

**Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting of
The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
September 30–October 2, 1999
Nordic Hills Resort
Itasca, IL**

Attendees:

Joint Committee Members:

Dr. Edith Beatty (ASCD)
Dr. Rolf Blank, (CCSSO)
Dr. Ruth Ekstrom (ETS)
Dr. Segun Eubanks (NEA)
Dr. Arlen Gullickson, Chair
Dr. Jerry Horn (Member-at-large)
Dr. Joan Kruger (CES)
Dr. Charles Moore (NASSP)
Dr. Diana Newman (AEA)
Dr. David Summers (NLPES)
Dr. Gary L. Wegenke (AASA)
Dr. Mark Wilson (AERA)
Dr. Robert Wilson (CSSE)
Dr. Donald Yarbrough (NCME)

Student Evaluation Standards Validation Panel:

Dr. Todd Rogers, Chair
Dr. Placido Garcia

Joint Committee Staff:

Ms. Mary Ramlow, Secretary
Dr. Jennifer Fager, Student Evaluation Standards Project Manager

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 30–OCTOBER 2, 1999
NORDIC HILLS RESORT, ITASCA, IL**

Meeting Objectives

1. To conduct the business of The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
2. To modify the JCSEE policies, *Operating Procedures*, and working procedures to bring them into compliance with ANSI requirements
 - A. JCSEE will modify its record retention policy immediately to require retention of records concerning new, revised, or reaffirmed American National Standards for at least one complete development cycle or until the standard is revised. In the event JCSEE withdraws any of its standards, records of the withdrawal will be retained for at least five years from the date of withdrawal. This revision in retention policy will be brought to the JCSEE at its September 1999 meeting. When approved, the changed retention policy will be incorporated into its *Operating Procedures*.
 - B. JCSEE will prepare a metric policy and submit a copy to ANSI upon formal approval by the full JCSEE.
 - C. JCSEE will modify its *Operating Procedures* to remove the explicit statements regarding provision of a quarterly newsletter and two regional workshops.
3. To review the project plan for revising *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and to review the nominees for validation panel.
4. To determine whether to revise *The Program Evaluation Standards* at this time (per ANSI requirements).
5. To review the project plan for developing standards for evaluation of students, to report on the progress of the project, and to review upcoming project work
6. To review the standards for student evaluations resulting from the Task Force work and revise them as need so they can be approved for external review and field testing
7. To elect a new vice chair for the Joint Committee to replace Dr. Gullickson who is now Chair of the Joint Committee
8. Election of at-large person, Dr. Jerry Horn, to the Joint Committee
9. To develop a general report of the meeting for distribution to the sponsoring and cooperating organizations

10. To plan for work following the Fall, 1999 meeting
 - a. Selection of the Validation Panel for *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* revision
 - b. Identification of National and International Review Panel nominees for the student evaluation standards project.
 - c. Completion of specifications for the first draft of the student evaluation standards and the form for reviewing it.
 - d. Initiating field testing of the student evaluation standards
 - e. Review of plans for reporting on progress to boards and members of sponsoring organizations.
11. To receive a report from the Validation Panel for student evaluation standards project
12. To address other matters as needed

Thursday, September 30, 1999

Dr. Gullickson welcomed everyone to the 25th annual meeting of the Joint Committee. Dr. Gullickson described the history and purposes of The Joint Committee. He indicated that the committee is now working on two major projects, one to develop standards for evaluations of students and the second to revise the 1988 *Personnel Evaluation Standards*.

Members of The Joint Committee introduced themselves, stated what association/organization they represented, and their interests. The chair of the Student Evaluation Standards Validation Panel (Dr. W. Todd Rogers) was in attendance.

The agenda was discussed and adopted.

Business Meeting

Chair's Report

Dr. Gullickson continued the meeting by asking how many of the members were involved in the revision of *The Program Evaluation Standards* or in the writing of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. Two were involved with *The Program Evaluation Standards* revision and no one still on the Committee was involved with *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. Dr. Gullickson stated his concern that there is no member on the Joint Committee with a history in terms of standards development. We lack a memory. It is a problem from his perspective to have people engaged in writing standards, now with the development of the Student Evaluation Standards, when we have no personalities to guide us who have been there and done that. Dr. James Sanders was involved in the development of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and

revising *The Program Evaluation Standards*. Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam was involved in developing *The Program Evaluation Standards* and *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. But with the departure of those two long-time participating members, the live history of involvement is gone. It is a concern when the issues are what is a standard, how do we write it, how do we deal with it, and how the decisions are made.

When the Joint Committee met last year, the Validation Panel was there. At that point in time, the Validation Panel had two members attending the committee meeting--Dr. W. Todd Rogers and Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam. Two concerns of the Validation Panel were that the draft Student Evaluation Standards needed a lot of work and that working on both *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and The Student Evaluation Standards draft was too much to do at one time.

Dr. Gullickson is also worried about the fact that the Joint Committee is operating outside of its guidelines. That the members do not read the operating procedures. One of the last acts of the 1998 Joint Committee meeting was the election of Dr. Gullickson as the chair. That election led Dr. Gullickson to review of the Joint Committee Operating Procedures. When you do that, you discover there are some anomalies in the operating procedures and there are anomalies between the operating procedures and the bylaws. Therefore a review of the operating procedures was added to the agenda. It was important to us because we made a conscious decision last year to stay with ANSI -- the American National Standards Institute. In the 1980s, the Joint Committee made the determination to go with the American National Standards Institute.

One result of that determination was that things that we approve through our standards validation process, go to ANSI and become certified American National Standards. At the current time, there is one American National Standard for program evaluation and it is ours; it is the Joint Committee's. There are no American National Standards for personnel evaluation, there are no American National Standards for student evaluation. There are lots of standards for personnel evaluation; there are lots of standards for student evaluation. None of them are American National Standards. When we get done with this process in the next several years, there will be an American National Standard for student evaluation. It will not be anything that detracts from the other standards, in fact it will work in tandem with the testing standards that are being prepared by many of our organizations. It's not the intention of the Joint Committee to detract from those kinds of standards or to deter people from using them. In fact, it is our intention to get people to use them along with this other kind of information. Our intention is to come out of this with clear-cut, strong standards that deal with things like equity and fairness; that deal with making sense to people in the classroom; so that we have things in North America (from ANSI's perspective for at least Canada and the United States), that are really strong, viable things for education. That's where we want to get. It's our job to create those standards. It's our job to ensure they are properly validated, and it's our job to get them down the path through ANSI, ultimately.

