

APPROVED
Department of Family Development
Research and Studies Committee Meeting
November 12, 2009
1:00-3:00pm
Minutes

1. Call to order- Nancy Crevier called the meeting to order at 1:06pm.
2. Roll Call was taken. Committee members present included: Patti Herman, Marilyn Kooiker, Mary Wood, and Nancy Crevier. Absent: Jackie Carattini and Julie Keown-Bomar. Guests were Marma McIntee and Ruth Schriefer. Donna Doll-Yogerst was taping the Wisline.
3. Certification of Meeting Posting- Nancy Crevier confirmed the meeting agenda was posted by Mary Detra on October 29, 2009.
4. Selection of Recorder – Jackie Carattini joined the meeting at 1:12pm
5. Approval of Minutes of Meeting on August 11, 2009- Approved minutes as printed. First by Herman, seconded by Kooiker.
6. Review and recommendations for paper #1 – *Enhancing the financial literacy of Wisconsin's youth: An evaluation of a financial simulation program for middle and high school students*, Barbara Haynes, Peggy Olive, Ruth Schriefer, Michelle Tidemann and Marma McIntee
 - 1- *Cover Page- Acceptable*
 - Included title, author and address
 - Included abstract
 - 2- *Situation Statement-*
 - Clear from Beginning, In paragraph 1, clarify where JumpStart Survey came from, and reference this. Also the Heinemann comment, reference it as well.
 - Only 1 reference cited in paragraph 3, could have been more
 - 3- *Objectives-*
 - Clearly stated and measurable
 - 4- *Methodology-*
 - Methods for gathering- Question using the database of questions verses a standardized tool, survey results may have been stronger if a standardized tool would have been used.
 - Knowledge gained-some unknown amount, “range of knowledge” –how do we really know what “increased my knowledge” really means since we know nothing about what knowledge they had to start with.
 - Strength- tied to DPI standards
 - Questions Asked: What is a general sense of what is learned on DPI standards? The group questioned why you couldn't evaluate topics or how they are implemented, or the goals for each individual event if they are different for each. Also, the longevity of the project in connection to evaluations was questioned, is that why the evaluations were not

changed so that the long term projects could keep that long term data in tact? Explain this more.

-Appendix 3-Effectiveness of the simulations, Post session evaluations (Reality Fairs/Evaluations)

-Did they have a base knowledge? How much did they know coming in?

-Was there a increased need for further financial education?

-If you could quantify the increase, this would strengthen the data.

-Appendix 5- How was this used? There was no reference or information in the document referring to it. Comment on the impact on high school students.

5- Results and Findings- Organization of data-

-Lot's of data, challenging to summarize

-A lot of tables and bar graphs, no similar pattern, in table #2 there were () missing, which made it confusing

-Again reviewers questioned if a standardized tool would have been more helpful.

-The paper didn't flow well with all the tables and graphs

-The formatting of the paper could have been improved with text wrapping

-Table 2, possibly explore the differences between Middle School and High School.

-P. 5 second paragraph last sentence, where did the number for the increase in knowledge come from? Comment more on this statement.

-P.11 first paragraph, first sentence- this is not mentioned any place else (referring to time and resources needed for a simulation) either connect it or take it out. Same page figure 4- format the key differently so we can read it.

-P.9 format the chart so that the word Respondents can be on one line.

- P. 10 table 6 is the correct percentage of MS students who plan to save 46 or 47%? There is one number in the text and a different one on the chart.

-P. 12 this is not data reporting, it's more recommendations and replications. We questioned putting it here. This sets the stage, maybe move it to earlier in the paper.

-P. 10 Paragraph starting with "overall", move this to the next page

-P. 12 on this page you have two single sentences as paragraphs, not proper formatting. Add to a place that fits.

-P. 12 first paragraph, why is important? Is there research to back this up? Cite the research here.

6- Recommendations and Implications-

-Make your conclusions using the surveys used

-There were no suggestions for further research or policy

-P. 12, fourth paragraph, the word "FUN" was used. Was this measured on the surveys? If it is a direct quote from a participant than state it that way.

-Were there thought-provoking ideas raised? Not really. Might look at middle school versus high school and compare

differences. Might address the benefits to the school districts themselves.

Overall Clarity and Organization-

-Was it clear and easily understood? Not really, the combination of formatting and font issues with challenge of so much data made it hard to follow. The data was not clearly reflected or stated in the body of the document.

Elements of Scholarship-

-It seemed to be missing a strong argument about why the Reality Fairs are done, is there research to back them up? Build on that research base, how they originated.

