Affordable Learning Georgia Textbook Transformation Grants

Final Report: Open Historical Game

General Information

Date: June 8, 2020

Grant Round: 1

Grant Number: Award ID: 000607-00001

Institution Name(s): Georgia Southern University

Project Lead: D. Jason Slone, Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Georgia Southern University. 912-478-5909. dslone@georgiasouthern.edu

Team Members (Name, Title, Department, Institutions if different, and email address for each):

Original team members: Claudia Cornejo Happel (Center for Teaching Excellence at GS); Ruth Baker (librarian at GS); Dr. Ahmet Akturk, Dr. Dan Pioske (GS Faculty, Subject Matter Experts/Content Advisors); Dr. Nicholas Proctor (Professor of History, Simpson College. nick.proctor@simpson.edu) and Dr. Mark Carnes (Professor of History, Barnard College. mcarnes@barnard.edu) Game Design Advisors; Dr. Melissa Gayan (GS Faculty, Play Tester)

NOTE: This changed during the course of the project. Claudia Cornejo Happel left GS for another job and thus wasn't able to participate. I was assigned a different librarian at GS, Dawn "Nikki" Rech participated rather than Ruth Baker (because Nikki knew more about OER). Faculty members Dr. Ahment Akturk and Dan Pioske provided informal comments and suggestions, but did not participate formally due to being too busy. And Dr. Gayan was unable to play-test the game because she had planned do so in the Spring semester, but we went fully online due to COVID-19.

Course Name(s) and Course Numbers: RELS 2100: World Religions

Semester Project Began: Fall 2019

Final Semester of Implementation: Fall 2019; January 2020

This changed from the original project plan. I had planned to run the game in the Fall 2019 semester and a second time in the Spring 2020 semester, but we went fully online in the Spring 2020 semester due to COVID so I was unable to play it that semester (although I modified it into a week-long debate online).

However, I was selected to run my game at the Reacting to the Past Winter Workshop at UGA in January 2020.

Total Number of Students Affected During Project: 66

1. Narrative

My goals for this project were to write a reacting game on the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict for use in RELS 2100: World Religions, in which I teach students about the history of Judaism (including the history of Israel) and the history of Islam (including modern Islam and the "War on Terror."), and in such a way that it could be used in many different types of courses in the USG. In addition, I wanted to develop the game using Open-Education Resources (OER) so as to help control educational costs for students.

I began the project in the Spring of 2019. I began researching (1) the history of the conflict, (2) role-playing "reacting" game design, and (3) how to find and use OER. In the Spring of 2019, with the help of a GSU College of Arts and Humanities undergraduate research grant, I was able to enlist the help of 3 undergraduate students at GS to research and help me draft role sheets. By the end of Spring 2019, I had written drafts of 35 role sheets and an outline of the gamebook (NOTE: I wrote the Instructor's Manual last). I also met with Nikki Rech during the Spring semester and shared with her my game needs. Over the course of the Spring and Summer, she shared numerous resources with me for how to find and use OER in the game/class.

In the Summer of 2019 I attended ta Reacting to the Past Game Designers conference in Ft. Myers, FL, and led a mini-workshop on my game. During the workshop, I presented my ideas for how to design the game, and invited feedback and suggestions for improvements. I received many wonderful suggestions, most of which I incorporated into my game.

Over the rest of the Summer, I finished writing the gamebook (GB) and instructor's manual (IM) in time to use for the Fall 2019 semester. I then play-tested the in two sections of RELS 2100: World Religions (35 students in one section, and 31 in the other).

In January of 2020, I was able to run my game at the Reacting to the Past Winter Workshop at UGA, with 12 faculty members from across the United States. The game went well, and I received useful feedback from game players – as well as 2 requests from faculty members to use my game in their classes (Dr. Andrew Goss, Professor of History, August University; and Dr. Nick Steneck, Associate Professor of History, Wesleyanne College). After the RTTP Winter Workshop, I revised the game and role sheets, incorporating feedback I had received from my students from the Fall semester who had played the game, and from faculty members who played the game at the UGA RTTP Winter Workshop.

