

CS 4730-001 Computer Game Design - Spring 2014

ENGR (20597)

INSTRUCTORS: Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Respondents: 24 / Enrollment: 61

Summary: CS 4730-001 Computer Game Design - Spring 2014 (20597)			
Overall Course Rating		Overall Instructor Rating	
CS-4730-001 Mean 4.29 CS-4730-001 Std Dev 0.86 CS-4730-001 Response Count 118		INSTRUCTOR: Sherriff, Mark Mean 4.57 Std Dev 0.67 Response Count 166	
Difference from Category Mean, Expressed in Category Standard Deviations		Difference from Category Mean, Expressed in Category Standard Deviations	
SEAS, 4000-level courses Mean 4.19 SEAS, 4000-level courses Std Dev 0.89 SEAS, 4000-level courses Response Count 9293		SEAS, 4000-level courses Mean 4.38 SEAS, 4000-level courses Std Dev 0.80 SEAS, 4000-level courses Response Count 13773	

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~						
<p>1. Did the "gamification" of the grading system in the course help or hurt your enjoyment of the course? Did it make sense? What could be done to improve the system?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">~ Question Type: Short Answer ~</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Individual Answers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">21</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>See below for Individual Results</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It made a lot of sense. I thought that it was helpful in motivating me to do work.</p> <p>It made sense, it was fun, more game-like activities would be great.</p> <p>It made me want to do the assignments and do them well because it was so satisfying to "level up".</p> <p>The course was definitely more enjoyable. Perhaps have more random encounter opportunities to balance out the lengthier time requirements to write the critical eyes/written words.</p> <p>I think that it was a great alternative to a traditional grading system. If you were to change anything, I would say integrate it even more into the curriculum (e.g., maybe Time Mages can submit certain assignments a day late, or other such perks).</p> <p>It made it much more fun. It made sense. To improve it, add more to it. Make it more involved and in depth.</p> <p>I thought it really helped. Overall it made knowing how I was doing in the course far easier than in any other course. It also helped me to better know what was going on. My one thought on improving is to give students more choice in the types of outside homework, I felt that while critical eyes and written words were effectively I would have preferred some more variation in the types of optional outside work to do. After doing like 3 critical eyes it started becoming more tedious than useful for my own education.</p> <p>No. I feel very strongly against the gamification in this class. I found it distracting, and felt that it took the focus off the course content. As a student, I did not know where my grade stood due to my unfamiliarity with the XP system. It was all very confusing and gimmicky. I can't emphasize enough how much I disliked the XP and VP system.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>I enjoyed it, but it made it more difficult to see how I was doing on my overall grade. At the end of the semester, I was surprised to see that I needed to complete several more side quests to get to an A. I think it would be helpful to have information on what level we should be at at different points in the semester to achieve a certain grade, if that is possible.</p> <p>There should have been more experience in the system. When I thought it wouldn't be required to write so many papers to get an A, I was excited to "game the system" by doing them. When I realized I would have to do them to do well, however, it took the joy out of doing them.</p> <p>Yes, but I think it also made the TA's more likely to take off "XP" instead of thinking of it as percentage points of your grade.</p> <p>It was great. I knew where I was at all times. Could have a couple of group side quests.</p> <p>The gamification of the grading system helped immerse the student in the game design attitude. Perhaps making it more clear that optional quests, such as Critical Eyes/Written Words, would be necessary to achieve an A or a B earlier on in the course would prevent so many students from submitting them at the last minute.</p>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark		Total	Individual Answers	21	<i>See below for Individual Results</i>
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Individual Answers						
21	<i>See below for Individual Results</i>						

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

I think it made the course more enjoyable, and was a more fun alternative to a traditional grading scheme. No improvements that I can think of at the moment.

I answered this on the exam

Gamification did help. It was hard to adapt to. The scaling between levels should be more evenly spread out between 1-20 instead of having the Grades matter the most between lvls 16-20. I'm not too sure how this can be implemented though

It did not make sense - things to spend VP on were not clear, though it is cool in theory.

It helped.

Cool idea... but it did kind of leave me in the dark about my grades. I ended up not getting the grade I was aiming for in the class, but also, I did everything possible to obtain that grade. Game programming is hard to do in a team.

It helped my enjoyment of the course and made sense. The system could have been improved by adding more types of quests.

2. Which of these was most motivating for you in the class?

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Achievements (Name That Tune, etc) (NA)	Titles (The Dreamer, etc) (NA)	Classes (Scout, etc) (NA)	Victory Points (the chips) (NA)	VP Rewards (Flasks, etc) (NA)	Quest-style Assignments (NA)	Gamercard System (NA)	XP Grading System (NA)
24	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	3 (12.50%)	4 (16.67%)	6 (25.00%)	10 (41.67%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Achievements (Name That Tune, etc) (NA)	Titles (The Dreamer, etc) (NA)	Classes (Scout, etc) (NA)	Victory Points (the chips) (NA)	VP Rewards (Flasks, etc) (NA)	Quest-style Assignments (NA)	Gamercard System (NA)	XP Grading System (NA)
24	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	3 (12.50%)	4 (16.67%)	6 (25.00%)	10 (41.67%)

