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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 5/5 (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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 4.4 |
| (0=lowest; $5=$ highest $)$ |  |

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

CEI: 4.4
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fair } \\ & (2) \end{aligned}$ | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 5 | 60\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.3 |
| The course content was: | 5 | 60\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.3 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.6 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 4.5 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 5 | 40\% | 20\% |  | 40\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 5 |  | 20\% | 40\% | 40\% |  |  |  | 4.8 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 5 | 20\% | 40\% |  | 40\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 5 | 20\% |  | 40\% | 40\% |  |  |  | 4.8 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 5 | 20\% | 40\% |  | 40\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: $1.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=5)$ 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: Spring 2018

## 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: | 5 | 60\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 1 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 13 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 9 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 6 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 7 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 8 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 14 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 12 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 5 | 40\% | 60\% |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 16 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 11 |
| Use of class time was: | 5 | 60\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.7 | 5 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 10 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 15 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 17 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 2 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 5 | 40\% | 20\% | 40\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 18 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4 |

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

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. I don't always consider myself as a creative person. I really had to develop a more growth mindset to stretch myself.
2. This class required me to step outside of my comfort zone creatively and focus on myself as a person/student, not a teacher.
3. Yes, it made me look at creative students in a different way.
4. Dr. Groman always made us move outside of our comfort zone, making us challenge ourselves and grow as students.
5. Got me out of my comfort zone

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

1. Dr. Groman's feedback on every single assignment was both encouraging and thought-provoking. She did an amazing job. She is the perfect person to teach this course.
2. I liked the meditation activities and other activities that I could bring directly to my classroom.
3. Practical application
4. I loved all the hands on activities and the ability to adapt what we did in class to my teaching.
5. readings

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

1. Nothing
2. $N / A$
3. n/a
4. thought log

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

## 1. Nothing

2. I wish more of the class focused on ways I could improve my students' learning. I wish more of the assignments were things I could use in my classroom. I felt like a lot of the assignments were "busy work."
3. n/a
4. none

EDIS 653 ACNW2
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FOR THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 6/9 (67\% high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof
Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

| Combined <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.5 | 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: 5.6
(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 | 33\% | 33\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| The course content was: | 6 | 50\% |  | 33\% |  | 17\% |  | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.6 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 6 | 50\% | 33\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.3 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT



On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: 1.7 ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) 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: Spring 2018

## 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: | 6 | 50\% |  | 50\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 15 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 6 | 50\% | 33\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 13 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 6 | 33\% | 67\% |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | 14 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 6 | 67\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 9 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 6 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 6 | 83\% | 17\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 7 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 6 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 8 |
| Use of class time was: | 6 | 67\% |  | 17\% |  |  | 17\% | 4.8 | 2 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 6 | 50\% | 33\% | 17\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 12 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 6 | 50\% |  | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% |  | 4.0 | 16 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 6 | 33\% | 17\% | 17\% | 33\% |  |  | 3.5 | 18 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 6 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 10 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 6 | 50\% | 17\% | 17\% |  |  | 17\% | 4.5 | 11 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 6 | 33\% | 33\% | 17\% |  | 17\% |  | 4.0 | 17 |

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 was interesting learning about rural versus urban areas and how that affects gifted education.
2. Yes, this did both of these things. Prior to this I had not given any thought to counseling and guidance needs of gifted students being any different that other college bound students.

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

1. I really enjoyed the jigsaw activities where I could choose the chapters to read/study in-depth and gain an overview of the other chapters from classmates. Very effective and a great use of our time.
2. I liked the jigsaw activities that allowed us to get information from multiple chapters without having to read every chapter.
3. Being able to discuss and ask questions about the readings. I am able to listen to others' questions and apply to my situation-I missed not getting to discuss as much as in previous classes.

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

1. Nothing
2. Not meeting very often due to weather.

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

1. Nothing! I loved it!
2. Class is for working professionals and can be overwhelming.
3. Looking for more of a practical approach-creating and/or modifying lessons for gifted students
```
EDIS 781 BC
THESIS CAPSTONE IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid
Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof
```

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/2 (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:

| Combined <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.9 | 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: 6.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent(5)Very <br> Good <br> (4) |  | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 2 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| The course content was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5.1 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5.1 |

## 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: | 2 |  |  | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  | 4.5 |
| 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 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| 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?


