S

School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics

Assessment Details and Brief	
Module Code:	CI410
Module Title:	Introduction to Game Design and Development
Author(s)/marker(s) of assessment:	Panagiotis Fotaris / Phil Jackson
Assessment number:	1
Assessment title:	Game design
Percentage contribution to module mark:	50%
Weighting of components within this assessment:	Design Report 100%
Module learning outcome(s) assessed:	• LO1: Communicate their own game design, rules, functionality, and user interfaces in writing using a combination of narrative & appropriate diagrams. • LO2: Describe game mechanics found in prior art and demonstrate the ability to predict their impact on gameplay.
The assessment is marked anonymously	☐ Yes ☒ No
Date of issue:	5/10/2020
Deadline for submission:	15/1/2021 15:00
Method of submission:	**You are required to hand a single component:** A 1750-word report uploaded to the CW1 Assignment area for CI410 on student central.
Date feedback will be provided:	8/2/2021

Assessment brief

You will need to demonstrate a design-led approach to the creation of a small mobile game paying specific attention to: Rules, Rewards, intended Audience as well as appreciation of the benefits of any hardware-specific mobile features such as; Touch screen, location sensing, web connectivity, motion sensing, Bluetooth WIFI.

- The Game design overview should include: Game Rules, Scoring, and Reward mechanics.
- You are encouraged to include flowcharts, sketches, and concept drawings to effectively communicate your design.
- You should include 2 personas of your intended customers, supported by evidence which supports your assertion. Consideration should be paid to the short and medium-term play cycle with a focus on player actions and game rewards.
- Any 3rd party content should be correctly referenced.

Marking rubric						
	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%)**
Report depth 40%	Completely unsatisfactory and weak in all sections.	A poorly structured report with vague language, may include some typos and require a lot of polishing. Some key information missing. Minimal use of mapping features to personas.	A well-structured report, very few typos. Covers most sections but to a poor extent. Some attempts at mapping features to personas.	A clearly structured well-written report. Covers all sections to a reasonable extent. A good depth and breadth of knowledge are shown. Sound attempt at mapping features to personas.	In addition, uses precise language (terminology) and concise in its narrative. Covers all sections, providing extensive links to other sources of information. Demonstrates clear understanding of the use of personas in design.	In addition, a deep understanding of the problem/solution in the domain is demonstrated, also with alternative solutions discussed. Sophisticated critical reflection. Professionally looking, clearly written report.
Report clarity 40%	Poor layout, minimal/no use of diagrams overall too simple for L4.	Acceptable layout, attempt made to use diagrams at a minimal level simple for L4.	Sound layout, good use of diagrams however with a significant number of inconsistencies / irrelevant diagrams for L4.	Clear layout, good use of relevant diagrams minimal inconsistencies for L4.	Highly readable layout, excellent use of highly relevant diagrams no inconsistencies for L4.	In addition to being highly readable with, excellent use of relevant diagrams report contains highly innovative ways of communicating key concepts.
Game design innovation Prototype innovation 20%	Minimal/no evidence of own innovation and or, highly derivative for L4	Evidence of at least one innovative game feature.	Evidence of at least two innovative game features.	Evidence of at least two innovative & complimentary game features.	Evidence of more than two innovative & complimentary game features.	Evidence of multiple interlinked & innovative game features of publishable standard.
	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%)**

1. *A copy of your coursework submission may be made as part of the University of Brighton's and School of Computing, Engineering & Mathematics procedures which aim to monitor and improve quality of teaching. You should refer to your student handbook for details.*
2. *All work submitted must be your own (or your team's for an assignment which has been specified as a group submission) and all sources which do not fall into that category must be correctly attributed. The markers may submit the whole set of submissions to the JISC Plagiarism Detection Service.*