Shortly after paying our ANSI membership, we were notified that we were going to be audited. A desk audit was conducted by our submission of requested materials to ANSI. The ANSI audit identified a number of areas where we have to revise our operating procedures to bring them into compliance. Those revisions were discussed later in the meeting.

There is no American National Standard for personnel evaluation. To take the current version of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and move it through to approval for ANSI meant that we would have to take it through every step of the process that a new standard has to go through. *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* have to be reviewed, not just by our Committee, but by a national and international review panel, they have to be field-tested, and public hearings have to be conducted.

With the amount of work involved to go through that process for each set of standards (personnel and student), Dr. Gullickson needed assistance. He asked Dr. Jerry Horn if he would be willing to assist. Dr. Horn was invited to this meeting to take a look at what the Joint Committee is and does, and join the Joint Committee if the membership was willing to elect him as an at-large member. If the membership elected Dr. Horn, then he would be assigned as the person in charge of developing *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* through the ANSI process.

Dr. Gullickson made this recommendation based on Dr. Horn's extensive experience using *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. Dr. Gullickson asked the Executive Committee to review his request to appoint Dr. Horn as a member-at-large and report back to the full membership.

Dr. Gullickson then moved to activities conducted throughout the past year. One of the things effective members are expected to do is promote the *Standards*. Last year shortly after the Joint Committee met, a presentation was made by Dr. Newman at AEA to discuss the process of the student standards and how that organization could be involved in the standards and solicit feedback from the organization. It was a well-attended meeting. It was a good way to solicit people who wanted to be reviewers on the standards. We passed out a sheet at that time and asked people who were there if they wanted to sign up as reviewers.

Drs. Horn and Gullickson completed a desk audit of the program of a consortium of engineering colleges and engineering college education programs using *The Program Evaluation Standards* as a basis for that. There were seven different institutions that were involved and we audited that program against the *Standards*. As is the case in every time we do this, the people who see it used that way are astounded at what they learn. They were also engaged in an audit of the Missouri teacher evaluation system done a year ago last summer and a program evaluation standards session and a desk audit for the Pacific Regional Educational Laboratory.

In March, a proposal was submitted to the Office of Educational Research Improvement to do studies that would support the Joint Committee. Dr. Gullickson was informed last week that they turned us down. There were 450 applications and they only funded 20. Those letters of support make a big difference when submitting a proposal. Dr. Gullickson asked that if you

don't have a letter of support on file with us that you take the time to go to your organization and ask for a letter. They are compelling reasons why an agency should want to fund us. Questions were raised regarding the letters of support. Dr. Gullickson stated that this letter should be on the part of the organization to support the development of the standards and to indicate to a funding agency that the Joint Committee isn't just a benign kind of thing but is an important piece of work.

In April, Dr. Yarbrough did an invited symposium at NCME where we talked about the role of that organization and the Joint Committee, both from a development perspective as well as from the product that the Joint Committee had produced. Several NCME members afterward had reasonably positive response to the presentation. They were interested to know this had been going on all along. Dr. Yarbrough enthusiastically echoed what was said--as a representative of his organization, NCME, one of the fundamental things that needs to be done is to keep this agenda in the minds of the membership. Dr. Mark Wilson submitted a proposal to AERA for a very similar presentation.

Dr. Gullickson noted that several of the members are making it a point to continually keep the *Standards* in front of the organization's membership. Each Joint Committee member is charged to bring the Joint Committee before their organization. This can be done through programmatic sessions at your conferences, items in the newsletter, or journal articles. That is a responsibility of the members.

In April, a task force was formed. One of the things the Joint Committee can do is create task forces to conduct its work. At last year's meeting, we were not pleased with the standards that had been written. There wasn't a person in here who looked at those and said, "This is it, we've got it in hand, and we're going to go with them." Dr. Gullickson explained how he used the Kellogg Foundation funds from year four to set-up a task force to develop standards for the Student Evaluation Standards.

The task force group met in April at the AERA/NCME meeting in Montreal. We looked through the charge to the task force, we set out the task, we identified who would be charged with writing which standards, and every task force member took about four standards to write and review. They returned those standards to Dr. Gullickson and then met with a group of teacher-educators in August to review the work. Time at that meeting was spent on cleaning up those standards. Dr. Gullickson was concerned that no one was in this group that had experience in developing standards. He asked Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam to step down from the student evaluation standards validation panel and join this group and guide them in the development of the standards. His help along with the task force and the educators-teachers group resulted in a superb set of standards for this year's meeting. Dr. Rogers was also in attendance at this meeting as validation panel chair to oversee the process. But seeing the need for experienced standards writers, he too joined the work of the group. Their work at this point, removes their impartiality and requires their stepping down from the validation panel.

Dr. Gullickson stated that we need additional proposals in order to serve the work of the Joint Committee. Many are in a better position to know where to get those funds than he is. You know your own organizations, and you know the importance of this and you can convey that message much more strongly. Part of his role as chair is to assist in making those points and helping to get that done. Part of the role of The Evaluation Center, as the host organization, is to facilitate that work to serve as the home agency. It will be the organization that will handle the funding so that there is a place where the money can be sent to handle the work.

To have a hosting institution, the Joint Committee contracts with The Evaluation Center. The hosting organization accounts for the grant monies, prepares for the meetings, sets-up the meetings, and conducts research and evaluation with the Joint Committee. It is a formal contract that comes to a close this Fall. The Joint Committee must determine at this meeting to either approve a renewing contract or say no, we want to do something different.

