

JCSEE 2020 Annual Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting (WebEx) – Friday October 2, 2020

Attendees:

Brad Watts -- Chair, WMU (Host)

Julie Morrison -- Vice-Chair, NASP representative, U Cincinnati,

Jen Merriman -- Secretary, Newsela, APA representative

Juan D'Brot -- Executive Committee, NCME representative, Center for Assessment

Katie Cunningham-- Executive Committee, UCEA representative, U of South Carolina

Hazel Symonette -- At large member, UW-Madison

Marla Steinberg-- Canadian Evaluation Society representative, independent eval consultant

Paula Egelson -- Associate Member of JCSEE, SREB

Louis Volante -- CSSE representative

Stacy Leggett -CREATE representative, W Kentucky University

Art Hernandez -- AEA representative, U of Incarnate

Not Present:

Goldie-- CDC representative

Morning Meeting

1. Introductions and welcoming of new representatives
2. Review 2019 minutes
 - a. Motion to approve -- Brad
 - b. Second -- Julie
 - c. Discussion
 - i. Julie suggests we delete references to the attachments where we do not have access to them
 - ii. Marla found the attachments and submitted to Brad
 - d. All approve except Louis who abstained
3. Financial Review and 2021 budget
 - a. Chair Update
 - i. Refund from State of VA
 - ii. APA and NCME need to resubmit checks due to covid
 - iii. Balance total up this year

The JCSEE mission is to develop and promote standards for conducting high-quality evaluations.

- iv. Declining publication revenue
 - 1. We need to evaluate whether the publications are outdated versus whether we need to do a better job publicizing our works versus other organizations working in this space
 - b. Motion to approve -- Marla
 - c. Second - Paula
 - d. All approve except Louis who abstained
- 4. Web site – update on issues last year
 - a. JCSEE.org site was unexpectedly owned by someone external to the joint committee
 - b. We instead are currently using evaluationstandards.org
 - c. Search programs have been updated to point people to the right place
 - d. We should have an archive for which multiple people have access in the cloud
 - i. use dropbox for archive repository
 - ii. google docs for working docs
- 5. Open updates from working groups and sponsoring organizations
 - a. Prince Edwards Island provincial government approached Brad to see if they could use the standards.
 - b. Art: Provide a statement on the website on use so that users can see what an acceptable use is, and if they want to use it beyond that to contact the chair. And perhaps give us a small fee to use of the standards
 - i. Brad -- this is listed on the program eval page but not the others, we can add
 - ii. Marla -- can we make the use allowances more explicit
 - iii. Hazel -- we want to be careful not to put up barriers to use
 - c. We will pick this up again in the afternoon
- 6. Committee roles (discussion and nominations)
 - a. Hazel motion, Marla second -- to continue Brad as Chair and vice chair as Julie
 - b. All approve Brad to continue as Chair except Brad who abstained
 - c. All approve Julie to continue as Vice Chair

Break Between Meetings

Afternoon Meeting (start 2pm)

- 1. Results of committee role voting
- 2. Standards review and renewal discussion
 - a. Personnel Evaluation Standards -- up for review 2021

The JCSEE mission is to develop and promote standards for conducting high-quality evaluations.

- b. Classroom Assessment Standards -- up for review in 2024
- c. Program Evaluation Standards -- up for review 2020
 - i. Paula elicited info in the CREATE 2019 conference regarding the standards
 - 1. New need: digital age is not mentioned (e.g., privacy); suggests small tweaks are needed
 - ii. Brad solicited feedback
 - 1. Interest and knowledge is slipping; age/relevance
 - 2. Format:
 - a. Are there different types of formats we can use at Sage?
 - iii. Julie: we need to adapt for social justice
 - 1. Marla: we likely need a DEI specialist
 - iv. Hazel: Proposes an addendum rather than a revision
 - v. Katie: other formats: Podcasts, websites
 - vi. Funding is needed for revisions
 - 1. Perhaps external groups can serve as external experts to give feedback?
 - 2. Arland may be willing financially support some type of activity on the standards
 - vii. Can we ask a work group to look over the standards to come up with a couple of recommendations?
 - viii. Marla: working group explored different audiences:
 - 1. People taking formal courses
 - 2. People with experience and working in the field
 - ix. Summary of Revision Proposal: We are leading toward revision but far more modest than the 3rd version.
 - 1. focus areas: Not even the standards perhaps, just around:
 - a. digital age; privacy, security
 - b. DEI, social justice/equity, cultural responsiveness
 - i. Who is qualified to conduct evaluations?
 - ii. Need to think about the evaluator
 - iii. Differences in power
 - c. format (less textbook like)
 - d. additional focus on accessible use / dissemination /awareness
 - 2. We will possibly use funding from Arland to review the standards against these 4 areas and make a recommendation for what we need to do (scope and sequence/timeline)
 - a. We would need to put together a document describing our ask to share with Arland
 - x. Process:

The JCSEE mission is to develop and promote standards for conducting high-quality evaluations.

1. A working group of the JCSEE writes up a plan to review the standards to develop a set of recommendations for revision; This is based on a review of the standards as well as any research we have already done
 - a. This needs to be specific about scope, cost, timeline, and deliverables
 2. This review plan (scope, cost, timeline, and deliverables) is then reviewed and approved by full committee
 - a. Funded with Arlan's funds as needed
 3. Once the review is completed, the full committee reviews the results and makes decisions about which, if any, revisions will be made.
 - a. Funding might be needed later for a full Task Force
- xi. Working Group (who will do the review):
1. Who:
 - a. Plan development: Julie, Brad, Marla (can help with planning), Art, Stacy if publication possibility, Paula
 - b. Mostly internal to JCSEE
 - i. JCSEE members should not be paid for this review work?
 - c. Should hire external folks where needed
 - i. need for DEI
 2. What are the questions the working group will answer?
 - a. digital age; privacy, security
 - b. DEI, social justice/equity, cultural responsiveness
 - i. Who is qualified to conduct evaluations?
 - ii. Need to think about the evaluator
 - iii. Differences in power
 - c. format (less textbook like)
 - d. additional focus on accessible use / dissemination /awareness
 3. When: January--working group will come back with their plan
 - a. Working group will meet Oct 21st 12pm est
- xii. Task Force (Does the formal revisions later on)
3. Other business and work group assignments as necessary
 4. Select mid-year meeting times and formats
 5. Reminder on 2021 in-person meeting to be held at WMU/Kalamazoo
 - a. Oct 2 & 3 2021
 6. Adjourn

Post-Meeting

The JCSEE mission is to develop and promote standards for conducting high-quality evaluations.

1. Official votes on PES renewal or updating
2. Finalize dates/times of interim committee and executive committee meetings

Executive Committee Terms

- **Chair: Brad Watts 2017-2020**
- **Vice-Chair: Julie Morris 2017-2020**
- *Secretary:* Jen Merriman 2019-2022
- Juan D'Brot 2019-2022
- Katie Cunningham 2018-2021

JCSEE Standards Schedule

- **Program Evaluation Standards – 2020**
- Personnel Evaluation Standards – 2021
- Classroom Assessment Standards – 2024