

# Evaluation Summary

National Forum on Education Statistics  
Summer 2008 Forum Meeting  
Bethesda, MD

## Summary

---

A total of 43 evaluation forms were submitted at the Summer 2008 Forum Meeting in Bethesda, MD. Respondents rated each of the fourteen included sessions and roundtables on the following grading scale. In rating roundtables and Standing Committee meetings, respondents were also given the option “NA.”

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
4	3	2	1

## Sessions

---

### **NCES Update (Closing Session)**

Mark Schneider, Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.16

Total number of responses: 40

#### *Comments*

“Helpful to hear about upcoming NCES studies – the brief time slot was good.”

“Limited new information presented by Mark Schneider.”

“Context and relationship to other ED work, as well as education-related initiatives in other federal departments, e.g. Census, Labor, HHS.”

“Recognize new members and committee chairs individually. Good to...”

“Always enjoy Mr. Schneider.”

### **FERPA Update (Opening Session)**

Leroy Rooker, U.S. Department of Education

#### *Summary*

Mean: 2.60

Total number of responses: 42

#### *Comments*

“It would be very helpful to have written summary instead of trying to take copious notes from verbal presentation, especially on this high stakes issue.”

“Visual presentation or handouts would have helped to follow along.”

“Could barely hear Leroy Rooker. A summary handout would have been helpful.”

“Need more time on FERPA.”

“Would like handouts for the updates like this one that are very critical.”

“Needs more time.”

“Never enough time to ask specific questions.”

“I look forward to a detailed presentation of the new regs at our next meeting.”

“Needs handouts and allow more specific questions.”  
“Just not his strong point.”  
“Monotone, delivery was boring.”  
“Same info – nothing new.”  
“Important info, limited by uncertain final outcome on regs. Tough to do.”  
“The visits to individual committees are always valuable – good for everyone to hear the same update at our joint session.”  
“FERPA speaker very dry and hard to pay attention to.”  
“Need more specifics. Leroy gives the same speech every time.”  
“Dry topic – Leroy is a great guy, but... a little [short] on engaging audience.”  
“FERPA and security/privacy in general need to be a continuing focus topic.”  
“Informative, but too long without handouts.”  
“His voice did not carry well in the room so it was difficult to follow. Needed more time with him in our standing committees.”  
“Good information, but presenter was not enthusiastic about topic.”

### **NCES Teacher Compensation Survey Update (Joint Session)**

Stephen Cornman and Frank Johnson, National Center for Education Statistics

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.00

Total number of responses: 33

#### *Comments*

“Disagree with conclusion of model not considering all elements. Individual elements lead to wrong conclusions.”  
“Very interesting information.”  
“In this session it was never identified that this survey is voluntary.”  
“I think the available data was too limited, but the presentation and methodology was correct and good.”  
“Very interesting – would like more information.”  
“Results from the data were interesting.”  
“This really wasn’t a joint meeting thing. More a data conference thing. We’ve seen most of their content before.”  
“Basic info good. Don’t think conclusions of analysis presented.”  
“Good hypothetical use of data. Need to expand to more states.”  
“I thought the data analysis on one coefficient was not meaningful and the audience knew it, too. So, the other info didn’t seem meaningful either.”  
“Great start – when will it be fully implemented.”

### **Data Across the P-20 Education Data System (Closing Session)**

Aimee Rogstad Guidera, Data Quality Campaign

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.42

Total number of responses: 36

#### *Comments*

“Nice materials. Great information.”  
“Let’s get the FERPA ↔ DQC issue resolved. Lots of ambiguity.”  
“DQC overview was excellent. Made case for K-20 exchange of data.”  
“Great presentation – excellent ideas and examples presented.”  
“The presented surveys often do not get to knowledgeable people and lack validity. I also felt this was a bit of marketing. These people lobby our legislators, often in opposition to SEA recommendation on behalf of private researchers.”  
“But how is DQC related to other groups doing similar work?”  
“Need more info on how to overcome the barriers [of] FERPA.”  
“Good example of why we collect data and why we need P-20. Very good presenter. [Polished] great spokesperson for P-20 ed.”  
“Very good session.”  
“Best Forum speaker – she has a vision! Bring back for an update in Seattle next year!”

