# Solent University

# Coursework Assessment Brief

# Assessment Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit Title: | Game Development Project |
| Unit Code: | CGP 601 |
| Unit Leader: | Kostas Dokos |
| Level: | 6 |
| Assessment Title: | Progress Report |
| Assessment Number: | AE1 |
| Assessment Type: | Written report |
| Restrictions on Time/Word Count: | 3000 |
| Consequence of not meeting time/word count limit: | There is no penalty for submitting below the word/count limit, but students should be aware that there is a risk they may not maximise their potential mark.  Assignments should be presented appropriately in line with the restrictions stated above; if an assignment exceeds the time/word count this will be taken in account in the marks given using the assessment criteria shown. |
| Individual/Group: | Individual |
| Assessment Weighting: | 30% |
| Issue Date: | 21-January-2019 |
| Hand In Date: | 01-March-2019 |
| Planned Feedback Date: | March 2019 |
| Mode of Submission: | On-line and presentation |
| Number of copies to be submitted: | n/a |
| Anonymous Marking | This assessment is exempt from anonymous marking. |

# Assessment Task

See Project Handbook.

# 

# Assessment criteria

The Progress Report is marked according to 5 areas of assessment criteria:

# 

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Background, Aim(s), Objectives** | | | **Weighting 15%** | | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| Missing or poor background, aim(s) and objectives.  Little or no coherent connection between these sections. | Brief discussion of project background and presents basic aim(s) and objectives. | Good background discussion including context and scope of project, which informs aim(s) and objectives. | | Background, context and scope discussion backed up by some references, leading to well defined aim(s) and objectives. | Well researched and referenced background, context and scope discussed, leading to clearly defined aim(s) and objectives. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Literature Review, Reading List, References** | | | **Weighting 20%** | | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| Missing, non- relevant or poor review of literature. Few or no examples of literature in reading list or references. | Identifies some relevant literature sources, but no discussion. Some evidence of background reading in a reading list.  Some valid references given, though may not use correct Harvard referencing. | Review briefly discusses how the literature might inform the project. Good evidence of relevant background reading in reading list. Range of valid references included, using Harvard referencing correctly. | | Review discusses how the literature might inform the project, and links sources to potential areas of research and development. Wide ranging evidence of background reading in reading list. Good range of valid references given. | Excellent analysis of literature given, with chosen sources clearly shown to inform all aspects of the project. Extensive and relevant background reading evidenced. Thorough and appropriate referencing provided. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Project Specification** | |  | |  | | **Weighting 15%** | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| Missing or non- relevant research shown. Missing or non- relevant specification. | Small amount of research shown. Presents a limited specification or statement of research questions. | | Modest amount of research shown. Specification or statement of research questions is informed by research and reflects stated project objectives. | | Good range of relevant referenced research discussed. Uses credible sources from research to inform specification or statement of research questions, fully reflecting project objectives. | | Wide range of relevant referenced research shown with excellent analysis. Uses analysis to derive a clear, concise and unambiguous specification (or statement of research questions) based on measurable values. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Potential Solutions** | |  | |  | | **Weighting 25%** | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| Solutions missing, not relevant to the specification given, or missing class diagrams, pseudocode, or equivalent documentation. | Presents few potential solutions. Choice made, but no rationale given.  Low detail and/or inaccurate pseudocode and flow diagrams (or research equivalent). Few components described, with little or no evidence of relationships between them (or research equivalent). | | Presents several potential solutions with background discussion. Some rationale based on background used to make a choice.  Pseudocode and flow diagrams (or research equivalent) showing some of the expected operations for select components, though there may be some errors or omissions. | | Presents a well thought out set of potential solutions. Good background discussion informed by references.  Defines and uses a modest set of criteria for the selection among potential solutions.  Pseudocode, flow and class diagrams mostly describe core operations.  Components and their relationships mostly fulfil specification (or research equivalent). | | Wide range of appropriate potential solutions. Excellent background analysis with solid references.  Comprehensive criteria for selection are clearly derived from aim(s) objectives and specification.  Pseudocode, flow and class diagrams completely describe operations.  Components and their relationships accurately fulfil specification (or research equivalent). |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5. Project Management Weighting 25%** | | | | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| No evidence of project management methods; or little or no or inappropriate discussion.  No risk analysis or awareness of risks. | Presents a basic project plan with some time estimates and dependencies shown, but parts may have insufficient or missing details.  Only very broad risks discussed, and little contingency planning | Reasonably complete and detailed plans with dependencies and estimates.  Suitable metrics provided for most tasks. Identifies some risks for critical tasks, with some consideration of contingencies. | Project management is well applied, with a complete and detailed plan. Work is broken down into tasks with appropriate time estimates, metrics and dependencies.  Good analysis of risks for majority of critical tasks, with well thought out and planned contingencies and mitigation plans. | As B3-B1, with additional discussion of the rationale used to plan.  Risk analysis includes thorough and timely mitigation steps.  Valid references used to back up this discussion. |

# Learning Outcomes

This assessment will enable students to demonstrate in full or in part the learning outcomes identified in the unit descriptors.

# Late Submissions

Students are reminded that:

1. If this assessment is submitted late i.e. within 5 working days of the submission deadline, the mark will be capped at 40% if a pass mark is achieved;
2. If this assessment is submitted later than 5 working days after the submission deadline, the work will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero;
3. If this assessment is being submitted as a referred piece of work (second or third attempt) then it must be submitted by the deadline date; any Refer assessment submitted late will be regarded as a non-submission and will be awarded a zero.

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2o-assessment-principles-and-regulations.pdf?t=1534423842941>

# Extenuating Circumstances

The University’s Extenuating Circumstances procedure is in place if there are genuine circumstances that may prevent a student submitting an assessment. If students are not 'fit to study’, they can either request an extension to the submission deadline of 5 working days or they can request to submit the assessment at the next opportunity (Defer). In both instances students must submit an EC application with relevant evidence. If accepted by the EC Panel there will be no academic penalty for late submission or non-submission dependent on what is requested. Students are reminded that EC covers only short term issues (20 working days) and that if they experience longer term matters that impact on learning then they must contact the Student Hub for advice.

A summary of guidance notes for students is given below:

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2p-extenuating-circumstances.pdf?t=1534423896787>

# Academic Misconduct

Any submission must be students’ own work and, where facts or ideas have been used from other sources, these sources must be appropriately referenced. The University’s Academic Handbook includes the definitions of all practices that will be deemed to constitute academic misconduct. Students should check this link before submitting their work.

Procedures relating to student academic misconduct are given below:

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/support/official-documents/information-for-students/complaints-conduct/student-academic-misconduct.aspx>

**Ethics Policy**

The work being carried out by students must be in compliance with the Ethics Policy. Where there is an ethical issue, as specified within the Ethics Policy, then students will need an ethics release or an ethical approval prior to the start of the project.

The Ethics Policy is contained within Section 2S of the Academic Handbook:

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2s-university-ethics-policy.pdf>

**Grade marking**

The University uses a letter grade scale for the marking of assessments. Unless students have been specifically informed otherwise their marked assignment will be awarded a letter grade. More detailed information on grade marking and the grade scale can be found on the portal and in the Student Handbook.

<http://portal.solent.ac.uk/documents/academic-services/academic-handbook/section-2/2o-annex-2-assessment-regulations-grade-marking-scale.pdf?t=1534424273208>

**Guidance for online submission through Solent Online Learning (SOL)**

<http://learn.solent.ac.uk/onlinesubmission>