3. Which of these motivated you the least?

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Achievements (Name That Tune, etc) (NA)	Titles (The Dreamer, etc) (NA)	Classes (Scout, etc) (NA)	Victory Points (the chips) (NA)	VP Rewards (Flasks, etc) (NA)	Quest-style Assignments (NA)	Gamercard System (NA)	XP Grading System (NA)
24	8 (33.33%)	4 (16.67%)	10 (41.67%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.33%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Achievements (Name That Tune, etc) (NA)	Titles (The Dreamer, etc) (NA)	Classes (Scout, etc) (NA)	Victory Points (the chips) (NA)	VP Rewards (Flasks, etc) (NA)	Quest-style Assignments (NA)	Gamercard System (NA)	XP Grading System (NA)
24	8 (33.33%)	4 (16.67%)	10 (41.67%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.33%)

4. How accurate is this statement for you: The project was of acceptable length.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
24	4.46	0.72	13 (54.17%)	10 (41.67%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
67	4.42	0.72	34 (50.75%)	30 (44.78%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (4.48%)	0 (0.00%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

5. How accurate is this statement for you: The project was of acceptable difficulty.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
24	4.54	0.51	13 (54.17%)	11 (45.83%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
66	4.50	0.53	34 (51.52%)	31 (46.97%)	1 (1.52%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

6. How accurate is this statement for you: The project helped me better understand the phases and intricacies of software development.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
24	4.46	0.59	12 (50.00%)	11 (45.83%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
67	4.40	0.63	32 (47.76%)	30 (44.78%)	5 (7.46%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

7. Which topic/lecture in this course was your favorite and why?

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark	
Total	Individual Answers
20	See below for Individual Results

All of the more code-oriented topics, like design patterns, physics, collisions, pathfinding, etc. These are the topics that most directly relate to learning how to code a game, which was my major motivation for this class.

The first lectures were interesting because I didn't know about game design at first.

World building was great. Very detailed, and it gave me new perspectives.

World building by Weimer was awesome. That's a really interesting and extremely difficult topic. But otherwise I really enjoyed the two lectures on input devices. The history of the controllers is extremely interesting and really helped change the way I look at many of the games I play now.

Physics and collisions

Everything! If I had to choose one though, MDA. It is easy to remember and a very important concept to know about games.

Collision detection, as I am interested in it

Scale vs. Kind was a very enlightening topic and made me realize a lot about the design of all games.

aesthetics/MDA

Learning about the game loop was fascinating to me. It's a completely different style of programming than what I'm used to. Learning how to think in "cycles" was a bit odd and really helped me to understand the mechanical

ECS, because I learned the most from it.

Physics. It was interesting to see how to model a physical system.

I really enjoyed any time we got pieces of video game history integrated into design discussions. For example, the lecture on the evolution of input mechanics with a demonstration of controllers was brilliant. It becomes easy to see why something is done, what problems are created, and what different approaches to solving those problems can be.

World Creation

World building with Weimer -- intricate and thought provoking. Of the non-guest lectures, controller design.

I loved the material on MDA. I felt like it provided a very helpful framework for the rest of the material in the class on game analysis.

My favorite was about second order design. I think it's very relevant for the future of the SAAS industry.

I thoroughly enjoyed the material on world building and game balancing.

Probably the history of games and the evolution of game controllers.

Balancing games because I like the activities involving D&D stuff. The lab that week was also fun (still with D&D)

8. Which topic/lecture in this class do you think you will find the most useful in the future?

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark

Total	Individual Answers
19	See below for Individual Results

ECS, AI

Game design approaches

I enjoyed learning about the economics and business aspect of Game Design.

MDA. for the same reasons.

Probably all of the game aesthetics. Despite these concepts being about games, I think they are applicable to a wider scope of things in the IT industry as well.

For me going into government contracting I think that the UI and means of control will be very applicable. However, overall I think every lecture will be very useful should I choose to do independent game development.

Physics implementation

Probably AI/ path finding or physics because we learned a little bit about some of the algorithms you can use to have fewer bugs because of the bullet through paper problem etc.

MDA

MDA

I'm hopeful that the lecture on monetization will prove useful.

The project will be most useful. I found the group work to be good software development experience.

Monetization. Revealed a lot of obstacles.

Play testing.

AI

Nothing really stands out more than the others for this, but I guess the more code oriented ones like I mentioned above.

Game architecture was particularly helpful. One issue you run into with the CS curriculum here as a whole is that students are taught to program for a single task or small system, and up to this point I think the only projects that remotely approached this scale had some built-in architecture. Solving class bloat and figuring out where and how to organize material was incredibly useful for game design in particular, but also CS in general, and I think it could have been earlier in the course (before we got too deep into our game's architecture) and more in-depth.

The AI overview was helpful in understanding how AI could/can be implemented. Also I found monetization lecture to be useful as well.

Understanding the basics behind AI and the various types of game development patterns.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

9. What lecture/topic(s) in this class "did not work" or were not seen as useful in the long run?

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark	
Total	Individual Answers
18	See below for Individual Results

Sprites

The material on game design patterns and ECS went over my head, not having taken 3240.

Everything was useful

None.

Some lecture topics felt a bit late in the process. My team, in particular, really could have benefited from the A* lecture much earlier. However, I understand that not all teams had use for this algorithm in their games.

narrative lessons - not much in the assignments had anything to do with it.

ECS, because I will never use it again.

n/a

idk

I don't think the fixes to reality were really pertinent to the rest of the course. It was an application of what we were learning that only pertained so far as it added some questions to the exams. It would certainly make a good lecture, but it didn't seem to warrant being half of our reading material.