ANSI recommended changes in the Operating Procedures that need to be discussed. For example, section 5.5—the appeal section. It states that we need to inform objectors directly of our response. This is a point that we have to take action on. We have to tell them that we listened to what they said and either acted or didn't act, and additionally their fifth concern was that we have to tell them how to proceed. If they still object, if they say, "You weren't listening, what you did is wrong, and I want to appeal this, and I want to make an issue of it," they have a right to appeal. Our operating procedures provide them that right, and they must be informed of that right. So that very last sentence states how they can proceed by the 5.5 appeal section of the operating procedures. Discussion ensued regarding how responses to appeals would be handled. If an objector sent a letter of object to the chairman, the chair has to make everyone on the committee informed of that. Then we meet and we review all of those objections or concerns. It may be nothing more than a statement that all objections reviewed are attached to the minutes. When the standards go to public hearings, people may read those near-completed things and say, "I don't like this." In fact it's inevitable. Someone will say "This doesn't meet our needs" in one way or another and they will object. We must read and respond to their objection as the Joint Committee. We may simply read it and say, "I understand what they're saying or I don't understand what they are saying and we will take no action on this." It's up to us to take action, but we have to read it and say yes we've read your objection and you can see by our minutes that we either took action or didn't take action.

A second way may be when you get a lot of input is to synthesize the objections on top, and then have the individual documents on the bottom so they could refer back to the individual comments. This allows the opportunity to get a gist of the reactions to each of the proposed sections. A third possibility if we get thousands of objections, is to set-up a task force to deal with it. It was moved and seconded that the Joint Committee will officially inform all objectors and commenters of how their concerns were addressed. The motion carried. Dr. Gullickson reviewed other ANSI requested changes to the operating procedures. Without further delay of reviewing the student evaluation standards, Dr. Gullickson asked to meet with the Executive

Committee to review these operating procedures changes and report back to the full membership.

Financial Report

Mary Ramlow reviewed the following information on the bank account and the sales reports for both *The Program Evaluation Standards* and *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. She noted that there are minimal expenses against the bank account because the Joint Committee currently has outside funding. That funding pays for the annual meeting expenses. A constant concern is when there is no outside funding and the expenses are charged directly to the bank account. The Joint Committee pays for the annual meeting conference rooms and the travel expenses of the chair, secretary, any other staff, and the members-at-large to attend the annual meeting.

**JOINT COMMITTEE
BANK ACCOUNT STATEMENT AS OF
AUGUST 31, 1999**

Balance as of August 31, 1998 **\$19,113.76**

Income

Royalty Payment from Sage Publishers	\$5,937.58
Interest 7/1 – 9/30/98	\$180.06
Interest 10/1 – 12/31/98	\$169.16
Interest 1/1 – 3/31/99	\$139.53
Interest 4/1 – 6/30/99	\$166.69
Share Account Balance	<u>\$5.00</u>

Income Total **\$6,598.02**

Expenses

American National Standards Institute:	
Membership for 98-99	\$1,995.00
Audit Fee	\$2,000.00
1999 Delaware Annual Registered Agent Fee	\$150.00
1998 Annual Franchise Tax Report	<u>\$70.00</u>

Expense Total **\$4,215.00**

NEW BALANCE AS OF AUGUST 31, 1998 **\$21,496.78**

SALES REPORT
THE PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS
Published – 1981

	<u>SALES</u>	<u>RUNNING TOTAL</u>
Published by McGraw-Hill, Inc.		
9/1/83 – 12/31/83	538	7,547
1/1/84 – 12/31/84	1,390	8,937
1/1/85 – 12/31/85	1,236	10,173
1/1/86 – 12/31/86	1,033	11,206
1/1/87 – 12/31/87	682	11,888
1/1/88 - 12/31/88	1,042	12,930
1/1/89 – 12/31/89	987	13,917
Change in overseer of account to Ira Seibel as of 1/1/90		
1/1/90 – 12/31/90	1,279	15,196
1/1/91 – 12/31/91	1,772	16,968
1/1/92 – 12/31/92	579	17,547
1/1/93 – 6/30/93	219	17,766
7/1/93 – 12/31/93	25	17,791
<u>Program Evaluation Standards</u> revised and printed by Sage Publications, Inc.		
1/1/94 – 12/31/94	2,612	2,612
1/1/95 – 12/31/95	2,398	5,010
1/1/96 – 12/31/96	2,249	7,259
1/1/97 – 12/31/97	1,185	8,444
1/1/98 – 12/31/98	1,677	10,121

SALES REPORT
THE PERSONNEL EVALUATION STANDARDS
SAGE PUBLICATIONS
Published – 10/88

	<u>SALES</u>	<u>RUNNING TOTAL</u>
As of 12/31/88	1,175	1,175
1/1/89 – 8/31/89	3,778	4,953
9/1/89 – 12/31/89	874	5,827
1/1/90 – 12/31/90	1,001	6,828
1/1/91 – 12/31/91	963	7,791
1/1/92 – 12/31/92	341	8,132
1/1/93 – 12/31/93	192	8,324
1/1/94 – 12/31/94	736	9,060
1/1/95 – 12/31/95	321	9,381
1/1/96 – 12/31/96	453	9,834
1/1/97 – 12/31/97	302	10,136
1/1/98 – 12/31/98	223	10,359

Sage Publishers has informed Dr. Gullickson that they would like to publish the second edition of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* with cosmetic changes. This is an important consideration since the royalty payments are what gives the Joint Committee funds to work with.

ANSI and our operating procedures require that all standards once published be reviewed every five years. This review is to verify that the standards still stand as produced and do not need modifying. *The Program Evaluation Standards* were published in 1994 and therefore need to be reviewed or reaffirmed at this meeting. No feedback forms have been received by the chair in regards to *The Program Evaluation Standards*. Numerous requests have been received to use the *Standards* in reports, thesis, or dissertations but no one requesting modifications to them. After discussion, it was moved and seconded that *The Program Evaluation Standards* be reaffirmed for three years. The motion carried unanimously.

