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| ***"Nobody in this industry knows what they’re doing, we just have a gut assumption."***  ***- Cliff Bleszinski***  ***"Golden rule of level design - Finish your first level last."***  ***- John Romero***  ***"You can make an amazing game, but you can't make a success. Your players make the success."***  ***- Irme Jele***  ***"Lets optimize for player experience rather than what we think will make more money."***  ***- Ron Carmel*** | Introduction For this assignment you will work as part of a development team  This assignment is comprised of multiple parts: Part A **Attend the scheduled meeting with your project supervisor**. You will meet with your supervisor at least 3 times during the project. This is a check-in and will be update the supervisor on your progress. Part B **Work at your placement.**  Successfully work at your placement/internship. Your mentor will fill out a short assessment form which will be used to mark some of the assignment criteria. Part C **Reflect on your time on the project.**  Write a 2000-word report which reflects on your time on placement/internship this should be a reflective piece and not simply a report of what you did. You should select 3 – 5 areas for reflection and/or personal development  The report should have the following structure:  **Introduction**  **Project Details**  **Typical Tasks Undertaken**  **Areas of Reflection**  **Conclusion**  This should be submitted to your supervisor before the assignment deadline. Part D **Attend the Game Academy Expo**  You will be required to attend the Game Academy Expo to demonstrate your game to Expo attendees. Your game and your team’s performance at the Expo will be evaluated through the ‘Product & Expo Evaluation’ component of the assignment.  You will receive informal feedback from staff during the Expo and you will receive formal feedback through Learning Space within three weeks of the Expo. FAQ  * **What is the deadline for this assignment?**   Falmouth University policy states that deadlines must only be specified on the MyFalmouth system.   * **What should I do to seek help?**   You can email your tutor for informal clarifications. |

# Marking Rubric

Assignment 2 – Studio Practice

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Outcome Name** | **Learning Outcome Description** | **Criteria** | **Weighting** | **Clear Fail** | **Near Pass** | **3rd** | **2:2** | **2:1** | **1st** | **>1st** |
| Collaborate  /  Collaborate | Produce work as part of a multidisciplinary team critically appraising practices, approaches, and tools; applying them to enhance development pipelines. | Effective team worker | 20% | Student has missed a large number of team meetings / SSP sessions  Teammates concerned with lack of presence  Student tends to be highly disruptive / chaotic | Student attends less than 50% of team sessions  Student tends to be disruptive / chaotic | Student attends most sessions.  Delivers acceptable work with occasional major issues  Has issues dealing with some teammates | Student attends most sessions.  Delivers acceptable work without major issues  Has occasional issues dealing with some teammates | Student attends most sessions.  Delivers generally good work with only minor issues | Student attends most sessions.  Delivers good work.  Inspires some teammates  No noticeable issues dealing with teammates. Tends to promote team harmony | Student is driving the team to achieve great things  Team is highly supportive of leadership direction and approach |
| Agile  Practitioner | 10% | Very low attendance  Team has little to no idea what’s going on  Not involved in planning activities | Low attendance  Work always slips  Delivers assets for integrate only at end of sprint  Minor involvement in planning activities | Average attendance  Some tendency work to slip, reluctance to share development issues  Struggles to contribute meaningfully to planning | Good attendance  Work is generally delivered, with only occasional slippages. Team is often, but not always made aware of issues.  Often contributes to planning | Good attendance  Work is generally delivered, with only occasional slippages. Team is generally made aware of issues.  Able to provide some support to teammates  Good contributor to planning | Good attendance  Work is delivered, with very few slippages. Team is generally made aware of issues and progress.  Able to provide reasonable support to teammates  Very good contributor to planning | Good attendance  Work is delivered, team is generally made aware of issues and progress.  Able to provide a lot of support to teammates  Extremely good contributor to planning |
| Version control  practitioner | 10% | Student ignores version control at all costs  Only delivers assets outside of version control | Student uses VC with many significant problems for the team  Mainly delivers assets outside of version control | Student uses VC with few problems | Student generally works off mainline of project.  Integration is often problematic | Student is generally working in a single branch with fairly successful integration to mainline  Integration generally works well | Student is generally working across multi-branches to deliver features  Integration works well | Student is successfully working across multiple branches  Student is an enthusiastic adopter of other ‘advanced’ version control concepts |
| Reflective Practitioner | 10% | Student fills in few, if any peer review forms for teammates | Student comments are generally lightweight platitudes (gr8 work m8)  Student generally ignores feedback | Student submits feedback that lead to flair ups between team members  Student often ignores feedback, but does take some onboard | Student submits generally reasonable feedback that leads to occasional flair ups between team members  Student acts appropriately to some feedback | Student submits generally meaningful feedback  Student tends to act appropriately to feedback given | Student submits meaningful and emotionally intelligent feedback  Student acts appropriately to feedback given | Student submits wise and highly enlightened feedback that team members are highly appreciative of.  Student seeks out opportunities for self-improvement |