In the Spring semester of 2020, I had planned to run version 2.0 of game during the middle 5 weeks of the semester, and we had begun prepping for game play when the University transitioned to fully online courses. Since my game was designed for F2F classes but not online classes, I had to make the difficult decision not to run the game in any of my Spring 2020 courses. Thus, the last semester it was implemented was Fall 2019.

Overall, I met my goals. I finished writing the game, and play tested in 2 undergraduate courses and at a faculty workshop. Overall, I am very happy with the game, though I am sure I will continue to "tweak" it on an on-going basis. I received positive feedback from students, as well as from faculty members who played the game at the UGA conference. The latter was especially helpful. And, frankly, I was pleasantly surprised when several faculty members from

the RTRP Winter Workshop said, “you have done the impossible – written a game about Israel that is informative and playable, without being offensive to either Israelis or Arabs.”

That last point is important. When I first began using “Reacting” games, I looked for a game on the Arab-Israeli conflict, but found none. I thought that was odd and unfortunate, so I asked several veteran RTTP gaming faculty members, and they all said, “yeah, we need one, but no one is willing to write it because it’s such an emotionally-charged topic.” One person said, “it’s the Third Rail of academia.”

I thought that not having a game on the Arab-Israeli conflict was an unfortunate gap in the reacting offerings, and therefore an unfortunate gap in curriculum for my courses. So I decided to write a game myself! When I announced my intention to write a game on Israel, several people warned me that I should avoid the topic. My own Department Chair had serious misgivings about it. But I was optimistic (naïve?) because I had played existing games that dealt with emotionally-charged topics about historical cases of violence and ethnic conflict (e.g., *Defining a Nation: India on the Eve of Independence, 1945*), and so I thought it could be done. I took great care to design the game, from the role sheets to the victory conditions, to make sure that the game was true to historical reality while also sensitive to concerns about ethnicity, morality, etc.

Related, one of the challenges of writing this game was that in actual history, the Arabs “check out” of the 1947 UNSCOP process because they felt like it was rigged in favor of partitioning Palestine for the creation of a Zionist state (in part because of US President Truman’s pro-Zionist leanings, and because of worldwide sympathy for Jewish people after WWII). I wanted the game to reflect this reality, but I worried that the students in the Arab faction would feel powerless and give up and not engage the game/class. That happened, to an extent. One option to fix this would be to redesign the game to give them a real chance of winning, but that would be historically inaccurate. So, I have chosen to leave the game design this way – and address it in the post-mortem (NOTE: importantly, students can still do well in the course/game even if their faction doesn’t’ win).

So, overall, the major challenge was game design. All games are hard to write, but one on the emotionally-charged topic of Israel was especially challenging. But, as I will describe below, this turned out to have a wonderful and unexpected side-effect: playing a game set in Palestine forced students to think about what happens in social contexts where one group of people feels completely marginalized and powerless, and many of them made connections to their personal experiences. Several students shared, “this must be what it is like being a minority person in the US.”

The other challenge I had was learning to find and use appropriate OER. When choosing to use OER, Nikki Rech from the GSU-Statesoro library helped me to find resources that were accurate, reliable, and sustainable. The latter is especially important if the game is to last for years (if web links are taken down, you’re out of luck). We eventually settled on using Wikimedia Commons for many resources, and Wikipedia for “intro” readings, as well as online versions of religious texts like the Hebrew Bible and *Qur’an*. I was reluctant to use Wikipedia (I thought – other faculty members will roast me!) but Nikki taught me that the site is actually fairly accurate and a great *starting point* for conducting research and learning about topics. So, she gave me an education in online information literacy – one that I passed on to the students. When we prepped for the game, my students were shocked that I asked them to use Wikipedia. They

shared that many professors refused to let them use it and would lower their grades if they did. So, I was able to have several impactful class discussions with students about informational literacy. This was not one of the original goals of the project, but it turned out to be an impactful side-effect.

