|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Feedback Cover Sheet** | **Faculty of Computing, Engineering and the Built Environment** | New Logo Tiny |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Name** | *Joshua Jenkins* |
| **Student Number** | 19120385 |
| **Module Code/Title** | CMP6187 Mobile Game Development |
| **Assessment Item** | Report 1 (2.5% Overall Grade)  Critical analysis of topics studied during Scheduled Learning. . |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Marker Name** | **Diego Vilela Monteiro** | **Date** | **10/10/2021** |
| **Second Marker** |  |  |  |
| **Feedback:** General comments on the quality of the work, its successes and where it could be improved | | | |
| ***Overall Report or Forum Feedback:***  As a first assignment this report meets some of the basic criteria. However, the depth of the analysis was superficial, touching mainly on the topics presented during scheduled learning. Other topics that could have been presented within the report for the analysis include but are not limited to:   * How does it affect new developers? Is there still space for new companies? * How can one stand out? * In what way is the market predicted to grow? * Are hypercasual games more popular due to hardware limitations and playing environment? Or because they are the most cost-effective to develop and sell?   I’m pleased that the references were presented correctly. The structure was good. The language would have been great for a forum post, however as you decided to go for the report route, you should have prepared the document using more professional language avoiding contractions. | | | |
| **Feed Forward:** How to apply the feedback to future submissions | | | |
| Please for the next report try to present a more in-depth conclusion based on what you have learned from the topic. Use the appropriate language for the medium. Try to associate what you have learned and with both existing mobile games and what you expect to produce by the end of the course. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element | Weighting | | **Mark %** | Weighted mark |
| Overall Quality | 1 | | **53** | **53.0** |
|  | | Use Ctrl-A F9 to auto calculate | **Provisional Uncapped Mark %:**  Rounded integer | **53%** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Provisional uncapped mark: %** | |  |
| *Marker to indicate Yes where applicable;* | https://cdn1.iconfinder.com/data/icons/arrows-set-3/96/Turn-Down-512.png | **Outcome** |
| **Work submitted late but within 1-24 hours of deadline** |  | Mark reduced by 5% of the awarded mark[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| **Work submitted late but within 5 working days of deadline** |  | Mark reduced by 10% of the awarded mark[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| **Work submitted more than 5 working days after deadline** |  | Mark of zero |
| **Support summary extension applied to original deadline** |  | Mark remains uncapped |
| **Proposed mark for submission to exam board**[[3]](#footnote-3)**:%** | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality and use of standard English & academic conventions** | | | | *Notes* |
| **Spelling & Grammar** | Good | Acceptable | Poor |  |
| **Academic Style** | Good | Acceptable | Poor |  |
| **Structure** | Good | Acceptable | Poor |  |
| **Referencing** | Good | Acceptable | Poor |  |
| If any of the above are highlighted as **Poor** you should arrange a consultation with a member of staff from the  Centre for Academic Success via [Success@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Success@bcu.ac.uk) | | | | |

**Marks awarded for criteria**

**Table of Assessment Criteria and Associated Grading Criteria- Section 1**

**Table of Report (2.5%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria | Written presentation |
| Learning outcome being assessed | 1. Justify design and implementation decisions made in the development of commercially viable mobile game projects. |
| **Weighting:** | 2.5% |
| Grading  Criteria 0 – 29% | No submitted work.  The work presents many major flaws, no reflection on the theme, and no visible attempt to add related content is present. |
| 30 – 39% | The work presents some major flaws, however some reflection on the theme is present, and little or no visible attempt to add related content is present. |
| 40 – 49% | The report presents some of the required structure; however, a good amount of reflection, exposition and related content is missing |
| 50 – 59% | The report follows the guidelines and meets the minimum requirements; however, the reflection, exposition and related content are poorly presented. |
| 60– 69% | The report is well written and referenced. Appropriate diagrams have been used to support the written work. It is possible to associate the concepts with the student’s prototype/game |
| 70– 79% | The report is very well written with clear and concise explanations. The diagrams are very good, clear, and explanatory supporting the written work. The report follows the university writing guidelines. It is easy to associate the concepts with the student’s prototype/game |
| 80– 89% | It is an excellent academic report with very good descriptive diagrams which support a well written and referenced piece of work. It is very easy to associate the concepts with the student’s prototype/game |
| 90 – 100% | The report is outstanding; an exceptional amount of reflection and exposition is presented. All other requirements are met. And the consideration with the student’s prototype/game is masterfully presented. |

**Table of Forum Discussion (2.5%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria | Written presentation |
| Learning outcome being assessed | 1. Justify design and implementation decisions made in the development of commercially viable mobile game projects. |
| **Weighting:** | 2.5% |
| Grading  Criteria 0 – 29% | No submitted work.  No visible attempt to present any sort of arguments, or an argument completely out-of-scope of the discussion. |
| 30 – 39% | Very poor attempt to present any sort of arguments, or an argument out-of-scope of the discussion, however following some reason to indicate how it could relate to the discussion. |
| 40 – 49% | Poor attempt to present an argument within the scope of the discussion. |
| 50 – 59% | A basic argument within the scope of the discussion and that a few references, reasoning and examples. |
| 60 – 69% | A novel and good argument within the scope of the discussion and that presents some references, reasoning and examples. |
| 70 – 79% | A novel and very good argument within the scope of the discussion and that presents clear references, reasoning and examples. |
| 80 – 89% | A novel and excellent argument within the scope of the discussion and that presents clear and well-researched references, reasoning and examples. |
| 90 – 100% | Exceptional and novel arguments within the scope of the discussion presenting masterfully researched references, reasoning, and examples. |

1. Where the original mark was a pass and a 5% reduction would take it below a pass, the minimum pass mark will be recorded. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Where the original mark was a pass and a 10% reduction would take it below a pass, the minimum pass mark will be recorded. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Marks are provisional until confirmed by an examination board and may be altered up or down. Successful claims for extenuating circumstances will result in the marks submitted to the exam board being uncapped. Marks shown in Moodle are always the uncapped mark. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)