

EDIS 710 OL
Field Practicum for Talent Development
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 1/1 (100% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
5.0	5.0
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.0
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The distance learning course as a whole was:	1	100%						5.0	5.1
The course content was:	1	100%						5.0	5.1
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	1	100%						5.0	5.0
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	1	100%						5.0	5.0

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	1				100%				4.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	1		100%						6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	1			100%					5.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	1			100%					5.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	1				100%				4.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=1)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		100%									

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=1)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		100%									

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 2.0 (N=1)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
												100%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=1)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
				100%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	1	100%						5.0	7
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	1	100%						5.0	14
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	1	100%						5.0	13
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	1	100%						5.0	1
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	1	100%						5.0	12
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	1	100%						5.0	15
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	1	100%						5.0	17
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	1	100%						5.0	16
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was:	1	100%						5.0	5
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was:	1	100%						5.0	3
Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was:	1	100%						5.0	4
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	1	100%						5.0	6
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	1	100%						5.0	2
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	1	100%						5.0	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	1	100%						5.0	11
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	1	100%						5.0	9
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	1	100%						5.0	10

EDIS 710 OL
Field Practicum for Talent Development
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 1/1 (100% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. Yes, during this class I was encouraged to try something new in my own classroom. I felt the learning was valuable because it helped me to grow as a teacher, and it helped me to see what my own students are capable of doing.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I found the "check-in" assignments to be helpful. It helped me to plan out my project and ensured I stayed on track.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. None

EDIS 653 OL
Guidance and Counsel for the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 7/7 (100% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.6	4.3
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.3
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The distance learning course as a whole was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	4.1
The course content was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	4.2
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	4.7
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	4.1

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	7		57%	14%	29%				5.6
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	29%	29%	29%	14%				5.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7	43%	14%	29%	14%				6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	43%	14%	29%	14%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	7	43%	14%	29%	14%				6.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: 1.7 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	29%	29%			14%					29%	

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=7)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
	43%	14%			29%					14%	

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=7)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
86%	14%													

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=7)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
				86%	14%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	12
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	11
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	4
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	7	43%	43%	14%				4.3	15
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	14
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	6
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	100%						5.0	7
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	7	86%	14%					4.9	9
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	2
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	16
Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	8
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	3
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	10
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	86%	14%					4.9	1
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	71%	29%					4.8	5
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	57%	43%					4.6	13
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	43%	57%					4.4	17

EDIS 653 OL
Guidance and Counsel for the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 7/7 (100% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. EDIS 653 enabled me to better understand the social emotional wellness of my students as well as myself. Social emotional learning and understanding is imperative to the success of our future generations.
2. Yes I learned about guidance and counseling and practices for dealing with the social and emotional gifted students. It stretched my thinking by being a facilitator in a project instead of the teacher. I learned the operating standards, my district's WEP, and the Myers Briggs Type Indicator.
3. Yes it helped me learn things in order to present them to others and learn from what others posted/shared
4. This class did stretch my thinking by looking at myself within the parameters of the topic and working with students. By taking the assessment to see my personality traits, I was able to relate that to student learning and see more clearly how those can impact students and myself.
5. Yes. I admittedly included very little affective curriculum. This course highlighted the need to address affective needs in ways I had not considered
6. Absolutely! I am much more equipped to understand the socioemotional needs of gifted students and utilize strategies to address them.
7. This class was very stimulating and improved my metacognitive skills. It's an understatement to say that my thinking was simply stretched. I was not expecting the level of reflection and self analysis this class evoked and I am grateful for it. There were so many issues I had not considered with uniqueness to the gifted population, equity and equality in GATE programs, and parenting a gifted child. It deepened my own philosophy as a teacher, parent, and individual.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Dr. Groman is a wealth of knowledge. Supplemental readings she added to our weekly course load were invaluable.
2. I liked doing the Dialogue Project. This was something new to me and enjoyed using the I'm Not Just Gifted a social emotional curriculum for guiding gifted children by Fonseca. The lessons were helpful!
3. Focus questions, doing the dialogue project
4. The readings and completing the chart.
5. The dialogue project
6. The weekly videos, syllabus, and course texts were very helpful.
7. The way it was chunked into parts! I loved having the variety of books to read, reflect and comment on through focus questions and the annotated bibliography. I really loved researching, especially my topics of interest. There was so much diversity in the readings I wish I had another few weeks to choose different chapters/topics that may have fallen in second or third place. Also the Myers-Briggs personality type indicator gave me a lot of food for thought about my personality and relating to others. I will definitely spend time delving further into this subject matter.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. This course did not distract me from learning.
2. Nothing
3. None
4. n/a
5. None
6. I can't think of anything that detracted.
7. Initially, I was a bit confused as to where to find everything and what exactly was due and when. The weekly videos took care of my confusion after the first few weeks as Dr. Groman guided us seamlessly through the expectations.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I do not have any real suggestions for the next offering of EDIS 653. Dr. Groman is a master educator. The structure of her course, the contents, and her presentation style matched my learning style perfectly.
2. Nothing I just wasn't very good at Blackboard at the beginning.
3. None
4. n/a
5. Somehow create more interaction amongst students
6. No suggestions. Dr. Groman did a great job and I learned so much.

