

Marking criteria			%	0-39% Requires Improvement	40-49% Satisfactory	50-69% Good	70-89% Excellent	90-100% Outstanding	
Prototype	1. Effective Prototyping (30%)	1.1 PX: Is it effective in assessing future player experience?	15	0-39%: Too simple to understand its purpose. Or, not quite representative of the game concept, or not quite intuitive of player experience.	40-49%: Somewhat representative of the game concept and intuitive of player experience.	50-69%: Quite representative of the game concept, gives a good idea of player experience.	70-89%: Very clear connection to the game concept and gives a clear idea of future player experience, with mechanics and levels supporting this.	90-100%: Outstanding clarity in prototyping the game concept and showing the player experience.	
		1.2 Focus: does it implement core features, and does it <b>not</b> implement non-core features?	15	0-39%: Very poor focus, includes major/many elements which don't need prototyping, or includes external assets, or prototype unrelated to design, or all core elements are absent.	40-49%: The prototype is related to the design, but few core elements of the design are implemented. The prototype may also implement some non-core features.	50-69%: Many core elements implemented, but focus is not on gameplay, but aesthetics. May value quantity over quality.	70-89%: Good focus, excellent identification of core gameplay features and inclusion of all.	90-100%: Outstanding prototyping of core gameplay features. All non-core elements were cut.	
	2. Implementation (max 40%)	2.1 Game environment	15	0-39%: No particular environment setup beyond simple planes, basic platforms or box walls. Collisions and environmental physics may not be set up properly.	40-49%: The environment is well set up with geometry that makes sense and collisions and physics work.	50-69%: The environment shows some thought behind the design and hints at future developments.	70-89%: Meets "Good" criteria and implements appropriate linearity, dynamics, procedural generation, or terrains.	90-100%: Outstanding environment, intuitive for the player to navigate and easily extendable for the full game.	
		2.2 Player interaction, e.g. controls, actions, interface.	15	0-39%: Controls not set up as keyboard & mouse, or the game is not single-player. The player may be able to interact with the game with basic functionality, but things don't quite work as intended, several bugs present. <b>The game doesn't use the new Input System.</b>	40-49%: Player interaction is implemented, but controls are not natural or as expected.	50-69%: Good player interaction, largely works as intended. Mostly correct implementation.	70-89%: Player interaction implemented correctly. Natural interactions. Several complex player interaction systems prototyped.	90-100%: Great and intuitive player interaction, with special attention paid to accessibility principles (forgiving precision, simplified actions, well-paced, undo/redo).	
		2.3 Other core gameplay elements, e.g. NPCs	15	0-39%: Non-core other elements implemented, or core gameplay elements added do not really have a purpose.	40-49%: There are few other core elements in the game, but they have a minimum impact on the game, or were not implemented correctly.	50-69%: There are some other elements with some impact on the game. Cohesion was considered when implementing game mechanics.	70-89%: The other elements are a part of the game and support the overall design well.	90-100%: All other core gameplay elements are perfectly implemented and round up gameplay to enhance the player experience.	
	3. Project Quality (20%)	3.1 Organization (assets & scene hierarchy)	10	0-39%: Very disorganised, includes many unused files. Messy scene hierarchy.	40-49%: Some effort to organize assets by category into folders. Some effort to name, order and group objects in the scenes for easier access.	50-69%: The project is mostly well organised. Some unused files are still present, but put away from the rest. Scenes have a well-organized hierarchy.	70-89%: Excellent organisation, makes implementation clearer. No unused files present (including demo scenes of imported packages).	90-100%: Outstanding organisation, significantly enhances implementation.	
		3.2 Script quality and documentation	10	0-39%: Scripts are hard to understand, not commented and not well organised. Or, comments are not in English.	40-49%: Scripts are mostly well organized and include some short comments.	50-69%: Scripts are well designed, modular, and serving only one type of functionality per file. Comments are either too few or too many.	70-89%: Excellent scripting practices and documentation of code. Code efficiency is made a priority and great use of advanced C# / Visual Scripting features is demonstrated.	90-100%: Outstanding scripting and documentation practices, meeting "Excellent" criteria and allowing for ease of code maintenance. Great integration with the Unity editor, making use of advanced features for controlling intricate behaviours.	