One item mentioned was to set-up a task force to develop a ten year plan for the Joint Committee. The plan may state what we are doing, where we are going, what needs to be done in between, and what should we do with the three sets of standards. Dr. Gullickson agreed to meet with the Executive Committee to discuss this option and report back to the full group.

Next discussed was having Dr. Horn join the Joint Committee as a member-at-large. Dr. Gullickson stated that he would like to have Dr. Horn join the Committee as a member not someone who is just visiting. He stated that Dr. Horn is an active user of the *Standards*, has worked with the staff in the Center in teaching people about the *Standards*, doing studies on the *Standards*, and is a fine candidate for coordinating the revision of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. He is gifted at organizing people to get work done. Dr. Gullickson reminded the members that as a member-at-large, the Joint Committee pays the bill for Dr. Horn to attend the meetings. At this time, he is attending the meeting with funding from a grant, but should our soft money funds dry up then the Joint Committee pays the bill. We don't pay him to attend, we just pay his travel expenses like your own organizations pay yours. We can appoint a member-at-large for one, two or three years. Joint Committee members serve at the pleasure of their organization as long as they choose to have you serve. The member-at-large has a term basis and that needs to be part of the motion. Dr. Horn would also be good at assisting in getting additional grants for the work of the Joint Committee. After discussion, it was moved and seconded to invite Dr. Jerry Horn to serve as a member-at-large of the Joint Committee for a period of three years. The motion carried.

The dates for next year's meeting were then discussed. At next year's meeting, we should be reviewing the second draft of the Student Evaluation Standards based on recommendations back from the reports of our people and possibly field testing as well, and possibly hearing results on *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. So, it was recommended that next year's meeting would be three days. With no objection to the same time of year, the dates of September 28, 29, and 30th, leaving October 1st and arriving on the 27th were recommended. Everyone concurred. Location would be determined by Dr. Gullickson keeping in mind difficulties in getting from airports to hotels.

After returning from lunch, Dr. Gullickson proceeded with the review of the student evaluation standards. He informed the members of the changes to last year's version of the student evaluation standards. The U7 is the U8 from last year. The old U7 on fiscal responsibility was deleted. The fiscal responsibility piece was dropped because teachers don't have enough cash in hand to make that a viable concern. They deal more with time and effort and not with money. These aren't large program kind of situations where money is a major concern.

Dr. Gullickson then split the group into two sections; one section for the introduction of the book to groups one and three. The second section goes to groups two and four to work on the functional table of contents. The introduction section was clarified to be everything that precedes the standards. He charged the groups to go through and find where the problems are. That they look at each part and write down problem areas that will require substantial amount of attention. The full group will reconvene at 4:15 p.m. to review what was found and make determinations about where to focus our energies. If you come back and say this is a mess, we've got to start over, then we need to rethink how we work the rest of the Joint Committee meeting.

Dr. Gullickson asked the members to first deal with the standards before working on the other parts of the book. He divided the members into four groups to look at the standards and at the remaining parts. Dr. Gullickson's strategy was to divide the entire group in half. There would be two groups in each half. That way there are two groups reviewing the same half of the standards giving it a redundant look. In other words, groups one and three look at the same standards, independently and come back with a perception that will allow us to identify things that are likely to be passed over if we give one group that's got a loud speaker and tends to focus on one issue. The first of the two groups focused on the introduction section, the invitation to users, and directions about applying the standards. The second two groups looked at development of the piece called the functional table of contents. It had not been done. The two groups need to think about what we might label as primary pieces and categories for the functional table.

The groups were given two hours to review and determine the magnitude of the task. In that regard, an hour was assigned to read the standards and identify what was seen as crucial problems in terms of the guide, and to decide if it doesn't deal with this or it doesn't deal with that. Then to identify how well it deals with the guide and if it has a clause or missing elements and then to make a judgment call as to whether it needs major revision or minor revision, say on a 1 to 5 scale. If it needed major revision it got a 5 point, if it needed minor or no revision, it got 1 point. If it was going to take 15 minutes to revise, somewhere in that neighborhood, it was assigned 3 points. The idea is to say this needs a lot of work or it needs a little work. There are about 4 or 5 standards that need a lot of work. This numbering system will be used to divide up the work based on what needs the most attention.

Group assignments were as follows:

Group 1

Eddie Beatty
Ruth Ekstrom
David Summers
Jerry Horn

Group 3

Don Yarbrough
Joan Kruger
Mark Wilson
Jennifer Fager

Group 2

Robert Wilson
Segun Eubanks
Gary Wegenke

Group 4

Dianna Newman
Rolf Blank
Charles Moore
Arlen Gullickson

The assignments were Groups 1 and 3 reviewed P1 to P8 and U1 to U7 and the Introduction. Groups 2 and 4 reviewed F1-3 and A1-10 and the Functional Table of Contents.

Before breaking into groups, a question was raised on the definition of evaluator for use in this book. Discussion ensued on the use of the words user and evaluator—are they interchangeable?

Who is the primary focus of the standards? Who is the audience for this book? Dr. Gullickson confirmed that every time this discussion takes place, the teacher ends at the top of the list. It was decided that the definition for evaluator for this book should be as follows: Used broadly in this book to refer to anyone who evaluates students or designs and/or conducts student evaluation. This includes anyone who designs and/or conducts student evaluations or who makes decisions about students.

Questions were also raised regarding the focus of this task. Dr. Gullickson clarified that the discussion from last year regarding classroom and including higher education resulted in the decision that the focus is on the classroom. This is not only the assessment that the teachers are in charge of but also administering those other kinds of non-classroom tests. Confusion led to review of the introduction section regarding the invitation to users and the purposes of these standards.

Dr. Gullickson stated that the focus of the standards is to address evaluation which would be defined as judgments about student characteristics, performances, or attributes. If we're writing a set of standards that go to how we make judgments about students performances, characteristics or attributes that's very different than writing a standard about how we should conduct assessments or run testing programs. What we're looking at to some extent is testing results or other kinds of measures that could be used in making those judgments. This is clarified further in the introduction portion of the draft. It's a systematic investigation of the merit or worth of an object for the purpose of conciseness, and in this term the object is the student. The individual student covered by these standards include those trained under or receiving instruction under educational and training programs, projects and/or materials or something like that.

