



Final mark awarded: _____

Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Science

Assessment Cover Sheet and Feedback Form - Resit 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) Demonstrate the ability to analyse and critically evaluate techniques used to optimise game engines*
- 2) Demonstrate the ability to analyse, create and evaluate game engine 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:

	Fail	Narrow Fail	3rd Class / Pass	Lower 2nd Class / Pass	Upper 2nd Class / Merit	1st Class / Distinction
Visportal implementation 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Visportal implementation. Work barely started 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Visportal implementation. Visportal implementation is fundamentally flawed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Visportal implementation. The visportal implementation works but is an inelegant implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Visportal implementation. The visportal implementation works and is elegantly implemented. No performance (fps) analysis was given 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Visportal implementation. The visportal implementation works and is elegantly implemented. Minimal performance (fps) analysis was given 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Visportal implementation. The visportal implementation works and is elegantly implemented. Excellent performance analysis was given
Introduction of sound to chisel 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Introduction of sound to chisel. Work barely started 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Introduction of sound to chisel. Sound introduction in chisel fundamentally flawed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Introduction of sound to chisel. The sound introduction would work but would be very limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Introduction of sound to chisel. The sound introduction works but borrows little from the lighting idea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Introduction of sound to chisel. Sensible design but there maybe some inelegant or lacking implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Introduction of sound to chisel. Excellent design and also excellent implementation
Detailed description of lights 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor Detailed description of lights. Work barely started 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Detailed description of lights. Poor understanding of how lighting is handled in chisel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory Detailed description of lights. The design of lights is mostly accurate - but there maybe some minor errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Detailed description of lights. No major errors in the design document. But there maybe elements missing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good Detailed description of lights. A good design which contains no major errors or omissions. Detail could be improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Detailed description of lights. An excellent design document produced which covers all areas and contains deep detail

Assessment Task:

The aim of this coursework is to extend the chisel free software package which allows doom3 maps to be built from the command line.

Chisel changes

Your extensions to this package should primarily be directed towards the two tools `txt2pen.py` and `pen2map.py`.

Your task is to:

- (i) provide a detailed description of how lights are introduced by the user in a txt map and how these lights end up in the map file (which is read by doom3). You should look at how `txt2pen` and `pen2map` handle lights. You should also discuss how the user can change lighting from a txt map source file.
- (ii) using your knowledge of (i) how would you change chisel to incorporate sounds. You should provide detail and code if possible.
- (iii) implementing open doors between rooms (using visportals). Make this change switchable from the command line.

The chisel software can be obtained using git:

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

Your submission must be a report of up to 2000 words. You should include screenshots and all the code which you change or write.