Prescriptions	Carl Johnson, NJ Stephen Koffler, NJ
	Small Group	Studying Minimum Competency Testing: A Clarification Forum	Judy Shoemaker, USED Enid Herndon, USED
	Small Group	Evidence of Achievement Growth in Florida Since the Introduction of Competency Tests	Janice Smith, FL Elaine Palmer, FL
	Small Group	Training Teachers to Use Test Results: The Delaware Experience	Janet Wall, formerly DE



	Small Group	New Techniques for Reporting Assessment Results: Formats for Teachers, Parents, and Students	Stan Bernkopf, GA John Adams, Intran
	Small Group	The Use of File Maintenance Computer Languages to Manage and Report Compensatory Education Test Data	Warren Williams, EMU Robert Smith, Wayne County ISD Wayne Esch, Northern Telecom Systems
Wednesday June 11 PM	Large Group	Is Johnny/Mary Taking Too Many Tests? What Can be Done?	Jennifer Greene Alan Farstrup David Morton, All Univ of Rhode Island
	Large Group	Valid Test Standards	Lorrie Shepard, Univ of Colorado
Thursday June 12 AM	Large Group	Measuring Change Over Time and With Different Tests: Equating Alternatives	Ross Green, CTB Alan Harte, ACT Joe Ryan, Univ of SC
	Large Group	Guiding NAEO Through the 1980's: An Open Forum with Members of the NAEP Policy Committee	Members of the NAEP Assessment Policy Committee
	Small Group	Getting the News Media to Accurately and Fairly Report State Assessment Results	Ed Roeber, MI Richard Cole, Publicom Marjorie Wightman, TX
	Small Group	Impact of a State Mandated Minimum Competency Testing Program on Schools: The Missouri Experience	Sandra Edelman, St. Louis PS Robert Lowenbridge, St. Louis PS
	Small Group	A Model Education Quality Act: Holding School Systems Accountable	Bill Rosser, Chicano Ed Project Frederico Pena, CO State Legislature
	Small Group	Secondary Research Opportunities Using NAEP Data	Donald Searls, NAEP David Wright, NAEP
		<b>Number of Sessions</b>	<b>37</b>

1985 Assessment and Policy Conference June 10-13, 1985 Hilton Harvest House Hotel Boulder, CO			
June 10 Monday PM	General Session	Public Policy and Assessment	John Casteen III, VA Calvin Frazier, CO Wilhelmina Delco, TX
	Workshop	Assessment and Teacher Quality	Linda Bond, CA Comm on the Teaching Prof.
	Workshop	Assessment and Curriculum	Margaret Marston, VA
	Workshop	Assessment and Administrator Quality	Terry Peterson, SC
	Workshop	Accountability and Public Support for Education	Din Ernst, AR
	Workshop	Accountability and Higher Education	Alma McGuinness, ECS
	Workshop	State-by-State Comparisons	William Pierce, CCSO
	Evening	Western Cookout, Boulder Valley Ranch	
Tuesday June 11 AM	Large Group	State Policies for Career Ladders and Teacher Assessment	Linda Bond, CA Comm on Teaching Profession Steve Cobb, TN Don Ernst, AR Gloria Cabe, AR
	Large Group	Equity and Educational Reform	Frank Newman, ECS Blenda Wilson, ECS
	Large Group	Using Educational Quality Indicators for State Program and Policy Decisions	Martha Darling, SWEDL James Smith, CA Roger Neppel, CO
	Small Group	Basic Concepts of Test Validity	Lorrie Shepard, Univ. of Colorado
	Small Group	Testing Beyond Minimums	Herb Rudman, MSU
	Small Group	Legal Issues of Teacher Education	Pat Lines, ECS
	Small Group	The Pros and Cons of Legislatively or State Board of Mandated Testing Programs	Anne Hess, AL William Brown, NC Elizabeth Creech, GA
	Small Group	An Overview of Changes and Trends in State-Level Assessment Programs	John Fremer, Psych Corp Wayne Neuberger, OR
	Small Group	Public Reactions to Disclosure of Test Scores	Karen Layton, KCNC News Michael Massorotti, Adams 50 Sch District
Small Group	Implications of Statewide Mastery Testing for Grade Promotion and Meeting Minimal Standards for Graduation	Keith Cruse, TX Susan Triplet, LA	
Tuesday June 11 PM	Large Group	Testing of Teachers: Where Are We Now and Where Are We Going?	Rod Roth, Univ of AR David Florio, AFT Jeff Schneider, NEA
	Large Group	Education and Demography	Harold Hodgkinson, IEL
	Large Group	Using Assessment Data to Promote the Principal as Instructional Leader	Terry Peterson, SC Lester Solomon, GA Null Tucker, Atlantic Assessment Center
	Small Group	Measuring Computer Literacy: Past, Present and Future	Marc Tucker, Carnegie Forum on Ed and the Economy
	Small Group	Norm-Referenced versus Criterion-Referenced Tests: Which Serves Statewide Assessment Better?	Doug Rindone, CT Gordon Ensign, WA
	Small Group	The Special Review Assessment: An Alternative to Testing for Graduation Requirements	Carl Johnson, NJ Stephen Koffler, NJ
	Small Group	Explaining and Using Standardized Test Scores	James Impara, VA Poly Tech University
	Small Group	Assessing the Impact of Educational Reform on Low Achieving Students	Robert Serow, NC State University Barbara Williams, ETS
	Small Group	Setting Passing Scores	Gary Estes, NWRREL Craig Mills, ETS
	Small Group	Bridging the Gap Between Tests and Theories of Reading and Writing	Jay Robinson, U-M Karen Wixson, U-M Richard Brengle, U-M
	Evening	Poolside Get-Together, NCS Sponsor	
Wednesday June 12 AM	Large Group	Identifying Meritorious Schools v. Academically Deficient School Districts	Thomas Fisher, FL Terry Peterson, SC P Alistair Mac Kinnon, NY
	Large Group	Rethinking State Strategies for School Improvement	Beverly Anderson, ECS Maxine Frost, Riverside Sch District
	Large Group	Using Student Performance Data and Information to Improve Instruction	Connie Dardin, AR Carl Johnson, NJ

	Small Group	NAEP 1986: Changes and Challenges	Robert Coldiron, PA Jules Goodison, ETS Ina Mullis, ETS
	Small Group	Validating Statewide Standards for Instruction and Assessment	Rebecca Christian, LA David Bayless, Westat Sherry Rubenstein, Westat
	Small Group	Current and Future Uses of Microcomputers in Achievement and Guidance Testing	John Fremer James McBride Paul McDermott, all Psych Corporation
	Small Group	Why Some Testing Programs Fail to Realize Their Potential – Failing to Distinguish Among Different Types of Programs	Richard Hill, ASME Stuart Kahl, ASME Pat Forjionne, CT
	Small Group	NCA Outcomes Accreditation	John Vaughn, NCA
	Small Group	Intended and Unintended Consequences of Teacher Testing	Margaret Goertz, ETS
	Small Group	Implications of New Conceptions of Intelligence	Gerald Bracey, VA
<b>Wednesday June 12 PM</b>	Special Session	The Federal Indicators Project: What is It and What It May	Jay Noell, NCES William Pierce, CCSSO
	Special Session	Pros and Cons of the NAEP State-by-State Assessment Option and Outcomes for the SREB-NAEP Pilot Study	Thomas Fisher, FL Stephen Koffler, NJ Joyce McLarty, TN
	Evening	Hospitality Get-Together, Harcourt	
<b>Thursday June 13 AM</b>	Large Group	Teacher Competency Tests: Why and How? When is it Right?	Marlene Goddison, ETS Irv Lehmann, MSU
	Large Group	Development of Higher Level Assessment Programs: Alternative Approaches	Ed Roeber, MI Betty Stevens, MI Joan Baron, CT Robert Coldiron, PA Peter Kneidler, CA
	Large Group	How Does the Testing Industry Ensure the Usefulness of Standardized Test Scores?	Mark Reckase, ACT John Fremerl, Psych Corporation
	Small Group	NAEP: Results from the 1983-84 Assessment of Reading and Writing	Ina Mullis, ETS Jules Goodison, ETS
	Small Group	Recent Developments in Teacher Assessment: From Induction to Incentives	Chad Ellett, LSU Lester Solomon, GA John Dolly, Univ of WY
	Small Group	Update on the Research Agenda for Assessment of Writing	Edys Quellmalz, Stanford Joan Barron, CT Richard Stiggins, NWREL
	Small Group	Using Assessment Information to Improve the Effectiveness of Colleges and Universities	Peter Ewell, NCHEMS
	Small Group	Establishing a Teacher Certification Testing Program – Texas as a Case Study	Richard Allen, NES Scott Elliott, NES Marvin Veselka, TX
	Small Group	NCES Elementary/Secondary Re-design Project	Richard Taeuber, NCES
	<b>Number of Sessions</b>		<b>51</b>

1990 ECS/CDE Assessment Conference June 10-12, 1990 Clarion Harvest House Hotel Boulder, Colorado			
Sunday June 10 PM	General Session	National Goals and Accountability for the 1990's	Garrey Carruthers, NM
		Desert in the Garden	
	Large Group	What Kind of Instruction Should Measurement Be Driving	Grant Wiggins, CLASS Dennie Wolf, Harvard William Lipischak, Ontario
	Large Group	What is the National Assessment Governing Board's Vision for the Future?	Roy Truby, NAGB Emerson Elliott, NCES Ramsay Selden, CCSSO Ed Roeber, Michigan
	Large Group	What Has Been the Impact of Assessment on Policy?	Marlis Mann, NM Mary Willis, SC Rexford Brown, ECS
	Small Group	What Are the educational and Political Barriers to Performance Assessment at the Local Level?	Pam Aschbacher, UCLA Grant Wiggins, CLASS
	Small Group	How Are Rewards and Sanctions Being Used to Improve Schools?	Linda Bond, IN Mary Willis, SC
	Small Group	How Can We Help Classroom Teachers Become Assessment Literate?	Richard Stiggins, NWREL Marge Mastie, Washtenaw ISD Ed Roeber, MI
	Small Group	What Have We Learned from 21 Years of NAEP?: Perspectives from NAEP Directors	Ralph Tyler, CASBS Frank Womer, U-M Roy Forbes, CAS, NC Beverly Anderson, ECS Archie LaPointe, ETS Jack Merwin, U MN
	Small Group	What is the Role of Assessment and Accountability in Restructuring Education in Kentucky?	Jack Foster, KY
	Evening	Poolside Get-together	NCS Sponsor
Monday June 11 AM		Breakfast Courtesy of Riverside Publishing	
	Large Group	What Will Testing in the 1990s Look Like?	Richard Stiggins, NWREL Dale Carlson, CA Robert Linn, U CO
	Large Group	What is So Real About Authentic Assessment?	John Fremer, ETS Clare Burstall, Nat'l Foundation for Ed Res in England and Wales
	Large Group	Is NAEP Pushing Us Into a National Curriculum?	Ramsay Selden, CCSSO Roy Truby, NAGB Emerson Elliott, NCES Stan Bernknopf, GA Doug Rindone, CT
	Small Group	What's the Difference Between Portfolios and Authentic Assessment?	Dennie Wolf, Harvard Grant Wiggins, CLASS
	Small Group	How Do Criterion-Referenced Tests and Norm-Referenced Tests Fit Together in a State-Mandated Program?	Linda Bond, IN Bill Brown, NC Keith Cruse, TX
	Small Group	What Are the Legitimate uses of NAEP Scales?	Gene Johnson, ETS Daniel Koretz, RAND
	Small Group	What is the Role of Assessment in Restructuring Education?	Beverly Anderson, ECS Bruce Wilson, Research for Better Schools
	Small Group	What is the Role of Assessment in Meeting Business' Expectations for Employability Skills	Bill Brown, MI Marti Hamlen, U.S. West
Monday June 11 PM	Symposium A	What's New in Large-Scale Authentic Performance Testing?	Grant Wiggins, CLASS Ross Brewer, VT Clare Burstall, Nat'l Foundation for Ed Res in England and Wales Joan Baron, CT Dale Carlson, CA Marilyn Sullivan, Ontario
	Symposium B	How Can Assessment Be Used to Improve Teacher Quality?	Joan Baratz-Snowden, NCTPS Pat Forgionne, CT Protase Woodward, ETS Ross Brewer, VT