Arguably the most surprising and impactful thing that happened with this project, as noted above, was that students made connections between the Arab-Israeli conflict and their own personal lives. This, too, was not a goal at the outset but turned out to be an impactful side-effect. GSU recently had several powerful and challenging racially-charged incidents on campus, and faculty and students are struggling with how to teach/learn/grow with regards to race, and by extension other issues of identity politics like gender, sexuality, etc. These topics are important to address in class, but it's often unclear to professors how to do so without causing a major backlash, or being counterproductive (e.g., Jonathan Haidt has recently written about how the way we teach "safetyism" is actually causing mental health problems, not fixing them. See: *The Coddling of the American Mind*). During the game, students in all 3 factions became very frustrated by the fact that neither side would compromise on a solution and therefore everyone was losing. The Arab faction actually came to feel powerless because the UN committee was "rigged." That approximates actual history, but more than one student noted, after the game was over, that this must be what minorities feel like in the US. I could tell it was a powerful "eye opener" for many students. As I note below, I would like to write an article for a teaching/pedagogy journal on this point: role-playing games set in other cultures/eras may provide an effective "safe space" for engaging in difficult but important issues. This was transformative for them, and for me.

Finally, I learned a lot about pedagogy in general by studying role-playing game design. As a result, I ended up writing a series of 1-day "micro-games" in other classes, and that helped to transform those classes. For example, I taught a special topics class on religion, sports, and society. I ended up writing simple 1-day micro-games on a number of topics for that class (e.g., a game on concussions in youth Catholic football leagues; a game on transgender athletes in college; etc.). Then, I gave my students an assignment to write their own games. They worked in pairs or groups of three and wrote fully developed game plans. I was astonished at how great their games were, and I ended up changing my syllabus in that class and playing several of their games (in modified online versions). And after the class was over, several students remarked that this was the "most fun" assignment they had ever had, and that they learned way more about the topic than they normally would because they had to do a lot of research outside of class. That was transformative for them, and for me – as I plan to use that type of assignment in other classes in the future.

2. Quotes

"The whole reacting to the past game class was new for me and I was very skeptical at first but I actually learned a lot more during the game than I did in any of my other lecture based classes. Getting characters in the game made me invested in the faction I was in, as well as in the result of the game, and in order to be prepared for the game I did way more outside research than I've done in my other classes. I really loved this class and learned more in it than I thought I would."

"The class is a game style course and the professor teaches the material before the games start, and then it's encouraged for you to learn more outside of class to have better arguments for the game. It really encourages studying outside class."

"I enjoyed the game. It was stressful due to the stipulations of the game in order to win, but the game itself was overall fun and educational."

"I absolutely LOVED the UNSCOP game. It gave me a better understanding of the fuel that Osama Bin Laden had (not that what he did was ok). Like all games, I admired the fact that we had the opportunity to put ourselves in the shoes of the key leaders of the different religions."

I really enjoyed the game and it was really easy for me to learn about the conflict through the game. I have always struggled with history and your class really helped me learn through the games."

3. Quantitative and Qualitative Measures

Measures Narrative

Quantitative

I assessed the success of the project quantitatively using two sets of scores from my Student Rating of Instruction (SRI) reports (NOTE: SRI reports from the two courses in which I played the game are attached to the end of this report).

Study 1

First, I examined the results of answers to SRI Question 2, which asked students to report how much they learned in the course compared to other courses of similar credit value (NOTE: score answers corresponded to the following: 1 = Much Less, 2 = Less, 3 = About the Same, 4 = More, and 5 = Much More).

Q2 Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How much did you learn in this course?

RESULTS: With 12 students responding in each class (24 total), the mean score was **4.3** (103 total points/24 student responses), meaning between "More" and "Much More." And 12/24 (50%) reported a score of 5, indicating that they leaned "Much More" in the class compared to classes of similar credit value.

Study 2

Next, I examined the difference between Q7 and Q8 to assess students' levels of interest in the subject matter before and after the class. This is an important metric because it's an indirect indicator of whether or not students may want to take more courses in our Department. (NOTE: score answers corresponded to the following: 1 = Not Interested At All, 2 = Mild Interest, 3 = Average, 4 = Interested, and 5 = Very Interested).

Q7 What was your level of interest in the subject matter before taking this course?

Q8 What was your level of interest in this subject matter after taking this course?

