

CSS 390 C  
Special Topics  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: D  
Responses: 12/25 (48% moderate)

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan  
Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Lecturer

**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:

<b>Median</b> <b>2.3</b> (0=lowest; 5=highest)	<b>College Decile</b> <b>0</b> (0=lowest; 9=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:

<b>CEI: 4.7</b> (1=lowest; 7=highest)
--

### SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	College
The course as a whole was:	12	8%	17%	17%	33%	8%	17%	2.2	0	0
The course content was:	12	17%	8%	17%	33%	25%		2.2	0	0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	12	17%	17%	17%	25%	17%	8%	2.5	0	0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	12	17%	25%		33%	17%	8%	2.2	0	0

### STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	College
<b>Relative to other college courses you have taken:</b>											
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	12		33%	8%	33%	8%	8%	8%	4.2	0	1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	12	17%	17%	17%	50%				4.5	1	0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	12	33%	50%		8%	8%			6.2	8	7
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	12	17%	25%	17%	42%				5.0	2	1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	12	17%	50%	25%	8%				5.8	4	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: 9.5 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=12)**

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
			25%	25%	8%	8%	25%				8%

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

**Class median: 5.5 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=12)**

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
25%	8%	17%	8%	8%	8%	8%		17%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.6 (N=12)**

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
17%	50%	8%	17%	8%										

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

**(N=12)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
8%	8%	75%	8%		

**STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS**

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK	
									Inst	College
Course organization was:	12	17%		25%	33%	17%	8%	2.2	0	0
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	12	8%	33%	25%	8%	25%		3.2	1	1
Explanations by instructor were:	12	17%	17%	17%	17%	33%		2.5	0	0
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	12	17%	17%	8%	33%	17%	8%	2.2	0	0
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	12	17%	33%	17%	17%	17%		3.5	1	1
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	12	25%	17%	17%	25%		17%	3.0	0	0
Contribution of assignments to understanding course content was:	12	8%	17%	8%	42%	25%		2.1	0	0
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	11	36%	36%	9%	18%			4.1	2	2
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	12	25%		17%	8%	42%	8%	1.5	0	0
Answers to student questions were:	12	8%	8%	50%	17%	17%		2.8	0	0
Availability of extra help when needed was:	12	8%	8%	33%	17%	17%	17%	2.5	0	0
Use of class time was:	12	8%	17%	33%	25%	8%	8%	2.8	0	0
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	12	17%	33%	17%	8%	17%	8%	3.5	1	1
Amount you learned in the course was:	12	17%	33%		25%	25%		3.0	0	0
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	12	33%	17%	17%	8%	25%		3.5	1	1
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	12		17%	25%	42%	8%	8%	2.3	0	0
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	12	17%		17%	42%	25%		2.1	0	0
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	12	8%	8%	33%		42%	8%	2.0	0	0

CSS 390 C  
Special Topics  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: D  
Responses: 12/25 (48% moderate)

Taught by: Yusuf Pisan  
**Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Lecturer**

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Not particularly.
2. The class content was centered around game design but did not expose the level of detail in game creation that I expected. The way the course is described infers the content will be centered around learning how to make a very basic game but instead I felt more as a trainee for a learning how to use a program without any instructions.
3. Making the games was intellectually stimulating, but I feel like that part was so separated from the content covered during lectures that it wasn't even a part of the class. As for the lectures, they were not stimulating at all, in fact I really had no interest or motivation to actively read the material or pay attention to lectures.
4. Yes, the class was intellectually stimulating but not exactly because of lectures but because of having to learn unity.
5. The class was intellectually stimulating in the individual work we did. The actual course content taught during the class period was less so, though some days it was still interesting.
6. It was sort of intellectually stimulating. Good theory about game development but poor explanations.
7. Yes, because I had to self teach a lot.
8. This class was not that intellectually stimulating.
9. The class was a great mix of fun and education. I am walking away with much more knowledge both in general and about games than I did before the class.
10. The class was intellectually stimulating. It gave us the opportunity as students to try our hand at game development, both solo and in teams of 5. It took a different path from most CSS classes and allowed us to create something from scratch and an idea rather than a set of requirements for a program, and for that reason I enjoyed it even more.
11. In some ways yes, because a lot of the theory section was needed to be implemented for the assignments like how to manage our teams.
12. yes, it required working with a team and making games

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

1. It didn't
2. Having guest speakers was mildly interesting and was worth showing up to lecture for.
3. Learning about making games it was all on my own figuring out unity, but the actual class material I don't know.
4. Final project
5. The individual work done during the group project.
6. Learning Unity.
7. Self teaching unity outside of class
8. Self studying and other students.
9. The framework of MDA was essential to help shape how to think not only about games but other aspects of life as well.
10. The one-button game and just practicing with Unity. My one button game was built in two days individually, and taught me a ton about unity and development. This took the same theme of allowing us to make anything we wanted, but required us to be creative to fit the mechanic to a single button. This struck me as the right amount of "requirement" for a game to be an assignment.
11. Assignments
12. group meetings

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

1. Lack of use in canvases for everything except submitting assignments
2. The overall structure of the 2 hour block was not well organized and we as a consequence did not get the time promised to be allotted at the end of the lecture for other tasks.
3. The lectures were just unbearable, and I really couldn't pay attention because of how boring and dry they were. I understand that there was knowledge to be gained from them but it was just so hard to sit through I couldn't take in any of it.
4. Sometimes it was more distracting to the class for the professor to get frustrated with students who weren't paying attention.

