EDIS 796 OLS<br>Internship in Talent Development Education<br>Course type: Online

```
Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: 14
Responses: 16/18 (89\% very high)
```

Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc 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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 4.9 |
| (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: 4.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 16 | 69\% | 19\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| The course content was: | 16 | 62\% | 25\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 16 | 69\% | 25\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.9 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 16 | 19\% | 31\% |  | 44\% |  | 6\% |  | 5.0 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 16 | 19\% | 31\% | 19\% | 31\% |  |  |  | 5.5 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 16 | 12\% | 38\% | 12\% | 38\% |  |  |  | 5.5 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 16 | 12\% | 31\% | 31\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 5.3 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 16 | 19\% | 31\% | 12\% | 31\% | 6\% |  |  | 5.5 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 3.5 Hours per credit: 1.2 ( $\mathrm{N}=16$ ) including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 16 | 94\% | 6\% |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 16 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 14 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 16 | 94\% | 6\% |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 16 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 16 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 17 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 15 | 60\% | 33\% | 7\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 15 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 16 | 62\% | 25\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 11 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 16 | 69\% | 19\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 16 | 75\% | 19\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 16 | 75\% | 19\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 2 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 16 | 69\% | 25\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 13 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 8 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 9 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 16 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 12 |

```
EDIS 796 OLS
Internship in Talent Development Education
Course type: Online
```

| Evaluation Delivery: | Online |
| ---: | :--- |
| Evaluation Form: | 14 |
| Responses: | $16 / 18(89 \%$ very high $)$ |

Taught by: Jennifer Groman Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc Prof

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, this course challenged me to apply everything l've learned.
2. It absolutely stretched my thinking. I know my situation was unique but I had to really think outside the box to access gifted individuals. This made it a priority to me when it wasn't previously. It has been great for the students and myself.
3. Yes, I have learned many new strategies that I have put into place during my internship as a gifted intervention specialist.
4. Yes, it was good way to combine knowledge from all courses.
5. The reflective aspects of this class were very stimulating. The reflection paper really made me sit down and look at the significant contributions of each class in the program sequence, which made this capstone very meaningful. Having Dr. Groman come observe in person was awesome; having a face to face conversation and having the opportunity for real time feedback of a lesson was helpful and motivating.
6. Yes, this course stretched me to apply the skills and knowledge gained in previous coursework to my current teaching situation. As such, it was intellectually stimulating because I was working with my actual students to improve their learning.
7. Yes - applying the prior knowledge into the classroom was challenging
8. This class was very helpful, especially for people who have had limited experience with gifted students.

## What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I loved being able to have Dr. Groman in my classroom and be able to talk to her face to face.
2. Observation and the feedback given throughout the semester.
3. The observation was critical.
4. Differentiation for Gifted Learners and Social and Emotional Concerns
5. Having an in-person observation was very helpful. It was nice to have the opportunity to meet in person and share ideas.
6. The observation and discussion time with Dr. Groman and the reflection paper
7. The lesson plan and internship plan contributed most to my learning because I was free to discuss ideas (in the plan) and had to apply my learning (in the lesson plan).
8. The internship itself
9. Face time with gifted students

## What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. None
2. N/A
3. nothing I found it all to be very helpful
4. None.
5. N/A
6. None, this course was very appropriate for the program, relevant to my own classroom, and manageable time-wise.
7. none

## What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. None
2. N/A Dr. Groman is one of the coolest individuals I've met. I've loved watching the videos and finally getting to meet her. I appreciate the quality feedback and feeling like I could ask whatever I needed to. Thank you so much Dr. Groman for being you.
3. Dr. Groman does an excellent job of preparing the students to pass the OAE exam and take on the responsibility of being a gifted teacher.
4. None, this course was well-structured, easy to follow and a good way to wrap up the gifted endorsement.
5. N/A
6. None, this course was very appropriate for the program, relevant to my own classroom, and manageable time-wise.
7. none

## EDIS 710 OL1

Field Practicum for Talent Development
Evaluation Delivery: Online
Course type: Online
Evaluation Form: 14
Responses: 1/2 (50\% high)
Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc 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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> 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: 6.5
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 3.7 |
| The course content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.7 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.6 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.6 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT



On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 2.2 ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 12 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 9 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 7 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 15 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 10 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 11 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 8 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 14 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 16 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 13 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 17 |

Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc Prof

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. I believe that this class did stretch my thinking and was intellectually stimulating. I learned a lot about different strategies to teach my gifted students with. I felt that the work was challenging, but it pushed me to do my best in the course.

