

CSS 385 A
Introduction To Game Development
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Yusuf Pisan
Instructor Evaluated: Yusuf Pisan-Lecturer

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 24/46 (52% high)

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 (0=lowest; 5=highest)	College Decile 7 (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 College	
The course as a whole was:	24	50%	38%	4%	4%		4%	4.5	6	7
The course content was:	24	46%	29%	17%	4%		4%	4.4	5	6
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	24	62%	25%	8%			4%	4.7	6	7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	24	54%	29%	12%			4%	4.6	6	6

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)		(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median	DECILE RANK Inst College	
Relative to other college courses you have taken:												
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	24	12%	46%	8%	29%	4%				5.7	6	7
The intellectual challenge presented was:	24	25%	29%	29%	12%	4%				5.6	5	4
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	24	38%	17%	21%	17%	4%	4%			5.8	5	4
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	24	25%	33%	21%	17%			4%		5.8	5	4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	24	38%	21%	17%	17%	4%	4%			5.9	5	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: 8.9 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=23)

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
4%	4%	4%	22%	22%	9%	9%	9%			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=23)

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
4%	17%	4%	13%	22%	17%	4%	4%	4%		9%	

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.7 (N=23)

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
43%	43%		9%	4%										

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

(N=23)

In your major 48%	A core/distribution requirement	An elective 52%	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
-----------------------------	--	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------	--------------

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:	23	35%	35%	17%	4%	4%	4%	4.1	4	4
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	24	42%	21%	29%	4%		4%	4.1	4	5
Explanations by instructor were:	24	50%	25%	17%	4%		4%	4.5	6	6
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	24	50%	29%	12%	4%		4%	4.5	5	6
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	24	50%	29%	12%	8%			4.5	5	5
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	24	46%	38%	8%	4%		4%	4.4	5	5
Contribution of assignments to understanding course content was:	24	54%	25%	8%	8%		4%	4.6	7	7
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	24	75%	17%	4%	4%			4.8	7	7
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	24	42%	29%	17%	4%	4%	4%	4.2	4	4
Answers to student questions were:	24	38%	42%	12%	4%		4%	4.2	3	4
Availability of extra help when needed was:	24	46%	25%	17%	12%			4.3	4	4
Use of class time was:	24	46%	21%	12%	12%	4%	4%	4.3	5	5
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	24	54%	25%	12%	4%		4%	4.6	5	5
Amount you learned in the course was:	24	50%	25%	12%	8%		4%	4.5	6	6
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	23	52%	26%	17%		4%		4.5	5	6
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	24	54%	29%	8%	8%			4.6	6	7
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	24	58%	25%	12%			4%	4.6	7	7
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	24	58%	25%	8%	4%		4%	4.6	6	7

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: D
Responses: 24/46 (52% high)

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. There weren't many tutorials on Unity to the point where I was given too much freedom on how to learn what techniques to use when creating games through unity.
2. Yes, I gave me a different perspective of thinking about games as well as insight from guest speakers about the game-making process (everything that went into it). And actually applying that into the makings of my own game caused me to have think outside the box.
3. There were interesting application of machine states and AI that had only been vaguely touched on in other courses. It was nice to put the concepts into practice.
4. It was, the class discussions in the first half of the quarter were fun, interesting, relevant, and informative.
5. I already knew about unity, so I didn't get a lot from this class. I would want more talking about the game design, level design, psychology of games etc
6. Yes this class has been my favorite CSS elective so far. It was fun to work on a game and share it with the class as well as play other students games.
7. I loved this game because I love video games and studying video games.
8. Yes it stretch my thinking, the homework and final project need a lot of time to implement, sometime we have bugs, we have to google to find solutions
9. Yes, presents additional concepts of game design that people who are interested in may not think of.
10. Yes, most of this material was new so I had to think about it a good amount to understand it.
11. Yes. This class was intellectually stimulating because it was very fun, and yet also difficult because we were trying to implement so many new concepts.
12. The open ended nature of the final project allowed me to focus on more advanced unity concepts. The format of game development naturally draws effort out of me. By letting me set the bar high I learned a lot more than what was inside this classes scope.
13. Yes, there were a lot of technical aspects relevant to video games that I had not been made aware of before, despite my experience with games. I think my experience with games made picking up the material easier, but it was refreshing to experience the course learning new things.
14. Yes, the class was very interesting, and I feel like it had a perfect balance, I would not change much. Good progression, good presenters, great projects, and good homeworks / explanations.
15. It was intellectually stimulating.
16. Having never used Unity before, I feel that this class definitely challenged me. The gap between building games vs playing them has been eye opening to experience.
17. Yes great fun class
18. This class was stimulating for the first few weeks but quickly devolved into a terrible experience. Teacher only scratched the surface of core game design philosophy and went into random detail about less relevant parts of game design.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The guest speakers. Really gave me insights on the nitty gritty of the gaming industry
2. Tutorials and physically experimenting with what we are learning (making games).
3. Home work and online tutorials to learn how to use unity game engine. I don't learn well from hearing a theoretic lecture on topics until there is repeated practice in the material or there is explicit "how to" instructions. Finally learning GitHub despite getting a vanilla explanation that was not very helpful.
4. Class discussions, videos, guest speakers.
5. I liked the projects
6. working on the final project
7. I loved the presentations and the guest speakers.
8. different game mechanics
9. Final project was really fun and presented lots of good challenges. Also liked the guest presenters from the industry.
10. The projects and in-class examples.
11. I really liked the history of gaming that was presented through the different articles, as well as the smaller GDC videos.
12. Learning about Navmesh / state machine was the most relevant of assignments.

