



ISPI VANCOUVER SPECTRUM

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE VANCOUVER CHAPTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT
SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003 SPRING 2003

Inside This SPECTRUM

Problem Solving Pays Off:

A Case Study by Ron Einblau 2

The ICE CREAM Approach to Online Facilitation

by Linda Waddell & Susan Byrne 3

Sun Run HPT?

by Jim Wright 6

Evaluation of Training

by Jennifer Stone & Virginia Watson 8

Be Part of the SPECTRUM 12

ISPI VANCOUVER SPECTRUM

Editor: Julie Case

VP Communications: Jim Wright

Spectrum visual/information design renovated by Jim Wright for this issue.

Copyright © 2003 ISPI Vancouver.

To reprint an article, obtain the author's permission. If *Spectrum* is your source, also credit *ISPI Vancouver Spectrum*.

Submissions: Send relevant articles to Julie Case, jcase@sage-resources.com.

ISPI Vancouver Site: www.ispi-van.org

A Menu to Celebrate: An Appetizer from the Editor?

by Julie Case, Consultant, *Sage Developmental Resources*

There is something satisfying about order. I love symmetry, analogies, and themes.

I also love to entertain, and last week I organized a dinner party for three of my closest friends to celebrate a birthday. In the week leading up to my dinner, I tried desperately to come up with a theme: Italian? Vegetarian? Something to tie everything together.

But as I searched through my recipes, I found myself discarding many to accommodate the food issues and allergies of my guests. The night before the dinner, I had yet to finalize the menu. By the morning, I knew there would be no theme. Dinner would simply be a selection of dishes that all of us could enjoy.

As the new editor of *Spectrum*, I invited ISPI members to contribute, and I was gratified to receive several

immediate responses. I thank those of you who submitted articles. It is exciting to be able to share your ideas with our readers.

I then set out to write something catchy that would guide readers through the journal and tie all the articles together. Alas, as with my dinner party, I found no theme except our diversity. This issue is a range of articles that tackle their own unique subjects. They are a spectrum.

I hope you enjoy this issue as much as we enjoyed our dinner party: each dish was savoured on its own, and by the end of the night we had all had a great time. It proved once again that a variety can be greater than the sum of its parts!

P.S. Keep those articles coming on all sorts of relevant topics!



Problem Solving Pays Off: A Case Study by Ron Einblau

ISPI Vancouver member Ron Einblau is President of [Einblau & Associates Ltd.](#), a full-service management consulting firm that specializes in organization development.

Continuous improvement models of productivity improvement tend to be overstated — or so say the detractors. They say that the models encourage doing the same thing over and over, only in a slightly different fashion. They argue that there is no substantial gain to the bottom line of the business.

Here is a short case study of a real company using a simple problem-solving process that resulted in a real and significant improvement. The company is a B.C.-based general insurance underwriter. The employees involved are underwriters who provide a skilled technical service to the organization. The employees involved were one team in a larger group of people being trained in a problem-solving process. One of the real-life problems this team chose to work on involved being able to “bind” or accept insurance risk on mobile homes. To us, that means they offer to provide us with our home-owner’s insurance. This problem had been an aggravation for some time.


The team’s problem was stated as “underwriter’s inability to authorize some mobile home plan documents.” The goal that the team set was that underwriters would be able to process and authorize standard mobile home plan documents. They wanted to achieve this goal within 30 days.

The team brainstormed all possible causes that kept underwriters from being able to immediately authorize mobile home plans. The two most likely causes were then identified as “unrealistic binding authority for underwriters regarding mobile home insurance” and “policy servicing clerk level of authority does not match underwriter’s level of authority.” The solutions proposed were to increase the binding authority to reflect realistic market trends and to ensure that authorities were consistent between policy servicing clerks and underwriters.

The team then surveyed other underwriters to determine what a realistic market level of mobile home insurance would be. The team sent

the problem-solving documentation and the benchmarking data they had collected to the person responsible for establishing levels of authority. The team pointed out the savings that would be made and the lack of risk. They asked to have the authority levels changed within 15 days.

The team received a reply the same day, confirming that the authority levels had been changed that day. This result was a decision that greatly increased the efficiency and effectiveness of the underwriters. It was achieved with no resistance, even though there had been resistance in the past. It was a small step. It did make a difference. The people doing the work felt empowered. The company is providing better service to customers and using up fewer resources to do so.

I’d call that a successful continuous improvement story — accomplished by the people who do the work, using their own common sense and a systematic means to present their findings to their management. 

