Southampton Solent University
Coursework Assessment Brief

Assessment Details

Unit Title:	CGP601/CGP602
Unit Code:	Game Development Project/Indie Game Project
Unit Leader:	James TerKeurst
Level:	6
Assessment Title:	Progress Report
Assessment Number:	AE1
Assessment Type:	Report
Restrictions on Time/Length :	3000 words plus supporting evidence
Individual/Group:	Individual
Assessment Weighting:	30%
Issue Date:	24 January 2018
Hand In Date:	23 February 2018
Planned Feedback Date:	March 2018
Mode of Submission:	Online Digital Submission
Number of copies to be submitted:	1
Anonymous Marking	This assessment will be exempt from anonymous marking as it falls within an exempt category under the University's Anonymous Marking Policy.

Assessment Task:

See Project Handbook.

Assessment criteria

N, S, F3-F1	D3 – D1 (3rd)	C3 – C1 (2:2)	B3 – B1 (2:1)	A4 – A1 (1st)
Background, Aim(s), Objectives				**Weighting 10%**
Missing or poor background, aim(s) and objectives. Little or no coherent connection between these sections.	Brief discussion of project background and presents basic aim(s) and objectives.	Good background discussion including context and scope of project, which informs aim(s) and objectives.	Background, context and scope discussion backed up by some references, leading to well defined aim(s) and objectives.	Well researched and referenced background, context and scope discussed, leading to clearly defined aim(s) and objectives.
Literature Review, Reading List, References				**Weighting 10%**
Missing, non-relevant or poor review of literature. Few or no examples of literature in reading list or references.	Identifies some relevant literature sources, but no discussion. Some evidence of background reading in a reading list. Some valid references given, though may not use correct Harvard referencing.	Review briefly discusses how the literature might inform the project. Good evidence of relevant background reading in reading list. Range of valid references included, using Harvard referencing correctly.	Review discusses how the literature might inform the project, and links sources to potential areas of research and development. Wide ranging evidence of background reading in reading list. Good range of valid references given.	Excellent analysis of literature given, with chosen sources clearly shown to inform all aspects of the project. Extensive and relevant background reading evidenced. Thorough and appropriate referencing provided.
Research, Specification (or Statement of Research Questions for Research Projects)				**Weighting 20%**
Missing or non-relevant research shown. Missing or non-relevant specification.	Small amount of research shown. Presents a limited specification or statement of research questions.	Modest amount of research shown. Specification or statement of research questions is informed by research and reflects stated project objectives.	Good range of relevant referenced research discussed. Uses credible sources from research to inform specification or statement of research questions, fully reflecting project objectives.	Wide range of relevant referenced research shown with excellent analysis. Uses analysis to derive a clear, concise and unambiguous specification (or statement of research questions) based on measurable values.
Potential Solutions				**Weighting 20%**
Solutions missing or not relevant to the specification given.	Presents few potential solutions. Choice made, but no rationale given.	Presents several potential solutions. Solutions have some background discussion. Shows some rationale based on background discussion to make a choice.	Presents a well thought out set of potential solutions. Good background discussion informed by references. Defines and uses a modest set of criteria for the selection among potential solutions.	Wide range of appropriate potential solutions. Excellent background analysis with solid references. Comprehensive criteria for selection are clearly derived from aim(s) objectives and specification.

