

**Twenty-third Annual Meeting of
The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation**

**October 3–4, 1997
Alexandria, VA**

Attendees:

Joint Committee Members:

Ms. Beth Bader (AFT)
Dr. Edith Beatty (ASCD)
Dr. Mark Davison, (APA)
Dr. Arlen Gullickson (Member-at-large)
Ms. Gwen Keith (CES)
Dr. Dianna Newman (AEA)
Mr. Wayne Rietberg (NAESP)
Dr. James R. Sanders, Chair
Dr. Kathleen Sullivan, (NLPES)
Dr. Jerry Valentine (NASSP)
Dr. William Webster (AERA)
Dr. Robert Wilson (CSSE)
Dr. Donald Yarbrough (NCME)

Joint Committee Staff:

Ms. Mary Ramlow, Secretary

JOINT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 3–4, 1997
ALEXANDRIA, VA

Meeting Objectives

1. To conduct the business of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
2. To review the funding status for two pending Joint Committee proposals and to begin work on both projects.
3. to review dissemination and training plans for 1997–1998.
4. To hold a reception for Association senior staff and officers.

Friday, October 3, 1997

Dr. Sanders welcomed everyone to the 23rd annual meeting of the Joint Committee. Dr. Sanders described the history and purposes of The Joint Committee.

Members of The Joint Committee introduced themselves and the organization they represented.

Dr. Sanders explained revisions in the meeting agenda due to recent notification of funding for the Student Evaluation Standards project. The revised agenda was discussed and adopted.

Chair's Report

Dr. Sanders reviewed progress made at last year's annual meeting on revising *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. He reported the possibility of funding from the Kellogg Foundation for a full-scale revision of the Standards, which he believes is necessary, rather than the minor update that The Joint Committee had discussed last year. Dr. Sanders described the standard Joint Committee revision process.

Dr. Gullickson reported on work in Alaska and Hawaii using The Personnel Standards. There was discussion about Web site development for the Joint Committee and Dr. Gullickson agreed to take the lead on it this year.

Financial Report

Mary Ramlow presented the financial report. Individual sales reports for *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and *The Program Evaluation Standards* books were presented. Dr. Sanders explained that royalties from the books pay for the annual meeting and other Joint Committee expenses. He

indicated that increased sales may provide for additional presentations, meetings, or activities that have not been possible in the past.

**JOINT COMMITTEE
BANK ACCOUNT STATEMENT AS OF AUGUST 31, 1997**

Balance as of September 30, 1996		\$13,724.48
<u>Income</u>		
Royalty Payment from Sage Publishers	\$6,793.48	
Interest 7/1 - 9/30/96	\$128.30	
Interest 10/1 - 12/31/96	\$124.42	
Interest 1/1 - 3/31/97	\$94.92	
Interest 4/1 - 6/30/97	\$118.91	
Revenue from sale of Step Guides and Training Manuals	\$1,908.95	
Income Total		\$9,168.98
<u>Expenses</u>		
Reimbursement for Joint Committee Expenses paid to The Evaluation Center	\$5,073.64	
Duplicating-\$1,688.75; Telephone-\$130.40; Supplies-\$46.99; Postage-\$300.76; Personnel-\$2,928.29		
1996 Annual Meeting Expenses	\$2,022.37	
Yarrow-\$1,956.15; Dr. Gullickson-\$33.36; Mary Ramlow- \$32.86;		
Delaware Annual Registered Agent Fee	\$99.00	
1995 Annual Franchise Tax Report	\$72.20	
Expenses Total		<u>\$7,267.21</u>
NEW BALANCE AS OF AUGUST 31, 1997		\$15,626.25

1998 Annual Meeting

Dates and locations for the 1998 annual meeting were discussed. Dr. Sanders suggested that 3 full days be set aside for next year's meeting due to the increased workload associated with the newly funded projects. October 1, 2, and 3, 1998, and the site, Yarrow, a retreat just outside of Kalamazoo, Michigan, were agreed on.

Other Business

Dr. Sanders explained that the Executive Committee conducts business as needed for The Joint Committee during the year between annual meetings. Currently, the Executive Committee consists of Gwen Keith, Edith Beatty, Bill Mays, Arlen Gullickson, and Jim Sanders. A replacement for Bill Mays was needed and Dr. Sanders asked that nominations be submitted to Dr. Gullickson for the election.

1997-1998 Dissemination and Training Plans

Various dissemination efforts were reported. Credentialing or training evaluators across the country using the standards was discussed. It was noted that there are numerous evaluators who know measurement and statistics, but resist learning and incorporating the standards into their practice.