Dr. Gullickson stated that it was important that there is consistency in the usage throughout all the standards. The definition of evaluator was discussed. It was clarified as one who designs or conducts systems of evaluation of a student or makes decisions based on student evaluation. The differences between user and evaluator were discussed. Evaluator means teacher in these standards. With these clarifications, the Committee then adjourned to small groups and were asked to reconvene prior to dinner.

Upon reconvening, each group leader gave their numbers for the standards they reviewed. Dr. Gullickson noted that this process identified the standards that need work and the standards that are close to being completed.

One needs to be familiar with this set of standards before calls can be made about it. The full group has to look at these standards and make calls to change it or improve it. Whichever occurs, Dr. Gullickson wants to leave at the end of this meeting with a modified version of this approved as a first draft so the process can continue to the field for review. That was a primary objective for the meeting.

Dr. Gullickson charged the groups to (a) read the standards, (b) read that half of the standards assigned to your group and identify what you consider to be the major issues for each of those

standards, and (c) reconvene tomorrow morning as a full group to collect that information by standard and talk about the major issues. The Committee adjourned to small group sessions.

Friday, October 1, 1999

Dr. Gullickson welcomed the group back to day two of the meeting. The second member of the validation panel arrived. His name is Placido Garcia and he is from New Mexico.

Dr. Gullickson reviewed the development of the student evaluation standards. He stated that guidelines are positive things that are done to yield positive results. The flip side to common errors is a list of difficulties, mistakes, possible negative side effects and there's a general rule that's been followed in the development of the other *Standards*. It is to start it with a gerund (i.e., failing to, fostering, making) that is a verb word in -ing form. The writers were asked not to replicate the guidelines in a negative form, so you ought to find a guideline above and it should not be replicated on the negative side below. The idea being that's a redundancy we'd like to avoid. Either it's a positive statement or a common error, but not both. The next piece is illustrative case. The writers were asked to prepare two cases, one where the standard was met and a second where the standard was not met. Some standards have three cases because the writers thought there were three different instances that were important enough that they need to be presented. With the illustrative case, there is first a description section, and then an analysis. An important rule in this case study is that all of the new information gets presented in the description. The information is then analyze, without providing any new information, a judgment or call is made. It's no fair to sneak in, "because the teacher wasn't available in the room" that wasn't in the description, so that people are making a judgment without that information in the description. Read the analyses carefully to make sure that they're not adding new information.

The last point, supporting documentation, addresses references to the literature and is an area the needs help. Too many of these standards don't have accompanying references to literature. Anything that can be done to identify new pieces of literature, either here or get back at the office, is important to do.

As stated at the end of the previous day, the purpose of this morning was to take time to discuss the major issues that were found with the standards. The group leaders gave their numbers for the student evaluation standards that they reviewed. The first major concern stated was that the P6 that was in the book was the old version. Dr. Rogers had the new version and it was given to Dr. Beatty for inclusion within her group's materials. Before going further, Dr. Gullickson stated that he met with the Executive Committee on how to divide up these standards for finalization in first draft form. It was decided to keep the current groups almost intact; one minor change was made to add a fourth person to Bob Wilson's group. The allocation of standards was assigned as Group 1 (Edith Beatty) P1 to P8, Group 2 (Bob Wilson) A1 to A10, Group 3 (Don Yarbrough) U1 to U7, and Group 4 (Diana Newman) F1 to F3 and A11 and A12.

The next step was for the group leader to allocate the individual standards within the group with the notion that each member writes and each member critiques. It was as close to an iterative process that could be done. Once a standard was complete on paper, they were to be given to the secretary to put it on electronic form. This final form was used for review the next day. It was anticipated that by the next morning, all of these things will be through the last stage so they could be reviewed by the full membership. The full group returned to small groups to continue their work and to report back after lunch.

After returning from lunch, each group leader gave an update on the standards they have reviewed and/or finalized to this point. The members reconvened into small groups and were to report back to the full group Saturday.

Saturday, October 2, 1999

Dr. Gullickson welcomed everyone to day three of the meeting. Committee members requested the time in the morning to finalize their small group work. Dr. Gullickson stated that the afternoon will be needed to work on the remaining items of the agenda. The members reconvened into small groups and were to report back after lunch.

Upon return from lunch, several concerns about the standards were mentioned. A summary of those items were the uneven references to other standards, do the cases fit the standard, the writer forgot to focus on those who are using the evaluation information—the students, how do standards from other groups interact with these standards, add cases that relate to the design of evaluations, and relate to university level teachers, the positive and negative examples should not be so extreme, that the qualitative and quantitative standards deal with data collection not the analysis, concern over not realizing what the standard is about until halfway through reading the standard, and the concern that the cases were focusing too much on the teacher alone and not with the teacher and interaction with school policies, district policies, and/or predominant practices. How are these concerns going to be addressed? It was suggested that a sub-group of the Joint Committee meet at the American Evaluators Association (AEA) annual meeting to review the feedback compiled from each of the groups. Four to five members of the Joint Committee agreed to meet on Friday night of the conference to review the compiled document in its entirety.

This resulted in the following time line. Results from the small group meetings would be typed up and given to the members within 2-3 working days of the end of this meeting. The full membership would review their small group portion and send their feedback to their group leader. The group leader would send their combined responses to The Evaluation Center for finalizing by the middle of October. That version would be sent to the sub-group within the week. The sub-group would then concentrate at that meeting on critiquing that document and drawing it into a more concise and final document. That final document will be sent to the full membership within two weeks of the AEA meeting for final review. The members would need to have their comments back to Dr. Gullickson by December 1. Those comments will be incorporated into the document that will be sent out early January to the national and

international review panel. The review panel responses will be received by the end of March. Review of those responses and, where appropriate, modifications to the standards will produce the second draft document. The second draft will be sent to the members for review before the next meeting. Dr. Gullickson asked if there was any objection to this process and if they agreed that those final standards would have their support to send on through the national and international review process. There were no objections.

