| HON 390 A | Evaluation Delivery: Online |
| :--- | ---: |
| HONORS INTERDISCIPLINARY SEMINAR | Evaluation Form: $A 80$ |
| Course type: Face-to-Face | Responses: $6 / 12$ ( $50 \%$ high $)$ |

Taught by: Jeffrey Weidenhamer, Jennifer Groman, Priscilla Roggenkamp, Stefan Swanson, William Vaughan 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 | 5.0 |
| (0=lowest; $5=$ highest $)$ |  |

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

CEI: 4.0
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The course content was: | 6 | 67\% |  | 17\% | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 6 | 67\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 6 | 67\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT



On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 2.7 Hours per credit: 0.9 ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (4) | No Opinion <br> (3) | Disagree (2) | Strongly Disagree (1) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Your grade in this segment of the course was determined fairly. | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| This professor should be invited to teach Honors courses again. | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| The instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning by provoking interest in the material, providing clear explanations of difficult concepts, encouraging student discussion and dialogue, and stimulating independent thinking. | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| The number and difficulty level of homework, projects, and other assignments were appropriate for meeting the Honors Program Mission of offering "courses that challenge the mind." | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  | 4.8 |  |


|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course organization was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 1 |
| Clarity of instructor's voice was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 15 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 9 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 10 |
| Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 13 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 8 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 17 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 11 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 18 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 12 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 14 |
| Use of class time was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 7 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 16 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% |  |  | 17\% |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 2 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |

HON 390 A
HONORS INTERDISCIPLINARY SEMINAR
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Jeffrey Weidenhamer, Jennifer Groman, Priscilla Roggenkamp, Stefan Swanson, William Vaughan 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, it was very different from any class I have ever taken.
2. Yes, it was interesting to explore a topic I don't usually consider in creativity.
3. This class definitely made me consider my own creativity differently.
4. This section of the course forced me to think outside the box when it comes to learning, which was definitely intellectually stimulating.
5. Not really, most of what we learned seemed really obvious.

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

1. The thought log and creative end project.
2. The application of the ideas to an individual in the presentation.
3. I think that the final project was interesting because it forced me to do things that I normally don't.
4. The knowledge and teaching style of the professor were the most important contributions to the learning environment of this section.

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

2. None.
3. Personally I think that there were too many large projects in this section and that it would have been better with either the creativity project or the biography but may be not both.
4. None
5. I think choosing only one project would have been better than having multiple projects crammed into 4 weeks.

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

2. o ul't topo! opang ul. [It was great to take! Everything was good.]
3. I would remove one of the final projects
4. None
EDLS 9898 ARR
SEMINAR/TOPICS IN ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP
Course type: Hybrid
Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

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:

| Combined <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | 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: 6.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.0 |
| The course content was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.1 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.1 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.0 |

## 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\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: $4.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course organization was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 18 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 12 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 13 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 14 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 16 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Use of class time was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |

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 654 OLS | Evaluation Delivery:Online <br> CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED <br> Course type: Online |
| :--- | ---: |
| Taught by: Jennifer Groman Form: | $14 / 1$ ( $82 \%$ very high $)$ |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.9 | 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: 5.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 9 | 78\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| The course content was: | 9 | 78\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 9 | 89\% | 11\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 9 | 78\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.7 |

## 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: | 9 | 11\% | 44\% | 22\% | 11\% |  | 11\% |  | 5.6 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 9 | 33\% | 44\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 6.1 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 9 | 33\% | 56\% |  | 11\% |  |  |  | 6.2 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 9 | 11\% | 56\% | 22\% | 11\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 9 | 33\% | 44\% |  | 11\% | 11\% |  |  | 6.1 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: $1.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=9)$ including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 9 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 9 | 78\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 14 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 9 | 89\% | 11\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 9 | 89\% | 11\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 9 | 89\% | 11\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 9 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 9 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 9 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 9 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 13 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 9 | 56\% | 33\% | 11\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 17 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 9 | 56\% | 33\% | 11\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 16 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 9 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 9 | 67\% | 22\% |  | 11\% |  |  | 4.8 | 11 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 9 | 67\% | 22\% |  | 11\% |  |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 9 | 78\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 8 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 9 | 78\% | 22\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 9 | 78\% | 11\% | 11\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 6 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 9 | 78\% | 11\% | 11\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 12 |