## 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: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 17 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 13 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 18 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 14 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 16 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15 |
| Use of class time was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 12 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 2 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |

```
EDIS 781 BC
THESIS CAPSTONE IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid
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 class was intellectually stimulating because I was forced out of my comfort zone to learn material relevant to my actual classroom. I was able to learn why some of my students perform the way they do, and some unique challenges they face.
2. Yes. This class was individually guided by my interests and passions, so, therefore, it was very interesting and applicable.

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

1. I am better able to guide my students towards success and provide my colleagues with needed information to change their mindset.
2. The readings and reflective writing that I did contributed a great deal to my learning. In addition, the lessons I had created previously needed some revisions and that was a helpful tool for reflection.

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

1. The biggest struggle I had was knowing when my project was finished. I had a hard time not branching out from my topic when new ideas emerged.
2. The tediousness of APA style took time but did not contribute to my learning. However, this requirement has helped me prepare for submitting an article to a professional journal.

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

1. Setting specific due dates to help with time management.
2. It would be helpful to have group meetings where we could read other students' Capstones and both give and receive feedback from our peers.
EDIS 654 ACST
CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: $3 / 3$ (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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.8 | 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: 4.5
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | $N$ | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very } \\ & \text { Poor } \\ & (0) \end{aligned}$ | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.7 |
| The course content was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.7 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 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: | 3 |  | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 5.0 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 3 |  | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% |  |  |  | 5.0 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 3 |  | 67\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 3 |  | 67\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 3 | 33\% | 33\% |  | 33\% |  |  |  | 6.0 |

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course,
Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: $1.5 \quad(\mathrm{~N}=3)$ 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: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 11 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 15 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 5 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 4 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 3 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 14 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 16 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 9 |
| Use of class time was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 13 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 6 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 3 | 67\% | 33\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 12 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 3 | 33\% | 67\% |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | 18 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 3 | 33\% | 67\% |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | 17 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 3 | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2 |

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

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 creative thinking. It helped clarify and give name to my own creative experiences.
2. Yes, creativity is a challenge for me.
3. It did! It was a challenge for me to think more creativity, but I feel like the course pushed me outside my box. :)

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

1. Practicing alternative ways to express learning/understanding of content
2. ideas that were shared
3. Journal and field trip

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

1. Nothing really
2. I dislike the papers we have to write.
3. none

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

2. Projects should be based on what we are teaching in class.
3. none

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses
Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Spring 2018
EDIS 796 AC LK
INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid
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:

