

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 940

TM 015 189

AUTHOR Marso, Rona'd N.; Pigge, Fred L.
 TITLE Training, Job Titles, and Responsibilities of Directors of Public School Standardized Testing Programs.
 PUB DATE Apr 90
 NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (Boston, MA, April 17-19, 1990).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Job Training; Management Development; Public Schools; *Standardized Tests; *Testing Programs
 IDENTIFIERS *Test Directors

ABSTRACT

A sample of 97 directors of public school standardized testing programs received mail surveys for the purpose of identifying the nature and extent of their training in educational measurement and evaluation, the number and types of State certifications held, the nature of their primary job assignment, and their job responsibilities associated with their employing school districts' testing activities. Survey` returned from 83 directors were used in the study. It was found that testing was a secondary responsibility for 99% of the directors. The primary job assignments (or titles) of most of the directors of testing were reported to be guidance counselor, student personnel director, and director of instructio./curriculum/supervision, respectively. Most of the testing directors had considerable formal education, but nearly one in five had completed none or only one formal course in testing and evaluation. The testing responsibilities of the directors were found to vary considerably, with nearly all directors reporting that they have basic test handling responsibilities. Over one-third of the directors reported not having responsibility for encouraging school personnel to use the results from testing and not having responsibility for training teachers to administer and interpret tests. Four data tables are included. (Author/TJH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Training, Job Titles, and Responsibilities of Directors of
Public School Standardized Testing Programs

Ronald N. Marso and Fred L. Pigge

Educational Foundations and Inquiry

Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

A paper presented at the annual conference of the
National Council for Measurement in Education
Boston, MA
April 17-19, 1990

Abstract

A random sample of approximately 100 directors of public school standardized testing programs were surveyed for the purpose of identifying the nature and extent of their training in educational measurement and evaluation, the number and types of state certification held, the nature of their primary job assignment, and their job responsibilities associated with their employing school districts' testing activities. It was found that testing was a secondary responsibility for 99% of the directors. Most of the testing directors had considerable formal education, but nearly one in five had completed none or just one formal course in testing and evaluation. The testing responsibilities of the directors were found to vary considerably with nearly all reporting having basic test handling responsibilities, and, rather dismayingly, over one-third of the directors reported not having responsibility for encouraging school personnel to use the results from testing and not having responsibility for training teachers to administer and interpret tests.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED320940

11/01/89

Training, Job Titles, and Responsibilities of Directors of Public School Standardized Testing Programs

The widespread adoption of educational accountability and the associated proliferation of testing in the this decade has renewed and increased concerns about standardized testing in the public schools (Haney and Madaus, 1989). A compounding factor in the growth of these concerns about testing is the commonly accepted belief that classroom teachers, if not all educators, have limited formal training in educational measurement and evaluation (e.g., Crooks, 1988; Diamond and Fremer, 1989; Ruddell, 1985; Stiggins, Conklin, and Bridgeford, 1986).

Relatedly, Marso and Pigge (1988a) found that teachers believe that standardized testing skills are less needed than are other testing skills; Sproull and Zubrow (1981) found that central administrators of schools do not perceive standardized testing as being a very important administrative function and that few schools have formal testing offices as such; Tyler and Sheldon (1979) reported a relatively unclear and weak linkage between standardized tests and classroom instruction; and Kinnev, Brichell, and Lynn (1988) found that building principals commonly do not perceive the need for testing specialists to be involved in the selection of standardized tests or in the construction of locally developed tests designed for district-wide use.

Despite the increasing evidence that many educators do not perceive standardized testing to be an important function in the public schools, Engen, Lamb, and Prediger (1982) reported frequent use of standardized tests even at the secondary school level where many educators perceive less need for the use of standardized tests as opposed to their use in the elementary grades (Marso and Pigge, 1988b). Further, these researchers reported that 70% of the guidance directors surveyed indicated even more career guidance testing would be done if time and funds were available. In addition to this evidence of continued frequent use of tests for pupil-oriented purposes, Airasian and Madaus (1983) described in detail the rise of policy-oriented uses of tests in the public schools (e.g. teacher evaluation, merit, and certification; pupil graduation and grade advancement standards, etc.).

