

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/2 (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 Median	Adjusted Combined Median
5.0	4.7
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 5.5
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The 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 instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	2	100%						5.0	4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:								
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	2		50%	50%				5.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	2		100%					6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	2		50%	50%				5.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	2		50%	50%				5.5
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	2		100%					6.0

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 2.8 (N=2)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		50%				50%					

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

Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 2.8 (N=2)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		50%				50%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=2)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
100%														

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

(N=2)

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

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (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 650 ACA
NATURE/NEEDS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 2/2 (100% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. This class was intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking because as one of the major courses within Gifted and Talented Education it encompassed and introduced all avenues of observing, identifying, and accommodating gifted learners based on their individualized needs. This course taught me to analyze all aspects of individual learners in terms of their talent development.
2. Yes. Yes. This class helped me to view others in a way I have not before.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. All aspects of this course contributed to my extended learning in terms of Gifted and Talented Education, but Piirto's Pyramid of Talent Development encompassed so much of what our learning was based upon. Analysis of this allowed me to learn about the genetic, personality, intelligence, talent, environmental, and motivational aspects that make up our gifted learners.
2. The Case study was a wonderful way to put bookwork to application. Loved it.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. No aspects of this class detracted from my learning.
2. Nothing

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. In my opinion, this was an excellent and intriguing course with no need of improvement. The smaller class size of this course also contributed to my understanding and analysis of the course's learning objectives since we were able to discuss these at full length as well as share and compare our own personal findings and questions during every class meeting.
2. none

EDIS 654 ACNW2
CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 6/11 (55% 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 Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.6	4.7
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 5.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	4.6
The course content was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	6		33%	33%	33%				5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	33%	33%	33%					6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	33%	67%						6.2
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	17%	83%						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?

Class median: 6.8 Hours per credit: 2.3 (N=6)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		17%	50%	17%				17%			

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

Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=6)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		50%	33%	17%							

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.9 (N=6)

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

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

(N=6)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
83%				17%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	8
Instructor's preparation for class was:	5	40%	60%					4.3	18
Explanations by instructor were:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	15
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	6	67%		33%				4.8	3
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	16
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	5	60%		40%				4.7	7
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	9
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	4
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	1
Answers to student questions were:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	17
Use of class time was:	6	67%		17%	17%			4.8	2
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	6
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	10
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	13
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	11
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	12
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	14

EDIS 654 ACNW2
CREATIVITY STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF THE TALENTED
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 6/11 (55% 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. Definitions and legal information were intellectually stimulating
2. Yes, it brought about a lot of new topics to consider for gifted education. Gifted education is not always as highly valued in the education world, creative thinking or giftedness in the visual performing arts is even less talked about.
3. Yes, it made me think about my own creativity and made me rethink my assignments.
4. Yes. Creativity has never come easy. The activities helped me to learn to be more creative.
5. Yes, it really got me thinking about "out of the box" ways to incorporate creativity in the classroom.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Looking at ODE documents
2. I think the talking about different assessments and looking at the characteristics of creative thinkers or performers look like so we can better identify them in our students.
3. Creativity Assignments that were hands-on and not just paper writing.
4. The creativity exercises forced me to work outside of my comfort zone.
6. I really liked how there was so much choice involved in projects and readings.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. At times too much creativity lessons
2. I think the syllabus was extremely hard to read. It changed several times throughout the course, which usually wasn't a bad thing, but assignment due dates on the syllabus did not always match up with the due dates on blackboard.
3. Too many texts to reference. I think the Understanding Creativity and Creativity in the 21st Century I referenced the most.
4. My job detracted from class. :)

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Making the creativity lessons/activities shorter
2. Cleaning up the assignment section of what specifically is assigned and when it is due.
3. I liked the class a lot. I would only improve the amount of text needed as I couldn't all of them fast enough through Ohio Link so I had to purchase.
4. None. It was a great learning experience and a different format from other classes. I enjoyed it.