	4. Gameplay Video (10%)	4.1 Gameplay video	10	0-39%: Gameplay video is too long (>8 minutes), too short (<2 minutes), very difficult to understand, or not strictly related to showcasing the prototype.	40-49%: Video shows the unity project, but with no voiceover.	50-69%: Video shows core gameplay elements, and voiceover explains the concept and implementation.	70-89%: Excellent video presentation of the game, focusing on only the core elements and clearly explaining the design and implementation.	90-100%: Outstanding game trailer produced, with clear explanations of gameplay. Accessibility principles are considered, and the video creates excitement for the game launch.	
	Total (game)		100						
	Individual (max 30%)	5. Game Development Process (30%)	5.1 Use of version control	15	0-39%: Minimal use of version control, too many merge conflicts left unsolved, or more repositories used than indicated.	40-49%: Few commits throughout the project, or several only just before the deadline, no proper use of version control.	50-69%: Appropriate number of commits throughout the project and evidence of good use of version control, using branches and handling merges and conflicts well.	70-89%: Excellent use of version control, additionally using issues, project task tracking and pull requests reviewed by other group members.	90-100%: Outstanding use of version control, with weekly commits and outstanding management of the project.
			5.2 Personal plan going forward	15	0-39%: Minimal plan for future developments included with no clear definitions of tasks.	40-49%: A plan is included for the rest of the development, but it is over or under ambitious. Many features included which cannot be done in the time allocated, or too few features included.	50-69%: Good development plan, with a list of time-bounded tasks.	70-89%: Excellent development plan, with time-bound tasks assigned to group members and clear milestones and deliverables noted. Tasks are detailed, realistic and achievable, with a good approximations for timescales.	90-100%: Outstanding development plan, meeting "Excellent" criteria and additionally including risk management assessment.
Total (CW1)		100							

Marking Criteria			%	0-39% Requires Improvement	40-49% Satisfactory	50-69% Good	70-79% Very Good	90-100% Outstanding	
Final Game Group (100% - individual points)	1. Levels (max 15%)	1.1 Level design, geometry and variations	8	0-39%: No thought put behind the level design. Monotonous simple levels. Inappropriate use of terrain, or poor construction of environment, missing colliders or correct delimitation of the play area.	40-49%: Some thought was put into level design, but it seems slightly random. Some variation in levels or play areas, but they are hard to distinguish. Level geometry is inappropriately simple/complex. Some bugs present.	50-69%: Good level design, but does not influence gameplay at all. Good variation, but not sufficient to clearly distinguish and remember the differences between the levels/parts of the game. Mostly bug-free and appropriate use of terrain and/or level geometry.	70-89%: Very good level design, with some key areas evident. Excellent construction of environment, with highly detailed terrain and level geometry, fitting within the game. Only minor flaws.	90-100%: Outstanding level design and variation across all levels / parts of the game, which greatly enhances gameplay. Clear stand-out elements. Outstanding construction of environment and/or use of detailed terrain, with no percievable flaws.	
		1.2 Player objectives (sensible, diverse, options, clear)	8	0-39%: No purpose for the player to play, or one very simple objective that does not make sense in context, or it's not clear at all how to achieve it.	40-49%: One very simple objective that makes some sense in context, missing clarity.	50-69%: Too many or too few objectives for the player that make sense in the context. Could be more clear.	70-89%: Good number of very clear objectives, with good variety in the options available to the player.	90-100%: A precise number of varied player objectives, with multiple paths to achieve them. The player can take meaningful actions that impact gameplay outcomes. Outstanding clarity.	
	2. Gameplay features (max 45%)	2.1 Player controls and player choices	9	0-39%: No player controls or choices.	40-49%: The player can control interactions with the game, but controls are not natural. Simple choices for the player, such as order of exploration of level areas. Many bugs. Or, the game doesn't use the new Input System.	50-69%: Controls mostly work as the player might expect. Some meaningful player choices with limited impact on gameplay.	70-89%: Very good controls, in line with player expectations and leading to a smooth play experience. Good range of player choices that impact gameplay. Only minor issues.	90-100%: Very clear, smooth, natural and bug-free player controls and outstanding meaningful player choices, with accessibility patterns behind them, significantly enhancing the play experience.	
		2.2 Combat system	7	0-39%: No combat available, or inappropriate combat elements added that do not fit the game.	40-49%: Simple combat available, few mechanics implemented, or implemneted incorrectly. Many bugs.	50-69%: A more complex combat system was implemented to allow for advanced interactions, mostly bug-free.	70-89%: Several complex combat mechanics were implemented, to allow for advanced interactions with no bugs.	90-100%: Outstanding implementation of a large variety of complex combat mechanics, greatly enhancing the playing experience. No percievable bugs.	