The research literature pertaining to educational testing provides little insight into how standardized testing programs in the public schools are administered, and, similarly, this literature provides little information about the individuals who are responsible for the administration of these programs. This literature does, however, suggest that limited administrative attention is provided for these programs. For example, it has been previously noted that few school districts have formal administrative offices for testing, that educational administrators commonly do not view testing as a significant element in the overall administrative structure of schools, that building principals do not perceive the need for testing specialists to be involved in the selection and evaluation of tests, and that typical educators' training in the field of testing and evaluation is limited. Contrarily, and also as already has been noted, this same literature suggests that in recent years standardized tests are more frequently given in the schools and are being given for more diverse purposes than in prior decades.

In two studies somewhat related to the management of public school testing programs, Sproull and Zubrow (1981) reported the results from extensive

interviews with 58 administrators (including directors of school testing programs) in 18 public school districts regarding practices associated with standardized testing programs, and Salmon-Cox (1981) reported the results from extensive interviews of 68 elementary teachers regarding the roles and uses of standardized achievement tests in the public schools. The latter researcher concluded that teachers use the results of standardized achievement tests just as a confirmatory function relative to data already collected about the pupils from other sources. Similarly, Sproull and Zubrow found that school administrators viewed their schools' standardized testing program as a peripheral function and primarily serving the instructional staff. Conversely, Salmon-Cox reported that teachers perceived the primary benefits of their school districts' standardized testing programs accrued not to themselves but to the school administration.

In summation, the existing educational measurement literature provides one with little information about the profiles of the individuals responsible for the administration of standardized testing programs in the public schools. Instead of providing assurance about the competence of directors of standardized testing and about the administrative significance associated with the role of directors of standardized testing in the public schools, this literature suggests that the standardized testing function has not been viewed as a significant element in the operation of the schools by either teachers or administrators and that directors of standardized testing, like other typical educators, may well be poorly trained in the field of educational measurement and evaluation.

The purpose of the present study was to identify and to describe the nature and extent of training in tests and measurements, the numbers of and types of state certification held, the job title and primary job assignment, and the testing associated responsibilities of directors of public school standardized testing programs. A secondary goal of this study was to determine if these selected characteristics of the testing directors or their jobs differed markedly by the geographical setting of and the type of administrative organization of their employing school districts.

Method

In the first stage of subject selection all superintendents of the 616 public school districts in Ohio, excluding vocational high school districts, were contacted via a one-time mail correspondence which inquired of their willingness to participate in a rather extensive investigation of standardized testing practices and of the uses of testing results by classroom teachers, administrators, and testing directors. A total of 171 superintendents indicated a willingness to have their school districts participate in the study.

From this group of 171 school districts indicating a willingness to participate in this extensive study, 106 districts were randomly selected using type of administrative organization (city, local county, and exempted village) of the school districts as strata in the selection process. Of these 106 randomly selected districts, 97 districts did participate fully in the study. The most frequently stated reason given by those superintendents not choosing to participate in the study was that their school district had some prior major commitment for the 1988-89 school year such as a scheduled evaluation by an accrediting association. The second most frequently given reason by the

administrators for not participating in the study was that their school district did not have an individual formally or informally designated as being responsible for standardized testing. In a few instances a local county school superintendent indicated that standardized testing was a service provided through their county office of education.

Of the 97 (92%) superintendents ultimately distributing the survey instruments within their school district, 83 (86%) of the designated testing directors returned usable response forms after two mail follow-ups of nonrespondents. Thirty-five of these respondents identified their employing school districts as being organized as city districts, 36 identified their districts as being local schools within county school systems, and 12 identified their districts as being exempted village schools. In describing their district geographically, 31 directors described their school district as being in a rural area, 47 as being in a suburban area, and five as being in an urban setting.