5. A lot of the class was individual work with little guidance. It was unclear if the professor was very available to help us with our many coding problems. Our success was based on the overall knowledge of code the group members had prior to the class, since no coding was taught during class but was required for the projects. We had some tutorials that were assigned for us to watch, but it is different than in class learning.
6. Unclear grading.
7. The lectures that did not exactly correlate to helping us a game.
8. No incentive for doing certain assignments. The assignments had no grade attached to it, even though it was something important we needed for the class.
10. I honestly didn't enjoy the persuasive/serious game theme and I thought it detracted from the class. I felt that my idea fit persuasive very obviously, but when it came time to choose a project to work on, none of the other projects really interested me. This made it really difficult to make a game that actually conformed to the theme while still being fun, and in the end my team made much more progress when we stopped caring about the persuasive element so much.
11. Having no introduction to our assignments and little guidelines.
12. Not sure

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

1. Use Java gui, teach and implementation, not unity, since the prerequisites are programming 1, which is Java. Or nix digital game making, and instead do several analogue games.
2. Less focus on being a game designer at a company and more focus on what a game is made of and how to make one. There was virtually no help with the program used to build the game and very little instruction given for how to stay on track with the expectations. The amount of clarification was frustratingly low for all individual assignments. Please focus on either doing group or individual work - there was too much of both and it got very confusing. Asking a group of students to find time between their individual schedules to meet is a near impossible task. We have more than 1 class.
3. There is a huge disconnect between the reading/lectures and making the games. I spoke with many students and we all agreed that it was unbelievable how we were expected to fully learn how to make games completely on our own for homework. Meanwhile, we had to keep up with the readings and lectures for the midterm that honestly shouldn't have even existed. I get that there are things about making games that aren't necessarily about making games, but the class felt like it was broken up into cover uninteresting and boring stuff in class and then learn how to/actually make games. The 50/50 separation of the two is what led to many students chose to not even read any of the readings, or pay attention to lectures. Everybody was concerned with making their game, and the fact that the class time spends literally no time at all covering how to work with unity, script, make basic functions, etc., made us not even slightly concerned about the in class material. By the time the midterm came around, nobody was prepared and the oddly focused questions made it even worse. The assignments were not always clear what it is we were supposed to do, and some assignments like the postmortem presentation were barely talked about in class. A classmate described it as, "we don't really talk about any of the assignments, we just do them randomly." This class needs to be heavily refocused and reorganized because it was truly an awful experience. I had lots of fun making games and working with my group members, but that part of the class didn't feel related to the class at all. It felt like I was taking this class, but at the same time I had just decided to make games in my free time. There needs to be some sort of integration of learning how to physically make the games in class. Maybe by implementing parts of the roll-a-ball tutorial into class or going over basic tutorials, anything. If the two parts of the class aren't somehow integrated, then it feels like one of them should be just cut out. If the class wants to teach students about scrum, postmortems, and other awful stuff like that, then just make the class about that. Expecting students to learn about that stuff in class, and then learn how to make games on their own is completely ridiculous and stupid. The least this class could do to improve is to swap the in class material and the homework, and then either drop the midterm or focus it around unity and making games. The way the class is now is broken, unorganized, and terribly structured. A step in the right direction for the class is to have a much better mesh of the two sides of the class.
4. I think there should be a lot more instruction in using Unity done in class. And a lot more support from the professor in using Unity for when groups have issues with their source control, assets, etc. This course should have been equal parts game design and actually learning how to use the software being assigned and how to coordinate that software.
5. Having sections of the class dedicated to learning the basics of Unity. Expecting us to learn the scripting process and how to navigate entirely outside of class is a lot, especially when you are taking the class assuming the professor will be teaching you. Expecting students to do some learning on their own outside of class is perfectly normal and expected, but I think that just not teaching the hardest part of the course (the coding skills and Unity skills) was very frustrating for many of us students.
6. - Teaching Unity game engine for developing games instead of making us learn by ourselves with no guidance (or at least giving us a start in the area) - Clearer assignment and project guidelines (adding rubrics) - Releasing grades sooner so we can know how we are doing - Not reading off of slides that are obvious to understand - Help with version control solutions - Less vague exam questions - Having assignments through Canvas
7. Please teach basics or something on unity. It will help students be able at least understand the engine and not start using the engine without prior knowledge. Start big project earlier to allow a more developed game.
8. This class could have been a lot better if it was more organized and had more assignments that were actually graded.
9. Group discussions about the bugs and methods we used for unity
10. - Keep the one button game, or some variation, and keep it individual. - Move the midterm up to week 5 or 6 because it's much more "general" than the rest of the stressful deliverables. - Change the main game requirement constraints from a theme to a mechanic of some sort. I really enjoyed having to work around the constraint of a single button rather than a theme.
11. Increase the amount of guidelines for assignments. Even until now I have no idea how the final assignment is being graded. Also include an introduction unity and scripting, it could be just one class period.
12. Use more of the book that we got for 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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> 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.