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**Implementation 80%:**

Please refer to the assessment rubric on the next page (copied verbatim from the assignment brief).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | Self | Peer | Supervisor |
| **Engine aspect: (25%)** | 70% (A) | 80% (A+) |  |
| **Game demo: (25%)** | 65% (B) | 70% (A) |  |
| **Assets: (15%)** | 55% (C) | 55% (C) |  |
| **Code quality: (15%)** | 70% (A) | 75% (A) |  |

Peer feedback: Agreed actions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Three positive aspects:   1. A challenging component choice. 2. A functioning demo. 3. A range of programmable concepts in use.   Three aspects to improve:   1. Bugs in demo to fix. 2. Could find ways to make some code more concise. 3. Could use comments a bit better to explain to others what your code is doing. | 1. Come up with an original Idea, Concept or Algorithm. (AI-Related) 2. Add assets to Pause/Menu screen. Separating pause and main menus. Look into custom Fonts. Optional:- custom format 3. Polish/Refine aspect and demo. |

**Implementation: 80%**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Unsatisfactory (E/F 0-39%)** | **Adequate (D 40-49%)** | **Sound (C 50-59%)** | **Good (B 60-69%)** | **Excellent (A 70-79%)** | **Outstanding**  **(A+ 80-100%)** |
| **Engine aspect:**  **(25%)** | Technically too simple for L5 or not working. | The aspect barely works, very limited/contrived use case. | The aspect works to some extent, valid use cases exist. | The aspect largely works, some work needed to make it more general. | The aspect fully works and can be used generally by any application without major modifications. | In addition, the aspect demonstrates use of original ideas, concepts or algorithms. |
| **Game demo:**  **(25%)** | Technically too simple for L5 or not working. | The game is barely playable, limited demonstration of engine usage. | The game works to some extent, some demonstration of engine usage. | The game largely works, appropriate demonstration of engine usage. | The game fully works, excellent use of the engine aspects (both developed and existing). | In addition, the demo is sophisticated enough (logically and visually) to be a publishable game prototype. |
| **Assets:**  **(15%)** | Irrelevant, unused or no assets. | Very few assets used. Assets do not fit any specific genre / theme. | Assets form a single theme and of decent quality. | Assets used are appropriate, include some high quality. | Full range of assets: images, sounds, fonts, custom formats. | Full range of assets with a professional level of quality, ready to be used in a publishable game. |
| **Code quality:**  **(15%)** | 3rd party referenced code with no modifications. | The code has been put together poorly and barely works. Layout is inconsistent, no documentation, code is monolithic. May contain some referenced 3rd party code. | The code works to some extent but has some significant issues: crashes, little adherence to good programming practices. May contain some referenced 3rd party code. | The code follows good programming practice and works as expected without major issues, OO approach is used appropriately, code documentation is present where required. Most of the code is original. | In addition, the code uses correct software design patterns and the quality is consistent throughout. The code is fully original. | In addition, the code demonstrates the use of advanced coding techniques and is professionally documented. |