****

# Assessment Information/Brief 2020-21

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Module title | Mobile Development |
| CRN | 35801 |
| Level | 6 |
| Assessment title | An Interactive Game for Android |
| Weighting within module | This assessment is worth 50% of the overall module mark. |
| Submission deadline date and time | Friday 22nd Jan, 11pm. |
| Module Leader/Assessment set by  Dr Ian Drumm, [i.drumm@salord.ac.uk](mailto:i.drumm@salord.ac.uk), N217 | |
| How to submit  Submit via blackboard the following..   1. The complete **Android Studio project** directory **zipped**. This must include all content enabling it to be imported into the IDEs of the examiners. This file’s name should be of the form *project\_<<surname>>\_<<firstname>>.zip* , for example: **project\_Smith\_John.zip**. 2. A **Word or PDF document** to be submitted via **TurnItIn**. This file’s name should be of the form *report\_<<surname>>\_<<firstname>>.zip*, for example: **report\_Smith\_John.doc**. 3. A **video** file. Using the free application <https://screencast-o-matic.com/> , or similar record your PC/Mac desktop for between 1 and 4 minutes, running your android application in Android Studio’s emulator. From here you can demonstrate user interaction, sensors, etc. This file’s name should be of the form *video\_<<surname>>\_<<firstname>>.zip*, for example: **video\_Smith\_John.MP4**. | |
| Assessment task details and instructions  Your task is to create an **Android** based game which demonstrates a science-based topic suitable for secondary school level (e.g. gravity, cell reproduction, etc). The game should utilise a user interface, interactive graphics, and other features appropriate to the android platform.  You must develop using **Android Studio / Java** only. (Not Kotlin!)  Do not use third party libraries.  Do not submit tic tac toe, snake, arcade clones or anything obviously taken from a text book or online tutorial. The maximum penalties will be pursued for any unfair means whatsoever. | |
| Assessed intended learning outcomes  On successful completion of this assessment, you will be able to:  Knowledge and Understanding   1. demonstrate a critical understanding OOP programming and academic concepts in the context of mobile development. 2. design and evaluate mobile applications software   Practical, Professional or Subject Specific Skills   1. demonstrate the practical programming of an Android mobile application using Java and Android Studio.   Transferable Skills and other Attributes apply academic concepts.demonstrate Critical evaluation  1. demonstrate Self-directed learning 2. demonstrate written communication of one’s understanding | |
| Module Aims   * to develop advanced skills in the key technologies used to provide interactive applications for use with mobile devices, taking into account the unique environment in which these applications operate * to make effective use of these technologies whilst still maintaining standards, particularly accessibility | |
| Word count/ duration (if applicable)  The report component should have a front page with title, your name, roll number and a list of contents, followed by be no more than 6 pages. | |
| Feedback arrangements  Mark will be available within 15 student working days. Each student will have also have written feedback broken down according to marking criteria. | |
| Support arrangements  Prior to delivery of assignment, classes from week 9 onwards will be run as surgeries.  askUS  The University offers a range of support services for students through [askUS](http://www.askus.salford.ac.uk/).  Good Academic Conduct and Academic Misconduct  Students are expected to learn and demonstrate skills associated with good academic conduct (academic integrity). Good academic conduct includes the use of clear and correct referencing of source materials. Here is a link to where you can find out more about the skills which students require <http://www.salford.ac.uk/skills-for-learning>.  **Academic Misconduct is an action which may give you an unfair advantage in your academic work. This includes plagiarism, asking someone else to write your assessment for you or taking notes into an exam. The University takes all forms of academic misconduct seriously. You can find out how to avoid academic misconduct here** [**https://www.salford.ac.uk/skills-for-learning**](https://www.salford.ac.uk/skills-for-learning)**.**  Assessment Information  If you have any questions about assessment rules, you can find out more [here](https://www.salford.ac.uk/askus/academic-support/student-handbook/your-studies/course-support/assessment-and-feedback).  Personal Mitigating Circumstances  If personal mitigating circumstances may have affected your ability to complete this assessment, you can find more information about personal mitigating circumstances procedure [here](https://sss.salford.ac.uk/).  Personal Tutor/Student Progression Administrator  If you have any concerns about your studies, contact your Personal Tutor or your Student Progression Administrator. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria  The following is a guide to the criteria that you need to satisfy in order to get a grade within each of the following ranges.   |  | **70-100%** | **60-70%** | **50-60%** | **40-50%** | **Below 40%** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **App and coding**  **60%** | Outstanding functionality and presentation.  Outstanding user experience fitting the assignment brief  Exceptionally daring, ambitious and creative application of the mobile platform. | Good creative programming with impressive functionality.  