

MINUTES
Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting
The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
The Evaluation Center - Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI
September 25-27, 2003

Attendees: **Joint Committee members**

Edith Beatty (ASCD)
Rolf Blank (CCSSO)
Flora Caruthers (NLPES)
James Cullen (CES)
Paula Egelson (CREATE)
Leslie Fritz (NEA)
Arlen Gullickson, Chair (At large)
Patricia McDivitt (ACA)
Dianna Newman (AEA)
Raymond Pecheone (AERA)
Todd Rogers (At large)
Lyn Shulha (CSSE)
Gary Wegenke (AASA)
Donald Yarbrough (NCME)

Guests

Placido Garcia
Daniel Stufflebeam (Thursday afternoon only)
Mary Yakimowski (CGCS)

Joint Committee Staff

Dale Farland
Sally Veeder, Secretary

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25

The meeting opened at 1:40 p.m. with a welcome by Arlen Gullickson, chair. Attendees introduced themselves to the group.

The agenda was reviewed and revised, moving the approval of the 2003-04 action plan from Saturday afternoon to Friday morning after the elections.

Yarbrough/Shulha moved/seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

The group was asked to review the 2002 meeting minutes. A few corrections were made.

Beatty/Shulha moved/seconded that the corrected 2002 minutes be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Sally Veeder presented the financial report. The total dollars available (checking account and money market account) were \$4,331.99. Encumbered expenses for the upcoming year were

estimated at \$11,586.92. Additional expenses that were not included in the report were costs for the meeting, Todd Rogers' task force expenses, and upcoming validation panel expenses.

Yarbrough/Yakimowski moved/seconded that the financial report be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Arlen Gullickson provided his annual report. His PowerPoint presentation covered the following topics:

- Meeting Objectives
- Review - Basis for the JCSEE
- Current Status
- Standards Development - Program
- Standards Development - Personnel
- Standards Development - Student
- Standards Sales in 2002-2003
- Total Book Sales
- Significant Joint Committee Activities in 2002-2003
- Executive Committee Activities
- Pending Actions
- Pending Issues & Opportunities
- Working Strategy
- JC Members - Expectations
- Task Forces
- Working Group Membership

Attendees were asked to look at the description of sponsoring organizations in the bylaws (p. 9). The bylaws indicate that sponsoring organizations will reflect a balance between two perspectives: Perspective A (technical) and Perspective B (practitioner). Dr. Gullickson asked attendees to read that section of the bylaws, look at the handout that listed perspectives for each sponsoring organization, and give any corrections to Sally Veeder.

In many cases, it is hard to decide an organization's perspective. When asked if we could indicate that an organization represented a primary perspective, but also has a secondary perspective, Dr. Gullickson emphasized that ANSI looks for a balance among the membership between technical and practitioner.

Daniel Stufflebeam provided a history of the Joint Committee, which began in 1975 with four organizations. Egon Guba noted that those being evaluated—schools and teachers—were not represented on the Committee. George Madaus said that unions also needed to be represented. The group decided that the Committee should have parity of those who evaluate and those who are evaluated. The Joint Committee wanted to do a better job of developing standards than APA, AERA, and NCME.

Stufflebeam suggested that the Joint Committee, not ANSI, should determine the balance of its members. Initially, JCSEE members were not representatives of organizations, but were representatives of a perspective.

Gullickson pointed out that ANSI reviews the JCSEE every five years to determine if the Committee lives up to its procedures and whether or not it is balanced between technical and

practitioner perspectives. Sponsoring organizations (1) identify a person to represent the organization and (2) determine the term of office, although NCME does not formally endorse the Joint Committee's work.

Shulha thought the use of the word *practitioner* was troublesome and suggested that *user* would be better. However, the JCSEE bylaws use the term *practitioner*.

Dale Farland read from an ANSI document the organization's position on balance.

Jim Cullen thanked Gullickson for his report. He said he found it very encouraging and well done, especially in the spirit of what the JCSEE tried to do last year. Gullickson responded that he often hears how useful the standards are. Dan Stufflebeam really oriented The Evaluation Center work around the standards, and substantial work on standards is going on in other places as well.

Personnel Evaluation Task Force Report (Rogers)

Eight people agreed to serve on the personnel evaluation standards task force: Peter Airasian (Boston College), Joyce Annunziata (retired, Miami-Dade County Public Schools), Jane Davidson (The Evaluation Center), Barbara Howard (SERVE), Don Klinger (Queens University, Kingston, Ontario), Jean Miller (Council of Chief State School Officers), Tarrell Portman (University of Iowa), and Ann Marie Ryan (Michigan State University).

To date, 11 standards have been revised: the 3 Feasibility standards and 8 Accuracy standards. The Legal Viability standard was moved from the Feasibility section to the Propriety section.

Two Propriety standards and two Utility standards have been written, but the task force had questions as to whether or not the standards should be written for an expanded audience. The task force members had difficulty with some of the cases when standards were expanded to fields other than education, especially in the Propriety and Utility sections, mainly because of the laws involving other groups.

Dianna Newman asked Rogers to explain the pluses and minuses of expanding the standards, and Don Yarbrough asked about the issues the task force members were dealing with. A serious problem the group is dealing with is that they have never met face to face as a group. Rogers has met only two task force members—one because he traveled to Lansing, Michigan, to meet Ann Marie Ryan when he was at The Evaluation Center for the MTS Summer Institute. He reported that it is critical for the group to meet together to work through the issues. He said, "E-mail does not work for everything."