RESULTS:

Q7 What was your level of interest in the subject matter before taking this course?

With 12 students responding in each class (24 total), the mean score for Q7 was **2.9** (70 total points/24 student responses), meaning between “Average” and “Mild Interest.”

5/24 students were either Interested or “Very Interested” in the subject matter before the course.

Q8 What was your level of interest in this subject matter after taking this course?

With 12 students responding in each class (24 total), the mean score for Q8 was **4.3** (102 total points /24 student responses), meaning between “Interested” and “Very Interested.”

21/24 students were either “Interested” or “Very Interested” in the subject matter before the course, which is a 420% increase from Q7.

Overall, while SRI scores report on the course as a whole and not just the game I wrote, these results indicate to me that the project was a success because had the game “failed,” I believe that would have shown up in the course SRI scores and general comments (which it did not).

Qualitative

In addition, I also tried to gather qualitative data from students by asking them to submit feedback on the game. I asked them to write freely and openly about their experiences. Unfortunately, the response rate was low (likely because I asked for comments after the semester had ended and students left campus for home). I received the following comments.

- *I really enjoyed this game. I was a member of the UNSCOP (Emil Sandstrom) and personally I felt like it needed to be more clear on how to start the game. I remember my packet saying I was a chair of the unscop but never saying that I needed to get up and have a speech to start off the game. I just remember sitting there the first day of the game and everyone kinda took a second to get started. Secondly, I remember the big goal trying to be to get everyone to come to an agreement (which was literally impossible) and no one ended up winning. Towards the end people decided that if their team couldn’t win then nobody should be able to so they weren’t really coming back with any good arguments, only saying “no” to anything proposed. I think there should be smaller victory objectives for each side that way there is some compromise and the game keeps moving forward. It just felt like the last couple of days nothing happened in the game and no one really learned anything extra and we were just waiting for it to be over since no one could win.*

- *I enjoyed the game. It was stressful due to the stipulations of the game in order to win, but the game itself was overall fun and educational. I wouldn't say that I learned a whole lot about Islam due to the Islamic side not trying as hard during this game, but I did learned a lot about Israel. I feel like the game would be a lot better if all three sides would have given maximum effort instead of only 2 out of the three sides trying.*

Commentary: These comments reveal to me that a design choice I made when writing the game actually “worked.” I deliberately wrote the game and victory conditions such that both sides would likely lose, but that the Arab faction would almost surely lose completely (NOTE: the Arab victory condition was to prevent the UN from partitioning Palestine for the creation of

Israel). I had a hunch that the Arabs would get frustrated and veto any compromise solution proposed -- and that that would frustrate the UNSCOP members (for whom a victory was creating a solution that both sides would support), and it did. I also feared that this game design would undermine student motivation and engagement, and I think that it did to a degree (both from these two comments and from what I saw in class). While I never want to undermine student engagement, I wanted the class to learn—to *feel*--how the Arabs of Palestine must have felt in 1947 – that the "game" was stacked against them. This is a very important learning outcome for the game, and one that is stated in the gamebook and strongly emphasized in the post-mortem debrief. I could have designed the game to give the Arab faction a real chance of winning, but I thought that would be too far from actual history and thus disingenuous.

4. Sustainability Plan

I plan to play this game in class every time I teach RELS 2100: World Religions (*after we return from COVID-19 to "normal" in-class teaching conditions). After every game, I will have a "post-mortem" debrief with students and ask for feedback. Then, I will revise the game, role sheets, etc. as needed. I will maintain all elements of the game on a cloud drive and revise perpetually.

In addition, I ran the game at the UGA Reacting to the Past Winter Workshop, and afterwards shared the game with two faculty members from other universities in Georgia (Dr. Andrew Goss, Professor of History, August University; and Dr. Nick Steneck, Associate Professor of History, Wesleyanne College). They plan to use the game in their classes and will provide feedback on what they find.

Finally, I have been trying to figure out how to play reacting games in online classes. In fact, lots of faculty members who play reacting games are doing the same and sharing ideas. I hope to be able to develop this game for use in an online format within the next year or so.