Evening Evening		Reception in the Garden	Psychological Corporation
		Country and Western Dance	CTB/McGraw-Hill
Tuesday June 12 AM	Breakfast		American Testronics
	Large Group	National Goals for Mathematics Assessment	Kenneth Hoffman, MSEB Tom Romberg, U WI
	Large Group	Developing Better Assessments: What's Needed?	Lorrie Shepard, U CO Eva Baker, UCLA Daniel Koretz, RAND
	Large Group	How Will We Assess National Performance Goals: Who Will Do It?	Michael Cohen, NGA Emerson Elliott, NCES Marshall Smith, Stanford Chester Finn, Vanderbilt
	Small Group	How Well Can Teachers Interpret Standardized Test Score Reports?	James Impara, VA Poly Tech
	Small Group	Sources of error Affecting the Reliability and Validity of Writing Samples and Other Performance Assessments	H.D. Hoover, U Iowa Steve Dunbar, U Iowa
	Small Group	Multiple-Choice Tests: What Is Their Potential and Limitations in Statewide Testing Programs?	Alan Hartman, MA
	Small Group	Can They Apply What They Have Learned? Application Level Assessments	Jack Hay, St Vrain SD Sherri Stephens-Carter, St Vrain SD
	Small Group	Assessing Students' Science Skills Using Hands On Equipment	Doug Rindone, CT
Tuesday June 12 PM	Large Group	Where Do You Draw the Line Between Curriculum Alignment vs. Teaching to the Test?	Bill Mehrens, MSU Rebecca Christian, LA Paul Sandifer, SC
	Large Group	The New Assessments of Reading: How Well Are They Working?	Tom Kerins, IL Peggy Dutcher, MI Barbara Kapinus, CCSSO
	Large Group	The NAEP 1990 and 1992 Trial State Assessment Program	Ina Mullis, ETS Gary Phillips, NCES Nancy Caldwell, WESTAT Stephen Koffler, ETS Ramsay Selden, CCSSO
	Small Group	Bias, Fairness and Differential Item Functioning	Gregory Canmilli, Rutgers Jeffrey Smith, Rutgers Brenda Lloyd, U VA
	Small Group	How Can Districts Develop Their Own Accountability Measures Which Satisfy the Policy Makers and the Public?	Roy Forbes
	Small Group	Education Indicator Panel: What is Their Role in the National/State Education Information Agenda?	Leigh Burstein, UCLA Ramsay Selden, CCSSO
	Small Group	What Can We Learn From Open-Ended Items	Anne Hafner, NCES Judy Pollock, ETS Ina Mullis, ETS
	Small Group	Measuring Science Process Skills: Where Have we Been and Where Are We Going?	John Bullock, USF Mark Heidorn, FL
<b>Number of Sessions</b>			<b>40</b>

1995 National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment June 18-21, 1995 Tapatio Cliffs Resort Phoenix, Arizona			
June 18 Sunday PM	Luncheon	Beyond Rhetoric: Lessons Learned in Implementing New Forms of Assessment	Ed Reidy, KY Ramsay Selden, CCSSO
	Large Group	Equity and Analytic Issues in Opportunity-to-Learn	Eva Baker, UCLA Lynn Winters, UCLA Joan Herman, UCLA Siek-Toon Khoo, UCLA
	Large Group	Health Education: Linking Preventions, Assessment and Standards	Ann Doucette-Gates, Macro International Wanda Jubb, CDC Ed Slawski, Harcourt David Lohman, AAHE Janet Collins, CDC
	Large Group	Parent and Public Acceptance of New Forms of Assessment	Carribeth Bliem, U CO Dale Carlson, CA Doris Redfield, VA
	Large Group	An OERI-Sponsored Study of Assessment of Student Performance: Findings and Implications	Nidhi Khattri, Pelavin David Sweet, USED Michael Kane, Pelavin Ruth Mitchell, Consultant
	Large Group	Defining Mastery Levels for Objectives	Judy Haynes, Florida James Fulton, California
	Large Group	Racial/Ethnic Score Differences on Performance Assessments	Monty Neil, NCEFOT Ed Reidy, KY Steve Ferrara, MD Richard Duran, UCSB
	Large Group	Large-Scale Assessments: Perils and Promises of Longitudinal Evaluations	Val Plisko, USED Elois Scott, USED Jeffrey Rodamar, USED Joanne Bogart, USED Palph Romaro, AZ
	Large Group	Portfolio Assessment: Reactions from a Pilot	Catherine Welch, ACT Mark Reckase, ACT Tim Miller, ACT Sharon Davis, Tupedo Emily Docker, U-M
	Large Group	Performance-Based Assessments to Guide Initial Teacher Licensure Decisions	Jean Miller, CCSSO Pat Forgione, DE Bill Thompson, TBA Consulting Penny Pence, Consult.
	Large Group	Effective Schools and Instruction in Mathematics: Innovative Analysis from the 1992 NAEP	Tim Madigan, NCES Ina Mullis, Boston Col. Arnold Goldstein, NCES Frank Jenkins, ETS Mary Lindquist, Columbus College
	Large Group	"Customizing" New Standards	Cheryl Tibbals, NSP Terry Bergeson, WA Gordon Ensign, WA
Large Group	How We Can Ensure Equity for English Language Learners in Statewide Assessment Programs: Findings From Two National Surveys	Anne Hafner, CSU/LA Diane August, NAS Charlene Rivera, GWU	
Evening		"Wine Assessment" CTB/McGraw-Hill	
Monday June 19 AM	Large Group	State Programs for Implementing Inservice/Preservice Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment of Students	Carmen Woods Chapman, IL SBE Riger Trent, OH Marcus Haack, IA Diane Smolen, MI
	Large Group	Opportunity to Perform in the Vermont Portfolio Assessment	Sue Rigney, VT Marge Petit, VT Lynne Mappus, Insite Nadir Atash, WESTAT
	Large Group	Large-Scale Assessment in SSI States	Janice Earle, NSF Susan Agruso, SC Wayne Martin, CO Kerry Davidson, LA
	Large Group	Primary Level Assessment System: Examining Possibilities – Portfolios, Performance Assessment	Ann Doucette-Gates, Macro International

		and Teacher Professional Development	Karen Kolanowski, NY Carol Brown, OH Janelle Rivers, SC Robert Calfee, Stanford Barbara Kapinus, CCSSO
	Small Group	A World of Difference in End-of-Secondary Exams: Science and Math Exams and Examination Systems in Seven Countries	Edward Britton, NCISE Senta Raizen, NCISE
	Small Group	Reconceptualizing the Role of Portfolios in Implementing Reform	Richard Hill, ASME Amy Buren, ASME Sally Schneider, ASME
	Small Group	Illinois Teams Up: Collaborative Efforts in a Statewide Assessment System for Students in Bilingual Programs	Mervin Brennan, IL Xavier Botana, IL Margo Gottlieb, IL Resource Center
	Small Group	A Presentation of Various Models Used to Train Teachers to Develop Their Own Performance Assessments	Doug Paul, Profiles Barbara Lawrence, UT Judy Arter, NWREL
	Small Group	Issues in Large-Scale Performance Assessment in Language Arts: Implications from NAEP	Barbara Kapinus, CCSSO Peggy Carr, NCES
	Small Group	The Puerto Rico Assessment of Educational Progress: The Challenges of Making the Results Come Alive	Griesel Munoz, GCE John Olsen, ETS Pedro Esquerdo, U PR
	Small Group	Many Visions, Many Aims: First Acts in the Drama of Curriculum	William Schmidt, MSU
<b>Monday June 19 PM</b>	Large Group	Pacesetter: Integrating Assessment and Instruction	Jill Stevens, Irving HS Ernest Kimmel, ETS Charleen Del Fino, Eastside Union HS
	Large Group	Wisconsin Performance Assessment	Rosemary Fitton, WI Tom McIntosh, WI John Fortier, WI
	Large Group	The Collaborative Development of Science Assessments: The SCASS Experience	Allen Doolittle, ACT Charles Warren, OH Jeff Grieg, CT Dan Ochs, KY Rolf Blank, CCSSO Megan Martin, CA
	Large Group	Integrating Instruction and Assessment with Math Portfolios	Neal Kingston, KY Jo Ann Mosier, KY Jan Boyles, KY Debbie Cox, KY
	Small Group	Performance-Based Assessment of Teamwork	Phyllis Grummon, MSU Stanley Rabinowitz, Far West Laboratory
	Small Group	A Systemic Approach to Alternative Assessment Design for Large-Scale and Local Needs	Pamela Aschbacher, UCLA David Niemi, UCLA
	Small Group	Assessing LEP Students in Elementary Level Math Classrooms	Julia Lara, CCSSO Rebecca Kopriva, CSU Sharon Saez, DE Lily Wong Fillmore, CSU
	Small Group	Validation of the 1994 NAEP Achievement Levels	Luz Bay, ACT Mark Reckase, ACT Susan Loomis, ACT
	Small Group	Reporting Results From Large-Scale Performance Assessments: The NAEP Experience	Gene Johnson, ETS Christine O'Sullivan, ETS Nancy Allen, ETS
	Small Group	The Student-Based Constructed-Response (SBCR) Method of Standard-Setting: Why It Is the Preferred Method	Stuart Kahl, ASME Timothy Crockett, ASME
	Small Group	The ABCs of School Testing	John Fremer, ETS Janet Wall, DMDC
	Small Group	Surveying the Landscape of State Educational Assessment Programs: What's New in State Assessment	Linda Bond, NCREL Rod Riffel, NEA
<b>Evening</b>	Reception	Harcourt, Riverside, and NCS	
<b>Tuesday June 20 AM</b>	Large Group	Certification of Rigorous Content, Performance, and Opportunity-to-Learn Standards: Policy Implications for States with High Stakes Assessment Programs	Roger Trent, OH Teresa Staten, MI Alan Morgan, NM Jeri Nowakowski, NCREL
	Large Group	State Content Standards and Student Assessments: What is the Evidence on Their Alignment	Susan Gross, NSF Rolf Blank, CCSSO Doug Rindone, CT Ellen Pechman, PSA

		Walter Secada, U WI Charles Warren, OH
Large Group	The National Forum on Assessment's "Standards for Student Assessment Systems"	Monty Neil, NCFOT Carmen Woods Chapman, IL Ken Goodman, U AZ
Large Group	Reinventing an Assessment System for Students, School, and the State (NY)	David Green, NY Roseanne DeFabio, NY David Allen, CES Michelle Risconscente, CES
Small Group	Is It Necessary to Administer a Nationally-Normed Test to Get National Norms?	Richard Hill, ASME D Ross Green, CTB
Small Group	Obtaining Trend Information from Open-Ended Assessments	Suzanne Triplett, NC Daisy Vickers, NC Eleanor Sanford, NC Mildred Bazemore, NC
Small Group	Practical Research Applications of Performance Assessment	Megan Martin, CA Darrell Bock, U Chicago Michelle Simowski, U Chicago
Small Group	The Impact of Teaching and Learning of Statewide Examinations Required for Graduation	Doug Paul, Profiles Jan Crandell, OH Pat Porter, TX Pat Sullivan, Meas Inc
Small Group	The Laboratory Network Program's Math/Science Alternative Assessment Database and Professional Development Toolkit	Linda Bond, NCREL Judy Arter, NWREL Arie van der Ploeg, NCREL
Small Group	Confronting the Challenges: Developing, Scoring, and Reporting Constructed-Response Items	Jay Campbell, ETS Christine O'Sullivan, ETS Alix Beatty, ETS Nancy Allen, ETS
Small Group	Looking Across Standards: Status of State Efforts	Maggie McNeely, USED Barbara Kapinus, CCSSO Joseph Conaty, USED
Small Group	An Evaluation of the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS)	Roger Pankratz, KY Mark Fenster, WMU Penney Sanders, KY Ed Reidy, KY
Small Group	Assessment and Evaluation Strategies for IASA/Title I	Kenji Hakuta, Stanford Charlene Tucker, CT Tom Stubbitz, PA Carole Perlman, Chicago Mel Webb, Philadelphia Mike Kean, CTB Rich Hill, ASME Julia Lara, CCSSO
Small Group	Assessment Accommodations: Legal Perspectives & Policy Implications	S E Phillips, MSU
Evening	Desert Steakfry at Tapatio Cliffs	CCSSO
Wednesday June 21 AM	Large Group	Progress and Plans for Including Students with Disabilities in National and State Assessments
	Large Group	Using "Learning Profile As A Tool for School Improvement
	Large Group	Using Service Learning To Meet and Measure Standards
	Large Group	Making Standards Real: Designing Large-Scale Portfolio Assessment for Instructional Consequences
	Small Group	SAT Score Scale Change: Implications for Assessment, Research and Policymaking
	Small Group	Strategies for Promoting Goals 2000 Parent-Student Partnerships
	Small Group	Assessing A Kindergarten Cohort