## EDIS 654 OLS

CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: 14

Responses: 9/11 (82\% 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. This course challenged me to step out of my comfort zone.
2. This class forced you to connect to your creative self and in doing this made students have to reach in to find their creative side. Individual self discovery was apparent.
3. This class was intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking by showing teachers how to consider the varying realms of creativity within gifted students. Meanwhile, I had various opportunities to explore my own creativity and apply this to my own teaching to best support my students.
4. This course allowed me to think outside of the box. I have been able to use the information in my classroom to enhance my student's learning.
5. This was a great course to take. Creativity is such an ambiguous term in education. I feel so much more informed and empowered to speak and lead on creativity recognition and training within my district. My thinking was stretched in how I view my own creative strengths and weaknesses and how I can grow as a creative individual. I certainly enjoyed Dr. Groman's creative training sessions on different aspects show its more than just brainstorming as many ideas as possible.
6. Yes, I do not typically think much about my own creativity. It did stretch my thinking, I was able to see some things I have already been doing in my own class and have been able to find new ways to engage the children's creativity and connect it with my required curriculum.
7. The class required us to apply, examine and broaden our own creative thinking and analyze creative strategies.

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

1. The aspects that contributed most to my learning were the activities and spending conscious time with myself.
2. The projects: biography and creativity. Working on these forced you to learn class concepts and apply them to your projects. I also liked that we were given the option of choice on what chapters to read for the week.
3. Reading closely and researching the many realms of creativity that gifted students may resonate with. Learning how these grow within students became very beneficial in effectively promoting their talents in the classroom.
4. The hands-on activities were most influential to my learning.
5. I enjoyed the weekly activities at the end of the weekly video to try and experience a new aspect or dimension of creativity. It was very helpful to be guided in learning how to open myself to see my own creativity. I also really enjoyed the activities that were posted to Padlet to see everyone else's creative processes in the class.
6. The required readings and applications.

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

1. I didn't find any aspect of this class detracting.
2. N/A
3. None
4. Online classes have more "freedom" and staying on task was a little bit challenging for me.
5. None. I was not overwhelmed with this class. I thought there was good pace to the semester and did not feel like every week was crammed with assignments.
6. Instructions in videos are difficult for me. I am not easily able to learn/understand by listening to others speak. (This is one reason I prefer online classes.) I
7. Nothing

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

1. The class is great as is. There seemed to be a few things added at the end (reflection and change of thought log), which added a little anxiety as I thought all course obligations had been fulfilled.
2. Nothing...enjoyed the class and the relaxed attitude of the course. Dr. Groman's passion for creativity was noted and felt by students. She has been a fabulous instructor throughout this program!
3. This made for an excellent online learning course. I appreciated the details of the syllabus calendar and the way in which this supported spacing out the work for larger projects from week to week.
4. I would leave things just as they are.
5. One of the most helpful assignments for me was the Cash FQ on adapting a lesson to the classroom. As someone who is green in gifted education, I enjoyed and benefited from seeing how other teachers are or planning to bring creativity to their classroom. I wish there were more opportunities to share how to implement creativity in the classroom in this specific course now knowing what I do.
6. Nothing
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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.0 | 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: 6.8
(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: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.6 |
| The course content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.6 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.7 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4.6 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT



On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 9.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 (N=2) 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: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 13 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 12 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 14 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 16 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |

## EDIS 781 OL <br> THESIS CAPSTONE 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. Yes. Finding several different application for the Thesis provided new ideas that had not been presented to me before.
2. This capstone experience absolutely stretched me as an educator, a student, a researcher, and a writer.

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

1. The research of several different techniques and strategies used within the thesis.
2. Online synchronous session was super helpful. Dr. Groman was extremely supportive and helpful. I learned so much about research, writing, and APA, which is new to me.

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

1. The formal write up and the length of time to do so. I needed to have the Case Study from 710 complete to begin my Thesis, allowing only two weeks between deadlines.
2. None

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

1. none
2. I was not ever really taught how to find scholarly articles, a small lesson on that would have benefitted me.