Rogers asked for guidance from the JCSEE.

Stufflebeam pointed out that the Joint Committee's mission statement refers to education. However, the standards have applicability in areas outside education and could be applied wherever education occurs: business, police departments, the military. Yarbrough pointed out that the group had a similar problem when the student evaluation standards were developed: K-12 vs. higher education. The addition of higher education diluted the cases that could be included.

Stufflebeam suggested that the task force get the best draft standards it can get. One person has to do the writing; otherwise, the document will not be coherent.

Newman suggested that the task force try to find a middle ground, indicating that we recognize that there are personnel issues pertaining to “education outside of regular education.”

Yarbrough asked for clarification that the issue is not with the standard statements, caveats, or rationale. Rogers responded that the introduction has several references to industry and manufacturing and that the rationales had to be expanded. Most of the language changes came in the case studies.

Yarbrough thought that we probably need two books: one for education and one for fields outside education. Perhaps the task force could add a chapter, citing other applications that we know about, leaving it to users to apply the standards. Stufflebeam encouraged the Committee to support a task force to develop a derivative document that would apply to other groups.

Lyn Shulha suggested that the task force identify audiences it is thinking about and make a statement that the book is geared primarily to those groups or at least differentiate to the reader what is available.

Yarbrough said he was thinking about audiences and sales at the same time. He was skeptical that administrators and teachers would resonate to case studies that had business, industry, and military references; and business, industry, and the military probably would not want to use a book that was meant for education.

Jim Cullen noted the huge focus on lifelong learning in Quebec. The Canadian Evaluation Society recently completed a major study of what it is to be an evaluator. He thought it would be presumptuous to develop a product for other fields unless the cases are extremely interesting. Rogers responded that he thinks JCSEE will reach a bigger audience if people like Jane Davidson are on the task force. He said that industrial organization people were purposely added to the task force for their input, but he asked for some clear direction as to what Committee members thought about the revision, which must be completed by 2006.

After continued discussion, Rogers said that to do the job right, maybe we should stay with the format of the first book, add the Legal Viability standard, and keep education training. Writing a second book would not be easy, but the case studies developed by the task force could be a start.

Newman suggested adding supplementary cases at the end of the book. This would allow us to collect reactions that would be beneficial when we look at the book again in five years. JCSEE should consider broader issues where we may need the option of putting supplemental cases in each of the three books. Patty McDivitt leaned more toward a supplemental publication targeted specifically to a certain group. She thought the Committee should leave the personnel evaluation standards book only for education.

Gary Wegenke said that people in educational leadership are constantly looking for standards. JCSEE standards are useful because they are focused on evaluation, which allows people to apply cases using the lens of evaluation. Looking at the book through whatever lens is what makes the cases exciting. We could minimize the impact of the book if we try to be all things to all people. He suggested staying with what we know best.

Gullickson said he was hearing from the group that the task force charged with revising the personnel evaluation standards should keep the case examples within education. He asked that someone make a motion or nod agreement with his statement. Everyone nodded agreement. Rogers said he had enough information to move ahead, but thought the same issue will come up again. The 1988 publication has been used successfully in noneducation settings. He suggested looking at the JCSEE's mission and deciding how wide the Committee is willing to go. He requested that the group make a motion. Gullickson asked everyone to think about it; a vote would be taken later that day or the next.

Program Evaluation Task Force Planning (Yarbrough)

The Committee would vote on Friday as to whether or not to go forward with revising the program evaluation standards. ANSI requires reapproval every five years; the maximum number of years a standard can be approved without revision is ten years. The 2002 JCSEE minutes indicated that a task force was to "do the development work based on a precise, detailed task description provided by the Joint Committee." Yarbrough's understanding was that a group would work on that charge on Saturday morning. Once the task force is given the charge, it will go forward with the work.

He asked that Committee members be thinking about what some of their sponsoring organizations would like to see in this revision.

Placido Garcia joined the group at this time. Gullickson introduced him, telling JCSEE members that Garcia had volunteered to help us think about funding matters. He will work with us for a couple of days. Garcia then told the group a little about his background (director of a legislative study committee for 19 years; president of MPG Company; owner of a small community bank; manages a cattle ranch).

Student Evaluation Standards Certification and Dissemination (Gullickson, McDivitt)

Last year, before the book was published, Corwin Press provided a preliminary launch of *The Student Evaluation Standards* through exhibits at conferences. Faye Zucker would send out a list of conferences where Corwin would exhibit; Patty would then send a proposal to present. ETS copublished the book with Corwin and launched it at a conference in Washington, DC, in February 2003. McDivitt presented the student evaluation standards at the meetings of the American Counseling Association in March and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in June. Teachers wanted to take the presentation down a different road—more toward content areas. For instance, how do the student standards fit with the NCTM and NCTE standards? How does this all work with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and student testing? Both conferences were well attended.

Gullickson reported that Lori Wingate (The Evaluation Center) had analyzed the NBPTS standards and sent her analysis to NBPTS. Gullickson and McDivitt had not heard from NBPTS.