		Donald Rock, ETS Julie Nicholson, U-M Sally Aykins-Burnett U-M
Small Group	NAEP/SCASS/Arts – Cooperative Development of NAEP-Linked Exercises for Arts Education Assessments at the State and Local Levels	Frank Philip, CCSSO Scott Shuler, CT Angelika Pohl, GA Stephen Lazer, ETS
Small Group	Electronic Portfolio to the Rescue – Can it Meet the Challenge	Hannah Kruglanski, Edunetics Corp Nadir Atash, WESTAT Priscilla Kimry, Plano ISD
Small Group	New Approaches to Establishing Performance Standards	Gage Kingsbury, Portland PS Linda Diamond, BW Associates Ron Houser, Portland PS
Small Group	Identifying the Skills Needed for High Performance Workplaces Through the National Job Analysis Study	Beverly Nash, ACT Robert Korte, ACT Phyllis Grummon, MSU
Small Group	The Advanced Placement Challenge: Providing Excellence and Equity for the Future	Philip Arbolino, College Board Eugene Pickel, Oak Ridge HS Louis Montoya, Clifton PSD
<b>Number of Sessions</b>		<b>65</b>

CCSSO National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment June 25-28, 2000 Snobird Resort Snowbird, Utah			
Saturday June 24	Pre-session	Mining Large-Scale Assessment Data for Improved Student Achievement: the Continual Improvement Method	Dave Bayless Jim Lunsford
	Pre-session	Assessment Literacy for Policymakers	Judy Arter, Assess. Training Institute
	Pre-session	National Assessment Governing Board Hearing: The Next Decade for NAEP Achievement Levels	Alan Morgan, New Mexico
	Pre-session	Climbing the Final Mountain: Best Practices in Including All Students	NCEO Staff
Sunday June 25 PM	Opening Session	Trends in Large-Scale Assessment	Pat Forgione, Austin ISD
	Large Group	Into the Black Box: Technology-Based Assessment in the Service of Learning	Lou Fabrizio, NC Charlotte Solomon, ETS Peter Behuniak, CT Dock Soule, Assess. Systems
	Large Group	Lessons from Benchmarking Standards and Assessments	Jennifer Vranek Matt Gandal, Achieve Bill Schmidt, MSU
	Large Group	Managing Change in State Assessment Programs – Practicing the Fine Art of Coordination and Communication	Cameron Harris, VT Duncan MacQuarrie, Tacoma PS Kelly Powell, AZ
	Large Group	Policy Perspectives on Assessment	Doug Christensen, NE Larry Grau, IN Jane Krentz, MN Betty Preston, MO
	Large Group	Designing and Developing Assessment Strategies for State, Local, and National After-School Programs	Mark Dynarski, Mathematic Pol Res Terry Peterson, USED Kathy Lewis, CA Marianne Kugler, Mott Adriana DeKanter, USED Darlene Currie, After-School Corporation Joan Herman, UCLA
	Large Group	State Testing Programs with Scholarships Attached	Jan Crandall, OH Joe Ryan, ASU Christine Schram, MI
	Large Group	Dodging Bullets: Minimizing the Probability of Analysis and Reporting Problems	Scott Trimble, KY Neal Kingston, MP Stuart Kahl, MP
	Large Group	Dual Language Assessment-Technical Issues	Ray Fields, NAGB Richard Duran, UCSB Teresa Garcia, AIR Fran Stancavage, AIR
	Large Group	Language Simplification of Test Items	Jamal Abedi, UCLA Jay Campbell, ETS Beverly Farr, AIR
	Large Group	Making Sense of Performance Indicators-The Case for Multiple Measures	Elois Scott, USED Valena Plisko, NCES Audrey Pendleton, NCES Wayne Martin, CCSSO
	Large Group	More of Miss Marple's Measurement Moments	S.E. Phillips, MSU Bill Schafer, MD
	Large Group	Opportunity to Learn as an Issue in State Testing Programs	Gerry Shelton, CA Richard Wolfe, U Toronto Bill Schmidt, MSU David Wiley, Northwestern
	Evening		Welcome Reception at La Caille
Monday June 26 AM	Large Group	Counting All Kids: How States Are Handling Inclusion for Accountability Reporting	Kathy Rosenberger, MD Chris Cloudt, TX Janet Durfee-Hildago, OH Martha Thurlow, NCEO
	Large Group	Improving Student Achievement: State Policies That Make a Difference	David Gissner, RAND Peggy Carr, NCES

	Large Group	Promoting Parents' Assessment Literacy: A Pooling of Procedural Ploys	Jim Popham, UCLA John Fremer, ETS
	Large Group	The Coming Testing Backlash (And How to Respond to It)	Orlo Shroyer, MO Gary Cook, WI Michael Feuer, NRC
	Large Group	Things Aren't working Out exactly as We'd Planned: Unintended Consequences of Implementing a State Testing/Accountability System	Art Thacker, HumRRO Gene Hoffman, HumRRO Sue Rigney, USED
	Large Group	Linking Test to Assessments	Gene Johnson, AIR Nancy Peterson, ACT Lauren Wise, HumRRO Diane Garvaglia, AIR
	Small Group	A "Grass Roots" Approach to State Assessment	Chad Buckendahl, Buros Jim Impara, Buros Barbara Plake, Buros Doug Christensen, NE
	Small Group	All Kids or the Kids we Taught: Using Longitudinal Approaches to Judge School Progress	Dale Carlson, CA Richard Hill, Center for Assessment
	Small Group	Fine Arts Assessment Comes Into Its Own	Susan Franks, CTB Jim Friedebach, MO Orlo Shroyer, MO Diane Miranda, CTB Frank Philip, CCSSO
	Small Group	Making Effective Use of Constructed-Response Items in Large-Scale Assessment	John Selisky, Riverside John Dossey, ISU Beverly Neitzel, WA
	Small Group	NAEP in the New Millennium: The 2003 Foreign Language Assessment	Beverly Farr, AIR Dorry Kenyon, CAL Steve Ferrara, AIR Mary Crovo, CCSSO Gene Johnson, AIR
	Small Group	Peeling Away the Layers of Ambivalence	Tom Deeter, IA Ellen Hedlund, RI Liru Zhang, DE
	Small Group	Solutions to Increasing Classroom-Based Assessment Literacy	Mary Foertsch, NCREL Edyth Young, NCREL
	Small Group	The Inclusion and Accommodation of English Language Learners in State Assessments: A State Policy Analysis	Lew Scialdone, Speakeasy Language Charles Stansfield, Second Language Test Charlene Rivera, GWU
	Small Group	What Are Our Research Priorities Regarding Inclusive Large-Scale Assessment?	Pat Almond, OR Carolee Gunn, UT Mancy Maihoff, DE Sue Beachard, CO Martha Thurlow, NCEO
	Lunch	Political and Policy Issues Related to Large-Scale Assessment	Judith Johnson, USED Doug Christensen, NE
Monday June 26 PM	Large Group	Are Holistic Standard Setting Methods Realistic Alternatives for NAEP?	Paul Nichols, ACT Ron Hambleton, U MA Jeff Nellhaus, MA
	Large Group	Assessing Kindergartners: Findings from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-99	Jerry west, NCES Kristin Denton, AIR Sally Atkins Burnett, U-M Elvira Germino-Hausken, NCES
	Large Group	IDEA 97's Mandate for Full Inclusion-How Have NAEP and State Testing Programs Responded?	John Mazzeo, ETS Scott Trimble, KY Susan Agruso, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Laurens Wise, HumRRO David Malouf, USED
	Large Group	Update on Meeting Title I Standards and Assessment Requirements	Grace Ross, USED Sue Rigney, USED
	Large Group	What States Wish Vendors Really Knew About Testing Programs	Pat Rael, NM Molly Zebrowski, NCS Jan Crandell, OH Wes Bruce, IN
	Large Group	Assessment and Teacher Quality	Robert Rothman, NRC David robinson, Cons. Abigail Hughes, CT
	Small Group	Combining Multiple Sources of Information in the Setting of Performance Standards	Brud Maxcy, ME Neal Kingston, MP

			Scott Marion, WY Allen Doolittle, MP
	Small Group	Developing a New Framework for Research and Evaluation	Elois Scott, USED Ricky Takai, USED Joseph Conaty, USED Alan Ginsburg, USED
	Small Group	Gender and Fair Assessment	Liru Zhang, DE Valeria Ford, Prince Georges PS Fen Chou, LA
	Small Group	National Research and Development on Accommodations for LEP Students	Jamal Abedi, UCLA John Olson, CCSO Arnold Goldstein, NCS Sharif Shakrani, NAGB
	Small Group	Putting it All together-Large Suburban District Teams for Standards and Assessments as Test Scores Rise	Jane Stewart, ISD 196 Renee Ervasti, ISD196 John Wllersheim, ISD196 Sharon Davenport, ISD196, MN
	Small Group	State Policymakers: Perspectives on Large-Scale Assessment: 2000 and Beyond	Dan Wiener, MA Shelby Samuelson, NCSL Jane Krentz, MN Ed Roerber, MP
	Small Group	Strategies for Improving Teachers' Decisions About Participation and Accommodation of Students with Disabilities in Large-Scale Assessment	James Shriner, U of IL Lizanne DeStefano, U of IL
	Small Group	Testing ELL Students in English Language Development	Rebecca Kopriva, Cons. Richard Diaz, CA Gerry Shelton, CA Richard Wolfe, U Toronto
	Small Group	The Impact of Testing Accommodations on Test Score Reliability and Validity	John Bielinski, U MN Jim Ysseledyke, U MN Melodie Friedebach, MO
	Small Group	Using Question Tryouts to Augment the NAEP Assessment Development Process	Andy Weiss, ETS Jay Campbell, ETS
	Reception	Sponsored by Harcourt, Riverside, and NCS	
Evening			
Tuesday June 27 AM	Large Group	Assessment That Illuminate Instructional Decisions	Richard Hill, Center for Assessment Steve Ferrara, AIR Jim Popham, UCLA
	Large Group	An Overview of the USED Guide on Federal Civil Rights Principles and Proper Test Use	Scott Palmer, USED Rebecca Kopriva, Cons.
	Large Group	Multi-State Research on the Read Aloud Accommodation in Mathematics-SCASS ASES Research Study Group	Gerald Tindal, U OR Nancy Maihoff, DE Merrie Darrah, East Shore SERCC Ken Olsen, U KY Pat Almond, OR
	Large Group	TIMSS-R and PIRLS International Studies	Dana Kelly, Boston Col Maggie McNeely, USED Kathy O'Connor, Boston Kelvin Gregory, Boston C
	Large Group	Working with the Media to Effectively Communicate Test Results to the Public	Michael Kean, CTB William Randall, WBR Roseanne DeFabio, NY Sharon Lewis, CGCS
	Large Group	The Internet as a Communications Tool in State Assessment Programs	Peter Behuniak, CT Gary Cook, WI Jesse Montano, MN Carmen Chapman, IL
	Small Group	Alternative Approaches to State Assessment Systems	Duncan MacQuarrie, Tacoma PS Don Watson, CO Nina Carran, IA Barbara Lawrence, UT
	Small Group	Alternate Assessment of ELLs: Three States, Three Options	Tim Boals, WI Charo Bastero, Mid-Atlantic Equity Center Margo Gottlieb, IL Res C
	Small Group	Designing a State Test that is More Than One Inch Deep	Phil Babcock, MI Stanley Ellis, Riverside
	Small Group	Can Instructionally Focused Professional Development Keep Accountability Stakes from Burning Teachers, Administrators, and Students?	Judy Robbins, MS Marilyn Rindfuss, Harcourt Gloria Turner, AL