## EDIS 710 OL1 <br> FIELD PRACTICUM FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION Course type: Online

```
Evaluation Delivery: Online
    Evaluation Form: 14
        Responses: 6/8 (75% very high)
```

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

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

| Combined <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.9 | 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: 6.0
(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: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| The course content was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.7 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much <br> Lower <br> (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 6 | 17\% | 33\% | 33\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 5.5 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 6 | 50\% | 33\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 6 | 50\% | 33\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 6 | 33\% | 50\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 6.2 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 6 | 50\% | 33\% |  | 17\% |  |  |  | 6.5 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: $2.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=5)$ 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 (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 6 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 16 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 12 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 13 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 14 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 17 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 15 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 2 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 7 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 9 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 8 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 11 |

## EDIS 710 OL1 <br> FIELD PRACTICUM FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION Course type: Online

```
Evaluation Delivery: Online
    Evaluation Form: I4
        Responses: 6/8 (75% 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. Yes. Creating and implementing a Case Student with my students helped provide future structure in my organization.
2. Yes. The research (module 2) piece of the big project got me thinking about using other teaching strategies even if I didn't pick it for my project.
3. This class stretched me as a researcher, and as an educator. I implemented a very successful mindfulness program in my classroom as a result of this coursework and this really shaped me as a researcher and assisted in my career practice.
4. This class was intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking by promoting the development of our own projects related to areas of growth in our gifted classrooms. The development of each module involved application of our course studies within our own classrooms and tailored to our students with the support of assessment data to determine effectiveness and next steps.

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

1. The Case Study.
2. I appreciated the push to try something new. I have continued to use the new teaching strategy I used for my project.
3. Learning how to do an annotated bibliography was super helpful.
4. The development of a cooperative learning framework for my gifted students.

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

1. The formal write up.
2. n/a
3. None
4. None

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

1. None
2. None. I think this class had a great lay out, expectations, and pace
3. I thought it was great. Dr. G is the best.
4. This made for an excellent online learning course with timely and helpful feedback along the way and ample support for success.
EDIS 796 OLS
INTERNSHIP 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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.7 | 4.3 |
| (0=lowest; $5=$ highest $)$ |  |

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

CEI: 5.2
(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: | 7 | 57\% | 43\% |  |  |  |  | 4.6 | 4.2 |
| The course content was: | 7 | 57\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 4.3 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 7 | 71\% | 14\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.4 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 7 | 57\% |  | 43\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 4.1 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much <br> Higher <br> (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower <br> (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 7 | 57\% | 14\% | 14\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 6.6 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 7 | 29\% | 43\% | 14\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 7 | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 7 | 14\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 5.2 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 7 | 29\% | 43\% |  | 29\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: $1.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=7)$ 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: | 7 | 86\% |  | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 7 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 7 | 86\% | 14\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 8 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 7 | 57\% | 43\% |  |  |  |  | 4.6 | 10 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 7 | 71\% | 29\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 16 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 7 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 7 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 7 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 7 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 7 | 57\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 14 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 7 | 57\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 12 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 7 | 71\% | 29\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 7 | 71\% | 29\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 7 | 57\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 17 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 7 | 86\% | 14\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 5 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 7 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 7 | 71\% | 29\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 13 |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online<br>Evaluation Form: 14<br>Responses: 7/12 (58\% 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
2. Due to the fact that the course was a field experience it was intellectually stimulating along with the papers that were assigned. I did feel that as a graduate course there were expectations of advanced work which is reasonable.
3. ...
4. The class was intellectually stimulating because I had to apply everything I learned about teaching gifted children. I had to create lesson plans to differentiate for the gifted students

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

1. Field experience
2. Working in the classroom with students
3. ..
4. The actual teaching of students and applying my skills and knowledge I have gained.

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

1. $100 \%$ online makes it hard to make connections. Much easier to do face to face and having actual discussions
2. N/A
3. ..
4. Nothing

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

1. This course was fine online, but I would suggest go back to the hybrid model for other coursework in gifted. The in person discussions are very valuable.
2. The course was meaningful with just the right amount of work.
3. Although I enjoy the independence, I felt there should have been more contact throughout the semester.
```
EDIS 650 ACLU
NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid
```