		2.3 Collectibles, crafting, and inventory systems	7	0-39%: No collectibles or inventory system, or inappropriate such elements added that do not fit the game.	40-49%: Very simple system implemented of collecting few types of objects with simple immediate effects (e.g. score, health), no inventory system.	50-69%: Many types of different objects available to collect with different complex effects, or a simple inventory system implemented.	70-89%: Additionally collectibes have vastly different effects on gameplay, and an inventory system implemented with interactive functionality, or a simple crafting system implemented to combine items and obtain new ones.	90-100%: Meets "Excellent" criteria and additionally a complex crafting system is implemented to create new items which impact gameplay in significantly different ways.	
		2.4 Theme and Narrative	7	0-39%: No narrative elements, or inappropriate narrative elements added that do not fit the game.	40-49%: Very simple narrative elements with no impact on gameplay.	50-69%: Many narrative elements with good variety and minor impact on gameplay, such as a simple branching plot.	70-89%: Additionally narrative elements significantly impact gameplay, such as NPC attitudes towards the player tracker or player choices with long lasting effects.	90-100%: Meets "Excellent" criteria and additionally complex narrative systems are implemented to significantly enhance gameplay, such as a complex branching narrative with multiple endings.	
		2.5 NPC AI	7	0-39%: No NPC AI, or inappropriate NPC AI added that does not fit the game.	40-49%: Simple NPC AI elements included with some variety, but with limited impact on gameplay, such as NavMesh agents that chase or run away from the player.	50-69%: More complex NPC AI elements with good variety and impact on gameplay, such as patrolling guards.	70-89%: Additionally NPC AI elements significantly impact gameplay, such as finite state machines that respond to player interactions with complex behaviours.	90-100%: Meets "Excellent" criteria and additionally complex NPC AI systems are implemented to significantly enhance gameplay, such as behaviour trees NPCs or combinations of techniques to achieve interesting interactions.	
		2.6 PCG	7	0-39%: No PCG, or inappropriate PCG added that does not fit the game.	40-49%: Simple PCG elements included with some variety, but with limited impact on gameplay, such as random spawning of enemies, or random enemy trait values (health, attack).	50-69%: More complex PCG elements that take into account rules for playability or use simple algorithms for generating content.	70-89%: PCG elements significantly impact gameplay, such as automatic level generator for increased replayability.	90-100%: Meets "Excellent" criteria and additionally combines several complex PCG systems to significantly enhance gameplay.	
		2.7 Other gameplay features (e.g. puzzles, skill trees)	7	0-39%: No other gameplay features.	40-49%: Very simple other gameplay features implemented, or not implemented correctly. Some conflicts with player interaction, negatively impacting play, some bugs.	50-69%: Simple gameplay features were implemented correctly, but they do not necessarily enhance the player's interactions or experience. Some bugs.	70-89%: Excellent implementation of several other gameplay features, supporting the player experience.	90-100%: Outstanding implementation of other gameplay features which greatly support the player's interactions and general experience.	
		2.8 Difficulty modes	7	0-39%: No difficulty modes.	40-49%: Few parameters are changed to adjust game difficulty, but this does not make a large difference.	50-69%: Good implementation of 2 modes, to make the game noticeably easier/harder.	70-89%: Excellent implementation of several difficulty modes, with clear changes in several parameters.	90-100%: Outstanding implementation of difficulty modes, with a focus on accessibility, with clear changes but little effect to the overall player experience.	



Final Game								
Group (100% - individual points)								
3. Non-playable features (max 15%)	3.1 Player-adjustable parameters (e.g. sound settings, input sensitivity)	6	0-39%: No changes available.	40-49%: The player can adjust few parameters, but this doesn't always work as intended.	50-69%: The player can adjust several parameters, which make a difference to the player experience.	70-89%: The player can adjust many parameters, which significantly improves the player experience.	90-100%: A complex set of parameters can be changed by the player in an easy and intuitive manner.	
	3.2 Menus (e.g. intro, end, pause, options, story, credits), cut-scenes and scene transitions	6	0-39%: No menus. No cut-scenes or scene transitions.	40-49%: Basic menus are included for starting the game, and an end screen. Ability to replay may be included.	50-69%: Simple menus are implemented (e.g. start, end, pause and/or settings). Cut-scenes and/or scene transitions were implemented, but there are some major issues.	70-89%: Several menus are implemented, customised for the game. Cut-scenes and/or scene transitions were implemented, but there are some minor issues.	90-100%: Outstanding and creative use of several intuitive and easy-to-use menus, putting accessibility first. Good use of cut-scenes and scene transitions where appropriate.	
