



Message From the Chair

Lilia M. Ruban

University of Houston

If you have knowledge, let others light their candles on it.
Source unknown

I am very excited to begin my term as Chair of the Research and Evaluation division. It is with a sense of trepidation that I am writing my first column in this role. I want to start this message by sharing with you a personal story, a story that has its purpose. My story, I hope, carries with it a message for all our members – seasoned researchers, fledgling researchers “baby does” and graduate students – American and international – alike. My journey started in January of 1995 when I first came to the United States from Ukraine as an international student to start my doctoral program in Gifted Education at the University of Connecticut. In my early 20s, inexperienced, perhaps very naïve, somewhat disoriented yet very happy, “green,” “a Russian bear in the American circus” (as some of the fellow doctoral students described me at the time), “hungry” for knowledge, poor, full of hopes and driven to succeed, little did I know that I were to yet receive my fair share of the cultural shock and the “reality check” over the coming years.

Some experiences sort of stand out in your memory as if they had just happened yesterday. I vividly remember my first day at the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (NRC/GT) at the University of Connecticut. A doctoral student who happened to stand next to me in the NRC/GT office, pointed to a tall dark-haired female professor who was surrounded by a flock of doctoral students, “That’s Sally.” A bit nervous, I approached her, and started tentatively, “Dr. Reis...” She promptly interrupted me, “Sally.” She smiled and whisked me off to show me around the Center. She paused by one of the faculty offices and pointed to the newspaper clipping on the wall. Alongside with a story (whose headline I had forgotten), there was a photo of a seasoned professor with wise eyes, sitting in an armchair in his office, his feet on the desk. “Joe,” she said. “That must be ...” flashed in my mind, “that must be Professor Joseph Renzulli.” I had read Renzulli’s seminal work on gifted children in a translated volume in Ukraine. At the time, his seminal work on gifted children was known and highly regarded in the former Soviet Union for well over a decade. In my wildest dreams, I simply couldn’t imagine professors of high caliber in the former Soviet Union putting their feet on the table (God forbid – not in front of the camera, or colleagues and staff!), and being addressed simply by their first name. “Uh ... I am not in Ukraine any more...” it dawned on me. This was more than 11 years ago.

Just a few days ago at an awards ceremony, the Provost announced my name, among others’, who were awarded tenure and promotion at our university. There were many highly accomplished faculty who received various prestigious awards for major accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching and service. The ceremony was quite elegant, with cocktail attire, a band playing music, mini-fountains in the reception room, and a general sense of excitement. “Major milestone,” my colleagues warmly congratulated me. “You have come a long way,” people who have known me for a while, would say. It just felt so special.

Inside this Issue:

Message from the Chair Lilia M. Ruban	Pg 1
Web-based Surveys: An Efficient Data-Gathering Tool Karen L. Westberg	Pg 3
Update from the Membership Committee Jill Adelson	Pg 4
2005 Pre-conference Evaluation Institute a Huge Success! Tonya Moon	Pg 5
NAGC SuperWeekend/Division Retreat	Pg 5
Research Gala Catherine M. Brighton	Pg 5
Quality Indicators Catherine M. Brighton	Pg 6
QUEST Elections Update Spring 2006	Pg 10
The Last Word Carol L. Tieso	Pg 13

As every major river that starts out with just a small stream and grows bigger and stronger as other streams and smaller rivers join in, a fortuitous confluence of many experiences and encounters with many special people has shaped me into the person I am now and has helped me achieve some of my dearest and wildest dreams. We cannot live in a society and at the same time be free from society — we do not become who we are in a vacuum, we always need to add a “social coefficient.” In his work on creativity and imagination in childhood and adolescence, Vygotsky quoted researcher Ribot, “Usually so much is said about the free flight of imagination, omnipotence of genius, that the social conditions are forgotten. It is as if there were no other individuals’ creativity; there is always a *social coefficient*. In this sense no invention is in a strict sense personal, there always remains something in it from anonymous co-workers.”

