

JOINT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Annual Meeting Minutes

October 1, 2021

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by Brad Watts, 9:30 EST on 10/01/2021

AGENDA: See e-mail message from Brad dated 9/30/2021

PURPOSE: The purpose of the meeting is to convene members for the annual JCSEE meeting focused on the review of 2020 meeting minutes, Standards review and approval, discussion on the classroom assessment standards, website updates, and addressing workgroup topics.

PRESENT: IN-PERSON

Kathleen (Katie) Cunningham, University Council for Educational Administrators (UCEA)
Paula Egleston, Member-at-Large
Art Hernandez, American Evaluation Association (AEA) – In-person
Julie Morrison, National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) – In-Person
Brad Watts, The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University (TEC) – In-person

PRESENT: VIRTUAL

Corrie Clinger, Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Effectiveness (CREATE) – Standing in for Stacy Leggett
Juan D’Brot, National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME)
Thanos Patelis, American Psychological Association (APA)
Marla Steinberg, Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) - Virtual

NOT PRESENT:

Louis Volante, Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) - Attended Day 2
Hazel Symonette, Member at-Large – Attended Day 2
Stacy Leggett, Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Effectiveness (CREATE) – Resigned from both CREATE and the JCSEE, she will need to be replaced.
Goldie MacDonald, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

1. APPROVAL OF 2020 MINUTES: Juan motioned to approve minutes, Marla seconded. Committee unanimously approved the minutes.
 - a. DISCUSSION OF MINUTES:
 - i. Marla noted that there were a lot of ideas proposed in the minutes. However, there may be a need to have an accurate record of what we have been able to accomplish. Brad noted that this is an important point, especially to track progress moving forward.
 - ii. Julie suggested we use the current meeting’s minutes to reflect updates to the previous meeting’s minutes.

- iii. Marla suggested that we revisit updating a work plan that identifies who is responsible for what with what timeline.
 - iv. Brad suggested that we also address this during unfinished business, which occurs first thing Day 2.
- b. SUGGESTED ACTION
- i. Include additional time on the second day of the meeting to potentially update a work plan as an appendix to this meeting's minutes.

2. FINANCIAL REVIEW AND 2020 BUDGET

- a. Chair update
- i. The JCSEE is in a better financial position due to reduced meeting expenses, more regular collection of dues, and removal of ANSI standards certification
 - ii. Balance total is up compared to last year
 - iii. Major expenses are associated with 2021 host fees, which must be renewed soon
 - iv. Book royalties continue to exhibit a slow decline, despite Sage revenue being up a little bit over the previous two years. Book royalties are predominantly from the Program Evaluation Standards. Paula raised a question about concentration of purchases regionally and whether a revised version might bump up revenue. No clear answer.
- b. Membership update
- i. Dues have been collected from 7 members this year: AEA, CDC, CES, CSSE, CREATE, NASP, NCME
 - ii. Outstanding dues
 - 1. UCEA
 - 2. AERA (no representative appointed)
 - 3. Inactive members: ACA, AIHEC, CCSO, NEA, NREA, NSBA
 - iii. At-large members are non-dues paying but are welcome to stay involved due to inclusion and interest
 - iv. There was also a brief discussion about reaching out to additional organizations, which might include universities that house an evaluation center
 - 1. From Art:
 - a. International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation
<https://www.ioce.net/>
 - b. National Council of Non-Profits
<https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/tools-resources/evaluation-and-measurement-of-outcomes>
 - 2. From Marla:
 - a. CUEE - Consortium for Universities for Evaluation Education.
<https://evaluationeducation.ca/>
 - b. ISEE - International Society of Evaluation Education.
<https://www.isee-eval.ed.org/>
- c. WMU Hosting Update
- i. Approaching end of 3-year agreement
 - ii. Completed supports included website revision, blogging (recall AEA 365 in Feb 2020), grad students working on standards articles, checklists, and general promotion
 - iii. Outstanding supports: grant application and more regular blogging/promotion
 - iv. Discussion
 - 1. Can the contract be renewed? Brad responded that this is likely the easiest route, but we should consider additional support

2. Art noted that the age of the standards (i.e., 2010) could be an overall barrier to their perceived applicability. It may be worth considering a refresh, rather than a revision.
 3. Paula: it could be important to focus our refresh on security of data, rather than a complete overhaul.
 4. Julie: while we are talking about the standards, we need to think about the role of the host in the process, like pursuing a grant.
 5. Marla: The special edition is a great example of how much work can still be done around the Standards, which could be the focus of a grant.
 6. Art: and then it is important to understand exactly how the host would support the grant.
- d. 2022 Budget Assumptions
- i. Assumptions include constant dues, royalty decline, maintenance of costs, WMU as host, and including an annual in-person meeting.
 - ii. Based on income and expenses, there is a net positive balance of \$2.00.
- e. MOTION
- i. Art – Move to approve the allocations even if the host changes.
 - ii. Paula – Seconds
 - iii. Motion unanimously passes.

