## EDIS 651 OL <br> CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATION OF THE TALENTED Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: 14

Responses: 1/7 (14\% low)

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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | 4.4 |
| (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: 7.0
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very <br> Good <br> (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very <br> Poo <br> (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| The course content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.3 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT



In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:
In your major
Distribution requirement
An elective

In your minor
A program requirement
Other
100\%

## 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: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 13 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 12 |
| 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 | 14 |
| 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 | 3 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| 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 | 7 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |

```
EDIS 651 OL
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATION OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Online
```

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: 14
Responses: 1/7 (14\% low)

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, I was able to look at different curriculum models and determine which model worked best for my students.

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

1. The different differentiation strategies

## 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 COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: 14
Responses: 4/6 (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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | 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: 6.1
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| The course content was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.8 |

## 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: | 4 | 50\% |  |  | 50\% |  |  |  | 5.5 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: $1.8 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=4)$ 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: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 13 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 12 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 14 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 16 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |

## EDIS 653 OL <br> GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED <br> Course type: Online

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. It was. We were required to plan a lesson and complete several self-evaluation pieces that were intellectually stimulating.
2. Yes, this class was very intellectually stimulating! I was able to learn from the readings, conversations, and projects and took time to reflect on each and determine how it all fits together and applies to my current teaching situation.
3. Yes. This was my first gifted and talented class. Many aspects I had never thought about in regards to guidance and counseling were part of the course. Several times, it made me think about my work as a teacher, and how to better meet the needs of students.

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

1. Lesson planning and self-evaluations.
2. I learn a lot from Dr. Groman as well as the readings and the conversations we've had. The activities I completed were helpful when I was trying to make sense of all of the information I was learning about.
3. The variety of assignments and the texts used made the content easy to learn, remember, and apply.

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

## 1. None

2. The class had a lot of writing activities, reading, and a large project to complete. While it seemed daunting at first, it was very helpful that Dr. Groman broke it all down each week. I also appreciated that with the interruption of Covid-19, she adjusted the expectations to be more flexible with the new situation that we were in as educators. Thank you!
3. None.

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

1. None
2. Fewer focus questions to write would be nice but overall, the class really is outstanding and made a huge impact on my growth as an educator of gifted students.
3. I can't imagine how this course could be improved. Dr. Groman's videos and assignment explanations could not have been easier to understand. There was no question as to what was expected, and for that, I'm very grateful. Dr. Groman extended nothing but grace and understanding when everything changed due to the virus, and again, I'm very grateful. There was a lot to juggle, and she made adjustments and reworked the syllabus because she knew how much we had on our plates. :)
EDIS 781 OL
THESIS CAPSTONE IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Online

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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.6 | 4.4 |
| (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: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.3 |
| The course content was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.3 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.3 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.6 |

## 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: | 4 |  | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 7.5 Hours per credit: $2.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=4)$ 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) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very } \\ & \text { Poor } \\ & (0) \end{aligned}$ | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 16 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 7 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 2 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 17 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 4 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 11 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 12 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 10 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 13 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 14 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 4 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 15 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 8 |

## EDIS 781 OL <br> THESIS CAPSTONE IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

 Course type: OnlineEvaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: 14

Responses: 4/6 (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?

1. This course was intellectually stimulating and also stretched my thinking because not only did I have to develop a thesis theme to explore, but I also had to research and apply supportive literature while developing a succinct written thesis to support my original idea of interest.
2. Yes. It was great to choose our own topic and have the freedom to explore it as we saw fit.

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

1. Exploring literature-based research aligned to my thesis theme contributed most to my learning because this activity allowed me to explore similar and opposing findings of well-respected writers and researchers (related to my theme) as well as connect these findings to contribute to my thesis ideas overall.
2. Student models were helpful. It was also helpful to see a rough timeline for the project, including the proposal.

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

1. No aspects of this class detracted from my learning.
2. none

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

1. This course was designed to be exceptionally supportive and allowed for flexibility in selecting and exploring a thesis theme as well as designing research and writing schedules to fit individual needs and abilities. This course aligns well to the distance learning format, and I do not see any need to change the course at this time.
2. Maybe just more clarification about how the final submission process works. I knew that we would have additional chances to revise until we were satisfied with the result, but I was not sure how that process worked with the April 25th deadline to have the grade assigned on this term. I was not sure if we would have to revise until we were both satisfied or until the paper was "passing."

| EDIS 710 OL <br> FIELD PRACTICUM FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION Course type: Online |  |  |  | Evaluation Delivery: Evaluation Form: Responses: |  |  |  | Online 14 $0 / 2(0 \%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taught by: Jennifer Groman Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMATIVE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor (1) | Very Poor <br> (0) | Median |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: <br> The course content was: <br> The instructor's contribution to the course was: <br> The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

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

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

| Under 2 | 2-3 |  | 4-5 |  | -7 | 8-9 |  |  | 12-13 | 14-15 | 16-17 |  |  | 20-21 | 22 or more |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| What grade do you expect in this course? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | A- | B+ |  | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- | F | Pass | Credit | No Credit |

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:
In your major Distribution requirement
In your minor
A program requirement
Other

## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

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

## EDIS 710 OL

FIELD PRACTICUM FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION Course type: Online
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?

