

EDIS 654 OLA
Creativity Studies for Teachers of the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 9/11 (82% 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
4.9	4.6
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 5.5
(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 distance learning course as a whole was:	9	78%	22%					4.9	4.6
The course content was:	9	67%	33%					4.8	4.6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	9	100%						5.0	4.8
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	9	67%	33%					4.8	4.5

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	9	33%	33%		33%				6.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	9	33%	22%	33%	11%				5.8
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	9	56%	22%	11%	11%				6.6
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	9	33%	33%		33%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	9	67%		11%	22%				6.8

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

Class median: 8.0 Hours per credit: 2.7 (N=9)

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

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

Class median: 5.8 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=9)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		44%	33%		22%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=9)

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=9)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
22%				78%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

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

EDIS 654 OLA
Creativity Studies for Teachers of the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
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. I spent a lot of time thinking of new submission formats and learning new tech with will prove helpful. Intellectually, the work was relevant.
2. I learned a lot that I didn't know about creativity with regard to gifted ness from this class. Surprisingly what I think I learned the most about in this class was about myself as a creative person.
3. As a math teacher ending the year my creative thinking was minimal. Dr. Groman's class was very stimulating, causing me to think outside of the box. The class encouraged me to reconnect with my creative side and stretch my thinking because of the activities she designed for us to complete.
4. Yes, this class made me think of myself as a creative person. This class made me reflect on my own life and really learn to appreciate the ability that I have to create. I learned about the Piirto Model of Creative Thinking and I can confidently make connections from it.
5. Yes, it pushed me to become more in touch with creativity for myself as well as for others
6. This class intellectually stimulated my creative side. I learned how to integrate creativity on a regular basis in my classroom. This course confirmed my thinking and beliefs rather than stretched them because of the environment I am currently teaching in.
7. Yes, It really forced me to go outside of my comfort zone and be more creative and share with other students in the class. I feel like I am able to take so many things that I learned and apply in my classroom.
8. Yes! The ideas presented in the videos, readings, and projects and papers assigned help me to think differently and outside of the box. It made me try new things and have new experiences that will help shape me as an administrator and as a creative individual.
9. This class helped me to gain a better understanding of creativity and creative individuals, which is something I knew little about before.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Considering new applications and tech to apply to my own work.
2. The ability to analyze people and apply the creativity concepts was most helpful for me. For that reason, I really liked the biographical sketch assignment. Also, the opportunity to express learning in more non-traditional ways (not having to write a formal paper for everything) was so refreshing.
3. Dr. Groman's weekly video postings were really helpful in making sure I was on the right path each week. The syllabus was well organized and detailed. Dr. Groman also had a calendar we could use to sign up to talk with her if needed, easily accessible.
4. I would say the creativity project really stood out to me as a big learning activity in this course. I learned so much about myself through this activity. I learned things about myself that I plan to bring into my future classroom.
5. The reading. The projects and connecting them to the reading.
6. I enjoyed studying Piirto and exploring different creative outlets such as the meditation project.
7. I loved the videos that Dr. Groman posted each week. They were entertaining, interesting, and very helpful.
8. The readings and putting the information into practice with presentations and projects.
9. One of the most valuable assignments was the creativity project. It helped me connect with the coarse readings. It also gave me valuable insight into what other creative individuals experience as they create.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. n/a
2. I don't think it detracted from the learning but I think I would have benefitted from learning more activities that you can incorporate in a regular Ed classroom to serve creatively gifted students.
3. I cannot really think of any, just took some adjustments as it was my first course of the EDIS program and I was overwhelmed.
4. N/A I felt all aspects of this course were beneficial and served an important role in my learning.
6. There was so much work. As a full time teacher, having assignments, activities and numerous projects and papers all due within a tiny period of time was stressful. It felt more like busy work that I just had to get done rather than being able to take my time and dig deep into the content. It felt very surface level.
7. None
8. N/A
9. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Solid planning and implementation here, particularly for the online format.

2. More opportunities for discussion and sharing amongst cases ages would be here. I would be to bounce ideas off of one another with regard to classroom application.

3. None, I enjoyed the class

4. I do not have any at this time. I feel that her course is as close to perfection as it can be and as educators, we always have areas to improve on. I am always thrilled to have Dr. Groman as a professor. She inspires me to give 110% when I'm teaching. The enthusiasm that she brings is admirable. She is also very understanding and helpful. I appreciate the videos that she provides every week which walk us through the expectations of that week. She is an all-around amazing professor and I feel very lucky to have been her student.

6. This course and all the assignments, would have been appropriate if it had been a 12 week course. The 6 week course should have been adapted, not condensed.