		Perspectives from Two States	
	Small Group	Disseminating Achievement Trends in Kids in Special Education: Multiple Factors that Influence Our Conclusions	Jim Ysseldyke, U MN John Bielinski, U MN Scott Trimble, KY
	Small Group	Not Alternate, Comprehensive! A System That Includes Students with Disabilities, Measures Standards, and Reports Progress	Pat Almond, OR Gerald Tindal, U OR Joel Arick, Portland State University
	Small Group	Standards Without a Statewide Assessment: Accountability, School Improvement, and Local Control in NE	John Crawford Patricia Irwin Barbara Plake, U NE James Impara, Buros
	Small Group	The 2002 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL)	Sheida White, NCES Andrew Kolstad, NCES John Hartwig, IA State U
	Small Group	Validity of Accommodated Assessments for SD/LEP Students	Fran Stancavage, AIR Jamal Abedi, UCLA
Tuesday June 27 PM	Symposia	GI Forum vs. Texas Education Agency: A Challenge to the Texas Graduation Test	Walt Haney, Boston Col Debra Verbil, TX Geoffrey Amsel, TX Keith Cruse, TX SE Phillips, MSU Ann Smisko, TX Jon Twing, NCS
	Symposia	How to Document Alignment Between Your State's Assessments and Challenging Content and Performance Standards	Karen Wixson, U-M Norm Webb U WI Paul LaMarca, NV Sue Rigney, USED Rolf Blank, CCSO
	Symposia	Reporting Large-Scale Assessment Results on the web: Lessons from State, Federal, and Commercial Sites	Nada Ballator, ESSI Carol Benjamin, ESSI Holly Spurlock, NCES Larry Ogle, NCES Kathy Rosenberger, MD
	Symposia	The Pen is Mightier than The Number 2 Pencil: Everything A Test Director needs to Know about the Media	Richard Colvin, LA Times Pat DeVito, RI
	Symposia	Training Education Stakeholders using Large-Scale Assessment Data: Lessons from the Past and Designs for the Future	Mindy Reiser, SMD Sameena Salvucci, SMD Carole White, DE Holly Spurlock, NCES
	Roundtable	A Model Statewide Student Assessment to Support School Accountability	Stanley Rabinowitz, WestEd Srijjati Anada, WestEd
	Roundtable	Alternate Assessment: A Showcase of Alternate Assessments	Paula Burkette, Mid-South RRC
	Roundtable	Critical Issues in Large-Scale Assessment	Phoebe Winter, CCSO Doris Redfield, Applachia Educational Laboratory
	Roundtable	Dialogue on the NCES Large-Scale Assessment Certificate Program	Carol Benjamin, ESSI Suzanne Triplett, NCES Holly Spurlock, NCES
	Roundtable	District and State Alternate Assessments for Students with Disabilities: Do They Complement or Conflict?	Sandra Thompson, NCEO Betsy Case, Harcourt Martha Thurlow, NCEO
	Roundtable	Impact of Web-to-Database Technology on Assessment	Steve Garrison, Anchorage School Dist
	Roundtable	Linking Health Education Curricular Frameworks to Classroom Implementation and Assessment to Student Learning	Nancy Hudson, DE Kathy Middleton, Toucan Janet Arns, DE
	Roundtable	NAEP on the Web	Marlene Goodman, ETS Dave Freund, ETS
	Roundtable	What Do We Need to Know About State Differences in Accommodations and Other Assessment-Related Factors?	Carl Andrews, CCSO Nadir Ballator, CCSO John Olson, CCSO
	Roundtable	A Mathematics Assessment Should Test Mathematics, Not Reading: One State's Approach to the Problem	Vonda Kiplinger, WindWalker Consulting
	Roundtable	Accountability Through School Report Cards: Efforts of Several States	Neal Kingston, Measured Progress
	Roundtable	Improving Reports of Student Results for Parents/Guardians	Carmen Chapman, IL Kit Viator, MA
Roundtable	Making NAEP Data Analyzable: New Data Analysis Tools	Larry Ogle, NCES Alex Sedlacek, NCES	

			Janis Brown, NCES Steve Gorman, NCES
	Roundtable	Out-of-Level Testing: When and Why?	Martha Thurlow, NCEO John Bielinski, NCEO Jane Minnema, NCEO
	Roundtable	Standards-Based Assessment and Accountability: A States' Progress Report 1996-1999	Dale Carlson, CA Allen Schednck, RMC Barry Gibbons, UCLA
	Roundtable	Technical Issues in Assessing ELLs: Reaching for Solutions	Liru Zhang, DE Jamal Abedi, UCLA Martha Thurlow, NCEO Anne Hafnew, CSU
	Roundtable	Technological Innovations in the SCASS Science Education Assessment Project: Creation of a New, Integrated, Comprehensive CD-ROM of Science Assessment Materials	John Olson, CCSO Cathy Wagner, MN John Smithson, WCER
June 28 Wednesday AM	Breakfast	The Future of Large-Scale Assessment	Craig Luigart, USED
	Large Group	An Examination of Results and outcomes form the 1999 Annual Survey of State Student Assessment Programs (ASAP)	Carl Andrews, CCSO Linda Bond, CTB Gerry Shelton, CA Nada Ballator, ESS Arnold Goldstein, NCES
	Large Group	District-Level and Market-Basket Reporting	Jody Koenig, NRC Pat DeVito, RI Lou Fabrizio, NC LeAnn Gamache, ESSC
	Large Group	How Can and How Should We Utilize Data from Student Assessment, Personnel Evaluation, and School Accountability Programs to Achieve Results?	Carole Butler Wallin, LA Russell French, U TN Feagin Johnson, AL Roger Pancratz, W KY U Doris Redfield, Appalachia Ed Laboratory
	Large Group	Policy Directives and Technical Solutions for Differential Weighting	Scott Trimble, KY Kelly Powell, AZ Hillary Michaels, CTB Steve Ferrara, AIR Kyoko Ito, CTB
	Large Group	Studies of the Effects and Consequences of Accommodations on Students' Achievement Test Scores	Brian McKeivitt, WCER Aleta Schulte, AEA 11, IA Stephen Elliot, WCER Ann Marquart, AEA 11 IA Dan Lewis, CTB
	Large Group	Seize the Data! Software Tools for Maximizing the Role of Data in School Improvement Planning	Betty Edwards, NSSE
	Small Group	Developing Evaluation of a Standards-Based Mathematics Curriculum that Links Appropriately to Standardized Tests	David Webb, U WI Tom Romberg, U WI Mary Shafer, U WI
	Small Group	FAST Forward: Technological Accommodations for Test-Takers with Disabilities	Charlotte Solomon, ETS Douglas Forer, ETS
	Small Group	How State Assessments Relate to NAEP: Some Statistical Information from the 90s	Dn McLaughlin, AIR
	Small Group	Reading Across the Nation: Perspectives from Idaho, Michigan, and a District in South Carolina	Tom Roe, Greenville SC Sally Tiel, ID Shawna Exline, ID Sheila Potter, MI
	Small Group	Scale Interpretation, Standard Setting, and Task-Scoring for the Golden State Examinations	Mark Wilson, UC Berkeley Karen Draney, UC Berkeley Richard Patz, CTB
	Small Group	Where the rubric Meets the Road: Assessing Mathematical Problem Solving and Critical Thinking Statewide	Claran Einfeldt, IS Kirk Ridge, Measurement, Inc
			<b>Number of Sessions</b>

2005 National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment June 19-22, 2005 Marriott Rivercenter San Antonio,, TX			
<b>June 17-18</b>	Pre-Session	2005 Workshop on Access and Alignment to Grade-Level Content for Students with Significant Disabilities	NCEO, NCCSAD, RRCs, CCSSO, NASDSE and NASTD
	Pre-Session	Are You Ready for Formative Classroom Assessments Aligned with State Standards... Online?	AEL and CCSSO
	Pre-Session	Making Tests Accessible for Students with Visual Impairments-A Workshop for Test Publishers and State Assessment and Accountability Personnel	American Printing House for the Bliind
	Pre-Session	Unlocking the Mysteries of Accessible Reading Assessments-2005 National Center for Educational Outcomes Annual Topical Clinic	NCEO
	Pre-Session	Comparing NAEP and State Measurement of Achievement Standards, Trends, and Gaps: Methods, Issues, and Results	AIR
	Pre-Session	Twelfth Grade NAEP – New Mission and Purpose in an Era of High School Reform?	NAGB
<b>Sunday June 19 PM</b>	Lunch	Washington Update: An Overview of the Status of National Educational Policy and Legislation	Tom Houlihan, CCSSO
	Large Group	Early Childhood Assessment-Assessing for Reading First and Beyond	Dee Cox, AR Faith Stevens, MI Melanie Pritchett, U TX Steve Dunbar, U IA
	Large Group	Universal Design, Technology, and Large-Scale Assessment-A Comparison of Two States' Approaches	Robert Dolan, CAST Brud Maxcy, ME Preston Lewis, KY Jacqui Kearns, U KY
	Large Group	English Language Learners in State NAEP and State Assessments-Shall the Twain Ever Meet?	Richard Duran, UCSB Eric Zibert, CA Pete Bylsma, WA Sharif Shakrani, NAGB
	Large Group	Results of 2004 EDEN Collection	Deborah Newby, CCSSO Hugh Walkup, USED
	Large Group	Reducing Cheating on State Assessments	John Fremer, Caveon Kit Viator, MA Raymond Nicosia, ETS Jim Popham, UCLA
	Large Group	Right from the Start-A Multi-State Study of Bidding Best Practices	Doug Kosty, OR Scott Norton, LA Wendy Roberts, DE Dean Nafziger, Edvance
	Large Group	Two States' Approaches to Online End-of-Course Assessment-Obstacles Overcome, Lessons Learned	Stan Jones, IN Helene Gniadek, ETS Shelly Loving Rider, VA Brian Farmer, VA
	Large Group	Validity of Assessment in Determining AYP for ELLs and Students with Disabilities	Charlene Rivera, GWU Jamal Abedi, UCLA Carlos Martinez, USED Thanh Van Anderson, OK
	Large Group	State Accountability Plans-Works Still in Progress	Ellen Forte Fast, edCount Bill Erpenbach, WJE Cons Robin Taylor, DE Robin Jarvis, LA
	Large Group	Key Considerations – Opportunities and Challenges in Assessing Primary and Pre-School Children	Jana Martella, CCSSO Virginia Crocker, MA Penny Milburn, IA Rolf Grafwallner, MD
	Large Group	Knowing What Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities Know-Constructing the Assessment Triangle of Alternate Assessments	Martha Thurlow, NCEO Scott Marion, NCIEA Lorraine Patusky, NH Jim Pellgrino, U IL
	Large Group	Alignment to Standards: Alternate Assessments, Expanded Benchmarks, Universal Design for Learning and Individualized Education Plans	Pat Almond, Consultant Janet Filbin, CO Tracy Hall, CAST Jerry Tindal, U OR
	Large Group	Three Approaches to Developing Diagnostic Information from Assessment Data	Richard Palz, Consultant Kristen Huff, College Board

<b>Evening</b>  <b>Monday June 20 AM</b>			Howard Mitzel, Pacific Metrics Phoebe Winter, Consultant Liru Zhang, DE
	Large Group	A Customized Alignment Methodology for Alternate Assessments for Students with Disabilities	Stan Rabinowitz, West Ed Fen Chou, LA Edynn Sato, West Ed Rachael Quenemon, NCEO
	Large Group	Strengthening the Link Between Assessment and Instruction	Scott Norton, LA Gloria Turner, AL Victoria Young, TX Pat Porter, Data Recognition
	Large Group	Successes, Challenges, and Outcomes of Using Different Approaches to Measure Student Growth for Accountability and Instruction	Ed Roeber, MI Tim Vansickle, MN Bill Schafer, U MD Yi Du, Data Recognition
	Large Group	NAEP Testing and State Testing-What's the Connection?	Sharif Shakrani, NAGB Theresa Siskind, SC Steve Dunbar, Iowa Testing Program Mary Yakimowski, CCSSO Stephanie Gertz, Riverside
	Large Group	Measuring Progress toward Proficiency of English Language Learners for NCLB Compliance-ELP Test Result Trends	Diane Johnson, Harcourt Kris Kaase, MS Jamal Abedi, UCLA John Olsen, Harcourt
		Opening Reception	Pearson Ed Measurement
	Symposia	Framework for Differentiating Level of Need and focusing Technical Assistance for AYP Identified Schools and Districts	Diane Lowery, SD David Lamitina, NV Christine Steele, WY Keith Butcher, WV Jan Sheinker, Consultant Kathy St Clair, NC
	Symposia	Assessing Young Learners' ESL Reading and Writing Skills under NCLB	Sari Luoma, Ballard & Tyge Sarah McMannus, NC Jim Bauman, CAL Dorry Kenyon, CAL Stephen Dunbar, U IA
	Symposia	Establishing Coherent Performance Standards Across Grade Levels	David Chyer, Data Recognition Carina Woong, PA Judy Park, UT Les Morse, AK Scott Marion, NCIEA
	Symposia	In Search of More Meaning-Integrating Value-Added Models and Measurement of Growth	Zarko Vukmirovic, Harcourt Tim Vansickle, MN Rense Lange, IL Cornelia Orr, FL Stan Rabinowitz, WestEd Chas DePascale, NCIEA
	Symposia	Large-Scale Assessment: What's Required and What's Desired? What's Implementable and What's Lamentable?	Stuart Kahl, Measured Progress Susan Sclafani, USED Patricia Ross, USED Mark Wilson, U CA Mike Timms, WestEd Scott Norton, LA
	Symposia	Setting Alternate Achievement Standards-Challenges and Solutions	Gerald Tindal, U OR Dianna Carizalas, U OR Steve Ferrara, AIR Stephen Elliott, Vanderbilt Leanne Ketterlin-Geller, U OR Nancy Arnold, WA
	Symposia	Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards-What Does Alignment with Grade-Level Content Standards Mean?	Jacqui Kearns, U KY Diane Browder, U NC Mike Burdge, U KY Janet Filbin, CO Dan Wiener, MA Dave Malouf, USED
	Symposia	Can AYP Be Modified So It is Both Politically Viable and Educationally Defensible?	Jim Popham, UCLA Ellen Forte-Fast, ed Count Robert Linn, CRESST Paul LaMarca, NV Theresa Siskind, SC



