

Individual Report

The report gives each individual an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the process of developing and evaluating the game, and their own contribution to the team's effort. Reports should be strictly no more than 3 pages in length. The structure and content of the report will be discussed in class, but a suggested structure is as follows:

Introduction

Research which museums did you visit? What were you looking for? What information did you collect, and how did you analyse it? What did you discover? How did this influence your design ideas?

Design concept Explain the overall design concept: objectives, key user interactions, relevance to the objectives of this assignment? Include sketches, diagrams, etc., to give a clear explanation. What different forms of AR will be used?.

Prototype How did you turn the concept into a running prototype? What decisions and compromises were made? How was the concept modified or improved? Include key screen shots or photographs.

Team working who was in your team; (briefly) how was the work and responsibility distributed between team members.

Conclusion Your evaluation of the process and product, highlighting what you have learned

Provisional Report Marking Criteria

Note: In order to gain high marks in any category, work must be of a truly exceptional standard, demonstrating not only skill, knowledge and clear understanding, but also insight and innovativeness!

The content of the report and the work it describes will be marked according to the following criteria.

	0-3	3	4	5-7
Research	No plausible evidence of research done or museums visited.	Museum visit appears to have been made; findings may be vague or their relation to design unclear.	Clear findings, based on observation, guiding design.	Method or approach described that yields insightful observations with a clear link to design. Backed up by references to literature.
Design description	Hard to follow, not clear what the design is.	Simple design idea; description of use must be clear. Makes sensible use of AR.	Use of AR clear, demonstrating a good understanding of the AR concept. With appropriate sketches / diagrams. Reasonable justification given in terms of the museum experience.	Excellent justification (probably by reference to museum observations or other data) for good design choices. Backed up with appropriate references.
Design Originality		Like many others: simple overlays.	New take on familiar ideas - variety of overlays, used creatively.	Highly original, inventive response to the problem; novel and appropriate interactions.
Prototype quality	Little evidence that prototype works or implements the concept	Seems to implement design idea - using Unity or similar (with sensible justification for other technology choices)	Good implementation; Thought given to appearance. Probably some use of scripting in Unity, or a native app developed from scratch.	Clear thinking about physical interaction as well as interaction with on-screen objects; more complex overlays.
Use and understanding of AR	No evidence of AR being used	Little thought given effective application of AR.	Sensible + appropriate augmentation of multiple objects; shows understanding of different overlay types. Understanding of AR concept; augmentation of museum artefacts, not just pictures of them.	Innovative and insightful use of overlays and interactions.

An additional 5 marks are available for the quality of the report.

	0-2	3	4	5
Presentation of report	Hard to understand; may have many errors of expression. Lacking detail.	Well structured and organised, appropriate use of pictures. Within page limit.	Good writing, Properly formatted , using appropriate references.	Excellent writing. Clear and relevant referencing