

qe906ssi Student Survey of Instruction

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

HEALTHSCIE - FALL 2014

INSTRUCTOR REPORT

01-29-2015

INSTRUCTOR	CALL#	DEPT	COURSE TITLE	BLDG	ROOM	TIME	DAYS	ENROLLED	SURVEYS	NORMING GROUP	
ROCHE	18297	SPA	64500	CPA	0A129	0850AM	F	33	30	Entire Department	
STUDENT ITEMS											
				MAJOR	MINOR	LER	ELECTIVE	OTHER	OMITTED		
1 I am taking this course for:				100.0%							
2 How many classes did you miss?				0	1-2	3-5	6-8	9+			
				63.3%	33.3%	3.3%					
3 The grade I expect to receive in this course				A	B	C	D	F			
				96.7%	3.3%						
4 What is your current KSU Grade Point Average?				0.0-1.9	2.0-2.5	2.6-3.0	3.1-3.6	3.7-4.0			
						3.3%	16.7%	80.0%			
				STRONGLY	AGREE	NEITHER	DISAGREE	STRONGLY	OMITTED		
				AGREE		A/D		DISAGREE			
										SECTION	
										MEAN SD	
										NORMS	
										MEAN SD	
STUDENT COMMITMENT AND LEARNING											
5 I did the required preparations for each class.				16.7%	43.3%	23.3%	16.7%				3.60 0.95 4.44 0.63
6 I learned valuable information/skills from this course.				10.0%	30.0%	26.7%	26.7%	3.3%	3.3%		3.17 1.05 4.51 0.68
INSTRUCTOR ITEMS											
COURSE ORGANIZATION											
7 Expectations were clear to me throughout the course.				26.7%	60.0%	10.0%	3.3%				4.10 0.70 4.47 0.74
8 The structure/organization of the course helped me learn.				20.0%	26.7%	33.3%	20.0%				3.47 1.02 4.30 0.90
9 The course materials/activities helped me learn.				20.0%	36.7%	26.7%	13.3%	3.3%			3.57 1.05 4.37 0.81
EVALUATION PRACTICES											
10 The assignments and tests allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.				6.7%	20.0%	40.0%	26.7%	3.3%	3.3%		3.00 0.95 4.34 0.82
11 I received feedback about my progress throughout the course.				46.7%	50.0%	3.3%					4.43 0.56 4.28 0.87
INSTRUCTOR CHARACTERISTICS											
12 The instructor gave clear written/oral explanations.				26.7%	50.0%	16.7%	6.7%				3.97 0.84 4.43 0.77
13 The instructor motivated me to think about the subject.				16.7%	43.3%	20.0%	20.0%				3.57 0.99 4.43 0.80
14 The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter.				56.7%	43.3%						4.57 0.50 4.69 0.58
15 The instructor showed respect for students.				33.3%	26.7%	23.3%	16.7%				3.77 1.09 4.64 0.66
16 The instructor was available for individual consultation.				36.7%	36.7%	16.7%	10.0%				4.00 0.97 4.53 0.67
**Total of Instructor Items 7-16				29.0%	39.3%	19.0%	11.7%	0.7%	0.3%		3.85 0.99 4.45 0.78

CONTINUATION: CALL# 18297

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEITHER A/D	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	OMITTED	SECTION		NORMS	
							MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
PHYSICAL FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY										
17 The classroom and physical facilities support the learning activities in this course.	30.0%	66.7%	3.3%				4.27	0.51	4.44	0.68
18 Equipment and technology used supported the learning activities in this course.	26.7%	60.0%	10.0%	3.3%			4.10	0.70	4.47	0.67
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR					
SUMMARY QUESTION										
19 Overall, how would you rate your learning experience in this course?	6.7%	20.0%	23.3%	46.7%	3.3%		2.80	1.01	4.22	0.99

Dr. Jennifer Roche
SPA 64500/18297
Fall 2014

Student Commitment and Learning

In the space below please write any comments on these or other aspects of your commitment and learning such as your interest, desire to learn, or motivation.

- I feel as though this class was a mixture of cognitive psych and research methods. I feel this class was redundant and that writing a research paper provided limited insight to language processes.
- I spent a lot of time with assignments rather than text and lectures.
- The information seemed valuable, but it was hard to relate the subject matter to how we would use it as SLP's.
- I think we should have been tested over the content.
- Not applicable to grad program.
- I don't particularly feel that the updated version of this class was beneficial to me. After hearing all of the projects and info this class previously provided, I feel like I missed out. The language science class was much more relevant to my future in this field.
- Students would read material if there were exams.
- I learned a lot of helpful skills for research purposes.
- Assignments were not directly related to lectures. It was difficult paying attention to lecture when we were not tested on the material.
- Lectures did not tie into assignments. Lectures were minimally relevant to the field of speech pathology.
- Did not feel this class was pertinent to our grad school classed for speech. Interesting though.
- I did not feel that this course was relevant to speech language pathology. I strongly feel that this course should not have replaced language science.
- While the information was interesting and relevant very little application was given to the field of SLP.