An enjoyable and appropriate user experience fitting the assignment brief.  Adventurously exploiting features of the mobile platform. | Competent application with functionality fitting the assignment brief.  Exploiting features of the mobile platform, as opposed to just desktop like functionality.  UI pretty and intuitive. | Working application though not ambitiously exploiting the unique possibilities of the mobile platform or mobile API.  Not fitting the brief as well as it could.  UI in some way clunky, unintuitive or unpretty. | No fully working application or a working application  with very limited functionality.  Not fitting the brief. | | Outstanding elegant design.  Code clearly building on all the notes and exercises presented in the module. Though with an adventurous wider exploration of Android features, technologies and API, that still integrates well with the application.  Entirely appropriate choices of classes, xml and resources.  Impeccable presentation of coding with appropriate comments, naming conventions, indenting, etc. | Elegant thoughtful design.  Good use of the notes and exercises presented in the module and some exploration beyond notes.  Thoughtful factoring of roles into appropriate classes, xml and resources.  Well-presented code with appropriate comments, indenting, naming conventions, indenting, etc. | Application of good design.  Competent coding, making good use of examples and notes presented in the module.  Tidy code with generally appropriate and consistent use of comments.  Classes, variables and methods named well and adhering to conventions. | Some evidence of design though lacking in structure and elegance.  Doesn’t make good use of notes and exercises presented in the module.  Code not as tidy as could be and lacking useful comments in some important places or has spurious comments. | Sloppy coding poorly presented.    Code doesn’t build or work well enough to meet the assignment briefing.  Application doesn’t load and work straight away when imported into assessor’s equivalent IDE.  Application uses third party libraries. | | **Report**  **40%** | Outstanding presentation and discussion of design.  Very good discussion of OOP theory applied.  Outstanding understanding of chosen mobile development platform, API, language and technologies demonstrated.  Very good critique of Android Java with clear comparisons and examples. | Very good design presented. Student may endeavour to employ ‘use case’, class diagrams and other UML to communicate design.  Good understanding of OOP theory applied.  Very good understanding of mobile development platform, API, language and technologies demonstrated.  Good critical evaluation of own work and Android development platform. | Good presentation and some evidence of design and evaluation.  Good understating of topics presented in notes and exercise evident.  Good use of diagrams where appropriate. | Report reasonable though too brief or too wordy with irrelevant content or waffle.  Some understating of topics presented in module evident.  Report could be better presented. For example, avoid untidy structure, untidy images, too much white space or an inappropriate balance of written explanation and figures.  Lacking in evidence of scholarly endeavour with no relevant references. Lacking in meaningful critical evaluation.  Not using the appropriate academic language in discussion of work and/or not writing in the third person. | Unconvincing written demonstration of an understanding of the code presented or wider topic. No meaningful discussion of how knowledge was applied.  Brief, irrelevant or unreadable report.  No real critical thinking or evaluation.  No name on report. | |
| The following is a generic guide to the criteria that you need to satisfy in order to get a grade within each of the following ranges.  **Outstanding (90-100)**   * Outstanding knowledge. * Exceptional application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Excellent professional execution of design methodology. * Outstanding critical analysis and synthesis. * Excels in self-managing a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process shows an aptitude to formulate new questions, ideas or challenges. * Incorporates evidence of original thinking; presentation is outstanding demonstrating a fluent academic style.   **Excellent (80-89)**   * Excellent depth of knowledge in a variety of contexts. * Coherent and systematic application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Excellent use of design methodology. * Excellent critical analysis and synthesis. * Integrates the complexity of a range of knowledge and excellent understanding of its relevance; confident in their ability to self-manage a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process * Arguments handled skilfully with imaginative interpretation of material; presentation is excellent, well-structured and logical; demonstrates a scholarly style; excellent grammar and syntax.   **Very Good (70-79)**   * Comprehensive knowledge demonstrating very good depth and breadth. * Clear insight into links between the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Strong use of design methodology. * Very good analysis and synthesis of material with evidence of critical and independent thought. * Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge between different contexts appropriately; balanced and mature approach to reflection used to enhance practice and performance; clear ability to self-manage a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process. * Presentation is of a very good standard, demonstrating a scholarly style. Very good grammar and syntax. Clear evidence of referencing to a wide range of primary and secondary sources which are used effectively in supporting the work.   **Good (60-69)**   * Consistently relevant accurate knowledge with good depth and breadth. * Clear and relevant application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Good use of design methodology. * Clear, in depth critical analysis, evaluation and academic argument with synthesis of different ideas and perspectives. * Utilises reflection to develop self and practice; aware of the influence of varied perspectives and time frames; demonstrates an ability to self-manage a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process. * Presentation of work is well organised with good use of language to express ideas or argument; very few inconsistencies in grammar and syntax good; good range of sources; well referenced with very few inaccuracies; good use of primary and secondary sources.   **Satisfactory (50-59)**   * Mostly accurate knowledge with satisfactory depth and breadth of knowledge. * Solid application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme * Fair use of design methodology. * Sound critical analysis and evaluation or synthesis. * Demonstrates basic ability of synthesise information in order to formulate appropriate questions and conclusions; reflective process is utilised, with insight demonstrating planning for future practice; shows the ability to self-manage a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process. * Relevant academic argument; presentation of work is fair in terms of structure coherence, clarity and academic style; some inconsistencies in grammar and syntax; fair range of sources identified with appropriate referencing and few inaccuracies; appropriate use of primary and secondary sources.   **Unsatisfactory (40-49)**   * Basic knowledge with occasional inaccuracies. * Appropriate yet basic application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Superficial depth or limited breadth, but an overall adequate identification of design methodology. * Critical analysis evident, with some evaluation and synthesis, although limited evidence of reflection. * Some evidence of an ability to self-manage a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process. * Some appropriate academic argument although not well applied and lacking in clarity; presentation of work is adequate in terms of structure, coherence, clarity and academic style; some inconsistencies; some grammar and syntax errors which detract from the content; narrow range of sources; referencing in presented work is adequate with some inconsistencies or inaccuracies; over utilises secondary sources; references used are inappropriate in terms of currency.   **Inadequate (30-39)**   * Limited evidence of knowledge. * Inappropriate application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Unsatisfactory design methodology. * Mainly descriptive evidence of analysis, inconsistent critical approach , little evaluation or synthesis. * Follows processes of reflection but fails to demonstrate insight; lacks coherence in the self-management of a significant piece of work. * Presentation is unsatisfactory; work is limited in terms of of structure, coherence or clarity; limitations in academic style; unsatisfactory referencing with errors; limited ability to support content with relevant sources.   **Poor (20-29)**   * Inconsistent or inaccurate knowledge. * Limited and inappropriate and inaccurate application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Poor use of methodology. * Descriptive, occasional attempts to analysis or evaluate material but lacks critical approach to evaluation or synthesis. * Identifies issues for reflection but lacks evidence of reflective processes. * Some but inconsistent ability to self-manage a significant piece of work or critical self-evaluation of the process. * Confusion or weakness in academic argument; presentation is poor; work is disorganised and lacks clarity; poor use of language; poor use of reference material; inappropriate or out dated sources with numerous referencing errors.   **Very Poor (10-19)**   * Virtually no relevant knowledge demonstrated. * Fails to adequately apply the practical and analytical skills from their programme. * Very poor use of design methodology. * No meaningful analysis or evaluation or synthesis. * Unable to self-manage a significant piece of work and to identify appropriate issues for critical self-evaluation of the process for reflection. * Academic arguments presented are inappropriate or very poorly linked; presentation is very poor; work has little discernible structure or clarity; very poor use of language; lack of ability to source adequate material; very poor referencing.   **Extremely poor (0-9)**   * Totally inadequate demonstration of required knowledge. * Not able to apply the practical and analytical skills from their programmes. * No appropriate design methodology. * No demonstration of analysis evaluation or synthesis. * No evidence of the ability to self-manage a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process. * Little academic value; presentation is extremely poor; work has no structure or clarity; extremely poor use of language; no references; no attempt to provide evidence of sources used.   Reassessment  If you fail your assessment, and are eligible for reassessment, you will need to resubmit on or before August. For students with accepted personal mitigating circumstances for absence/non submission, this will be your replacement assessment attempt. |

The task for reassessment will be the same as the original task.