Corwin will exhibit at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in February 2004 and at NBPTS in November 2003. McDivitt submitted proposals for both. Other spring 2004 conferences are confirmed: ATE, NAESP, and NASSP. Corwin may present at other conferences as well, e.g., AERA, ASCD, CEC, and the International Reading Association. The

NCTM past president showed a lot of interest in the standards. Perhaps JCSEE should create a second document that would lean toward the curriculum side. The facilitator's guide is more teacher friendly. It looks like something you could do in the classroom with teachers.

McDivitt said she is not sure of the relationship of the student standards to the curriculum association, which has lots of marketing tools, including a Web site, a comprehensive catalog, and a guide entitled *Titles That are Interesting to Educators*. Assessment is now being included in curriculum brochures.

JCSEE Member Reports on Joint Committee-Related Work 2002-2003

Cullen mentioned that the CES conference had good cooperation from Corwin, and attendees showed interest.

JC members were asked to provide a brief note to be published on the Web site each time they engage in a professional activity that deals with the standards and the JC's work.

Edith Beatty reported making some headway with ASCD. Flora Caruthers reported that NLPES' fall training session was to be held in Lansing, Michigan, in October 2003. Jim Sanders will be the keynote speaker, and there will be a poster session on the program standards. Cullen reported that there was a panel discussion at the CES meeting in Vancouver. Fifteen people attended. The CES Web site mentions the standards and also lists the names of people on the validation panel and review panels. Leslie Fritz reported that NEA is working to provide materials to its members regarding ESEA. Glen Cutlip has directed people to the JCSEE's work.

Newman reported that AEA has been very active in terms of looking at the JCSEE standards. A diversity committee had multiple sessions to consider the standards, and a subcommittee of the diversity committee has looked at the standards in depth. In addition, a town hall meeting was held. Newman presented to the AERA SIG on research on evaluation and shared what is going on with the standards. She has made 8-10 presentations in the last 6-10 months, discussing use of the standards and letting people know that *The Student Evaluation Standards* are available. Higher education institutions are undergoing accreditation, so these three sets of standards are timely in relation to that work, an area where JCSEE should continue working.

Shulha said that Rogers makes sure everyone knows about JCSEE work. He suggested standards for Canada. Wegenke reported that AASA members have copies of *The Student Evaluation Standards*; committees have copies of the book and/or know about them. He will present to the Michigan School Boards Association annual meeting. Yarbrough said that 4-5 years ago NCME was concerned to the point that Sanders, Gullickson, and he explained how the student evaluation standards are different from the testing standards. At the last board meeting, Yarbrough showed the book and was pleased with the feedback. One concern: how to get the book in the hands of teachers. A graduate student in Iowa is writing his dissertation on how to deliver information about the student standards to teachers in a way that results in actual use. So far, proposals to use NCLB money to assure teachers are using the standards have not been funded.

Gullickson pointed out that one of the most important things is to take the standards book to government bodies and tell them "This is something the organization needs to know about." JCSEE members also need to make presentations to their member organizations. A

PowerPoint presentation can be found on the JCSEE Web site. He reminded JCSEE members that they should not hesitate to ask for help.

Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

A dessert reception was held at the Gullickson home at 7:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2003

The meeting began at 8 a.m.; Paula Egelson joined the meeting and was introduced to the group.

Gullickson reiterated that during today's meeting the group had to decide whether to revise the program evaluation standards. He also announced Todd Rogers' resignation from the Joint Committee. Rogers has served as vice chair of the Committee and as leader of the task force to revise the personnel evaluation standards. In addition, Don Yarbrough was completing his second term as a member of the JCSEE Executive Committee. According to the bylaws, a person can be reelected to the Executive Committee only once.

Gullickson suggested that the group look for a replacement for Yarbrough on the Executive Committee and elect him as vice chair.

Discussion turned to choosing a date for the next annual meeting. Traditionally, the meeting has been held during the last week in September.

Newman/Yakimowski moved/seconded that next year's annual meeting be held on September 23-25, 2004. The motion passed unanimously. The venue will be decided later, pending available funds.

Post Hoc Approval of The Student Evaluation Standards Facilitator's Guide

Cullen described the guide as a great starting point, a considerable improvement over the first edition. He suggested we consider the guide as a "test" and see how it works for people. Egelson thought Wingate did a great job and appreciated Lori's spending a day in North Carolina.

In response to a question, Gullickson explained that Wingate gets editorial credit, but the revenues come to the Joint Committee. Our contract with Corwin is the same for the guide as it is for the book: The JCSEE royalties are 15 percent of sales. We do not expect a large number of guides to be sold. It was intended to increase the sale and use of the student standards. Many of the materials in the guide can be photocopied and used, and Newman wondered if there was anything in the guide that prohibited copyright infringement. The copyright statement is on page ii and spells out what can and cannot be used and by whom.

Yakimowski suggested that the guide is marketable right now, tying the student standards to NCLB. Gullickson strongly encouraged use of the guide, asking JCSEE members to take it to people in their organizations.

Suggestions for changes in the guide should be sent to Lori Wingate at The Evaluation Center.

Yarbrough/McDivitt moved/seconded that the Joint Committee approve the *Facilitator's Guide to The Student Evaluation Standards*. The motion passed unanimously.

Caruthers suggested that a similar facilitator's guide would be useful to use with *The Program Evaluation Standards*.