It was suggested that Joint Committee members promote the standards as a requirement for training evaluators within their own organizations. This would be an effort to promote consistent professional training requirements for evaluators throughout the U.S.

Also discussed was the need to develop a new list of content courses that should be required for all evaluators. A reference was made to content policy and list of major training programs for evaluators that appeared in the New Directions journal a few years ago. Such a list of training programs using the Standards could be condensed into a one-page document to be distributed by Sage Publications.

It was noted that sponsoring organizations need to do more promotion of the Standards to their members in the form of symposiums or presessions. This type of promotion will be necessary with the new Student Evaluation Standards. The representatives from the following organizations agreed to do a symposium, pre-session, or workshop at their annual meeting: AERA, NAESP, NLPES.

Dr. Yarbrough agreed to disseminate information on the new Student Evaluation Standards and its relationship with the APA's test standards at an administrative level meeting of APA scheduled for November 16.

It was noted that several organizations/associations have requested more specific information on applying the standards. Several step-by-step processes used in teaching evaluation in the classroom were mentioned. If these could be put in dissemination form, it would be a helpful tool for a workshop or pre-session at annual meetings.

A suggestion was made to ask Sage Publications to distribute free copies of the Standards to professors who teach evaluation.

Student Evaluation Standards Project

Task A—Proposed Time Line and Budget

It was suggested that in November the validation panel (6-7 members) should be appointed and an agreement should be developed with the panel as to their roles, responsibilities, payments schedule, etc. It was also suggested that in years 2 and 3, half of the validation panel members attend alternate meetings as a budget savings.

The literature review process was discussed, with suggestions it should be a priority to begin as soon as possible. The bulk of the review should be done by December, so that the material can be given to a panel of writers in January.

Dr. Sanders asked for 5 to 10 names of people from each association who could be writers for the first draft of the standards, so they can be contacted in early December. Requirements for qualifications of writers was discussed. It was suggested that nominations of writers be open and not restricted to association members. Dr. Sanders indicated that the budget included 30 writers, but only providing a token payment. For year 1, writers would prepare drafts January to April 1998. The drafts should include illustrative cases, actual cases, not fictional. May through August 1998 the writers would work on filling in gaps. In August 1998 a notebook of drafts would be sent to each Joint Committee member, so that members could read and be prepared to select the best at the October annual meeting.

In year 2, we will recruit reviewers for both international and national review panels. Project staff will create a report to The Joint Committee based on the reviewers recommendations. In the October 1999 annual meeting, The Joint Committee will incorporate what the reviewers said to rewrite the standards.

In year 3, there will be field testing. A report will be written from the results. The report will be used in October 2000 at the annual meeting to rewrite the standards.

In year 4, hearings will be advertised and conducted, one on the east coast, one on the west coast, and one central North America. The project staff will prepare a report of the results of the hearings to go to The Joint Committee. That report will be used at a 3-day retreat in 2001 to make final changes in the standards, and then votes on each standard will be taken. After that, we will submit the document to ANSI for their review. Once we receive approval, we will go ahead to publication. We are looking for the final product in 2002.

Questions were raised about the overlap if funding becomes available for revision of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* while the Student Evaluation Standards project is in process. There was discussion about creating two separate teams. There was another suggestion to recruit the validation panel to work on both the personnel and the student standards.

Dr. Sanders indicated that the validation panel will attend The Joint Committee annual meetings, and that travel expenses for Dr. Sanders, Dr. Gullickson, and Ms. Ramlow will be shifted to the project, saving The Joint Committee \$2,000 to \$3,000 per year. In year 2, he proposed that half of the validation panel (3 people plus the Chair) attend the annual meeting to save travel expenses. In year 3, the other half of the validation panel (3 people plus the Chair) would attend the annual meeting. That would leave \$41,000 for Year 4.

Dr. Sanders clarified that the panel of writers actually work independently, matching their qualifications to the topics assigned to them. Discussion was held around qualifications of the writers and how to recruit appropriate panel members. It was suggested that validation panel writers need to be familiar with *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and *The Program Evaluation Standards*, as the same framework will be used for The Student Evaluation Standards project.

A motion was made and seconded that the time line and budget for the project be approved. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Task B—Identify Literature, Documents, Issues/Topics

Dr. Sanders asked the members to break up into two working groups to discuss and identify literature, documents, and issues of topics that are important to include in the Student Evaluation Standards project. He asked them to include standards that already exist, e.g., NCME, AFT and NEA.

Other members stated that the items should not be limited to K-12, but to all education. Further, the items must focus on evaluation, rather than testing.

