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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 10/46 (22% low)

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	College Decile
4.2	**4**
(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	College
The course as a whole was:	10	60%	30%	10%				4.7	7	8
The course content was:	10	40%	30%	20%	10%			4.2	4	5
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	10	30%	30%	10%	10%	20%		3.8	2	2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	30%	30%	10%	20%	10%		3.8	2	3

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	College
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	9	56%	11%		33%				6.6	9	9
The intellectual challenge presented was:	9	33%		44%	22%				5.1	3	2
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	9	44%	33%		22%				6.3	8	8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	9	44%	11%	22%	11%		11%		6.0	7	7
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	9	44%	22%		22%	11%			6.2	7	8

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: 11.2 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=9)

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
				22%	33%	22%	11%		11%		

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

Class median: 9.0 Hours per credit: 1.8 (N=9)

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
	22%		11%	22%	22%	11%			11%		

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 4.0 (N=9)

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
78%	11%		11%											

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

(N=9)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
	11%	89%			

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:	9	33%	22%	33%		11%		3.8	2	3
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	9	44%	33%	11%		11%		4.3	3	4
Explanations by instructor were:	9	44%	22%	22%		11%		4.2	4	5
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	9	44%	22%	11%	11%	11%		4.2	4	5
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	9	44%	22%	22%	11%			4.2	3	4
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	9	56%	11%	11%	22%			4.6	6	7
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	9	56%	11%	11%	22%			4.6	4	5
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	9	67%	22%	11%				4.8	5	6
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	9	67%	22%		11%			4.8	6	7
Answers to student questions were:	9	56%	11%	33%				4.6	5	6
Availability of extra help when needed was:	9	44%	22%	22%	11%			4.2	3	4
Use of class time was:	9	56%	22%	11%		11%		4.6	6	7
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	9	56%	22%		11%	11%		4.6	5	6
Amount you learned in the course was:	9	67%	11%	11%	11%			4.8	8	8
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	9	56%	22%	11%	11%			4.6	5	6
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	9	44%	22%	22%			11%	4.2	4	5
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	9	56%	22%		22%			4.6	5	6
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	9	33%	33%	22%			11%	4.0	3	3

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A
Responses: 10/46 (22% low)

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. Yes, especially the case studies on games such as Farm Simulator. I was also encouraged to explore a variety of skills in game development such as sound design and AI navigation.

2. Yes, this class does stretch my thinking because Professor Pisan gives us a lot of time to play other groups' games instead of talking about the lecture. We enjoy giving feedback and showing our game to others to play, and receiving their feedback and suggestions.

3. No, it took more time than intellect

4. This class was intellectually stimulating if you wanted it to be. You have to put in the effort if you want to learn.

5. Yes, game architecture raises challenges that was different from what I was used to in normal software architecture

6. Yes. Most of my game design experience prior to now has been primarily focused on creating and implementing a game, but this class forced me to think about playtesting, and building games for users rather than for myself.

7. Yes and Yes. This class required a lot of time spent doing personal projects and working within a team for the final group project almost all class assignments required critical thinking besides some of the tutorial projects so all of them were both intellectually stimulating and stretched my thinking.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The team project.

2. In-Class Activity Playing Others Game Giving Feedback Watching the trailer from the previous Student's Game Giving us time to work on our Game Project

3. Self projects

4. The individual assignments and the group project contributed the most to my learning in their own ways

5. Individual projects and final group project

6. The group project helped me learn the most as I needed to research and experiment with the Unity Packages and different methods of implementation. I found this trial and error method to be very helpful in learning about what to do and not do when creating games and software.

7. The projects and Unity Tutorial projects for sure.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Not much really.

2. None

3. No grading or thorough instructions for expectations

4. The assignment instructions for the individual assignemnts were conflicting and non-specific at times

5. Some of the lectures felt like bloat. But, this is probably because I like playing games and have experience in game development.

6. I did find myself sacrificing working on other projects in order to focus on the group project. I think this was beneficial to improving the outcome of our group project, but I did miss out on the experience I could have gotten with the 2 projects I skipped. However, I think the fault for this is primarily on my time management and my group's quality expectations.

7. None of the aspects of the class can really detract from the learning as a lot of the class is learning different unity elements on your own and applying them to the assigned projects.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. The lectures seemed to be such a minor part of the class that I was confused on why we did them. While I consider myself to have a lot of knowledge of game development, some of my peers probably wanted to learn more theory on what makes games fun.

2. I feel like 5 individuals project is quite a lot, because the final project took about 5 weeks to finish, and a 2-person project took about 2 weeks. Game mechanic write-up for about half a week. I would say including 4 individual projects would be enough to get 4.0 instead of 5 individual projects.

3. Better organization and instructions

4. Perhaps have more concrete milestones for the group project

5. None

6. No suggestions come to mind. I really enjoyed the way this class's content was presented and the grading methods used.

7. For improving the class I have just one suggestion maybe a few more classes covering different mechanics/unity features and how to implement them would be cool to give students a chance to learn more of the unity features from the professor directly.

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.