

# **COURSE SUMMARY REPORT**

Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell

First Year Pre-Major Program Term: Autumn 2024

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: A

Responses: 15/29 (52% high)

B CORE 104 H, Joint with B CORE 110 E Discovery Core: Arts And Humanities

Course type: Face-to-Face Taught by: Yusuf Pisan

Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Assoc T 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:

Median 4.6

College Decile

(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:

CEI: 4.2 (1=lowest; 7=highest)

#### **SUMMATIVE ITEMS**

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median		LE RANK College
The course as a whole was:	15	60%	20%	20%	(-/	(-)	(•)	4.7	7	7
The course content was:	15	47%	33%	20%				4.4	5	6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	15	60%	7%	33%				4.7	5	5
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	15	60%	27%	7%	7%			4.7	6	6

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

STUDEN	IT ENGAG	EIVIENI															
								Much Higher			Average			Much Lower		DECI	LE RANK
Relative	to other c	ollege co	urses you	have tak	en:		N .	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Median		College
Do you ex	xpect your	grade in t	his course	to be:			15	27%	27%	13%	33%				5.6	6	4
The intelle	The intellectual challenge presented was:						15	20%		13%	40%	20%	7%		4.1	0	0
The amou	The amount of effort you put into this course was:						15	33%	27%	20%	13%	7%			5.9	6	7
The amou	unt of effor	t to succe	ed in this c	ourse was	s:		15	27%		27%	33%	13%			4.6	1	2
Your invo	lvement in	course (d	oina assia	nments, at	tending cla	asses.	15	40%	7%	27%	27%				5.4	2	3
etc.) was:		000.00 (0	og acc.g			,		.070	. , ,	, ,	_, ,,				0	_	
On avera	ige how m	any hours	ner week	have you	spent on th	nis course,					Class	media	n: 6.0	Hours r	er credi	t: 1.2	(N=15)
including a	attending on	classes, do	ing readin	ıgs, review							0.000		0.0		, or orour		(11-10)
Under 2	2-3		4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11		12-13		14-15	1	6-17	18-	-19	20-21	22	or more
	20%	6 2	7%	13%	27%					13%							
	total avera n advancir	0		w many do	you consi	ider were					Class	media	n: 4.1	Hours p	er credi	t: 0.8	(N=15)
Under 2	2-3 4-5		4-5	6-7	8-9 10-1		1 12-13		14-15		16-17 18-19		-19	20-21 2		22 or more	
	33%	6 5	3%	7%						7%							
What grad	de do you	expect in t	his course	?										Class	s mediar	ո։ 3.9	(N=15)
A (3.9-4.0) 60%	A- (3.5-3.8) 13%	B+ (3.2-3.4) 13%	B (2.9-3.1) 13%	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.	_	O+ 2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1	_	)- '-0.8)	E (0.0)	Pas	s Cre	edit	No Credit
In regard	to your ac	ademic pr	ogram, is t	this course	e best desc	ribed as:											(N=15)
lac		А	core/distr		A	elective		le i			Α					Oth a ::	
In your major requirement 7% 60%			An	elective		In your minor			A program requirement 13%					Other 13%			



# COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Bothell First Year Pre-Major Program Term: Autumn 2024

## STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent		Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Madian	DECILE RANK Inst College		
Course organization was:	N 15	(5)	(4) 33%	(3)	(2) 7%	(1)	(0)	Median 4.2	4	4	
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	15	47%	JJ /6	20%	33%			3.3	1	0	
•	_		000/								
Explanations by instructor were:	15	40%	20%	33%	7%			4.0	3	2	
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	15	33%	33%	27%	7%			4.0	3	2	
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	47%	40%	7%	7%			4.4	4	4	
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	15	33%	40%	27%				4.1	3	2	
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	15	60%	13%	20%	7%			4.7	5	5	
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	15	93%	7%					5.0	8	8	
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	15	53%	33%	13%				4.6	4	3	
Answers to student questions were:	15	47%	27%	27%				4.4	4	3	
Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	47%	13%	33%	7%			4.2	3	3	
Use of class time was:	15	40%	27%	20%	13%			4.1	3	3	
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	15	47%	33%	7%	13%			4.4	3	3	
Amount you learned in the course was:	15	60%	20%	7%	13%			4.7	7	7	
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	15	40%	13%	47%				3.8	1	2	
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	15	60%	7%	33%				4.7	6	6	
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	15	60%	27%	13%				4.7	6	6	
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	60%	13%	27%				4.7	6	6	



## **COURSE SUMMARY REPORT**

Student Comments

University of Washington, Bothell First Year Pre-Major Program Term: Autumn 2024

Evaluation Delivery: Online Evaluation Form: A

Responses: 15/29 (52% high)

