University of South Wales
Prifysgol De Cymru

Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Science

Assessment Cover Sheet 2019-20

Module Code:	Module Title:	Module Team:
CS2S566	Tool Development for Computer Games	Gaius Mulley
Assessment Title:		**Assessment No.:**
Practical Coursework 2 *Touchmap*		2
Date Set:	**Submission Date:**	**Return Date:**
20-Jul-2020 00:00	21-Aug-2020 23:55	16-Sep-2020 23:55

IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP RECORDS OF ALL WORK SUBMITTED.

Marking and Assessment

This assignment will be marked out of **100%**.

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

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 design
- 2) Apply relevant software engineering techniques to develop applications to generate data for use in a game engine

Awarded mark is only provisional: subject to change and / or confirmation by the Assessment Board.

Assessment Task

Your task is to implement a Python based GUI tool which will produce maps suitable for chisel.

Your tool should initially allow users to click on tiles which can be chosen to be either a wall, dooror space.

It can be extended to include other attributes such as pickups,monsters, lights and textures ifdesired. Your report must also include a user guide and line by line commentary. The semanticchecking of a limit of walls per room and door sizes would be beneficial. Also you might want torestrict the density of monsters (for example a hellknight should have spaces around it).

Marking Scheme

	Fail (0/29)	Narrow Fail (30/39)	3rd Class / Pass (40/49)	Lower 2nd Class / Pass (50/59)	Upper 2nd Class / Merit (60/69)	1st Class / Distinction (70/100)
code quality and use of Python (30%)	☐ Very poor code quality and use of Python. The code adds very little to the code given in the lectures	☐ Poor code quality and use of Python. The additional code is either too minimal or too broken to be of much use	☐ Satisfactory code quality and use of Python. A single feature was changed. Some obvious code weaknesses exist, but the overall direction was sensible	☐ Good code quality and use of Python. Sensible changes attempted, code contains some errors but is along the correct path	☐ Very good code quality and use of Python. Interesting and effective changes made either visually or structurally	☐ Excellent code quality and use of Python. Code contains independent ideas and is well crafted
human computer interface (20%)	☐ Very poor human computer interface. Poor code and poor choice of controls	☐ Poor human computer interface. Some obvious features might be missing or/and the code was poor	☐ Satisfactory human computer interface. Quality of code handing the controls might be improved and the controls chosen are limited	☐ Good human computer interface. Good choice of controls but the code could be improved. Alternatively excellent code but the choice of controls could be improved	☐ Very good human computer interface. Very good choice of controls and the code which implements them is clean	☐ Excellent human computer interface. Independent thought shown in addition to the previous box
line by line commentary (20%)	☐ Very poor line by line commentary. Many code lines are uncommented	☐ Poor line by line commentary. Many code lines comments are misleading	☐ Satisfactory line by line commentary. The commentary addresses some of the areas with errors and omissions	☐ Good line by line commentary. The commentary addresses the majority of areas with a few errors or omissions	☐ Very good line by line commentary. The commentary addresses the majority of areas with no major errors or omissions	☐ Excellent line by line commentary. The commentary contains a high amount of independent thought and also all the major areas are covered without errors
user guide (30%)	☐ Very poor user guide. There are gaping holes in the documentation	☐ Poor user guide. The user guide is misleading	☐ Satisfactory user guide. The user guide might contain minor omissons and errors	☐ Good user guide. The user guide contains weaknesses in some areas	☐ Very good user guide. The user guide was well written and contains useful relevant information	☐ Excellent user guide. Well written documentation with very relevant screenshots showing independent thought
Global:						