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# Game Programming Project – Game Application (Rubrics) (35%)

This document gives the marking rubrics for PGGE Assignment 3: Game Programming Project – Game Application

# Q1: Make at least two refactoring changes to the project (10 marks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F: <5**  **Poor** | **D: >= 5 < 6**  **Adequate** | **C: >= 6 < 7**  **Good** | **B: >= 7 < 8**  **Very Good** | **A: >= 8**  **Excellent** | **Marks**  **(/10)** |
| **Q1** | Unable to run the program, or the student did not attempt the question. | Able to run the program, but the code is poorly written and very difficult to read.  The student had attempted at least one code refactoring.  No comments. | Able to run the program, and the code is readable only by a person who already knows its purpose.  The student had attempted at least two code refactoring.  Some superficial comments exist and a poor attempt at describing the working of the program. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted at least two code refactoring.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted more than two code refactoring.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. |  |
| **Total** | | | | | |  |

# Q3: Make any one of the following extensions to the multiplayer capability of the project (10 marks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F: <5**  **Poor** | **D: >= 5 < 6**  **Adequate** | **C: >= 6 < 7**  **Good** | **B: >= 7 < 8**  **Very Good** | **A: >= 8**  **Excellent** | **Marks**  **(/10)** |
| **Q2** | Unable to run the program, or the student did not attempt the question. | Able to run the program, but the code is poorly written and very difficult to read.  The student had attempted to solve the problem but did not achieve the desired outcome.  No comments. | Able to run the program, and the code is readable only by a person who already knows its purpose.  The student had attempted and solved the problem but have implemented less than two features.  Some superficial comments exist and a poor attempt at describing the working of the program. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted and solved the problem but have implemented less than three features.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted and solved the problem and have implemented more than three features.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. |  |
| **Total** | | | | | |  |

# Q4: Make two aesthetic enhancements (5 marks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F: <5**  **Poor** | **D: >= 5 < 6**  **Adequate** | **C: >= 6 < 7**  **Good** | **B: >= 7 < 8**  **Very Good** | **A: >= 8**  **Excellent** | **Marks**  **(/10)** |
| **Q3** | Unable to run the program, or the student did not attempt the question. | Able to run the program, but the code is poorly written and very difficult to read.  The student had attempted at least one of the two tasks.  No comments. | Able to run the program, and the code is readable only by a person who already knows its purpose.  The student had attempted both the tasks but has a problem with one of them.  Some superficial comments exist and a poor attempt at describing the working of the program. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted both the tasks successfully.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted both the tasks successfully and have used multiple sounds for different buttons.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. |  |
| **Total (x 0.5)** | | | | | |  |

# Q4: Make performance optimization to the project (10 marks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **F: <5**  **Poor** | **D: >= 5 < 6**  **Adequate** | **C: >= 6 < 7**  **Good** | **B: >= 7 < 8**  **Very Good** | **A: >= 8**  **Excellent** | **Marks**  **(/10)** |
| **Q2** | Unable to run the program, or the student did not attempt the question. | Able to run the program, but the code is poorly written and very difficult to read.  The student had attempted the performance optimization but did not achieve any actual performance gains.  No comments. | Able to run the program, and the code is readable only by a person who already knows its purpose.  The student had attempted the performance optimization and achieves performance gain by at least 10%.  Some superficial comments exist and a poor attempt at describing the working of the program. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted the performance optimization and achieves performance gain by at least 20%.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. | Able to run the program, and the code is relatively easy to read.  The student had attempted more than one performance optimization and achieves performance gain by at least 10% in each optimization.  The student has thoroughly commented on the code with proper and meaningful descriptions. |  |
| **Total** | | | | | |  |
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