It was recommended that a glossary be included with the review panel version. Dr. Gullickson agreed to have the glossaries from the other two books available for the AEA meeting. That would be a place to start so that a glossary would be included within that version to the members in mid-November. Placement of the supporting documentation, suggested readings, and references was also discussed. It was agreed that the suggested readings would be better as a part of the implementation process that would take place after the standards were completed. It was also agreed that the supporting documentation and references would remain in the same location as originally drafted. The members then stated which of them could receive the results of the work at this meeting by email. Two members requested hard copy of the document.

Dr. Rogers noted concern that every ones responsibility ends up being no ones responsibility. Once the members get back to their offices, time is not their own and therefore, one says that the other will do the work. All members need to make a commitment to do the work. In order for the document to be ready for the review panel, it must be read throughout for consistency in language and person. It was recommended that Dr. Gullickson do this.

National/International Review Panel

The next item discussed was the review panel for the student evaluation standards. Dr. Jennifer Fager had distributed the handout titled National / International Review Panel Recommendations by Joint Committee Members to the group. This document listed Dr. Fager's email address on the front to be used by anybody in the room. She reported she had either names and no addresses or in one case, lots of names and lots of email addresses. This data has been collected over the last year will be double-checked to make sure people are still available and interested and at those addresses that were provided. ASCD, Great City Schools, NEA, NSBA, CES, NASSP, NEASP, NLPS, AERA, CSSE and NCME have not submitted any information. Dr. Fager asked the information be emailed to her to expedite this process. A concern was stated that some organizations do not have international people to recommend. Dr. Gullickson directed them to speak with their organization President to see if any recommendations could be made. Some organizations draw from a very similar group of people and therefore names submitted may not lead to a new person to contact.

Dr. Fager mentioned that typically, just because she's received umpteen names doesn't mean that they will respond positively or respond at all. Her preference is to err on the side of way too many names rather than not enough. Based on survey practices, there will be only a 15 to 30 percent positive response rate to participate. Dr. Fager offered to prepare a letter to go out to each person that is on the list. That letter would state who nominated them and why. Dr.

Gullickson read the *Operating Procedures* that speaks to review panels. Its not particularly clear or specific. It says the first draft of the standards shall be critiqued by a national review panel and an international review panel. Each panel shall include approximately 60 persons, equal numbers of which will be nominated by each sponsoring organization, and then it goes on to speak to what the critique would entail. As a sponsoring organization, the members were asked to nominate several people. The original request was 10 national and 5 international from each organization representative. Dr. Kruger mentioned that a letter from either the CES president or herself would probably be a very good idea. One Joint Committee member contacted each person they recommended and asked if they would be willing to participate. Dr. Fager stated that prior contact increases the likelihood of their participation. If the Joint Committee member will not be able to do this, Dr. Fager will send the appropriate letter or email informing them of our request. The time commitment from the reviewers for this work covers a month to a month and a half. The reviewer would not need all that time but gives the reviewer a chance to spread the task out over a period of time. There are several things a reviewer is asked to do with the book and there is a form to fill out. Dr. Gullickson read the criteria as stated in the *Operating Procedures*. The criteria will include at least the following: need for the document; responsiveness to concerns in the field; scope of the standards; validity of their advice; practicality; political viability; legality; clarity and depth of treatment; and appropriateness of language. So there are about 6 to 8 items that they need to respond to in terms of those standards. The names of all reviewers will be published in the appendix of the book. One member asked Dr. Gullickson to check with Sage Publishers to see if they would donate a book on the published standards to each reviewer. He would do so. Dr. Fager asked that the nominations be to her by November 15, 2000. These nominations can come by mail or her email address is Jennifer.Fager@wmich.edu.

Field Test Plan

Next Dr. Fager discussed the field test design draft. She distributed a draft plan that was developed based on *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* and *The Program Evaluation Standards* protocols for field testing. She noted that in the past to find volunteers for field testing the *Standards*, each of the Joint Committee supporting organizations advertised in their journals for volunteers to participate in the field testing. Dr. Fager asked each member to also send her names of sponsoring organization journals where these advertisements would go. She then reviewed the various aspects of the draft plan. Dr. Fager clarified that critical cases were unusual or highly visible cases that stood out in the media or are in violation of some standard(s) where those cases that might fit the *Standards* scrutiny. The last pages of the plan are the report guide for field testing. Any feedback on this plan should be addressed to Dr. Fager. This plan will have to be finalized by the next Joint Committee meeting.

Validation Panel Report

Dr. Rogers commended the members for the serious and intense effort paid to the task over these three days. He first updated everyone on the concerns the Panel stated last year. They asked that Dr. Gullickson become the principal investigator for both grants. That has happened. They asked that *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* be postponed for a year. It was. They

would have asked to postpone the decision to do whatever with *The Program Evaluation Standards* but that was resolved within the group. That was good and is seen as ways of protecting the time and effort needed to develop *The Student Evaluation Standards*.

With the revising of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*, the group was commended for letting Dr. Jerry Horn do it. The Panel thought it was imperative to establish a meeting schedule that effectively accommodates the needs of both projects. Even with a different time table for developing the second draft, a concern was stated that if the Committee does not get the panel results until the next meeting and three days are needed to revise them, that it will be tough next year to work on the revision of *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. They would recommend the possibility of having two separate meetings. But if the Joint Committee can stay with the timetable that's been outlined, the members will only need the first day or day and a half to have the field test draft ready to go. If not, a lot more work will need to be done at the next meeting just for developing the second draft.

Dr. Rogers concern was based on his experiences when he worked on *The Program Evaluation Standards*. At that time, they were talking to program evaluators. When they did *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*, it was with people who did personnel evaluations. There are many more people involved in student evaluation with all kinds of opinions and attitudes as to how it ought to go. If these panels work, the Committee is going to get a diversity of response much greater than anything received for the first two *Standards*. It may be tough to distill that information. For example, one particular person who we all knew said A. This particular person who we all knew well said B. Those are the kinds of conflicts the Committee will receive because they are known. We know who they are.