In a similar vein, I can make a strong case that no personal achievement is in a strict sense personal, there always remains something in it from the powerful influence exerted on any particular individual by his or her mentors, colleagues, fellow doctoral students, friends, and family and loved ones (special kudos to my husband Dennis and my two little boys – my life would never be quite as fulfilled without you!). I have been extremely fortunate to learn and grow professionally over the last decade in different environments – at my alma mater UConn, at my present university where I am a faculty member, in this division and this organization at large – where I have lived, worked on various projects, made mistakes and made a fool of myself, struggled, cried and laughed with many supportive and special people who have made a lasting influence on my life. I have been fortunate to follow Jonathan Plucker and Claire Hughes, our past chairs. I have been fortunate to work with many outstanding professionals and wonderful people – Tonya Moon, our chair-elect, Catherine Brighton, program chair, Carol Tieso, the editor of *Quest*, Betsy McCoach, who was instrumental in her role of chair of the membership sub-committee of our division. This list could go on and on, yet it is simply not possible to acknowledge all individuals whom I would like to recognize and thank personally.

Perhaps there has never been a more exciting time to become involved in the leadership activities in our vibrant and innovative division, which has recently become the second largest in terms of membership, only behind Curriculum Studies. As the National Association for Gifted Children is initiating major changes in its organizational structure and functional roles, as evidenced in spirited discussions at the most recent Leadership Super Weekend in Bethesda, Maryland (March 24-26, 2006), there will be opportunities for everyone in our division to get actively involved in a variety of ways, however large and small, to make our division better, to make our association better and to make our work as researchers become more relevant and exert higher impact on policy and practice.

In his inspirational Inauguration speech more than four decades ago, President John Kennedy called on his fellow citizens, “Ask *not* what your country can do for you, ask what *you* can do for your country.” I would allow myself to make a correction. Get involved, and opportunities for you to help the division and the division to help you would come your way in many rewarding ways! My word of encouragement to graduate students and beginning researchers: Many of the productive scholars in our field whom you cite in your papers had actually started out early on in our division, with smaller roles and had become some of the most prominent leaders in our field. The sense of belonging is an important one in academe – it might be easy to get “lost” at a big conference, or within a big organization such as NAGC. My friend and fellow doctoral student once shared an insight with me, “Don’t be afraid to approach “big,” famous name researchers at a conference. Many of the most eminent scholars are also some of the very approachable, personable and willing to help.” I have personally observed on many occasions how casual conversations and brief encounters at the division working and business meetings and at the Dissertation Crackerbarrel have turned into promising research direction, conference presentations and eventually publications. You will see your self-efficacy increase with your personal experience of working with peers (your proximal models) and seasoned researchers (your distal models) who may provide you with instrumental mentoring, guidance and advice, and with vicarious observations of other students and researchers being engaged in productive scholarly endeavors. My word of thanks to our seasoned researchers, our mentors and leaders in our field to whom we all can aspire: What you do in helping along those who are less experienced and who need your help – your efforts really do make a difference.

Last but not least, I would encourage our members to check out our new division website that has just recently been unveiled. Log on to www.nagc.org, and under “About NAGC,” click on “Divisions.” This webpage is still under construction, and many other things will be added on as we progress with this effort. We’d like to hear from you! Drop me a note at lruban@uh.edu, or contact any of our officers (their emails are published elsewhere in this newsletter.) Believe me, they are very personable, hard working and helpful individuals who want to improve our division, and they, too, would love to hear from you.

Web-based Surveys: An Efficient Data-Gathering Tool

Karen L. Westberg
University of St. Thomas
Minneapolis, MN

Using Web-based surveys is an effective and efficient way to gather data for research and evaluation projects. In the past couple of years, I have used Web-based surveys to gather data for evaluations of gifted education services in school districts, and I encourage other researchers to use them if they aren't already doing so. The benefits of gathering survey data online include the availability of ready-to-use templates; the ease and speed with which people can respond to surveys, which results in a better response rate; the capability of seeing results in real time; the ability to filter data in various ways; the resources for aggregating, summarizing, and depicting results; the ability to download data into spreadsheet programs for further analyses; and the capability of using language translation services for surveys.