Project Management				Weighting 10%
No project management method chosen, or chosen method has little or no or inappropriate discussion.	Project management method chosen and adequately described.	Discussion of several project management methods, Some rationale based on discussion to make a choice.	Discusses a good range of project management methods, with appropriate references. Defines and uses a modest set of criteria for selection.	Wide range of appropriate project management techniques thoroughly discussed, with solid references. Comprehensive criteria for selection are clearly derived from discussion.
Risk Analysis, Planning				**Weighting 25%**
Little or no risk analysis. No project planning, or planning is inadequate and/or inappropriate. Does not use project management methodology.	Presents a basic project plan with some time estimates and dependencies shown, but parts may have insufficient or missing details. Few metrics for measuring progress are in place. Only very broad risks discussed, and little contingency planning.	Uses chosen project management method to create a reasonably complete and detailed plan with dependencies and estimates. Suitable metrics provided for most tasks. Identifies some risks for critical tasks, with some consideration of contingencies.	Uses chosen project management method to create complete and detailed plan broken down into hour long tasks (where appropriate), with dependencies, time estimates and metrics for all tasks. Good analysis of risks for majority of tasks, with well thought out and planned contingencies.	As B3-B1. In addition presents a discussion of the rationale used to establish estimates, dependencies, metrics, risks and contingencies were formed. Valid references used to back up this discussion.
High Level Design				**Weighting 5%**
Incorrect or missing pseudocode, flow diagrams and component overview (or equivalent for research projects).	Low detail and/or inaccurate pseudocode and flow diagrams (or research equivalent). Few components described, with little or no evidence of relationships between them (or research equivalent).	Pseudocode and flow diagrams (or research equivalent) show some of the expected operations, though there may be some errors or omissions. Partially complete set of components shown, with some evidence of relationships (or research equivalent).	Pseudocode and flow diagrams (or research equivalent) mostly describe operations. Components and their relationships mostly fulfil specification (or research equivalent).	Pseudocode and flow diagrams (or research equivalent) completely describe operations. Components and their relationships accurately fulfil specification (or research equivalent).

Learning Outcomes

This assessment will enable students to demonstrate in full or in part the learning outcomes identified in the unit descriptors.

Late Submissions

Students are reminded that:

If this assessment is submitted late i.e. within 5 working days of the submission deadline, the mark will be capped at 40% if a pass mark is achieved;

If this assessment is submitted <u>later</u> than 5 working days after the submission deadline, the work will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero;

If this assessment is being submitted as a referred piece of work (second or third attempt) then it <u>must</u> be submitted by the deadline date; <u>any</u> Refer assessment submitted late will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero.

http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2o-assessment-policy-annex-1-assessment-regulations.pdf?t=1411116004479

Extenuating Circumstances

The University's Extenuating Circumstances procedure is in place if there are genuine circumstances that may prevent a student submitting an assessment. If students are not 'fit to study', they can either request an extension to the submission deadline of 5 working days or they can request to submit the assessment at the next opportunity (Defer). In both instances students must submit an EC application with relevant evidence.   If accepted by the EC Panel there will be no academic penalty for late submission or non-submission dependent on what is requested. Students are reminded that EC covers only short term issues (20 working days) and that if they experience longer term matters that impact on learning then they must contact a Student Achievement Officer for advice.

A summary of guidance notes for students is given below:

http://portal.solent.ac.uk/support/official-documents/extenuating-circumstances/extenuating-circumstances.aspx

Academic Misconduct

Any submission must be students' own work and, where facts or ideas have been used from other sources, these sources must be appropriately referenced. The University's Academic Handbook includes the definitions of all practices that will be deemed to constitute academic misconduct. Students should check this link before submitting their work.

Procedures relating to student academic misconduct are given below:

http://portal.solent.ac.uk/support/official-documents/complaints-conduct/student-academic-misconduct.aspx

Ethics Policy

The work being carried out by students must be in compliance with the Ethics Policy. Where there is an ethical issue, as specified within the Ethics Policy, then students will need an ethics release or an ethical approval prior to the start of the project.

The Ethics Policy is contained within Section 2S of the Academic Handbook:

http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2s-university-ethics-policy.pdf

Anonymous Marking

A copy of the University's Policy on Anonymous Marking, process details and student guidance on submission sheet completion can be found on the following links, which are also uploaded on the Student Portal.

Fact Sheet:
http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/policies-procedures-guidelines/anonymous-marking-fact-sheet.pdf

Process:
http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/policies-procedures-guidelines/anonymous-marking-process.pdf

Grade marking

The University uses a letter grade scale for the marking of assessments. Unless students have been specifically informed otherwise their marked assignment will be awarded a letter grade. More detailed information on grade marking and the grade scale can be found on myCourse.

Policy:
http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2o-assessment-policy.pdf

Fact sheet:
http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-4/4o-grade-marking-briefing-for-students.pdf