

JCSEE 2024 Annual Meeting Agenda

November 14-15, 2024

The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University
Ellsworth Hall, Fourth Floor

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by Julie Morrison, 9:30 EST on 11/14/2024

AGENDA: See e-mail message from Julie dated 11/7/2024

PURPOSE: The purpose of the meeting is to convene members for the annual JCSEE meeting focused on updating the workplan for revising the PES, reviewing the JCSEE Operating Procedures, and considerations of the expert review process.

PRESENT:

Julie Morrison (Chair), National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
Art Hernandez (Vice-Chair), American Evaluation Association (AEA)
Brad Watts (Treasurer), The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University (TEC)
Paula Egleston (Executive Committee), Member-at-Large
Juan D'Brot (Secretary), National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME)
Goldie MacDonald, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
Maggie Barber, University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)
Man-Wai Chu, Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE), sit-in Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Effectiveness (CREATE)
Matt Sanscartier, Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) – Virtual (President!)

NOT PRESENT:

Thanos Patelis, American Psychological Association (APA)
Corrie Klinger, Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Effectiveness (CREATE)
Hazel Symonette, Member at Large – Hazel has noted that she will be stepping down from the EC as she can no longer attend meetings.

THURSDAY

1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:** The meeting began at 9:37 Eastern. Each representative introduced themselves, their current position, and the sponsoring organization they represent. Julie is briefly

working through the agenda.

2. REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 2023. Need to identify whether we voted on revising the PES. Note – we recognize we need to do a better job of capturing the procedures that we’re following.
 - a. Goldie noted that there was a missing motion and vote specific to the PES review, item 8.b.
 - b. MOTION: Julie motions to add a letter c. on the top of page 4 to item 8. Julie motions to officially revise the PES.
 - i. Goldie seconds.
 - ii. Art moves to approve.
 - c. VOTE: Unanimous approval.
 - d. Brad is making the revision to the meeting minutes from 2023. He will send out
 - e. MOTION to approve amended minutes by Maggie. Seconded by Art.
 - f. VOTE: Unanimous approval.

3. CHAIR AND HOST ORGANIZATION REPORTS.
 - a. 2024 Financial Review
 - i. There has been a steadily growing balance, but there was a slight decline from 2023-2024. The 2023 annual meeting was expensive due to hotel fees (nearly \$5k) and several member dues outstanding.
 - ii. Art suggested to reach out to former members of the JCSEE to ensure there is enough coverage on the standards from other organizations before they go out to review.
 - iii. Goldie suggested identifying organizations that are particularly interested or focused on program evaluation and consider who could be involved.
 1. Julie – AERA
 2. Maggie - AACT
 3. Paula - Rural Education Association
 4. Tribal Organizations – American Indian Higher Education Consortium
 5. Goldie – American Cancer Association
 6. Art – AALHE Association for Assessment of Learning in Higher Education
 7. Goldie - American Sociological Association
 - b. 2024 Projected Budget
 - i. Based on current revenue and fees, along with declining royalties, the JCSEE will likely face a budget deficit in 2025.
 - ii. Committee revisited the possibility of increasing the dues from \$300 to \$400.
 - iii. MOTION: Art moved to increase dues from \$300 to \$400
 1. Maggie seconded
 2. VOTE:
 - a. Brad – Abstained
 - b. All others voted yes.
 - c. Passed 8 to 1.
 - iv. MOTION ON 2024 BUDGET:
 1. Hold on vote until after discussing PES revision plan.