Hundreds of Websites provide services for designing online surveys, but three sites are probably most widely used, i.e., surveymonkey.com, zoomerang.com, and quia.com. Some sites provide free online survey services, but consumers should be aware that sites vary in terms of the security they provide, the number of people who may respond to the surveys within a given time period, the types of unique features, and the prices for extra features. Because many sites offer a free 30-day trial, individuals can explore the features of various fee-based survey services. The company that I have used most frequently is surveymonkey.com, and I will describe some of the experiences using this site for a recent evaluation of a local school district's gifted education services.

In this recent self-study/evaluation project, I served as a consultant with a district's K-12 gifted advisory committee. I worked with the educators on the design of online surveys for elementary and secondary teachers and with the parents on the design of surveys for parents of elementary and secondary students. While I could have designed the surveys myself, having the teacher and parents involved in the selection of the questions and the design of the survey served to build ownership in the review process. A quick demonstration of surveymonkey.com provided them with an understanding of the capabilities of the site, e.g., contingency questions that could be formulated and types of response formats that could be used. After I placed the surveys online, I provided links to the surveys in two formats. Links for the teacher surveys were included in a broadcast email message sent to teachers, and links in html for the parent surveys were placed on the district's Website. Parents were informed in school newsletters on how to access the surveys on the district's Website. Although online survey services provide additional methods for soliciting responses to surveys, such

as pop-ups on Websites, these types of surveys are used generally for marketing purposes.

When initially soliciting responses to an online survey, it is important to inform participants about anonymity. The only identifier for most online surveys is the Internet Protocol (IP) address (a series of 12 or more digits) of the computer used when responding to the survey, which means that it is, for our purposes, an anonymous response. I have found that people respond almost immediately when provided with a link to a survey in an email message. In our 24/7 world, most individuals want to deal immediately with tasks or requests for information presented in emails. Imagine getting the majority of the responses to a survey within 24 hours as compared to getting responses to a survey distributed through the mail. Surveys through the mail usually require pre-notification letters and follow-up reminders, which means that the process generally takes a few weeks. Immediate responses result high survey response rates. The response rate to surveys with links provided on Websites is also good (better than any I have had through the mail), but not as high when a link is included in an email message.

I have been using purposive sampling methods for evaluation research projects, but random sampling can be used with online surveys if the target population regularly uses computers and the Web. I recently responded to a survey on issues in higher education for which the researcher used cluster random sampling procedures. The researcher randomly selected several universities throughout the country, obtained permission from the universities' Institutional Research Boards (IRBs) to conduct the survey and send out mass emails, and obtained the faculty distribution list at these institutions. I thought it was particularly wise of this individual to include information in his email message about obtaining permission from institutions' IRBs, which most likely increased the response rate.

In the self-study/evaluation project described earlier, only teachers and parents responded to online surveys, but I have had elementary and secondary students take surveys for other evaluations of gifted services. In a couple districts, I have found that the district administrators wanted students to respond to the surveys in school, not at home. Instead of giving students the links to the surveys, a computer or a few computers were set up in central locations (library or computer labs), and students were asked to respond to the online surveys during certain time periods. A teacher placed a bookmark on the computers for

the survey during those time periods. When doing this, it is important to remember to set up a collection procedure that will enable multiple responses from the same computer. When using surveymonkey.com, for example, open "collection options" and select "multiple options per respondents, shared computer" which means that after respondents leaves the computer, their answers are considered finished and cannot be edited, but the next user can respond to the survey.

The aggregated frequencies of close-ended survey responses are automatically available in horizontal bar graphs on most online survey programs. The filtering capabilities for these results are a particularly useful feature. For example, if I included a question about teachers' grade level, the responses to any or all questions can be obtained (filtered) and depicted according to a specific grade level that I select as the filter. In my most recent evaluation project, I became curious about the views of Grade 1 teachers because the gifted education services were more limited at that grade level. I learned that their views on some things were quite different than those of the teachers at the other elementary grade levels.