The ICE CREAM Approach to Online Facilitation

by Linda Waddell and Susan Byrne



Lynda Waddell (left) and Susan Byrne

Linda Waddell and Susan Byrne completed their Master of Arts in Distributed Learning at Royal Roads University (RRU), Victoria, BC, where they conducted an action research project on online facilitation. It led to a well-received ISPI Vancouver event presentation — and this article.

Linda Waddell, a member of ISPI Vancouver, is the owner of TecKnowledge-eLearning Inc., Vancouver. Susan Byrne is the Director of Program Development at St. Clair College, Windsor, Ontario. They can be reached at lwaddell@hsa-lps.com and sbyrne@stclair.on.ca respectively.

Online facilitation receives very little attention in organizations until it begins causing problems in a learning environment. Dropout rates surge, and overall interest in facilitated online courses declines. The immediate reaction is to “fix it” with technical training for online facilitators on how to use the electronic tools efficiently. Current research in online settings suggests an alternative: *offer your online facilitators ice cream.*

What is the **ICE CREAM** of online facilitation? It is the acronym for a framework that helps facilitators attend to the key ingredients of great online learning:

-  **I**nteraction
-  **C**ommunity
-  **E**ngagement
-  **C**ommunication
-  **R**espect
-  **E**mpathy
-  **A**ttentiveness
-  **M**otivation



Interaction

Dropout rates for online learning can range from 30 to 50 percent in group-facilitated online courses. This phenomenon has been linked directly to low levels of interaction and to little or poorly conceived learner support. Interaction is necessary for effective online learning.

There are two equally important types of online learning interaction: (1) individual learner interaction with content and (2) learner interaction with others about the content. Online interaction contributes enormously to knowledge construction. Research has demonstrated that meaningful interaction with others about learning content strongly increases learning and retention.

Community

Effective online learning programs are often based on a collaborative, interactive, constructivist approach: the learner builds meaning through action, reflection, and dialogue. This is why it is so vital to create, foster, and maintain a learning community. Students are stimulated to participate when they feel part of a group that shares common interests and concerns, as well as issues and problems. This is like visiting the town square, where familiar people gather and generate a sense of welcome and encouragement for dialogue.

Engagement

Students are more successful in completing programs and remain connected to online learning longer as a result of increased active engagement in the community. This happens in direct proportion to the facilitator's ability to trigger stimulating discussion with and among all of the learners. The facilitator needs to read learners' statements and responses in the discussion forum, analyze them to generate dialogue points, and subtly guide thinking and interactions through perceptive questioning.

Communication

Online communication gives rise to more misunderstandings and difficulties than face-to-face communication. In order for learners to communicate and interact at a deep, meaningful level, the facilitator must develop an environment where trust, honesty, and respect are present. In an online message, the "tone" and "voice" of the facilitator play an important role in encouraging the type of interactivity and reflection that result in commitment, persistence, and meaningful learning.

Respect

Respect and trust are the foundation for collaboration and sharing of information and ideas. Establishing trust in an online environment without face-to-face communication presents challenges. How do you build respect and trust through electronic interactions? The answer lies in the way the facilitator responds to each person's queries and remarks. Open participation can occur only if people feel safe and comfortable enough to contribute their thoughts, e.g., if they

feel respected for their questions, comments, and ideas.

The climate that the online facilitator sets and nurtures is a key factor in maintaining an environment of trust. A subtext of caring or its opposite is generated by what the facilitator says and how she/he expresses the words.

Empathy

It is important for the facilitator, through the mode of salutation, choice of words, selection of expressions, and treatment of what the participant shares, to demonstrate that he/she is really *with* the learners in an online course. A casual and informal voice, for instance, along with comments that express understanding/empathy for a learner's difficulties, helps keep the learning community strong. Often, telling a story about oneself that personalizes a situation and presents a less-than-perfect view of the facilitator breaks down barriers and fosters a stronger sense of community online. Sharing pain, tempered with wisdom and guidance, is a powerful means of demonstrating empathy.



Attentiveness

Everyone likes to be acknowledged. It can be particularly punishing not to be recognized online, especially since some learners go to the trouble of crafting in-depth, well-researched reflections and essays. There is nothing worse than speaking up in class, presenting a personal perspective on an issue, and having no one notice those remarks.

The facilitator must be continuously present. Timeliness in reaction is essential. In addition, a key role of the facilitator is to re-state and summarize postings to demonstrate understanding of what participants have expressed (without being redundant) and react to these.