The physics and collision lessons came too late in the year.

Not too sure

Indie game development.

Sprite lecture -- at that point, we already had learned sprites in Monogame

I guess monetization, since this course is about game design. it was a good lecture though!

Controller input

I think they were all useful.

They all worked, they were just out of order significantly. I feel as if the world creation lecture should have been one of the first lectures because it is essentially an introduction to how to craft a compelling game world.

10. How accurate is this statement for you if you used the podcasts from this class: Podcasts were useful to catch up on material that I missed due to absences.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.36	0.74	7 (29.17%)	5 (20.83%)	2 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (41.67%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
66	4.38	0.82	24 (36.36%)	11 (16.67%)	6 (9.09%)	1 (1.52%)	0 (0.00%)	24 (36.36%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

11. How accurate is this statement for you if you used the podcasts from this class: The podcasts were useful to review material that I was unclear on.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.00	1.00	5 (20.83%)	4 (16.67%)	3 (12.50%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (45.83%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
67	4.38	0.88	25 (37.31%)	10 (14.93%)	5 (7.46%)	2 (2.99%)	0 (0.00%)	25 (37.31%)

12. How often did you listen to the podcast for a lecture?

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark						
Total	Every lecture (NA)	Nearly every lecture (NA)	Whenever I needed to review a topic (NA)	Only when I missed a class (NA)	Randomly just to see what it was like (NA)	Never (NA)
24	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (33.33%)	4 (16.67%)	1 (4.17%)	11 (45.83%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses						
Total	Every lecture (NA)	Nearly every lecture (NA)	Whenever I needed to review a topic (NA)	Only when I missed a class (NA)	Randomly just to see what it was like (NA)	Never (NA)
67	1 (1.49%)	0 (0.00%)	27 (40.30%)	11 (16.42%)	2 (2.99%)	26 (38.81%)

13. Do you have any suggestions/comments that we should take into account for future projects for this course?

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark	
Total	Individual Answers
13	See below for Individual Results

no

no

Maybe have two waves of playtesting, or at least people should, on their own, playtest once more before the expo

Make VP uses clearer, start programming early on (first half of the course had little to none of it)

Clearer guidelines on what should be done at the alpha and beta stages.

I think that the readings and lectures should be better integrated with where we are in the lecture. I often found myself googling solutions to problems (e.g., collision detection) only to learn about them several weeks later. I find it unlikely that by the time the collision detection lecture occurred, anyone who needed it hadn't already solved that problem. Why would lectures on prototyping come after lectures on balancing? Things like game architecture and ECS were put in a little too late to really make full use of what we were learning without spending a lot of time re-writing code. All the material was useful, but just not quite in the order I needed to develop a game alongside it.

start earlier

Be up front about time constraints, but also take into account the difficulty of the game being implemented. The platformer games were very crisp, but that's because their mechanics were done by the time the prototype was pitched to the class.

Smaller teams.

Maybe give us a few more tutorials on how to do things in Monogame

The project should somehow be extended, in that the time for the prototype should be halved and the project should start from the very beginning of the class. Also, the game expo should be during finals week. I feel as if we only had a month to really develop the game, and there were unfair expectations on what we had to do within the time limit.