I wish we would have worked specifically with SALT. I don't feel competent in performing a language sample.

-The lecture topics were interesting, but did not have a linear progression of skills/topics of relation, as is typical for most courses.

-I don't really feel like I am leaving this class w/ the knowledge I should have. The materials seldom seemed relevant to speech-language pathology and if it was, the connection was never made. We were never tested on any material from lecture. This made me unmotivated to learn.

Course Organization

In the space below please write any comments on these or other aspects of organization, such as syllabus, textbook, websites, discussion, participation in small group projects, or workload.

-The PPT lectures were a bit confusing, esp b/c there was no clear hierarchical organization pertaining to theories vs concepts assoc w/ various theories. Although PPT w/out transitions were available they were useless b/c many of the animated transitions overlapped hiding important information from previous slides.

-The competency was somewhat surprising, but I learned a lot about summarizing articles and writing projects.

-Powerpoint were a bit confusing.

-Maybe organize ppts a little better. More tests would help us pay attentions.

-Powerpoint slides were difficult to understand at times because there were so many boxes and overlapping areas.

-The research paper was super beneficial. However, lecture was completely pointless because we never were assessed on our knowledge.

-In the future, I would provide more of an in-depth overview of the assignments at the beginning of the course so students can better plan their specific research proposal.

-I felt the main focus of the course was on the research proposal (which I did not mind!) but the information from lectures kind of get lost in that project.

-I think there needs to be more focus on the language sample analysis.

-I didn't like all of the illustrations and transitions within the lecture slides, as it took a long time to load and either blocked information (if downloading the no transitions file) or added 100 extra pages to the slides.

- Students would read material if there were exams.
- The way Dr. Roche set up the research assignments was very helpful – really helped me structure my research design.
- Powerpoints need more organization.
- The last 4 classes taught by Dr. Roche were extremely helpful but before that, content covered in classes did not feel very relevant to practice.
- Instructions were vague for writing the research proposal.
- Dr. Roche was obviously overwhelmed with the amount of grading we had to do.
- Not requiring a test over the lecture zapped my motivation to study the material. Being in my first semester I was so overwhelmed with other work that the lack of pressure to learn the material meant that I, well...never studied the material. Just being honest.
- The discussion project helped me to apply and learn from the lecture topics.
- I appreciate that the course was organized according to the syllabus. However, I don't feel like I learned very much from the lectures. The material seemed extremely completely irrelevant to our field.

Evaluation Practices

In the space below please write any comments on these or other aspects of course evaluation such as assignments, exams, juries, papers, peer evaluations, portfolios.

- The assignments usually did not reflect the text and materials for lectures.
- Liked that we could redo assignments. Would have learned more if tested on subject matter.
- Greatly appreciate the feedback on all assignments.
- Loved being able to resubmit our paper!
- As much as I liked not having quizzes/exams, I probably would have read more/took more notes if there had been. The research project was great but not sure how much it pertained to the class.
- Feedback was generally provided in a timely manner.

-I believe formal assessments would have been more helpful and useful in my learning. I felt like I didn't really have to study the information and there was no way to tell whether I could apply it on a test.

-I initially did not enjoy the research essay, but I feel as though my technical writing skills have greatly improved and appreciate this assignment now that I can clearly see the benefits.

-Paper unrelated to lecture/what I learned. Detailed/thoughtful feedback greatly appreciated.

-I feel that the semester long paper might not have been the best use of our time as I personally learned about my one topic and how to write a paper more than I learned about normal language processes as a whole.

-I think it would be helpful if future assignments were directly related to the course material. This would help to reinforce the information from lectures.

-Confused as to how lectures had anything to do with proposal assignments.

-We had one assignment that allowed us to show what we learned. The paper was not relevant to course material.

-The work required was representative of doctoral work. Research is not required for masters students. We have already taken research methods, which covers any research information we need.

-The paper seemed almost wholly unrelated to the overall course. It didn't require me to use what I learned in class.

-The research paper proposal assignments were interesting but were not, in my opinion, appropriate assignments for this course. It would be beneficial to have lecture-based assignments.

-We were NEVER tested on materials –we only completed a research proposal which was worth the majority of our grade in the course. Research was unrelated to normal language.

Instructor Characteristics

In the space below please write any comments on these or other aspects of the instructor, such as preparedness, delivery, communication or professionalism.

-Dr. Roche is knowledgeable about her field and accommodating to our needs. However, she continually spoke of an open door policy and "ask me questions anytime", though when approached, she always seemed in a rush (which is fine), agitated, and at times hostile. She was

very kind and generous in class, outside of class her demeanor was more negative, which made coming to her outside of class disheartening.