Eleven percent of the testing directors reported their employing school districts to have a K-12 pupil enrollment of less than 1,000, 34% reported an enrollment of 1,001 to 2,000, 34% reported an enrollment of 2,001 to 4,000, 14% reported an enrollment of 4,001 to 8,000, and approximately 7% reported a school district K-12 enrollment of over 8,000 pupils. These data related to district organization, geographic location, and pupil enrollment were determined to be quite typical of the characteristics of all the K-12 public school districts across the state. This in turn suggested to the writers that this sample of 83 testing directors and their employing school districts were very likely representative of all the testing directors and the nonvocational K-12 public school districts in Ohio.

Although other teacher and administrator employees of the selected school districts also participated in the larger study, this present report is limited to the testing directors' responses to a specifically prepared set of 22 survey items. Three of these survey items requested information from the directors pertaining to the demographic nature of their employing school districts, four items inquired about their professional training, and the other 15 items pertained to the specific job responsibilities of the directors which were associated with their school districts' testing programs.

The survey instruments were mailed directly to the randomly selected superintendents who had agreed to participate in the study. These superintendents were instructed to forward one set of survey instruments to the individual who was formally or informally designated as director of standardized testing in their school district. In the absence of a single individual being designated as director of testing, the superintendents were directed to forward this set of survey instruments to the member of their staff most knowledgeable about and most involved in the standardized testing program within their districts. Sets of other survey instruments also were distributed by the superintendents to elementary and secondary teachers, principals, and supervisors for the larger investigation.

Findings

The procedures used to reach those individuals most knowledgeable and most responsible for standardized testing in the participating school districts were deemed to be successful. Just one of the 83 respondents having returned a

completed and usable survey instrument indicated that he/she was not responsible for his/her school district's standardized testing program.

Primary Job Responsibility

Of the 81 respondents indicating their primary job responsibility on the survey form, most checked guidance counselor with testing responsibilities (33%) followed by pupil personnel director (21%), director of instruction (11%), director of testing (1%), research/evaluation office (1%), and 33% responded "other." Of this latter 33% checking their primary job assignment as "other", five described their primary responsibility as school psychologist, six as a supervisor or director of curriculum, one as director of guidance and counseling, three as program evaluation, four as building principal, four as superintendent, and five as central office staff (e.g., assistant superintendent).

The primary job responsibility information reported under the "other" category, as directly reported by the respondents, was then used to reclassify the responses from all 81 respondents within nine categories. This was done to present a second view of the data to that reported within the original six categories including the "other" category as presented on the survey form. The reclassified primary job responsibilities revealed that 34% of the testing directors were primarily guidance counselors, 21% were pupil personnel directors, 18% were directors of instruction or curriculum, 6% were school psychologists, 6% were assistant superintendents or administrative assistants, 5% were associated with evaluation/research offices or departments, 5% were superintendents, 5% were building principals, and just 1% reported their primary job responsibilities to be directors of testing. Both the data associated with the original survey form classifications and the data resulting from the reclassification resulting in the elimination of the "other" category are presented on Table 1.

 Insert Table 1 about here

Level of Training

The directors of testing were directed to report the number of testing courses which they had completed at either the graduate or undergraduate levels, their highest academic degree earned, and their acquired state professional certifications. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents reported having completed three or more formal testing courses, and 22% of the directors reported having completed six or more courses. Just 4% of the directors reported having taken no testing courses, but another 14% of the directors reported having taken only one testing course.

This data suggests that most of the testing directors probably had a good background in testing, but, at the same time, nearly 1 in 5 of the directors reported having no more formal educational measurement and evaluation training than would be expected of a fully certified classroom teacher in most states across the nation. Presumably, this limited training, one or no testing courses, would be considered by the measurement profession to be insufficient training to fulfill the testing directors' role as inservice trainers of those

educational staff responsible for the administration and use of standardized tests in their employing school districts. Specifically, The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (ARRA-APA-NCME, 1985) clearly declare that those responsible for school testing programs are to insure that the individuals within their school district who are responsible for test administration and use are to be properly instructed in fulfilling these responsibilities.

The testing directors' responses to the survey items pertaining to highest academic degree earned and to advanced professional state certificates held (certificates beyond classroom instruction) suggest that the directors had an adequate or even an extensive general education background. This data certainly suggests that most of the directors had considerable training in other areas of education as well as in educational measurement and evaluation.