Assignment 2 – Product & Expo Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Outcome Name** | **Learning Outcome Description** | **Criteria** | **Weighting** | **Clear Fail** | **Near Pass** | **3rd** | **2:2** | **2:1** | **1st** | **>1st** |
| Process  /  Deliver | Produce prototypes based on your own intellectual property that deliver distinguished experiences, justifying how and why it could engage, immerse an audience, and/or lead to innovation. | Conceptual  Coherence  (game mechanics, settings, theme,  aesthetics,  interface & platform) | 5% | No game presented  Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate. | A small subset of the game components work well together to create a coherent experience, but they are stymied by the overall experience of discordance between components leading to a generally awkward experience for players. | A core of the game components work well together to create a coherent experience.  However, there are some components that break the overall coherence leading to a conceptually awkward experience for players. | Generally, the game components work well together to create a coherent experience.  However, there are some aspects of components that break the overall coherence | The game components work together to produce create a coherent experience | The game components work well together to produce create a coherent experience which players can respond positively to | There is a clear harmony of design between game components creating a highly coherent experience which players can respond extremely positively to |
| Creative innovation  (is there novelty in what you have made) | 10% | No game presented  Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate. | Game is generally a rehash/homage of an existing game with little, if anything to distinguish it. | Game developed from an existing game or genre with the addition of innovative mashups / extensions.  Resulting game concept is of questionable engagement | Game developed from an existing game or genre with the addition of innovative mashups / extensions.  Resulting game concept is reasonably engaging | Game developed as a generally organic concept drawing components that make some sense for game.  Resulting game concept is reasonably engaging | Game developed as a generally organic concept drawing components that make much sense for the game.  Resulting game concept is clearly engaging | Game is genuinely novel and extremely engaging to play |
| Completeness  (does it feel like a completed product or a tech demo / prototype) | 5% | No game presented | Game is presented but feels like a ‘proof of concept’ or prototype with few features. | Game feels like a product in development with placeholder game elements, wrapper and levels. | Game feels like a near content-complete product with some placeholder elements in game, wrapper or levels (not all three). | Game feels like a complete product but may have a time/content limited player experience (number of levels / player activities, gameplay components) | Game feels like a complete product with a balanced player experience with no obvious content constraints. | The game gives the impression of being a released commercial game with no perceivable issues |
| Player Experience  (do people enjoy playing it?) | 10% | No game presented  Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate. | The game generates some moments of engagement and enjoyability for players, though its generally not a great experience | The game generates some engagement and enjoyability for players, though there is feeling of endurance rather than enjoyment. | The game generates some clear engagement and enjoyability for players, though there is clear scope for improvement. | The game is generally engaging and enjoyable for players, though there is some scope for improvement. | The game is generally highly engaging and enjoyable for players. | Players want to play the game beyond reasonable expectations |
| EXPO  Engagement  (Can you engage with attendees at the Expo and leave them with a strong positive vibe about your game?) | 10% | No game presented at Expo | Game is presented at Expo, but team is largely unavailable to present their game | Game is presented by team.  Little enthusiasm for product from team.  Players feel uncomfortable playing in team’s presence  Players are left unclear / confused from team’s communication | Game is presented by team.  Clear enthusiasm for product from team.  Players neutral playing in team’s presence  Team communications are generally clear, but adversarial approach alienates some players | Game is presented by team.  High levels of enthusiasm for product from team.  Players enjoy playing in team’s presence  Team communications are generally clear and generally open to player feedback / concerns | Game is presented by team.  High levels of enthusiasm for product from team.  Players enjoy playing in team’s presence  Players are engaged through team’s communications | Game is presented by team.  High levels of enthusiasm for product from team.  Players enjoy playing in team’s presence and can engage is open conversation with team members  Players are highly engaged through team’s communications |
| EXPO  Brand  (Quality of Marketing materials, clarity of studio/game identity, alignment with target market, IP awareness) | 5% | No game presented or  no marketing materials | Game presented but with very limited / no marketing materials.  Team is largely unavailable to present their game | Marketing materials presented appear random and disjointed: art style, composition, choice of materials.  Materials do not present the brand in a positive light.  Brand creates a negative buzz at Expo | Marketing materials presented are fairly coherent.  Materials present the brand in a neutral light.  Brand creates a neutral / no buzz at Expo | Marketing materials presented are coherent.  Materials present the brand in a positive light.  Brand creates some positive buzz at Expo | Team presents a strong and coherent brand across all marketing materials and game.  Marketing materials are professional and are well-received by stand attendees.  Brand creates a very positive buzz at Expo. | Brand comes across as being very professional.  Game is ‘talk of the Expo’ for the right reasons. |
| EXPO  Stability  (Does it work reliably?) | 5% | No game presented | Game is too unstable / non-functional to be played enough to evaluate.  Team is largely unavailable to present their game | The game runs, but has obvious and significant stability issues (crashing, becoming inoperable).  Most play-throughs result in the game crashing or becoming inoperable in some way | The game runs but has occasional significant stability issues (crashing, becoming inoperable).  Some play-throughs result in the game crashing or becoming inoperable in some way | The game has no major significant issues but there are clear small-scale bugs and issues  Play-throughs generally have no inoperability issues. | There are no major issues and only slight and largely imperceptible bugs and issues  Play-throughs generally have no inoperability issues. | The game gives the impression of being a released commercial game with no perceivable issues  Play-throughs generally have no inoperability issues. |