Multiple filters can be used also when examining online survey results, e.g., when I filtered the survey responses by grade level (i.e., Grade 1) and years of teaching experience and compared the responses of teachers with less than three years of teaching experience to those with 11 or more years of experience, I discovered some interesting differences in their responses. For example, one of the items on the teacher survey was, "I differentiate instruction for gifted learners in my classroom" with a 4-point response scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. One hundred percent of the teachers with fewer than three years of experience strongly agreed or agreed with this statement, while 80% of the teachers with more than 11 years of experience strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. While filtering is the same as a "select if" or "select cases" statement in statistical software packages, the advantage of using it in an online survey program is that the results are immediately available in visual form.

As an aside, I want to share the results of one item that I have used on teacher surveys lately that has been highly disconcerting: "When students participate in the gifted education program, they should be expected to complete the work they miss in the regular classroom." On the most recent online teacher survey that I conducted, 41.1% (n = 76) of the elementary teachers strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. Despite the efforts of many people in our field to help teachers realize that this is not a defensible or appropriate practice, the responses in this district, as well as in other districts, indicate that a great deal of professional development is needed to address attitudes toward gifted learners and gifted services.

When data analyses for evaluation or research projects require other descriptive statistics or inferential

procedures, the data gathered for an online survey must be downloaded (called "exported" on most sites) into a spreadsheet program, such as Excel. And, if desired, it can be then imported into a statistical software package, such as SPSS. While this can be done easily, it generally takes a few minutes for the data to be downloaded into an email account.

I have found that using an online survey Website is a wonderful tool for experienced and novice researchers. I ask graduate students in my general research methods course to conduct online surveys, and a couple of my doctoral students have used this tool as well. Because it is so easy to design surveys and to obtain results in such a timely fashion, the use of online surveys, as opposed to paper surveys, will be used increasingly on a regular basis by all of us.

Update from the Membership Committee Jill Adelson

Have you purchased your *Quest* CD yet? You can have over a decade of articles on research and evaluation at your fingertips! We had these for sale at the NAGC Convention, but there are still some left. You get all the *Quest* newsletters from Spring, 1992, to Fall, 2005, for only \$10. Issues focus on such topics as lifespan development of the gifted and talented, qualitative research, cross-cultural research, innovation in identification, program evaluation, ADHD and giftedness, professional development, and more. For more information or to order a CD, just email me.

Currently, the Research & Evaluation division has 373 members. This is up from last year's 321 members. However, we want to continue to get the word out about the division and continue to increase membership. We are completing the process of designing a new R&E division brochure, and we plan to send this brochure and the *Quest* CD ad to lapsed members, current members, university gifted education programs, university libraries, and state gifted associations. If you have other ideas to spread the word about our division or would like to assist on the committee, please contact me at the email address below.

Please take a moment and share this issue of *Quest* with a colleague, tell them about the benefits of being an R&E division member, and invite them to join! See you at the NAGC convention.

Jill Adelson
jill.adelson@uconn.edu
Membership and Public Relations Chair

R & E in Action! Exciting Events Past and Present

2005 Pre-conference Evaluation Institute a Huge Success! Tonya Moon

On Wednesday, November 9, 2005 the Research and Evaluation Division held its first pre-conference institute focusing on evaluating gifted programs. The institute was collaboratively facilitated by faculty from The College of William and Mary, the University of Connecticut, and the University of Virginia. The institute was filled to capacity with participants in various roles such as state directors of gifted education, district coordinators, building administrators, program directors, and lead teachers. Participants were exposed to the general principles of program evaluation and spent the day putting those principles into practice by participating in an simulated evaluation team looking at the major components of gifted programming—program services, identification, and professional development. The R&E Division will be conducting another pre-conference institute on program evaluation at the 2006 NAGC conference in Charlotte, NC on November 1, 2006 to meet the needs of those who were unable to attend last year's institute. Registration materials are available from the NAGC website (www.nagc.org). The cost of the Institute is \$149 and includes a continental breakfast, lunch, and all materials.

