

CSS 385 A  
Introduction To Game Development  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: A  
Responses: 6/42 (14% low)

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

**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>College Decile</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>4</b>
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	(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: 5.7</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:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	6	7
The course content was:	6	50%		33%	17%			4.0	3	5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	6	33%	33%	17%	17%			4.0	2	3
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	6	17%	33%	17%	33%			3.5	2	3

**STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

<b>Relative to other college courses you have taken:</b>	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK	
										Inst	College
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	6	17%	50%	17%	17%				5.8	7	8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	6	33%	33%		17%		17%		6.0	8	7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	6	50%	33%			17%			6.5	9	9
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	6	33%	33%		33%				6.0	7	7
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	6	33%	33%		17%	17%			6.0	7	7

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: 11.5 Hours per credit: 2.3 (N=6)**

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

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

**Class median: 8.5 Hours per credit: 1.7 (N=6)**

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

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.9 (N=6)**

<b>A</b>	<b>A-</b>	<b>B+</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>B-</b>	<b>C+</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C-</b>	<b>D+</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D-</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Credit</b>	<b>No Credit</b>
(3.9-4.0)	(3.5-3.8)	(3.2-3.4)	(2.9-3.1)	(2.5-2.8)	(2.2-2.4)	(1.9-2.1)	(1.5-1.8)	(1.2-1.4)	(0.9-1.1)	(0.7-0.8)	(0.0)			
67%	33%													

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

**(N=6)**

<b>In your major</b>	<b>A core/distribution requirement</b>	<b>An elective</b>	<b>In your minor</b>	<b>A program requirement</b>	<b>Other</b>
50%		50%			

**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:	6	17%	50%	17%	17%			3.8	2	4
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	6	17%	50%	33%				3.8	1	2
Explanations by instructor were:	6	17%	50%	33%				3.8	2	3
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	6	33%	33%	33%				4.0	3	4
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	6	50%	17%	33%				4.5	5	6
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	8	8
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	6	50%	33%	17%				4.5	3	4
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	8	8
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	6	83%	17%					4.9	8	9
Answers to student questions were:	6	67%	33%					4.8	7	8
Availability of extra help when needed was:	5	60%	40%					4.7	6	7
Use of class time was:	6	33%	33%		33%			4.0	3	4
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	6	50%	33%		17%			4.5	4	5
Amount you learned in the course was:	6	67%	17%	17%				4.8	8	8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	6	67%	17%		17%			4.8	7	8
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	5	6
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	6	67%	33%					4.8	7	8
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	6	50%		50%				4.0	3	4

CSS 385 A  
Introduction To Game Development  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: A  
Responses: 6/42 (14% low)

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

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. This class was intellectually stimulating. There was a lot of self-studying, reading documentation, and watching tutorials on youtube. We had to apply all that knowledge differently to produce our final product.
3. I learned a lot about Unity and game development.
4. Yes, this class was both intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking. I was exposed to many new concepts in this class and had to learn them quickly, but through doing this I gained a great sense of accomplishment.
5. The course is what you make of it. If your team decides to be ambitious with their game, they will have alot of work. If your team decides to be more conservative with their game, they will have less work.

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

1. I feel as though, we didn't learn much directly from the professor, but the structured ability to work with others to develop a game is very appreciated. I learned a lot through this process, and it was also a ton of fun.
2. Self-study
3. Creating our game
4. The use of new software and writing code to work with that software is one of the things that contributed most to my learning. I would say the freedom to go about things in our own way also contributed to my learning because I had to make many decisions about how I wanted to implement features into my game.
5. The fact that we had to manage the project on our own taught me alot about time management in a project context. Also, the alpha/beta/final playtesting taught me how to get feedback from those kinds of apps and incorporate them into the next iteration. The guest speakers were 100% the highlight of the classes, keep having them come in!

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

2. Nothing I could think of
3. not enough examples, unclear group assignment expectations
4. No aspects of this class detracted from my learning.
5. The professor kind of gave us the majority of each class after about week 3 or 4 to just work on our projects. For those students without lots of willpower, it was just 'goof off time' and that detracted from those students in the teams who wanted to work on the project. The team time IS up to the team's discretion, but some structure to it might help keep some teams on track.

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

2. Maybe give a better introduction to unity at the beginning of the quarter, and do some class exercises that are closely related to the first few assignments.
3. Needs more examples at beginning of quarter to help students understand what's going on
4. I would suggest that you go over with students how to import complicated assets such as advanced enemy pathing or lighting systems. I would suggest you do this after the hero assignments so the students are fairly familiar with Unity before doing this.
5. The professor is very knowledgeable about making video games, so it would be good if he checked in individually with each team as the quarter progressed to see if they were on track, and to warn the team if they were being too ambitious, as they might not know.

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.