|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Name / Number:** | Marks |
| Research Report Introduction & Background Notes: Report must be completed to be eligible to receive an project module mark | **/20** |
| Comments: |
| Research Report Literature Survey & Research Notes: Report must be completed to be eligible to receive a project module mark |
| Comments: |
| Research Report Critical analysis and conclusions Notes: Report must be completed to be eligible to receive a project module mark |
| Comments: |
| SRS / Game Design Document (GDD) | **/5** |
| Comments: |
| Technical Design Document (TDD) | **/5** |
| Comments: |
| **Videos, Poster and** **Presentation** | **/5** |
| Comments: |
| Process (GitHub) | **/10** |
| Comments: |
| Technical Achievement Notes: See Technical Achievement Rubric | **/55** |
| Comments: |
| Total | **/100** |
|  | |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1st Reader | 2nd Reader | Head of Department | | Signature |  |  |  | | Print Name |  |  |  | | Date |  |  |  | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Report Rubric** | | |
| **0 to 5** | **5 to 15** | **15 to 20** |
| **Novice** | **Practitioner** | **Expert** |
| * Poor use of grammar, structure & content with little evidence of knowledge of problem domain * Limited project introduction and background * Limited feasibility and evidence of requirements analysis * Limited evidence of literature survey and research * Limited evidence of critical analysis and conclusions | * Good use of grammar, structure & content with satisfactory evidence of knowledge of problem domain * Acceptable project introduction and background * Satisfactory feasibility and evidence of requirements analysis * Satisfactory evidence of literature survey and research * Satisfactory evidence of critical analysis and conclusions | * Expertly written and structured to a high standard with content that exhibits expert knowledge of the problem domain. * Extensive project introduction, background, feasibility study and evidence of requirements analysis * Extensive evidence of literature survey and research * Critical analysis and conclusions written to a highly professional standard |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Report Marking Scheme** | | |
| **Abstract** | | |
| **0 to 0.25** | **0.25 to 0.5** | **0.5 to 1** |
| * Introductory statement unclear, does not connect to literature. * Purpose is irrelevant or unclear. * Approach not mentioned but implied or inappropriate. * Findings/conclusions unclear or misinterpret results. | * Introductory statement clear but not engaging. * Purpose not concise, might contain irrelevant information. * Approach unclear or not connected to purpose of scholarship. * Findings and conclusions presented but might be unclear or missing information. | * Introductory statement connects topic to literature and purpose of work, describes approach to the study, summarises findings and conclusions |
| **Introduction / Background** | | |
| **0 to 0.5** | **0.5 to 1** | **1 to 2** |
| * There is no clear introduction or main topic and the structure of the paper is missing. * The research question is not testable no matter how clear and concise the question is. | * The introduction states the main topic and previews the structure of the paper. * Identifies part or all of the research question in an unclear manner, but is still testable. | * Exceptional introduction that is very engaging. * Previews the structure of the paper. Clear and concise research question stated that is testable. |
| **Literature Review** | | |
| **0 to 1** | **1 to 2** | **2 to 3** |
| * There is no clear introduction or main topic and the structure of the paper is missing. * The research question is not testable no matter how clear and concise the question is. | * There is no clear introduction or main topic and the structure of the paper is missing. * The research question is not testable no matter how clear and concise the question is. | * There is no clear introduction or main topic and the structure of the paper is missing. * The research question is not testable no matter how clear and concise the question is. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | | |
| **0 to 1** | **1 to 3** | **3 to 4** |
| * Very poorly written description of the aims, procedure, sample, and measures. Lists steps in an order that are not sequential, not easily followed, or incomplete. | * Describe most of the aims, procedure, sample, and measures. * Lists all steps in a detailed, sequential order that are not easily followed | * Describes all the aims, procedure, sample, and measures. * Lists all steps in a detailed, sequential order that are easily followed. |
| **Results** | | |
| **0 to 1** | **1 to 3** | **3 to 4** |
| * Incorrect data is provided regardless of inclusion or presentation of all other criteria. | * All data is recorded and organised in a clear manner. Most observations are provided. * Analysis of data is provided with a few errors. Some graphs are missing. * Errors of experimentation are provided. | * All data is recorded and organised in a clear manner. * All observations are provided. * Complete and correct analysis of data is provided with supplementary use of graphs. * Errors of experimentation are provided. |
| **Conclusion** | | |
| **0 to 0.5** | **0.5 to 1** | **1 to 2** |
| * Lack of summary of topic | * Good summary of topic with clear concluding ideas. Introduces no new information. | * Excellent summary of topic with concluding ideas that impact reader. Introduces no new information. |
| **References** | | |
| **0 to 0.5** | **0.5 to 1** | **1 to 2** |