Nope

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~																																																
	Not really, fun class, good challenging project.																																																
<p>14. During the project, how many hours per week did you dedicate specifically to project work?</p> <p>Question Type: Multiple Choice</p> <p>~</p> <p>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>0-2 (NA)</th> <th>3-5 (NA)</th> <th>6-8 (NA)</th> <th>9-12 (NA)</th> <th>13-16 (NA)</th> <th>17 or more (NA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>6 (25.00%)</td> <td>8 (33.33%)</td> <td>6 (25.00%)</td> <td>3 (12.50%)</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>0-2 (NA)</th> <th>3-5 (NA)</th> <th>6-8 (NA)</th> <th>9-12 (NA)</th> <th>13-16 (NA)</th> <th>17 or more (NA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>67</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>27 (40.30%)</td> <td>22 (32.84%)</td> <td>10 (14.93%)</td> <td>6 (8.96%)</td> <td>2 (2.99%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							Total	0-2 (NA)	3-5 (NA)	6-8 (NA)	9-12 (NA)	13-16 (NA)	17 or more (NA)	24	0 (0.00%)	6 (25.00%)	8 (33.33%)	6 (25.00%)	3 (12.50%)	1 (4.17%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							Total	0-2 (NA)	3-5 (NA)	6-8 (NA)	9-12 (NA)	13-16 (NA)	17 or more (NA)	67	0 (0.00%)	27 (40.30%)	22 (32.84%)	10 (14.93%)	6 (8.96%)	2 (2.99%)						
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	0-2 (NA)	3-5 (NA)	6-8 (NA)	9-12 (NA)	13-16 (NA)	17 or more (NA)																																											
24	0 (0.00%)	6 (25.00%)	8 (33.33%)	6 (25.00%)	3 (12.50%)	1 (4.17%)																																											
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	0-2 (NA)	3-5 (NA)	6-8 (NA)	9-12 (NA)	13-16 (NA)	17 or more (NA)																																											
67	0 (0.00%)	27 (40.30%)	22 (32.84%)	10 (14.93%)	6 (8.96%)	2 (2.99%)																																											
<p>15. How would you rate the availability of TAs?</p> <p>Question Type: Likert</p> <p>~</p> <p>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Excellent (4)</th> <th>Good (3)</th> <th>Average (2)</th> <th>Weak (1)</th> <th>Very Poor (0)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>0.51</td> <td>12 (50.00%)</td> <td>12 (50.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Excellent (4)</th> <th>Good (3)</th> <th>Average (2)</th> <th>Weak (1)</th> <th>Very Poor (0)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27</td> <td>3.48</td> <td>0.51</td> <td>13 (48.15%)</td> <td>14 (51.85%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)	24	3.50	0.51	12 (50.00%)	12 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)	27	3.48	0.51	13 (48.15%)	14 (51.85%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)																																										
24	3.50	0.51	12 (50.00%)	12 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)																																										
27	3.48	0.51	13 (48.15%)	14 (51.85%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
<p>16. How would you rate the helpfulness of the TAs?</p> <p>Question Type: Likert</p> <p>~</p> <p>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Excellent (4)</th> <th>Good (3)</th> <th>Average (2)</th> <th>Weak (1)</th> <th>Very Poor (0)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>3.21</td> <td>0.51</td> <td>6 (25.00%)</td> <td>17 (70.83%)</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Excellent (4)</th> <th>Good (3)</th> <th>Average (2)</th> <th>Weak (1)</th> <th>Very Poor (0)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27</td> <td>3.19</td> <td>0.48</td> <td>6 (22.22%)</td> <td>20 (74.07%)</td> <td>1 (3.70%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)	24	3.21	0.51	6 (25.00%)	17 (70.83%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)	27	3.19	0.48	6 (22.22%)	20 (74.07%)	1 (3.70%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)																																										
24	3.21	0.51	6 (25.00%)	17 (70.83%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)	Very Poor (0)																																										
27	3.19	0.48	6 (22.22%)	20 (74.07%)	1 (3.70%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
<p>17. How often did you make use of the TA office hours?</p> <p>Question Type: Multiple Choice</p> <p>~</p> <p>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Every week (NA)</th> <th>Every other week (NA)</th> <th>Once per assignment (NA)</th> <th>Rarely (NA)</th> <th>Never (NA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>7 (29.17%)</td> <td>8 (33.33%)</td> <td>8 (33.33%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Every week (NA)</th> <th>Every other week (NA)</th> <th>Once per assignment (NA)</th> <th>Rarely (NA)</th> <th>Never (NA)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27</td> <td>1 (3.70%)</td> <td>1 (3.70%)</td> <td>8 (29.63%)</td> <td>8 (29.63%)</td> <td>9 (33.33%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark						Total	Every week (NA)	Every other week (NA)	Once per assignment (NA)	Rarely (NA)	Never (NA)	24	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (29.17%)	8 (33.33%)	8 (33.33%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses						Total	Every week (NA)	Every other week (NA)	Once per assignment (NA)	Rarely (NA)	Never (NA)	27	1 (3.70%)	1 (3.70%)	8 (29.63%)	8 (29.63%)	9 (33.33%)												
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Every week (NA)	Every other week (NA)	Once per assignment (NA)	Rarely (NA)	Never (NA)																																												
24	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (29.17%)	8 (33.33%)	8 (33.33%)																																												
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	Every week (NA)	Every other week (NA)	Once per assignment (NA)	Rarely (NA)	Never (NA)																																												
27	1 (3.70%)	1 (3.70%)	8 (29.63%)	8 (29.63%)	9 (33.33%)																																												
<p>18. Any specific comments about the TAs you would like to share?</p> <p>Question Type: Short Answer</p> <p>~</p> <p>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Individual Answers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>See below for Individual Results</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark		Total	Individual Answers	7	See below for Individual Results																																										
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Individual Answers																																																
7	See below for Individual Results																																																
	<p>no</p> <p>no</p> <p>Nah. They cool.</p> <p>Very helpful</p> <p>None</p>																																																

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~ ~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Martin, Jack, and David - best T.A.s ever! They also did not just help only during their scheduled hours. Every single test/assignment, they were there to help while off the clock.

They were really nice

19. How was the balance between theory and technical?
 ~
 Question Type: Likert
 ~
 contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)
24	3.79	1.02	5 (20.83%)	13 (54.17%)	3 (12.50%)	2 (8.33%)	1 (4.17%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Weak (2)	Poor (1)
27	3.78	0.97	5 (18.52%)	15 (55.56%)	4 (14.81%)	2 (7.41%)	1 (3.70%)

20. What other topics do you wish we had time to cover or which topics did we cover that you wish we could have covered more deeply?
 ~
 Question Type: Short Answer
 ~
 contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark	
Total	Individual Answers
14	See below for Individual Results

Since I plan to play games more than create them, I would have appreciated more time spent on theory, but I thought the balance was fine, considering the number of students in the class who may actually build games later in life.

Designing for multiplayer, Game music

This is a tough one, but maybe looking at some examples of a design architecture for some specific games?

3D engines

Not a topic but, I wish we had more hands on things or demos at lab

Audio in games

Would have liked to go into more detail with MVC and different sorts of engines (like Unity).

Sprite animation/ sprite sheets etc.

I wanted more information of how to incorporate Sprite sheets and animations into Monogame. I also wish we had discussed more patterns of level loading and use in Monogame and in general.