Approve Initiation of Work to Revise Program Evaluation Standards

ANSI staff indicated that the program evaluation standards should be revised, since ANSI approval will be continued only through 2005. If we start now, we may be able to get the set of revised standards to a publisher by 2005.

Caruthers wondered what the implications were if the ANSI approval expires. Gullickson responded that one key element is that ANSI helps the JCSEE stay on task with the issues before it. For example, there are concerns about diversity. Much has been learned in the past 10 years that is not reflected in the current version of the program standards. If we continue to use the standards without revision, they become out of date.

Beatty/Caruthers moved/seconded that the Joint Committee approve initiation of the work to revise the program evaluation standards.

Discussion followed the motion.

McDivitt pointed out that many standards documents are now available. The ANSI process lends itself to being more valid, because we have to indicate who was involved and why standards were written. Beatty remarked that a revision would build on a firm foundation.

Newman pointed out that while ANSI approval is important, it is vital that JCSEE rework the document because members believe it should be reworked—not because an outside force says it needs to be reworked. AEA has taken an in-depth look at the document in the last two years; it has gone beyond the work of the dissemination committee. People who don't even know about the Joint Committee are very much aware of the standards and think they are important, but outdated. The standards as now written do not meet the criteria of cultural diversity. The AEA diversity committee really wants to see the program standards revised and has a 100-page, single-spaced document indicating where revisions should take place.

Yarbrough said he thought AEA's work was exemplary. Reports from other organizations would be helpful to the task force.

Cullen reported that the Canadian Evaluation Society has conducted a major study on the core body of knowledge and promotion of program evaluation. The study received worldwide input, and he would encourage and be willing to work on a revision of the program standards.

Newman questioned when a revised version of the program standards would be ready for approval by the JCSEE. Farland responded that ANSI approval expires on March 15, 2004. It does not have provision to ratify beyond ten years.

Yarbrough said it is conceivable to have the revision finished by 2005. The program evaluation standards have been used effectively by people who are familiar with them, and it shouldn't be a big problem to find people willing to work on the task force. Rogers indicated that the personnel

evaluation standards revision should be completed by September 2005, including national and international reviews and field studies. He suggested that the JCSEE approve the motion and that Yarbrough should work out a time line to meet the ANSI criteria. We may have a period of time where we have standards that are not approved by ANSI.

Gullickson pointed out that there is nothing in the operating procedures about revising two sets of standards at the same time. The process we have followed in the past is to have field trials and national hearings. The input gained from these is used to make final revisions. ANSI wants the revision process to be fairly efficient rather than extending over a long period of time. People lose interest when the process is spread out over too long a period.

Yarbrough suggested that nominees who do not have the time to serve on the task force should be asked to serve on a review panel. He will be attending an evaluation society meeting in Germany in November 2003 and will also try to make contact with European evaluation groups as well as those in Turkey, Africa, and Russia. CES used the Internet and other resources to recruit people for its study. Cullen will put Yarbrough in contact with a person who might be able to help. Caruthers pointed out that AEA has international members who might be willing to help.

Newman strongly supported the revision effort. She pointed out that the required national hearings should be scheduled from Fall 2004 to Spring 2005 in order to "hit" the constituencies.

The motion to initiate the work to revised the program evaluation standards passed unanimously.

Overarching Committees' Study and Development of Action Plans

Gullickson pointed out that he had assigned attendees to committees to work on specific tasks during the meeting. Each group was asked to create a brochure or a briefing paper.

Standards Development (Rogers*, Cullen, Farland) - JCSEE needs to look at standards development and construct a framework that deals with all standards development in general.

Standards Dissemination (Egelson*, Caruthers, Fritz) - How do we get the standards out and provide training and certification? Should we create facilitators' guides to get materials out and used in effective ways? Should we work with CREATE?

Standards Research (Yarbrough*, Pecheone, Shulha, [Stufflebeam]) - How should/can we work in this area?

Funding (Business Plan) (McDivitt*, Blank, Wegenke, [Garcia]) - JCSEE needs to be more responsive to the financial needs of the Committee to make sure we remain fiscally solvent. Garcia volunteered to work with us on this matter.

Diversity (Newman*, Beatty, Yakimowski) - We need to be more responsive in our publications and on our Committee. This committee can benefit from AEA's work and Newman's involvement in that.

At 9:45 a.m. the Committee broke into working groups. Each group was provided with space to work and a computer.

Rolf Blank and Ray Pecheone joined the group when it reconvened at 3:10 p.m., introduced themselves, and gave some background on their work and expertise.

Reports From Overarching Committees

Funding committee (Blank, Garcia, McDivitt*, Wegenke). McDivitt reported that the committee thought it imperative that JCSEE solicit funds. Key funding sources need to be identified, with letters of inquiry sent to potential funders. A program description should be developed.

JCSEE should focus more on the long-term strategy. One suggestion was to establish an endowment for The Evaluation Center and the Joint Committee.

Yarbrough wondered if the committee had a plan to implement the strategy. (Work through Western Michigan University [WMU]). Caruthers asked about the relationship with WMU. (Work through WMU to obtain funds earmarked for use by The Evaluation Center [EC]). Yarbrough: It is difficult to separate EC from JCSEE; working with a foundation would get much more difficult. How would EC make sure the JC would benefit? (Charge forward. Involve the University counsel. We may end up with benefactors.)