3. PERSONNEL STANDARDS REVIEW AND APPROVAL

- a. Background
- i. Last year, put together a working group to review the standards for revision/refreshment considerations
 - ii. There was slated to turn the classroom assessment standards into a physical, publishable book. Brad noted that he occasionally gets emails asking for a physical copy but not a tremendous amount of interest.
- b. Personnel evaluation standards
- i. Last cycle of review included:
 1. 2016 to explore revisions
 2. 2017 to discuss the status of the personnel standards
 3. 2018: personnel evaluation were revisited but no direction determined
 4. 2019-2020: not discussed
 - ii. Discussion
 1. Art: currency is worth considering, given that the last issue was put out in 2009. If we're going to do this, it should broadly consider personnel evaluation and focused at all levels. Not just k-12 but also universities. Not just teachers, but other levels of administrators. Could potentially expand the standards beyond education. Priority should be the content, not the dissemination. That can happen next.
 2. Corrie: In terms of use of standards, Corrie is personally using the standards as a reference point to supplement the use of the Program Evaluation Standards.
 3. Thanos: the timing suggests they are worth revisiting. Second, a couple of the standards may need to be refreshed from a content perspective (e.g., effective reporting vs. functional reporting; biased management and refocusing on fairness and social justice). Third, disappointing that sales are functionally non-existent.
 4. Katie: If they are refreshed, a paper or other session at UCEA would be a great place/fit to share the updates.

5. Art: A refresh could involve other organizations and connections within our own organizations. But if we are advocating for something, we should make sure it's current.
 6. Corrie: There is a possibility that CREATE could serve as a vehicle for supporting dissemination either through a session, publication, or something similar.
 7. Katie: Suggesting that it might be important to focus on an intensive day of work that could be funded by a conference to serve as a vehicle for review: <https://www.aera.net/Education-Research/Education-Research-Conferences-Program>
 8. General discussion about the need to think about how we approach the problem moving forward.
 9. Art: we have to be aware of the potential mission creep, which will require a focused task and intended outcome.
 10. Julie: The JCSEE doesn't have exclusive oversight of the personnel standards, so some type of cross-walk might be an important place to start. The cross-walk could also be part of the introduction, so any revision or refresh could start there.
- iii. Key questions to consider prior to vote
1. Is it practical to focus on this now?
 2. What group would actually take this on in a dedicated fashion?
 3. Goal is to make a decision on revise, revisit, and abandon tomorrow.

Break for lunch – Reconvene at 1:15 Eastern

- c. Classroom assessment standards
- i. Discussion around turning the classroom assessment standards into a print on-demand through Amazon
 1. Thanos: Is it possible to grant access to the standards for free?
 2. Corrie and Don: Could be ways to make it free and still establish revenue through grants or through commercial vendors. Potentially, could also charge states a per-state access to open it to all educators (e.g., \$500 per state).
 3. Don (through Corrie): There are options to reaching out to organizations, private sectors, foundations, and even JCSEE member organizations to fund and promote.
 4. Approximately 43 citations recently
 5. Corrie: Classroom assessment standards do reflect a chunk of the work around cultural responsiveness and social justice
 6. Juan: What about a position paper on behalf of the JCSEE in order to shop around on the
 - ii. Known issues
 1. Potential issues with ownership and need to transfer
 2. Amazon access provides challenges to certain students in universities
 - a. Amazon contractual issues (per Don) appear to be easily transmissible
 - iii. RECOMMENDED ACTION
 1. Table this for now, but there appears to be some support for making the standards freely available based on solicited funding
 2. Establish a position paper task force to shop around the classroom

assessment

iv. MOTION

1. Vote for the committee supporting an investigation of moving the classroom assessment standards into the public domain and explore funding opportunities
2. Juan – motion
3. Brad – second
4. No further discussion
5. Unanimous approval
6. Small group led by Juan, Corrie, and Thanos to draft a position paper outline to present to the larger group on 11/30 @ 2:00 p.m. Eastern

4. MEETING STRUCTURE

a. Discussion

- i. Generally, committee members believe that there is a benefit to being in person
- ii. Katie: there is a benefit to promoting an in-person meeting, but having a hybrid option would allow folks with different perspectives in different locations to also be present
- iii. Paula: A hybrid approach would be beneficial
- iv. Thanos: It would also be important to make sure we can promote the connection among those people who can only join virtually