All of the testing directors reported possessing at least a master's degree, 84% at least a master's degree plus 15 to 30 hours, and 27% indicated they possessed a specialist or a doctoral degree. In terms of advanced professional state certificates held, the data indicate that the typical director held at least two advanced certificates (mean of 2.0) from the state. Nearly one-half of the directors reported holding a state certificate in guidance and counseling (46%) followed in frequency by certificates held in pupil personnel services (37%), superintendency (36%), high school principalship (34%), elementary principalship (23%), school psychologist (18%), supervisor of instruction (7%), and other advanced (nonteaching) areas (8%). The set of data related to the directors' academic training and types of advanced certificates held is reported in Table 2.

 Insert Table 2 about here

Testing Responsibilities

Nearly all of the testing directors indicated having responsibilities for test selection (89%), for reporting test results (88%), for ordering tests and materials (87%), and for handling the scoring of tests (77%). In addition approximately one-half or somewhat more of the directors reported having responsibilities for encouraging the use of test results (66%); for preparing test results for annual community reports (61%); for training teachers to interpret and use test results (60%); for the development and the implementation of school district policy on testing, test use, score confidentiality, etc. (60%); for management of state-mandated pupil competency testing programs (55%), and for providing an orientation training to those responsible for standardized test administration and proctoring (48%).

Many fewer of the directors noted having responsibilities for the preparation of test score reports for parents (34%), for the maintenance of pupil permanent records (32%), for coordination of college admission testing (ACT or SAT) programs (23%), and just four directors listed "other" testing responsibilities not identified on the survey form. These latter four respondents noted responsibility for the testing associated with special education programs, for evaluating staff responses to the use of new standardized tests, for Chapter I testing and records, and for the distribution

and packaging of testing materials. The testing directors' responses to the testing responsibilities section of the survey instrument are shown in Table 3.

 Insert Table 3 about here

District Demographic Setting and Organization

The responses of the directors to the survey items were also grouped by the demographic setting (rural, suburban, and urban) and the administrative organization (city, exempted village, and local district in a county system) of their employing school districts. Generally, the rural and exempted village districts in Ohio are comprised of schools with lower pupil enrollments which are located in the more rural areas of the state. The urban districts are typically schools with larger pupil enrollments and which are located in metropolitan centers. The suburban districts are typically schools rather diverse in size but residing in outlying regions of a metropolitan area. The local districts operate within a county system of schools and tend to be either located in smaller communities or serve as consolidated schools located between small communities. The K-12 pupil enrollment ranges within the school demographic and organization classifications as reported by the testing directors are presented in Table 4.

 Insert Table 4 about here

The analysis of the testing directors' responses to the survey items by the demographic setting and administrative organization classifications of the respondents' employing school districts revealed that differences exist within both of the district classifications relative to their primary job assignment, their training, and their testing program associated responsibilities. In the rural, local, and exempted village school districts the primary job responsibility of the testing directors is likely to be guidance counselor; in the city or suburban school districts the testing directors' primary job responsibility is likely to be a director of pupil personnel services; and in the urban schools the director of testing is more likely than in rural or suburban districts to have a more central and/or instructional related responsibility (principal, superintendent or assistant, and director of instruction/curriculum/supervision) (see Table 1). Relatedly, the city and suburban school directors of testing are likely to have somewhat more formal academic training as opposed to the directors employed in the rural, local, and exempted village school districts (see Table 2).

Relative to standardized testing program associated responsibilities of testing directors employed by the different classifications of the employing school districts, it appears that the testing responsibilities of the directors are rather similar among the different classifications of the employing school districts. The few differences that can be noted suggest that the testing directors employed in the rural and local school districts as compared to their counterparts in the other districts are more likely to be involved with the maintenance of pupil records ($X^2 = 8.82$, $df = 2$, $p = .012$ for the demographic classification; $X^2 = 10.81$, $df = 2$, $p = .005$ for the administrative organization

classification)¹; that the testing directors employed in the local and the urban schools as opposed to those employed in city and exempted village or the rural and suburban districts are less likely to be involved with the preparation of school community annual reports; and that the testing directors employed in urban districts are more likely to be involved with the training (orientation) of test proctors and with the development of district policies related to testing as opposed to the directors employed in the other school districts; city testing directors are more likely than village or local district directors to be responsible for scoring of standardized tests and local school district testing directors are more likely to be responsible for coordinating ACT/SAT testing as compared to directors in city or local county schools (see Table 3).