```
Evaluation Delivery: Online
    Evaluation Form: A5
        Responses: 5/6 (83% very high)
```

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

| Combined <br> Median | Adjusted <br> Combined <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.1 | 4.2 |
| (0=lowest; $5=$ highest) |  |

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

CEI: 4.9
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

## SUMMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair <br> (2) | Poor <br> (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very } \\ & \text { Poor } \\ & (0) \end{aligned}$ | Median | Adjusted Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The course as a whole was: | 5 | 20\% | 60\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| The course content was: | 5 | 20\% | 60\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 4.4 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT



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?


COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses
Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Spring 2018

## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|  | N | Excellent <br> (5) | Very Good (4) | Good <br> (3) | Fair (2) | Poor <br> (1) | Very Poor (0) | Median | Relative Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course organization was: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 7 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 6 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 11 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 5 | 40\% | 60\% |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 10 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 13 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 2 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 5 | 80\% | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 1 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 5 | 20\% | 80\% |  |  |  |  | 4.1 | 15 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 5 | 40\% | 60\% |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 12 |
| Use of class time was: | 5 | 40\% | 20\% | 40\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 16 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 5 | 60\% | 40\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 5 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 5 | 20\% | 60\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 14 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 5 | 40\% | 20\% | 40\% |  |  |  | 4.0 | 18 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |  |  |  | 4.2 | 9 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 5 | 40\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |  | 4.0 | 17 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 5 | 40\% | 60\% |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 8 |

## EDIS 796 AC LK

INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 5/6 (83\% 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 class was intellectually stimulating. As I reflected on my lesson, I had to be more creative to meet the needs of my diverse learners.
2. Yes, my internship was stimulating and part of a program that I am passionate about.
3. Yes. It made me look at things from different perspectives.
4. NA

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

1. I learned most from the feedback from my instructor.
2. The logged hours working with students.
3. The hours spent for the log
4. practical use of knowledge

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

1. Nothing
2. N/A
3. n/a
4. none

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

1. Nothing
2. N/A
3. n/a
4. none
EDIS 651 CT
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATION OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 8/8 (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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.7 | 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: 5.5
(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 course as a whole was: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| The course content was: | 8 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.8 |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken: | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average <br> (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be: | 8 | 12\% | 38\% |  | 38\% | 12\% |  |  | 5.0 |
| The intellectual challenge presented was: | 8 | 25\% | 38\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was: | 8 | 12\% | 50\% | 25\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was: | 8 | 12\% | 50\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 5.8 |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 8 | 12\% | 50\% | 25\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 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?


COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses
Ashland University
College of Education
EDIS Inclusive Services
Term: Spring 2018

## 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: | 8 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 8 |
| Instructor's preparation for class was: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 13 |
| Explanations by instructor were: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 6 |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 5 |
| Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was: | 8 | 75\% | 12\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.8 | 1 |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was: | 8 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 17 |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was: | 8 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 4 |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was: | 8 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 7 |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was: | 8 | 75\% | 25\% |  |  |  |  | 4.8 | 3 |
| Answers to student questions were: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 9 |
| Availability of extra help when needed was: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 10 |
| Use of class time was: | 8 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 15 |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was: | 8 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 18 |
| Amount you learned in the course was: | 8 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 11 |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were: | 8 | 62\% | 38\% |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 2 |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were: | 8 | 50\% | 50\% |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 12 |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was: | 8 | 50\% | 38\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 14 |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 8 | 50\% | 38\% | 12\% |  |  |  | 4.5 | 16 |

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

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. I thought the face to face sessions were a great way to bounce ideas off of each other.
2. I appreciated the practical aspect of this class. The Cash book was/is an excellent reference that I am sure I will use in the future. As always, the participation by others in the class made this class valuable as I learned from my classmates in addition to learning from Dr. Groman and the texts.
3. Yes, most of the content in the course was new to me and required me to expand my thinking on the topic.
4. This course was challenging and the readings were very beneficial.
5. Yes. This class presented us with many opportunities to think about various ways to meet the curriculum needs of gifted and talented students. Although some information was review, there were many different choices in our learning.
6. The material presented in the course was excellent and stretched my thinking to the max. The creativity in this class was excellent and made think how I need to present my own information in the class more creatively.
7. I did find the class to be intellectually stimulating. I initially took the course as a professional development ceu and am inspired to complete the entire program. The course really clicked with me, because I am looking to rejuvenate my teaching career with a program that will value my creativity and lesson planning skills.

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

1. The Cash text was a great addition to this course.
2. Not sure. Museum curriculum was new to me, and I think was the unexpected area of learning. The speakers were really great! The final project also contributed to my own learning.
3. The readings and associated assignments.
4. The readings and guest speakers were of great support.
5. The readings in various textbooks were very helpful, but I also enjoyed working through the various writing assignments which helped me to process and reflect on the content.
6. The curriculum was well presented with a balance between standards and higher order questions like evaluation. Made the learning fun.
7. The readings from Jane Piirto's book contributed to me developing an informed teaching philosophy utilizing differentiated instruction for the gifted learner. The museum excursion project and the final curriculum project contributed to my learning and confidence in this field.

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

1. na
2. none
3. N/A
4. None
5. Some of the assignment sharing was not relevant to my particular grade/content area. I think that some of the sharing could be reduced so that more time could be spent discussing the content in general.
6. My own busy schedule was a hindrance to my learning this spring. I could not do as much as I would like to be able to do.
7. There was a nice sense of community with this course, so I did not experience any distractions.

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

1. na
2. add something with technology? Lists of websites, blogs, podcasts, etc. that others have found useful with gifted students
3. None
4. None
5. I did feel that the syllabus structure was a little confusing or overwhelming with the assignment information listed separately from the calendar, especially because dates were not quite consistent with what was originally posted.
6. The class was excellent. As a student and teacher, I tried to do too much this winter/spring.
7. Perhaps visiting a university laboratory school or gifted academy.

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.