## **Roundtables**

---

### **Attendance Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.17

Total number of responses: 18

#### *Comments*

“Good participation and request for data from states regarding attendance analysis.”  
“Good codes, model for state to examine.”  
“Topic is good – work is almost completed.”  
“Looking forward to the final product.”

### **Crisis Data Management Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.28

Total number of responses: 18

#### *Comments*

“Comprehensive update.”  
“Good participation and follow-up – clarifications of natural or man-made crisis to manage to help in these times.”  
“Gives states something to think about. How prepared are you to send records to other states... quality of data, efficient way to send, how quickly can it be assembled, etc.”  
“Seems like this group is on good timeline.”  
“Very important work, well done.”

### **Data Ethics Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.33

Total number of responses: 18

#### *Comments*

- “It might be useful to ‘post’ scenarios and have an interactive way for others to post their suggestions/solutions.”
- “Canons and vignettes will be very helpful in promoting ethical use of data.”
- “Relevant – can’t wait.”
- “Allowed and encouraged additional feedback on a topic SEAs and LEAs must deal with daily. Recommend continued discussions on this topic.”
- “Well-presented – good discussion.”

### **Longitudinal Data Systems Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.13

Total number of responses: 15

#### *Comments*

- “So who is going to help states that are struggling?”
- “Presentation still seems to be at the awareness level. Also, where is higher ed?”
- “Update was thorough and complete. Glad to hear they will release chapters in advance.”

### **Metadata Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.67

Total number of responses: 12

#### *Comments*

- “Finally understand it! Great subtitle suggestions.”
- “Work seems to be completed – no new information.”
- “Very open to feedback even though the process for this task force is nearing completion.”

### **PK-12 Data Model Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.18

Total number of responses: 19

#### *Comments*

- “Still too esoteric.”
- “Again, cool stuff. Get beyond spending time at awareness level.”
- “Interesting, relevant, exciting work.”
- “Very good presentations and material provided. Open to new ideas and clarifications. Thank you.”

### **Race/Ethnicity Task Force (Roundtable)**

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.35

Total number of responses: 23

#### *Comments*

- “Provided a clear, plain language explanation of the reporting requirements.”
- “We need this published within the next few weeks, even if it’s just electronic. We have a critical need for this in providing support to LEAs. I am very concerned about further delays.”

“Needed to share more content information.”  
“LEAs and SEAs anxious for this information.”  
“This is a much-needed document. There still seems to be unanswered questions re: implementation. It would be very helpful for the Forum to host a central location (online) for states to post their documents regarding the rollout to districts (presentations, training materials, etc.).”

## **Standing Committee Meetings**

---

NOTE: There were 6 respondents who selected a numeric rating, but did not specify which standing committee meeting they attended. Therefore, their ratings are not included in the calculations for the meeting summaries below.

### *Summary of unspecified meeting responses*

Mean: 3.67

Total number of responses: 6

### **Standing Committee Time (NESAC)**

Linda Rocks, Chair, Bossier Parish, LA

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.81

Total number of responses: 16

#### *Comments*

“Smaller room for standing committee meeting.”  
“The discussion breakouts of SEA-only, LEA-only and combined were particularly useful.”  
“Need to address Safe and Drug Free data issues – before states get too far down the road in rolling out their SLDS.”  
“Good discussion. Need to connect the Forum to EIMAC.”  
“Always very informative. Really like the SEA/LEA breakouts.”  
“Linda Rocks.”  
“Good discussion, especially when we broke out SEA/LEA.”  
“The topics were appropriate and most presentations were well done.”  
“Linda and Helene were great and presentations on FOIA and the on-time grad rate were excellent.”  
“Very well run and full agenda with time to share information and challenges.”  
“Especially enjoyed Robert Curten’s presentation and PowerPoint on MA graduation rate calculations. Liked opportunity for SEA-SEA and LEA-LEA breakouts.”  
“Agenda was full. Could allow for more open discussion time.”

### **Standing Committee Time (PPI)**

Levette Williams, Chair, Georgia Department of Education

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.70

Total number of responses: 10

#### *Comments*

“Chair was extremely organized – facilitated a lot of good discussion.”

“PPI could always use [more].”

“Really good PPI conversations. Great leadership from Levette.”

