



A MESSAGE FROM YOUR PRESIDENT – LINDA CROCKER

Being Involved in NCME

Since assuming the presidency, I have been touched by the number of colleagues who have said, “Let me know how I can help. NCME is important in my professional life, and I want to be more involved.” In these days when we are all being asked to “do more with less” in our jobs, it is gratifying to know that NCME has so many members who want to serve the organization. The Board of Directors and I are grateful to all who have expressed interest in working on a special committee or activity for NCME. Board members are committed to involving as many members as possible in the work of NCME and to receiving suggestions for improvement of services.

One vehicle for achieving this is the Annual Meeting Breakfast and Business Meeting Survey. Through the survey, members are invited to express interest in serving on various committees and to suggest topics for the program for the coming year as well as award nominees. Results from the 2002 survey provide evidence that NCME is a thriving organization with a high degree of member commitment to the organization’s goals and activities. Respondents to the survey were strongly dedicated to participation in the annual meeting program for 2003 as reviewers, discussants, or moderators; 118 out of 133 respondents (89%) volunteered to assist with the annual meeting. In addition, the number of members interested in the various committees was as follows:

- For the committees on Standards and Test Use; International Measurement Issues; and Educational Testing, Legislation and Policy Analysis, more than 25 individuals indicated interest in each.
- For Publications; Professional Practices; and Minority Issues, 15-19 members expressed interest in each.
- Selecting recipients of Annual Award, Career Award, and the Brenda Loyd Dissertation Award attracted interest of 10-13 volunteers for each.
- Graduate Student Issues, Membership, and Recruitment of Measurement Specialists were also popular choices (11-13 indicated interest in each)
- Committees for Training & Professional Development, and Outreach & Partnership attracted interest of nine volunteers each.

Regrettably, the Board can appoint only 2-3 new members for each of the above committees in any year, so I hope that these data provide a context for understanding if a member is not appointed to a particular committee after generously volunteering to serve. I also hope that members will volunteer again next year, even if not tapped this year. The vitality of any organization can be measured in the “depth of its bench” — the number of equally qualified individuals who were interested and available to hold offices, staff committees and participate in work efforts beyond those appointed. Having reviewed the surveys, I realize that NCME is blessed with a very strong bench!

Finally, I offer some advice and encouragement to members who may feel that their interest in the organization goes unnoticed or that opportunities for service to NCME are too limited. Committee service and holding office are not the only, or even most important, ways to participate in NCME. The phrase “learning community” although greatly overworked, aptly describes NCME. We join this community to share our ideas and research results with our peers and, more importantly, to learn from them. NCME is an important source of continuous professional development and renewal for members at all career stages.

The most direct ways to participate in the central work of this community include submission of manuscripts to our journals, submission of proposals for papers or training sessions, recruitment of new members among your colleagues and students, serving as a manuscript reviewer, or serving as a proposal reviewer for the annual meeting. The risk of manuscript rejection or discussant’s critique may dissuade some members to withhold their work from review, to seek

continued

Being Involved in NCME, continued

other outlets for participation, or even to withdraw altogether. Nonetheless, consistent participation over time in the central scholarly activities of the organization characterizes those who are nominated and selected for additional responsibilities. Indeed, it is this consistent participation (and the experiences of risk and failure) that prepares editors, editorial boards, award committees, committee chairs and elected officers to carry out their roles with dedication, sound judgment, and sensitivity. Thus, the crux of my message of encouragement is simple: “Hang in there. Continue to enter your creative work into the stream of ideas that is the lifeblood of a scientific professional society. The future of NCME belongs to those who accept this challenge as part of their obligation of membership in this community of learners.” I look forward to representing you this year and would be pleased to receive your suggestions for how NCME can better serve your professional needs.

