B IMD 363 A
Studio Elements III: Practicum
Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 13/31 (42% moderate)

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	College Decile
2.0	**0**
(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: 5.2
(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	DECILE RANK College
The course as a whole was:	13		8%	31%	23%	38%		2.0	0	0
The course content was:	13			31%	69%			2.2	0	0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	13			31%	38%	23%	8%	2.0	0	0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	13			15%	46%	23%	15%	1.8	0	0

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	12	25%	8%	17%	50%				4.5	1	1
The intellectual challenge presented was:	12	17%	17%	33%	33%				5.0	2	1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	12	33%	42%	8%	17%				6.1	7	5
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	12	17%	58%	8%	17%				5.9	6	4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	12	33%	25%	25%	17%				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
	8%	8%	17%	17%	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
17%	8%	25%	8%	17%	17%			8%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.8 (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
50%	33%	17%												

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
83%				17%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst	DECILE RANK College
Course organization was:	12		17%	17%	58%	8%		2.2	0	
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	12		8%	42%	25%	17%	8%	2.5	0	
Explanations by instructor were:	12	8%		33%	33%	17%	8%	2.2	0	
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	12		17%	33%	33%	8%	8%	2.5	0	
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	12		17%	42%	17%	17%	8%	2.7	0	
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	12		17%	42%	25%	8%	8%	2.7	0	
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	12	8%	25%	17%	25%	25%		2.5	0	
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	12	8%	17%	50%	17%		8%	3.0	0	
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	12		8%	42%	42%	8%		2.5	0	
Answers to student questions were:	12		8%	42%	25%	25%		2.5	0	
Availability of extra help when needed was:	12	17%	17%	25%	17%	17%	8%	2.8	0	
Use of class time was:	12			17%	25%	25%	33%	1.2	0	
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	12	8%	8%	25%	50%	8%		2.3	0	
Amount you learned in the course was:	12		17%	42%	17%	25%		2.7	0	
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	12		25%	42%	17%	17%		2.9	0	
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	12		17%	17%	58%	8%		2.2	0	
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	12	8%	8%	25%	42%	17%		2.3	0	
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	12	8%	17%	25%	25%	17%	8%	2.5	0	

B IMD 363 A
Studio Elements III: Practicum
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 13/31 (42% 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. I think there are really interesting and exciting concepts and practices in game design, but unfortunately, I don't think we were able to experience much of them. The practice did not coincide with the instruction which created this wide disconnect that was really hard to shake off.

2. The class was intellectually stimulating, but in a very frustrating way. It felt like most of the learning we actually had to apply was self-directed, but we were also given directed learning that we didn't actually end up applying to many of the assignments. Most of what I learned as a result of this class I learned from looking up tutorials online.

3. The challenges brought up through class projects and assignments required a lot of independent study and learning. I'm well practiced with that so I got a lot out of it, but I could other people crashing really hard if they didn't have self-teaching skills.

4. This class allowed me to look at games as a designer of games rather than a player. I do not play games so I did not care for the subject matter, but in the end I enjoyed thinking of new ways to improve the overall game feel and aesthetic of our game.

5. Yes, because we need to self- teach ourselves since I learned nothing from this class. I understand it's a class that we potentially have to self- teach ourselves but at least teach us some basic knowledge on how to work with unity would really help us a lot, especially when we are working on small assignments and group projects.

6. Yes, made me search and learn for creative alternatives to game design when answers weren't present.

7. Super interesting game design but lectures could have been shorter

8. Yes in some ways, but not really as I did not understand unity from the start and I had to learn most basic through youtube videos

10. The class content was very intellectually stimulating, it stretched my thinking by forcing me to learn about different game genres, subjects, and topics I had no prior knowledge of. Additionally, it forced me to learn about game theories I had no knowledge about.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Working with my classmates.

2. There were a couple of assignments, one about finite state machines and one about paper prototyping, that expanded upon what we learned in the readings and made us apply those concepts. These assignments were great, and I actually had a lot of fun working on them.

3. Working on projects was really interesting and caused me to "go and figure out" a lot of new things. I picked up a lot through trying to complete project challenges.

4. Working in teams. Looking at examples.

5. None.

6. Creative freedom to create games as i saw them

8. YOUTUBE TUTORIALS

9. Independent learning.

10. Friday class sessions with the opportunity to work with my group mates and class mates to just learn, work, and grind.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. It didn't feel like Yusuf was here to work with us. Like I mentioned before, there was a huge disconnect between the time that was devoted to lectures, and the time we had to practice and implement the material. Our lab time was poorly structured. Our TA or whoever was only available on days we did not have lab or class, and Yusuf told us that we would need to rearrange our schedules in order to utilize their assistance. In short, we were not given enough support during either times, to work and collaborate within our cohort. There was also a significant amount of tension between Yusuf and students that built up throughout the quarter. Unfortunately, I feel like there was a mutual disrespect of each other's time and commitment to the class.

