IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

EDIS 650 CT1
NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 9/9 (100% very high)

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:

Median
4.8
(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 (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	9	67%	33%					4.8
The course content was:	9	78%	22%					4.9
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	9	78%	22%					4.9
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	9	78%	22%					4.9

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:	9	11%	56%		33%				5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	9	11%	89%						6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	9	11%	67%	22%					5.9
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	9	22%	78%						6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	9	11%	56%	11%	22%				5.8

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: 7.2 Hours per credit: 2.4 (N=9)

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
		22%	33%	11%	22%	11%					

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

Class median: 6.0 Hours per credit: 2 (N=9)

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
	11%	33%	22%	22%		11%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=9)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
56%	33%	11%												

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

(N=9)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
33%				67%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	9	56%	44%					4.6
Instructor's preparation for class was:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Explanations by instructor were:	9	78%	11%	11%				4.9
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	9	89%		11%				4.9
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	9	89%	11%					4.9
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	9	89%	11%					4.9
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Answers to student questions were:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Availability of extra help when needed was:	9	67%	22%	11%				4.8
Use of class time was:	9	67%	22%	11%				4.8
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	9	67%	33%					4.8
Amount you learned in the course was:	9	67%	33%					4.8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	9	78%	22%					4.9
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	9	67%	11%	22%				4.8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	9	56%	44%					4.6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

EDIS 650 CT1
NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 9/9 (100% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. It was intellectually stimulating. It definitely stretched my thinking since I had been in the regular classroom before this year. Using the information and applying it really helped.

2. Yes. Yes.

4. I received a lot of ideas and strategies to use with my students. The OAGC conference opened my eyes to questions that parents might have about their children and the different services that they receive at school.

5. When becoming qualified to teach our highest achieving students, it is imperative to be masterful in our teaching. Average is not acceptable. This class encouraged students not only to complete requirements, but to approach each assignment by making personal connections and making applications to our own teaching.

6. The instructor was well prepared with good questions for discussion. The material was challenging and rewarding. I have a new understanding of gifted.

7. The class exposed me to a lot of new information. Often I feel that education courses are fairly "common sense," but this exposed me to a lot of theory and content that was brand new. A great survey course.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Class discussion over material read.

2. Interesting readings, class discussions

4. I would say the OAGC conference and chapter 6 in TC&A contributed the most to my learning. Getting a parent's point of view on gifted children was enlightening. Also, chapter 6 focused on the types of students that I work with.

5. This course was effective in giving an overview of the requirements, rewards, and challenges to be expected once granted an endorsement. I appreciated that for the assignments, students were also permitted to explore and respond to areas of interest.

6. The ideas of how gifted think and act. This gave me insight into the students I teach.

7. The readings were very helpful and provided a lot of thorough research. The professor's feedback on written work was excellent; I always looked forward to seeing her comments.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. I hated the long drive to Columbus. It was tiring.

2. Nothing

4. I cannot think of any aspect that detracted from my learning.

5. Completing papers correctly in APA was challenging for an older student like myself who has been away from the process for a long time. While it was beneficial to me to revisit, at times I felt like it took away time I could have spent on content.

6. Time constraints of my job. Factor of life. Class was great.

7. I felt that the stress of preparing the case study was distracting. I wonder if there are ways to modify this assignment a little to make it more straightforward in terms of requirements without losing the value of the application experience. Sometimes I felt that the in-class sharing of our focus questions was a little awkward and not always productive. I wish I had a better recommendation for how to improve that part of the course, but I think it's an area that could be more valuable in a slightly different format.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Dr. Groman was outstanding. I would prefer attending class at AU's main campus.

2. None. Great class!

3. This class was challenging, the case study was a little overwhelming since we were limited to who we were able to use as a subject. If we are in a smaller school or position to teach all of the students it made it very difficult to observe a subject and interview outside of a school environment.

4. I cannot think of any improvements at this time. The class was great, and the teacher really showed her enthusiasm for the course, which kept the class engaged.

5. While I think the text has a lot of benefits; one of the greatest being the continuity between classes which will prevent holes in learning, it is probably getting outdated in some areas.

6. Do not change a thing.

7. Honestly, this class was very hard work for me, but I don't necessarily think that I would change it substantially because it was a positive experience overall that I learned a lot from.