Dr. Rogers recommended a small team of writers be put together. That happened with the group meeting at AEA. Other recommendations that were going to be made, was one about carefully reviewing the whole document; that's being done. They were going to recommend that if at all possible, the Joint Committee members contact potential reviewers on the national panel at least—more difficult on the international reviewers. Some of the members have already done that. Concern over the haziness and the definition of evaluation and assessment and that kind for stuff, should be taken care of on November 5.

It is very crucial to get a project staff member. The current project staff don't have the time to do all of the things they have to do. If there's somehow or another a way for paying for a person who's first job is to work on the student standards, that you do it. He recommended that to the Committee and thought it would do well. Dr. Rogers was not familiar with the current budgets to know if that would fit within them or whether outside funding sources could be found, but it sure would help.

The Validation Panel's next concern was already taken care of. They said it would be crucial that the Joint Committee members be provided with material before each meeting so that they can at least read it perhaps on the plane coming in. That concern was covered with the suggested time line with a summary of the responses from the national and international panel

members and Identification of the particular standards each member will be responsible for in the revision process. If he was a member and was doing the U's, then he would get the full set of specific comments. That strikes him as what was outlined and if that would be done, then it might make this meeting a little less intense.

The web site was a great idea. They encouraged the associations to put something up on their web page about what this Committee is all about, and then you put in their address and you can double-click on that and up comes the Joint Committee's one and some of these things. They saw this as a way of expanding the knowledge base about the Joint Committee. It was the first step in marketing. As more and more people come on, they're going to become aware of the *Standards* and perhaps it will whet their appetite.

A question was raised on if a full set of the draft *Standards* are put up on the web, what's to stop someone from downloading them and just saying "now I have them"? And will this cut into sales? The Validation Panel members suggested putting up maybe one standard from each of the four areas as a sample of the *Standards* for this web site that might be open to the public as opposed to just members of the Joint Committee. Dr. Rogers was not sure if that was a real concern or not.

The last concern of the Validation Panel was that some of the groups weren't represented at this meeting for example school boards who hire teachers, those who look after kids, both NEA and AFT represent teachers and so forth. There are rules in the operating procedures as to how many times they can be absent and so forth. Dr. Rogers encouraged whomever was responsible to make sure that as many as possible of the organization representatives be at next year's meeting. The results from that meeting are going to affect what they are doing. The Joint Committee will be sending out the final draft after that 2001 meeting and that's a critical one. Hopefully, the public hearings won't find a whole a lot of errors. Then in 2002 there won't have to be an enormous amount of changes. Dr. Rogers surmised that a lot of changes will be made next year. That completed their report for this year.

Dr. Gullickson was pleased with the encouraging report. He commented that the operating procedures called for the Joint Committee to have a staff director that oversees the work and development of standards. It just doesn't stipulate where the money comes from to pay for the staff director. If we were to put a staff director on salary at this moment, it would take them about a month or two to get up to speed with us. Then the time line would be useless. Dr. Rogers recommended that the Executive Committee deal with this dilemma. The Pew Foundation and the Panasonic Foundation were mentioned as possible funding sources. Discussion ensued on what a staff director would cost, would that person have to be located at The Evaluation Center, what funding sources could be contacted, and whether the sponsoring organizations should be solicited for contributions. Dr. Gullickson noted on the last item that there are several organizations that do not have people here this year because of funding. Based on that, he did not feel that the sponsoring organizations would be able to assist financially. With no additional questions on the Validation Panel Report, Dr. Gullickson stated that he would share the Validation Panel report with the members once received.

Association Update

Dr. Gullickson updated the members on the status of the associations. NEA's representative, Segun Eubanks, is the first one that has been at a Joint Committee meeting in years. AFT made a commitment to replace Beth Bader who resigned but no one was assigned before this meeting. Kevin Hollenbeck representing NSBA resigned late in the summer. NSBA is working on finding someone to replace Hollenbeck for next year's meeting. When these representatives get assigned, they will be allocated with a task group for the Joint Committee. Two other associations, Council of Greater City Schools and National Association of Elementary School Principals, have representatives assigned but they were not able to attend this meeting.

Executive Committee Report

ANSI Compliance. Three sections of the Operating Procedures were reviewed to be in compliance with ANSI requirements. They were sections 5.1 (Openness and Consensus) and 5.7 (Records), and to create a new section 5.9 pertaining to ANSI standards with two subsections 5.9.1 Metric Policy and 5.9.2 Patent Policy. After discussion, a motion was made and seconded that each section stated below be approved as revised or created. The motions carried unanimously.

Change section 5.1 of the Operating Procedures. Currently it reads (Section to be changed in **bold**):

5.1 Openness and Consensus

Throughout the development and revision of its standards, the Joint Committee shall seek participation from a large diversity of directly and materially affected persons and groups. For example, school district superintendents, teachers, state government officials, school principals, educational psychologists, school board members, curriculum specialists, school counselors, evaluators, research methodologists, and testing experts are among the many persons and groups that may be affected. These are examples only, and participants will not necessarily be limited to these alone.

Representatives of the Committee and Project Staff will attend and participate in the annual meeting of each Sponsoring Organization. Participation will include giving progress reports at board meetings, presenting papers and symposia, and offering training sessions. The Committee shall also publish accounts of its work in various newsletters and journals. Included will be reports of progress, pertinent literature reviews, analyses of significant issues, and commentary by independent critics.

The Committee will prepare and distribute materials to assist interested persons and groups to conduct discussions about and provide training in the area of its standards activities. **These materials will include quarterly newsletters, sets of transparencies, a new videotape each year that presents the latest work plan or version of the standards, and ultimately a technical manual for applying the Committee's standards. The newsletter will be sent**

without charge to a mailing list of interested parties--to be expanded throughout the process. The availability of the materials will be announced in the newsletter and, on request, distributed at cost. The Committee will also maintain annually a technical assistance service at the home office of the Committee and offer two regional workshops each year. In addition to keeping its constituents abreast of its standard activities, and responding more specifically to certain interested groups, the Committee will consistently collect and record reactions and suggestions and provide them to the full Committee.

