CGP600 - Advanced Games programming practical demonstration sheet for AE1

Student Name: _____ Student Number: _____

Student Name: _____ Student Number: _____

Date seen: _____

Documentation, Analysis and Design [55%]

Formatting

1 ☐ Inconsistent fonts/headings

2 ☐ .doc. Formatted styles used. Consistent fonts. Relevant headings used

3 ☐ Proffessional formatting with clear headings and contents. Implements some custom styles

Sections/Content

1 ☐ Little relevant content. Some explanation of mechanics. Some attempt at testing carried out.

2 ☐ Content is relevant. Further explanation of mechanics, graphics, design patterns and logic

3 ☐ As above, plus links to similar games. Appendices used.

Images/Equations

1 ☐ Fewer than 3 images, with no title or referencing, **OR** fewer than 3 equations
(Other than basic transforms etc.. Covered in class)

2 ☐ More than 3 referenced and titled images, **OR** 3 or more equations
(Other than basic transforms etc.. Covered in class)

3 ☐ More than 3 referenced and titled images **AND** more than 3 equations
(Other than basic transforms etc.. Covered in class), with understanding demonstrated

References

1 ☐ Sources stated. Fewer than 10 references

2 ☐ Attempt at Harvard referencing, though incorrect in places. 10 or more references

3 ☐ 15 or more references. Correct use of Harvard referencing througout report

Functionality and core requirements

1 ☐ Functionality only realises core requirements

2 ☐ Functionality realises more than just the core requirements

3 ☐ Advanced functionality other than just the core requirements.
With more than one possible solution discussed above the core requirements

Flow/class Diagrams(game mechanics, program flow and structure etc..)

1 ☐ Simple flow diagrams **AND/OR** pseudocode, which only realise a few of the game mechanics

2 ☐ All of the game mechanics described in flow diagrams **AND/OR** pseudocode, less than 10 inconsistencies/errors

3 ☐ Extensive use of flow diagrams **AND** pseudocode used to describe entire game, with less than 5 inconsistencies/errors.
Flow diagrams linked with class diagrams

Development techniques

1 ☐ Little discussion of 3D development techniques (i.e shaders, texturing, lighting effects)

2 ☐ Design includes discussion on at least 2 areas of 3D development techniques

3 ☐ 3 or more areas of 3D development techniques discussed

Object oriented design

1 ☐ Vague and inconsistent discussion of Object oriented development techniques

2 ☐ Simple but clear and correct discussion of Object oriented development techniques

3 ☐ Discussion of Object oriented development techniques are also clearly linked to other areas of the design (flow/class diagrams, requirements and techniques)

Total : **0** of **24** **=** **0 %**

Task Breakdown and Rational [35%]

User story

1 ☐ Simple list of game requirements

2 ☐ Complete user stories using the format: **'As a <Role> I can/want to <Goal> so that <Result/why>'**

3 ☐ As above (**'As a <Role> I can/want to <Goal> so that <Result/why>'**),
but also includes extra requirements outside the core

Critical paths, tasks, timescales, dependencies

1 ☐ Simple list of tasks produced. Not all critical paths, tasks, timescales and dependencies linked

2 ☐ Simple Gantt chart produced. Only screenshots used as evidence

3 ☐ Fully functioning Gantt chart produced, linking all critical paths, tasks, timescales and dependencies (irrefutable evidence of this is required)

Testing plans

1 ☐ Simple Ad-Hoc tests planned for and clearly documented

2 ☐ Either Black box or white box testing planned for and clearly documented

3 ☐ Ad-Hoc, Black box and White box testing planned for and fully documented

Work Breakdown Structure

1 ☐ Basic top down diagram produced. Does not follow the 100% rule (does not cover entire scope/deliverables). Does not fully define deliverables

2 ☐ WBS produced which fully follows the 100% rule and defines deliverables and possible milestones, though activity times may be unrealistic and some tasks are repeated

3 ☐ As above with no task repetition, realistic times for milestones and good level of detail
Also makes good use of the user stories

Grid tasks/times relating to WBS

1 ☐ List of tasks and times produced, but does not relate to WBS

2 ☐ List of tasks and times produced, relates to over half of the WBS

3 ☐ List of tasks and times relates to entire WBS

Total : **0** of **15** **=** **0 %**

Critical Reflection and Discussion of Group Work [10%]

Evidence of equal distribution of work

1	☐	Evidence of groupwork shown. Not clear who did what in one or two areas. Not equally distributed
2	☐	Clear, who did what in every area. One or two tasks unequally distributed
3	☐	Clear who did what in every area. Fully balanced workload between each team member

Reflection of the Design Process

1	☐	Brief reflection on the design process from all team members, along with some valid strengths/ weaknesses shown
2	☐	Detailed reflection on the groupwork design process . ALL team members describe what has been learned and what could be improved
3	☐	As for the above two areas, including a detailed explanation of what problems occurred from ALL team members and how they were or could have been resolved

Identification and resolution of problems

1	☐	Less than 50% problems identified
2	☐	50%+ problems identified. Some problems have solutions
3	☐	All current problems identified with solutions discussed for all

Software backup methodology (Source control, multiple saves etc..)

1	☐	Memory stick and harddrive saves only. Evidenced within document
2	☐	Cloud based saves, utilising apps like Google drive. Link and access to source MUST be provided
3	☐	Source control software used (Git, Mercurial etc…). Link and access to set up repository MUST be provided

Total : **0** of **12** **=** **0 %**

Grand Total: **0 %**