Excellent online facilitators succeed in responding to every participant at least once or twice throughout a course if it is a large group and more frequently if it is a relatively small one. Setting expectations in terms of how much responsiveness is feasible for a particular course helps participants to be realistic about attentiveness.

Motivation


Learning independently requires dedication and commitment, even for the most disciplined student. As a result, it is not surprising that many problems associated with online learning result from lack of motivation. Without an instructor and fellow students close by, a feeling of isolation can emerge. If an online course has been designed simply as a place where resources are stored for reading, learners can become easily bored. Other priorities in the immediate environment quickly capture the learners' attention. Online facilitators can inject energy and boost motivation by just being present.

There are excellent examples of effective courses designed in weekly chunks in which each lesson topic offers an intriguing focus. Facilitators build interest by sending out emails at the beginning of the week to introduce the topic. Each of the following, for example, might provide a unique type of learning activity to captivate participants: materials that require the learner to become a Sherlock Holmes and deduce the outcomes of a case,

a series of interviews that must be turned into a newspaper report, and a panel of experts with opportunities to pepper them with questions. "Cookie cutter" courses that are highly predictable in their repetitive sameness are especially ineffective for online environments. Like your favourite ice cream store, a variety of offerings stimulate the appetite.



Final Thoughts

So there it is, **ICE CREAM**, an easy-to-remember acronym that helps the online facilitator to mix the eight essential ingredients for turning out a wonderfully appealing online course that will have the learners coming back for more. Quality content quality facilitation quality learning. **Delicious!** 

Sun Run HPT?

by Jim Wright

A recent ISPI Vancouver meeting featured Matt MacEachern, who relates workforce performance improvement to his challenges in climbing the world's highest mountains. An ISPI Vancouver Website article about another recent event compared work performance under pressure to a girls' soccer shootout. Are there human performance technology (HPT) lessons to be learned from such challenges, which blend training, strategy, and mental strength? It's something to think about as you read on.

Background: Jim Wright, Coordinator of Instructional Development, British Columbia Open University, wrote this article for the Living Well Conference for Open Learning Agency (OLA) employees in April 1998. OLA's main location, which includes the BCOU, is on Mathissi Place, Burnaby. The entrance is about 100 metres from the corner of Sanderson and Mathissi.

In the dry July of '94, I turned off Sanderson toward OLA on a lunchtime walk, and a runner stopped in my path. She stared at the tall grass between Mathissi and Visitors' Parking and told the sky ". . . can't believe what I'm seeing broke out right in front of me . . . can't believe. . . ." It was a brush fire.

I ran to phone 911. Actually, I could just manage to jog the 90-or-so metres to the front desk, and I was so winded that Linda on switchboard had to start the call.

Today, April 19, I ran for OLA again, and the distance was much longer, the 10 kilometres of the Sun Run. So is this article about a fast Sun Run time for Team OLA? Not exactly.

First it's about the bathroom scale, which I found to be 8 pounds wrong — on the low side. It was early January, and Christmas had enhanced my pregnant male profile. I used to call the spare pounds "a comfortable reserve in case of a lingering illness," but at X + 8 they had grown to a comfortable reserve in case of a biblical famine. Rather than diet, I trained for the Sun Run. I'm now down a full 20 pounds to the low 180s, not too bad on a 6-foot frame.

It's also about hiatus hernia, a stomach-valve glitch that has knocked me out for 20 to 50 days a year, even though I've managed not to miss much work. In the last couple of years there have been some healing factors such as H.-pylori antibiotics and a dynamic work environment, but the physical exercise to train for the Sun Run has been most helpful. For the first time in 10 years, I'm rarely sick.

Naturally, this article is partly about a running injury, the rite of passage for would-be runners. Mine was a sprained knee. I hurt my right knee in a mundane way, but I aggravated it by keeping on running, so I guess it counts. On the last day of Week 6 in the 13-week "Novice Runners" schedule, I pulled up lame in mid-workout and retreated home to make an ice pack and announce my trophy injury, little knowing that it would take 12 physio visits, 6 weeks, and 1 cortisone shot before I could finish that workout.

It was perfect. Like real runners, I knew it was a sign to mend my ways and learn about stretching, walking, running, and so much more that we naïvely think we know. I even learned how to eat and breathe. In the quest for truth, I searched the Web and haunted libraries, bookstores, and my physiotherapist.