I would have liked to explored game graphics more thoroughly.

None

I think we should have spent more time on technical solutions to theoretical problems. That's not to say "Show us example code," but more things in line with how pathfinding was handled; there is a problem, here's the gist of what your code should be doing to solve this.

There should have been an introduction to coding in XNA and going over some of the basic things, such as frames and basic sprite manipulation (which we got to eventually but as I mentioned earlier lectures were out of place in this class).

Wish we had covered monetization more deeply.

Since I plan to play games more than create them, I would have appreciated more time spent on theory, but I thought the balance was fine, considering the number of students in the class who may actually build games later in life.

Designing for multiplayer, Game music

This is a tough one, but maybe looking at some examples of a design architecture for some specific games?

3D engines

Not a topic but, I wish we had more hands on things or demos at lab

Audio in games

Would have liked to go into more detail with MVC and different sorts of engines (like Unity).

Sprite animation/ sprite sheets etc.

I wanted more information of how to incorporate Sprite sheets and animations into Monogame. I also wish we had discussed more patterns of level loading and use in Monogame and in general.

I would have liked to explored game graphics more thoroughly.

None

I think we should have spent more time on technical solutions to theoretical problems. That's not to say "Show us example code," but more things in line with how pathfinding was handled; there is a problem, here's the gist of what your code should be doing to solve this.

There should have been an introduction to coding in XNA and going over some of the basic things, such as frames and basic sprite manipulation (which we got to eventually but as I mentioned earlier lectures were out of place in this class).

Wish we had covered monetization more deeply.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

21. How accurate is this statement for you: The game library provided in the lab was essential for the course, either for learning game design or having a selection of games for evaluation.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
24	3.21	1.22	4 (16.67%)	5 (20.83%)	10 (41.67%)	2 (8.33%)	3 (12.50%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
27	3.11	1.25	4 (14.81%)	6 (22.22%)	10 (37.04%)	3 (11.11%)	4 (14.81%)

22. Rice 340 was a good location for this course and I found the lab machines a good resource to have.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
24	4.21	0.83	10 (41.67%)	10 (41.67%)	3 (12.50%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses							
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
27	4.11	0.89	10 (37.04%)	12 (44.44%)	3 (11.11%)	2 (7.41%)	0 (0.00%)

23. How often did you utilize the resources in Rice 340 after class hours?

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark						
Total	1-2 times total (NA)	3-4 times total (NA)	Avg. twice a week (NA)	Avg. three times a week (NA)	Almost daily on class days (NA)	Literally every day I could (NA)
24	5 (20.83%)	6 (25.00%)	6 (25.00%)	7 (29.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses						
Total	1-2 times total (NA)	3-4 times total (NA)	Avg. twice a week (NA)	Avg. three times a week (NA)	Almost daily on class days (NA)	Literally every day I could (NA)
27	7 (25.93%)	6 (22.22%)	7 (25.93%)	7 (25.93%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

24. Which did you find more useful for exploring ideas about game design: Critical Eyes or Written Words? Why?

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark	
Total	Individual Answers
20	See below for Individual Results

Critical Eyes, mainly since the ideas were there and it's a matter of finding them as you play through or review it. Written words kind of do almost the same thing but it's a lot harder to come up with a fun idea to go with so there's the big hurdle at the very start.

I thought both were equally useful. The Written Words forced me to

Both. They let me consider games from a non technical standpoint.

Both were helpful to explore game design, but I leaned towards critical eyes since I didn't have many innovative ideas for games that I thought would qualify for written words

Both were great, but I loved written words because it forced us to write very creative ideas and to think about why or why not a certain mechanic would be unique

I felt both were really useful to try and think of the game as a whole instead of merely examining individual pieces and really seeing the interconnectedness of the mechanics, dynamics, and aesthetics. However, I felt that having more choice would have been nice besides just reviews or a new idea.

Critical eyes--they forced me to think about the constitution of games I often played without thinking about.

Critical eyes - more grounded.

Critical eyes, because they focus more on the technical analysis than the creative aspects of design.

Written Words. They were good for planning ideas for games. Not so much Critical Eyes, because writing papers is not really my thing. (However, the verbal Critical Eye was helpful.)

Critical Eyes - forced me to actually evaluate games using game design concepts

Critical Eyes were more useful because I had to analyze a game. The Written Words became very repetitive after the first 2 because it was not a lesson in writing a game but rather coming up with enough interesting mechanics.

I preferred critical eyes. I had a few issues with written words: It felt like I would come up with a general idea, then just fill out a form. There was no real application of design principles necessary if the idea was good, they would just fall into place the same way they would have had I not taken the course. A lot of the fields weren't really relevant (How should I know what game libraries I would use to design a mobile game? If I've only ever designed a game in this class, how would I know how big a team I need or how long it would take? And does that matter?). I think Written Words could be reworked a lot to pertain more specifically to course material, and I think that critical eyes could be expanded (or have some alternative), so that specific aspects of larger games could be explored or compared. For example, I would have loved to write about how the resource system in Dark Souls II affects gameplay compared to more traditional gold/xp systems, but instead it was a footnote in a more surface-level exploration of the game as a whole.

Critical eyes because I just went through all the formal elements of a game one at a time and it helped me to learn that way

Both were useful because one came from the perspective of a game already designed, while another from a creative aspect.

