CSS 385 A
Introduction To Game Development
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I
Responses: 8/42 (19% 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:

Median	College Decile
4.3	**5**
(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: 5.0
(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 distance learning course as a whole was:	7	43%	14%	29%	14%			4.0	4	5
The course content was:	7	43%	14%	29%			14%	4.0	4	4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	43%	29%	14%		14%		4.2	3	4
The effectiveness of the distance learning format was:	7	57%	14%		14%		14%	4.6	6	7

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:	7	29%		29%	14%		14%	14%	4.8	2	3
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	14%	57%	14%	14%				5.9	6	6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7	29%	14%	29%	29%				5.2	2	2
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	14%	43%	14%	29%				5.7	4	4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	7	29%		57%	14%				5.1	1	1

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: 10.5 Hours per credit: 2.1 (N=7)

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
		43%			14%		43%				

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

Class median: 9.8 Hours per credit: 2 (N=7)

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
		43%			43%	14%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=7)

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
29%	29%	14%	14%								14%			

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

(N=7)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
29%		71%			

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
The helpfulness of the distance learning staff overall was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6	7	
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	7	57%	29%			14%		4.6	4	4
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	7		71%	14%			14%	3.8	2	2
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	7	14%	43%	14%	14%		14%	3.7	1	2
Tailoring of instruction to varying student skill levels was:	7	57%		29%			14%	4.6	7	
Clarity of course objectives was:	7	57%		14%	14%	14%		4.6	6	7
The organization of the study guide was:	7	57%		14%	14%	14%		4.6	6	
Content of the study guide was:	7	57%			29%	14%		4.6	5	
Relevance of textbook for self-study was:	6	33%		17%	17%	17%	17%	2.5	0	
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding course content was:	6	50%			33%		17%	3.5	2	3
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding course content was:	7	57%		14%	14%	14%		4.6	7	7
Usefulness of video media in understanding course content was:	7	57%		29%		14%		4.6	5	
Usefulness of online resources in understanding course content was:	7	57%	14%	14%		14%		4.6	7	7
Usefulness of audio media in understanding course content was:	7	57%		29%		14%		4.6	6	
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	7	57%	14%	14%		14%		4.6	6	6
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	43%		43%		14%		3.3	1	1
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	43%	14%	29%	14%			4.0	3	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	43%		29%		29%		3.2	1	1

CSS 385 A
Introduction To Game Development
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: I
Responses: 8/42 (19% 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. Yes it was, I had such a good time in this class. I loved learning and applying my css skills ive developed in other core classes and using them in a game that I really liked working on.

3. This class was very intellectually stimulating. I had to write code for a scenario I had never written for before (code being repeatedly called every frame), solve problems I had never encountered before (how to create a large map with small pieces efficiently, how to calculate physics, force, acceleration, etc), and I had to be creative throughout the process (researching those who came before, trying to create a new concept, weeding through hours of brainstorm material, confidence to say a potentially bad idea to the group to get things started).

4. Yes this class was intellectually stimulating! There was so much free rein to create whatever kind of game you wanted. I know for our group, we thought big and then had to reel it in based on what we could learn in the time we had.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Professor Pisan, you always make class interesting. I like the effort you have put into designing interesting lectures.

2. My team definitely contributed to my learning because they were both very responsive and helpful.

3. The first line-up of projects really helped me get a handle on Unity and wrap my mind around how to code for games. The term project forced me to be self-reliant since every team was solving a very different set of problems. Overall, the projects (and the research required to complete them) were really important. The postmortem paper was also a key factor. It was so useful to learn from their experience.

4. The final project and the feedback forms we filled out for the other groups. The feedback forms didn't provide a lot of help for changes to make to our own game but they helped us look critically at our game and get ideas from other games. The only time we took the feedback from others into account was during the play testing when they gave us verbal feedback. Mostly because the early feedback were things we either had in the works, or wouldn't have time to implement on top of the things we wanted to do.

5. None. Everything I learned was a result of self-teaching, trial and error, and YouTube tutorials.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. It felt like I did not get enough help with homework. I had to google or consult my other project partners in group assignments to devise a plan. The assignments helped, but like we had to google a lot. Although your lectures are interesting, I wish it is more direct. Like perhaps you should work on a game from start to finish throughout the first 5-6 weeks of class to show us how you can do a game as a sample.

2. Nothing did.

3. Unity behaves so mysteriously. I often would have duplicate files suddenly generate themselves causing hundreds of error messages (this happened 3 times). Most of the time when I merged, things happened smoothly, but sometimes things would break unexpectedly due to a mysterious error that would resolve if I cut the code from a file and then pasted it back in. Unity is an amazing tool, but also confusing and buggy.

4. Things like the game analysis class exercise and the imagine play exercise. I felt like we didn't have enough time in class to flesh out these types of assignments and they didn't help us form the game any better than what we already had. Also the Hero assignment with cameras. The first two Heros were very helpful for teaching us Unity and how to look up how to do things. But the third one just cut into our final game development time and didn't teach us that much more.

5. Wasted time every class to do a sing-along. One class was spent entirely on chatting about Animal Crossing. A LOT of wasted time in this class.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. I cant think of any.

3. 1. Prepare a .gitignore file for students so that they don't run into the horrible errors we had to troubleshoot (unless that was by design?). 2. Explicitly say that you can merge code to main from branches on a unity project and scene settings and everything will be preserved. My team was uncertain how unity reacted to git merges and spent about 1-3 weeks testing to make sure it worked before we could safely establish a workflow.

4. The class is focused on the final project, but not a lot of class time is dedicated to helping further that project along. It might be nice to have more classes either teaching you Unity mechanics or just showing you what all Unity can do. That way you know what's possible and what to try to teach yourself. All of the game analysis assignments didn't really work well because the games were too short, there was no story and primary focus in the long term so all of the games could only really be was "challenge" theme.

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.