NAGC SuperWeekend/Division Retreat

The NAGC SuperWeekend and Division Retreat were held March 25-28, 2006 in Bethesda, MD. R&E representatives attending the retreat were Catherine Brighton, Program Chair, and Tonya Moon, Chair-Elect. The three-day event had two major foci—Friday was spent making recommendations to the NAGC Program Committee regarding the R&E sessions for the 2006 Annual Conference. The R&E division received over 40 proposals for 21 slots. The second part of the weekend was spent in a Division-wide retreat with representatives from the other divisions and a professional organizational facilitator to begin to reexamine the division structure and the divisions' role in the larger NAGC organization. Three possible models were developed and considered by the retreat participants; a task force of division representatives is to be assembled to continue this work.

Research Gala Catherine M. Brighton

At the 2005 Research and Evaluation Working Meeting held in Louisville, KY, members of the division voted to eliminate the dissertation award due to low submissions in the past several years but instead to sponsor in conjunction with the Graduate Student Committee a Research Gala with the intent of highlighting the research efforts from graduate students across the 74 colleges and universities offering training and research programs in gifted education. The Research Gala was approved at the business meeting and the first annual Gala will be held in Charlotte, NC on November 3, 2006 (7:30-10:00pm).

The Research Gala will bring together graduate student submissions displayed in a poster format, juried by scholars and researchers in our field. An overwhelming show of support from volunteers willing to serve as jurors came forward immediately. These jurors will provide feedback to the graduate students' executive summary-style manuscripts of work in progress or completed works. Winning submissions at the Masters and Doctoral levels will be recognized at the 2006 R&E Business meeting with one overall winner earning a free registration for the 2007 NAGC Conference. Interested participants can send a letter of intent to Gala organizers, Catherine Brighton (brighton@virginia.edu) or Carol Tieso (clties@wm.edu) by August 1, 2006.

Jury Panelist: The role of the juror involves

- a.) reading a small number of graduate student research abstracts (10 pages each) *prior to* the NAGC Research Gala;
- b.) participating in a judging event completing a quality rubric to determine the winning poster project(s) prior to the Gala event;
- c.) if possible, attending the poster session on November 3, 2006 at the annual NAGC conference to meet the graduate student participants.

Mentor: The role of the mentor involves

- a.) attending the NAGC Research Gala on November 3 to meet the individual(s) whose project topics match the mentor's area of expertise and experience and to have a conversation about the shared interest topic;
- b.) periodically corresponding (by email and/or face to face at the conference) with these identified graduate students on a formal or informal basis about the topical area.
- c.) providing feedback on papers and posters prior to the Gala.

Quality Indicators by Catherine M. Brighton

1. Theoretical Framework. The paper must reflect the student's understanding of the area of study. This will be most obvious in a thorough but defined literature review that clearly identifies a problem and leads logically to the research questions posed. The literature review should demonstrate a thorough understanding of the literature related to the chosen topic.

2. Questions. Research questions are the foundation of the research study. Questions must be both important to the field and answerable. Questions may be important in that they are timely, relate to practical problems, have significant implication for a wide audience, focus on a critical population, fill an identified gap in the literature, build on existing knowledge or theory in significant ways, clarify or build upon equivocal or as yet unreplicated findings, or result in new or better instrumentation, to name only a few. The student must make the case in the paper as to why a particular question is important.

Questions are answerable to the extent that they are neither too narrow nor too broad, data can be collected (or are available in archival form) and analyzed, and when the methods used to address them are scientifically appropriate and feasible.

3. Methodology. The student must demonstrate knowledge of research methodology in both (a) selecting and describing an appropriate research *design*, and (b) describing the research *methods* to be used to identify and select a sample, and collect and analyze data. This will be evident in their description of participants, data sources, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and plans for (and ultimately presentation of results of) data analyses.

4. Results. The study must present the results of data analysis in a way that is clear and understandable, and provides direct answers to the research questions posed. Results must be described and presented in ways that are consistent with the methodology chosen. (This indicator does not apply to study proposals or works in progress.)