Some good ideas came from unlikely places. For example, I'd rather starve than follow the Hilton Head Over 35 Diet and might starve anyway if I tried (Do some people really measure their meat in fractions of an ounce?), but the book by that name had a solid set of resistance exercises that I can do with 7-pound weights while watching the news.

A more likely source of ideas and encouragement was Michelle, our Team OLA leader. It cost a few extra dollars to sign up for the Sun Run on the OLA team, with our logo on our backs, but the coaching was worth much more, as was a coupon that Michelle passed on, saving \$22 on running shoes that I had researched through the Web and *Runner's World*.

While doing all this learning, I set about training for a run without actually running. I started keeping count with a little digital timer and soon found that it's not hard to fit in at least 60 minutes of walking a day. For example, there are 7 minutes of walking to and from the Sanderson parking lot, at least 20 minutes for my daily lunchtime walk, another 10 minutes if I take a walk break in mid-afternoon, 20 minutes walking the dog in the evening, and lots more minutes when there is a lawn to be mowed or errands to be "run." If I watch a game on TV, I may ride a stationary bike. When I couldn't play tennis because of the wonky knee, I could still get an aerobic workout doing long ground strokes against a wall. Whether I am swimming or pruning, I aim for a fairly brisk pace. None of that has the same training effect as running, but it does add up.

By the beginning of this week, Easter Monday, the knee had almost recovered. I managed to run and walk 10 kilometres on Richmond's Sturgeon Bank dike in about 80 minutes, and that time became my Sun Run goal.

At the Sun Run start today, I soon realized that it would be less a run than an experience. There is something a bit eccentric about getting up before six on a Sunday morning to try to run in a mass of bodies through downtown streets in order to end up 10 kilometres later almost back where you started, so perhaps the experience has something to do with forty thousand people feeling free to be eccentric at the same time.

I was intrigued by the seven men and women I spotted running with prow-shaped baby strollers in front of them in blissful contravention of the rules. These are probably the same people with a knack for clipping me in the Achilles tendons with shopping carts in supermarket aisles (their training route?). What surprised me was that I didn't see even one person get upset about that or anything else. The Sun Run may be the cure for road rage.

Besides being an experience, the run actually began as a walk. I took more than four minutes to cross the start line, where I started my timer, and then moved with the tide. The people around me were bobbing up and down, but I just walked fast until the pace sped up. At the 9 kilometre mark, I was amazed to find that it had taken only 64 minutes. For the last kilometre, the experience finally turned into a race against time.

I crossed the finish line and stopped my timer. It said 69:56. That's slow by some standards, but there was a sense of accomplishment, especially from finishing the final kilometre, which is slightly uphill, in less than 6 minutes.

As I slowed to a stop, I happened to think back to the OLA brush fire four years ago. Today I had no reason to phone 911, but the flash of insight was that I could have called today on the spot on my own. After 10 kilometres, I wasn't out of breath.

Five years later, Jim Wright is again amply prepared for a biblical famine, but he still applies Sun Run HPT — to [BC Open University](#) instructional development, ISPI Vancouver communications, tennis, and life's little challenges.



Evaluation of Training

by Jennifer Stone and Virginia Watson, virtual guests of ISPI Vancouver who live in Georgia

This article is over four years old, but it ties in with the Gene Fusch presentation at a recent ISPI Vancouver event: *Justify Your Job! What Happens When the ROI Model Does Not Fit*. When Dr. Fusch presented a case

study of how to determine the ROI of training and other performance improvement interventions, he drew on Donald Kirkpatrick's traditional four levels and Jack Phillips' fifth level. This article is a good review and more.

"Half the money I spend on advertising is wasted, and the trouble is, I don't know which half."

David Ogilvy attributed this quote to John Wanamaker, the legendary department store mogul, in *Confessions of an Advertising Man*, but the concept could just as easily be applied to training. How much of the \$58.6 billion budgeted by U.S. companies for training last year actually paid off? How can such return on investment (ROI) be measured?

Training executives today are more concerned about these questions than ever; in fact, the 1997 National HRD Executive Survey conducted by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), showed that "determining the impact of training on financial performance" was the top challenge for more than half (55.9%) of the HRD professionals surveyed. However, bottom line accountability is elusive, and some say it's downright impossible.

Kirkpatrick's Four Levels

Evaluation research has developed as a result of substantial support by the federal government, beginning in World War II training and evaluation activities. It provides answers to the questions of "Do we implement or repeat a program or not?" and "If so, what modifications should be made?" Today, measurement in the form of instructor and course evaluations is a fixture of most training programs.