	3.3 Loading/saving of games, checkpoints, persistence	6	0-39%: No data management.	40-49%: Information is maintained between scenes and/or play-throughs.	50-69%: Additionally implements full saving/loading of games.	70-89%: Additionally saves player progress throughout the game with checkpoints.	90-100%: Outstanding data management, allowing the player to save/load games, saving progress with checkpoints and preserving data between scenes and between play-throughs, as appropriate.	
	3.4 GUI / HUD	6	0-39%: No GUI / HUD. The amount of information presented on the screen is not appropriate to the game (either too much, or too little).	40-49%: The amount of information is appropriate, but clarity could be improved.	50-69%: The amount of information is appropriate and presented clearly.	70-89%: Excellent display of information, with the player's attention clearly directed; intuitive and smooth experience in understanding the information presented.	90-100%: Outstanding HUD, clear and intuitive to the player, enhancing the play experience and putting accessibility first.	
4. Aesthetics (max 15%)	4.1 Sound effects, 3D sounds and background music	3	0-39%: No audio.	40-49%: Few sounds are <b>used</b> , but either do not work correctly or are not suitable to the game or situations presented.	50-69%: Several types of sounds <b>used</b> , which work correctly but have limited impact on the play experience.	70-89%: A wide variety of sounds are <b>used</b> throughout the game and highlight different moments or interactions appropriately.	90-100%: Outstanding <b>use</b> of a wide variety of sounds within the game, significantly enhancing the player experience.	
	4.2 Lights, reflections and shadows	3	0-39%: Only Unity default light.	40-49%: Several simple custom lights are used, but their placement seems slightly random.	50-69%: Several different types of lights are used, but general scene illumination could be improved. Ambient lighting has also been adjusted.	70-89%: Several lights are used, with shadows and reflections customised, well-placed within the level to highlight different areas appropriately.	90-100%: Outstanding use of lights, shadows and reflections, setting an appropriate atmosphere for the game.	
	4.3 Cameras, possibly multiple and/or dynamic, and post-processing	3	0-39%: Only Unity default camera or a static camera. Not everything the player needs to see is captured.	40-49%: One dynamic camera is used (e.g. follows the player), or multiple cameras are used, but there are some major issues (e.g. incorrect displays, wrong sensitivity or inappropriate movements).	50-69%: Dynamic or multiple cameras are used with only minor issues.	70-89%: Additionally, post-processing effects are used which alter the look of the game.	90-100%: Outstanding use of cameras, displaying information clearly to the player. Dynamic and/or multiple cameras are used where appropriate, and post-processing effects are applied efficiently to round-off the game look.	
	4.4 Particle effects, 3D models and animations	3	0-39%: No particles or animations. Only Unity default shapes, materials and textures.	40-49%: Some simple particle effects, 3D models, materials/textures and/or animations were <b>created</b> , but there are some major issues or they are not appropriate for the game.	50-69%: Appropriately complex visual assets were <b>created</b> , which work correctly.	70-89%: Excellent use of <b>created</b> particle effects, 3D models, materials/textures and animations where appropriate.	90-100%: Outstanding use of <b>created</b> particles, 3D models, materials/textures and animations to bring up a dynamic, unique and lively look to the game.	
	4.5 Immersion, emotion and accessibility	3	0-39%: No immersion or emotion. Accessibility not addressed at all.	40-49%: Some immersion or emotion. Little attention given to accessibility.	50-69%: Good immersion or emotion. Some accessibility patterns accounted for.	70-89%: The game is built with immersion and emotion in mind, excellently exhibited throughout. The game is accessible to a wide range of players.	90-100%: Outstanding immersion and emotion throughout the game. Outstanding care for game accessibility, most people would be able to play and enjoy the game.	

Final Game	Group (100% - individual points)	5. Project Quality (max 5%)	5.1 Organization (assets & scene hierarchy)	3	0-39%: Very disorganised, includes many unused files. Messy scene hierarchy.	40-49%: Some effort to organize assets by category into folders. Some effort to name, order and group objects in the scenes for easier access.	50-69%: The project is mostly well organised. Some unused files are still present, but put away from the rest. Scenes have a well-organized hierarchy.	70-89%: Excellent organisation, makes implementation clearer. No unused files present (including demo scenes of imported packages).	90-100%: Outstanding organisation, significantly enhances implementation.