5. Future Affordable Materials Plans

This was not my first time using Reacting games in class, but it was the first time doing a unit in class that used only Open-Education Resources. I was pleasantly surprised by how well it worked, and so when I design classes in the future, I plan to use more OER. In fact, over time I hope to be able to redesign all of my classes to use only OER in order to (1) lower educational expenses for students, and (2) help students to develop information literacy skills with online resources (which I think is important in today's world). One of the additional pleasant and unexpected results was that in working with Nikki Rech, a librarian at GS who specializes in OER, I learned a lot about the nature of online resources – sustainability, accessibility, etc. There's a lot to consider when adopting OER and she helped to inform me of that. I also was pleasantly surprised to learn that Wikipedia isn't entirely bad and may actually be an acceptable resource for use in class. I shared this with students, explaining with emphasis (!), that one should always fact check, consult additional resources, only start—not finish—with Wikis, etc. So, by using OER in this game/class, students also got supplement instruction/experience with online resource information literacy.

6. Future Scholarship Plans

Finally, as noted above, one of the most unexpected and positive results of this project is that I came to realize that role-playing reacting games set in other cultures and eras can create a kind of “safe space” for students to engage with complex and emotionally-charged issues like race, gender, power, etc. Students assigned to the Arab faction were forced to experience (albeit in a relatively low-stakes scenario) how it feels to be powerless against social forces. Then, students brought that back to the contemporary US, saying “wow, now I understand a little better what it might be like to be a member of a minority group and feel powerless.”

On the other hand, putting women and students of color in leadership roles helped them to develop confidence and assertiveness. One student, an African-American female who had a leadership role in the game, said to me, “I’ve never felt so empowered!” Several students said to me that this was one of the most powerful aspects of the game for them.

The experience has motivated me to write an article about this, exploring how role-playing games set in other cultures and historical eras provide a powerful “safe space” for students to engage with important but difficult topics.

In addition, writing a reacting game was very pedagogically and intellectually rewarding. It was a lot of work and very challenging, but I grew to love it. I learned *a lot* about the historical situation in Israel, as well as about pedagogy in general. As such, I may write another game -- on the theological debate about free-will vs. divine sovereignty in Protestant Christianity, set in Savannah, GA during the 1730s when John Wesley lived and preached in Savannah.

SRI Fall 2019 - 1 Survey
201908 - 1 - 12DEC2019

Georgia Southern University
GSU

Course: RELS 2100 A - World Religions

Department: PHIRELSTUD

Responsible Faculty: Donald Slone

Responses / Expected: 12 / 35 (34.29%)

General

		RELS 2100 - A						
		Responses					Course	
		ML	L	ATS	M	MM	N	Mean
Q1	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How much effort did you put into learning the material covered in this course?	1	3	3	1	4	**12**	**3.3**
Q2	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How much did you learn in this course?	0	0	2	2	8	**12**	**4.5**
Q3	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: To what degree were you intellectually challenged in this course?	0	1	3	4	4	**12**	**3.9**
Q4	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How often did you seek outside help with this course?	3	0	3	4	2	**12**	**3.2**
Q5	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How difficult was this course?	1	6	3	2	0	**12**	**2.5**
Q6	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How was the workload of this course?	0	2	6	3	1	**12**	**3.3**

Responses: [**ML**] Much Less=1 [**L**] Less=2 [**ATS**] About the Same=3 [**M**] More=4 [**MM**] Much More=5

General

		RELS 2100 - A						
		Responses					Course	
		NIA	MI	A	I	VI	N	Mean
Q7	What was your level of interest in the subject matter before taking this course?	2	1	4	3	2	**12**	**3.2**
Q8	What was your level of interest in this subject matter after taking this course?	0	1	0	4	7	**12**	**4.4**

Responses: [**NIA**] No Interest at All=1 [**MI**] Mildly Interested=2 [**A**] Average=3 [**I**] Interested=4 [**VI**] Very Interested=5

General

		RELS 2100 - A	
		Responses	Course

		YES	NO	N	N/A
Q9	Is this a required course for you?	4	8	**12**	0
Q10	Is this course in your major?	3	9	**12**	0