However, when what goes on in the classroom is not the outcome of interest, these are the wrong measurements or at least the unimportant ones to take. An outcome that is of importance answers the question of "How have you used what you learned?" This type of evaluation is difficult to conduct, as it requires being done at three months, at six months, or even at 12 months from the time of the training. Adding to the difficulty is the aspect that the evaluators need to be co-workers, managers, and outside customers of the participant who took part in the training.

In order to classify areas of evaluation, Donald Kirkpatrick created what is still one of the most widely used approaches, even though it was first developed in 1959. At the time, he was a professor of marketing at the University of Wisconsin. His four levels of evaluation are:

- **Level 1: Reaction** — a measure of satisfaction
- **Level 2: Learning** — a measure of learning
- **Level 3: Behaviour** — a measure of behavior change
- **Level 4: Results** — a measure of results

Here are questions that should be asked at each level:

- **Level 1: Reaction:** Were the participants pleased? What do they plan to do with what they learned?
- **Level 2: Learning:** What skills, knowledge, or attitudes have changed? By how much?
- **Level 3: Behaviour:** Did the participants change their behaviour based on what was learned in the program?
- **Level 4: Results:** Did the change in behaviour positively affect the organization?

Although the Kirkpatrick model is 40 years old, its elegant simplicity has caused it to be the most widely used method of evaluating training programs. ASTD's survey, which reports feedback from almost 300 HRD executives and managers, revealed that 67% of organizations that conduct evaluations use the Kirkpatrick model.

Current Trends

Although the Kirkpatrick model has served trainers well in terms of evaluating whether learners liked their instruction, whether they learned something from it, and whether it had some effect for the company, evaluation experts are now pointing out that the four-level approach has weaknesses. Mainly, it can't be used to determine the cost-benefit ratio of training, or return on investment (ROI). It also can't be used diagnostically, i.e., when a training program doesn't deliver the expected results.

When looking at ROI and cost-benefit analysis, it is important to remember that:

- Improving **efficiency** means achieving the same results with lower costs.
- Improving **effectiveness** means achieving better results with the same costs.
- It is possible to get better results with lower costs, and this is called improved **productivity**.

In order to calculate **return on investment (ROI)**, evaluation experts such as Jack Phillips have recommended the addition of a fifth level to Kirkpatrick's model for some programs. This requires collecting Level 4 data, converting the results to monetary values, and then comparing those results with the cost of the training program.

Here is Phillips' basic formula for calculating ROI:

- Collect Level 4 evaluation data. Ask: Did on-the-job application produce measurable results?
- Isolate the effects of training from other factors that may have contributed to the results.

- Convert the results to monetary benefits. Phillips recommends dividing training results into hard data and soft data. He says hard data are the traditional measures of organizational performance because they're objective, easy to measure, and easy to convert to monetary values. They include:
 - Output (units produced, items assembled, tasks completed)
 - Quality (scrap, waste, rework)
 - Time (equipment downtime, employee overtime, time to complete projects)
 - Cost (overhead, accident costs, sales expenses)
 Conversely, soft data include:
 - Work habits (tardiness, absenteeism)
 - Work climate (grievances, job satisfaction)
 - Attitudes (loyalty, perceptions)
 - Initiative (implementation of new ideas, number of employee suggestions)
- Total the costs of training.
- Compare the monetary benefits with the costs. The non-monetary benefits can be presented as additional — though intangible — evidence of success.

It takes a lot of time and effort to conduct evaluations at this level, and not every program needs this much attention. But when it's important to know the real value of a program, ROI measurement can go a long way toward justifying company efforts. For example, Magnavox Electronics Systems Company in Torrance, CA, maintains an 18-week literacy program covering verbal and math skills for employees.

Here are the results of a five-level evaluation the company conducted:

- **Level 1:** Reaction was measured by post-course surveys.
- **Level 2:** Learning was measured with the Test of Adult Basic Education.
- **Level 3:** Changes in behavior were measured by daily efficiency ratings.
- **Level 4:** Business results were measured through improvements in productivity and reductions in scrap and rework.
- **Level 5:** ROI was calculated by converting productivity and quality improvements to monetary values. The resulting ROI was 741%.

According to Phillips, the purposes and uses of evaluation are to improve the human resources development (HRD) process and to decide whether or not to continue this process. He states that evaluation should:

- Determine whether or not a program is accomplishing its objectives.
- Identify the strengths and weaknesses in an HRD program.
- Determine the cost/benefit ratio of an HRD program.
- Decide who should participate in future programs.
- Identify which participants benefited most or least from the program.
- Reinforce major points made to the participants.
- Gather data to assist in marketing future programs.
- Determine if the program was appropriate.