I found Critical Eyes more useful, because I felt that it provided more opportunity to apply the concepts in the course to real-world examples.

Critical Eyes. Written Words require more original idea creation, which takes time. Critical Eyes did challenge the student, but the content was already present.

Critical Eyes. Helped me to hash through and break down my ideas about a game to figure out what was going into it and what the core components were. And it was helpful in seeing the possibilities of what games can be. Now I look at games more critically.

Critical Eyes, they allowed us to explore games and what made a game good or bad

Critical Eyes, began to see the game from a developer's view

25. Are there other "must play" games that you think should be included in the course?

Question Type: Short Answer

contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark	
Total	Individual Answers
14	See below for Individual Results

Hearthstone.

Yes, I think there should be a game from (almost) every genre required. Fighting game, sports game, RPG, etc.

I bought the Stanley Parable because it was recommended in one of your emails, and I think it approaches a "must play" for this course, although I would have it replace Gone Home rather than sit alongside it (since they do have a lot in common).

Portal.

no

WoW

Fez, Super Meat Boy

Cave Story?

Some form of a MMORPG.

No

The game should have many more must play games. This was my main gripe with the course. At the beginning, we were presented with the idea that we would be playing games for homework weekly. However, we only ever played two games. Some games that should be included: WOW, Halo 1

Titanfall

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~																																																
	<p>Risk of Rain. holy moly. just started playing it. it's a rogue-like rpg game with crazy game play and it's coop!</p> <p>None</p>																																																
<p>26. Ignore your grade in the course and consider this statement: I feel I have a better understanding about the concepts of game design because of this course.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ <i>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>4.75</td> <td>0.44</td> <td>18 (75.00%)</td> <td>6 (25.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27</td> <td>4.67</td> <td>0.48</td> <td>18 (66.67%)</td> <td>9 (33.33%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	24	4.75	0.44	18 (75.00%)	6 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	27	4.67	0.48	18 (66.67%)	9 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)																																										
24	4.75	0.44	18 (75.00%)	6 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)																																										
27	4.67	0.48	18 (66.67%)	9 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
<p>27. Ignore your grade and consider this statement: I have a better understanding about the ideas and technology behind game construction because of this course.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ <i>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>23</td> <td>4.65</td> <td>0.57</td> <td>16 (69.57%)</td> <td>6 (26.09%)</td> <td>1 (4.35%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>26</td> <td>4.58</td> <td>0.58</td> <td>16 (61.54%)</td> <td>9 (34.62%)</td> <td>1 (3.85%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	23	4.65	0.57	16 (69.57%)	6 (26.09%)	1 (4.35%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	26	4.58	0.58	16 (61.54%)	9 (34.62%)	1 (3.85%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)																																										
23	4.65	0.57	16 (69.57%)	6 (26.09%)	1 (4.35%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)																																										
26	4.58	0.58	16 (61.54%)	9 (34.62%)	1 (3.85%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
<p>28. To what degree do you agree with this statement: the team size from the project was appropriate (please elaborate in your class comments).</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ <i>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>4.25</td> <td>0.85</td> <td>10 (41.67%)</td> <td>12 (50.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>2 (8.33%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>67</td> <td>4.43</td> <td>0.70</td> <td>35 (52.24%)</td> <td>28 (41.79%)</td> <td>2 (2.99%)</td> <td>2 (2.99%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	24	4.25	0.85	10 (41.67%)	12 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	67	4.43	0.70	35 (52.24%)	28 (41.79%)	2 (2.99%)	2 (2.99%)	0 (0.00%)
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)																																										
24	4.25	0.85	10 (41.67%)	12 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																																																	
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)																																										
67	4.43	0.70	35 (52.24%)	28 (41.79%)	2 (2.99%)	2 (2.99%)	0 (0.00%)																																										
<p>29. How effective were the guest lectures? Comments or suggestions for the future?</p> <p>~ Question Type: Short Answer ~ <i>contributed by Sherriff, Mark (mss2x)</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Individual Answers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>19</td> <td><i>See below for Individual Results</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark		Total	Individual Answers	19	<i>See below for Individual Results</i>																																										
Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																																																	
Total	Individual Answers																																																
19	<i>See below for Individual Results</i>																																																
	<p>Great; all of them were helpful.</p> <p>Loved all of the guest lectures. Felt they added interesting and unique outside experience from the normal lectures. I liked that they were at the end of the semester, since they typically didn't have immediate pertinence to our projects, but provided useful information for going forward.</p> <p>Interesting but not always relevant</p> <p>They were effective but not well timed.</p> <p>The guest lecturers were great. I value Professor Sherriff's opinion on video games more than anyone else's, but it was good to hear from other points of view as well.</p> <p>fun</p> <p>Monetization was great to learn about!</p>																																																

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

Effective.

Great! Nice to hear from other people

The professor guest lectures were very interesting. The TA lectures were rather unorganized. Martin did the best job out of the TA lectures.

Great

They were very interesting if maybe not as practically useful for the course.

Guest lectures were solid

World creation was extremely effective I felt I learned a great deal that will help me should I plan to continue doing game development.

Awesome

I liked the TAs' lectures, and they provided a nice change of pace.

I liked them fine. I think it may have made more sense to spread out guest lectures over the course.