(Two groups met for approximately one hour)

Dr. Gullickson's group reported that they covered a wide array of topics, including

–Standards

- existing standards, e.g., NCME, the Canadian standards, and the provinces' content standards that overlap into evaluation
- NCTM type standards

–Topics

- the nature of evaluation decisions being made in such areas as social development, academic development, selection decision, placement decision, developmental appropriateness, accountability, impact of evaluation on the learner, what kinds of information should be reported, how the information can be used, what should be public record, who controls student evaluation, who does the evaluation, who has input into evaluations, what are the appropriate

criteria and how can they be applied, grading concerns, grading distributions, what information goes into grades, positive and negative effects of evaluation, evaluation to inform instruction vs. evaluation to inform accountability, different types of testing, grading, social promotion, diversity, legal issues, special education, self-assessment, formal vs. informal evaluation

A documents list had not been prepared, but the group members agreed to contact members of their associations, collect appropriate documents and send them to Dr. Sanders. The Northwest Lab was suggested as a source of materials.

Dianna Newman reported for the second group and stated that the following should be considered

–Standards

- the NCME, AERA, APA

– Issues

- the previous work done by Kellogg on administrative policies and teacher policies
- state laws or state mandates, i.e., do a survey to assess the practices in use on the state level
- sample of school systems using a large school system
- legal areas like Freedom of Information Act, IBEA (special ed laws) Federal Human Subjects guidelines, because those would encompass the use on assessments
- Canadian and Australian requirements, because many of those organizations use our guidelines
- at the post-secondary level, what is out there from board certification and licensure, and is there is an overarching national association, or state organizations, with standards
- minority or group use in terms of assessments
- need to address parents, i.e., National PTA has an advocacy group, and Developmentally Disabled Planning Council has a parent advocacy group
- National Conference of State Legislatures may have useful information
- how to include the student's view, as no one knows of a group that represents students, other than perhaps a Graduate Student Association.

Also mentioned by others were the following issues

- special education and academically talented issues
- reporting issues
- confidentiality
- post-secondary issues, e.g. occupational testing
- overlap between program and personnel and the new student standards, i.e., where student assessment is also used for teacher assessment and program assessment, and where we draw the line between standards, where we encourage statistical data to be used and not be used.
- how the role of student evaluation fits into site-based management
- how technology is used and misused in testing; the inequity in issues that can happen involving class and ranking institutions.

- use of student evaluation to rank teachers
- use of tests as quality indicators, how that can be positively and negatively used
- credential issues, and whether this is a student issue or program issue
- cost effectiveness, and whether or not evaluation can disrupt the instructional process
- community members and employers

In discussing a functional table of contents, three different ways to organize it were discussed. One was to break it down by how evaluations are actually used for decisions like grading, diagnostics. A second way is to break it down by steps for actually doing evaluation, budgeting, managing, reporting, developing, etc. A third way to organize it is by stakeholders and how different stakeholder groups use the information.

Dr. Sanders reminded the members to think about the nominations for the validation panel and to fill out the nomination form for Saturday. There was discussion about asking Todd Rogers from University of Alberta in Edmonton to serve as chair of the validation panel, as he is well versed in the operating procedures of The Joint Committee, is knowledgeable about the Standards, and is well qualified in the area of testing.

The group adjourned to prepare for the reception.

Saturday, Oct. 4, 1997

Dr. Sanders welcomed the members and reconvened the meeting. He indicated that during the previous night's discussion, questions were raised about how student evaluation standards will be different from other standards. Dr. Sanders suggested to answer those who pose this question is to explain that the project will begin with the Joint Committee's conceptual framework of what sound evaluation is, i.e., utility, propriety, feasibility, and accuracy. We need to consider what things need to be done to have student evaluation that is fair and legal; what are the things that have to be done to make student evaluation useful; and how to develop and properly run student evaluations. This can be used as an organizer for answering this question.

Election of Executive Committee

Dr. Sanders stated that there are two continuing members, Gwen Keith and Edith Beatty. Jim Sanders and Arlen Gullickson are also continuing members. He asked Dr. Gullickson to provide a report of nominations for the new executive committee.

Dr. Gullickson reported that Dr. Donald Yarbrough was nominated by the committee. The nomination was seconded and approved by a voice vote.

Validation Panel

Dr. Sanders opened nominations for chair of the validation panel. Todd Rogers was nominated; the nomination was seconded and approved by voice vote. Dr. Sanders stated that if Rogers refused the position, he would come back to the members for further nominations.

Dr. Sanders asked the members to fill out and turn in the validation panel member nomination ballot to Mary Ramlow.