Responses: [**YES**] Yes [**NO**] No

General

RELS 2100 - A

		Responses					Course
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**N**
Q11	What grade do you expect in this course?	5	7	0	0	0	**12**

Responses: [**A**] A [**B**] B [**C**] C [**D**] D [**F**] F

General

RELS 2100 - A

		Responses					Course	
		SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**
Q12	Important points were stressed in this course:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q13	The course material was well organized:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**
Q14	The presentation of the course material was clear:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q15	The class stayed focused on course objectives:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**
Q16	The graded activities reflected course content:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q17	The expectations of this class were clearly communicated in the course syllabus:	9	3	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**

Responses: [**SA**] Strongly Agree=5 [**A**] Agree=4 [**N**] Neutral=3 [**D**] Disagree=2 [**SD**] Strongly Disagree=1

Q18 - What aspects of this course contributed most to your learning? Please be as specific as possible

Response Rate: 66.67% (**8** of **12**)

1 how governments and states work

2 We were challenged to play specific roles from history and in order to have your best chance of winning the game and debating successfully, you have to know your information.

3 This class was not was I was expecting. The instructor gave each student a specific role to play and we had to think critically about historical events that dealt directly with religions and conflicts. I believe I will remember this class more than a lecture.

4 The whole reacting to the past game class was new for me and I was very skeptical at first but I actually learned a lot more during the three games than I did in any of my other lecture-based religious studies class. Getting characters in the game made me invested in the faction I was in as well as in the result of the game and in order to be prepared for the games I did way more outside research than I've done in my other religious studies classes. I really loved this class and learned more in it than I thought I would.

5 The role playing helped me the most in this class.

6 The games were amazing. You learn without realising it. Powerpoints were nice, but not always necessary, since you had to research and read the game book.

7 The class is a game style course and the professor teaches the material before the games start, and then it's encouraged for you to learn more outside of class to have better arguments for the game. It really encourages studying outside class.

8 Learning about different religions and how to debate

Q19 - In what ways can this course be improved to enhance student learning?

Response Rate: 58.33% (**7** of **12**)

1 n/a

2 bigger classroom

3 This course does not need improvement, it was by far one of my favorite classes I have ever had.

4 This class taught me a lot, but we only touched on a few of the religion students of the world. Maybe a "game" about some of the lesser known religions could be created in the future.

5 N/A

This class is awesome

6 Have more opportunties to get involved in the debates

7 Dr. Slone could let students know their participation grade/points gained at the end of each class so they can be better prepared to participate in the next classes more if they are behind.

Instructor Oriented Questions	**Donald Slone**						
	Responses					**Individual**	
	SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**
Q20 The instructor was available to students:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q21 The instructor was helpful to students:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q22 The instructor was enthusiastic about the content (or material) in this course:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**

Q23	The instructor was prepared for this course:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q24	The instructor encouraged class participation, discussion, or questions:	12	0	0	0	0	**12**	**5.0**

Responses: [**SA**] Strongly Agree=5 [**A**] Agree=4 [**N**] Neutral=3 [**D**] Disagree=2 [**SD**] Strongly Disagree=1

SRI Fall 2019 - 1 Survey
201908 - 1 - 12DEC2019

Georgia Southern University
GSU

Course: RELS 2100 B - World Religions

Department: PHIRELSTUD

Responsible Faculty: Donald Slone

Responses / Expected: 12 / 31 (38.71%)

General

		RELS 2100 - B						
		Responses					Course	
		ML	L	ATS	M	MM	N	Mean
Q1	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How much effort did you put into learning the material covered in this course?	0	0	4	8	0	**12**	**3.7**
Q2	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How much did you learn in this course?	0	0	3	5	4	**12**	**4.1**
Q3	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: To what degree were you intellectually challenged in this course?	0	0	5	5	2	**12**	**3.8**
Q4	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How often did you seek outside help with this course?	0	2	8	2	0	**12**	**3.0**
Q5	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How difficult was this course?	0	2	8	2	0	**12**	**3.0**
Q6	Compared to other courses of similar credit value: How was the workload of this course?	0	2	6	4	0	**12**	**3.2**

