# Solent University

# Coursework Assessment Brief

# Assessment Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit Title: | Computer Games Programming |
| Unit Code: | DAC 526 |
| Unit Leader: | Nicholas Thomas |
| Level: | 5 |
| Assessment Title: | 2D Game |
| Assessment Number: | 2 |
| Assessment Type: | Software Product |
| Restrictions on Time/Word Count: | 750 words (documentation and testing) |
| Consequence of not meeting time/word count limit: | There is no penalty for submitting below the word/count limit, but students should be aware that there is a risk they may not maximise their potential mark.  Assignments should be presented appropriately in line with the restrictions stated above; if an assignment exceeds the time/word count this will be taken in account in the marks given using the assessment criteria shown. |
| Individual/Group: | Individual |
| Assessment Weighting: | 70% |
| Issue Date: | 24/19/18 |
| Hand In Date: | 07/01/19 |
| Planned Feedback Date: | 4 weeks after submission |
| Mode of Submission: | Hard copy/on-line/DVD/ |
| Number of copies to be submitted: | Where on-line submission via ‘Solent Online Learning’ is used, students are not required to submit a hard copy. |
| Anonymous Marking | This assessment is exempt from anonymous marking. |

# Assignment Task

The second assessment for this unit consists of the **software development** of a 2D game. You should work individually for this element - you CANNOT choose to work in a group. **Do not** request to work in a group, the tutor will not consider these requests.

# What you need to do

You need to produce a written report documenting the **software implementation and testing process**. The report should describe what you did and why you did it, and must be supported by evidence of what you have done.

Please review the **overview of game requirements** from the AE1 assessment and your **group design** **report** during this assessment.

# Part 1 - Implementation (70%)

Using the design from AE1, implement the game in Object Oriented C++. Ensure you document any changes, additions or redesigns you needed to do to successfully implement the game.

Ensure your code is well structured, with meaningful naming and appropriate use of comments.

This is an **individual** assessment. Do not share any code implemented from the design with the other students.

# Part 2– Testing (20%)

Write a report detailing the process of testing your game, to be done both during implementation and after completing the game. Your report should include the following:

1. A report of how you tested your game. You should detail all the tests you performed on the game to check that it was functioning correctly, whether the test succeeded, and if not, what you did to correct the errors encountered.
2. Relevant diagrams and screenshots.
3. References to code and use of debugger.

# Reflection (10%)

Write a brief reflection describing issues you had with the project, was your design problematic, how and why did you change your project from your design?

Discuss what went wrong and what went right.

# What you are required to hand in

**Each student should hand in their own report separately.**

**(All documents should be in .doc or.docx format.)**

**Electronic hand in on the Solent Online Page**

Submit online on the units SOL page under the *Assessment* tab. A link will be provided labelled AE2.

1. An **electronic** copy of the implementation and testing report.
2. A zipped copy of your **project folder**. Ensure this project can be copied **anywhere** and still correctly compile and run. Include the appropriate SDL folders for this to work.

# Assessment Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **F1 – F3** | **D1 – D3** | **C1 – 3** | **B1 – B3** | **A1 – A4** |
| **IMPLEMENTATION:**  **Understanding and proper use of programming syntax to create application that fulfils design.**  **(70%)** | **Code does not work, major bugs**  **Code unreadable**  **Code is not documented**  **Basic functionality not implemented** | **Code works, major bugs**  **Code poorly formatted and unreadable**  **Code is not documented**  **Basic functionality not implemented** | **Code works, minor bugs**  **Code is not well formatted**  **Code is partially documented**  **No extra functionality has been implemented**  **Redesign not documented** | **Code works correctly, few minor bugs**  **Code is readable**  **Code is documented**  **Extra functionality (e.g. gravity) has been implemented**  **Redesign partially documented** | **Code works correctly**  **Code is properly formatted and readable**  **Code is fully documented**  **Advanced additional functionality (e.g. AI) has been implemented.**  **Any redesign fully documented and justified** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CRITERIA** | **F1 – F3** | **D1 – D3** | **C1 – C3** | **B1 – B3** | **A1 – A4** |
| **TESTING:**  **(20%)** | **No test plan**  **Solutions to problems not documented**  **No evidence of test results provided**  **No analysis of test results documented** | **Test plan has poor coverage**  **Solutions to problems not documented**  **No evidence of test results provided**  **Little or no analysis of test results** | **Documented use of test plan with partial coverage**  **Solutions to problems partially documented**  **Some evidence of test results provided e.g. screenshots**  **Little analysis of test results** | **Documented use of test plan with good coverage (i.e. most program features included in test plan)**  **Solutions to problems documented**  **Evidence of some test results provided e.g. screenshots**  **Some analysis of test results documented** | **Fully documented use of thorough and detailed test plan**  **Solutions to problems fully documented**  **Evidence of test results provided e.g. screenshots**  **Detailed analysis of test results documented** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **F1 – F3** | **D1 – D3** | **C1 – C3** | **B1 – B3** | **A1 – A4** |
| **Reflection**  **(10%)** | **Little or no reflection on project.** | **An attempt at a reflection has been submitted but is limited in scope.** | **A clear reflection covering all factors of the project, what went wrong/right.**  **Lacking in some detail.**  **Lists improvements with little or no description.** | **A clear reflection covering all factors of the project, what went wrong/right.**  **Describes some improvements** | **A clear reflection covering all factors of the project, what went wrong/right**  **Leaves out no detail, fully describes improvements.** |

# 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:

1. 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;
2. If this assessment is submitted later than 5 working days after the submission deadline, the work will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero;
3. If this assessment is being submitted as a referred piece of work then it must be submitted by the deadline date; any 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-principles-and-regulations.pdf?t=1534423842941>

# 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 the Student Hub for advice.

A summary of guidance notes for students is given below:

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2p-extenuating-circumstances.pdf?t=1534423896787>

# 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/information-for-students/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>

**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 the portal and in the Student Handbook.

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2o-annex-2-assessment-regulations-grade-marking-scale.pdf?t=1534424273208>

**Guidance for online submission through Solent Online Learning (SOL)**

<http://learn.solent.ac.uk/onlinesubmission>