

Evaluation Summary

National Forum on Education Statistics
Winter 2008 Forum Meeting
San Francisco, CA

Summary

A total of 59 evaluation forms were submitted at the Winter 2008 Forum Meeting in San Francisco, CA. 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

Using Forum Products in Local Education Agencies (Opening Session)

Tom Purwin, Jersey City Public Schools, NJ

Summary

Mean: 3.08

Total number of responses: 58

Comments

“Would have liked to get a more detailed review of existing publications.”

“Skip the video.”

“I would rather have a national speaker.”

“Need a good handout – summary list.”

“I’m familiar with Forum products already.”

“Useful model.”

“New PowerPoint missed the mark, but very useful pubs.”

“Jersey City has already done what I need to do and his presentation and reminder of existing products is very timely.”

“Would like the presentation slides.”

“A little too long – the message was what we can do to the ‘teachers.’”

“Loved seeing the stats on publication hits and downloads.”

“LEA relevant topics are always useful.”

PK-12 Data Model Update (Joint Session)

E. Glenn McCain, Platte Valley School District, Weld Re-7, CO

Jeff Stowe, Arizona Department of Education

Vincent Paredes, SIFA

Summary

Mean: 3.16

Total number of responses: 57

Comments

- “Would have liked to have logged on to the site.”
- “Redundant. Should have some printed materials as well to reflect on during presentations to record concerns or [??] for feedback online as they had solicited members to do.”
- “More demo please – and bigger – was hard to see.”
- “Complex model, understand concept but maybe too much for a non-technical person.”
- “Could not see – maybe too technical.”
- “Important content – difficult to present.”
- “Not sure where this product is going.”
- “Needed more handouts and/or screenshots to see what was being referenced. Couldn’t see screen well.”
- “Presenter Glenn was engaging, but topic was confusing.”

FERPA Update (Joint Session)

Leroy Rooker, U.S. Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.02

Total number of responses: 57

Comments

- “The hands on during committee was great.”
- “Nothing new to say for 2 years.”
- “Didn’t learn much.”
- “Session lacked substance. I look forward to the update.”
- “These sessions always generate more questions. Continue.”
- “Always informative. More Leroy.”
- “Received good concrete info from Rooker.”
- “Couldn’t hear!”
- “Technical difficulties with the mike.”
- “Need more details.”
- “No new information.”
- “Hard to hear. Repetitive – ‘Comply with FERPA according to FERPA regulations.’”
- “Better in small group sessions, but overall informative.”

NCES Update (Closing Session)

Mark Schneider, Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics

Summary

Mean: 3.13

Total number of responses: 49

Comments

- “Need time for questions for Dr. Schneider.”
- “To the point (by committees).”
- “Good information from Commissioner.”
- “Always enjoy hearing Mr. Schneider. Good to hear what’s happening in NCES on things we are not always aware of.”

“When will new SLDS funding be announced?”
“Very good speaker. Very enthusiastic – went a little too long.”
“Window into push toward P-20, K-12 ↔ Higher Ed. Informative.”
“Too long. Overwhelming with list.”
“Linkages with Higher Ed. is the key. Can it be done? Good vision articulated.”
“Reports were too brief. Next time speaker needs to use 30 minutes.”
“Mark is a very good speaker and keeps the audience interested (me at least).”
“Was an update – just a review of surveys.”
“I’d hoped for a clear and concise update.”
“Need PK-12 → post secondary topics on Forum agendas.”

Roundtables

Attendance Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.09

Total number of responses: 23

Comments

“Just a huge issue to be tackled.”
“Would like more discussion. Is anyone considering teacher attendance?”
“Any focus we can put on student achievement is beneficial. We have too many children missing too many days of school!”
“It was a lunchtime roundtable and it was hurt by the scheduling during lunch. I would avoid this in the future.”
“Well presented. Good opportunity to add feedback.”
“Is there enough ‘meat’ here to warrant a task force?”

Crisis Data Management Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.39

Total number of responses: 23

Comments

“Too early to really judge – but seems good so far.”
“Something that is needed.”
“Excellent topic – business continuity is IT.”
“All states need to begin planning for displaced students.”
“Well presented. Much additional feedback.”
“Can’t wait for the product!”
“Interesting and important.”

Data Ethics Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.37

Total number of responses: 35

Comments

“Looking forward to seeing product. Be sure to send email to Forum members soliciting case scenarios.”

“Necessary work coming out of improved access to data.”

Longitudinal Data Systems Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.20

Total number of responses: 30

Comments

“Difficult to understand product’s positioning relative to EIMAC’s LDS work and IES’s support site.”

“Timeline seems slow.”

“I thought it went well.”

“Why is this taking 2 years to complete?”

“More geared toward states, but there is a need at the local level for these systems.”

“Look forward to being involved.”

“Wish we had more time!”

Metadata Task Force (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.25

Total number of responses: 22

Comments

“Well presented. Good feedback given to improve efforts.”

“Looking forward to it. It will tie in nicely with the efforts of my agency.”

PK-12 Data Model Task Force (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.04

Total number of responses: 28

Comments

“Need to encourage a P-20 discussion and ‘Version 2.’”

“Where is Vince taking this thing? Truly useful or hocus pocus?”