Wegenke said the EC has a history, "friends of the EC." Perhaps the EC could become involved with the United Way.

Yarbrough suggested that the committee should find out about the WMU Foundation's rules. We would need to develop something official that would "court" donors.

Blank said this suggestion is based on the idea that it would be a way to recognize that evaluation is a key thing that is happening. Both the EC and JCSEE have extensive networks that want evaluation to continue. We should hold up what has happened already. We need to make a connection between JCSEE and WMU.

Standards development (Cullen, Farland, Rogers*). Rogers reported that this committee worked under the assumption that JCSEE will not develop a new set of standards. Cullen and Farland looked at the operating procedures. Task forces should free up community members to look at research, training, and dissemination (clearinghouse). Rogers has developed a time line for revising the personnel standards. The task force will determine if the personnel evaluation standards are ready. Yarbrough interjected that JCSEE members should be able to read and provide input, just like a national reviewer. The Executive Committee did not deal very well with the development of the facilitator's guide. JCSEE members did not have the opportunity to read it before it went to the publisher.

Gullickson pointed out that this task force is responsible for getting reviewers from organizations and for pushing reviews and field trials.

Cullen asked if the JCSEE sees itself as only making revisions. He suggestion that the JCSEE should consider the whole question. Perhaps this group would want to set standards with a different group (collaborators). Yakimowski wondered at what point JCSEE collaborates with

other organizations. Gullickson responded that Corwin press searched for copublishers. ETS was interested, as was ASCD. ASCD later declined. JCSEE has the right to go with whatever publisher it wants.

Rogers said he is uncomfortable with ETS being a copublisher. That decision should not have been made by Corwin. JCSEE ought to visit the role of the publisher or copublisher. Yarbrough responded that the Executive Committee reviewed the contract. He took it to some colleagues, none of whom raised the issue of a copublisher. We could insert that stipulation into a contract. Caruthers wondered about the significance of having ETS as a copublisher of the book. It has a very good reputation. How does that take away from JCSEE? Yarbrough responded that ETS gets free publicity by copublishing, but it may add a negative image to the book because it is involved with standardized testing.

Cullen said that the EC checklist site is a profound piece. He suggested that it should be a requirement that the task forces develop or use checklists that are on the Web.

Standards research (Pecheone, Shulha, Stufflebeam, Yarbrough*). Yarbrough reported that Shulha will chair the overarching committee for the coming year. The group recommended that this committee become a standing subcommittee because of the things that need to be dealt with. The committee distributed a handout entitled "Possible Strategies," which suggested preparing and advertising a new link on the JCSEE Web page: Research Opportunities. This link might contain the JCSEE's research mission, information about the New Scholar Award (\$100), resources and publications, a call for research proposals, and opportunities for conference presentations.

Other suggestions were to create a small editorial board to review submitted research; submit proposals for funding to further the research agenda; solicit research proposals and studies; and advertise the JCSEE Web address on sponsors' electronic mailing lists, newsletters, and Web pages. Shulha said that lots of people are looking for things to think deeply about; perhaps this committee could encourage young scholars to look at the JCSEE's work and give us feedback. Perhaps someone on the JCSEE could submit proposals to AEA and AERA, for example, and involve the young scholars. This would be one way to get new people interested in our work.

Gullickson said that Evaluation Center staff will help organizations put items on the Web. He asked what should be shared on the Web and in what format?

Yarbrough stressed that no standards revision should go forward without a research document that provides up-to-date research on the standards. Any suggestions for this subcommittee should be sent to Lyn Shulha. Her name will be added to the Joint Committee (Evaluation Center) Web site.

Standards dissemination (Caruthers, Egelson*, Fritz). This work group supported the continuing existence of this committee for the upcoming year. They provided a handout that described an action plan for the coming year. The JCSEE may want to add facilitators' guides for the program evaluation standards and the personnel evaluation standards. The committee's suggestions go beyond what a voluntary group can do. JCSEE members need to keep in mind that there are other audiences besides education. We need to prioritize which audiences we want to target; there are probably some that we have not thought about.

Caruthers suggested that JCSEE should explain how a book geared to education could be used by other groups.

Joint Committee members should disseminate JCSEE materials to their own organizations and colleagues. Standards books should be available for sale at conferences and meetings. Egelson suggested that JCSEE might have a speaker's bureau, and Cullen said every new member should receive information about the Joint Committee. Linking with the sponsoring organizations is a starting point, and we should get links on search engines such as Google.

Yarbrough pointed out that we do not have a good body of research on dissemination, and it will be different for each set of standards. Research could inform JCSEE policy.

JCSEE might be well served to consider using each organization's Web site, newsletter, and/or journal to inform readers about the availability of the standards. Bite-sized bullets would work well. Blank said he could put such information on CCSSO's Web site. Yakimowski suggested that a summary of the 2003 meeting that talks about the standards books should be made available to JCSEE members for addition to their organizations' Web sites.

Diversity (Beatty, Newman*, Yakimowski). The committee recommended that this working group become a standing committee of the JCSEE and that JCSEE “. . . continue to embrace and expand upon its efforts to achieve diversity across all aspects including organizational structure, processes, and products.” This group thought that a member of the Executive Committee should be assigned to monitor diversity. This may require a change to the bylaws.