Responses: [**ML**] Much Less=1 [**L**] Less=2 [**ATS**] About the Same=3 [**M**] More=4 [**MM**] Much More=5

General

		RELS 2100 - B						
		Responses					Course	
		NIA	MI	A	I	VI	N	Mean
Q7	What was your level of interest in the subject matter before taking this course?	1	5	3	3	0	**12**	**2.7**
Q8	What was your level of interest in this subject matter after taking this course?	0	1	1	6	4	**12**	**4.1**

Responses: [**NIA**] No Interest at All=1 [**MI**] Mildly Interested=2 [**A**] Average=3 [**I**] Interested=4 [**VI**] Very Interested=5

General

	RELS 2100 - B	
	Responses	Course

		YES	NO	N	N/A
Q9	Is this a required course for you?	7	4	**11**	1
Q10	Is this course in your major?	1	9	**10**	2

Responses: [**YES**] Yes [**NO**] No

General

		RELS 2100 - B					
		Responses					Course
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**N**
Q11	What grade do you expect in this course?	5	6	1	0	0	**12**

Responses: [**A**] A [**B**] B [**C**] C [**D**] D [**F**] F

General

		RELS 2100 - B						
		Responses					Course	
		SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**
Q12	Important points were stressed in this course:	9	3	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q13	The course material was well organized:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**
Q14	The presentation of the course material was clear:	9	3	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q15	The class stayed focused on course objectives:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q16	The graded activities reflected course content:	10	2	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**
Q17	The expectations of this class were clearly communicated in the course syllabus:	12	0	0	0	0	**12**	**5.0**

Responses: [**SA**] Strongly Agree=5 [**A**] Agree=4 [**N**] Neutral=3 [**D**] Disagree=2 [**SD**] Strongly Disagree=1

Q18 - What aspects of this course contributed most to your learning? Please be as specific as possible

Response Rate: 83.33% (**10** of **12**)

1 We were involved

2 The way Dr. Slone had the class play the games.

3 The nature of reacting to the past enables students to learn better than in a normal test-based course.

4 The entirety of the class contributed to my learning. In having conversations with friends, etc. I have been able to not only explain the events that we've learning about, but I actually know what I'm talking about versus regurgitating information. I loved the mixture of light lecturing and the game playing. It puts things into a completely different perspective and makes you think and feel deeply for your character, the event, and so on. I just couldn't say enough and words can't express my love for this class!!!! And it isn't even in my major!

5 The ability to apply in a way that felt like reliving history

6 Student engagement and interaction with one another and with the teacher helped me learn and retain more information than in any other course I have taken.

7 Reacting to the past games really helped me understand the material in an in-depth and personal way.

8 RTTP

9 Playing the games gave our class a better understanding of what occurred throughout history and a personal connection to the religious groups that we impersonated.

10 Discussing/debating in class about course content

Q19 - In what ways can this course be improved to enhance student learning?

Response Rate: 75.00% (**9** of **12**)

1 n/a

2 Required Attendance

3 NA

4 NA

5 It is awesome, do not change it.

6 I would recommend putting people who seem to really butt heads on the same team at least once. There were people that consistently went against each other and the side comments and snide comments were super frustrating because they didn't help anything. SO, I think it would be interesting to see how those people interact with one another once they're on the same team because I think it would completely change the dynamic of the game, especially if they're big personalities.

7 I dont think any improvements are needed

8 I can't think of any

9 By continuing to encourage discussion

Instructor Oriented Questions	**Donald Slone**						
	Responses					**Individual**	
	SA	**A**	**N**	**D**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**
Q20 The instructor was available to students:	9	3	0	0	0	**12**	**4.8**

Q21	The instructor was helpful to students:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**
Q22	The instructor was enthusiastic about the content (or material) in this course:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**
Q23	The instructor was prepared for this course:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**
Q24	The instructor encouraged class participation, discussion, or questions:	11	1	0	0	0	**12**	**4.9**

Responses: [**SA**] Strongly Agree=5 [**A**] Agree=4 [**N**] Neutral=3 [**D**] Disagree=2 [**SD**] Strongly Disagree=1