Summary and Implications

Pertinent information provided by the participating testing directors indicates that the school districts participating in this study are quite representative of the public nonvocational K-12 school districts in Ohio. Additionally, the responses of the participating directors to the testing job responsibilities enumerated on the survey form indicate that these testing job duties are representative of those performed by the directors of standardized testing in the nonvocational K-12 grade public schools in Ohio. Just four "other" responses were made by the testing directors in addition to their responses to the job duties enumerated on the survey form, and each of these four responses could have been readily subsumed under the responsibilities enumerated on the survey form.

The testing directors reported a diverse range in the amount of their formal academic training. The number of completed formal graduate and undergraduate level testing courses reported by the directors ranged from none to six or more; the highest academic degrees held reported by the testing directors varied from master's to doctoral degree; and the testing directors reported possessing from one to six state advanced professional certifications. Similarly, the respondents reported having a diverse range of testing related responsibilities in their role as director of standardized testing in their employing school districts. The numbers of testing directors checking each of the 13 testing responsibilities stated on the survey form varied from 23% to 89% of the respondents. The most frequently checked testing responsibilities were those directly associated with the testing process (e.g. ordering, administration, scoring, etc.).

The primary job assignments (or titles) of the majority of the directors of testing were reported to be guidance counselor, pupil personnel director, and director of instruction/curriculum/supervision, respectively. Fewer than ten percent of the respondents reported having a primary job assignment not within these three categories.

Several of the testing directors reported having completed a very limited number of courses in educational measurement and evaluation (18% reported having taken one or no courses), but on the other hand many of these directors also reported having completed several testing courses. Conversely, in regards to general educational background, most testing directors reported holding master's plus additional hours or higher academic degrees and possessing two or more state advanced professional certifications. Regarding the advanced certificates, the guidance and counseling, pupil personnel, superintendency,

high school principalship, elementary principalship, and school psychologists state certificates were most commonly held by the testing directors.

There were few patterns of difference in the primary job assignments of the testing directors found to be associated with the demographic (rural, suburban and urban) and administrative (city, exempted village, and local county school district) classifications of the directors' employing schools. The directors of testing employed in rural local county schools or rural exempted village schools as compared to the other school classifications were more likely to have a primary job assignment as guidance counselor; those employed in the suburban and city schools were more likely to have a primary job assignment as director of pupil personnel services; and those employed in the urban schools were more likely to be a central office administrator (superintendent, assistant to the superintendent, or a director of instruction/curriculum/ supervision) than were the directors employed in other types of school settings.

The testing directors employed in the rural and exempted villages reported having completed fewer testing courses than those directors employed in the other schools. Differences in testing responsibilities reported by the testing directors employed in the different types of school districts were noted relative to the maintenance of pupil records, scoring of tests, preparation of annual community reports, coordination of ACT/SAT testing, testing policy development, and in the training of test proctors.

Several specific findings appear sufficiently salient to the purpose of this study to enumerate for emphasis in summary:

1. Approximately 1 in 5 of the directors of standardized testing programs in the nonvocational K-12 grade public schools appear to have no more formal training in tests and measurements than what would be expected of a beginning certified teacher.
2. Most testing directors reported possessing a rather extensive formal education with the vast majority holding a master's degree plus 15 to 30 hours or more advanced degrees, and the typical director reported having two or more state of Ohio advanced professional certificates.
3. Very few (1%) of the testing directors reported their primary job assignment to be director of testing.
4. Rather dishearteningly, approximately one-third of the testing directors noted that encouragement of the use of the results from standardized testing in their schools was not part of their job responsibility. Optimistically, but perhaps not realistically, one could assume that others in these school districts were sufficiently trained for this task and effectively provided such encouragement.
5. The most frequently reported testing program responsibilities of the directors dealt with the basic, unavoidable procedures associated with testing: test selection, ordering tests and testing materials, providing for the scoring of the tests, and reporting test results.
6. Approximately one-third of the testing directors reported having responsibility for the maintenance of pupil records, and over one-half

of the directors reported having responsibility for the development and implementation of school district policy related to testing, test use, test score confidentiality, etc.