(Phillips, 1983)

A New Model?

Not everyone agrees with the Kirkpatrick model. Elwood Holton, writing in *HRD Quarterly* (1996, 7:1, pp. 5–21), goes so far as to say it isn't even a model, but rather merely taxonomy. The biggest problem, he says, is in trying to use the four levels to determine where a problem exists with a given educational program.

Holton proposes a new model that will "account for the impact of the primary intervening variables such as motivation to learn, trainability, job attitudes, personal characteristics, and transfer of training conditions." The important differences from the Kirkpatrick system are:

1. Reactions (Level 1) as a primary outcome are absent.
2. *Individual performance* is used instead of *behaviour*.
3. Primary and secondary influences on outcomes are included.

Three primary learning outcome measures are proposed:

1. **Learning** — achievement of the learning outcomes desired in the intervention
2. **Individual performance** — change in individual performance as a result of the learning being applied on the job
3. **Organizational results** — consequences of the change in individual performance

The model includes three primary influences on learning: trainee reactions, motivation to learn, and ability.

This proposed model needs to be tested, Holton says. A simpler model may emerge from such testing. For example, perhaps measuring only primary intervening variables will be sufficient, or perhaps only a few key variables within each category should be measured.

Conclusion

In implementing the evaluation process, Phillips cautions us to remember Murphy's Laws:

1. If things can go wrong, they will.
2. Nothing is as easy as it looks.
3. Everything takes longer than you expect.
4. Projects take longer than they do.



Friend Victoria West-Pawl, Virginia Watson, and Jennifer Stone celebrate their 1999 graduation as Masters of Science in Instructional Technology from Georgia State University, Atlanta.

ISPI member Jennifer Stone, jennifer.s.stone@fnf.com, is now a performance consultant for Fidelity Information Systems, Atlanta. Virginia Watson, va@watson.st, is an information architect specializing in Web-based delivery of medical education. "But currently," says Virginia, "my focus is on training my two toddlers. With Level 3 proof of their train-the-trainer skills. And immeasurable ROI." The family lives in Alpharetta, Georgia, on a farm with 8 acres and many emus.



Be Part of the SPECTRUM: An Invitation to Participate

Help *ISPI Vancouver Spectrum* become even more relevant for you!

In early March, ISPI Vancouver members received a bulletin inviting contributions to the Spring 2003 issue. As you can see, the response was good.

Invitation: You are once again invited to help make *ISPI Vancouver Spectrum* an even better professional resource for you and all our chapter members.

Background: As you may know, *Spectrum* was always our quarterly *newsletter*, distributed formerly in print by mail and currently in PDF by email. We now also have weekly updating of our www.ispi-van.org Website, including articles about chapter events almost as they happen, and we have frequent bulletins and other emailed information. Such advances have changed the need for a quarterly *newsletter*, and *Spectrum* has become a quarterly *journal*. Our current goal is to enhance one traditional strength of *Spectrum*: participation by our members.

You: ISPI members have a lot to offer. We ask each of you to send content for *Spectrum* and/or our Website. You don't have to be a great writer! Send us your articles, news, tips, etc., and we'll try to use them. Perhaps *Spectrum* can even become an *interactive journal*, with members responding to articles, sharing experiences, and asking questions. This may result in ongoing themes in the journal or on related pages on www.ispi-van.org.

Topics: Here are just a few of the many possible ideas for your submissions:

- Stories about accomplishments in your work, like Ron Einblau's article in this issue
- Reviews of relevant books, conferences, etc.
- Annotated sets of URLs for Web content about performance themes or other interesting topics
- Articles based on your research, like "ICE CREAM"
- Articles you've written for your own organization that you can share, like "Sun Run HPT?"
- Articles written by someone else that you would like to recommend, like "Evaluation of Training"
- Responses to articles you've seen in *Spectrum* — starting, we hope, with responses to this issue

Guidelines: Use Word, with simple formatting. Include full copyright facts if you send something from another source for re-publication. We may edit your content. We will try to use it in *Spectrum* and/or on our Website.

Act now! Thanks so much for considering this invitation. We look forward to hearing from you. Our next deadlines are June 19 and September 18, 2003. Please send your ideas, articles, etc., to *Spectrum* Editor Julie Case, jcase@sage-resources.com. In your email subject line, please include the word "Spectrum."

