# Solent University

# Coursework Assessment Brief

# Assessment Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit Title: | Game Development Project |
| Unit Code: | CGP 601 |
| Unit Leader: | Kostas Dokos |
| Level: | 6 |
| Assessment Title: | Final Report |
| Assessment Number: | AE2 |
| Assessment Type: | Report |
| Restrictions on Time/Word Count: | 7000 words plus software and source code |
| 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: | 70% |
| Issue Date: | 21-January-2019 |
| Hand In Date: | 3-May-2019 |
| Planned Feedback Date: | June 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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Final Product** | | | **Weighting 40%** | | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| The final product is not working or is crushing or is missing.  The final product fails to achieve the set aims and objectives. | The final product meets most/all of the aims and objectives, but is barely working or has game-breaking bugs. | The final product realises the student aims and objectives.  The final product has achieved most of the specified features and has minor or no bugs. | | The final product fully realises the student’s aims and objectives.  The final product has minor or no bugs and is features completely meet the specification. | The final product realises the student’s aims and objectives in a concise, elegant and expertly crafted manner.  In addition to meeting the specification, product quality is considerably polished in one or more aspects. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Professionalism** | | | **Weighting 20%** | | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| The student has not submitted the required video  The student hasn’t attended the final demonstration day  Poor document structure making it hard to read. | The student has submitted the required video demonstrating the features of the final product using the appropriate format and guidelines  There is no evidence of supervisor feedback incorporated into the product  Poor presentation during demonstration | There is minimal evidence of feedback from the supervisor implemented in the final product  Basic presentation during the demonstration  The report is within the required word count and follows the required formatting guidelines. | | There is visible supervisor feedback incorporated in the final product  Good and thorough presentation during the demonstration  The report is also well-structured, written communication is solid and is relatively easy to read. | As before, but there is also client-feedback (where applicable) as well as supervisor-feedback in the final product.  The report also has excellent structure, easy to read and short sentences, improves pacing and demonstrates attention to detail. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Execution** | |  | |  | | **Weighting 25%** | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| Poor execution of the project, with a lot of unjustified work or gaps in the schedule that suggest a non-methodical approach was taken into the completion of the project or no plan was followed.  Limited or no bibliography, evidence of research or referencing. | The student has supported his or her submission with evidence of tracked work, iterations, and a project management tool’s logs of completed work  The student has provided adequate bibliography and reading which potentially suggests basic research was done on the topic regarding execution and/or implementation and/or evaluations. | | Like before, but the student has also done proper Harvard style referencing within the report, with a limited amount of in-line referencing indicating some use of research and found sources.  The student has additionally justified the tracking methods of the project, has shown adaptation to change and has completed milestone retrospectives, demonstrating clear progress over the semester | | Like before, but the student has additionally provided implementation details, has demonstrated high quality implementation skill for the specific project.  The student has also shared a couple of snippets which are well-documented | | Like before, but there are adequate in-line references showcasing depth of research.  The student has also demonstrated fair use of testing techniques for their end product. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Evaluation, Reflections, Future Plans** | | |  |  | | **Weighting 15%** | |
| **N, S, F3-F1** | **D3 – D1 (3rd)** | **C3 – C1 (2:2)** | | | **B3 – B1 (2:1)** | | **A4 – A1 (1st)** |
| Insufficient reflection parts where most or all of the questions were not answered adequately, and there is no indication that the student has learned or there are clear knowledge gaps on basic concepts, critical analysis, evaluation or applications of the required methodologies. | Basic discussion on whether the finished product meets the set goals and objectives.  Student briefly discusses what went right and what went wrong. | Like before, but student also provides information regarding the process used to verify goal completion  Furthermore, student states the raised questions from the overall development experience. | | | Like before, but student also justifies the reasons certain objectives were not met and analyses the reasons, proposing new structures or solutions that could solve identified problems.  Student also sets the foundation for future development of the project and possible areas of further improvement. | | Like before, but student mentions any changes to his or her schedule and/or processes if the project was repeated  Student also mentions what was learned from the entire process.  Finally, student mentions what could have been done differently during the development process of this project |

# 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>