The group went back to JCSEE's mission statement and encouraged the group to embrace and expand upon its diversity efforts in relation to the organizational structure, process, and its products.

In addition, the JC should prepare (1) a communication to AEA (it could be made available to other organizations) and (2) a position paper detailing JCSEE's position on diversity. The bylaws and operating procedures should be reviewed to be sure that diversity is adequately represented. It was also suggested that the Joint Committee take immediate, proactive steps to achieve diversity in terms of organizations who sponsor its work and in terms of members who serve, have leadership, and in all steps of standards development. Diversity is more than the demographic characteristics that are represented by organizations and people who serve. It is important that the JCSEE go beyond this.

Shulha commented that she didn't know what particular diversity characteristics need to be addressed. Perhaps JCSEE and AEA could work together on this issue. Newman responded that someone on the Executive Committee could work with task force chairs to see that diverse reviewers are included on the review panels. Yakimowski suggested that this Executive Committee member could make annual reports, similar to the financial report.

Newman asked if JCSEE had ever included a subsection in any publication that documented the steps we underwent to make sure diversity was considered. Yarbrough thought it should be added to the Introductions and highlighted in other areas.

The group decided to work until 6:15 p.m. so that the committees could work on motions that would be voted on the next morning.

Yarbrough/McDivitt moved/seconded that the scope of the current *Personnel Evaluation Standards* revision be focused primarily on educational training and personnel, regardless of context, with extension to other groups at the time of the next revision (3rd edition) and that the Joint Committee facilitate research on how best to expand the constituency for *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* at the next revision. The motion passed unanimously.

In discussing the motion, Rogers pointed out that the Propriety section is the set with problems. Newman reminded the group that time lines would have to be addressed. Yarbrough said that the task force should come out with some statement/directive about the difficulties being encountered, what we need to think about to jump start the next revision.

Fritz said the challenge is to have the capacity to adequately disseminate what JCSEE has done to this point, describe the state of the education theme at this point, and to do everything possible to get the standards out there and put to the best use.

Yarbrough/Fritz moved/seconded that the Vice Chair of the Joint Committee be charged with oversight of and reporting the efforts of the Joint Committee to respond positively to issues regarding diversity.

Pecheone asked if the charge to the vice chair is to report on any effort made by this Committee, no matter how big or small? Are we trying to ensure that the issue of diversity is in the foreground of everything we do? Caruthers wondered how we will measure whether or not the vice chair has carried out this task.

Yarbrough responded that we are at a point where the JC needs a structured mechanism on the issues of diversity, and at least one elected officer should be responsible for oversight. He said nothing will happen if we don't have a structure and someone in place to see that the suggestions of JCSEE members are carried out. The membership of this committee is one of the issues that has to be dealt with—we need ethnic and perspectives diversity. The vice chair can help with bringing new people to the Committee and share in recruiting activities.

Fritz/Shulha suggested/supported that the motion be tabled and that the diversity subcommittee be asked to develop a motion.

Beatty pointed out that diversity has always been an issue. It is much larger than just membership on the JCSEE. It is wonderful that the vice chair will spearhead the work of the subcommittee.

Fritz pointed out that the motion is vague and didn't list any special set of recommendations or concerns. Pecheone asked how diversity was being defined.

Rogers said that JCSEE has been buffeted by AEA's formally creating a task force to report at its next meeting. There is no quick fix.

Yarbrough said he was responding to the validation panel's charge and that he would have to leave this meeting without a clear action step.

Yarbrough/Fritz withdrew their motions.

Newman/Yarbrough moved/seconded that a diversity task force be created and that its assigned duties be as follows:

- development of a position paper on the Joint Committee’s position on diversity**
- review of the bylaws, principles, and operating procedures to determine areas in which diversity should be addressed**
- development of steps to achieve diversity on and within the Joint Committee in terms of the organizations, individuals, leadership, task forces, and all steps of standards development**
- communication with organizations, requesting feedback on the Joint Committee’s position on diversity; furthermore, that a member of the executive committee serve on this task force**

Yakimowski asked what the accountability measures would be to be sure that the work gets done. Gullickson responded that the executive committee member should report at the next annual meeting.

The position paper would speak to communication. JCSEE representatives should respond to their organizations’ questions.

The phrase on communication was struck, followed by withdrawal of the motion.

Fritz/Yarbrough moved/seconded that everyone is supposed to communicate to their organizations that this group (JCSEE) has taken action to create a task force, develop a position paper, recommend appropriate changes, address the makeup of the Joint Committee and the process of developing standards. JCSEE is not offering any conclusions about where it will end up; diversity is an issue now being addressed and its components are being addressed. The motion carried unanimously.

Shulha/Newman moved/seconded that the Joint Committee chair create a research task force to work with the executive committee to further the research-related objectives of the Joint Committee as outlined in the Operating Procedures document and other Joint Committee documents. The motion passed unanimously.

Fritz questioned the difference between a task force and an overarching committee. The response was that some groups work on assigned tasks during the meeting (task force), and some continue after the meeting (overarching committees).

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2003

The meeting reconvened at 8:40 a.m.

The group agreed that the working committees needed a little more time to work on their assignments. The groups were asked to provide their reports in electronic form so that we have a good record of where each group is.