NCME Board of Directors: 2002-2003

- President:* Linda Crocker
University of Florida
lrcrocker@coe.ufl.edu
- Vice President:* Suzanne Lane
University of Pittsburgh
sl@pitt.edu
- Past President:* H.D. Hoover
University of Iowa
hiram-hoover@uiowa.edu
- Directors:* Douglas Becker
Riverside Publishing
douglas_becker@hmco.com
- Wayne Camara
College Board
wcamara@collegeboard.org
- LeAnn Gamache
Assessment Services and Technical
Assistance Center (ASTAC)
lgamache@uswest.net
- Mark Reckase
Michigan State University
reckase@pilot.msu.edu
- Sharif Shakrani
National Assessment Governing Board
sharif.shakrani@ed.gov
- Rebecca Zwick
University of California-Santa Barbara
rzwick@education.ucsb.edu

Brenda H. Loyd Awards Announced

Jeffrey Smith, Rutgers University

The 2002 Brenda H. Loyd Dissertation Award Committee was fortunate to have eight outstanding dissertations to review. On our first round review, we were able to narrow our choices to three particularly good pieces of scholarship. In our final round, we were faced with two dissertations that were quite close and both of exceptional quality. We decided to make an award and to have an honorable mention as well. The 2002 Brenda H. Loyd Dissertation Award was given to Edward William Wiley of Stanford University. His dissertation, “Bootstrap Strategies for Variance Component Estimation: Theoretical and Empirical Results” was chaired by Richard Shavelson. The honorable mention award went to Frederic Robin of the University of Massachusetts. His dissertation, “Development and evaluation of test assembly procedures for computerized adaptive testing,” was chaired by Steve Sireci. The committee consisted of Susan Brookhart, George Engelhard, Xitao Fan, Deborah Harris, Dale Whittington, and Jeff Smith (Chair). We congratulate Ed and Robin and look forward to great things from them in the future.

NEWSLETTER ADVISORY BOARD

- BETTY BERGSTROM, Computer Adaptive Technologies, Inc.
GREGORY CIZEK, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
JOAN HERMANN, CRESST/UCLA
SHARON LEWIS, Council of the Great City Schools
DUNCAN MACQUARRIE, Tacoma Public Schools
KAREN MITCHELL, SRI International
LORA MONFILS, Graduate Student – Rutgers University
S.E. PHILLIPS, Consultant
NAMBURY RAJU, Illinois Institute of Technology
LAWRENCE RUDNER, ERIC/University of Maryland
STEVE SIRECI, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
LISA F. SMITH, Kean University
JON TWING, NCS Pearson
DENNY WAY, Educational Testing Service
DOUGLAS F. BECKER, EDITOR, Riverside Publishing
- Send articles or information for this newsletter to:*
Douglas F. Becker Phone: (800) 767-8420, ext. 7006
Riverside Publishing Fax: (630) 467-7126
425 Spring Lake Drive e-mail: douglas_becker@hmco.com
Itasca, IL 60143

The *NCME Newsletter* is published quarterly. The *Newsletter* is not copyrighted; readers are invited to copy any articles that have not been previously copyrighted. Credit should be given in accordance with accepted publishing standards.

Popham Honored with Career Award

Following are the comments of Cyndie Schmeiser, Chair of the 2002 NCME Career Award Committee. The award was presented at the annual NCME Breakfast Meeting.

It is both a pleasure and an honor to present this year's NCME Award for Career Contributions to Educational Measurement. I had the privilege this year to work with a terrific committee: Sharon Lewis, Christine Chan, Bob Brennan, and Rick Stiggins. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for all of their hard work as members of the committee.

The committee's work this year was not easy, as we were blessed with many nominations of qualified individuals who have made many valuable contributions to our profession. But I must say that the recipient of this year's award is a most deserving individual, one whom I would venture to say has touched each one of our lives in many, many ways.

Our award winner this year has been actively engaged in the field of measurement for over 30 years. He is the author of over 20 books and nearly 200 journal articles. His early work in criterion-referenced measurement laid the groundwork for the use of behavioral objectives as frameworks for building assessments and interpreting test results. His work provided key insights into the importance of reporting test results that describe what individual students know and are able to do.

Our award winner this year has had an unwavering commitment that educational measurement should be meaningful for teachers, principals, parents, and students. He has had a direct and meaningful impact on educational leaders and policymakers across the US and continues to push for the right kind of assessment information to inform evaluations about school effectiveness.

He has played a variety of roles throughout his career:

- As teacher to the thousands of students who enrolled in his classes, in his workshops, or learned through his videos and writings;
- As mentor to the hundreds of graduate students who studied with him;
- As test developer, engaged in the development of assessments that have provided meaningful information to students, teachers, and administrators;
- As consultant and advisor to many schools, school districts, state departments, and federal institutions and agencies;
- As friend to many.