Monday June 20 PM	Large Group	Documenting Validity of Accountability Systems-A Progress Report	Jack Jennings, CEP Brian Gong, NCIEA Tom Spencer, LA Mitch Chester, OH Keri Briggs, USED
	Large Group	Successes, Trials, and Tribulations of online Accommodations Testing	Cornelia Orr, FL Jeri Frank, PEM Paul Nichols, PEM Preston Lewis, KY Bob Dolan, CAST
	Large Group	State Level Alternate Assessments-Do They Have an effect on Instruction?	Cynthia Corbridge, RI Doris Jameson, NY Dan Wiener, MA Rebecca Walk, Measured Progress
	Large Group	Classroom Assessment FOR Learning as a Foundation for Achievement Success	Rick Stiggins, ATI Betty Edwards, Measured Progress Jay Linksman, IL Donna Snodgrass, Cleveland Municipal SD
	Large Group	The Importance of Performance Standards in Measuring of Student Growth	Damian Betabenner, BC Scott Marion, NCIEA Richard Hill, NCIEA Laurie Wise, HumRRO
	Large Group	Comparability Studies of Large-Scale Assessments-Experiences, Challenges, Study Results, and Action	Alvaro Arce-Ferrer and Allen Lau, Harcourt Liru Zhang, DE Randy Bennett, ETS Stephen Dunbar, U IA John Olsen, Harcourt
	Large Group	Determining Appropriate Accommodations for ELLs on Large-Scale Assessments- Challenges and Solutions	Therese Gleason Carr, SC Karen Samuelson, U MD Theresa Siskind, SC
	Large Group	Policy, Infrastructure, and Validity Issues in Introducing Online State Assessments	Walter Way, PEM Douglas Kosty, OR Lisa Chandler, TX Robert Triscari, VA Walter Way, PEM
	Large Group	Developing Alternate Assessment Technical Adequacy (ASES-DAATA): Discussions and Initial Findings of a Collaborative Research Study	Beth Cipoletti, WV Jerry Tindal, U OR Pat Almond, Consultant Jan Barth, WV Sandra Warren, CCSSO
	Large Group	The Effects of Writing Assessment-Accountability versus Instructional Relevance	Liru Zhang, DE Allen Lau, Harcourt Robert Triscari, VA Shungwon Ro, MN Tim Vansickle, MN Robin Taylor, DE Phoebe Winter, Consultant
	Large Group	Aligning English Language Proficiency Tests to States' English Language Standards: Mississippi, South Dakota, and Wyoming	Kris Kaase, MS Ann Larsen, SD Christine Steele, WY Norm Webb, U WI
	Large Group	Technologic Advances in Scoring Essays	Paul Nichols, PEM Bo Wang, College Board Daisy Vickers, PEM Carolee Gunn, UT
	Large Group	Speed Up or Slow Down-Quality Control Challenges in the Web Era	Fen Chou, LA Hal Sanderson, UT Jason Schwartz, Pacific Metrics Doris Redfield, AEL
	Large Group	Using Student Growth Data for School Accountability-Practical Approaches	Brian Gong, NCIEA Marty McCall, NWEA Lou Fabrizio, NC Mitch Chester, OH
	Large Group	Universal Design and Methods for Test Preparation	Betsy Case, Harcourt Carl Wieland, TX Michael Karchmer, Gallaudet Robert Dolan, CAST
Large	Profile Analysis via Multidimensional Scaling (PAMS)	Se-Kang Kim, Harcourt	

	Group	for Diagnosis of Student Performance in State Tests	Liru Zhang, DE Daeyong Seo, Harcourt
	Large Group	Proficiency Across the States-A Closer Look	Bil Schmidt, MSU Scott Marion, NCIEA Ted Rebarber, Accountability Works Matt Gandal, Achieve
	Large Group	Technical Issues Concerning Standard Settings for the Newly-Developed English Language Proficiency Tests	Jamal Abedi, UCLA John Olsen, Harcourt Julia Lara, CCSSO Leslie Lightbourne, LA
<b>Evening</b>		Reception	Harcourt and Riverside
<b>Tuesday June 21 AM</b>	Large Group	Challenges in Meeting NCLB High School Requirements for Science Assessment	Claudia Davis, LA Gloria Turner, AL Ray Young, PA Patty McDivitt, Data Recognition
	Large Group	Instructionally Supportive Score Reporting	Annette Bohling, WY Rense Lange, IL Kris Ellington, FL Margie Jorgensen, Harcourt Jim Poham, UCLA Tracy Gardner, Harcourt
	Large Group	Partnerships and Challenges-Statewide Implementation of online Testing and Student Information Systems	Mary Ann Wolf, SETD Lan Neugent, VA Rich Mincer, ID
	Large Group	Validity of Accommodations Used in NAEP and NCLB for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities	Jamal Abedi, UCLA Martha Thurlow, NCEO Gerald Tindal, U OR Thanh Van Anderson, OK Laura Ayala, TX
	Large Group	Issues in Developing a High Stakes Web-Based Assessment for Young English Language Learners	Cheryl Alcaya, MN Gary Buck, Lidget Green Julie Henderson, MN Therese Carr, SC
	Large Group	The WIDA Consortium's Approach to Developing an Integrated Assessment System for English Language Learners	Elizabeth Cranley, WI Margo Gottlieb, TMS Fred Davison, U IL Dorry Kenyon, CAL Timothy Boals, WI
	Large Group	Making the Switch-Operating a Large-Scale Assessment Program While Monagaing a Transition Between Assessment Contractors	Lisa Ehrlich, Measured Progress Kit Viator, MA Cornelia Orr, FL Charlene Tucker, Harcourt Chas DePascale, NCIEA Mikel Brightman, Harcourt
	Large Group	21st Century Skills: Assessing a New Set of Skills for a New Technological World	Margaret Honey, EDC Karen Cator, Apple Caroline McDowell, SAP John Behrens, Cisco Karen Bruet, Dell
	Large Group	Do Graduation Tests Measure Up? A Closer Look at State High School Exit Exams	Matt Gandal, Achieve Mitch Chester, OH Jeff Nellhaus, MA Sharif Shakrain, NAGB
	Small Group	Re-Thinking Technical Reports in Light of Standards-Based Assessments and NCLB	Tim Crockett, Measured Progress Scott Marion, NCIEA Paul LaMarca, NV
	Small Group	Reading First, Math Next-Diagnostic Early Math Assessment Using Handheld Computer Technology	Herb Ginsburg, TC Columbia, University Margaret Honey, EDC
	Small Group	Incorporating Person Fit Analysis Into the Assessment Framework Using IRT	Leonardo Sotaridona, CTB Steven Fitzpatrick, PEM Bruce Randel, CTB
	Small Group	Flexible Scoring-Online Training, Scoring Support Centers, and Technology to Score Large-Scale Performance Assessments	Daisy Vickers, PEM Kathleen Williams, College Board Carolee Gunn, UT Roseanne Harris, NJ Mimi Brailsford, SC
	Small	Explaining your Assessment System to the Media in	Ed Roeber, MI

	Group	Good Times and Bad	Jenny Caputo, San Antonio Express-News Stephanie Gertz, Riverside
	Small Group	NCLB and Decision Consistency-Contributions of State Design Features	Mitch Chester, OH Wes Bruce, IN Ellen Forte Fast, ed Count
	Small Group	Measuring Growth-Where Policy Makers and Psychometricians Meet	Kim O'Malley, PEM Shannon Housson, TX Tim Vansickle, MN
	Small Group	Forms, Tools, and Administration/Response Options That Increase Validity and Comparability of Scores for ELLs	Rebecca Koprive, U MD Phoebe Winter, Consultant Chen-Su Chen U MD
	Small Group	Who's Making AYP? NAEP 2003 Results as Indicators of State Adequate Yearly Progress	Jason Nicholas, WY
<b>Lunch</b>		Aligning 21st Century Skills and Assessments: Preparing the Next Generation of Citizens and Workers	Ken Kay, Partnership for 21st Century Skills
	Symposia	State and District Issues in Implementing NCLB Assessment Requirements: Trials, Tribulations, and Successes	Cleo Figgures, Philadelphia Shelly Loving-Ryder, VA William Caritj, DC Gary Schaeffer, CTB
	Symposia	The Role of Local Assessments in State Accountability Systems-Types of Use and Quality Control	Susan Brookhart, Duquesne Annette Bohling, WY Scott Norton, NCIEA Pat Roschewski, NE Jim Popham, UCLA Brian Gong, NCIEA
	Symposia	Evaluating AYP Classifications: Emerging Practices to Enhance Accountability Systems	Paul LaMarca, NV David Lamitina, NV Carolyn Haug, Measured Progress Robin Jarvis, LA Scott Marion, NCIEA
	Symposia	Applying Guidelines for Technical Documentation of Large-Scale Assessments to Alternate Assessments	Pat Almond, Consultant Sue Bechard, Measured Progress Jacqui Kearns, U KY Jerry Tindal, U OR Rachael Quenemon, NCEO Sue Rigney, USED
	Symposia	Innovative/Practical Implementation of NAEP Data Analysis Tools and Research Designed to Prepare All Students for Success	Stephanie Weideman, SD Cindy Simmons, MS Canda Mueller, KS Kathryn Sprigg, WA Robert Kohl, PA Rima Zobayan, USED
	Symposia	Technical and Policy Issues in Using Computerized Adaptive Tests in State Assessments: Promises and Perils	Shungwon Ro, MN Ron Houser, NWEA Shudong Wang, Harcourt Michael Nering, Measured Progress Jim McBride, Renaissance Learning John Olsen, Harcourt
	Symposia	Current and Future Technological Applications in Large-Scale Assessment	Leannae Ketterline-Geller, U OR Tracey Hall, CAST Michael Russell, BC John Poggio, U KS Gerald Tindal, U OR
	Symposia	Innovative Approaches to Assessing Science Achievement	Jeff Grieg, CT Sarah Gronna, HI Greg Hall, WA Dean Gange, Harcourt Steve Schneider, WestEd Tracy Gardner, Harcourt
	Special Session	Including Students with Disabilities in Large-Scale Testing Programs-A Preview of Federal Initiatives	Gerald Tindal, University of Oregon
<b>Wednesday June 22 AM</b>	Breakfast	Standard and Poors Data Analysis Initiative	Abby Potts, CCSSO S & P Representatives
	Large Group	NCLB Peer Review of State Assessment Systems: How's It Going?	Sue Rigney, USED Kay Rigling, USED