7. None

8. N/A

9. None

EDIS 650 OLSA
Nature and Needs of the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 19/21 (90% 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
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: 5.8
(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 distance learning course as a whole was:	19	79%	21%					4.9	4.8
The course content was:	19	89%	11%					4.9	5.0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	19	84%	11%	5%				4.9	4.9
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	19	58%	42%					4.6	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:	18	11%	44%		44%				5.6
The intellectual challenge presented was:	19	32%	47%	16%	5%				6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	19	53%	37%	11%					6.5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	19	32%	42%	16%	11%				6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	19	47%	26%	11%	16%				6.4

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=19)

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
		42%	5%	5%	26%	11%		5%			5%

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

Class median: 7.0 Hours per credit: 2.3 (N=19)

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
5%	11%	26%	11%	5%	32%	5%	5%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=19)

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Pass	Credit	No Credit
79%	11%	11%												

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

(N=19)

In your major	Distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
11%				79%	11%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	19	79%	11%	11%				4.9	7
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	19	74%	16%	11%				4.8	15
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	19	89%	5%		5%			4.9	11
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	19	68%	16%	11%	5%			4.8	6
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	19	79%	11%	11%				4.9	13
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	19	95%	5%					5.0	12
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	19	89%	11%					4.9	17
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	19	84%	5%	11%				4.9	16
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding content was:	19	89%	5%	5%				4.9	1
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding content was:	19	84%	11%	5%				4.9	4
Usefulness of on-line resources in understanding content was:	18	89%		11%				4.9	2
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	18	89%		11%				4.9	5
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	17	88%		12%				4.9	3
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	19	84%	16%					4.9	9
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	19	89%	5%	5%				4.9	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	19	84%	11%		5%			4.9	10
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	19	74%	21%	5%				4.8	14

EDIS 650 OLSA
Nature and Needs of the Talented
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I4
Responses: 19/21 (90% very high)

Taught by: Jennifer Groman

Instructor Evaluated: Jennifer Groman-Assist Prof

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating in regards to the content being taught. I felt the instructor used a variety of lessons and assignments to help with this..
2. Absolutely! Although I was overwhelmed at first, Dr. Groman was very receptive to answering questions that came up. I feel I learned a lot I did not previously understand about gifted learners.
3. This class took me through all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. Not only has it stretched my thinking, it has also sparked me to have conversations with my coworkers and will impact the way I teach next year.
4. I enjoyed this class. There is definitely more to identifying gifted students than what most people realize. My thinking was definitely stretched especially in regards to reaching and identifying gifted students who are from underrepresented populations. The case study was a great culminating project. It definitely enhances the understanding of all the material when it can be applied to a real person in your community. I really enjoyed having Dr. Groman as my professor. She is very knowledgeable, very approachable, and very responsive. I appreciate the thorough explanations of each assignment and what was expected of us.
5. EDIS 650 introduced quite a bit of new information. Learning about the various theories and models was interesting and beneficial. The class and the material covered definitely had me "stretch my thinking" in terms of evaluating and analyzing new information and how this new information aligned with (or not) my current knowledge. There was a lot of processing of information going on that, in turn, allowed me to reassess my own ideas and beliefs.
6. Yes, I learned a lot about the gifted child and the varying needs and qualities they have.
7. Yes, I was challenged to tie course information to the work I will be doing in the fall. I learned so much and was reminded of so much more from other education courses. I thought the pacing was helpful and appreciate the effort in the timing of work.
8. This class was full of information. However, it was presented in manageable chunks and laid out in an easy to follow manner.
9. Absolutely. Great beginning course to the program.
10. Yes, very much so. I appreciated the variety of assignments and real-world connections.
11. This class was intellectually stimulating, and encouraged me to stretch my thinking. The focus questions pushed me to connect my thinking to research based practices and theories.
12. Yes, the chapters we read as well as the weekly focus questions stretched my thinking and actually changed my perspective related to gifted education. This class has absolutely been intellectually stimulating!!!
13. Yes, because I was presented with new strategies for reaching students that I had not used previously
14. Yes. This class caused me to reflect upon my own personal beliefs and biases. I now have a different point of view after reading the research.
15. Yes, I learned a lot about theories of gifted education and learned a lot about the necessity of gifted education
16. Yes! I learned quite a bit about gifted education. I came in with some prior knowledge having 16 years of teaching experience, but it was great to learn about the history, theories, and models of gifted education. The case study experience was especially valuable, and I will likely continue to use Piirto's work to create student profiles.
17. This class was very beneficial to my profession. The content provided and the required textbooks were relevant, easy to read, and beneficial to learn. I feel much more confident with gifted students and instruction, and am looking forward to receiving students in the future!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The videos from the instructor, the reading assignments, slide presentations, overall weekly assignments, and the organization of the class as it was presented over the weeks. It was very upfront and also helpful to have the class glossary and historical documents.
2. The weekly videos and well organized folders made this class easy to navigate. It was really well presented overall. I think I learn the way Dr. Groman does because she organized in a way that I would for my own students.
3. The assigned readings and Dr. Groman's feedback contributed the most to my learning. Peer conversations on padlet were also beneficial.
5. The focus questions had a major contribution to my learning. The structure of the focus questions, learning more about APA citations, and also having some choice as to how to present my response to the question were all beneficial.
6. I really enjoyed the reading from EGT and compiling my case study project.
7. I enjoyed all the sources, and the collection of ideas and information to help understand the field of gifted ed. I really enjoyed the case study and was challenged to apply ideas and delve into my work to make meaningful connections to my chosen student. I also enjoyed the thinking toward the philosophy paper.
8. I enjoyed writing the focus questions and reading Dr. Groman's feedback.
9. The video explanations of expectations weekly as well as general discussion about content was helpful. Hearing it for me is always better than reading it - there were many nuances that were picked up in video that were not in the syllabus.