5. Conclusions and/or Implications. The student must place findings in appropriate context, discuss how results do and do not answer the research questions posed, and discuss the implications of these findings for practice and further research. Limitations of the research study should also be discussed in the context of appropriate interpretation of findings, including but not limited to generalizability or transferability. (This indicator does not apply to study proposals or works in progress.)

6. Writing. The paper must be written in a style and to a standard of quality that is commensurate with the

professional literature in the student's area of study. This implies that all of the indicators above are met with regard to conceptualizing, implementing, and reporting an empirically sound research study, and further that the manuscript is written in a scholarly style and is free of grammatical, spelling, and typographical errors. In addition, proper attribution in the form of citations should be provided for ideas, wording, or the work of others that are used in the study. Such references should be presented in an acceptable style (typically that of the American Psychological Association).

7. Poster Presentation. The poster presentation must be designed in a style and to a standard of quality that is commensurate with poster presentations at conferences such as American Educational Research Association (AERA) and American Psychological Association (APA).

Rating the Indicators

For each category described above, several statements are provided as general indicators of quality. Readers of the papers may rate each statement according to the following criteria. These ratings are meant as general guides only. They also require subjective judgments of Research Gala jurors.

Acceptable. *Acceptable* implies that this aspect of the paper requires no further revision on the part of the student. Research Gala Jurors are strongly encouraged to elaborate on this designation for papers that are of extraordinarily high quality. For example, if some aspect of the paper is exemplary in that it is consistent with the nature and quality of the current published literature in the student's area of study, specific comments about this should be made in the comments sections that follow each category or the general comments sections at the end of the quality indicators checklist.

Minor Revision Necessary. *Minor Revision Necessary* implies that while this aspect of the paper needs some correction, elaboration, or other improvement, it does meet a minimal standard of quality. This designation implies that while some revision of the manuscript may be necessary before being noted as acceptable or exemplary, the paper may only require minor modifications.

Major Revision Necessary. *Major Revision Necessary* implies that this aspect of the paper does not meet a minimal standard of quality and jurors suggest that specific aspects be addressed or corrected prior to submitting the manuscript for review.

Quality Indicators Checklist

	Acceptable	Minor revisions	Major revisions
1. Theoretical Framework			
A. A clear statement of the problem is presented, with important and relevant concepts defined.			
B. A clear link is established between what is known (existing literature) and what needs to be known.			
C. The importance of the general topic and specific questions posed is made clear.			
Comments:			
2. Questions			
A. The research question(s) are clear and answerable.			
B. The questions posed can feasibly be addressed in the context of this manuscript.			
C. Posing and addressing the question(s) can be done in an ethical manner.			
Comments:			
3. Methodology			
A. The research design is described in detail, with particular attention to all variables to be addressed.			
B. Threats to internal and external validity are identified (as applicable).			
C. The sample and/or sampling plan are described and are appropriate.			
D. Procedures for data collection are described in detail and are appropriate to the questions posed.			
E. Data collection tools (e.g., instruments, interview or observation guides) are described in detail and are appropriate.			
F. Data analysis plans are appropriate and are described in detail, with particular reference to the research question(s) posed.			
Comments:			

	Acceptable	Minor revisions	Major revisions
4. Results			
A. Results are presented clearly and concisely.			
B. Results answer the question(s) posed.			
Comments:			
5. Conclusions and Implications			
A. Results or findings are summarized clearly with direct reference to the research questions posed.			
B. Results or findings are placed in appropriate context in the broader area of study.			
C. The implications of findings for practice and for further research are discussed in detail.			
D. The limitations of the study are acknowledged and discussed in the context of interpreting findings (e.g., generalizability, transferability).			
Comments:			
6. Writing			
A. The paper is written in a scholarly manner that is consistent with the research literature in the student's field of study.			
B. The manuscript is free of grammatical, spelling, and typographical errors.			
C. The manuscript follows a structure and organization consistent with APA or other relevant style requirements. Proper attribution is given when the work of others is used or cited			
Comments:			
7. Presentation			
A. The student's poster presentation is clear and concise, organized in conjunction with APA guidelines for poster presentations; handouts or powerpoint presentations enhance, rather than detract from this clarity.			
B. The student's informal presentation and interaction with jury members (and/or audience) during the Gala demonstrate his or her clear understanding of the topic, the relevant literature, and all aspects of the study.			
C. The student presents the study in a professional manner.			
Comments:			