## What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I felt that the overall project contributed a lot to my learning. All the assignments were associated around this project and it helped me produce a great project. I also think the professor was big aspect to my learning as well.

## What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. I think that some of the modules were similar to the others. I would not say that this detracted from my learning.

## What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I think overall, the class was great. It went very quickly and I was able to learn a lot about my teaching. I think starting module 3 earlier could have helped so I was able to have more time working on the project, without rushing.

Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc 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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 5.2 |
| (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: 5.2
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5.2 |
| The course content was: | 16 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 5.0 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5.2 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 16 | 69\% | 31\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.1 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much <br> Higher <br> (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower <br> (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 16 | 19\% | 25\% |  | 50\% |  | 6\% |  | 4.4 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 16 | 38\% | 25\% | 19\% | 12\% | 6\% |  |  | 6.0 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 16 | 31\% | 31\% | 12\% | 19\% |  | 6\% |  | 5.9 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 16 | 38\% | 19\% | 31\% | 6\% | 6\% |  |  | 5.8 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 16 | 19\% | 31\% | 19\% | 19\% | 12\% |  |  | 5.5 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 5.2 Hours per credit: $1.7 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=16)$ including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 16 | 69\% | 12\% | 19\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 16 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 16 | 94\% |  | 6\% |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 12 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 16 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 16 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 16 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 14 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 16 | 75\% | 12\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 16 | 69\% | 25\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 8 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 16 | 69\% | 31\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 16 | 88\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 16 | 81\% | 19\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 2 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 16 | 75\% | 19\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 10 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 16 | 69\% | 25\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 15 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 16 | 69\% | 31\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 13 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 16 | 81\% | 12\% | 6\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 11 |

Taught by: Jennifer Groman Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc Prof

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes. It allowed me to consider and develop my creative self in relation to teaching students.
2. I enjoyed this class because it exposed me to new ideas, thoughts and experiences. Dr. G "forced" me to try new things I never would have on my own unless encouraged by her.
3. I loved this class! This was my favorite class that I have taken so far at Ashland University. It was fun, intellectually stimulating and different than any other class that I have taken.
4. Yes- it made me practice activities I was not completely comfortable with but it allowed room for growth.
5. I learned a lot about creativity and myself. It made me think differently than I had before.
6. This class definitely took me out of my comfort zone.
7. yes!
8. I have a better appreciation for how to integrate creativity into my classroom.
9. Yes, creativity is an area that I don't think is explored very much so there were a lot of new content and ideas.
10. This class was overstimulating and fantastic. I gained so much valuable insight about what it takes to nurture creatively gifted students as well as myself.
11. Yes - content I wasn't knowledgable of prior to course
12. Yes. This class was intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking. I learned a lot about differentiation and student choice.
13. This class pushed me out of my comfort zone and required me to complete work that challenged me.

## What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Learning different methods to incorporate creativity into the classroom.
2. I enjoyed the weekly creativity projects. Not only did I enjoy them, I also had my students do them as week. It was amazing to go from the student to teacher.
3. I loved the openness of the assignments and the creativity project.
4. The meditation field trip day.
5. I enjoyed the activities that were included in the weekly videos. It gave an example or application of the material.
6. The Cash book was the most helpful to me.
7. the text books, the mini-biography project
8. Practical applications and time to reflect
9. Assignments and materials that helped me relate creativity to my classroom and my students.
10. Each lesson was so different and meaningful. Practicing creative activities and using a thoughtlog each week improved my depth of understanding how creatives work, struggle, and succeed. Dr. Groman's weekly videos took us on a different journey each week and I have already begun to implement some of the strategies learned with my current students.
11. All
12. Creativity monster What Matters sculpture Meditation Day Assignment
13. Video lectures