			5.2 Script quality and documentation	3	0-39%: Scripts are hard to understand, not commented and not well organised. Or, comments are not in English.	40-49%: Scripts are mostly well organized and include some short comments.	50-69%: Scripts are well designed, modular, and serving only one type of functionality per file. Comments are either too few or too many.	70-89%: Excellent scripting practices and documentation of code. Code efficiency is made a priority and great use of advanced C# / Visual Scripting features is demonstrated.	90-100%: Outstanding scripting and documentation practices, meeting "Excellent" criteria and allowing for ease of code maintenance. Great integration with the Unity editor, making use of advanced features for controlling intricate behaviours.
		6. Game Trailer Video (5%)	6.1 Game trailer video	5	0-39%: Video is too long (>8 minutes), too short (<2 minutes), very difficult to understand, or not strictly related to showcasing the game. Or, no voiceover.	40-49%: Video shows the unity project, and voiceover explains the concept and implementation.	50-69%: Video shows core gameplay elements, and clearly explaining the design and implementation.	70-89%: Additionally, key gameplay elements are highlighted and pitched at the right level for the intended audience.	90-100%: Outstanding game trailer produced, with clear explanations of gameplay. Accessibility principles are considered, and the video creates excitement for the game launch.
			Total (game)	100					
	Individual (max 50%)	7. Game Development Process (max 50%)	7.1 Playtesting participation and constructive feedback.	17	0-39%: None or minimal participation in playtesting, offering very simple comments.	40-49%: Playtesting few other games, or offering simple feedback with no actionable points, or submitting own game once.	50-69%: Participation in several playtesting sessions and playtesting feedback offered informs of bugs found or suggests simple improvements.	70-89%: Playtesting feedback is concise yet precise, providing key actionable points to improve the game design and/or implementation.	90-100%: Outstanding participation in all playtesting sessions and feedback offered succinctly includes outstanding constructive criticism helping to improve other games.
			7.2 Use of version control.	17	0-39%: Minimal use of version control, too many merge conflicts left unsolved, or more repositories used than indicated.	40-49%: Few commits throughout the project, or several only just before the deadline, no proper use of version control.	50-69%: Appropriate number of commits throughout the project and evidence of good use of version control, using branches and handling merges and conflicts well.	70-89%: Excellent use of version control, additionally using issues, project task tracking and pull requests reviewed by other group members.	90-100%: Outstanding use of version control, with weekly commits and outstanding management of the project.
			7.3 Self-defined learning goals	5	Self-defined evaluation criteria, evidence to support assessment included with report submission. Mark awarded verified and adjusted as needed by teaching staff.				
		Total (CW2)		100					

Multiplier	Very low (X=0.5)	Lower (X=0.7 - 0.95)	No modifier (X=1.0)	Very high (X=1.05 - 1.1)
1. Is it playable? [Multiplier for final mark]	Not playable, the game doesn't run or crashes. Marked off of Unity project and gameplay video only.	Somewhat playable, the game runs but there are some errors which block part of the game.	The game is playable, all runs as intended (or with minor errors that allow to still test it).	
2. Is it engaging? [Multiplier for final mark]		Not engaging at all.	Somewhat engaging.	Very engaging.
3. Submitted QMPlus document, Github with Unity project, Github with web build and video.	Submission instructions not followed (e.g. submit zip directly on QMPlus, or via email)	Missing one or more elements of the submission.	All project items correctly submitted.	
4. Follows one of the given designs or makes reasonable changes.	The game's design is different to those given and not approved by teaching staff.		The project follows one of the designs, or changes make sense.	The project follows one of the designs, and changes are informed by playtesting to significantly improve on the design.
5. Self-created assets [FINAL GAME ONLY]			No self-created assets.	Many self-created assets.
6. External asset integration [FINAL GAME ONLY]	Excessive or inappropriate use of external assets: too many assets, or assets used not referenced.	External assets are used, but are not quite fitting within the game, or are not quite fully integrated with the rest. All are referenced.	No external assets. Or, good, not excessive, use of appropriate external assets, well-integrated into the project, all referenced.	
7. Progress from prototype [FINAL GAME ONLY]	X=0: Same submission or very small changes with no actual impact on the game.	Few improvements from prototype with minimal impact on the game.	Several or many changes from prototype, good progress shown.	Great progress from prototype, polished result.