“Redundant with other sessions.”

“Needed more time.”

Race/Ethnicity Working Group (Roundtable)

Summary

Mean: 3.50

Total number of responses: 40

Comments

“Good product, good timeline.”

“Good information for SEA to get out.”

- “Very important. Useful. Well presented.”
- “Confusion on definitions – 2-part question – is really one answer?”
- “Good information. Will appreciate more guidance.”
- “Not enough time for discussion.”
- “Helpful handout.”
- “Not enough time – heavy topic; very well attended; presentation lengthy but necessary so feedback time was limited.”

Standing Committee Meetings

NOTE: There were 5 respondents who selected a numeric rating, but did not specify which meeting they attended. Therefore, their ratings are not included in the calculations for the meeting summaries below.

Summary of unspecified meeting responses

Mean: 3.40

Total number of responses: 5

Standing Committee Time (NESAC)

Linda Rocks, Chair, Bossier Parish, LA

Summary

Mean: 3.63

Total number of responses: 19

Comments

“Always a lively discussion.”

“Good to excellent dialogues under Linda’s leadership.”

“Linda and Helene are great!”

“The joint meeting with PPI was disappointing. There were too many people and it was hard to hear.”

“SEA/LEA specific and SEA/LEA working relationships good twin focus, appropriately balanced.”

“NESAC was very informative and there was good discussion.”

“Best organization of any I have attended in past 3 years – good variety and a plus for SEAs and LEAs.”

“Linda does a great job.”

“Great discussions! Nicely organized.”

“Nice mix of activities, like joint sessions.”

Standing Committee Time (PPI)

Levette Williams, Chair, Georgia Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.53

Total number of responses: 15

Comments

“Would have preferred to have topics with across the board commonality.”

“Excellent communication and networking.”

- “Need more time to discuss issues without having update presentations from working groups/task forces. No time to look to the future.”
- “Excellent topics – good discussions!”
- “Excellent discussion – seems like there are increasingly more problems and issues than can be solved in the limited amount of time.”
- “Great interaction and discussion.”
- “Good presentations/valuable information/lively conversation.”

Standing Committee Time (TECH)

Kathleen Gosa, Chair, Kansas State Department of Education

Summary

Mean: 3.81

Total number of responses: 16

Comments

- “Need more time for discussion/collaboration.”
- “Good conversations.”
- “Overall the attention to detail and the constant interaction of committee members was extremely useful.”
- “Kathy Gosa does an excellent job.”
- “Keep up the state presentations on uses of ‘new’ tech.”
- “Great discussions! Nicely organized.”

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

- “Would like access to electronic copies of all session handouts and PowerPoint presentations.”
- “New members should have mentors assigned to them throughout the Forum.”
- “ASQ, APQE, Baldrige, etc., etc., etc. Any consideration about presenters talking about quality management? Not just data but organizational structures and processes. You need quality organizations to make good use of quality data. It helps build that culture of data quality, that culture of good data use that impacts states and schools all the way down to FERPA implementation, etc.”
- “1) More sessions geared toward new members. 2) An agenda and coverage of FAQs during the new member luncheon.”
- “Location of hotel dreadful. Nothing within walking distance.”
- “1) I would like to see the agenda early on with contact persons in order to pose inquiries or suggestions on topic coverage before I get to the Forum so that the needs of my district can be addressed or given to someone or some group to address. 2) Ensure all member handouts are listed in handbook. It is nice to see that our entity is a participant and is acknowledged.”
- “Presenters who present to more than one standing committee might as well do a joint presentation followed by question sessions to follow up on individual standing committees.”
- “Location problematic – too far away from anything. Very inconvenient.”

“I missed having bottled water as an option to sodas, more fruit at breakfast – ran out. I found it rude to turn out the lights in the café area. Nice chime reminder, but should be it.”

“Why do we have updates on task forces/working groups in committee, at roundtables, and the closing session. It’s overkill.”

“Really liked the theme of data quality throughout the committees.”

“1) Forum should sponsor a working group on OCR. We should wait for USED. 2) Need to have a P-20 discussion – maybe similar to EIMAC.”

“Not necessary to have an OCR workgroup!”

“Closing reports should ‘highlight’ not ‘list.’”

“Well organized meeting – TECH leader was very good.”

“Nice hotel, however pool and restaurants closed. I would have liked to be closer to downtown S.F.”

“Wow! The Forum does good work! Impressive!!!”

“I think the large group presentations were enhanced by the opportunity to ask questions of the presenters following their presentation in the small groups. Some of the logistics didn’t seem to work as well as in the past.”

“OCR report was discouraging.”

“For some reason this meeting didn’t have the spirit and zing I’ve seen before. On the other hand, we are encouraged in a lot of work projects – so maybe we’re just a little busy.”

“Need to be in hotel/location within walking distance to more restaurants.”

“Keep coffee available all afternoon!”

“First time here – I learned a lot.”

“It is remarkable how much work the Forum is doing.”

“Excellent Forum – great support by NCES and Marriott.”

“The roundtables, especially the second round, were poorly attended.”

“Need standing committee agendas in Forum agenda.”

“Great Forum overall.”

“Reserve more rooms in hotel eating facilities.”

“Beverage service should be left up during the Forum work day.”