| * Lack of Harvard format/numerous errors. | * Conforms to Harvard rules for formatting and citation of sources with minor exceptions. | * Conforms to Harvard rules for formatting and citation of sources are perfect. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grammar/Usage/Mechanics** | | |
| **0 to 0.5** | **0.5 to 1** | **1 to 2** |
| * Has many spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors that considerably detracts from the readability of the paper. | * May contain some spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors. | * Control of grammar, usage, and mechanics. * Almost entirely free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. |
| Project Report should be written using the Project Report template | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Software Requirements Specification (SRS) / Game Design Document (GDD) Rubric** | | |
| **0 to 3** | **3 to 4** | **4 to 5** |
| **Novice** | **Practitioner** | **Expert** |
| * Poor structure & content with little evidence of knowledge of problem domain * Limited project introduction and background * Limited feasibility and evidence of requirements analysis * Limited evidence of literature survey and research * Limited evidence of critical analysis and conclusions | * Good structure & content with satisfactory evidence of knowledge of problem domain * Acceptable project introduction and background * Satisfactory feasibility and evidence of requirements analysis * Satisfactory evidence of literature survey and research * Satisfactory evidence of critical analysis and conclusions | * Report structured to a high standard with content that exhibits expert knowledge of the problem domain. * Extensive project introduction, background, feasibility study and evidence of requirements analysis * Extensive evidence of literature survey and research * Critical analysis and conclusions written to a highly professional standard |
| SRS / GDD should be written using the appropriate template | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Design Document (TDD) Rubric** | | |
| **0 to 3** | **3 to 4** | **4 to 5** |
| **Novice** | **Practitioner** | **Expert** |
| * Poor structure & content with little evidence of knowledge of technical design * Limited introduction and background * Limited evidence of addressing technical requirements * Limited evidence of critical analysis and conclusions | * Good structure & content with satisfactory evidence of knowledge of technical design * Acceptable introduction and background * Satisfactory evidence of addressing technical requirements * Satisfactory evidence of critical analysis and conclusions | * Report structured to a high standard with content that exhibits expert knowledge of technical design. * Extensive project introduction, background, study and evidence of addressing technical requirements * Critical analysis and conclusions written to a highly professional standard |
| TDD should be written using Technical Design Document template | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Video Rubric** | | |
| **0 to 3** | **3 to 4** | **4 to 5** |
| **Novice** | **Practitioner** | **Expert** |
| * Poor video with irrelevant or out of context content * Unclear communication and message delivered to audience * Poor use of visual aids and ineffective use of presentation tools | * Good video with relevant content * Clear communication and good message delivered to audience * Made use of visual aids and presentation tools | * Excellent video with highly relevant and enlightened content * Highly professional communication and communiqué with audience * Used visual aids and presentation tools to a high and engaging standard. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Process Rubric** | | |
| **0 to 3** | **3 to 7** | **7 to 10** |
| **Novice** | **Practitioner** | **Expert** |
| * Environment appeared to be untested, not operational, unprepared or ineffective. * Little evidence of use of personal software process | * Environment appeared to be tested, operational, prepared and effective. * Evidence of use of personal software process * Process is demonstrable to peers | * Environment appeared to be tested, operational, prepared to a high standard and very impactful. * Expert use of personal software process * Process in demonstrable to wider audience including industry and public showcase. |
| NOTE ***50% of Process Mark*** is allocated to *Presentation* at the end of ***Sprint 2*** | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Achievement Rubric** | | |
| **0 to 25** | **25 to 40** | **40 to 55** |
| **Novice** | **Practitioner** | **Expert** |
| * Project will achieve minimum functionality * Project may contain some syntax and/or run-time errors * Project code will be poorly commented and/or formatted * Project will contain basic features; application will not be tested properly * Project code will not follow applicable coding conventions * Presentation, project code and documentation will display a poor understanding of technologies | * Project will achieve expected functionality * Project will contain no syntax or unhandled run-time errors * Project will be reasonably commented and formatted * Project will contain no additional features * Project will be tested to a reasonably degree * Project program code will follow appropriate coding conventions * Presentation, project and documentation will display an adequate understanding of technologies | * Project will include novel functionality e.g. Game use of accelerometers, camera, etc. as part of game play * Project will contain no syntax or unhandled run-time errors * Project will be expertly commented and formatted * Project will contain advanced features * Project will be tested expertly * Project code will follow applicable coding conventions * Presentation, project code and documentation will display an expert understanding of technologies used. |