NAGC Research Gala Graduate Student Application:

Name: _____

College/University: _____ Advisor _____

Program of study/major area: _____

Contact information

Mailing address: _____

Phone number: _____ Email: _____

So that we may begin to plan the Gala event and ensure that we enlist judges with expertise and experiences that match the participants, we need a brief abstract that describes the project—brief statement of the importance of the study, research question(s), methodology employed to investigate the question(s), project findings if possible, and any recommendations or implications as a result of these findings. It is acceptable to describe work in progress.

Brief project abstract (250 words or fewer) (please insert the description into this form)

Please submit this page ***no later than August 1, 2006:***

(Late applications will not be accepted)

Catherine Brighton (brighton@virginia.edu)

Carol Tieso (clties@wm.edu)

QUEST Elections Update Spring 2006

Because of NAGC's recent flurry of activity, the R&E elections for Assistant Program Chair have been delayed until this summer. However, the ballots have been sent to NAGC and should go out shortly. Look for your ballot to choose either **Carol Carman, Courtney Crim, Wendy Leader, or Abdullah Ficici** for Assistant Program Chair for the 2006-2007 year. The elected Assistant Program Chair will then become Program Chair for the 2007-2008 year.

After the Division Business Meeting in Charlotte in 2006, I will be taking nominations for the following officer positions:

- Chair-Elect
- Secretary/Treasurer
- Quest Editor
- Assistant Program Chair

The lists of people who have participated in each of these positions in the past reads like a "Who's Who in Gifted Education." Division leadership is an EXCELLENT opportunity to become involved in NAGC's leadership and is a fabulous opportunity to assist in some of the major decisions facing the division and the organization. It's also a great addition to a vitae to be an officer in a national organization's division. Finally, and most importantly, it's a very nice way to make a difference in gifted students' lives by working with other professionals at the national level. The ideas and products that this division has come up with have impacted students, teachers, administrators, and researchers. Come be a part of it!

If you have any interest in serving as any of the following positions, or know someone that you would recommend in any of the following positions, please be sure to contact me, Claire Hughes, at CEHL2X@yahoo.com.

Details of the positions include:

Chair-Elect Research and Evaluation Responsibilities and Timelines

- *Elected every two years*
- *Serves for two years before becoming Chair*
- *Will Serve as Chair for two years and then Past-Chair for two years- Six years total commitment*

Task	Timing	Person/s Responsible
Represent R&E at NAGC Leadership Retreats	March, November	Chair/ Chair Elect
Conduct Three- Year Evaluation	Every Three Years- Due November 2007	Chair Elect
Assist with Strategic Plan	Every 3 years. Next due 2007	Chair/Chair-elect
Place Evaluation form on Web Site accessible to members only	By August 2007	Technology Chair/ Chair-Elect
Compile and analyze evaluation results and submit report to Board	August	
Report at Officer's Meeting/ Business Meeting	Wednesday of conference	All Chairs of Committees

There are essentially three functions of the Chair-Elect:

- 1) To represent R&E at NAGC leadership functions
- 2) To work with the Chair on new initiatives
- 3) To do the Three-Year Evaluation

**Secretary/Treasurer
Research and Evaluation
Responsibilities and Timelines**

- *Elected every two years*

Task	Timeline	Person Responsible
Email New Member Welcome Letters	Ongoing	Secretary
Participate in Membership Committee	Ongoing	Secretary
Take minutes during Business and Working meetings	Conference	Secretary
Finalize and email conference minutes to members	January and again in November	Secretary/Chair
Copy and pass out previous year's minutes at the annual Business meeting	Conference	Secretary
Track any income from sales or paid activities at the conference; submit sales details to NAGC for proper crediting	Conference	Secretary/Chair

