

**Evaluation Summary:
National Forum on Education Statistics
Winter 2007 Forum Meeting
Atlanta, Georgia**

Summary

A total of 57 evaluation forms were submitted at the Winter 2007 Forum Meeting in Atlanta, GA. Respondents rated each of the ten 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

NCES Update (Opening Session)

Mark Schneider, Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.26 Total number of responses: 53

Comments

“How about some visuals”

“Good pinch hitting”

“Topical presentation on Katrina and Rita.”

“Wish Mark could have been here.”

“Despite weather difficulties, presentations were good. Substitutes did an excellent job.”

Disaster Recovery Planning in SEAs and LEAs (Opening Session)

Derrick Lindsay, Mississippi Department of Education
Linda Rocks, Bossier Parish Schools (LA)

Summary

Mean: 3.56 Total number of responses: 54

Comments

“Would have helped to have some clear ‘lessons learned’ and guidelines for all to prepare for disasters.”

“Data demands of Katrina was great insight into how data systems must respond quickly to accurately capture info during these events.”

“Informative. Relevant.”

“Great, informative presentation by both Linda Rocks and Derrick Lindsay.”

“Great presentation.”

“What a difficult thing to overcome.”

“Raised consciousness of need for local/state recovery plans. Guidelines should be formulated.”

“Very interesting. Good hints and tips on how to handle disasters.”

“Excellent presentation. We need to have a disaster procedure with policies in place that would allow state agencies to send student data.”

“Great to have both an LEA and SEA perspective.”

“Very good. Need to do more in this area for future meetings.”

EDEN Update (Monday Joint Session)

Ross Santy and Lee Hoffman, U.S. Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.19
Total number of responses: 54

Comments

“Sharp and clear.”

“Was looking for a little more detail, but good to know Ross will be in cyber café to answer questions.”

“Too much promise/too little information.”

“Brief, but informative.”

“While current assumes everyone is on same page and intimately connected with data collection.”

“Very good. Question! Will EDEN be a policy making body? Or will they collect the data determined by others?”

“Not too interesting for LEAs.”

Teacher/Staff Compensation (Tuesday Joint Session)

Frank Johnson, National Center for Education Statistics

Summary

Mean: 2.84
Total number of responses: 55

Comments

“I really question the planning behind the project. I think it should go back to the drawing board for clarification.”

“Scary: There is a ‘rush to publish.’ Within the Forum there’s disagreement about ‘comparability.’ If we do get the ‘submission’ correct—there’s a fear about how ‘policy makers’ will misuse the data.”

“Good exchange – information shared was relevant and helpful.”

“Session revealed need for greater SEA and LEA input on study.”

“Good information revealing what the project is not.”

“Ramifications of outcomes haven’t been fully thought out.”

“Much more work needs to be done before collection of this data. Concerned about voluntary collection turning to mandatory quickly.”

“Not thought out well.”

“Presentation good. Our state collects many of the data elements on individuals, but additional burden on LEAs at this time and limited lead in time could create dissention/disaster.”

“Delivery okay. Topic great to know what’s coming, but how this is being done – garbage in, garbage out. They need to collect more data about the data so they compare apples to apples.”

“It needs more thought before deployment.”

“Hopefully Frank didn’t confuse pointed questioning with lack of support for the project. It’s a good goal, but needs to be well thought out.”

“This is a very complex collection – please don’t try to over simplify it.”

E-Transcripts (Closing Session)

Michael Sessa, Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC)
Larry Fruth, Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA)

Summary

Mean: 3.17 Total number of responses: 53

Comments

“Nice to be among those who really know their business and are doing the right things for the right reasons!”

“Wish the word had gotten out about PESC prior to some states worked on LDS grants.”

“It’s great that K-12 and higher ed are collaborating on common standards in areas of overlap.”

“Duplicate of the TECH Standing Committee.”

“Informative.”

“Would like 2-way transcript info of higher ed back to LEA.”

“Derek was a great leader throughout the Forum.”

“Great cooperation between K-12 and post-secondary. Important in looking forward.”

Data Quality Curriculum Task Force (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.18 Total number of responses: 28

Comments

“Remote feed didn’t work well. Task force work is excellent.”

“Lots of tech trouble.”

“Great exchange of information. Stayed on task. Useful and will be used info.”

“Problem with transmission – would have preferred face-to-face.”

“Presenters stuck in snow storm. Ghedam did very good job of filling the gap. I am most interested in this!”

“We really need this document ASAP.”

PK-12 Data Model Task Force (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.24
Total number of responses: 25

Comments

“Not enough time for questions. It’s a roundtable, not a lecture.”

One of the speakers needs to talk less.

Truancy Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.38
Total number of responses: 24

Comments

“Good direction and conclusion.”

Metadata Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.21
Total number of responses: 29

Comments

“Clear, informative and professional.”

“Great and timely effort – special focus needed on the people/process side of implementing, owning and maintaining metadata.”

“Rushed to get approval. We need this, but presentation to product requires more in-depth thought – PR to market product.

“OK.”

Standing Committee Meetings

NOTE: There were 12 respondents who either selected a numeric rating or made a comment on a Standing Committee Meeting, but did not specify which meeting they attended. Therefore, their ratings are not included in the calculations for the meeting summaries on the following pages. A summary of these responses is below.

Summary of unspecified meeting responses

Mean: 3.55
Total number of responses: 11

Comments that could not be matched to a specific meeting

“Although not an official member, it was a great opportunity to meet and discuss issues in a smaller setting.”

“The session on Monday afternoon was too long.”

Standing Committee Time (NESAC)

Sonya Edwards, Chair, California Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.73
Total number of responses: 11

Comments

“Well-run topical meetings.”

“Great leadership with Sonya and Linda.”

Standing Committee Time (PPI)

Robert Beecham, Chair, Nebraska Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.59 Total number of responses: 11

Comments

“Excellent facilitation by Bob and Levette.”

“A lot of info in short time. Glad to hear FERPA presentation.”

Standing Committee Time (TECH)

Jeff Stowe, Chair, Arizona Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.46 Total number of responses: 24

Comments

“Maybe I’m mistaken, but I feel like we had too many reports and not enough work. I like Jeff’s closing idea!”

“Less roundtable discussion was better – more presenters great.”

“Very informative.”

“Excellent discussions!”

“Moved well through a very full agenda.”

“Too much time re-hashing joint session topics. Stay on agenda.”

“Best in years.”

“Jeff did a great job.”

“Good updates on what’s going on – never enough time to cover it all.”

“Not much open time for discussion – too many presentations.”

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

“Was a waste of time to have e-transcript presented in TECH session then repeated in closing.”

“Thank you for a quality and quantitative meeting.”

“Joint session speakers should not do same presentations in standing committee meetings, i.e. electronic transcript.”

“Very well run meeting. Thanks for the cyber café.”

“Good to have input from USED at Forum.”

“OVERALL – EXCELLENT meeting – well worth time for SEA and LEA representatives. Powerful work being done.”

“Excellent session – we need to go deeper with the data tools. Well done.”

“Best yet. Great site.”

“Very timely topics and sessions. Always great to have USED staff members present [to] answer questions.”

“This hotel is in the middle of nowhere – except for a mall.”

“Excellent hotel and location. Great organizational efforts putting together a great conference. Thanks for all your support.”

“Job well done!”

“I like the tabbed format of the program – very easy to follow – like the resource page, too. This format is worth repeating! Thanks.”

“Wireless in the meeting areas would be helpful – many presentations referenced websites that it would have been good to access while they were speaking.”

“Best Forum in last 10 years.”

“Very good Forum meeting!”