Several items need to be addressed during the 10:00-11:45 a.m. session:

- The Council of Great City Schools has not participated in the JCSEE's work recently. Yakimowski informed the group that CGCS is willing to be a sponsoring organization again. We will need a motion to invite CGCS to return to sponsoring organization status.
- We will seek nominations to replace Don Yarbrough on the executive committee.
- We will seek nominations for the vice chair position.

Reports from Overarching Committees

McDivitt said the Business Plan committee had fleshed out its plan a little. No motion was required. The group had assignments for JCSEE members:

Send (via e-mail) suggestions to Patti McDivitt by November 1, 2003.

1. We need to increase book sales. We should try to get the Standards presented as a part of a conference—especially preconference sessions where we could make some money. JC members should go back to their sponsoring organizations and explore this possibility, if not for this year, then for next year.

Either half-day or full-day preconference sessions could be scheduled. The available materials would probably have to be modified. Sometimes organizations can get a percentage of the conference registrations.

2. Brainstorm and come up with a list of key foundations, organizations, and businesses (include addresses) with which we could build partnerships. We are not necessarily asking for money—just in getting a relationship started.
 - Look for ideas
 - Develop a starting point for networking
 - A key contact name would be helpful (include address)
3. Go back to your sponsoring organization and talk with the development officer and/or the president/executive director or whoever could provide some help in what we are trying to do. Get ideas from this person (what are your ideas about how an endowment works; how could we set it up?).

Blank restated the charge: If you are a development officer and you were trying to set up an endowment and foundation to help raise money (JC standards) and you had The Evaluation Center that is affiliated with Western Michigan University, what would you do? Is it a good idea? Is the Joint Committee too specific? How would you market it?

Yarbrough asked if The Evaluation Center (EC) wants to have a foundation. Gullickson responded that it is important for JCSEE members to establish a relationship in their organizations so they can collaborate on these matters. Talk about the relationship with the Joint Committee and how its work fits into the work of the organization. How can they benefit each other? Say, "We are facing some challenges. We need your thoughts about what are viable ways to meet these challenges and how we might work with you to meet them."

Blank wondered if WMU should look at its relationship with The Evaluation Center. We could ask someone involved with development at WMU, "What do you, as a development person, know that might be useful? If you had this type of situation, what would you do?"

Fritz pointed out that The Evaluation Center, WMU, and JCSEE are distinct groups; JCSEE is an independent body. She wondered if the committee was suggesting that we may want to change the relationship between JCSEE, EC, and WMU. Is there only one option on the table? How would the JC build itself up, assuming it gets funds from all these organizations? Gullickson responded that attestations must be filled out.

Standards development. Rogers reported that this committee had nothing to add about developing and revising standards. His task force is working on the personnel standards document. He will do a dry run with Yarbrough. He will gather together everything he has regarding revising sets of standards and will give it to whoever will be revising the student evaluation standards.

As for time lines, under the present system we will be revising the personnel standards and program standards almost concurrently. We might try to work on one set a little later. Otherwise, we may have two sets of standards to look at. This might negate some of the work.

Research. Shulha and Yarbrough will study possible research strategies and will work to get a new link on the JC Web site.

Yarbrough/Shulha moved/seconded that the Joint Committee authorize the research task force to review submissions for and possibly award an Outstanding Young Researcher Award annually. The motion passed unanimously.

These submissions could link to evaluation reports and/or dissertations. The winner would receive a framable certificate and \$100 (either from the JCSEE or a benefactor). It might be possible to offer a joint award with another organization, e.g., CREATE.

Yarbrough wondered if JCSEE can receive tax-free donations. Gullickson replied that this will be clarified by next year's meeting. We need to be sure we get the message out to organizations/foundations; many like to fund young people.

Egelson suggested that JCSEE could do a pre-session at the July 2004 CREATE conference.

Dissemination. Egelson's committee members recommended that it continue to work throughout the next year. Much of what this committee discussed overlapped with other committees.

- Identify a communication coordinator (from EC)
- Identify someone within the Committee
- Identify a Webmaster and graphic designer
- Encourage Committee members to submit proposals to organizations and other groups throughout the year to support standards work
- Encourage JC members to submit articles for publication

- Communicate (Gullickson) with publishing companies regarding exhibits at conferences (advertising and book samples); i.e., what are publishing companies interested in doing regarding dissemination of JCSEE materials?
- Make sure JCSEE is linked to search engines (using whatever term we decide on)
- Establish links between sponsoring organizations and JCSEE
- Link with research
- Reestablish a Joint Committee listserv
- Support the revision of the JCSEE Web site
- Design brochures that describe the standards products

These tasks should be completed by end of January 2004. JCSEE members will be notified when these tasks are completed through a report that will be distributed.

The JCSEE Web site will be redesigned by Farland and a colleague of Cullen's.

Cullen reminded the group that the day before it had been suggested that the program development groups set a date to meet. This has budget implications, and he wondered if such meetings required authorization by the Executive Committee. Gullickson responded that such meetings likely will have to be electronic, because the budget picture for JCSEE is bleak. We need to sell a lot of books! The Executive Committee will have to decide about meetings.

Diversity. This committee discussed and began working on the list of actions approved the day before. Gullickson has in hand a partial draft of a position paper. Most of the work of this committee will be accomplished within the next 3-4 months. At that point a draft will be shared with the group.

Newman requested that the task force working on the program standards share its drafts with the diversity committee.