7. Perhaps an optional meet in person. I would gladly travel from Columbus to meet our professor and my peers who were from a variety of backgrounds and great contributors.

EDIS 796 OL
Internship in Talent Development Education
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 8/12 (67% high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.8	4.5
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 5.3
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The distance learning course as a whole was:	8	62%	25%	12%				4.7	4.4
The course content was:	8	62%	25%	12%				4.7	4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	4.6
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	8	62%	25%		12%			4.7	4.3

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	8	38%	38%		25%				6.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	8	38%	12%	12%	38%				5.5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	8	38%	38%	12%	12%				6.2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	8	38%	25%	25%	12%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	8	38%	25%	12%	25%				6.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 4.8 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=8)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
12%	12%	38%	25%				12%				

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=8)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
12%	12%	50%	12%				12%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=8)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
50%		12%										38%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=8)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
				100%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	8	88%		12%				4.9	2
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	6
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	8	100%						5.0	4
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	8	75%	12%	12%				4.8	1
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	8	62%	12%	25%				4.7	16
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	10
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	14
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	8	88%	12%					4.9	11
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6	15
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was:	8	50%	25%	25%				4.5	17
Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was:	8	62%	12%	25%				4.7	7
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	8	75%	12%	12%				4.8	5
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6	12
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	8	62%	25%	12%				4.7	13
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	8	75%		25%				4.8	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	8	88%		12%				4.9	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	8	75%		25%				4.8	9

EDIS 796 OL
Internship in Talent Development Education
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 8/12 (67% high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

2. It stretched my thinking by expecting me to take knowledge learned through other classes and implement it here.
3. It helped me to think about all of the pieces that we've learned and how they can be incorporated into education, as we know it, through lessons and providing professional development to staff.
4. Yes. It made me think more about how I was going to reach all students and what was the best way to teach them.
5. It was in planning and using prior strategies
6. Yes, It also provided ongoing resources for me to use in my career.
7. Yes. Putting program content into practice through an internship gives students the opportunity to observe and apply what they have learned about in the program.
8. Yes because I had to apply everything I have learned throughout the program.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. The lesson writing and video taping of the lesson.
3. The hands-on experience of having contact with gifted students.
4. The lesson I taught really made me see how gifted individuals react and learn in different situations.
5. Teaching my group of gifted
6. Evaluation of the resource notebook.
7. Contact hours. Reflection paper.
8. Designing a lesson plan and updating my philosophy of education.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. The resource notebook. I do not find organizing my things for someone else helpful. I also tend not to refer back to my own work, and rather will refer back to the textbooks. Finally, I would rather revisit NAGC and ODE websites that downloaded documents that will change at different intervals.
3. n/a
4. Trying to get myself videoed and uploaded. It was hard to find time in the school day to film and then to make sure it was all there and would all piece together to make one video since my camera stopped recording at a certain point.
5. None
6. None
7. Time-management and being in a teaching position that had limited access to identified gifted learners.
8. Nothing.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Getting enough clock hours with students (although I'm sure that's the state requirement) and making sure students know from Day 1 of the program that the Resource Binder is hard to put together unless you don't do it class by class!
2. Set deadlines or check-ins earlier in the class would have helped me greatly. I do not work well in self-paced courses.
3. n/a
4. none
5. None
6. Only to maybe do one week where we walk through next steps, example OAE filling out application together to have it complete or resume assistance to be a quality candidate.
7. It was wonderful! Thanks for everything, Dr. G.
8. Continue this class as it is designed. You're the best, Dr. G!

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5)*; *Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7)*; *Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.