7. Relative to responsibilities for other types of testing programs within their employing school districts, most of the testing directors (approximately 75%) reported not having responsibility for college admission testing (ACT/SAT), but approximately one-half of the directors did report having responsibility for the state-mandated pupil minimum competency testing program in their school districts.
8. Approximately one-half of the directors of testing did not report having responsibility for the training of test administrators and proctors or for the training of teachers in the use and interpretation of test results. Once again one might assume optimistically, but perhaps not realistically, that others in their school districts were sufficiently trained for this task and effectively provided such instruction.
9. Testing directors in the smaller and rural school districts more frequently reported their primary job assignment to be guidance and counseling and generally reported having completed fewer testing courses as compared to those directors employed in other school district settings.
10. The typical director of standardized testing who participated in this study can be described as a counselor, a director of pupil personnel services, or a director of instruction with testing responsibilities, as possessing two advanced state of Ohio professional certifications, as having academic credits beyond a master's degree, and as having completed at least two educational measurement and evaluation courses.

As the professional educational measurement literature provides very limited data regarding the training and job responsibilities of directors of standardized testing programs in the public schools, just a few relationships are drawn between the findings of this study and those findings or conclusions from other reports appearing in the professional literature:

1. The findings of this study lend support to the concern of several writers in the field (e.g., Crooks, 1988; Diamond and Frazer, 1989; Ruddell, 1985; Stiggins, Conklin, and Bridgeford, 1986) that many educators' have limited training in tests and measurements.
2. Many directors of testing in K-12 nonvocational public schools are probably not sufficiently trained in testing and evaluation to insure that others involved in the administration and use of standardized tests in their employing school districts are properly instructed to perform these tasks in accord with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA-APA-NCME, 1985).
3. The expectation within the measurement profession as stated in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA-APA-NCME, 1985) that those responsible for testing provide appropriate inservice instruction to those involved in the administration, interpretation,

and use of standardized tests does not appear to be a reality. One-third or more of this sample of testing directors did not report these activities to be part of their job responsibilities.

4. As was reported by Sproull and Zubrow (1981), the responses of these testing directors suggest that the vast majority of their employing school districts do not appear to regard management of their standardized testing program as significant administrative function. Just one percent of the participating school districts had a formal administrative office for testing, and most of the testing directors reported their primary job assignment to be other than director of testing.
5. The finding in this study that 57% of the testing directors were also certified by the state (if not also acting) as building principals suggests an interesting paradox in light of the finding of Kinney, Briehall, and Lynn (1988) that building principals do not perceive the need for the participation of testing specialists in matters such as the selection of standardized tests or in the development of district-wide tests. If over one-half of the directors of standardized testing also are trained as principals, perhaps many testing directors, as well as principals, do not perceive the need for expertise in conducting various testing activities.
6. The finding in this study that approximately one-half of the testing directors also are responsible for their districts' state-mandated pupil minimum competency testing program suggests that Airasian and Madaus' (1983) concern that policy-oriented uses of tests might have a negative impact upon the time and responsibilities of those individuals responsible for directing instruction associated testing may be a reality, at least in Ohio.
7. The finding that approximately one-third of these testing directors did not perceive their job responsibilities to include the encouragement of the use of standardized test results in their schools' instructional programs certainly lends support to Tyler and Sheldon's (1979) contention that the linkage between standardized tests and classroom instruction may be unclear and weak in many schools.
8. And last the traditional, but in this case a most appropriate, conclusion that more information is needed on the research topic which in this case is the training and responsibilities of directors of K-12 nonvocational public school standardized testing programs. The current measurement literature provides little empirical data about these individuals who have primary responsibility for the effectiveness of the operation of public school testing programs. It may be that the role of these individuals as described in the professional measurement literature may not be consistent and/or reasonable in light of the reality of the extent of their training and of the diversity of their job responsibilities in the typical public school setting.