Large Group	Ensuring Fair and Accessible Assessments Through flexible, Technology-Based Modes of Administration	Michael Russell, BC Mary Ann Snider, RI Robert Dolan, CAST Steve Landau, Touch Graphics
Large Group	Test Later, Report Sooner-Innovations in Rapid Scoring and Reporting	Sharron Hunt, GA Mary Reel, TN Theresa Siskind, SC Dave Ernst, PEM
Large Group	Staying on Target-Advancing Student Achievement with Formative Assessments	Rich Young, PEM Selvin Chin-Chance, HI Roberta Alley, AZ Jon Twing, PEM
Large Group	Challenges – Assessment and English Language Learners	Kevin Meara, ETS Brian Robinson, NJ Stuart Kahl, Measured Progress Joyce Wang, ETS Kit Viator, MA
Large Group	Demonstrating Multi-Year improvement for Urban Districts on State Assessments	Sharon Lewis, CGCS David Rogosa, Stanford Richard Schwartz, CTB Katherine Blasik, Broward County, FL Linda Bond, CTB
Large Group	Confidence Intervals versus Effect Size in Comparing Changes in Scores or Percent of Students Reaching Specific Achievement Levels	Sharif Shakrani, NAGB Gene Johnson, AIR Jamal Abedi, UCLA Peggy Carr, NCES John Mazzeo, ETS
Large Group	Towards Coherence Between Classroom Assessment and Accountability	Dylan William, ETS Margie Jorgensen, Harcourt John Smithson, U WI Mark Wilson, U CA
Small Group	Data Displays to Support a Review of Trends in Student Achievement for Instructional Improvement	Jim Stack, SF Unified Duncan MacQuarrie, WERA Selvin Chin-Chance, HI Tom Kerins, U IL
Small Group	Setting New Achievement Levels and Achievement Level Descriptions under NCLB	Howard Mitzel, Pacific Metrics Robin Taylor, DE Matthew Schulz, ACT Sharif Shakrani, NAGB
Small Group	Creating a Vision-Building the New NAEP Science Frameworks and Specifications	Steve Schneider, WestEd Alice Fu, WestEd Mary Yakimowski, CCSSO
Small Group	Why in the World?-Contextualizing International Assessment Results	Val Plisko, USED Elois Scott, USED Eugene Owen, USED Jennifer Manise, CCSSO
Small Group	Weaving “Considerations for Universally Designed Assessments” Into the Test Development Process	Tim Crockett, Measured Progress Sandy Thompson, NCEO Michael Hock, VT
Small Group	I/T: Using CAT to Maximize Information per Unit of Testing Time-A Reading First Application	James McBride, Renaissance Learning Jim Ysseldyke, U MN Laurie Wise, HumRRO
Small Group	Closing the Gap-Setting State Assessment Standards to Maximize Sensitivity to Growth	Gerald DeMauro, AIR Steve Ferrara, AIR Stephan Ahadi, AIR
Small Group	Harnessing Educational Data-The Requirements and Benefits of a Statewide Data Management/Warehouse System	Lan Neugen, VA Jun Choi, NJ Brian Farmer, PEM
Small Group	Computer Adaptive Testing in State Assessment	Susan Davis, Buros Teresa Eckhout, Buros David Breithaupt, ID Chad Buckendahl, Buros
<b>Number of Sessions</b>		<b>93</b>

# ATTACHMENT B

## Survey of Past Conference Attendees

Recollections from the 25th Anniversary – 1971-1995 – The opening session at the 1995 assessment conference consisted of Irv Lehmann providing an overview of the conference from its early days until that conference. As part of this effort, participants were asked to record what the conference has meant to them, how it had helped them professionally, and what special memories they had of the conference. Some of these thoughts are recorded below. Note that the organizational affiliation shown is as the 1995 conference. The date shown is the date that each individual first attended the conference.

I learned more than I ever dreamed possible the first year and must come to keep up with things.

**Barbara Montatto, Texas Education Agency, 1992**

This conference has been the one constant activity in my professional career. It has been an annual time to take stock professionally. I have benefited by keeping current on innovative assessment policies and practices, plus interacted with many of those active in the field. On a personal note, have loved to watch the growth of the conference and how much it means to a number of other attendees. I have special memories of the year in Boulder that I tore cartledge in my knee and had to have surgery on it, as well as the year that it snowed the night before the conference began.

**Ed Roeber, Council of Chief State School Officers, 1994**

I certainly have benefited from the conference in that I, a state assessment person, have learned a lot of which has informed my work and extended my knowledge. The conference has provided a chance to touch base with a diversity of professionals who work in diverse settings – but who share many common problems and challenges. I also really like these people! I have a special memory of last year – the trip to the Albuquerque zoo. What a wonderful program of varied pleasures – intellectually, aesthetically, culinary, musically, etc. (This year was not so rich in pleasures.)

**Angelika Pohl, GA Department of Education, 1994**

This conference has provided the means to keep up with trends. It provides a network of colleagues and friends. The sessions used to be honest – people sharing what was really happening and debating the merits of different assumptions, principles, and approaches. This was a safe place to talk openly! It isn't any more – it has a heavy political agenda and presentations are pretty sanitized

**Anonymous, 1984**

This conference has provided an opportunity to interact with peers in other states and to gain national exposure.

**Anonymous, 1982**

This conference provides the big picture perspective with plenty of ideas of what to do next “back on the farm.” The networking is fantastic – met a lot of wonderful people. Personally and professionally, I enjoyed the break from the office, meeting new people, getting validated/affirmed for what I am doing, and getting good ideas on what to do next. My special memory is the trip to Sedona with my wife who accompanied me to the conference.

**Ric Williams, Battle Ground (WA) Public Schools, 1994**

The most benefit comes from this conference is getting beyond rhetoric and learning of pitfalls to be avoided. It is great to have an opportunity to get together with other states test directors and communicate and learn

**Anonymous, 1990**

I've been able to articulate to my state clients (we're a federally funded TA group) the status of national assessment issues, especially as they relate to students with disabilities. I've made contacts that I would not have made otherwise. I feel that I'm most up-to-date on assessment issues. I have special memories of feeling the dry, high altitude air in Colorado for the first time, sensing the increasing attention to assessments for all children, including those with disabilities, and hearing Mike Cohen react to participant questions about the plans and intents of Goals 2000.

**Ken Olsen, Mid-South Regional Resource Center, 1992**

Hearing what is happening in other locations gives us better information on what works and what doesn't. It is a great place for debating issues and learning from others. The more the discussion, the better the session. The debate between Jim Popham and Roger Farr a few years ago was fantastic.

**Lou Fabrizio, CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1991**

Keeping our district staff current, well-informed, and questioning how our assessment practices can improve has been the primary benefit of the conference. LSAC has been my major source of continuing education as Director of Evaluation for a large school district. My special memory of the conference is that the best, most controversial, and policy (political) sensitive measurement issues get solid presentation here. AERA is too big for me. This is a learning environment. – humane scale of number of participants, sessions, etc.

**Ann Kratzer, Colorado Springs, CO School District, 1979**

This has been an excellent networking opportunity to stay in touch with others in the field. I have learned a great deal at every conference.

**Anonymous, 1989**

We are moving much more slowly and calculated when considering portfolio/performance assessments. We've learned a lot of politics and assessment. The LSAC has been very helpful especially in learning of actual state experiences with portfolios – its really good to move beyond rhetoric! The conference provides a great opportunity to meet counterparts in other states.

**Anonymous, 1988**

The assessment conference provides an opportunity to keep abreast of the changing assessment scene. Unlike AERA/NCME and APA, it provides an opportunity for measurement folks and classroom/curriculum folks to share ideas on assessment. I especially liked the conferences in Colorado. Rather than going south (NM, AZ), lets go north to Wyoming, etc. if we can't use Colorado.

**Anonymous, 1991**

I especially like sharing of NAEP information and learning what others are doing. The conference has meant meeting people, networking, schmoozing, sharing and growing in knowledge and awareness of testing and assessment issue.

**John Olsen, AAMC, 1990**

My state has definitely gained from the conference. It is great professional development tool for the entire testing staff. The conference provided an extremely valuable network which without this support, I probably would not be state director today. Many professional development opportunities have come to me as a result of this network. I recal in the mid 70's being one of perhaps two or three women on the conference program, plus lots of really good times with colleagues, and Pat Forgie doing the alligator (don't mention my name on this one!)

**Rebecca Christian, 1975**

The conference has helped me gain new information – it is well organized and is well communicated. An example of this is ideas on ways to organize assessment processes and programs. I am interested in, but not trained or by job description required to implement or design assessments. The conference provides me with concentrated information and an opportunity to develop a knowledge base on assessment that I try to share with others in my department

**Anonymous, 1992**

I will use what I have learned in our Goals 2000 work this year. Most importantly, I will use the contacts that I have made. I feel very fortunate to have been able to attend this conference. Funding is a problem and this has forced us to cut back on these professional development opportunities. I have found that hardworking, dedicated professionals are seriously committed to finding a way to make large-scale assessment mirror good instruction!

Anonymous, 1995

This conference provides the only chance to meet the leaders in the field – state and university – on an informal basis. Unlike other conventions, where presentations are based on two-year-old data, this is up to the minute, cutting-edge stuff.

Joan Sonnenshein, The Psychological Corporation, 1979

## Results of the 2006 Survey of Past Attendees

---

As a part of putting this historical paper together, the author surveyed a number of past attendees to ascertain how the conference had affected them professionally, what memories especially stand out from the conference, and so forth. A copy of this survey, which was e-mailed to past attendees, follows this section of attendee recollections.

I believe I have attended all of the large-scale assessment conferences with the exception of the first one. In the earliest days, the conference was held at the Harvest House Hotel in Boulder, Colorado, and was attended by a handful of state testing directors and some people who worked for NAEP. The conference was sponsored by the Education Commission of the States.

There was less emphasis on a formal program and an array of presentations in those days. Typically, we attended a workshop to hear the latest news from NAEP staff and then gathered around a large table to discuss problems that were of interest to state assessment directors.

Within a short period of time, the conference gained popularity to the point where the attendees reserved all available hotel and motel rooms in Boulder, and the conference hotel ran out of available meeting room space. Statewide assessment programs were expanding, and there was considerable interest in the use of high school graduation tests. The onslaught of legal challenges to these tests guaranteed high attendance for any session that described these court cases and informed participants how to prepare an adequate defense.

When CCSSO assumed responsibility for the large-scale assessment conference, the agenda was broadened. The agenda was no longer driven solely by the needs of state testing program directors. Instead, the program included topics that were of interest to a diverse audience of educators and policy makers. Attendance dramatically increased. Pre- and post-conference sessions were added.

I greatly valued the small group discussions that characterized the conferences of the early and middle 1970's. There always was sufficient time for hallway conversations and personal contacts over a cup of coffee. By contrast, recent conferences have been so crowded that it is impossible to participate in all of the relevant sessions, and it is quite likely that one cannot squeeze into the rooms where the most important topics are being discussed. The old intimacy and in-depth discussions have been replaced, and I miss them.

I have been involved in large-scale assessment program development and implementation since 1969. Over the years, the annual large-scale assessment conferences have been of great value to me, primarily because they created opportunities to hear new ideas, compare solutions to problems, and, most importantly, gain strength from my colleagues who were confronting similar challenges in their states.

**Tom Fisher, 1972**

Following are some brief reminiscences concerning the Council of Chief State School Officers Assessment Conferences:

I attended my first conference in 1974 when the "large" in Large-Scale only referred to the scope of the testing programs, not the size of the conference. It seems to me that there were only 100 participants back then, and everyone knew one another.

Back in the "old days" the conference was always held in Boulder, Colorado. One of the receptions was usually outdoors, and it always seemed to rain just when the bar opened.

For many years, CTB hosted the opening reception, although sometimes it was on the second night. These receptions were often theme events—typically related to the Wild West environment. Folks wore cowboy boots, cowboy hats, and bandanas, and the band was usually "country."

Other memories of the Boulder meetings include several favorite restaurants deep in the mountains noted for their wild game. These restaurants tended to be off the beaten track and we often had a difficult time finding our way back to Boulder in the dark.

The move from Boulder to other locations created occasional health hazards. For example, quite a few participants had difficulty breathing at the 9,000 + altitude in Utah; and then there were the mosquito bites the year we were in Houston. (As you may recall, the meeting followed a week of heavy rains and flash floods.)

On a professional level, the CCSSO LSAC has become an important activity year after year. Though it is now very large, it does an excellent job of addressing the areas in which I am most interested. Though my focus now tends to be upon government affairs and assessment policy rather than measurement, the conference has remained just as relevant.

**Michael Kean, 1974**



Here are a couple of recollections regarding the annual large-scale assessment soirees, not operated by CCSO but, in their earlier years, as you will recall, directed by other outfits. If these comments are of any use to you, quote away.

I guess when I read your January 8 note, the first thing that came to my mind was the time that I was having a formal debate with Paul Williams at one of the conference sessions—so far back that we were still meeting in Boulder. I believe that Paul was with CTB-McGraw Hill at the time, but I'm not sure. I really can't recall what the issue being debated was, although I suspect it had something or other to do with educational testing. What I do recall, however, is that at some point in the debate—perhaps because I thought I was losing—I took a glass of water from the podium and simply poured it on Paul. Maybe I thought I needed to drive a point home with more verve, I'm not sure. Paul, suitably surprised by his baptismal-like inundation, seemed (at least to me) to be a less effective debater during the remainder of our session. It is difficult for a person to be suave if that person is soggy. In future years, Paul has often reminded me of the incident but, interestingly, has never done so when there is any water within reaching distance.

Here's another incident that came to mind regarding a conference session after we had bounced our way out of Boulder. I had reached a decision that I'd not be attending "large-scale" anymore because, for several years in a row, there were too many sessions in which psychometricians were simply strutting their stuff. At the close of one of those psychometrically swathed conferences, I told John Fremmer of ERS that, "This is my last conference, John. Too many sessions have much to do with number-adulation and squat to do with what we're supposed to be about, namely, the education of kids!" If I recall, correctly, that conversation took place outside the hotel—at the conference's conclusion—when John and I were walking toward our separate rental cars. He, of course, was heading toward the local Marriott hotel where he was staying. For John, in order to pick up Marriott Award Points, a "local Marriott hotel" is operationally defined as any Marriott hotel within the contiguous 48 states. Anyway, after John heard my rant about what I regarded as the increasingly too-technical nature of the annual conferences, he gently urged me to change my mind. John has always been such a mellow colleague.