Few professionals have contributed to the advancement of the profession as a university researcher and scholar, assessment developer and contractor, and as consultant and advisor. Our award winner has had a career that has included contributions in all of these roles.

It is with great pleasure and privilege that I honor this year's recipient of the NCME Career Award – to a man of immeasurable contributions to our profession, to a man of great vision, dedication, endless energy, and extraordinary humor – to Dr. James Popham.

Millman Award Announced

In 1995, the Department of Education at Cornell University, where Dr. Millman spent his entire career, initiated the Jason Millman Promising Scholar Program. The award was intended to honor the lifetime work of Dr. Millman, to recognize his contributions to the field of applied measurement, and to continue Dr. Millman's support of scholars who are just beginning their research careers.

Beginning in 2003, the National Council on Measurement in Education with the support of the Millman endowment will continue the tradition started at Cornell of selecting and recognizing recipients of the Millman award. As in the past, the award is designed to honor Dr. Millman's work by recognizing a scholar at the early stages of his/her career whose research has the potential to make a major contribution to the applied measurement field. In addition to recognition by NCME, the successful candidate will receive \$1000. Only one candidate will be chosen to receive the award each year.

Criteria for Eligibility: To be eligible for the award in a given year, the candidate must:

- have received his/her doctorate within the last five years;
- have two (2) or more unique papers either accepted for presentation at an NCME annual meeting or published in NCME publications within the last five years; and
- have the support of his/her professional colleagues that his/her work represents a significant contribution to the field of applied measurement.

Application Procedures: For full consideration candidates must submit the following:

1. A letter of nomination from a professional colleague who is a member in good standing of NCME.

2. At least two (2) letters of recommendation from individuals (other than the nominator) that speak to (1) the candidate's contributions to the field of measurement as a teacher, and/or as an applied measurement practitioner, and/or as a measurement researcher; and (2) the reasons for which the candidate's work represents a significant contribution to the field of applied measurement.
3. Two (2) or more unique papers presented at any of the last five NCME annual meetings, or published in the last five years in an NCME publication.
 - A. NCME annual meeting papers can be in a revised format.
 - B. Nonpublished or published dissertations do not qualify as a paper, although papers developed on the same or similar topics would qualify.
 - C. The candidate must be the first author on all multiple-author papers. In this case, the candidate must provide a statement that defines his/her contributions to the paper.
4. The candidate's current curriculum vita.
5. A letter from the candidate outlining his/her career goals and how his/her work contributes significantly to the field of measurement.

Deadline: Deadline for submission is October 1, 2002. All materials must be submitted on the same date for receipt by the deadline date. Only complete sets of materials will be considered. The Committee will acknowledge receipt and notify the candidate if any materials are missing.

Method of Submission: Candidates may use more than one mode of delivery for submitting materials. One (1) copy is required for materials submitted electronically. Six (6) copies are required for materials submitted as hard copy. If some materials are submitted electronically and some by surface mail/package delivery, they must all be submitted on the same date. If more than one mode of delivery is used for the submission, the candidate must notify the Committee chair of the modes and expected date(s) of arrival. Submission dates and expected arrival dates must precede the deadline date.

Submit materials to Committee Chair:

Mary Lyn Bourque
 Attention: NCME Millman Award
 Mid-Atlantic Psychometric Services, Inc.
 758 Sheldon Hill Road, P.O. Box 113
 West Wardsboro VT 05360-0113
 802-896-6714
 FAX: 802-896-6780

By e-mail: mlbourque@aol.com, use Subject Line: NCME Millman Award

Testing Impact of the Reauthorized ESEA on Local Districts

Duncan MacQuarrie, Tacoma (WA) Public Schools

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) extends the previous testing and accountability provisions of this statute. Several amendments contained in this legislation will dramatically affect local school districts.

"Title I" of the act retains the mandate for states to implement criterion-referenced assessment programs tied to challenging curriculum content. However, it greatly expands the use of such assessments beginning in 2005-2006 by requiring all students to be tested in reading and mathematics in grades three through eight as well as at least once during grades nine through twelve. In addition, beginning in 2007-2008, states will be required to test science at least one time during grades three through five, six through nine, and ten through twelve. This requirement to test in at least seven grades more than doubles the previous federal mandate. In many states this dramatic increase in required state assessments is likely to drive out existing local assessments or discourage consideration of new ones.