Invitations to New Sponsoring Organizations

There was discussion about the number of invitations, as there are six open slots. There was a motion to leave it to the Chair's discretion that up to six of eight organizations there were discussed will be invited to be sponsoring organizations, with an effort to keep a balance of technical and practitioner membership. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

Task Groups

Dr. Sanders asked the group to split into two smaller groups to address the two remaining tasks:

- Group 1. To solicit from members of sponsoring organizations their ideas about issues, and comments for the student evaluation standards. This task force is needed to work on a procedure and form that we can send out to organization members. The procedure may be that it goes to the association board to solicit.
- Group 2. The second task is how to solicit issues, comments from people outside of the sponsoring organizations, including parents, employers, policymakers, students and general public. What are the trouble spots in student evaluations, what are good practices that we need to capture and include as standards. We need a procedure for doing that. Something that is feasible and will accomplish the spirit of this objective—getting widespread input from the very beginning to focus our attention.

Dr. Sanders indicated that he would like to see these processes completed by the end of December 1997. Others indicated that there would not be time to go to their boards, but it may be possible to present the idea to the board president and ask for suggestions on how to proceed. Another suggestion was to use EVALTALK or AERA listserv, and other listservs or put a notice in other newsletters that go out soon inviting comments. There was also discussion about a method of involving students or a group of student advocates in the outside group.

The Joint Committee adjourned to work in two groups.

Dr. Sanders then reconvened the Joint Committee and reiterated that two tasks were to develop a procedure and materials that can be used for soliciting comments from sponsoring organization members and from other outside organizations, keeping feasibility in mind.

Dianna Newman reported that her group focused on a memo to send to persons with member organizations, asking them to respond immediately. She suggested that individual edits should be made and it should be sent out on letterhead. Dr. Newman suggested that each person send the memo (append to the minutes) to approximately 10 people in their organization, including executive board members. As soon as responses are received, they should be forwarded to Dr. Sanders.

The other thing that was discussed was putting this up on listserves that we subscribe to, like AERA's listserv and EVALTALK. A Joint Committee on-line mail box could be created so that people could respond directly. Mary agreed to set that up as soon as possible.

The second group who focused on organizations outside of the sponsoring organizations reported they considered sending out an announcement. The heading would be either:

- Standards for Student Evaluation and Related Decisions or
- National Standards for Student Evaluation and Related Decisions

The suggested text of the announcement is:

One of the greatest problems facing education today is how to evaluate students fairly for their own good and the good of society. The Joint Committee on Educational Standards representing 24 organizations is requesting as broad as possible input on student evaluation and related issues. These issues include testing, grading, reporting, placement, admission, and whatever you want from pre-kindergarten through college (and we can extend that as well). In particular we want to know what you think about how to make student evaluation and related decisions (1) fair to all; (2) most useful; (3) accurate; (4) effective in decisions. These international guidelines once developed, reviewed, and adopted will set the standards for student evaluation and its effect on students in society.

Place your comments directly to our Web page at the following address. You may also send letters or E-mail to this address.

This could be posted on America On-Line, Web page organizations by the 4 categories, NCSL contacting all the state legislative chairs, chief state school officers, National Chamber of Commerce, JC, identification of the graduate students affiliations, organizations, employee organizations, national PTA organizations, national organization of student councils, with major emphasis on students.

There was discussion about placing a public-service-type announce in a popular paper, like USA Today, but there may be more response from malcontents than from those who have something constructive to say.

There was discussion about contacting a wider range of groups. One group that should be aggressively pursued is Associations of Student Government. There is a National Association of Student Government for undergraduate students.

There was discussion about evaluation in Mexico and Columbia. There was concern that membership on The Joint Committee from a diverse international population might create major issues that would get in the way of the issues The Joint Committee is trying to address.

Dr. Sanders thanked the committee members and complimented them on their productive work sessions. A motion was made to adjourn; it was seconded and passed by voice vote.

APPENDIX A

Date

TO:

FROM: Dianna Newman
AEA Representative to The Joint Committee

James Sanders, Chair
The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation

We need your help in identifying issues and concerns related to student evaluation. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation is developing a new set of standards for student evaluation. As part of that process, we want input from stakeholders directly involved in the evaluation of students. Note that students can include those in K-12, post secondary, continuing, and occupational educational settings. We have identified four areas of impact as listed below. For each area, please indicate what you see as important topics, references, issues, or concerns. These may be related to practice, theory, or use of student evaluation. Please respond to each of these areas on this sheet and return it Dianna Newman by November 1, 1997.

Issues that deal with:

- the propriety, ethics, rights of students, parents, and educators

- the usefulness of student decision-making practices

- workability and practicality of decision-making practices

- technical appropriateness of decision-making practices