There are essentially three functions of the Secretary/Treasurer:

- 1) To take and disseminate minutes from the Business meeting to the membership and NAGC
- 2) To welcome new members and participate in Membership committee
- 3) To assist the Chair in any financial sales from the conference

**Quest Newsletter Editor
Research and Evaluation
Responsibilities and Timelines**

- *Elected every two years*

Task	Timing	Person Responsible
Determine themes or topics for the year	Ongoing	Editor/ Officers
Determine "columns" that will run regularly	Ongoing	Editor
Invite authors to write articles- give them two months to submit	November/ June	Editor
Work with Chair to get Message from the Chair	February/ June	Editor/ Chair
Format newsletter on Pagemaker or Publisher/ convert to pdf	February/ August	
Submit newsletter to NAGC	February/ August (6-8 weeks before publication)	
Work with Program Chair to get schedule for conference to put in September newsletter	August	Editor/ Program Chair
Send out newsletter via email to members	March/ September	

**Assistant Program Chair
Research and Evaluation
Responsibilities and Timelines**

- *Elected every year*
- *Serves for one year and then becomes Program Chair*
- *Commitment of two years*

Task	Timeline	Person Responsible
Get volunteer reviewers for proposals & chairs	November at Conference	Asst. Program Chair- elect
Coordinate with GSC chair to plan grad student reception and crackerbarrel	August	Asst. Program Chair
Organize speakers for the crackerbarrel	August	Asst. Program Chair
Write a short story on grad student events at the conference for the Fall Quest	September	Asst. Program Chair

Advertise grad student events including crackerbarrel October Asst. Program Chair
(create flyer and send to grad programs, students, etc.)

There is essentially one function of the Program Chair:

- 1) To prepare the Crackerbarrel for the next conference

We are accepting applications beginning after November, 2006 for positions to be elected for the 2007-2009 years. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

Publication Corner

Editor: Carol L. Tieso

Graphic Layout & Design: Siamak Vahidi

The Last Word (Tieso)

The Last Word
Carol L. Tieso
The College of William and Mary

This issue is a bit different. We have one exciting article by Karen Westberg that focuses on using the web to collect data; something all of us can use!

The rest of the issue highlights the exciting new activities that R & E has sponsored or is sponsoring at this year's conference. Tonya Moon briefly describes the incredibly successful Pre-Conference Institute that was held at the 2005 conference and will be offered again this year. The institute brought together researchers from the Universities of Connecticut and Virginia and the College of William and Mary to provide participants with an overview of the major issues involved in the important work of program evaluation and gifted education. This year, the institute will again be held on the Wednesday prior to the official opening of the conference.

Jill Adelson has provided us with an update on last year's successful sale of past issues of *Quest* on CD. This year they will again be available on a first-come, first-serve basis to all R & E members, then the general membership.

This fall, at the national conference, the Research and Evaluation Division and the Graduate Student Committee have again joined forces to create an extravaganza of festivities. However, this year, the festivities take on a more "cultured" appearance with the 1st Annual (we hope!) NAGC Graduate Student Research Gala, supported and sponsored by NAGC and R & E. At the time of publication, more than 30 of the most prominent researchers in the field have volunteered to serve as either a mentor or a judge for this event. Catherine Brighton has provided an overview of the celebration along with specific information about mentor and judge roles. We had a marvelous turnout last fall and we again look forward to this new slate of activities. Don't forget to pack your black tie!

The fall 2006 issue of *Quest* will focus on the theoretical underpinnings that guide our research in the field. Please feel free to express your ideas and suggestions for improving *Quest*. Enjoy your summer and plan to join us in Charlotte in November!

NAGC Annual Convention

November 1-5, 2006

Charlotte, NC



Quest

Research and Evaluation Division
National Association for Gifted Children
Carol L. Tieso, Ph.D., Editor
Gifted Education
College of William and Mary
Box 8795
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795