-She has a very warm and approachable personality and it's clear that she is invested in her students success.

-Dr. Roche is approachable and tells students what she is looking for. Her knowledge on the course material is great and helpful. Sometimes Dr. Roche's feedback is not constructive.

-I think written feedback could have been worded more sensitively.

-Dr. Roche can be condescending at times. We are not undergrads. We have worked hard to get here and deserve more respect for our abilities.

-WHEN I could catch Dr. Roche 1 on 1 she was extremely helpful.

-Unintentional condescension...I don't think it was ever meant to be rude, but could easily have been taken that way. This is not a class of undergrads.

-Everything was very interesting but it is hard to be motivated at 8:50 am!

-Dr. Roche is a great instructor, I just don't feel this class was particularly relevant. I do not plan on doing research in the future, and writing a "research" paper was nearly the only thing we were graded on.

-I feel as though comments added to our submitted word files could have displayed a higher level of professionalism. Adding 7 exclamation marks to a critique serves no purpose.

-Professor extremely knowledgeable and personable. 😊

-The feedback provided for assignments could have been worded in a nicer manner. Some comments were harsh.

-Instructor was unprofessional both on comments in papers and in presenting herself verbally. She is obviously passionate about her work but her unprofessional image did not immediately gain her the level of respect that is customary for a professor.

-Not respectful to students. Condescending, especially on written feedback on assignments. Not professional.

-Always willing to help if we had questions – very knowledgeable about the subject matter – tried to make it interesting.

-Upon going to her office hours, she made students feel like they were interrupting her work. She told us to consult peers for all questions even when peers did not know answers.

-Perhaps it wasn't intentional, but Dr. R used a condescending tone and attitude toward the students. I constantly got the feeling that she knew everything there is to know about writing and that she was graciously going to show us how it's done by "tearing apart" our papers.

-Your feedback often seemed too harsh. It didn't feel like constructive criticism. It made me feel stupid or inadequate.

-I felt the lecture over alternative transcription analysis options would have been very effective had it been better prepared and we had several lectures and practice on that topic.

-I was NOT motivated to learn about this material which is not the case in other courses. Dr. Roche was knowledgeable of the material she taught, but having NO background in speech pathology hurt the class overall. Dr. Roche was not respectful of the students – she was unprofessional in emails and over comments in grading.

Physical Facilities, Equipment and Technology

In the space below please write any comments about physical facilities or use of equipment and technology.

-The research paper should not be the primary focus of this class as Research Methods cover most of that and I didn't see a connection between the course information and the paper.

-Good power points and information.

-A discussion board was supposed to help solve students questions, however, it was not set up until week 11. It was also not confidential as told. This discouraged students from asking questions for fear of looking stupid.

-When taking notes, it was often hard to follow the Powerpoint because the info on your slides overlapped. The technology you used for a lang sample was very confusing and I don't think I will be able to utilize it in my future.

Summary Question

In the space below please write any overall comments about this course or instructor not covered above.

-I feel as though this class taught me information I had already previously learned (neuro & cogn psych & research methods). To me, unless I am getting a Phd. Learning how to set up an experiment and write a research paper was not as educational as the language science class, this one replaced. I feel like I have missed an essential component of information due to this changing course. Dr. Roche is knowledgeable about her area, but she is not an SLP and has limited insight into being a clinician, which showed throughout the class. I believe this class needs to be reformatted to provide us with more relevant information, not something that has been previously targeted in other grad class.

-The course content did not always seem to be relevant to practice. However, the annotated bibliographies will really help me be an evidence based practitioner.

-I would have enjoyed this class more if it would have been relatable to SLP. I felt like I learned more during the two lectures that Dr. Audet taught, than I did throughout the rest of the course.

-Really appreciated extended deadlines!

-Again, research paper was so helpful, lecture was not.

-Great professor who is dedicated/knowledgeable but course design did not maximize learning.

-I also really enjoyed and benefitted from the two days of guest lecturing by Dr. Audet. I learned a wealth of information through that. I would have liked more of that.

-I am extremely disappointed that this class was replaced by Dr. Audet's language science. At this time in my schooling, I expect to learn clinically relevant information, which this class in no way provided. I feel cheated. I already took a Research Methods course.

-I really enjoyed Dr. Roche as a professor. She is very helpful and bubbly and excited to be here, but I did not feel this class was a good class for our major. We did not learn therapy based material and wrote a paper the entire semester that was not related to the class material.

-There were no exams in this course. This did not motivate students to even open the textbook or pay attention during class. I feel that this course could be drastically improved if it contained exams and course material related to clinic situations as an SLP.

-Focus less on psychology and more on field related topics. I understand psychology is involved in normal language processes, but I thought there was too much focus on psychology.

-Did not learn as much as I hoped...the research proposal took most of the time and I already took that class.