“Great things happen when you put people with knowledge, experience and commitment in the same room.”

“Need more working/brainstorming time. Need more FERPA time. Reports take much time. Accountability via reports maybe could be written and/or PPT and put online and printed form for those who seek the information. We want to contribute, not only sit and listen.”

### **Standing Committee Time (TECH)**

Kathy Gosa, Chair, Kansas State Department of Education

#### *Summary*

Mean: 3.92

Total number of responses: 12

#### *Comments*

“Liked the idea of having discussion sessions after presentations. Good information sharing.”

“This committee does great work and is very in touch with state/LEA needs in this area. Lots of good ideas were shared.”

“Kathy Gosa was a great Chair!”

“Excellent sessions. Learned a lot.”

“Recordation was very helpful.”

“Lots of good discussion time!”

“One of the most informative and thought provoking sessions we’ve had.”

“Very well-run with timely, relevant topics. The professional development sessions are especially helpful.”

### **Additional Comments**

---

Question: Do you have any additional comments you would like to make about these activities or about any other aspect of the Forum meeting?

#### *Comments*

“Miss the roundtables and larger room at the Mayflower.”

“I would like to see more joint sessions.”

“Did not like the theatre seating in the combined session.”

“As a new member, I was welcomed into the Forum. Members sought me out as a new member. I learned a lot about the Forum’s work – even though I thought I knew a lot coming in. Planned evening activities were incredible and provided yet another opportunity to get to know members and have further dialogue.”

“Put committee initials after names in back of book (PPI, NESAC, TECH). Most importantly, add SHIO (and more to be defined) to the cooperative. They are at least as important as ASBO, NCSL, and SREB.”

“Please add a printer to the Cyber Café for low volume printing by attendees, e.g. contact/web info, boarding passes for flights home, critical requests from the office, maps, etc.”

“Please do not schedule meetings before 9 am. The meeting space is problematic. No place for participants to sit and network during breakfast. Also, breakfast includes protein (e.g., eggs,

etc.). We're not getting breakfast, but can't claim reimbursement if we need a real breakfast. Please consider discontinuing the vendor demonstration area.”

“Please hold the meetings in conventionally located areas – DC, Boston, Chicago.”

“I like the hotel, but the meeting rooms are not as conducive as before. We need a larger common area for networking.”

“Fewer roundtables. More time in standing committees. Maybe have task forces present to standing committees.”

“Love the sharing.”

“Good setting. Good location.”

“Need more on MSIX.”

“Hotel layout is awkward for a meeting of this size. With the continued emphasis on Higher Ed linkage, perhaps some Higher Ed speaker(s) to the Forum would be helpful. Also Dept. of Labor – as P-20 happens, we need to know those regs as well. Bottom line – the Forum needs to help facilitate USDA, Labor, Hi Ed integration for our P-20 builds. Thanks.”

“The facilities were cramped. Not set up to foster networking, socializing.”

“What should states do for elementary courses if using CIP or SCED?”

“Forum participants outside SEAs and LEAs should be listed to heighten awareness.”

“Possible working group – National student ID for PK-20.”

“Time for discussion in standing committees was extremely helpful.”

“Appreciate Lee's efforts to get the evening activities organized. Anyone who wants to can have an evening activity. Great idea and great leader on Peggy's part. Thanks, Lee – as always, thoughtful and concerned.”

“Seems very crowded in the Haverford room when we meet together. Registration area and refreshment and vendors too crowded. I'm not sure how this will work when all the MIS participants come. Very nice evening reception. More tables so conversations may occur.”

“The reception was delightful.”

“I would appreciate handouts from the US ED and other presenters. Handouts and materials make sharing this important information easier and realistic. Handouts don't need to be full PowerPoints. For presenters who did provide handouts, thank you for the extra effort!”

“Schedule precluded attending all roundtables.”

“Next meeting: Have more, but shorter sessions of roundtables. Couldn't attend all those on LDS, metadata, PK-12 data model, and race/ethnicity that I was interested in.”

“Next time, serve some protein for breakfast. Even cream cheese would have helped. Thanks for afternoon coffee!!”

“Breakout SEAs and LEAs.”

“The evening reception was wonderful! Great food. More seating was needed during the breakfast time.”

“Great conference!”