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 653 ACLK
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/5 (40% moderate)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman, Theresa Scherzinger
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:

Median
4.0
(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: 4.2
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	2		50%	50%				3.5
The course content was:	2		50%	50%				3.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	2	50%	50%					4.5

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:	2		50%		50%				5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	2			50%	50%				4.5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	2		50%		50%				5.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	2		50%		50%				5.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	2		50%		50%				5.0

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: 1.5 (N=2)

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
	50%		50%								

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

Class median: 3.5 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=2)

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
50%			50%								

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=2)

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=2)

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

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	2			100%				3.0
Instructor's preparation for class was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Explanations by instructor were:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	2	100%						5.0
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Answers to student questions were:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Use of class time was:	2	100%						5.0
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	2	100%						5.0
Amount you learned in the course was:	2	100%						5.0
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	2	100%						5.0
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	2	50%	50%					4.5
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	2	50%		50%				4.0
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	2	100%						5.0

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 653 ACLK
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/5 (40% moderate)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman, Theresa Scherzinger
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

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. all

2. Being able to collaborate with other teachers.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. none

2. Too many face to face meetings when we could have done a Google hangout or something else.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. none

2. Use more online resources to enhance the time we do spend in class. Because it is a "hybrid" class, some face to face were required, but that could be lessened with technology. Realizing that the audience is all teachers that already have Master's degrees, and changing the course work based upon that audience would have made the course more effective.

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 653 ACST
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery:	Online
Evaluation Form:	A5
Responses:	4/5 (80% very high)

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:

| **Median** |
| **4.8** |
| (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 (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	4	75%		25%				4.8
The course content was:	4	75%	25%					4.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	4	75%	25%					4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	4	75%	25%					4.8

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:	4		75%		25%				5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	4	25%	50%	25%					6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	4	25%	25%	50%					5.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	4	25%		75%					5.2
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	4	25%	50%	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: 3.5 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=4)**

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
	50%	50%									

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 3.5 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=4)**

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
	50%	50%									

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 4.0 (N=4)**

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=4)**

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

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	4	100%						5.0
Instructor's preparation for class was:	4	100%						5.0
Explanations by instructor were:	4	100%						5.0
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	4	100%						5.0
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	4	100%						5.0
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	4	100%						5.0
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	4	100%						5.0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	4	100%						5.0
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	4	100%						5.0
Answers to student questions were:	4	100%						5.0
Availability of extra help when needed was:	4	100%						5.0
Use of class time was:	4	100%						5.0
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	4	100%						5.0
Amount you learned in the course was:	4	75%	25%					4.8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	4	100%						5.0
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	4	75%	25%					4.8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	4	75%	25%					4.8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	4	75%	25%					4.8

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 653 ACST
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 4/5 (80% 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. It stretched my thinking regarding emotional functioning of minority populations.

2. Yes, everything I learned was new.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The books we read were interesting.

2. discussions

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. writing papers

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I liked having opportunities to communicate my learning in formats other than the traditional paper. Keep that going.

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.

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

EDIS 654 CT1
CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 7/8 (88% very high)

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:

Median
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: 6.0
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	7	71%	29%					4.8
The course content was:	7	57%	43%					4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	100%						5.0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	100%						5.0

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:	7	29%	57%	14%					6.1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	71%	29%						6.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7	29%	71%						6.2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	29%	57%	14%					6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	7	43%	43%	14%					6.3

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: 6.5 Hours per credit: 2.2 (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%		43%	14%	14%						

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **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
14%	14%	29%	29%	14%							

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.9 (N=7)**

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
71%	14%		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
14%				86%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	7	57%	43%					4.6
Instructor's preparation for class was:	7	100%						5.0
Explanations by instructor were:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	7	100%						5.0
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	7	100%						5.0
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	100%						5.0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	7	100%						5.0
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	7	100%						5.0
Answers to student questions were:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Availability of extra help when needed was:	7	100%						5.0
Use of class time was:	7	71%	29%					4.8
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	7	100%						5.0
Amount you learned in the course was:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	71%	29%					4.8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	86%	14%					4.9
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	71%	29%					4.8

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 654 CT1
CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 7/8 (88% very high)

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 own creativity that I did not think that I had.

2. Yes! Readings were relevant and interested mg. Class discussions were engaging and interesting.

3. This course took me out of my comfort zone in a good way. I did not believe that I was very creative, but from this course I was able to explore my creativity, and realized that I do have some hidden talents.

4. Yes; I enjoyed exploring my creative process!

5. Yes, the conversations in class really kept me thinking.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I appreciate the compassion that Dr. Groman has for her students and the understanding and flexibility that she provides.

