



Final mark awarded: _____

Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Science

Assessment Cover Sheet and Feedback Form 2017-18

Table with 3 columns: Module Code, Module Title, Module Lecturer, Assessment Title, Assessment No., No. of pages submitted, Word Count of submission, Date Set, Submission Date, Return Date.

Part A: Record of Submission (to be completed by Student)

Extenuating Circumstances

If there are any exceptional circumstances that may have affected your ability to undertake or submit this assignment, make sure you contact the Advice Centre on your campus prior to your submission deadline.

Fit to sit policy:

The University operates a fit to sit policy whereby you, in submitting or presenting yourself for an assessment, are declaring that you are fit to sit the assessment. You cannot subsequently claim that your performance in this assessment was affected by extenuating factors.

Plagiarism and Unfair Practice Declaration:

By submitting this assessment, you declare that it is your own work and that the sources of information and material you have used (including the internet) have been fully identified and properly acknowledged as required. Additionally, the work presented has not been submitted for any other assessment. You also understand that the Faculty reserves the right to investigate allegations of plagiarism or unfair practice which, if proven, could result in a fail in this assessment and may affect your progress.

Intellectual Property and Retention of Student Work:

You understand that the University will retain a copy of any assessments submitted electronically for evidence and quality assurance purposes; requests for the removal of assessments will only be considered if the work contains information that is either politically and/or commercially sensitive (as determined by the University) and where requests are made by the relevant module leader or dissertation supervisor.

Details of Submission:

Note that all work handed in after the submission date and within 5 working days will be capped at 40%. No marks will be awarded if the assessment is submitted after the late submission date unless extenuating circumstances are applied for and accepted (Advice Centre to be consulted).

Table with 2 columns: Acknowledgment text and Student Number(s) field.

1University Academic Misconduct Regulations
2Information on exclusions to this rule is available from the Advice Centre at each Campus

IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP RECORDS OF ALL WORK SUBMITTED

**Part B: Marking and Assessment
(to be completed by Module Lecturer)**

This assignment will be marked out of 100%

This assignment contributes to 50% of the total module marks.

This assignment is bonded

Learning Outcomes to be assessed (as specified in the validated module descriptor <https://icis.southwales.ac.uk/>):

1) To critically evaluate the techniques that underpin modern game engines2) To be able to justify techniques used in the design, development and evaluation of game engine and gameplay code

Feedback/feed-forward (linked to assessment criteria):

- Areas where you have done well:

- Feedback from this assessment to help you to improve future assessments:

- Other comments

Mark:

Marker's Signature:

Date:

- **Work on this module has been marked, double marked/moderated in line with USW procedures.**

Provisional mark only: subject to change and/or confirmation by the Assessment Board

**Part C: Reflections on Assessment
(to be completed by student – optional)**

Use of previous feedback:

In this assessment, I have taken/took note of the following points in feedback on previous work:

Please indicate which of the following you feel/felt applies/applied to your submitted work

- A reasonable attempt. I could have developed some of the sections further.
- A good attempt, displaying my understanding and learning, with analysis in some parts.
- A very good attempt. The work demonstrates my clear understanding of the learning supported by relevant literature and scholarly work with good analysis and evaluation.
- An excellent attempt, with clear application of literature and scholarly work, demonstrating significant analysis and evaluation.

What I found most difficult about this assessment:

The areas where I would value/would have valued feedback:

The aim of this coursework is to extend the PGE and Python interface API code. You should start by incorporating per object inelastic collisions. Secondly you should introduce the ability to assign per object gravity. You should also implement a simple version of frozen bubble in Python for pge to guide your pge changes.

You can obtain pge from github via:

```
git clone https://github.com/gaiusm/pge
```

Once you have implemented these changes you should consider making any other improvements based on your own research.

For each improvement you make you should generate simple Python test cases to demonstrate your code is working.

Your report must consist of a program listing, a line by commentary of any changes/improvement that you make and appropriate screen shots.

	Fail	Narrow Fail	3rd Class / Pass	Lower 2nd Class / Pass	Upper 2nd Class / Merit	1st Class / Distinction
Inelastic collisions and per object gravity 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Inelastic collisions and per object gravity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Inelastic collisions and per object gravity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Inelastic collisions and per object gravity. A single feature was changed. Some obvious code weaknesses exist, but the overall direction was sensible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Inelastic collisions and per object gravity. Sensible changes attempted, code contains some errors but is along the correct path 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Inelastic collisions and per object gravity. Interesting and effective changes made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Inelastic collisions and per object gravity. Code contains independent ideas and is well crafted
Any other improvements 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Any other improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Any other improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Any other improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Any other improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Any other improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Any other improvements. The improvements contain a high amount of independent thought
Test programs 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Test programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Test programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Test programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Test programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Test programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Test programs. Very thorough tests produced
Documentation/Commentary 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Documentation/Commentary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Documentation/Commentary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Documentation/Commentary. The commentary addresses some of the areas with errors and omissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Documentation/Commentary. The commentary addresses the majority of areas with a few errors or omissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Documentation/Commentary. The commentary addresses the majority of areas with no major errors or omissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Documentation/Commentary. The commentary contains a high amount of independent thought and also all the major areas are covered without errors