Effective! Get Weimer again next year

They were interesting but not very applicable to designing games

30. The course addressed technically rigorous subject matter consistent with the course objectives.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.33	0.96	13 (54.17%)	8 (33.33%)	2 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1860	4.40	0.72	934 (50.22%)	769 (41.34%)	89 (4.78%)	33 (1.77%)	12 (0.65%)	23 (1.24%)

31. The instructor used methods other than/in addition to traditional lectures (for example, active learning, in-class problems, collaborative learning, in-class discussion) effectively in this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
23	4.65	0.57	16 (69.57%)	6 (26.09%)	1 (4.35%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1974	4.29	0.86	924 (46.81%)	731 (37.03%)	161 (8.16%)	63 (3.19%)	26 (1.32%)	69 (3.50%)

32. There was a reasonable level of effort expected for the credit hours received.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
23	4.17	0.98	9 (39.13%)	12 (52.17%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.35%)	1 (4.35%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1860	4.30	0.84	875 (47.04%)	779 (41.88%)	111 (5.97%)	63 (3.39%)	26 (1.40%)	6 (0.32%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

33. The homework assignments helped me learn the subject matter.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.48	0.59	12 (50.00%)	10 (41.67%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1860	4.20	0.89	724 (38.92%)	680 (36.56%)	191 (10.27%)	56 (3.01%)	30 (1.61%)	179 (9.62%)

34. The textbook increased my understanding of the material.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	3.90	1.00	6 (25.00%)	9 (37.50%)	5 (20.83%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	3 (12.50%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1854	3.80	1.07	346 (18.66%)	387 (20.87%)	258 (13.92%)	109 (5.88%)	34 (1.83%)	720 (38.83%)

35. The course material was well organized and developed.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.50	0.72	15 (62.50%)	6 (25.00%)	3 (12.50%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1959	4.22	0.88	823 (42.01%)	803 (40.99%)	165 (8.42%)	75 (3.83%)	31 (1.58%)	62 (3.16%)

36. The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.62	0.71	17 (70.83%)	6 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1966	4.65	0.58	1344 (68.36%)	536 (27.26%)	44 (2.24%)	10 (0.51%)	6 (0.31%)	26 (1.32%)

37. The instructor was well prepared for class.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.79	0.51	20 (83.33%)	3 (12.50%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1967	4.48	0.72	1111 (56.48%)	654 (33.25%)	105 (5.34%)	22 (1.12%)	13 (0.66%)	62 (3.15%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

38. I received adequate preparation from the prior courses in the curriculum to be successful in this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
23	4.52	0.59	13 (56.52%)	9 (39.13%)	1 (4.35%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1859	4.12	0.89	681 (36.63%)	803 (43.20%)	222 (11.94%)	85 (4.57%)	26 (1.40%)	42 (2.26%)

39. The grading policy was fair.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.17	0.92	10 (41.67%)	10 (41.67%)	2 (8.33%)	2 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1969	4.24	0.87	879 (44.64%)	744 (37.79%)	208 (10.56%)	72 (3.66%)	22 (1.12%)	44 (2.23%)

40. The instructor responded adequately to in-class questions.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
24	4.58	0.58	15 (62.50%)	8 (33.33%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1973	4.48	0.70	1092 (55.35%)	715 (36.24%)	86 (4.36%)	20 (1.01%)	14 (0.71%)	46 (2.33%)

41. The instructor effectively used technology in support of the learning goals for this course.

Question Type: Likert

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
23	4.65	0.49	15 (65.22%)	8 (34.78%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses								
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1965	4.28	0.82	851 (43.31%)	779 (39.64%)	169 (8.60%)	54 (2.75%)	18 (0.92%)	94 (4.78%)