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 4/6 (67% high)

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

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

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.4	4.7
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 5.5
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	4.8
The course content was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	4.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	4.8
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	4	25%	75%					4.2	4.6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	4		25%		75%				4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	4		50%	50%					5.5
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	4		75%	25%					5.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	4		75%	25%					5.8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	4		50%	50%					5.5

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 6.8 Hours per credit: 2.3 (N=4)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
			75%		25%						

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

Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=4)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		50%	50%								

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=4)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
100%														

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

(N=4)

In your major 75%	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement 25%	Other
----------------------	--------------------------	-------------	---------------	------------------------------	-------

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	7
Instructor's preparation for class was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	14
Explanations by instructor were:	4	75%	25%					4.8	2
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	1
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	10
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	11
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	5
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	6
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	4
Answers to student questions were:	4	75%	25%					4.8	3
Availability of extra help when needed was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	12
Use of class time was:	4	25%	75%					4.2	17
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	13
Amount you learned in the course was:	4	25%	75%					4.2	15
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	4	50%	50%					4.5	9
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	4	50%	50%					4.5	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	4	25%	75%					4.2	16
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	4		50%	50%				3.5	18

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 4/6 (67% high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. This topic is extremely relevant to some of my current struggles with my students, and I appreciate having several resources to explore and use in tasks.
2. Yes
3. Yes. The content is highly relevant for the teaching profession, and the professor made class interesting.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I liked the focus on diverse populations and being able to take a hard look at special counseling needs of our students.
2. In class dialogue
3. The variety of content was helpful. For example, I liked how the textbooks were differentiated for our needs (urban vs. rural, early childhood vs. adolescent). I also enjoyed having choices in special topics and in final project format and purpose. I loved learning about MBTI as well. The dialogues were challenging and good practice too.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Some of the activities really put me outside of my comfort zone and made it a source of anxiety for attending class, but Dr. Groman was appropriate in structuring those times.
2. None
3. I think we could have spent more time on the When Gifted Kids Don't Have All the Answers text because it seemed practical compared to the more theoretical/research-heavy/abstract Piirto text, but at the same time, Galbraith & Delisle did seem somewhat surface-level for teachers in a talent development program.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. None
3. The course was very well organized and paced, and Dr. Groman's classroom atmosphere is always positive and inviting. I cannot think of specific recommendations, but I sometimes wish that I had a better way of documenting concrete strategies that I take from class. Maybe an ongoing strategy journal of some kind?

EDIS 781 BC
 THESIS CAPSTONE IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
 Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
 Evaluation Form: A5
 Responses: 1/1 (100% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

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

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined 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 (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	1	100%						5.0	3.9
The course content was:	1	100%						5.0	4.0
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	3.9

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
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, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=1)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		100%									

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

Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 1.5 (N=1)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		100%									

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=1)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
100%														

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

(N=1)

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

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	1	100%						5.0	1
Instructor's preparation for class was:	1	100%						5.0	17
Explanations by instructor were:	1	100%						5.0	11
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	1	100%						5.0	10
Conduciveness of class atmosphere to student learning was:	1	100%						5.0	7
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	1	100%						5.0	9
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	1	100%						5.0	13
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	1	100%						5.0	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	1	100%						5.0	14
Answers to student questions were:	1	100%						5.0	16
Availability of extra help when needed was:	1	100%						5.0	15
Use of class time was:	1	100%						5.0	8
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	1	100%						5.0	12
Amount you learned in the course was:	1	100%						5.0	6
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	1	100%						5.0	4
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	1	100%						5.0	2
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	1	100%						5.0	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	1	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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 1/1 (100% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

EDIS 796 CT
INTERNSHIP IN TALENT DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
Course type: Hybrid
Taught by: Jennifer Groman
Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 0/1 (0%)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

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

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

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

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------------

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

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------------

What grade do you expect in this course?

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
---	----	----	---	----	----	---	----	----	---	----	---	------	--------	-----------

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

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
---------------	--------------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------	-------

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

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

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A5
Responses: 0/1 (0%)

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?

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. IASystem reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.¹ In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4)*.

Comparative ratings. IASystem provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, IASystem reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several IASystem items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. IASystem calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

¹ For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.