2. Art suggested an upward bound of the budget, which could lead the committee to reconvene if we exceeded the budget to set a new cap.
 3. Budget context:
 - a. Target validation committee: 6 people @ \$400 stipend/person
 - b. Meeting location for August JCSEE meeting: \$X amount
 4. MOTION: Brad moves to revise the budget based on the need for a validation committee, PES in-person for August, and will then propose a new budget to the JCSEE for vote following the meeting.
 - a. Juan seconds
 - b. Unanimous approval
 5. ACTION ITEM: We decide on the compensation of the honorarium for reviewers as informed by the budget
- c. Dues update
- i. Payment received: AEA, APA, CDC, CES, CSSE
 - ii. Not received: CREATE, NASP, NCME, UCEA
4. PES REVISION: REVIEW JCSEE OPERATING PROCEDURES
- a. PES revision progress
 - i. Julie is describing the level of procedure associated with the PES revision, and how we need to be more concrete in terms of documentation.
 - ii. Review of Timeline to Date
 1. 2023 Annual meeting – Established point people for each of the Standard Domains
 2. March – May 2024: Critical review of the Standards because of the need for more than a refresh
 3. May 2024: In-person review of the critical review of the Standard Statements and descriptions. Currently in rough/incomplete forms
 4. July 2024: Further review on descriptions, definitions, benefits and risks
 5. October 2024: Brad, Art, and Julie presented at AEA and highlighted a small number of the Standard Statements. This identified a couple of holes.
 - iii. Looking Forward – Procedural Next Steps
 1. Finalize official first draft
 2. National and International Review, which require setting criteria for the review and determining the characteristics of the reviewers
 3. Field Test, or application activity and recruit more broadly to determine whether the Standards apply
 4. National Public Hearing
 5. Finalize the Standards
 6. Validation of the Standards
 - iv. Context – the steps in 4.a.iii. are required under ANSI.
 1. Goldie – is there any value in returning to an ANSI set of standards due to its view of being a national accreditation body that elevates the PES
 2. Goldie – The issue is less likely about an accrediting body, but more about following a process that is similar to an accepted accrediting body.

3. Juan - There is also the issue about whether there needs to be a feedback cycle specific to the process itself. There is latitude within each of these steps, but the goal should be to establish procedural validity that has to be followed.
 4. Art – we need to be thinking about this as three things:
 - a. As we are going through the process, we need to formally adopt a process, but that’s a procedural thing, not a policy thing.
 - b. I don’t think we should be appealing to ANSI at all, but we should be inclusive in terms of feedback. Potentially obtaining feedback from the leadership of our respective organizations.
 - c. Monitoring, review, and revision is missing from the process.
 5. Maggie – Do we have the capacity to operationalize the need for review and revision. What do we include in a procedural format, what is the expectation on the JCSEE.
 6. Art – we don’t have to specify how each sponsoring organization operationalizes what is stated in the procedures. But we can define what the operationalization should look like.
 7. Goldie is describing that she will be taking a sabbatical for 14 months to support the standards revision. The only caveat is that it would take a high degree of responsiveness from the other JCSEE member organizations. Goldie is also bringing along 2 fellows and a student researcher.
 8. Art also applied for a sabbatical for 6 months, which would allow him to support the development
 9. Man-Wai took a sabbatical with the hope of focusing on the classroom assessment standards. But that might shift to the PES.
- b. Workplan development and discussion:
- https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1susYtjmXYGLIC7nA7_VS5eZp_15sHcPfZae3KuCa3os/edit?gid=0#gid=0
- i. Maggie – there needs to be revisions to the procedures to expand from national to international viewpoints.
 - ii. ACTION: Goldie will be reaching out to CDC and Fellows and editor to check in on the availability of a DEI editor/inclusivity effort
 1. This falls under 2.2.E.
 - iii. Goldie – What about the analysis of the landscape of other criteria or checklists. At what point does this get put into the standards?
 1. Juan – this feels like it needs to go earlier in the writing and revision process so that it’s not a lot of re-writing.
 2. The timing of the landscape scan should happen after November (depending on what the JCSEE wants to give Goldie’s fellows)
 3. Art – If we want this to be widely adopted, we may not want to do in-text citations. We may need to be honest about how much we did/did not use it.
 4. RECOMMENDATION: we should be stating our stance in terms of principle, not in terms of required practice.
 - iv. RECOMMENDATION: 2.3.2 needs to include using the information from the review.