References

- AERA-APA-NCME. (1985). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Airasian, P. W., & Madaus, G. F. (1983). Linking testing and instruction: Policy issues. Journal of Educational Measurement, 20(2), 103-119.
- Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. Review of Educational Research, 58, 438-481.
- Diamond, E. E., & Fremer, J. (1989). The joint committee on testing practices and the code of fair testing practices in education. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 8, 23-27.
- Engen, H. B., Lamb, R. R., & Prediger, D. J. (1982). Are secondary schools still using standardized tests? The Personnel and Guidance Journal, January, 287-290.
- Haney, W., & Madaus, G. (1989). Searching for alternatives to standardized tests: Whys, whats, and withers. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 683-688.
- Kinney, D., Brickell, J., & Lynn, M. A. (1988). Testing programs in Illinois elementary school districts: The relationships between standardized achievement, competency-based, and teacher-made tests. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans.
- Marso, R. N., & Pigge, F. L. (1988a). Standardized and competency testing programs: Classroom teachers' needs and proficiencies as viewed by principals and supervisors. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED TM 012854).
- Marso, R. N., & Pigge, F. L. (1988b). Ohio secondary teachers' testing needs and proficiencies: Assessments by teachers, supervisors, and principals. American Secondary Education, 17, 2-9.
- Ruddell, R. B. (1985). Knowledge and attitudes toward testing: Field educators and legislators. The Reading Teacher, 38, 538-543.
- Salmon-Cox, L. (1981, May). Teachers and standardized achievement tests: What's really happening. Phi Delta Kappan, 631-634.
- Sproull, L., & Zubrow, D. (1981). Standardized testing from the administrative perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 631-794.
- Stiggins, R. J., Conklin, N. F., & Bridgeford, N. J. (1986). Classroom assessment: A key to effective education. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 5, 5-17.
- Tyler, R. W., & Sheldon, H. W. (1979). Testing, teaching, and learning. Report of a Conference on Research on Testing. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Footnote

¹These differences were "crudely" tested for significance by expecting equality of percentages among and between classifications and then (illicitly) using percents as though they were frequencies in a goodness of fit Chi square analyses.

Table 1

Primary Job Descriptions of the Directors of Testing and Results of a Researcher
Reclassification Eliminating the "Other" Category (N=81)

<u>Checked Job Description</u>	<u>District Demographic</u>								<u>District Organization</u>						
	<u>Total</u>		<u>Rural</u>		<u>Suburban</u>		<u>Urban</u>		<u>Exempted</u>						
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>City</u>		<u>Village</u>		<u>Local</u>		
Guidance counselor with															
testing responsibility	26	33	14	47	11	24	1	20**	4	12	5	42	17	50**	
School program evaluation/															
research office	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	
Pupil personnel services															
director	17	21	2	7	15	33	0	0**	10	29	2	17	5	15**	
Director of testing	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	
Director of instruction	9	11	3	10	5	11	1	20	6	18	1	8	2	6**	
Other (specify) _____	26	33	10	33	13	29	3	60**	13	38	4	33	9	26	

Researcher Classified Primary Job Descriptions*

<u>Job Reclassification</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Guidance counselor or director with testing responsibilities	27	34
Pupil personnel director	17	21
Director of instruction/curriculum/supervision	14	18
School psychologist	5	6
Assistant superintendent/administrative assistant	5	6
School program evaluation/research office	4	5
Superintendent	4	5
Building principal	4	5
Director of testing	1	1

*Includes respondents checking the "other" category which were reclassification by the researchers

**Significant at the $p < .05$ level

Table 2

Directors' Training: Graduate and Undergraduate Testing Courses Completed, Highest Academic Degree, and Advanced State Certifications Held (N=81)