Several months later, I received a telephone call from John who, to my surprise, was heading the program committee for the upcoming year's conference. His committee was inviting me to give the initial address at the opening session of the subsequent conference. As I recall, they even offered me a small stipend for doing so. John, clever recruiting devil that he was, had hooked me. After all, how could I not attend a "large-scale" conference at which I was the opening speaker? I assented, and can even recall the title of the invited address that I gave, namely, "Where Large-Scale Assessment is Heading, and Why It Shouldn't." Back in the fold, I have continued to attend the large-scale conference every year thereafter—except for the session held in a Houston shopping mall. Many of us who could still recall seeing the glorious Rockies in the background during our Boulder conferences could not deal with a conference featuring, as a scenic background, a food court and an assortment of shops, even shops featuring on-sale items.

The last thing, Ed, deals with the financial status of the assessment organizations that routinely provide the evenings' reception sessions for attendees. Although I know nothing about the stock market and how to determine the fiscal health of corporations, it always seemed to me that if one wanted to know how financially healthy a corporate vendor was, all you had to do was gauge the lavishness of their reception at "large-scale." (In passing, I should note that you can always tell how important a traditionally offered conference is when folks start referring to it simply by its modifiers—without using the noun "conference." To illustrate, for years the traditional ETS Invitational Conference was referred to only as the "ETS Invitational." Similarly, these days when colleagues ask you whether you are planning to attend this year's conference, they usually say, "Will you be going to this year's Large-Scale?" Clearly, the large-scale assessment conference has moved into a lofty noun-free status.) Okay, back to the story-line You will recall, Ed, that there was about a decade of conferences during which each assessment organization tried to out-do its competitors by staging an almost opulent reception at the annual conference. I think the high point, in my recollection, was the year that one of the testing outfits featured a gigantic ice-sculpture at its evening reception. I can't actually remember who or what the ice-sculpture represented. For all I know, it might have been a statue of Norman Null, inventor of the famous null hypothesis. But, had I been a stock-market junkie at that time, I would have taken some serious corporate buy/sell cues from the grandeur of those evening receptions.

Jim Popham, 1971

I attended my first conference in June 1991, I believe that was in Boulder, Co. I didn't even have an office yet since I had just been hired. Wayne Martin and I were visiting and I commented that the State Test Directors really had a lot of interesting things to share and I felt lost.

Wayne said, "Don't let it bother you. In a couple years you will be able to pile it on just like the veterans!" That is a quote you can use. Now 15 years have passed and at my last State Directors meeting I hardly recognized a soul and as I listened to some of the problems they had already I wondered how many would stay in the position for long.

The Snowbird Utah Conference sticks out because of the altitude problems. A colleague of mine got altitude sickness and missed the entire conference. He never left his room until it was time to leave for home! The Boston Conference was great because of all the outside things to do. I got to attend a Red Sox game at Fenway Park!

I don't recall the location but at one conference I was asked to be on a presentation panel about an hour before it was to occur. One of the panelists could not make it so I said yes. Fortunately the Wayne Martin prediction came true!—see the first statement above.

Large-Scale has been extremely valuable to me personally. I learned so much and grew as a professional in the assessment arena because of it. Over the years I have been able to take home many good things that I could use in my own presentations. It is a great conference.

Gary Skogland, 1991

Thanks for asking. I think your approach to this task is an excellent one. I am sure many others can provide better (and earlier) reminisces than I can (I never made it back in the Boulder days). If I had to (and you are twisting my arm after all) share one memory it would be from Boston 2004 when the Number Two Pencils were playing at a party. Several staff members asked me to dance and I easily refused. I neither dance well nor comfortably. Then a state testing director asked me. I started to reluctantly tell her no, that psychometricians don't dance. While that line worked with staff, testing directors are made of sterner stuff and know how to get results! She pointed to several dancing psychometricians and I had no choice but to have fun.

On a more serious note, the Large-Scale Assessment Conference has allowed me to learn more and learn faster about state testing programs and the testing industry than would have been possible any other way. It is practical, important, and has profound impact. I found that true when I was Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Assessment in Kentucky and equally as true over the subsequent eleven years working for testing companies.

Neal Kingston, Date Not Given

*On what the conference has meant to me in my career:*

The conference always provided me with several helpful things. It provided access to and interactions with key people in other states and testing companies so that I could learn what others were struggling with. The conference activities (including ASAP and EIAC meetings) helped me to build a very strong network of friends and colleagues that served me well in the many years I worked in the RI SEA and also helped tremendously in the later years at the National Research Council and now as a private contractor. Beyond that, the conference was an opportunity to interact in a direct way with the people who "wrote the books" e.g. Bob Linn, Jim Popham, H.D. Hoover, etc. Another, perhaps less noble but no less important benefit, was getting the hell away from the crazy office for a week of learning, laughing, and talking and eating too much.

*A recollection of how the conference can help less experienced members:*

In 1985 I had been with the RI SEA for a while handling federal program evaluation but was a newbie when it came to state assessment programs. The Department reorganized yet again and I ended up taking over assessment programs as well. I went to my first Large-Scale Conference in Boulder as well as the associated ASAP meeting (headed by none other than Ed Roerber) not knowing anyone and sat listening to the discussion on a wide range of topics. Rhode Island's testing program was very small but about to get much bigger so I listened carefully as Stan Bernknopf from the Georgia SEA talked about having to put multiple RFPs together. Two weeks later I found out that I too had to develop a comprehensive RFP so I called Stan, introduced myself again and asked for copies of his that I could "borrow" from. He gladly mailed them (this was ancient times – before email) and he saved me a great deal of time.

*On the sites:*

I had the privilege of serving on the planning committee for the conference for about 13 years - way too long actually but it was fun, I got to connect with friends on the committee, and CCSSO never seemed to want to kick me and Sharif Shakrani off the committee. (They eventually came to their senses and brought our terms to an end.) In any case, we helped set the theme each year and selected the presentations. We also suggested sites each year but the final decisions were made by CCSSO. Most of the sites have worked out well, even the drastic move of coming east to Boston in 2004. The worst one in my opinion was Houston – Tara Lipinsky notwithstanding. That year I didn't tell anyone that I had served on the planning committee for fear that they would think that I had lost my senses helping to pick a conference site in a boring city, at a huge Mall of all things.

*An interesting time (for me at least):*

One of the years the conference was in Colorado Springs I was asked to be on a luncheon panel to discuss the Politics of Assessment. I had spent hours preparing for the presentation but it just wasn't coming out right. My wife Pattie was with me and, knowing that I don't usually get nervous at all with public speaking, asked me why I seemed upset. I said that what I was planning to say was boring to me so the audience sure wouldn't be interested. Finally, with 20 minutes to go before the luncheon I ripped up all my notes and wrote down a few things that had been frustrating to me politically in the last few months and just spoke from those ideas. It went great. The points seemed resonate with the crowd. There was much nodding in agreement when I said 1) I wish my Ph.D. program in measurement and evaluation had had political science courses in it; and 2) I was starting to wish for the old days when the newspapers put testing articles on page 32 rather than page 1 – above the fold. Being quoted was not the kick I thought it would be.

Pat DeVito, 1985

When I started attending the Conferences in the early 1970's, there wasn't really much in the way of large-scale assessment to talk about it. These were times when we were "inventing" large-scale assessment. As a quite young man, I found myself needing all the help I could get. Some of the questions were the same as those we still debate: "Do we use a shelf test or do we develop our own test?" Other questions were quite different: "Does anyone have a scoring machine capable of scoring thousands of tests?" These conferences allowed us access to experts in statistics and research that independently we could not have afforded. We shared mistakes as well as successes. We talked about the controversies that arose and how to handle them. We discussed how to include students that were often overlooked. Somehow, we found the answers or simply made them up as we went along.

While there has been a vast amount of information sharing over the more than thirty years that I have attended large-scale assessment conferences, the most important contribution that this conference has made to my life and my career is summed up in one word – relationships. These are relationships that are truthful and respectful. These are people who can say to you: "That is about the dumbest idea I ever heard." They are also people that can give you encouragement: "That sounds like a good idea – why don't you try it." Without these relationships, the wheel would have been reinvented many, many times. Without people saying: "We tried that and it didn't work." many tax dollars would have been wasted. While each trip to a large-scale assessment conference was a nightmare of paperwork to get the travel approved, you always came home saying that trip was worth all the hassle – and you knew it was worth the funds that were expended.

Retiring from one state about eight years ago, I truly missed the relationships that I had established with the assessment community. Being able to start again with another state and being able to again relate to the friends I respect and admire – the pioneers as well as the newcomers – has been very rewarding. I have yet to have one true assessment person tell me that they won't miss their large-scale assessment friends and these conferences. These are people you see once a year or less but will help you in a second with a phone call or an e-mail.

**Jim Hertzog, 1974**

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to share some experiences and thoughts about the CCSSO Assessment Conference. In an educational world filled with meetings, papers, symposia, etc. the meeting has carved out a unique niche for itself. I recall sitting with Irv Lehman as he laid out why he thought such a meeting was needed and what some potential benefits could be. Even then, over 30 years ago, I was pretty jaded with all the meeting stuff and Irv had to convince me. He did, and I'm glad he did because something like it would have had to be invented if he and others hadn't done so. It made sense to me, too, that CCSSO attach its name and good efforts to it. It was becoming very clear at that point that the feds were looking for a stronger role to play in the shaping of standards and tools to be used in assessing whether those standards were being met. (This was long before NCLB was dreamed up and NAEP was in swaddling clothes, of course.) The Assessment Conference has matured as time has gone on and has served as not only a solid central meeting place, but as an interactive repository for ideas and practices needing try-out, research, and lots of continuing discussion. I view the meeting as absolutely crucial to getting the tailor-made state test off the ground. For example, when Kentucky first went through its educational upheaval, it had to figure out how to assess progress being made in reaching new goals and standards. For a while there the CCSSO meeting had so many Kentucky related items on its agenda that J. D. Hoover opened a session he was in by wondering just when it (Kentucky) had become the center of the testing universe!

On the other hand, the CCSSO meeting has helped perpetuate and spread some things not so good for educational testing and American education. By this I mean the emphasis on high stakes testing, on the summative with little attention to the formative, and the lack of attention to helping school people tie the asking of a question to sensible next instructional steps. To be sure, something like this last has been on many programs but not as a highlighter. I can lay this same criticism on my self as a member of NCME, AERA, APA, and other professional organizations who continue primarily to research, publish, and discuss the necessary mechanics of testing, e.g. scaling, IRT, norms, standard setting and so on while doing not much for someone who is trying to teach reading or math to school kids. Of course, it's a hard thing to do: Building absolutely real questions to ask and then offering real classroom technical advice as to next instructional steps to take to alleviate learning problems uncovered by good measurement.

The above is not likely to be accomplished through simply calling for "accountability." It is not that teachers know what to do with their students' test scores, or performance observations, or whatever– and are simply not doing their jobs. The truth is that most teachers have never learned about how a good educational test can be of benefit to them and their students.

To do something about the testing and instruction issue will take some re-arranging of priorities, money, and manpower. Teacher training institutions, college professors, test and textbook publishers, professional educational and psychological organizations, state and federal education departments, teacher unions—anyone who has major influence on assessment, curriculum and instruction need to sit together and ponder the most promising amalgams that could be concocted. To get this done, somebody is going to have to offer a hall and organizational support.

I suggest we need a National Conference on SMALL Scale Assessment sponsored by CCSSO. Ed, use any part or none. Quote me or not. Do what you need to do for your paper. I also need to add that you, yourself, have played a large, large role in making the Assessment meeting work.

P.S. I forgot to mention my most memorable CCSSO meeting. It was in Boulder in 1982 and I had just arrived at the hotel and found a message from Jovanovich's secretary informing me that I had just been canned. It didn't surprise me because he and I were increasingly at swordpoints as to the publishing direction of The Psychological Corporation, but I thought his timing was a little unseemly since I now had to announce my own demise as PsyCorp president to the 15 staff member also attending the meeting. (Now that I think of it, I probably should have been fired for allowing 15 staff members working in New York to go to a meeting in Colorado.) Anyhow, it was memorable in many ways. Not the least was that all kinds of people wanted to buy me a drink.