- v. RECOMMENDATION: We need to make an action plan about who is doing what for outreach within their own respective organizations.
- c. Reviewer Criteria
 - i. Julie has started a list in the PES Revision Work Plan
- d. Outreach issues
 - i. Goldie is suggesting to consider establishing a plan around how we want to develop an outreach plan
 - ii. How do we want to think about a set of communication resources?
 - iii. We spent a significant amount of time talking about the outreach and recruitment email. See document: [PES Reviewer Nomination Outreach Email - Google Docs](#)
 - iv. PROPOSED REVIEWER PLAN
 - 1. Separating reviewers by
 - a. Field testers
 - b. International reviewers
 - 2. Each member will approach their sponsoring organization and with leadership, nominate individuals with a tailored invitation sent to each organization. If they agree, they become reviewers. Target number of reviewers is at least 25.
 - a. We will provide each organization with the criteria for reviewers.
 - 3. JCSEE members will approach targeted organizations who are not currently sponsored organizations and recruit at least 2 individuals to be a potential reviewer
 - 4. Open-ended questions is going to be pushed to row 17, field testers.
 - 5. See PES Revision WorkPlan
 - v. MOTION: Moved by Julie
 - 1. Seconded by Man-Wai
 - 2. Unanimous Approval (9/9)
- e. MOTION: Art moves to motion that Julie is named Chair of the Task Force for PES review
 - i. Maggie seconds
 - ii. VOTE: Unanimous approval

Day 2

- 5. Meeting called to order by Julie at 9:01 a.m.
 - a. Brief overview of the day's focus, including the administrations and operations, classroom assessment standards, and PES revision.
- 6. JCSEE ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS
 - a. Two areas of focus – see Workplan
 - i. Outreach for participating on the JCSEE
 - ii. Outreach for request for reviewers
 - b. Elections
 - i. No one up this year for 2024
 - ii. Juan (Secretary) and Paula up for re-election in 2025
 - iii. Julie elected as chair starting 2024;

- iv. Partial terms
 - 1. Paula filled in for Brad's vacated role, and has stuck with treasurer
- v. MOTION: Julie moves to retain Brad as treasurer (Not kicking out)
 - 1. Seconded by Maggie
 - 2. Unanimous vote yes
- c. Hosting agreement
 - i. Hosting agreement is renewed every 3 years. Generally, we are happy with the support provided by WMU.
 - ii. WMU was host starting in 2022, so next year (2025) we will need to consider who will be the host for 2025.
 - iii. WMU has indicated they are willing to support any promotional materials or outreach. They just need a comms plan and resources to support increasing visibility of the review.
- d. Annual meeting location
 - i. Goal: Hosting agreement is that we return to the host organization once every three years
 - ii. Years – future planning
 - 1. 2024: Kalamazoo meeting
 - 2. 2025 Mid-Year Meeting to work on revisions:
 - a. Location: Kalamazoo
 - b. Dates: Week of August 13-15
 - c. Details: 3 working days; 4 nights.
 - 3. 2025 Annual Meeting
 - a. Location: Potentially Calgary
 - b. Dates: 11/12 – 11/13 (Thursday and Friday)
 - c. Details:
 - 4. 2026 Annual Meeting
 - a. Location: Las Vegas
 - b. Dates: TBD
 - c. Details:
 - 5. 2027
 - a. Location: Kalamazoo
 - b. Dates: TBD
 - c. Details:
 - iii. MOTION: Julie moves to meet the PES revision group in Kalamazoo, annual 2025 meeting in Calgary, and annual meeting in 2026 in Las Vegas, and 2027 at WMU.
 - 1. Second by Maggie
 - 2. VOTE: Unanimous approval

7. CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

- a. Update: Man-Wai noted Corrie is looking into the steps for revision
- b. Process: Man-Wai, many processes because of validation and field testing.
 - i. Concerns about process; this appears to be addressed by our current planning around the PES.
- c. Background and context:

- i. The original Student Evaluation Standards were published in 2003; likely that Arlen Gullicksen led that development. ETS was a co-publisher of those standards. Writing likely began in the very late 90s.
- ii. Caroline Wylie was pulled into the work around 2007 when Carol Dwyer at ETS was retiring and Arlen was starting to talk about the idea of a second edition. Don Klinger and Patty McDivitt were the co-chairs of the second edition, and Caroline was part of the writing committee.
- iii. Caroline wrote up a detailed revision of the first edition from the perspective of formative assessment
- iv. Given that the 2nd edition is already 10 years old (writing was finished in 2013-14) it seems time to start thinking about a 3rd edition
- v. The second edition was a fairly dramatic revision of the standards:
 1. since formative assessment was largely absent from the original standards
 2. to ensure that the standards were clearer about which guidance applied to formative assessment and how it might play out differently for summative classroom assessment
 3. the format and language of the other JCSEE standards did not seem to work as well for classroom assessment/teacher audience
- vi. The 1st edition was renamed to the Classroom Assessment Standards
- vii. The guess is that the 3rd edition would have require less dramatic revisions. Likely Q1 and Q3 (standards titles listed below) are ready for an update given recent field-wide discussions of fairness and equity.
- viii. Standards:
 - 1. Foundations**
 - a. F1 Assessment Purpose
 - b. F2 Learning Expectations
 - c. F3 Assessment Design
 - d. F4 Student Engagement in Assessment
 - e. F5 Assessment Preparation
 - f. F6 Informed Students and Parents/Guardians
 - 2. Use**
 - a. U1 Analysis of Student Performance
 - b. U2 Effective Feedback
 - c. U3 Instructional Follow-Up
 - d. U4 Grades and Summary Comments
 - e. U5 Reporting
 - 3. Quality**
 - a. Q1 Cultural and Linguistic Diversity
 - b. Q2 Exceptionality and Special Ed

- c. Q3 Unbiased and Fair Assessment
- d. Q4 Reliability and Validity
- e. Q5 Reflection

ix. Next Steps:

1. Need to identify the historical approach to contracting and make sure that the JCSEE owns it, and not an individual
2. TO DO:
 - a. Untangling the Kindle contract and who owns what for the Classroom Assessment Standards; Paula is going to see Barbara next week to see where the contract for the CAS stands.
 - b. Identifying legal issues with contracts (connect with WMU as a sponsoring to support legal support)
3. MOTION: Art move to amend the procedures language related to the host organization supporting legal needs on behalf of JCSEE for contracts (incorporate into section 2.9.2).
 - a. Second: Juan D'Brot
 - b. VOTE: Unanimous approval
4. MOTION: Juan moves to table the revision of the CAS and develop a workplan during the annual 2025 meeting and to rediscuss the committee to lead that work.
 - a. Art seconds;
 - b. VOTE: Unanimous approval
5. EXPLORE in 2025:
 - a. How does the CAS, for example, get hosted on the JCSEE website as a static PDF, which then drives traffic to the website
 - b. What about working through an official publisher, where the organization (JCSEE) funds free access to the publication.
 - c. TO DO: Explore the contracting and publication options during the 2025 year.

8. PES REVISION: SMALL GROUP WORK

- a. The Committee is working on the current version of Art's Proprietary section in order to establish a shared understanding of the Domain Statement, Introduction, and the Standards Statement.
- b. Reminder: Notes that were used for guidance:
 - i. Guidelines for Revising the Standard Statements and Descriptions
 1. Standard Statements must be understandable as standalone sentence.
 2. Explicit focus on evaluation quality v. implicit references to quality.

3. Descriptions include (a) defined terms, (b) why important, and (c) benefits or risks relevant to evaluation quality.
 4. Should read as elevator speech on why standard important and needed.
- ii. We are using the following Google drive folder for shared access:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aMQKFS1IMiILBUvsMhwIPa9EDWfbbRgh?usp=drive_link
- c. MOTION (Goldie): Write an article for JMDE on major accomplishments in PES revisions to date
 - i. Second by Man-Wai
 - ii. VOTE: Unanimous Yes

9. NEXT STEPS

- a. PES Writing Next Steps:
 - i. TO DO: By January 10, each lead will have the completed Domain intro and standard statements
 - ii. TO DO: January 24, discuss the official final document draft in a virtual meeting
 - iii. TO DO: Bring it to the larger JCSEE to vote on adoption of each section virtually
 - iv. TO DO: Move on to plain language edit, to follow with a review of the plain language edit to ensure intent still works
 - v. TO DO: Each JCSEE member will approach organizations → we need an agreed upon set of criteria to give to organizations for reviewers.
- b. ACTION: Goldie will be setting up a Qualtrix for expert recruitment (Name, role, etc.)
- c. ACTION: Complete the JCSEE Letter for Recruitment Letter
 - i. Goldie to take this on and send to the larger JCSEE to review on or around 12/10