

UTS 31262/32004 Introduction to Game Development - Assessment 4 Rubric

	<b>Novice</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>Code Understanding</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> When asked about parts of code, the response from the student indicates that they do not understand the code that they have written.	<b>2-3 points</b> When asked about parts of code, the student understands what it is doing at a higher level but struggles to explain the smaller details of how the code works and/or there are inaccuracies in the explanation.	<b>4-5 points</b> When asked about parts of code (and through the demo video), the student clearly understands quite well how the code works and is able to articulate sensible logic and reasoning for the code that they have written.
<b>Code Completeness</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> There are game breaking logic bugs in the game that prevent normal gameplay. OR The game is playable but there are red exception errors in the console window resulting from the student's code.	<b>2 points</b> There are no game breaking logic bugs and no red exceptions in the console window. There are some yellow warning messages that could be fixed but these are not significant.	<b>3 points</b> There are no logic bugs, red error exception, or yellow warning messages in normal play.
<b>Code Optimization</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> The game runs slowly on the computers in the lab OR there is a large disregard for performance evident within the code.	<b>2 points</b> There are some non-performant lines of code that could have been avoided but mostly the code looks fine and runs well.	<b>3 points</b> Effort has been taken to make the code as performant as possible by avoiding obviously slow code. See the Assessment 4 specifications for examples of these.
<b>Code Commenting</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> There is little or no commenting of the project code or the commenting does not make sense or offer any useful insight to an outsider.	<b>2 points</b> There is some commenting that makes sense but it is sporadically applied.	<b>3 points</b> There is a reasonable amount of commenting throughout the code and it is applied consistently to major code blocks, such as classes, methods, and significant loop and conditional blocks.

<b>Keeping to Scope</b>	<b>0 points</b> One or more of the assessment constraints (on the first and second page of the Assessment 3 specifications) is not adhered to.		<b>3 points</b> All the assessment scope/constraint requirements (on the first and second page of the Assessment 3 specifications) are adhered to. For frame-rate independent motion, use <code>Application.targetFrameRate</code> to test different frame-rates.
<b>Git Usage</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> The Git repository has rarely been used and has very few commits.	<b>2 points</b> The Git repository has been used reasonably frequently but there could be more use of branching and commit messages to properly organize the repository.	<b>3 points</b> The Git repository has been used extensively, suggesting on-going progress on the assessment over time. There is good use of branches and commit messages to organize the project.
<b>Quality of Experience - Menu and Recreated Level</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> The Main Menu is either missing options to select the other scene or is very basic in its appearance.  The Re-created level is missing significant portion of gameplay or has major bugs .	<b>2-3 points</b> The Main Menu scene is functional and somewhat visually appealing but could use more work or match the theme of the game better. The Re-created level mostly plays well, though there are some missing features from the original game, there could be more responsive controls, more feedback to the player, OR there are a few easily noticed (but not game breaking) bugs	<b>4 points</b> The Main Menu scene is visually appealing, matching the theme of the game, and easy to use to load the other two scenes and exit the game. The Re-created level feels similar to the original game and plays smoothly, has responsive input, provides the player with good audio and visual feedback cues, and no minor bugs or only edge-case bugs.

<b>Quality of Experience - Design Iteration</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> There is no Design Iteration level, the level is barely functional, OR the design change is very small, not very interesting, and hasn't required any additional learning.	<b>2-3 points</b> The Design Iteration provides somewhat of small twist on the original game, though the complexity isn't that much beyond what has been done in re-created level and lab activities. OR There is a relatively complex and interesting Design Iteration but it has not been executed that well, there are missing features from what was promised in Assessment 3, or there are numerous obvious bugs in the level.	<b>4-5 points</b> The Design Iteration level provides a novel experience, based upon the original game but taking it in an interesting new direction. The complexity of the work done (relative to the complexity of the original game) has required the student to learn new skills. If something very challenging has been attempted, it may not be perfect but it is a good first attempt that can be learnt from in future. If something simpler has been attempted, it runs just as well as the Re-created level in the top tier of the Quality of Experience - Recreated Level item above.
<b>Art and Audio Completeness</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> There are significant visual or audio assets missing from either the Re-created level or the Design Iteration level. OR some of the visual assets are not the student's own creation or audio assets are copyrighted.	<b>2 points</b> There is a reasonable amount of visual and audio assets in both levels of the game and any feedback provided by the tutor in Assessment 3 has been acted upon. There is still room for more assets to be included to enhance the experience of the game.	<b>3 points</b> There is a fairly complete set of both visual and audio assets in both the Re-created and Design Iteration levels. There are no obvious missing assets that should have been included to provide a high quality experience to the player.
<b>Pre-Recorded Demo Video</b>	<b>0-1 points</b> There is no demo video, it is very brief, or it lacks clear and detailed information about the work that has been done.	<b>2 points</b> The demo video covers a few topics and is fairly easy to understand, though there are some things that are missing or could be explained in more detail. The video is a maximum of 10 minutes.	<b>3 points</b> The demo video covers all of the dot points in this section of the Assessment 4 specifications. It is clear and easy to understand, interesting parts of code have been analysed, and it a good proxy for the live demo in the lab. The video is a maximum of 10 minutes.