## What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

## 1. None.

2. The holiday season.
3. Nothing.
4. None
5. Mini-biography
6. I felt some of the projects were a little difficult to understand.
7. having to make a video
8. none
9. None
10. This class became more personal than I expected which was necessary, but distracting.
11. None
12. thoughtlog

## What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. None.
2. Nothing specific. I absolutely loved this class and it by far has been a top 3 out of any classes I have taken as an adult.
3. Nothing, It was amazing :)
4. None
5. nothing- I really really thought it was a great class
6. I enjoyed this course
7. No suggestions, Dr. Groman has created a great course and clearly shows a passion for creativity that is contagious.
8. none
9. None
10. This is an amazing class. It is, by far, the best in the gifted endorsement program. It was enjoyable due to the assignments and the push to "take risks" and go outside of our box.

## EDIS 650 OL

Nature and Needs of the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: 14
Responses: 6/7 (86\% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc 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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 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: 4.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The course content was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 6 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.7 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much <br> Higher <br> (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 6 |  | 17\% | 33\% | 50\% |  |  |  | 4.5 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 6 | 17\% | 33\% | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  | 5.5 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 6 | 33\% | 33\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 6 |  | 50\% | 17\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 5.5 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 6 | 17\% | 50\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 9.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 12 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 13 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 2 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 14 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 15 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 16 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 11 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 9 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 6 | 83\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 7 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 6 | 83\% |  |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.9 | 8 |

## EDIS 650 OL

Nature and Needs of the Talented
Course type: Online

```
Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: 14 Responses: 6/7 (86\% very high)
```

Taught by: Jennifer Groman Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc Prof

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. It's always beneficial to collaborate with peers and discuss experiences in the field. It does stretch my thinking to consider diversity in equity to content and the quality of instruction I provided to my students based on course discussion with peers.
2. This class involved extensive, very engaged readings that demanded critical thinking and thought provoking reflections. Dr. Groman did a wonderful job of truncating the reading assignments into more manageable.
3. This class was amazing. Dr. G is the best teacher I have ever had. Yes it stretched my thinking. I learned so many new things.
4. This class was intellectually stimulating. As a result, I understand more about identifying gifted students.
5. Yes

## What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Padlet, text and case study
2. The online discussions as well as the projects/presentations we were required to submit.
3. The content, reading, collaboration, and the teacher. The teacher was key. She is the best teacher I have EVER had.
4. I enjoyed the reading from the textbook and the case study.
5. Connections between learning to real-life examples in my current educational experience.

## What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Nothing detracts my learning path. I'm laser focused!
2. The readings were a bit long at times, and overall i prefer in person classes but other than that, nothing majorly took away from this course.
3. Some items on blackboard. Sharing to Padlet. The class didn't detract from learning. Keeping up with it during school with other things coming up like illness and funerals.. however she is very reasonable with her high expectations.
4. Some of the readings assignments were poorly scanned, making it difficult to understand fully.
5. Video presentations added an extra step.

## What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Nothing -- I just wish more of us could've met in person!
2. Perhaps trim up the readings a bit, other than that, no super noticeable improvements.
3. None.
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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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.0 | 3.6 |
| (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: 6.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| The course content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 3.5 |

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 6.5 Hours per credit: $2.2 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very } \\ & \text { Poor } \\ & \text { (0) } \end{aligned}$ | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 13 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 8 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 1 |  |  | 100\% |  |  |  | 3.0 | 17 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 12 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 9 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 14 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 10 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 15 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 11 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 16 |

Taught by: Jennifer Groman Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assoc Prof

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. I learned a lot about my writing ability. I was never $100 \%$ confident in my writing skills. I think I learned a lot about researching and finding appropriate and supportive articles for my thesis.

## What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The aspects that contributed most to my learning was all the research that I did. I also felt the writing and having to use APA style also contributed.

## What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The times where I had to wait for the writing center to give feedback I was not learning as much while waiting. I do not blame them though, I know they are working with a lot of students. Once they did give me feedback, the feedback was always GREAT!

## What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I think it was great. I wish that I would have gone to my professors office hours more to get face-to-face feedback. That was on me though. She was always available when I needed her.

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).

[^0]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ 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.