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 7/17 (41\% 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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3.9 | 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: 5.4
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 7 | 29\% | 29\% | 43\% |  |  |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| The course content was: | 7 | 29\% | 29\% | 43\% |  |  |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 7 | 43\% | 14\% | 43\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 7 | 43\% | 29\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 4.3 |

## 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: | 7 | 14\% | 29\% | 43\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 5.3 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 7 | 14\% | 43\% | 43\% |  |  |  |  | 5.7 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 7 | 43\% | 14\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 7 | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 7 | 43\% | 14\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: 1.7 ( $\mathrm{N}=7$ ) including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?


COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses
Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Fall 2019

## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good <br> (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course organization was: | 7 | 29\% | 14\% | 29\% | 14\% | 14\% |  | 3.2 | 18 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 7 | 43\% | 43\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.3 | 13 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 7 | 43\% | 29\% | 14\% | 14\% |  |  | 4.2 | 10 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 7 | 43\% | 29\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 11 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 7 | 43\% | 29\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 12 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 7 | 43\% | 43\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.3 | 9 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 7 | 57\% | 29\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 5 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 7 | 57\% | 14\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 6 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 7 | 57\% | 14\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 4 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 1 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 7 | 57\% | 14\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 2 |
| Use of class time was: | 7 | 43\% | 43\% | 14\% |  |  |  | 4.3 | 7 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 7 | 57\% | 14\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.6 | 3 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 7 | 29\% | 43\% | 29\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 14 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 7 | 29\% | 29\% | 43\% |  |  |  | 3.8 | 17 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 7 | 43\% | 29\% | 14\% | 14\% |  |  | 4.2 | 8 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 7 | 29\% | 29\% | 43\% |  |  |  | 3.8 | 16 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 7 | 29\% | 43\% | 14\% | 14\% |  |  | 4.0 | 15 |

## EDIS 650 ACLU <br> NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED <br> Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 7/17 (41\% 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. It allowed me to consider topics I was unfamiliar with.
2. Yes, this class was stimulating and stretched my thinking. This was new information for me.
3. Yes it stretched my thinking because I had no clue about gifted education.
4. Yes, I did not have any understanding of gifted education until this course.
5. Very much so - it was a subject area fairly foreign to me, so I found all of it stimulating.

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

## 1. Group discussion and sharing

2. This class has given me a good basis for my understanding of gifted education.
3. How to identify gifted students.
4. Laws and conversations in class.
5. Class discussions

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

## 1. None.

2. None
3. I thought the class was interesting and look forward to the next class.
4. Miscommunication/inconsistency between syllabus, what was said in class, and what was on Blackboard.
5. n/a

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

1. A lot of work for teacher's who are also working full time.
2. Instructions in the syllabus could be clearer. The timeline was easy to misunderstand. A few times the syllabus contradicted what the Dr. Groman said in class.
3. The class was great as a physical education teacher I was pretty overwhelmed with the padlet assignments and comments. The comments were very gifted answers from very smart teachers I was afraid to comment based on that.
4. Due dates and assignment specifics more clearly communicated across the syllabus, what was said in class, and what is on Blackboard.
5. n/a

| EDUC 710 OL1 | Evaluation Delivery: Online |
| :--- | :---: |
| FIELD PRACTICUM IN EDUCATION | Evaluation Form: 14 |
| Course type: Online | Responses: $10 / 18$ ( $56 \%$ 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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.2 | 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: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The distance learning course as a whole was: | 10 | 40\% | 30\% | 10\% | 20\% |  |  | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| The course content was: | 10 | 40\% | 30\% | 10\% | 20\% |  |  | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 10 | 50\% | 20\% | 10\% | 20\% |  |  | 4.5 | 4.3 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 10 | 40\% | 20\% | 10\% | 30\% |  |  | 4.0 | 3.8 |

## 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: | 10 | 20\% | 60\% |  | 20\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 10 | 10\% | 60\% | 10\% |  | 10\% | 10\% |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 10 | 20\% | 70\% | 10\% |  |  |  |  | 6.1 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 10 | 30\% | 60\% | 10\% |  |  |  |  | 6.2 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 10 | 20\% | 70\% | 10\% |  |  |  |  | 6.1 |

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?


## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poor } \\ & \text { (1) } \end{aligned}$ | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was: | 10 | 50\% | 10\% | 30\% |  | 10\% |  | 4.5 | 8 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 10 | 50\% |  | 20\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 4.0 | 15 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 10 | 60\% |  | 10\% |  | 30\% |  | 4.7 | 4 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 10 | 40\% | 10\% | 30\% | 10\% | 10\% |  | 3.5 | 17 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 10 | 40\% | 20\% | 10\% | 20\% | 10\% |  | 4.0 | 16 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 10 | 60\% | 10\% |  | 20\% | 10\% |  | 4.7 | 11 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 10 | 60\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |  | 4.7 | 12 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 10 | 60\% | 10\% |  |  | 30\% |  | 4.7 | 10 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 9 | 56\% |  | 11\% | 22\% | 11\% |  | 4.6 | 2 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 10 | 50\% | 20\% |  | 20\% | 10\% |  | 4.5 | 6 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 10 | 40\% | 20\% | 30\% |  | 10\% |  | 4.0 | 13 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 10 | 50\% | 20\% | 20\% |  | 10\% |  | 4.5 | 7 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 10 | 60\% | 10\% | 20\% |  | 10\% |  | 4.7 | 1 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 10 | 40\% | 30\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |  | 4.2 | 14 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 10 | 50\% | 20\% |  | 20\% | 10\% |  | 4.5 | 9 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 10 | 60\% | 10\% |  | 20\% | 10\% |  | 4.7 | 3 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 10 | 60\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |  | 4.7 | 5 |

