**Example Feedback on Game Projects**

Feedback on presentations was given immediately after the presentation using the Presentation Rubric, but *no points were considered*. The students could use this feedback to improve their final report, which was due 3-5 days later. When grading the project later, I took into account the presentation rubric comments I had made as well as comments I made on their final reports as well. Text that went to students is in **purple** ink.

***Fruit Ninja (24/25)***

Rubric comments in Presentation section:

* Attractive slide design and not too much text on slides.
* The slide design near the end wasn’t as good. There was a long Discussion slide and Conclusion slide that were essentially bullet points. Would have been a stronger presentation if you had different slides to make these points separately.
* I really liked your slide that showed the normal arcade play and arcade play with secondary task load. That was an excellent example the impact of the task.

Rubric comments in Content Besides Analysis section:

* Good overview of the game.
* Interesting article review about dyslexia.
* Might also consider adding some lit review based on academic research that’s related to these tasks, like visual search or Fitts’s law, etc.

Rubric comments in Analysis section:

* Nice analysis of the 3, 4, 5 point combos. So the high point combos are key.
* You talked about the missed fruits, but there wasn’t anything about missed fruits on the screen while discussing that. (Unless I missed it somehow.) Maybe have a display for missed fruit?
* Be sure to mention the ergonomic issues in the report, possibly citing our readings (longer nails on fingers, etc.).
* Didn’t hear as much analysis about bomb avoidance as I expected. Did you have any analysis about that? Could be something about the visual similarity between bombs and certain fruits. (This is not critical; just asking.)
* Is there any analysis you could do based on the data you have that would enable you to make predictions about how an expert vs. novice would score? E.g., “If a player does XYZ, they will score in range #-##.”
* It seems like you did a series of different analyses, but I wasn’t sure how they fit together. I could have been taking notes when you made the connection, but perhaps make sure the report has a steady flow like this.

Additional comments I made on the PDF of their report document at different points:

* Be sure to cite Figure 1 in the text somewhere, so the reader knows when they’re supposed to look at it.
* Would be a good place to cite visual search research.
* This article should be cited by its first author, like (Belchior et al., 2013)
* This is interesting! [Referencing one of their findings]
* Would have been more effective to have these data presented visually as charts to help make sense of them more quickly. (-1) [All the data were presented as tables.]
* Good citation! Might also consider Fitts’s law if you encounter something like this again. Or Hick-Hyman Law
* I wonder if it would have worked to have the non-native English speakers say the name of the fruit in their native language.

***Super Monkey Ball (22/25)***

This is one of the lower grades in the class for this project.

Rubric comments in Presentation section:

* Overall well-designed slides. Not too much content on one slide.
* But, often there was a lot of speaking about one slide without any visual change, which made it a little less engaging.
* Pic on Data Collected slide was a little blurry. Also, it’d be useful on that table to set all the numbers to the same precision (same number of decimal places) so that you can more easily visually scan to see numbers that are similar or different. A chart with bars corresponding to the numbers would be even better.
* I can imagine during the Analysis slide, you could have had brief videos illustrating the concepts (speed, balance by tilting, etc.) There was a lot of time on this slide with no visual change.

Rubric comments in Content Besides Analysis section:

* How did you define “expert” vs. “novice”?
* If you had “hypotheses” or “research questions,” be sure to note those.
* Be sure to explain details about your distraction task.

Rubric comments in Analysis section:

* I’m hoping the report can have more in-depth data analysis than in the slides. I liked the data you showed, but I’d like to see some charts so that you can see if there are patterns.
* Also, is there any way to put numbers on any strategy info that you measured between experts and novices?

Additional comments I made on the PDF of their report document at different points:

* It would have been nice to have a title and your names at the top.
* Report is well written and easy to read.
* Good followup on my “Content Besides Analysis” questions.
* Nice lit review!
* Good job on discussion, especially.
* You wrote about the timing (experts were quicker, slower when distracted etc.) but didn’t show any numbers or charts. Was hoping you’d turn the timing data into something visual. Overall, analysis didn’t seem as thorough as it could have been. (-3)

***Cytus (23.5/25)***

Rubric comments in Presentation section:

* Well-designed slides. Not too much content on one slide.
* Good job using your time, establishing the problem and describing the game quickly and then moving to your work.

Rubric comments in Content Besides Analysis section:

* I liked the way you defined novice and expert carefully.
* I liked your point and examples of how the distraction messages take up diff amounts of real estate on diff devices / OSs.

Rubric comments in Analysis section:

* Might re-do your data charts so that the data markers vary in shape, so that for someone color blind, they can still tell the diff between the data lines. The difference between blues are a little subtle.
* I might have been taking notes when you described what click-effect was, but be sure that’s described in the report.
* Did you mention how many novices vs. experts you had?
* Be sure to describe your messaging distraction method in detail.
* Did your data show novices learning over the initial songs? Wasn’t sure if players did an initial trial to get used to Cytus, e.g. with a diff song than the test trial songs.
* Do you think an audio distraction would have been more distracting than a visual distraction?
* Song dependence is an interesting idea. Can you elaborate any? What might be the features of the song that might affect that?
* Might consider drawing error bars on the data points in the charts.

Additional comments I made on the PDF of their report document at different points:

* In Figure 11.1 (and 12.1), I like having the graphs, but I can’t tell the difference between the two red triangle data glyphs, so I can’t tell which line is novice easy and which is novice hard. Plus, since the lines cross, it’s not really obvious. (-0.5)
* It’d be good to keep a consistent level of precision with your numbers, e.g., have 2 significant figures or 2 decimal places or some strategy like that. In Figure 11.2, the averages with large numbers of decimal places seem out of place. (-0.5)
* When you mention paper [3] that looked at Guitar Hero, it would have been nice if you reported on whether the paper answered its original question of whether the musical resources leveraged are similar to ones used by musicians. But maybe the paper didn’t answer its own question.
* Great job incorporating Fitts’ law! (Don’t forget the apostrophe.) Could include the Hick-Hyman law as well since in the more advanced levels of Cytus, there are multiple dots to choose from at a given time.
* I like your dynamic attention zone concept.
* I wasn’t really sure, with your messaging distraction task, what you measured. Was it whether they responded to the message? How fast they responded? Whether they noticed it? (-0.5)
* Also, whenever you have a mean, please report a standard deviation to indicate the variation range.
* Good discussion. Sorry the distraction messaging task didn’t work well.