MAJOR PROJECT - Final Report – 55%

Student Name:	**Dan O'Dwyer**
Title of Project:	Gamification in Learning
Supervisor:	**Bev Holland**
2nd marker:	**Nik Whitehead**
Course:	**Computing DIS CNC EEE** **Games Development SE Web (please indicate)**
Project Type:	**Survey Review Experiment Development (please indicate)**

	Mark %
First Marker's General Comments and Original Mark	54
Second Marker's General Comments and Original Mark A rather unambitious project that clearly suffered from time management problems.	54
Comment After Consultation With Other Marker & Final Agreed Mark	52

Signature: Nik Whitehead Date: 27/4/21

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
1.Research-informed Literature				
Introduction	/5	/5	/5	2.5 /5
Literature Review	/20	/35	/20	8 /15

Comments:
The abstract is a bit long and is not [illegible] to used enough. The aim is a little vague – showing that something has been "implemented effectively" needs more explanation. Objectives are okay, but suggest no link to the literature.
Much of the literature review relies on one resource. Comparison of apps is good, but needs to be linked to the body of literature

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject				
Methodology	/5	/5	/5	2 /5
Survey Design	/15	-	-	-
Requirements/Design	-	-	-	4 /5

Comments:
The methodologies are reasonable, but there is no discussion of resources, planning, or ethical issues. The latter are very important when developing apps for children, which this is.
Some of the graphics are discussed, but there is no discussion of the design of the lessons or the games. Some interface points are discussed.

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
3. Analysis				
Results & Discussions	/25	/25	/25	12.5/25
Conclusions and Recommendations	/10	/10	/10	5 /10

Comments:
More detail needs to be provided on the testing process – who was in the focus groups? How long did they take? How were they carried out? A good way to collect data on this would be to use the User Experience Questionnaire or the System Usability Scale. Discussion and conclusions should link back to the literature review

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
4. Practical Application and Deployment				
Development	-	-	-	7 /15
Experimental Design	-	-	/15	-

Comments:
Description of the implementation is minimal, and the code fragments show trivial actions. No discussion of the development of the interface design or development. Given that RAD was used as a development method I'd expect to see strong evidence of incremental builds. Very weak

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
5. Skills for Professional Practice				
Reflection	/10	/10	/10	6 /10
Quality of Report	/10	/10	/10	4 /10

Comments:

Needs a table of figures to go with the table of contents. Very limited set of references, insufficient for a project of this magnitude.
An honest reflection.

TOTAL:	**/100**	**/100**	**/100**	**/100**