Task forces will have ideas that will need to be authorized by the Joint Committee.

Addition of Sponsoring Organization

The Council of Great City Schools (CGSC), a former sponsoring organization based in Washington, DC, was interested in being involved with JCSEE again. CGSC represents more than 100 major school systems across the U.S., at least 1 school in each state. The organization has several subgroups that deal with curriculum, research, and assessment. CGSC was the first organization to develop a position paper on NCLB.

Yarbrough/Rogers moved/seconded that we invite the Council of Great City Schools to be a sponsoring organization of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. The motion passed unanimously.

Gullickson advised the group that Rogers will be leaving the Joint Committee. His leaving creates some significant voids. He will have to be replaced as vice chair of the Committee.

Beatty/Shulha moved/seconded that Don Yarbrough be appointed to complete Todd Rogers' term as vice chair of the Joint Committee (2005). The vote was unanimous by acclamation.

Yarbrough explained that he is appointed to JCSEE every year. There is no problem with him continuing for at least two more years or through the revision of the program evaluation standards.

Cullen/Egelson moved/seconded that JCSEE provide an expression of appreciation to Todd Rogers for his contributions to the Joint Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Gullickson expressed his great pleasure in working with Rogers over the years, saying that Rogers' contributions were "way beyond the call." He volunteered to work with the Joint Committee before he became a member. Shulha agreed that Rogers' activities are only the "tip of the iceberg," saying that he is a very highly regarded colleague.

Discussion turned to replacing Rogers on the Executive Committee. Nominations were requested from the floor, and two people were nominated: Paula Egelson and Dianna Newman. Paper ballots were prepared and distributed. Egelson became the new member on the Executive Committee.

McDivitt/Shulha moved/seconded that the ballots be destroyed. The motion passed unanimously.

The group left for lunch at a local restaurant.

Reports From Task Forces

Rogers reported for the personnel evaluation standards task group. The time line had been revised based on where “we are now.” By December 31, 2003, the first draft of the book should be complete.

Still needed were nominations for the national and international review panels. JCSEE members will see a semifinal draft at next year’s meeting. A facilitator’s guide and checklist will be developed between October 2005 and January 2006. The guide for *The Student Evaluation Standards* is priced the same as the book. Should the guide for *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* be used as a loss leader in order to get it out to teacher leaders to stimulate the sale of books?

JCSEE needs to replace Rogers as chair of this task force. Gullickson said he would like to find someone who evaluates personnel and/or has used the personnel evaluation standards.

NEA is interested in hosting a public hearing. Queens University hosts an overseas recruiting meeting in February 2003. Fifty to 80 superintendents and principals attend.

Program standards task force. Yarbrough said he would sort through his notes and send them out after the meeting.

Yarbrough was concerned that the responsibilities given to the various task forces would be too much to get accomplished. He suggested that Gullickson tell the task forces how to organize their priorities. Individuals have to decide what they can take on, because we cannot come back next year and say “This is too much; I can’t do it.” He hoped that individuals would contribute where they can be most effective. He said he would be asking individuals for help with tasks.

Student evaluation standards task force. McDivitt reported that her task force reviewed everything that had been talked about during the meeting. The group thought we should start the process of revising the student standards this year by gathering as many comments and reviews as possible. Hopefully, there will be at least one person from each sponsoring organization who would be willing to review the book and facilitator’s guide. By next year’s meeting, based on feedback received, JCSEE could put in place a task force, name a chair, develop a “high level” schedule of work, and have the student standards revised and published by 2007.

Gullickson had suggested that a proposal might be submitted to the National Science Foundation (NSF) for a teacher professional program. This task force asked Gullickson to go ahead and do whatever has to be done to submit the proposal to NSF—have keynote speakers and other major players, have a session tied to the standards presented at the beginning of a professional conference, etc.

Rogers said having three standards revisions going on at the same time is too much. Maybe the work could start in the fourth year, with the revision coming in the seventh year. A prior attempt at working with two revisions at the same time fell flat.

Yarbrough commented that this was a wonderful planning meeting. The work will not end when we leave. He suggested that everyone needed some breathing space to consider everything that had been discussed.

Gullickson said this was the time to begin thinking about the student evaluation standards revision and begin to put things in place.

Gullickson asked that the Executive Committee meet with him before they leave. He will write up work the task forces would be doing during the next year and get that out in a week.

People working on the Web site should talk with Farland so that we have a consistent format.

A draft logo was distributed. Yarbrough was bothered by the "JC," saying it made him think of Jesus Christ, not Joint Committee. Someone else wondered why a scale with pivot and trays was used. Veeder will e-mail a copy of the JCSEE logo to members who request it.

2004 Meeting Dates

Following the procedures JCSEE has used in the past, the 2004 meeting will be held on September 23-24-25. Various venues were discussed. The costs for people on the other side of the country have to be considered, as do the travel costs for Evaluation Center staff (Farland, Gullickson, Veeder).

Yarbrough/Fritz moved/seconded that the Executive Committee of the Joint Committee seriously consider Palo Alto as a site for the next meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Gullickson asked that people send him their thoughts about ANSI, the most expensive item in the budget. Shulha asked if JCSEE could reapply without penalty; Gullickson didn't know.

Yarbrough/Caruthers moved/seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion passed unanimously.

Sally Veeder
Secretary