2. Instructor's knowledge. Also class community was exceptional.

3. Allowing students to choose the format for writing papers. Having open discussions about our creativity and building trust among the classmates.

4. In class activites; the creativity project

5. This is one of the most valuable classes I have taken this far. I really appreciated the openness of the class and felt extremely comfortable.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. No ne

3. I cannot think of any at this time.

4. I struggled keeping a daily journal of my creative thinking

5. n/a

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Keep Dr. Groman I only wish that I would have had her for the beginning of my program.

2. Keep Dr Groman teaching it!

3. I cannot think of any at this time.

4. None, I enjoyed it !

5. n/a

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 710 OL1
FIELD PRACTICUM FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
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:

Median
4.0
(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: 6.5
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	1		100%					4.0
The course content was:	1		100%					4.0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	1		100%					4.0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	1		100%					4.0

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:	1			100%					5.0
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%						6.0
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, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 4.2 (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: 6.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 (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: 4.0 (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%					

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	1			100%				3.0
Instructor's preparation for class was:	1		100%					4.0
Explanations by instructor were:	1			100%				3.0
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	1	100%						5.0
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	1			100%				3.0
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	1		100%					4.0
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	1	100%						5.0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	1		100%					4.0
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	1		100%					4.0
Answers to student questions were:	1	100%						5.0
Availability of extra help when needed was:	1	100%						5.0
Use of class time was:	1		100%					4.0
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	1	100%						5.0
Amount you learned in the course was:	1	100%						5.0
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	1	100%						5.0
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	1	100%						5.0
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	1		100%					4.0
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	1			100%				3.0

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 710 OL1
FIELD PRACTICUM FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
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; This was the first timeI've conducted a research project within my classroom and examined its effect upon my practice which is always insightful to educators

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Incorporating the project into my own classroom and seeing its effects first-hand

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The annotated bibliography (module one) was my greatest struggle, perhaps because I have never completed one before and was focused more upon the structure than the content

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. None, it was very beneficial !

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 796 CT
INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/3 (67% high)

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:

Median
4.8
(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 (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The course as a whole was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
The course content was:	2	50%	50%					4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	2	100%						5.0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	2	100%						5.0

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:	2	50%			50%				5.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	2	100%							7.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	2	100%							7.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	2	50%	50%						6.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	2	100%							7.0

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: 1.5 (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: 1.5 (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: 4.0 (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%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course organization was:	2	100%						5.0
Instructor's preparation for class was:	2	100%						5.0
Explanations by instructor were:	2	100%						5.0
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	2	100%						5.0
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	2	100%						5.0
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	2	100%						5.0
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	2	100%						5.0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	2	100%						5.0
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	2	100%						5.0
Answers to student questions were:	2	100%						5.0
Availability of extra help when needed was:	2	100%						5.0
Use of class time was:	2	100%						5.0
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	2	100%						5.0
Amount you learned in the course was:	2	100%						5.0
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	2	100%						5.0
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	2	100%						5.0
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	2	100%						5.0
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	2	100%						5.0

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDIS 796 CT
INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/3 (67% high)

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?

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
Education
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDUC 710 OL1
FIELD PRACTICUM IN EDUCATION
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 6/16 (38% 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:

| **Median** |
| **4.6** |
| (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: 5.6** |
| (1=lowest; 7=highest) |

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The distance learning course as a whole was:	6	50%	50%					4.5
The course content was:	6	50%	50%					4.5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	6	67%	33%					4.8

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:	6		17%	17%	67%				4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	33%	50%		17%				6.2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	17%	50%	33%					5.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6	33%	33%	17%	17%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	33%	33%	17%	17%				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: 4.5 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=6)

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
	33%	33%			17%		17%				

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=6)

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
17%	17%	33%			17%			17%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=6)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
67%		17%	17%											

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

(N=6)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
67%	17%			17%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

Ashland University
College of Education
Education
Term: Fall 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	83%	17%					4.9
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	67%	33%					4.8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	67%	33%					4.8

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

EDUC 710 OL1
FIELD PRACTICUM IN EDUCATION
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 6/16 (38% 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, yes, it was thought provoking

2. Yes. The application of learning was wonderful.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Technology

2. The instructors feedback.

3. I really appreciated the feedback I received each time from Dr. Groman on the assignments.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. n/a

2. Na

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. none

2. Na

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.