5. WEBSITE UPDATE

a. Discussion

- i. Brad provided an update on the process to develop a training statement to post materials
- ii. Art suggested that there be space on the page to promote our own membership work. Second, how do we approach outside development? Do we need a sub-committee to review the content of things we would post on the website?
- iii. The committee did a quick review of the February virtual meeting minutes in order to contextualize the discussion around training.
- iv. The committee then briefly reviewed the potential JCSEE disclaimer
- v. Art noted that there is no place that explicitly allows training from any source *outside* of the JCSEE or member organizations.
- vi. Brad noted that it would be surprising to get submissions out of thin air
- vii. The committee discussed exactly what the level of adjudication should be, where Marla reminded the group that during the virtual meeting, we were not trying to restrict the scope of the materials, indicating that the public disclaimer should be wide.
- viii. Juan suggested that the minimum criteria needs to be refined and that the criteria needs to be as inclusive as the disclaimer
- ix. We will revisit this in the work groups (note: this was revisited after the meeting)

6. SPECIAL ISSUE OF THE JOURNAL OF MULTI-DISCIPLINARY EVALUATION

a. Background

- i. Brad provided some background on status of the articles to review (n = 10). He noted that the journal editor would be happy with 6-8 articles to include in a special issue.
- ii. The guest editors
 1. Brad

2. Art
3. Marla
4. Juan
- iii. Reviewers
 1. Katie
 2. Thanos
 3. Julie
 4. Paula
- iv. Submitters
 1. Julie
 2. Paula
 3. Goldie

Break from Day 1; Reconvene on Day 2 at 9:30 a.m. Eastern.

PRESENT: IN-PERSON

Kathleen (Katie) Cunningham, University Council for Educational Administrators (UCEA)
 Paula Egleston, Member-at-Large
 Art Hernandez, American Evaluation Association (AEA) – In-person
 Julie Morrison, National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) – In-Person
 Brad Watts, The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University (TEC) – In-person

PRESENT: VIRTUAL

Juan D’Brot, National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME)
 Thanos Patelis, American Psychological Association (APA)
 Marla Steinberg, Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) – Virtual
 Louis Volante, Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) - Attended Day 2
 Hazel Symonette, Member at-Large – Attended Day 2

7. PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. Discussion

- i. Marla: We do need to refresh the PES, but the question is really how should we do it? Small working group last year morphed into a special issue. We may need to rekindle another working group, and there is some money that could support some development. We likely need to revisit the standards with a lens of social justice and equity.
- ii. Brad: There is general agreement here, but there is a refresh necessary. It may be worth voting directly on the Personnel Evaluation Standards. Brad is proposing that we determine whether we focus on the Personnel and Program standards.
- iii. Julie noted that she saw the cons against trying to revise the standards. We have limited capacity and we should focus on what we’re known for, which is the PES, and that the Personnel Eval standards would be a big task to take on and revise. We are a mighty volunteer group, but the emphasis of the Personnel Evaluation Standards was tied to NCLB and the Bush administration associated with value added models. Other than a call for using multiple measures, it doesn’t spur the same hot topic that it was in the late 1990s. Do we let them sit? Or do we pull them off? She contended that the committee doesn’t have the time and energy to revise

the Personnel Evaluation Standards.