The Joint Committee is the consensus establishing group when making decisions on approval of a standard. The Joint Committee uses information from reviews, field tests, hearings, and persons and groups that may be directly and materially affected in its decisions. Evidence of consensus to be submitted to ANSI will be the minutes of Joint Committee meetings in which decisions about individual standards are made. Further evidence of consensus is provided to all interested parties through commissioning and disseminating external independent evaluations of the Joint Committee's decision-making process.

The replacement reads as follows:

The Committee will use the Internet to provide access to the annual meeting minutes, the latest work plan, draft versions of standards, and other opportunities for information exchange. In addition to keeping its constituents abreast of its standard activities, and responding more specifically to certain interested groups, the Committee will consistently collect and record reactions and suggestions and provide them to the full Committee.

Change the records retention statement for Section 5.7. Previously the statement read as follows:

5.7 Records

Complete historical documentation of each standards project shall be maintained on file at the location of the Host Organization for a period of not less than 5 years after approval of the standards. These files shall include all standards that were considered, and all reports and documents that were developed in relation to the project, and shall be made available to the public.

As changed it reads (change is in bold):

5.7 Records

Complete historical documentation of each standards project shall be maintained on file at the location of the Host Organization. Records concerning new, revised, or reaffirmed standards will be retained for one complete development cycle or until the standard is revised. Records concerning withdrawn standards will be retained for at least five years from date of withdrawal. These files shall include all standards that were considered, and all reports and documents that were developed in relation to the project, and shall be made available to the public.

Add a new section: 5.9 American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Compliance.

5.9.1 Metric Policy

The Committee does not employ metrics in its standards statements.

5.9.2 Patent Policy

The Committee will comply with the ANSI Patent Policy for American National Standards.

Nominations

There was a vice-chair vacancy on the Executive Committee now that Dr. Gullickson is our chair. Jerry Horn was nominated. The Executive Committee opened the floor for other nominations. No other nominations were received so the nominations were closed. Dr. Gullickson read the vice-chair's duties and responsibilities as stated in the operating procedures. Jerry Horn was accepted by acclamation.

Renew of the Host Contract with The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University

Dr. Gullickson distributed the current contract after it was moved and seconded to renew the host contract with The Evaluation Center. After review, it was recommended that a date when the first contract was entered into and each time it was revised be included at the bottom of the contract. Other editorial recommendations were made. Being no other changes, the motion carried unanimously to renew the contract with The Evaluation Center as amended for three years.

Task Forces

Task force for the external review of *The Program Evaluation Standards*. Two members, Diana Newman and Joan Kruger, confirmed their interest in serving on this task force. Dr. Gullickson asked this group to prepare a plan that would elicit information from all organizations on the pros and cons of *The Program Evaluation Standards*.

Task force for developing a 10-year plan. The Executive Committee will look at that issue and bring it before the full Joint Committee at the next meeting.

Review of the Bylaws and Operating Procedures

The Executive Committee expressed concern that the Bylaws and the Operating Procedures may not always be completely congruent and that any discrepancies between the way we operate will be of interest to ANSI. They asked Dr. Gullickson to carefully review the Bylaws and note any areas that appear to be outdated or that need to bring before us for attention or any changes.

Validation Panels

Dr. Gullickson read a letter dated September 29 from the Validation Panel chairman, Dr. Todd Rogers. It read as follows:

“Dear Arlen, please accept my resignation as chair and member of the Validation Panel, Student Evaluation Standards. I became intimately involved with writing standards for the Student Evaluation Standards when the writing task force met on August 16 and August 17, 1999. I believe that the work I completed at that time could compromise my impartiality as a member of the Validation Panel. Further, others had questioned my involvement. Consequently, I feel I cannot fairly continue as a chair or member of the Validation Panel. I propose that my resignation take effect once a new chair for the Validation Panel has been appointed. I will work with this person to ensure a smooth transition should this be acceptable to you. I have enjoyed my time as chair and remain committed to the successful development and distribution of the Student Evaluation Standards. If you believe I can help in other ways, please feel free to ask me. Sincerely, Todd.”

It was noted that Dr. Rogers’ contributions to these meetings have been absolutely critical, especially because so many members have served for such a short period of time. He has a history which he’s brought up at almost every meeting about this is how we used to do it and this is what happened. Dr. Gullickson noted appreciation for Dr. Rogers’ involvement the whole way, and to the extent that he can keep Dr. Rogers involved in ways that are possible, Dr. Gullickson wants to do that.

With the resignation of Dr. Rogers and Dr. Stufflebeam from the Student Evaluation Standards Validation Panel, Dr. Gullickson asked the members to get recommendations from the presidents of their association/organizations for a new chair and possibly others for the Student Evaluation Standards as well as recommendations for Validation Panel members for the Personnel Evaluation Standards. These recommendations should come from the presidents of the associations/organizations.

Dr. Gullickson is authorized to appoint people to be the members of the Validation Panels but needs recommendations in order to do that. According to the Operating Procedures, “The specific functions of this panel shall be to identify and examine the assumptions underlying the Joint Committee’s work, to critique and report on the panel’s validation process, to assess the applicability of the standards in various national and international contexts, to confront the Committee with issues and ideas drawn from pertinent theoretical analyses and empirical research; and to report publicly on the results of their validity checks. Six persons shall be selected to serve on this panel including a personnel psychologist, a scholar in the field of research on teaching, a philosopher of education, an expert on international education, an expert on law in education, and an expert on the administration of education. The Joint Committee will establish a systematic selection process with assistance from the project staff and will define the qualifications of each panelist and obtain nominations and supporting information from the president of each supporting organization. The Committee will review and discuss the

recommendations and rank order the nominees for each position, subsequently the project staff will recruit the panelists in accordance with the Joint Committee's specification." Dr. Gullickson will work with the Executive Committee regarding the rank ordering and recruiting.

With no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned with Dr. Gullickson thanking everyone for a great meeting; extremely productive. He was pleased with it, and thankful that everyone was here to do the work and looks forward to working with everyone this year and next year.