**Multiplayer Distributed Programming CA1 2017/18 Marking Scheme**

**Name:**

**Mark:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Input (10) |  |
| States and menus (10) |  |
| Sprites and animation (10) |  |
| Collision detection and physics (20) |  |
| Shaders (10) |  |
| Music and sound effects (10) |  |
| Gameplay (10) |  |
| Network discussion (10) |  |
| Screencast, version control and code structure (10) |  |

For each of the items that are marked out of 10 or 20 you can get the marks by doing the following:

9/10, 17/20 – Each element fits together to make an excellent game. The input is natural, animation looks great, collision and physics are novel, plan for networking is complete and screencast is clear, concise and very well presented.

7/8, 14/16– The game and each element are very good. The features don’t have quite the same sophistication as above. 5/6, 10/13 – A good game with well-chosen resources. Small problems with the implementation or a limited implementation. More detail needed in the screencast.

4, 6/9 – Not really hitting the mark. The game just about works and hasn’t been well thought out or implemented and explanations in the screencast are lacking. 1-3 , 1/5– Code doesn’t meet the requirements set out in the specification.

0 – Code doesn’t compile, no screencast submitted, code not properly accredited.