10. Breadth of information -- many resources and important aspects of the content
11. I found it helpful to read/interact with other student perspectives online, and the weekly videos were a great check-in to make sure I was on track with the expectations.
12. The required readings contributed the most to my learning. I also like how the final case study project tied all of our learning from the course together in a very practical way.
13. The readings paired with the case study
14. Dr. Groman has a ton of great information in her online course. I often went back to reread or peruse the links she had posted.
15. I appreciated learning about theories in gifted education.
16. The case study. Talking to real life subjects about giftedness and talent taught me a lot and it helped to experience the process of identification and to find themes and make connections with the presentations from others.
17. I really enjoyed the padlet platform to read classmates work and share my own. With the online format, this was a great way to showcase one another's thoughts. I also appreciated the flexibility in letting us make sense of our learning in any way we chose (i.e. a professional paper or power point).

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. I didn't enjoy the time spent reviewing APA style of writing for an endorsement. I understand the reasoning behind it, but I felt it took too much of my time away from learning the content.
2. N/A
3. No aspects of the class detracted from my learning.
5. This critique is more about the learning platform and NOT the class itself. I did not receive notifications about announcements in Blackboard until the day after the announcement had been made. It was a minor inconvenience.
6. N/A
7. I would say there were no big distractions.
8. This is the first class that I've taken that was completely online, so it was difficult to find things at until I got used to the format. Dr. Groman's videos were very helpful.
9. Organization of Blackboard. Too much information in weird places. Each course operates differently in where they place it and trying to find things can be difficult.
10. Commenting on other students' work can be challenging with an asynchronous course, since not everyone posts at the same time, so sometimes my comments felt forced.
11. Blackboard is a new LMS for me, so I did occasionally struggle to find my way around.
12. I would prefer to be in person. However, I live in Dayton, OH and would not be able to attend Ashland in person. I just learn better in person.
13. Not sure
16. The accelerated pace. The amount of content of a 12 week course into a 6 week module is quick. My preference may be to take the normal paced classes in the future, however I am looking forward to having my GIS endorsement sooner so its a give and take.
17. N/A

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Keep up the great videos and organization of assignments. I liked how some of our focus question assignments did double duty and contributed to the final summative assignment. For me the Choice Activity was just one more thing to do and not necessarily contributing to my overall learning considering the condensed time schedule.
2. None. I really enjoyed this course and look forward to having Dr. Groman as an instructor again. She is very receptive to the needs of the students.
3. Continue to do what you are doing.
5. I really don't have any. I enjoyed the class, learned a lot of new information, and feel more confident already in my knowledge of gifted students.
6. I think the class was great! I loved that Dr. Groman had weekly videos to introduce the week, they were very helpful.
7. I have no suggestions. I was really pleased and motivated by this work, instructor, and information in the course.
8. I don't have any suggestions. It was an interesting class.
9. While Case Study is valuable, doing so in a summer course was slightly difficult. Schools (around me) were out of session already and having access to students and records was difficult. I also miss the discussion board usage to hear other peoples ideas and takes on things.
11. None. I thought the coursework was reasonably paced for summer semester, and the instructor had a visible presence online.
12. My only suggestion would be to explain each week how the focus question ties into the final case study project and to explain the case study early on in the course. It took a few weeks before I could see that everything in this course is perfectly connected. The content is all relevant and connected, I would just suggest making that very clear in the early weeks in regards to the focus questions. I knew the focus questions would help with the final case study, I just didn't know enough about the case study at the beginning to really understand how they would be connected.
13. None at this time
16. Not much! The course was very well organized. The professor made herself available and kept us informed with check in videos, which I found extremely helpful. Thank you!
17. Thank you for your flexibility and feedback. I appreciate how you take the time to read and comment on the work submitted. Thank you for the learning experiences provided in this 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.