EDUC 710 OL1
FIELD PRACTICUM IN EDUCATION
Course type: Online

| Evaluation Delivery: | Online |
| ---: | :--- |
| Evaluation Form: | 14 |
| Responses: | $10 / 18(56 \%$ 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. nothing
2. Yes, the assignments were helpful to use with my classes and allowed me to research more engaging material, that students showed interest in working while in class.
3. Yes. I was able to extend a project I implement in my classroom to work for this class with some additions.
4. Yes-- made me go out of my comfort zone.
5. Yes, I found this course to be intellectually stimulating. It encouraged me to look at other teaching strategies and their effectiveness.
6. Yes, I like all the information presented by the profession and the way she presented it.
7. The assignment related to demographics was quite enlightening. It provided a broader frame of reference to influence lesson planning. The research based teaching strategies were also a good refresher.

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

## 1. nothing

2. Researching for the assignment and building different aspects to reach every student.
3. Self reflection regarding what worked for my students and what didn't.
4. I really wish I had the opportunity to make more classes with Dr. Groman. She is by far the best instructor I've had during my online coursework in the graduate program. The work set out for students was reasonable yet challenging, and directly related to the work I am doing with my students in my classroom. Dr. Groman allowed us to self-direct our own project depending on our needs for our classroom, which I appreciated. A lot of work in graduate classes feels like busy work, but again, this was relevant to my current needs. Additionally, she provided extensive, helpful feedback on my writing assignments. I love that she allows students to re-do assignments for mastery. In previous classes, I was not allowed to do this even though it would have furthered my knowledge of the subject. She also posted weekly videos in which she talked through assignments. As someone who overthinks things, it was really nice to have this to refer to and also showed that she really cared about her students, which is a difficult feat in an online course! Finally, I felt she was very fair about due dates which helped me to be less stressed. As a full-time teacher taking this course, I was grateful to know that there was a bit of a grace period on assignments so that I could do my best work and also not have to put off my own pile of planning or grading for my students. Thank you, Dr. Groman!
5. The data collection throughout my project.
6. All
7. It was helpful to have full input on what type of project I wanted to do in my classroom as this lent to direct improvements for my students. Frequent videos and checkpoints are helpful in supporting the learning process. Responsive coaching via email aided in differentiated the learning.

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

## 1. too much work, unfair expectations

2. None, every aspect was helpful in building a lesson, using creativity to reach students and sharing with students.
3. The annotated bibliography. This is not necessary. Very time consuming and I am teaching fulltime. Not meaningful to me at all. Also, why do I have to write a thesis for 788 and then turn around and write even longer (all papers combined) for 710 for only two credit hours? I feel the instructor made this class much more laborious than it needed to be. Also, she was an extremely harsh grader and her lax videos did not match her grading marks.
4. None.
5. None, I felt the information was concise and easy to access.
6. It is an asset to have a well developed, detailed online class, but I found the requirements and outcome expectations to be closely scripted and difficult to decipher. I spent more time thinking about what the professor wanted to see as well as how she wanted to see it rather than reflecting on my own experience and learning. This is not in line with the open format of designing one's own experience. An authentic learning experience ought to allow for a unique reporting outcome. Trying to mimic how another person might do it detracts from the reflective process.

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

## 1. none

2. The only downside to this course- is waiting for 2 or more students to respond to discussions- online, having to keep checking weekly, every other day, hoping 2 people have responded.
3. Get rid of the annotated bib or reduce the expectations for final paper. I said in four different locations what my project entailed and her comments on my final paper made it seem like she had no idea what I did with my students. Her method of feedback was quite harsh for a pass/fail, two credit hour class. Up until this point, I have had wonderful, understanding, respectfully-critical and meaningful courses/professors. I am disappointed with this one and very glad the semester is over.
4. none!

## 7. None

8. Having two classes in one Blackboard platform is confusing and unnecessary. The courses should be separated to allow students to look at only the content required for their course. Feedback comments should be streamlined to provide essential learning opportunities for each student, not a laundry list of all that is wrong based on how the professor would do it. Providing too many, and at times, unprofessional comments takes away from the learning experience and degrades the working relationship.

| EDIS 650 OL | Evaluation Delivery: Online |
| :--- | ---: |
| NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED | Evaluation Form: 14 |
| Course type: Online | Responses: $4 / 5$ ( $80 \%$ very high $)$ |
| Taught by: Jennifer Groman |  |
| Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof |  |

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

| Combined <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 5.0 |
| (0=lowest; $5=$ highest $)$ |  |

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

CEI: 5.5
(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 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The course content was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |
| The effectiveness of the distance learning format was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5.0 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much <br> Lower <br> (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 4 | 25\% |  | 25\% | 50\% |  |  |  | 4.5 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 4 | 50\% |  | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 4 | 50\% |  | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 6.5 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 9.5 Hours per credit: 3.2 ( $\mathrm{N}=4$ ) 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 | 50\% |  | 50\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 16 |
| Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 14 |
| Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was: | 4 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was: | 4 | 25\% | 50\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 15 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 7 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 8 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 13 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 9 |
| Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 2 |
| Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 11 |
| Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 1 |
| Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 12 |
| Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was: | 4 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 10 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 4 | 75\% |  | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 4 | 25\% | 50\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 17 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 4 | 75\% |  |  | 25\% |  |  | 4.8 | 6 |

## EDIS 650 OL <br> NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED <br> Course type: Online