-The surveys didn't show an understanding of the knowledge that the students were coming to the fairs with. What were they exposed to prior to the fairs? What is the baseline? What are the schools offering other than the fairs (relative to Financial Education)? This may have an impact on the results.

-The paper didn't show evidence of creativity or adapting.

-Could there be more of the "so what", what are the impacts or implications?

-Is there a value to the school districts? Not stated or shown. Add comments from schools.

-Why are they evaluating the simulations? Is it worth while? What are they gaining knowledge of and how will it be used? Expand on this to show its value.

-More background info might be needed. With the current economy, why is financial education so important? Why are reality fairs effective in the current economic times?

Motion by Mary Wood to return for revisions, seconded by Marilyn Kooiker. Vote: 3 yes, 3 no. Motion did not pass. A second motion was made by Patti Herman to reject the paper in its present form, seconded by Mary Wood. Motion was passed with 6 votes.

Review and recommendations for paper #2 – Mentoring the Next Generation of Faculty in the Department of Family Development, Marma McIntee and Michelle Tidemann

1- Cover Page- Acceptable

-Included title, author and address

-Included abstract

2- Situation Statement-

-Very clear, the purpose was indicated well

-First sentence, period and not a question

-2nd paragraph, should be "authors" and not "author's"

-Would have liked more explanation on the documented problems and challenges, and then the improvements (if any) that were made after the 2004 ad-hoc mentoring committee.

3- Objectives-

-Intent and purpose were clearly stated and measurable

-Analysis of Research- Was clearly in the paper but NOT in this section. One suggestion might be to state that this paper will be a summary of the research on mentoring.

4- Methodology-

-Methods for gathering- What can we draw from the literature review? We weren't sure if it was an Informative or Persuasive paper. There seemed to be a disconnect with the "Adult Development Theory"

-Suggestions- Identify traditional and contemporary strategies, Where are we today and then suggest strategies for the future

- Reality is that we are an exclusively female organization. May want to expand on Carol Giligan, relationship theory, how women grow professionally and mentor cultural and diverse populations

- P. 5 2nd paragraph, begins with "Recent literature identifies"- where is the explanation of this?

-P. 5 5th paragraph, begins with "Similarly, Kirchmeyer (2005) refers... "studies show" which studies are you referring to? Site the source.

- P. 6 1st paragraph, The sentence that reads "However, there was confirmation that mentoring benefits both career advancement..."- seems to contradict previous statements.

- P. 6 1st paragraph, Are you missing the people who do not come in on the tenure track? What is the mentoring role there? Revisit this whole paragraph, rewrite the sequence of sentences so it is clearer.

- P. 6 last paragraph, "Could" is a weak word; may want to replace. Also, "big picture awareness is more important" than what? Not clear.

5- Results and Findings- Organization of data-

-it was logical but VERY heavy on the literature review

-Table 1- not helpful, just made us confused, Table 2- very helpful but had typos, recheck it.

6- Recommendations and Implications-

-Some strong recommendations and implications to the department "could" have been made.

-From the literature review, literature suggests we go or do (fill in the blank). Recommendations would be stronger if they were directly linked to what the literature said.

-Could flow better.

-Need to add a summarizing paragraph.

-Possibly suggest policy changes for department.

-How can we apply mentoring theory into our everyday activities?

Overall Clarity and Organization-

-Was it clear and easily understood? Look at the flow of arguments. Hard to follow and understand.

-Table 2, had spelling errors

Elements of Scholarship-

-Research base- apply to us mentoring with women and diverse populations. Make it more specific to our situation.

-Why is it important to look at "mentoring" differently?

-Valued by those for whom it was intended? Who reviewed this? Was it shared with specialists or the department first?

Motion by Nancy Crevier to reject as presented, seconded by Patti Herman. Motion was passed with 5 votes. (one person left the meeting)

7. Follow up on proposed series on Preparing and Writing for Publication **Deferred to January meeting.
 8. Review and Update of Appendix F.1 **Deferred to January meeting.
 9. Review and Update of Appendix F.2 **Deferred to January meeting.
 10. Rising Concerns **Deferred to January meeting.
 11. Upcoming Meetings – Identify dates in the second week of February, May, August and November **Deferred to January meeting.
 12. Adjourn
- * Other individuals who would like to participate in this meeting should contact Committee Co-Chairs, Patti Herman at (608)742-9680 or Nancy Crevier at (715) 732-7510, at least two working days before the meeting. Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication and/or need a reasonable accommodation for disabilities or limitations should contact Mary Detra at (608) 265-9887 (the deaf or hard-of-hearing can call 711 for call relay) at least two working days before the meeting.

Recorded By: Jackie Carattini,

j:\uwx\dfd\research & studies\2009\11-12-09 approved minutes.doc