- iv. Paula: Agree with what Julie said, and they were developed during a particular time and it's not our current area of expertise. I would state that the standards should be left as is and we keep it as part of the assessment and program evaluation standards, but not do anything to those standards.
 - v. Juan: Corrie (CREATE) is not online and she should likely be consulted about the work that CREATE might be interested in doing around revisiting the standards.
 - vi. Thanos: I do think that the PES and classroom are the first and second priority, therefore should be the focus of the Joint Committee. The Personnel standards, having been a product of this committee, should be the responsibility of the Committee given its stewardship. So perhaps prioritizing the order of events is important. He feels they should not be abandoned, but a viable strategy would be to keep as is, but put them on the docket to be refreshed at some later point after the PES focus.
 - vii. Juan: Agreed with Thanos and perhaps name that we have made a decision for classroom, need to prioritize PES, and then focus on the review of the personnel.
 - viii. Art: Suggested that we set up a schedule for refresh exercises, and that we organize it into the following
 1. Review and refresh the PES – 18 month
 2. Review and expand classroom assessment standards to include program level outcome assessment and move beyond K-12 – 24 month
 3. Then move forward to personnel evaluation standards, despite that their development started from somewhere specific, and then we can refresh these accordingly – 18 month
 4. Key is that we should focus on refresh, rather than revise.
 - ix. Paula: Agreed with what Art has said, but the bylaws could make this a problem.
 - x. Brad: The initial outreach and research we did is that it's not that the PES statements aren't relevant, but how they're presented, shared, and distributed need to be revised. For example, case studies and formatting. The list may stay the same, but the areas and sub-areas may be refreshed. The personnel evaluation standards may need a larger revision to the statements.
 - xi. Julie: I thought we heard a cross-walk as the focus, as a starting point for a refresh or revision.
 - xii. Hazel: We should prioritize strategic decisions to get folks to use the standards in different ways. If we can get the standards to a place that people can access the language, especially given the difficulty of what it took to get social and cultural language in the most recent revision.
 - xiii. Julie: are there issues with refreshing, as per Paula's question?
 - xiv. Brad: my initial take is that no, it is not a problem.
 - xv. Hazel: Our role is not to *have* to do a revision every 5 years, but rather to review whether a revision is needed. Our role can be to review and that satisfies the bylaws.
 - xvi. Brad: we need to take a vote and there are really only a few options
 1. No revision or refreshment of Personnel at this moment, even though they are dated. We need to revisit
 2. We need to remain focused on the PES
 - xvii. Julie: amend that to say that we don't want to cast off
- b. MOTION (later revised)
- i. Maintain the personnel evaluation standards without revision, at this time, and focus on the PES at this time. Following a 3-5 year work plan, pick up the personnel

for a refresh after focusing on PES and classroom.

1. Hazel: and also to reference other personnel evaluation approaches
 2. Brad: is it better to just say we accept them as is for another 5 years or we're dropping them.
 3. Hazel: can you not have the in-between state where there is a bridge between letting them mold, but also reference guides to action
 4. Brad: investigating if there are other personnel standards out there that we can endorse
 5. Julie: Yes, to Hazel – cross-walk the standards, but potentially later rather than now.
 6. Hazel: it is important to think about how we should be investing our time into something that we are potentially claiming
 7. Thanos: what would it mean to abandon the standards? Delete and strike? What is the implication?
 8. Brad: We would delist them as being an official standard approved by the joint committee. They're barely in publication, and we would remove them from our website and they're no longer approved and promoted by the committee
 9. Hazel: I would hope that you wouldn't remove them, but the notation that you said. Responsible transparency is what I would say.
- c. REVISED MOTION (later revised, again, see below)
- i. Julie: Move to keep personnel evaluation standards in tact as they appear with a footnote for transparency acknowledging that we are past the revision cycle, but we would explore with our sponsoring organizations (specifically CREATE) to engage in a cross-walk to possibly refresh the standards in the future.
 - ii. Hazel: Second. Also, that we acknowledge that the field has changed, and that we want to acknowledge that we need to reflect that change, but given our bandwidth.
 1. Discussion
 - a. Brad: would Julie and Hazel be willing to write a statement for the website. Yes, agreed.
 - b. Thanos: I like the acknowledgement of working with sponsoring organizations to do something. Maybe we are more general than a cross-walk, which is to study the personnel evaluation standards rather than commit to developing a cross-walk.
 - c. Hazel agrees.
 - d. Marla: this speaks to assessing needs to revising the standards. Are we the appropriate group, where we typically think about what's being used, and
 - e. Hazel: Only language I was asking for is holding onto that space, but we shouldn't commit to that cross-walk. We should prioritize being responsibly transparent to be aware of the shift in the field.
 - f. Julie: Marla, were you suggesting that the needs assessment would be to ensure that we address each group of standards and ensure that they are appropriately reflective of the standards.
 - g. Art: a simple statement that standards are under review by the JCSEE, less is more. In terms of what is needed, it would be wise to go back to our member organizations and that no one is particularly vested in any of the standards, before we let go of anything. Last point, one of the things we're talking about is that

we don't know what the outcome is going to be. Obsolescence is a problem. But it may not be changing the content but presenting them in a different way. And also if there are areas that need to be amplified to give voice or weight to key ideas that may have not been as recognizable how we have approached this before. I also think I'm echoing Hazel in that we don't want to start from scratch, but perhaps reorganized.