```
Evaluation Delivery: Online
    Evaluation Form: I4
        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. Yes, it helped me better understand giftedness
2. I learned a lot and now many things I had read before seem to have a connection. I feel I have a good foundational knowledge.
3. Yes. I learned more about the basics of giftedness and gifted education
4. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating. The assignments were thought provoking as well as research based. We were constantly examining our learning as it relates to our own beliefs on educating the gifted and talented.

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

1. The characteristics of giftedness and models of giftedness
2. Ther readings and focus questions contributed most to my learning.
3. Readings and focus questions and case study
4. The organization of the professor contributed most to my learning. She provided helpful feedback to challenge my thinking and stretch it further. She is clearly passionate and knowledgeable in regards to theory, laws, and the practice of the education of the gifted and talented.

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

1. Trying to figure out how to do a PowerPoint with audio. I am not very good with technology.
2. Nothing distracted from my learning.
3. N/A
4. I felt the speed of the course was difficult as full time working mother of two young kids. It would have been helpful for the course to by the typical \# of weeks to provide for more time to work on the assignments. At times I felt rushed.

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

1. none
2. It was a lot of written work. I learned a lot, but I was overwhelmed at times to get everything completed. I am not sure if I should suggest a reduction in assignments because I believe that they all contributed to my learning.
3. Stick to the assignments given. The syllabus is so detailed, yet 2-3 times it seemed the expectation changed during the course. If the syllabus is going to spell out every detail, the instructor should not be able to change things last minute. When working full time and balancing school work, it is hard to plan ahead then things get changed later.
4. Lengthening the semester

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.