New provisions also directly tie performance on these state assessments to a federal goal of having all students meet state defined proficiency standards in reading and mathematics by the year 2014. In order to achieve this goal, states, school districts, and schools will be required to meet annual yearly progress (AYP) targets. These AYP targets will be state specific and reflect the baseline data from their 2002 testing and the goal of having one hundred percent of students meet the state's performance standards in the year 2014. The differences between the percent of students meeting a state's standards in 2002 and the hundred percent goal are to be divided into twelve equal increments. These increments then will represent the AYP targets for each school, school district, and the individual state. Schools failing to meet the AYP target in two consecutive years will be considered to be "failing schools." However, it is not just the simple aggregate performance at a building level that can trigger failure to meet AYP, but the failure of any one of seven separate subgroups to show AYP that can initiate such a status. The disaggregated performance of any of the five major ethnic/racial subgroups, students with disabilities, or students with limited English proficiency can each independently be the trigger for a school to fail to meet AYP.

It has been well documented that what states identify as “proficient” performance varies considerably from state to state, and even between grade levels and subject areas within states. (See the February 20, 2002 issue of *Education Week*.) States with demanding performance standards, and therefore lower percents of students achieving proficient level or higher, will likely find themselves failing to make AYP in just a very few years. Local school districts with schools failing to make consistent AYP will be required to fund tutoring offered by providers “with a demonstrated record of effectiveness” and/or fund the transportation of students from such failing schools to other schools as a part of a required “options” provision of the law. Schools that continue to fail to make adequate progress will become subject to restructuring of one form or another consistent with state law. The number of such schools is likely to be numerous in states that have adopted demanding content and performance standards intended to promote systematic curriculum reform. The danger is, unless there is relief from this legislation, those states may find it necessary to revise their content and performance standards to avoid unreasonable numbers of schools being classified as failing schools and therefore subject to the above consequences. One of the stated purposes of this act is to raise educational standards and provide all children with a challenging curriculum. Unless the provisions for AYP can be moderated, it is quite possible some states will find themselves under considerable pressure to lower their standards.

The accountability model contained in the new ESEA requires all states accepting Title I funds to participate in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assessments in reading and mathematics at grades four and eight every other year as a validity check on their annual yearly progress. Although states are required to participate in the NAEP, participation of school districts, individual schools, and students is strictly voluntary. In all states, but particularly in those states that currently have legislation mandating participation in the NAEP, this provision could result in lower participation rates or at least give districts and schools greater negotiating power for special considerations in other areas in return for agreeing to participate. Obtaining parental permission has always been an option for schools and districts. However, under these new provisions, school staff will be required to inform the parents of each student selected for the NAEP sample “that their child may be excused from participation for any reason, is not required to finish any...assessment, and is not required to answer any test question.” This requirement could have the unanticipated result of dramatically altering the

representativeness of future samples. This is particularly critical since in the last NAEP collection the state samples contributed for the first time to the national data. This may turn out to be a non-issue, but it also could become a fatal flaw in subsequent collections if students and parents choose to protest the increase in mandated student testing by opting out of the NAEP testing. If this were to happen, we would lose a valuable indicator of the national health of our education system.

Visions of Test Results Dance in Their Heads

Eva L. Baker, CRESST

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002) incorporates assessment and accountability reforms that are intended to improve on the decade-long conception of the role of standards and assessments in the attainment of educational quality. *Visions of Test Results Dance in Their Heads*, presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting in 2002, examines the theory underlying the role and use of assessment in such reforms. The paper focuses on the real uses of assessments, not simply to classify children or schools, but to provide guidance to educators to improve the system. Focusing on the multiple purposes of assessment systems, the paper suggests that assessments today are not well designed for the dual purposes of accountability and school improvement. In fact, we oftentimes do not even have a clear understanding of what it means to pass a test. What kind of interpretation are we really looking to make – mastery, transfer, prediction, and promotion?