**Tom Fitzgibbon, 1971**

I do recall the luncheon panel discussions that were moderated by Frank Newman (from Education Commission of the States). Through his highly skilled questioning, panelists were prodded to consider many perspectives related to each issue being discussed. What a mind-expanding experience!

**Roger Trent, Date Not Given**

The conference has proved invaluable to me in providing networking opportunities with colleagues in state departments of education, the US Department of Education, universities, and testing companies. With the advent of IASA and then NCLB, it became more important to share understanding of and approaches to creating large-scale state assessment systems. The presentation format, designed to combine multiple state perspectives, provides a wide-angle lens view and introduces state department participants to experts who can inform development and implementation processes. The evening receptions allow for candid conversations about professional experiences, both successes and pitfalls. The combination, of presentations and receptions, serves to create a community environment that connects participants to an astounding range of: talented and experienced educational/assessment professionals and diverse and customizable educational/assessment resources.

Some of the greatest strengths of the conference include opportunities to: ask state-specific questions of a national audience, receive a range of expert technical input from a variety of perspectives, problem-solve state-specific approaches, associate with a group of educators who largely understand the complex dynamics related to developing and implementing large-scale state assessment systems, and establish a dynamic community of learners

**Rosemary Fitton Abell,, Date Not Given**

The conference offers a rare opportunity in the year to learn about important developments and innovations in the field of large-scale K-12 assessment. Because the information is provided real-time, primarily by individuals who themselves are managing Large-Scale testing programs, the information is almost always current, relevant, and practical. It is this practical aspect of the conference that I most value.

The conference represents an important opportunity for those of us engaged in managing state assessment programs to learn about what is happening on the testing scene nationally. Each year, I use the information gathered through formal sessions and informal exchanges with other conference participants, to inform our plans for ongoing program improvements and refinements in Massachusetts.

**Kit Viator, 1985**

In the late 80's, I wondered why test publishers would pay to host receptions for college professors to bash testing. Over time, the presentations became more balanced and productive for the industry.

Boulder, Colorado was a good venue for the conference until it became too small for the number of attendees.

The session that I remember most is the NRT debate regarding the Lake Wobegone effect.

The value of the conference for me as getting to know the opinions of people in the field of educational measurement. As a test publisher, this knowledge was important to our product development planning.

**Jack Dilworth, Date Not Given**

The first time I attended the Large-Scale Assessment Conference (LSAC) was in 1990. It was a lot smaller then and held in a funky old hotel in Boulder. I had never even heard of the conference but was told it was a good one to attend, and with my new role as a program director for the NAEP Trial State Assessment and the formation of the NAEP Network, it was an opportunity to meet many of the state test directors and other SEA staff, and to find out more about some of the issues affecting them. Going to the LSAC was a real eye-opener.

Over the years, the LSAC has been a good barometer of hot topics in large-scale assessment. Little did I know what a hot topic NAEP was becoming at that time.

In addition to NAEP, some of the things that have been "hot" include: standards-based assessments, standard setting, CRTs, performance assessment and hands-on tasks, accommodations and inclusion of students with disabilities and English language learners, alignment methods, accountability systems and AYP, computer-based testing/online assessment, ELP tests, and, of course, NCLB. Just looking through the LSAC programs over the years would give an indication of what issues were of high interest to states, assessment companies, and researchers.

I quickly learned that the LSAC was one of the most important, if not THE most important assessment conferences in the country. It was always a great place to learn what was happening, as well as to share information about current activities. Since 1990, I have attended more than 200 sessions at LSAC and wished there had been time to attend even more, and I have delivered around 50 presentations and been fortunate to be part of many interesting sessions where very useful information was shared with attendees. I know that all these sessions have had a positive impact on me, and like to think that they have influenced the assessment field and helped to make policy and practice better across the states and nation.

Besides the content of the LSAC program, the sites where the conference was held have always been an important part of the event. When I reflect on some of my favorite settings, my best memories were usually of places in the mountains and away from any big cities. The beauty of places like Breckenridge, Tapatio, Snowbird, and of course Boulder only enhanced all the professional activities held during the conference. There was something special about being together in a natural setting with one's peers and interacting in a stress-free environment.

In addition to all the good sessions and nice places, my memories of LSAC include various social activities. One of the great things about this conference is the opportunity to have fun with one's colleagues in an enjoyable setting. There have been innumerable special receptions hosted by the testing companies where a good time was had by all. Among the most memorable for me were the ones at the Albuquerque Zoo, the Broadmoor, the Houston Museum of Science, and the Old Western BBO and Dance at Tapatio Cliffs. Yee haw!

However, for me, some of the fun disappeared in 1998 when I took the job of Director of Assessment at CCSO, following in the footsteps of Ed Roeber. Now instead of just attending the conference and maybe doing a presentation or two, I had to do lots of work to help prepare for LSAC and ensure that everything went as planned. To an outsider, the conference may seem to be lots of fun and a great opportunity for professional development, but from the inside, it requires an incredible amount of attention to planning, communication, and execution. The months, weeks, and days leading up to this annual conference, and the 10 days when everything was being held, were a mix of excitement and then, once everything was finally over, exhaustion. Kudos really need to be given to all the CCSO staff that take care of the myriad things required to pull off a successful conference year after year. Let me tell you from personal experience, it is not an easy task.

Also, I forgot to mention that the LSAC is never held just by itself, but it always has a number of other important meetings piggybacked on it, such as NAEP and/or NAGB meetings, EIAC, ASAP (State Assessment Directors), and lots of SCASS groups. Typically there may be a total of seven or more additional meetings held in conjunction with LSAC. This makes a lot of sense since a critical mass of assessment experts are coming together in one place, but it also requires a lot of work and time to coordinate. However, for most attendees, it is another benefit in attending the conference – to meet with key groups and to get to learn that much more.

Finally, in summary, I want to reflect on how the LSAC has affected me personally. I firmly believe it continues to be the most important assessment conference in the country, if not the world. The sessions have covered some of the most relevant topics in our field. Although attendance has grown incredibly in recent years, it has not gotten "too big for its britches." The conference not only attracts most of the key players in state assessment but many others involved in this work. The LSAC has had a tremendously powerful impact on my career and I have learned and benefited greatly from the information shared at LSAC over the past 16 years and the opportunities to interact with my colleagues. I look forward to attending and participating in the conference for another 16 years (or more!).

John Olson, 1990

National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment has been a reliable milestone in my career. That's rather trite, because many people connected with state assessment would say the same thing. The topics that have appeared in Large-Scale programs provide a historical record of the evolution of state assessment and other programs since the first meeting, in 1971. Last year was my 21st year of attending Large-Scale. My focus was on assessing the proficiency of English language learners and alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities. When I first attended Large-Scale in 1985, my focus was minimum-competency testing programs, such as the Maryland Functional Testing Program (MFTP). The work and ideas that colleagues have presented in Large-Scale meetings have, of course, influenced my work. However, what sticks most closely with me are their spirit, enthusiasm, and energy, which have had a significant influence on me as a professional and as a person.

My first day of work as a professional was the first day of the 1985 meeting in Boulder. I was a new psychometrician for the Maryland State Department of Education. I recall that there may have been 90 people in attendance. Most of them attended a panel presentation on some state assessment matter. The panel members included Paul Williams, then of Maryland, Tom Fisher, then of Florida (and not far past the Debra P. case), and Ed Haertel of Stanford University, among others. The presentations were quite technical, as I recall, but they also explicitly addressed practical matters. I found that combination of rigorous technical analysis and hard-nosed practicality a revelation. That revelation certainly has guided my thinking and work over the years. As a grad student just beginning his career, and having spent five years being subtly socialized for an academic career, I found the line-up of high-profile state assessment directors and academic researchers particularly encouraging.

Over the years, I have enjoyed many illuminating presentations and funny conversations, good parties, and excellent meals. I remember experiencing debilitating altitude sickness in Breckenridge (OK—for me, virtually any meeting at 4,000 feet or higher above sea level); making a presentation to 100 people in shorts, T shirt, and sneakers because my baggage had not arrived; having more than one technology mishap (which provide fodder for Jim Popham); and stopping in Baltimore-Washington International airport, after arriving late from the Albuquerque meeting, to watch OJ Simpson live on TV in the infamous white Ford Bronco.

I relish the opportunity at Large-Scale each year to catch up with friends and colleagues from other state assessment programs, academia, commercial testing companies, and other not-for-profit research and development firms. And I always look forward to sharing experiences with other recovering State Assessment Directors.

The Large-Scale meetings now are much larger than in 1985. I understand that last year's meeting was the largest ever, with approximately 1,200 registrants. What I find more significant than the numbers is the new diversity of professionals who attend and have presented in recent years. In the 1990s, we began to see larger numbers of state assessment program people as those programs expanded. Many were content area experts who had become expert item and test developers. More recently, many of us have had the opportunity to work with and develop acquaintances with professionals from other areas, including second language acquisition and special education.

I hope to have the good fortune of participating for 20 more years. I can't wait to see what will happen next.

**Steve Ferrera, 1985**

I have attended this conference annually since 1974. I even attended to actual first conference, held in Ann Arbor in 1970. The conference has served as an annual career-check for my since I first started attending. It often provided an opportunity of presenting on new work under way in Michigan, as well as to learn about interesting work under way in other states. It was a rare conference that I did not return home from energized with new ideas and enthusiasm to improve my assessment program.

The original conferences in Boulder were so good because the group was small and each state was facing considerable political pressure to cut back or eliminate their fledgling assessment programs. Getting together provided an opportunity of supporting one another and helping each of us to sustain our efforts. We gave ideas to one another which was encouraging.

In the early days, the program consisted mainly of NAEP sessions. After a couple of years, this proved so boring that I spoke to the conference planning chair about sessions about what states were doing. As a result, I was asked to join the conference planning efforts in the late 70's. I continued in this role until the late 90's. For this reason, the conference has meant a lot to me. In the mid-90's, my wife and I actually planned a couple of the conferences. That was so hectic that I barely made it to any sessions, so it is much nicer just to attend!

I think what means the most to me about this conference is the annual opportunity to see old friends and colleagues and to get caught up on their life and life transitions – marriages, divorces, children, children graduating from high school, going to college, graduating from college, getting married, getting jobs, retirement, post-retirement work, and so forth. I have grown up and grown old with a whole generation of folks who I met and stayed in contact with via this conference. This is why it has been the signpost of my career and adult life, because no matter where I worked or where my colleagues were employed, we would meet the “same time next year” and get caught up to date about what was happening at home and at work.

The conference is much larger than it used to be, and many more new people attend each year, and a few of the “old-timers” do not come back, so in this sense the conference is transitioning. However, enough of the old still remains and enough of us older folks still attend that I can still carve out the old feeling within the larger conference.

**Ed Roeber, 1974**

I'll give it a try to react to the conference for this paper, but I am really surprised that anybody would be interested. I had accumulated a fair amount of stuff over the years in case I was ever called on to reminisce, but I threw it all away a few years ago because I didn't think that was ever going to happen. My guess is that about 95% of the conference attendees don't know about the “Boulder” Conference as we all called it and, certainly, don't know who Frank Womer and Irv Lehmann are or what agencies actually sponsored the conference and why.

**John Adams, Date Not Given**

## Survey Used in 2006 to Elicit Comments from Past Attendees

---

Frank Philip, director of the annual CCSSO National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment, has asked me to write a history of the conference. While I can describe the conference history, sites, and so forth myself, just laying out the who, where, when, what, and why of the conference would result in fairly boring historical account. Therefore, I am writing to a number of individuals who actively participated in the conference in the past for their recollections about the conference that I can use in the paper.

I hope that you might be willing to write me about how this conference has affected you and your career over the more than three decades that it has been in existence. I am looking for any of the following that you might be willing to share:

Anecdotes about the conference or conference attendees;

---

Recollections about an interesting time or activity at the conference;

---

Stories about the conference or what occurred at the conference;

---

Reflections on the value of the conference to you and your career.

---

I am willing to be quoted: \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No

Name \_\_\_\_\_

I plan on using quotes from the material that you send back, so make sure that your anecdotes, recollections, stories, and reflections are suitable for publication! Seriously, though, do let me know if you are willing to be quoted or wish to remain anonymous.

If you know of others who might be interested in contributing to this historical piece, please feel free to forward this e-mail to them or to give them my telephone numbers listed below. My goal is to personalize the conference as a way of showing the newbies what they may find out in the future.

To be most helpful to me, I need your response by January 31, 2006. I hope that you will share some interesting anecdotes about what this conference has meant you. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

If you prefer to give me your ideas by telephone, I can be contacted at 517-373-0739 (office) or 517-575-0125 (home). Thanks in advance for your assistance!

ed