2. The weekly unity challenges in the first half killed this course for me. They were by far the most intense assignments we had in that portion of the quarter, and they had nothing to do with the readings. They were just there to get us ready to make a game in Unity at the end of the quarter. Meanwhile, the course was trying to teach us about actual game design, but we ended up skimming the readings so that we could get to the assignments that we were actually being graded on. This wouldn't be so bad if we had more readings on how to use Unity. The only direction we were given in the beginning was to watch and read a series of tutorials online that barely scratched the surface of how to use Unity. These tutorials were helpful, but only in very specific circumstances. Aside from the Unity animation controller and navmesh system, the rest was up to us to figure out on our own. The class was torn between being a class about learning how to design games and learning how to use Unity to make what you designed. We didn't have time to do both, and since this class tried just that, it feels like we barely learned either.

3. Lecture at some points felt really relevant to the course, however a majority of the time it felt really out of place. The information was all valuable, but I can see why most people got really frustrated about the lack of immeadiate relevance. If someone wasn't really interested in game development, but was taking the course because it was a pre-requisite: their eyes probably rolled back quite a bit. There's was also a lot of odd public shaming stints and strange behaviors that really freaked out a bunch of the students. Girls left the room crying, the professor would talk about people when they were out of earshot, and he would pause lecture if any particular person wasn't paying absolute attention. It was kind of frustrating, because the lecture kept stopping short even when the majority of people were trying to follow along. A lot of people lost interest in the class and stopped showing up. I never jumped ship myself, but it was really discouraging to see the classroom get thinner and quieter as time went on.

4. Not working with Unity during class time. Trying to make a new learning style work as I do not learn best by reading and taking notes directly from a slideshow presentation. I felt I did not grasp concepts through lecture, but by doing it myself on my own time.

5. The content of the class material is very unorganized and vague, especially assignments and projects. It would be very helpful if professor Pisan can teach us some basic skills on how to work with unity for us to be able to apply those skills on assignments and projects.

6. The teacher. Acts like a high school teacher towards students using their devices IN A CLASS AND MAJOR THAT DOES 100% OF OUR WORK ON OUR DEVICES

8. boring lectures that doesn't make me understand unity any better

9. Poor use of class time.

10. Actual class lecture on Tuesday and Thursday was utterly pointless, useless, and just an entire waste of time.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. There has to be more engagement with the material and within the cohort.

2. I think a class on game design is a great idea. I also think a class on how to use Unity is a great idea. I don't think mixing the two into one ten-week course is a good idea at all. I think if this course is going to be run again, it needs to be one or the other. If it's a course on how to design games, then let the students pick their engine. That way, if someone knows how to use Unity, they can use it. If they don't, they can learn a simpler engine like Game Maker and not be as overwhelmed. If it's a course on how to use Unity, then give the students more readings on Unity and take out the readings on general game design. The constant Unity assignments meant that the readings on game design went in one ear and out the other, if students even did them when they could have been working on the Unity assignments. I love game design, and I want this class to be good. However, as it is right now, I just don't think it's working. A class like this will scare people away from game design more than it will get them interested in it, and I don't want that to happen. I think that for this class to work, it'll need extensive reworking, and if it can't get that kind of reworking, I don't know if it should be an IMD requirement.

3. Don't single people out so often, it's awkward and feels wrong to watch as a bystander. I'd have liked working on more short-term challenges, maybe discussions about mandatory readings (maybe require reflection papers?). The lecture could've been translated into reading assignments that we discuss together as a class. Keep up the efforts in trying to connect and encourage students (there was definitely some of that and you could definitely tell it was genuine, but it was off-putting to hear it after someone sitting behind you just got humiliated).

4. Using class time to work on our projects. Not having so many mini-projects so we get more time to work on our final project. Less presentations, more in class demos. Improve assignments so they feel more integrated with what we are learning.

5. Give students class time to work on big projects, because you cannot expect us to build a perfect game without giving us in class time to work on it while assisting us when we meet problems. Also, explaining and clarifying what needs to be done and included for small assignments would be great because the instructions can sometimes be very vague.

6. Use relevant lecture material and teach the students how to use the program you're supposed to be teaching.

7. more time to just play fun games and learn about why they are fun

8. Maybe guide everyone on unity more instead of expanding our thinking in making games? I feel like if we taught to use unity, we would spend less time on youtube and possibly make an awesome game

9. More structure. More in-class tutorials for better use of class time.

10. Actually teach unity during class instead of expecting the class to teach themselves. I don't pay my tuition money to listen to an instructor show me game trailers and explain what agile frame work is. The way this class was taught this quarter was embarrassing and absolutely below the standards I expected of IMD.

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.