	<u>District Demographic</u>								<u>District Organization</u>						
	Total		Rural		Suburban		Urban		Exempted						
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	City		Village		Local		
a. Number of Testing Courses Completed															
None	3	4	1	3	2	4	0	0	1	3	2	17	0	0*	
One	11	14	8	27	3	7	0	0*	3	9	1	8	7	19*	
Two	13	16	4	13	8	17	1	20	5	15	3	25	5	14	
Three	18	22	5	17	11	24	2	40*	6	18	3	25	9	25	
Four	16	20	5	17	11	24	0	0	8	24	2	17	6	17	
Five	2	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	8	0	0*	
Six or more	18	22	6	20	10	22	2	40*	9	27	0	0	9	25*	
b. Highest Academic Degrees Held															
Bachelor's degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Master's degree	13	16	5	16	8	17	0	0*	2	6	2	17	9	25*	
Master's plus 15-30	47	57	19	61	25	54	3	60	18	53	8	67	21	58	
Specialist degree	12	15	5	16	6	13	1	20	8	24	1	8	3	8*	
Doctorate degree	10	12	2	6	7	15	1	20*	6	18	1	8	3	8*	
c. Advanced State Certificate Held															
Guidance counselor	38	46	17	55	17	36	4	80*	12	34	5	42	21	58*	
High school															
principalship	28	34	10	32	16	34	2	40	11	31	3	25	14	39	
Elementary															
principalship	19	23	8	26	10	21	1	20	7	20	5	42	7	19*	
Pupil personnel															
services	30	37	6	19	21	45	3	60*	17	49	2	17	11	31*	
Other*	51	62	17	55	32	68	2	40*	27	77	5	42	19	53*	

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

**Other: Superintendency 30 (36%), school psychologist 15 (18%), supervisor of instruction 6 (7%), and other miscellaneous 5 (6%)

Table 3

Directors' Reported Responsibilities Pertaining to Districts' Standardized and Related Testing Programs (N=81)

Testing Responsibilities	District Demographic									District Organization					
	Total		Rural		Suburban		Urban		Exempted						
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	City	Village		Local			
Maintain pupil records	26	32	13	42	12	26	1	20*	7	20	3	25	16	44*	
Selection of tests	73	89	25	81	43	91	5	100	35	100	11	92	27	75	
Ordering tests & materials	71	87	23	74	43	91	5	100	34	97	9	75	28	78	
Scoring of tests	63	77	20	65	39	83	4	80	31	89	7	58	25	69*	
Reporting test results	72	88	25	81	43	91	4	80	32	91	11	92	29	81	
Annual community test reports	50	61	16	52	32	68	2	40*	26	74	9	75	15	42*	
Orientation test proctors	39	48	15	48	19	40	5	100*	20	57	5	42	14	39	
Training teachers score interpretation and use	49	60	18	58	28	60	3	60	22	63	7	58	20	56	
Develop policy testing and scores	49	60	15	48	29	62	5	100*	24	69	6	50	19	53	
Preparation of parental score reports	29	35	9	29	18	38	2	40	15	43	3	25	11	31	
Manage minimum competency testing program	15	55	18	58	24	51	3	60	21	60	7	58	17	47	
College admission testing (ACT/SAT)	19	23	10	32	8	17	1	20	6	17	2	17	11	31*	
Encourage use of test results	54	66	20	65	31	66	3	60	23	66	6	50	25	69	
Other	4	5	2	6	2	4	0	0	1	3	1	8	2	6	

*Significant at the $p < .05$ level

Table 4

Pupil Enrollments (K-12) and Numbers of schools Classified by Demographic Setting and Administrative Organization of the Employing Districts of the Respondents

Pupil Enrollment	<u>District Demographic</u>						<u>District Organization</u>							
	Total		Rural		Suburban		Urban		City		Village		Local	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 1,000	9	11	6	21	3	7	0	0	1	3	1	8	7	21
1,001 - 2,000	27	34	15	52	12	26	0	0	5	14	7	58	15	44
2,001 - 4,000	27	34	8	28	18	39	1	25	16	46	4	11	7	21
4,001 - 6,000	7	9			7	15	0	0	4	11			3	9
6,001 - 8,000	4	5			4	9	0	0	2	6				
8,001 - 10,000	2	3			1	2	1	25	2	6				
10,001 - 15,000	2	3			1	2	1	25	2	6				
15,001 - 20,000	1	1					1	25	1	3				