- h. Hazel: it sounds like we're conflating. One is to put a pin in personnel, and it hasn't had the same scan with culture and context that caused the PES to explode in 2010. We don't have the bandwidth. So we just need to acknowledge that the field has changed but for PES, that's a whole different ball game.
- i. Louis: When it comes to personnel evaluation standards, even if we had the capacity, they wouldn't be used that much. Internationally, they are not used as widely. PES that operate in other jurisdiction, and the issue with personnel standards is not unique to North America. The EU uses the PES (not the NA, but the European) and they don't push the policy value of an equivalent of personnel standards. Not saying we shouldn't do it, but just something to think about.
- iii. One pertaining to the fact that the committee has decided that the personnel evaluation standards remains as is under the joint committee
- iv. Creating of a cross-walk of
- d. RE-REVISED MOTION
 - i. **MOTION: That the joint committee Keep the standards and create a disclaimer to ensure we are being responsibly transparent.**
 - ii. Brad move for a vote
 - 1. Unanimous
 - 2. Appoint: Julie and Hazel to draft disclaimer for approval by the full committee.

8. TERM ON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – KATIE ON UCEA

- a. Katie Cunningham will be replaced by UCEA next year so we need a replacement executive committee member.
- b. Five members are needed for executive board – Brad is calling for volunteers
- c. Brad: Nominated Art
- d. Julie Motions to vote for art
- e. Brad seconds
- f. Vote – Unanimous vote in favor of Art

9. HOSTING AGREEMENT

- a. Background
 - i. Our hosting agreement is up 12/31
 - ii. Brad: Summary was provided yesterday. The only thing they have not yet helped with is a grant to support work. Challenge may have been COVID or difficulty in finding a private non-profit area to do work. If there is a time to ask them for additional things from the group, now would be the time to do it.
 - iii. Katie: It is a good time to revisit grant funding opportunities, and some of this work is super labor intensive, so more active pursuit of a grant
 - iv. Hazel: What's up to vote is to continue, right? I think we should stay with who we

- are and operationalize how to do it better.
 - v. Brad: When we go back to them, need to resign another 3-year contract, is there anything else that we want or need to clarify.
 - vi. Hazel and Brad: Codify something within the role of a grad student who can work on the articles that we submitted.
- b. MOVE
- i. Art - Offer WMU another 3 year contract
 - ii. Julie – Second
 - iii. Vote
 - 1. All approved with Brad abstaining
 - iv. Notes:
 - 1. More explicitly defining the structure for exploring grant funding opportunities

Note: Paula left to catch a flight

10. IN-PERSON MEETINGS

- a. Discussion
- i. We spent some time yesterday to address the meeting location
 - ii. Hazel: How did WU hosting go?
 - 1. Katie It was convenient and easy.
 - iii. Brad: Having done planning, hybrid is more difficult, but we understand the worry about the travel
 - iv. Art: The option is made available upon request to access the meeting virtually. There may be folks who cannot attend because of a conflict, so the responsibility for virtual access and request should be on the requirement of the member. We should continue to require
 - v. Thanos: The bylaws do not reference face-to-face. There shall be at least one meeting a year and the time and venue shall be announced prior.
 - vi. Juan: Should not make it official that we must attend in person, but it is implied.
 - vii. Hazel: it is understood that this is in person
 - viii. Louis: I don't think we want to require F2F as it could constrain quorum for important motions - in the event people can't attend.
 - ix. Juan provided a quick view of the bylaws for review—bylaws reference “venue”
 - x. Hazel: Venue does not say face-to-face, and we need to be mindful of things like CREA. so let's keep it from being a burden on the organizer, and making access remote available.
 - xi. Louis: keep in mind that Kalamazoo is not the easiest place to get to. But the goal should be to not constrain ourselves.
 - xii. Marla: Alexandria, VA was also good.
 - xiii. Brad: Also need to think about the days.
 - 1. Hazel: preference for sat and sun
 - 2. Marla: sat/sun
 - 3. Julie: sat/sun
 - xiv. Julie
 - 1. In addition to las vegas, san Antonio is also possible, which could include a free of charge stay.
 - 2. Also discussed New Orleans, cheap like vegas
 - 3. D.C./Alexandria, VA – appeal could be office one day at AERA or one of our sponsoring organizations (AEA and AERA)

- 4. Art: Need to confirm that we have the space, to ensure the space is free
- xv. Louis suggested to establish a rank order for us to identify top choices and work our way down the list
- b. VOTE ON DAYS OF WEEK
 - i. 71% selected Friday/Saturday
 - ii. 29% selected Saturday/Sunday
- c. VOTE ON LOCATION
 - i. Top 3:
 - 1. Washington, D.C.,
 - 2. Denver,
 - 3. San Antonio
 - 4. Las Vegas
 - ii. Top 2
 - 1. Vega
 - 2. D.C.
 - iii. Investigating Washington D.C. and Vegas.
- d. VOTE ON DATES
 - i. October 7-8, 2022.

MEETING ADJOURNED @ 12:07 Eastern