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

## EDIS 796 OL <br> INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: 14
Responses: 1/2 (50\% 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 <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | 4.7 |
| (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: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

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

## 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\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 2.5 Hours per credit: $0.8 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ 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) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 1 |  | 100\% |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 17 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 12 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |
| 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 | 13 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 14 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 16 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| 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 | 5 |
| 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 | 9 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |

```
EDIS 796 OL
INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Online
```

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 Dr. Groman challenged as educators to put our previous coursework to work in the field. This course was to put theory into to practice.

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

1. Dr. Groman's experience that she shared during this class.

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

1. COVID-19 Pandemic, Governor Mike DeWine and his closure of school buildings

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

1. None. Dr. Groman went above and beyond to modify the course to fit the realities of education during this time. Please give Dr. Groman a bonus for all her hard work. She modified the syllabus 3 times in response to the changing situation and did not put an undue burden on us as students who are trying to teach in this challenging time.
```
EDUC 710 OL
FIELD PRACTICUM IN EDUCATION
Evaluation Delivery: Online
    Evaluation Form: 14
    Responses: 8/19 (42% moderate)
```

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 <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: 5.8
(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: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 4.5 |
| The course content was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 4.6 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 4.5 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 4.5 |

## 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: | 6 | 33\% | 50\% |  |  | 17\% |  |  | 6.2 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 6 | 33\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 17\% | 6.2 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 8 | 12\% | 50\% | 25\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 8 | 25\% | 62\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  | 6.1 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 8 | 12\% | 75\% |  |  | 12\% |  |  | 6.0 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.8 Hours per credit: 2.4 ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good <br> (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 9 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 13 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 12 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 2 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 14 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 16 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 8 | 88\% |  |  | 12\% |  |  | 4.9 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 8 | 88\% |  |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.9 | 15 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 7 | 71\% |  | 14\% |  | 14\% |  | 4.8 | 6 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 4 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 8 | 75\% |  | 12\% |  | 12\% |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 8 | 88\% |  |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 7 | 86\% |  |  |  | 14\% |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 8 | 88\% |  |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.9 | 8 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 8 | 88\% |  |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.9 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 8 | 88\% |  |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.9 | 7 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 8 | 88\% |  |  |  | 12\% |  | 4.9 | 11 |

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT

## EDUC 710 OL <br> FIELD PRACTICUM IN EDUCATION <br> Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online<br>Evaluation Form: 14<br>Responses: 8/19 (42\% moderate)

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. The class was very relevant. I am so happy to have taken it.
2. Yes, it forced me to rethink how I teach French. It has given me some valuable resources to use moving forward.
3. no
4. The class was intellectually stimulating it caused me to examine my practices to see what could be improved and research strategies that may improve my practice and/or abilities of my students. Once the shutdown happened the course caused me to evaluate how myself and my school district were handled the situation. It was also helpful to see how other districts were handling it and to know that I wasn't alone in some of my struggles.
5. Loved it! I found it very helpful to my teaching career.
6. Yes, the content pushed me to investigate new teaching strategies that I was not using on a regular basis. It also forced me to evaluate data that at times I pass over due to the busyness of my days.

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

1. The feedback from Dr. Groman was great. I grew as a teacher and person due to her dedication.
2. The overall project that I had to complete forced me outside my comfort zone and taught me so much.
3. none
4. I got to choose the focus area, which made the learning more enjoyable.
5. The end project contributed to my learning. Also, the research on different strategies and how to use them.

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

1. None
2. Absolutely nothing.
3. everything

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

1. I don't have suggestions. I think you adapted our lessons. I think it is very applicable. I think the class connects us to the real world and our real world teaching. Anything we can take and implement into our classes is useful. Most classes aren't like this one. I really enjoyed it.
2. Nothing. This was an excellent course.
3. cancel
4. Dr. Groman did an excellent job of quickly adapting the class to schools closing. She made what could have been a stressful situation (trying to continue project without access to students) useful and as stress-free as possible. I really appreciate how she adapted the class and allowed the students to use their current situation as the material for the final project.

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.