13. I think that the beginning assignments (the challenges) contributed most to my learning. Without that technical understanding of Unity, I would have had more difficulty decreasing the scope of the final project and I wouldn't have been as confident in my fundamental skills/knowledge of Unity.
14. The teacher is great, and does a good job at explaining things enthusiastically.
15. The final project and the guest speakers.
17. The homework
18. Doing everything myself.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. N/A
3. Class room set up was difficult to work in for group work. Working with people with low motivation, poor time management, or rigid thinking detracted the learning process. Minimal explanation on how to use gitignore file without actually showing what they are or how to create/use one in a manner that was helpful to all learning levels. I finally gave up on gitignore.
4. In the second half of the quarter, it was really difficult to know whether we were doing the right thing or not and whether we were on track. Grading based on class feedback is fine, but if most of your grades come from class feedback, your grade doesn't reflect how much you learned (we don't even know how much we are expected to learn!), but how impressive your product is.
5. Playing in class game like the cat mouse game, didn't do much. The sims hw wasn't very useful
6. nothing
7. The lectures could sometimes be a little hard to follow, but only barely. It's a very minor complaint.
8. none
9. Assignments like FSM are a big waste of time. Very short time between alpha and beta.
10. Some of the vague instructions were hard to know what was being asked of us.
11. None
12. For me personally, I was already familiar with unity and the basics of game dev. So a intro class was, of course, a little redundant, especially at the beginning. Not the fault of the class structure, just personal
13. The aspects of the class that detracted from my learning is the length of the presentations due to the sheer amount of groups in the class. Although, I think that it was important to have a paper prototype and a digital prototype.
14. Not much. I enjoyed it.
15. Not starting the final project at the start of the quarter.
17. None
18. Teacher expected us to make a fully fledged game using Unity but little to no time in class was actually spent teaching the students Unity.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. Perhaps go over an example of how to use certain parts of the game engine in the beginning as students are learning to consolidate their basic understandings of the game engine (lectures can only go so far)
3. Create a heavier consequence for slackers that don't pull their weight.
4. I'd prefer to have more measurable individual milestones throughout the second half of the quarter than just "hey, here is a theme, make a game and do dev logs". Maybe besides developing a game, we could also do something specific in Unity as individual homework deliverables that would teach us about various aspects of Unity (like we did with the FSMs and the pathfinding in-class exercise). If these tasks were defined so that they would take some small amount of time (let's say 2-3 hours), we'd all learn something, and still have enough time to develop the final game. As it is, after our final project is done, I will know a lot about UI and some other very specific aspects of Unity, but I will not know other things that I didn't work on at all (Animations, Sound, pathfinding, etc.)
6. more unity workshops
7. We covered some of these suggestions in class. Starting the final project earlier was a big one.
8. If you spend more time to talk about Unity, it should be good
9. Make the project throughout the entire class and not half the class.
10. I liked hearing from other developers so more of that would be nice.
11. I do not really have anything different than what was already said.
12. More unity, less "fun projects"
13. N/A
14. I think if we had more design time for the final project, and focused on limiting scope, that would be great.
15. Start the final project at the start of the quarter.
17. None
18. Actually teach Unity in addition to game design if you expect students to make a game. I couldn't really apply any game design philosophy when I was so focused on making the game function and not crash.

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.