Take a mathematics test, for example. Does passing the test mean that the student has mastered a demonstrable set of content and skills? If so, what’s in and what’s out of the set? Do we mean that the student will be likely to transfer the competence to other application settings and to other methods by which the same competence might be demonstrated? Do we mean that the passing students (or those at higher proficiency levels) are now competent to learn next year’s mathematics? Do we mean that those who score below some threshold will not be able to succeed at the next grade or in the world of work?

To answer all these questions “yes” (and I think that standards-based educational reform believes that the answers should be positive), we need to be sure that assessment design is both specific and comprehensive. We need to know 1) the operational limits of the target domain of learning, 2) the horizontal vector of transfer, that is, what generalization across how broad a content or task domain is expected; 3) the vertical relationships

among tested domains, 4) confidence that progress markers are placed where standards are – qualitative differences in performance really matter.

The paper concludes with guidance about test design. If our goal is to improve educational quality and student competence, we must create and support complete educational systems that encourage young people to learn, to adapt, and to be prepared for a range of tasks. Tests must measure actual changes in learning, support multiple purposes such as transfer and generalizability, and improvements should be substantially attributed to instruction. To help accountability systems achieve these purposes is our goal and our responsibility.

Visions of Test Results Dance in Their Heads, by Eva L. Baker will be available shortly as a CRESST technical report. See www.cse.ucla.edu.

No Psychometrician Left Behind

Stephen G. Sireci, University of Massachusetts Amherst

I was asked to briefly comment on how the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation is likely to affect psychometric faculty across the United States. Based on my recent experiences, I predict there will be at least two major effects. First, we will be called upon more often to inform public policy debates on educational assessment. Second, we will become more involved in educational program evaluation.

The NCLB legislation will make testing a significant part of millions of Americans lives. The mandated reading and math tests in grades 3-8 will be used for accountability and other purposes, and teachers, students, and parents will struggle to better understand why these tests are needed and how they can improve student learning. Educational measurement specialists employed at colleges and universities will be seen as independent authorities on testing issues and so we are likely to be sought out by the media to provide commentary on these issues. Such interviews will provide significant opportunities for us to educate the public about sound testing practices and the benefits of instructionally supportive assessment. We need to prepare for such calls by acquiring training in how to get our lessons across in an interview format.

The public's increased awareness of testing issues will also filter into our university classrooms where non-measurement students take statistics and research methods classes. Research studies using standardized test scores and other accountability measures associated with NCLB will be brought up by students, which will again provide significant teachable moments for us to educate others about appropriate testing practices.

With respect to program evaluation, we should note that the legislation calls for “effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research...” (p. 49). Textbook publishers and other companies that market special products to enhance learning will be required to demonstrate that their claims are justified using scientific scrutiny, which translates into modern methods of program evaluation. It is noteworthy that the words “scientific” and “evaluation” appear throughout the NCLB legislation. Again, given our independence from the developers of instructional products and educational assessments, university faculty with statistical and psychometric expertise are likely to be called upon to conduct evaluation and validation studies on measures and materials designed to assess or improve student learning.

What will the NCLB legislation NOT change for university faculty? We will continue to be incredibly busy, as are all of us in educational measurement these days. The demand for measurement expertise continues to outpace the supply. Let us hope that we do not get so stretched that the quality of our assessments suffers. The time is ripe for all measurement professionals to use our talents to inform the public about good testing practices and to better design our assessments to serve not only accountability purposes, but to also serve the one goal that will make all of our efforts worthwhile—improving student learning.

Call for Nominations – *EM:IP* Editor

The NCME Publications Committee is soliciting nominations for the editor of *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*. The next *EM:IP* editor will be responsible for issues appearing between January 2004 and December 2006. Nominations will be screened by the NCME Publications Committee. The committee offers a slate to the president who, in turn, makes a recommendation for appointment to the NCME Board of Directors. This appointment process is designed to provide for a smooth transition between the incoming and outgoing editors.

Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice is a quarterly publication that is aimed at practitioners and users of tests, as well as professional educators, legislators, school personnel, and interested citizens. Its primary purpose is to promote a better understanding of educational measurement and to encourage reasoned debate on current issues of practical importance to educators and the public. *EM:IP* also provides one means of communication among NCME members and

between NCME members and others concerned with educational measurement issues and practices.

