Final mark awarded:_____

Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Science

Assessment Cover Sheet and Feedback Form 2017-18

Module Code: CS2S566	Module Title: Tool Development for Computer Games	Module Lecturer: Ben Daubney, Gaius Mulley
Assessment Title: Pygame Missile Command and Marble Madness CW1		Assessment No. 1
No. of pages submitted in total including this page: Completed by student		Word Count of submission (if applicable): Completed by student
Date Set: 23-Oct-2017 00:00:00	Submission Date: 08-Dec-2017 23:55:00	Return Date: 05-Jan-2018 23:55:00

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[1]. 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%[2]. 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).

You are required to acknowledge that you have read the above statements by writing	Student Number(s):

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

your student number(s) in the box:	

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 identify the functional and non-functional requirements of a game engine / game design2) Apply relevant software engineering techniques to develop applications to generate data for use in a game engine*

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:	

Assessment Task:

Your coursework consists of three components. Firstly implement a simple Missile Command game for the first level only in Python and Pygame, you may use circles/squares to represent cities missiles and aircraft.

Secondly implement a very simple 2D version of Marble Madness using Python and the Physics game engine PGE. PGE is alpha code and you might expose bugs within the library. In industry you might be asked to use preproduction code and/or write a simple program as a test harness. If you do find a bug you should document it carefully and include the bug report as part of the coursework submission in your report.

Finally you should include a comparison of the two implementation techniques in your report and also include any bug reports in this section.

Your report must consist of a program listing and a line by commentary of all your code. Your report should not exceed 2000 words excluding code.

	Fail	Narrow Fail	3rd Class / Pass	Lower 2nd Class / Pass	Upper 2nd Class / Merit	1st Class / Distinction
Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques 30%	• Very poor Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques	• Poor Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques	• Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques is satisfactory. The comparison addresses the some of areas with errors and omissions	• Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques is good. The comparison addresses the majority of areas with a few errors or omissions	• Very good Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques. The comparison addresses the majority of areas with no major errors or omissions	• Excellent Bug reports and Comparison of two techniques. The comparison contains a high amount of independent thought and also all the major areas are covered without errors
PGE implementation of Marble Madness 30%	• Very poor PGE implementation of Marble Madness	• Poor PGE implementation of Marble Madness	• PGE implementation of Marble Madness is satisfactory	• PGE implementation of Marble Madness is good. Some attempt at using more advanced features and techniques could have been shown	• Very good PGE implementation of Marble Madness. Some attempt at using more advanced features and techniques could have been shown. Some insight into the theoretical concepts presented to you is evident	• Excellent PGE implementation of Marble Madness. Excellent use of advanced features found in PGE
Pygame implementation of Missile Command 40%	• Very poor Pygame implementation of Missile Command	• Poor Pygame implementation of Missile Command	• Pygame implementation of Missile Command is satisfactory	• Pygame implementation of Missile Command is good. Some insight into the theoretical concepts presented to you is evident	• Very good Pygame implementation of Missile Command. Relevant concepts presented in lectures have been applied to the implementation and game is working well	• Excellent Pygame implementation of Missile Command. Excellent use of advanced features found in Pygame