Computer Games Design – Assessment 2015-16

Introduction
This is a module taught both as an individual and as a team approach. The individual takes a specific role during the creation of the game design, and keeps a detailed personal blog of his/her work and how it feeds into the final design. There are three pieces of work to be produced, *each worth one third of the final mark*:

1. a detailed game design document – team task
2. a pitch to potential financial backers of the game development project – team task
3. a personal blog of work done, issues met, problems solved, etc. – individual task

The Game Design Document
This can be a conventional document, or it can be in the form of an e-portfolio, or a combination of both. It's up to each team to decide on the format that they think best communicates the detailed design of their game idea in a professional manner.

It should include *as a minimum* the following: an outline of the game idea, drawings of proposed levels, storyboards/flowcharts of significant action scenes in the levels, sketches of characters, scenery, etc., sound and music exemplars for effects and aesthetic experience of the game.

It should include possible development environments (with reasoning for preferred option), task breakdown (assuming a one-year development timescale), personnel requirements (for creative components, administration, roll-out, etc of the game), target hardware (with reasoning detailing target demographics), development cost of the game, pricing options.

All content must be IP cleared, and each member's role in the creation of the document clearly outlined.

To be submitted by Friday of Week 12.

Team Pitch
Each team will make an appointment to meet the Lecturer **during week 11 or week 12**. Time slots for team pitches will be allocated on the basis of first come first served.

At the meeting the Lecturer will role-play a potential financial backer for the proposed computer game. Other University staff and/or students may also be in attendance. Each team will have 15 minutes in which to make a pitch in the hope of securing financial backing. Following the pitch there will be a question and answer session which will take no more than 5 minutes. Timings will be strictly observed. The format of the pitch is up to the teams, but the following should be noted:

- All members of the team must participate;
- A formal "stand up and talk" presentation is expected for at least part of the time; and
- Each team should try to stand out from the crowd - in a good way.

The materials used during the pitch must be submitted via Moodle once the pitch has taken place.

Personal Blog

Each team member must keep a detailed blog of all work done on the project.

This must be updated at least weekly starting from week 1, and it should include a range of the following items: personal sketches of ideas, imagery and notes, details of real-world sites visited, details of games played/considered, software used/considered, hardware considerations, personal blog on progress, reflections on the process and lessons learned for the next project. You must provide the URL of your published blog, plus a pdf version of the blog content.

Pdf version to be submitted by Friday of Week 12:

Peer Review Forms

Each team member must complete a Peer Review Form for him/herself and for each of the other team members.

To be submitted by Friday of Week 12.

Submission

All submissions must be made through Moodle. All files must be named as follows:

- For individual submissions, include your Banner id, e.g. *CGD_B00000000_blog.pdf*
- For team submissions, include the team name, e.g. *CGD_TeamName_Design_Document.rtf*
- Where multiple files are being submitted use an archive utility like [7-Zip](#) to compress them into a single zip file, which you should name as above.

Marking

The same marking regime applies to all three parts:

"The work presented is ...
A - of a standard that would be expected in a professional games development studio
B1 - satisfies all the criteria requested
B2 - satisfies all the criteria presented, but has some significant flaws
C - is adequate but not of great quality
D - requires significant rework in order to pass
E - requires restarting from scratch
F - shows no evidence of any work being done".

The work will be marked by Jim Scullion (Ayr and Paisley) or Gerry Creechan (Hamilton). Marking will be checked by another academic from the School of Computing. Results are also checked by an External Examiner from another university, and then finally approved by the Subject Panel. Only at that stage is the mark final, and you can check it on Banner.