B CORE 104 H, Joint with B CORE 110 E Discovery Core: Arts And Humanities

Course type: Face-to-Face Taught by: Yusuf Pisan

Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Assoc T Prof

#### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

- 1. sure, it got me thinking about why people make different kinds of games and how they do so.
- 2. I found that this class was intellectually stimulating. Specifically, as someone who is not majoring in the field of game design or computer science, I enjoyed exploring another discipline and stretching my thinking. I believe I have developed a more creative mindset thanks to this class. At the same time, this class gave me the opportunity to brush up on my group work skills and even gave me opportunities to improve on them.
- 3. This class stretched my thinking because we got to learn different mechanics of different board games and video games in different situations.
- 4. I had to learn to be creative with resources I was given and also work with many other people in the class which ensured teamwork/leadership skills.
- 5. Yes, this class helped me think outside the box and be creative. This class stretched my thinking by making my imagination flow.
- 6. I have a lot of creative thinking, it did stretch your thinking a bit, there were challenges when given a task and certain requirements in completing the task, like a game, which makes a lot of sense given the name of the course.
- 7. It was kind of easy, so didn't really challenge me much.
- 8. The course was intellectually stimulating because it was quite fun and enjoying to think amount and work through, however it didn't really stretch my thinking or expose me to anything I didn't already know aside from a few different terminologies.
- 9. Yeah, it was interesting to make a board game, and to try to connect it to a real world issue.
- 10. Yes, the class was intellectually stimulating, as it involved many interesting and creative writing topics but the final involved a ton of thought and creativity too.
- 11. This class got me to think about things I've never thought about and raised some interesting ideas
- 12. It was intellectually stimulating, and it required us to learn to get along with a group which was good.

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

- 1. I thought the final project to make a board game was great since I went through the entire process of planning, making all parts, testing, troubleshooting, and peer feedback.
- 2. The group work was definitely effective in helping me learn. I also found that the readings at the beginning of the quarter (especially the one regarding ethics taught by games) were the most effective in understanding the application of games for more than just entertainment. The readings, I felt placed students in the right mindset for when they start to develop their own "educational" games.
- 3. We got to test different board games and video games
- 4. Working in groups, or having to write papers where its my own intellectual ideas on paper.
- 5. I think engaging with my peers helped me contribute to the people in my class most. This class helped me meet new people and learn more about how my peers are as people according to the games they made as a group.
- 6. The challenges, it puts your patience to the test and your ability to work around or fix complications.
- 7. There were a few essays we did out of class, thats when i learned the most, just from researching topics i didn't already know much about.
- 8. The amount of creative work and the hands on group projects were very engaging, and you actually think through the problems and situations in the course.
- 9. The group project of making a board game was the most significant thing.
- 10. I think the peer reviews really helped our final shine as it allowed us to get constructive criticism and work from there.
- 11. The aspects of this class which contributed most to learning were the lessons
- 12. Teaching during class which happened mainly during the first half of the semester.

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

- 1. If anything, some of the other students in the class didn't seem serious about it and were just playing games or chatting during the class.
- 2. There was not much that distracted me from learning in this class. I personally found that all aspects of the class (the readings, papers, group work, etc) were crucial in understanding game design and how it can be applied to multiple disciplines.
- 3. When we had to write some assignments about 1000-2000 words long.
- 4. None
- 5. The essays. The essays in this class were sort of too much for me because I know that I have to balance out this class with 2 other classes but it was hard for me and for my mental health to focus on one class while juggling another class but also maintaining some time for myself all at the same time. I had to make some sacrifices by putting my mental health first for my last essay for this quarter and it almost cost me my grade.
- 6. Nothing really.

© 2011–2024 IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 31786

- 7. playing one of the assigned game was hard because it was a flash game and i had to go out of my way to make it work
- 8. The class was very late in the day and also had some long videos and very quiet work sessions at the start of the course that made it very easy to detach and fall asleep.
- 9. I'm not sure, I can't think of anything off the top of my head
- 10. N/A Good class all around.
- 11. I think that some of the essays we had to write for the class seemed out of place in terms of their requirements and no in class time was spent talking about them at all.

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

- 1. I have none.
- 2. I believe students would benefit from reading a little more literature regarding how games can be made to teach ethics and other topics.
- 3. No suggestions I really loved this class
- 4. None! I enjoyed this class a lot
- 5. Make assignments due on Wednesday instead of Sunday
- 6. Nothing! I really enjoyed the course!
- 7. start the final project a bit earlier, the final part was a bit rushed. also, lower the amount of required playtesters.
- 8. Overall I think the course is well made and a very educational but fun course.
- 9. In the course description it said we'd be making a game using Game Maker, but it was a physical board game, which isn't a huge issue, but making the description accurate would be an improvement.
- 10. N/A Good class all around.
- 11. I think the class should be less reliant on playtesting from other non-involved people and that the lengthy amount of class time should be used with more efficiency

© 2011–2024 IASystem, University of Washington Survey no: 31786



*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. 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>&</sup>lt;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.