If you are interested in this position, if you would like to nominate a colleague, or if you would like additional information, please contact Doug Becker, Publications Committee (douglas_becker@hmco.com or phone: 800-767-8420, ext.7006). Deadline for nominations is June 28, 2002.

NCME Recruitment

How did YOU become a psychometrician? The NCME Recruitment Committee wants to know!

The NCME Recruitment of Educational Measurement Specialists Committee is compiling NCME members' stories about how they fell into the wonderful world of educational measurement. Our plan is to compile a list of these stories and publish it on our web site as a recruitment tool. We believe that if we can get the word out about the rewards of our profession, and about the diversity of people who are in it, we may attract new members.

Please contribute to this effort by sending us your biographical story. The typical biography should be about one single-spaced page and should explain your educational background and how you found out about educational measurement. Please send all bios to Luz Bay at Lbay@measuredprogress.org.

NCME Past Presidents

2001-02	H.D. Hoover	University of Iowa
2000-01	John Fremer	Educational Testing Service
1999-20	Michael Kolen	University of Iowa
1998-99	Edward Haertel	Stanford University
1997-98	Cynthia B. Schmeiser	American College Testing Program
1995-97	Robert L. Brennan	University of Iowa
1995-96	Brenda H. Loyd	University of Virginia
1994-95	Wendy M. Yen	CTB McGraw-Hill
1993-94	Anthony J. Nitko	University of Pittsburgh
1992-93	Ronald A. Berk	John Hopkins University
1991-92	Barbara S. Plake	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
1990-91	Dale C. Carlson	California Department of Education
1989-90	Ronald K. Hambleton	University of Massachusetts
1988-89	Irvin J. Lehmann	Michigan State University
1987-88	Carol Kehr Tittle	Queens College New York
1986-87	Richard M. Jaeger	University of North Carolina-Greensboro

1985-86	William A. Mehrens	Michigan State University
1984-85	George F. Madaus	Boston College
1983-84	Nancy S. Cole	University of Pittsburgh
1982-83	Loretta Shepard	University of Colorado
1981-82	Robert L. Linn	University of Illinois
1980-81	Roger T. Lennon	Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich
1979-80	Jason Millman	Cornell University
1978-79	John Meene	Iowa State University
1977-78	Eric F. Gardner	Syracuse University
1976-77	Joan Bollenbacher	Cincinnati Public Schools
1975-76	Thomas J. Fitzgibbon	Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich
1974-75	Christine H. McGuire	University of Illinois-Medical Center
1973-74	Willard G. Warrington	Michigan State University
1972-73	William E. Coffman	University of Iowa
1971-72	Jack C. Merwin	University of Minnesota
1970-71	Richard E. Schutz	Southwest Regional Laboratory
1969-70	Frank B. Womer	University of Michigan
1968-69	J. Thomas Hastings	University of Illinois
1967-68	Howard A. Bowman	Los Angeles Public Schools
1966-67	Wilbur L. Layton	Iowa State University
1965-66	John C. Flannagan	American Institutes for Research
1964-65	Frederick B. Davis	University of Pennsylvania
1963-64	Julian C. Stanley	University of Wisconsin
1962-63	David V. Tiedeman	Harvard University
1961-62	Paul L. Dressel	Michigan State University
1960-61	Max D. Engelhardt	Chicago Public Schools
1959-60	Arthur E. Traxler	Educational Records Bureau
1958-59	Victor H. Noll	Michigan State University
1957-58	Robert L. Ebel	Educational Testing Service
1956-57	Walter N. Durost	Test Service & Advisement Center
1955-56	Frank S. White	Rosier College
1954-55	Hershel T. Manuel	University of Texas-Austin
1953-54	Warren G. Findley	Educational Testing Service
1952-53	J. R. Gerberich	Educational Testing Service
1950-52	Henry D. Rinsland	University of Connecticut-Storrs
1949-50	Jacob S. Orleans	City College of New York
1948-49	Ray G. Woods	Ohio Department of Education
1946-47	Roy C. Woods	Marshall College
1944-46	E. C. Denny	Iowa State Teachers College-Cedar Falls
1940-42	H. E. Schrammel	Kansas State University-Emporia
1938-40	Earl Bennet South	New York State College-Albany