42. The average number of hours per week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was:

Question Type: Multiple Choice

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4730-001					
Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
24	0 (0.00%)	4 (16.67%)	8 (33.33%)	7 (29.17%)	5 (20.83%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses					
Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
1862	61 (3.28%)	569 (30.56%)	776 (41.68%)	281 (15.09%)	175 (9.40%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~																
<p>43. I learned a great deal in this course.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ contributed by Office of the Provost</p>	Results for CS-4730-001																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>4.54</td> <td>0.72</td> <td>15 (62.50%)</td> <td>8 (33.33%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	24	4.54	0.72	15 (62.50%)	8 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)									
24	4.54	0.72	15 (62.50%)	8 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1849</td> <td>4.29</td> <td>0.85</td> <td>888 (48.03%)</td> <td>727 (39.32%)</td> <td>146 (7.90%)</td> <td>66 (3.57%)</td> <td>22 (1.19%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	1849	4.29	0.85	888 (48.03%)	727 (39.32%)	146 (7.90%)	66 (3.57%)	22 (1.19%)
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)										
1849	4.29	0.85	888 (48.03%)	727 (39.32%)	146 (7.90%)	66 (3.57%)	22 (1.19%)										
<p>44. Overall, this was a worthwhile course.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ contributed by Office of the Provost</p>	Results for CS-4730-001																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>23</td> <td>4.61</td> <td>0.66</td> <td>16 (69.57%)</td> <td>5 (21.74%)</td> <td>2 (8.70%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	23	4.61	0.66	16 (69.57%)	5 (21.74%)	2 (8.70%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)									
23	4.61	0.66	16 (69.57%)	5 (21.74%)	2 (8.70%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1855</td> <td>4.30</td> <td>0.90</td> <td>935 (50.40%)</td> <td>684 (36.87%)</td> <td>139 (7.49%)</td> <td>58 (3.13%)</td> <td>39 (2.10%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	1855	4.30	0.90	935 (50.40%)	684 (36.87%)	139 (7.49%)	58 (3.13%)	39 (2.10%)
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)										
1855	4.30	0.90	935 (50.40%)	684 (36.87%)	139 (7.49%)	58 (3.13%)	39 (2.10%)										
<p>45. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ contributed by Office of the Provost</p>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>4.62</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>15 (62.50%)</td> <td>9 (37.50%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	24	4.62	0.49	15 (62.50%)	9 (37.50%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)									
24	4.62	0.49	15 (62.50%)	9 (37.50%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1963</td> <td>4.36</td> <td>0.77</td> <td>959 (48.85%)</td> <td>828 (42.18%)</td> <td>114 (5.81%)</td> <td>44 (2.24%)</td> <td>18 (0.92%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	1963	4.36	0.77	959 (48.85%)	828 (42.18%)	114 (5.81%)	44 (2.24%)	18 (0.92%)
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)										
1963	4.36	0.77	959 (48.85%)	828 (42.18%)	114 (5.81%)	44 (2.24%)	18 (0.92%)										
<p>46. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ contributed by Office of the Provost</p>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>1.02</td> <td>17 (70.83%)</td> <td>5 (20.83%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	24	4.50	1.02	17 (70.83%)	5 (20.83%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	1 (4.17%)
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)									
24	4.50	1.02	17 (70.83%)	5 (20.83%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.17%)	1 (4.17%)										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1964</td> <td>4.45</td> <td>0.78</td> <td>1137 (57.89%)</td> <td>643 (32.74%)</td> <td>131 (6.67%)</td> <td>33 (1.68%)</td> <td>20 (1.02%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	1964	4.45	0.78	1137 (57.89%)	643 (32.74%)	131 (6.67%)	33 (1.68%)	20 (1.02%)
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)										
1964	4.45	0.78	1137 (57.89%)	643 (32.74%)	131 (6.67%)	33 (1.68%)	20 (1.02%)										
<p>47. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.</p> <p>~ Question Type: Likert ~ contributed by Office of the Provost</p>	Results for CS-4730-001, Sherriff, Mark																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>0.59</td> <td>13 (54.17%)</td> <td>10 (41.67%)</td> <td>1 (4.17%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> <td>0 (0.00%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	24	4.50	0.59	13 (54.17%)	10 (41.67%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)									
24	4.50	0.59	13 (54.17%)	10 (41.67%)	1 (4.17%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)										
Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>Std Dev</th> <th>Strongly Agree (5)</th> <th>Agree (4)</th> <th>Neutral (3)</th> <th>Disagree (2)</th> <th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1969</td> <td>4.41</td> <td>0.79</td> <td>1081 (54.90%)</td> <td>700 (35.55%)</td> <td>130 (6.60%)</td> <td>36 (1.83%)</td> <td>22 (1.12%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	1969	4.41	0.79	1081 (54.90%)	700 (35.55%)	130 (6.60%)	36 (1.83%)	22 (1.12%)
Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)										
1969	4.41	0.79	1081 (54.90%)	700 (35.55%)	130 (6.60%)	36 (1.83%)	22 (1.12%)										

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~

~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

48. Please make any overall comments or observations about this course:

~
Question Type: Short Answer

~
contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4730-001	
Total	Individual Answers
14	See below for Individual Results

Fantastic course! Still working out some of the details of the structure, but Sherriff knows how to teach like very few other professors at UVa.

Great course

Professor Sherriff is the best instructor at UVA, especially for the Game Design course. The T.A.s were very knowledgeable and helpful. This was my favorite class ever. The only thing I would change is to reduce the size of the teams.

Congrats on being a Dad!

I have a lot of thoughts about this class. To sum it up, I think it comes down to the lack of balance between solid game design content and other stuff. The majority of effort in this class was spent on minutiae: XP and VP, guessing songs, nerd jokes, achievements, things like that. I get that some students like that and that its fun, and I'm not trying to be a huge grinch here, but frankly there wasn't good class content to balance all that out. The depth of topics covered was really superficial--for example, the "Game Physics" lecture did little other than cover newtons laws and conservation of momentum, along with some trivial takeaways like "you only need good enough physics". I left that lecture, along with several others, feeling like I had learned nothing about game design in the real world. I'm not trying to grill Prof. Sherriff here, but the content of the class needs to be beefed up quite a bit

Thought the class was too much effort/work to match the grade: I did really well on the exams and project and ended up with a B in the course. I would hope that in a project class the project would count for more.

Best class I've ever taken at UVA.

I never noticed anyone wearing overalls in lecture

Teams were slightly too large to split the work up without making one person just an art or asset person. Then again, I'm probably just bad at splitting work up and wanted to do too much myself. McGonigal was a good book, the workshop book less so. Excerpts from the workshop book would suffice as supplemental materiel

There's a new Sherriff in town.

Loved the course! Felt like I learned a good amount regarding game design and not just gaming in general

Great course. I strongly support the addition of more courses related to game-development.

Sherriff was really un-friendly outside of the classroom or office hours (any time he didn't have to be there)

I absolutely loved this class and the way the grading was set up. It's a little unclear how +/- grades will be determined because it seemed that level 19 would be an A and not half A, half A- so I hope that's the case