Prototype

		%	0-49% Poor	50-59% Satisfactory	60-69% Good	70-79% Very Good	80-89% Excellent	90-100% Outstanding
Group — Effective Prototyping	1. Is it playable?	14	Not playable, the game doesn't run or crashes.	Somewhat playable, the game runs but there are some errors which block part of the game.	>	>	>	The game is playable, all runs as intended.
	2. Is it engaging?		Not engaging or barely engaging, too simple to understand its purpose.	The game is somewhat engaging.	The game is engaging enough for one play-through, but would not pick it up again.	The game is quite engaging, could play it again.	The game is very engaging, could play/replay it for several minutes and pick it up again later.	The game is exceptionally engaging and I would buy it to play more.
	3. Does it implement core features?		Prototype unrelated to design.	The prototype is related to the design, but core elements are absent	Few core elements of the design are implemented.	Most core elements of the design are implemented.	Excellent identification of core features and inclusion of all, but some could have been better integrated in the prototype.	Outstanding prototyping of core features.
	4. Does it **not** implement non-core features?		Very poor focus, includes major/many elements which don't need prototyping, or includes external assets.	The prototype implements some non-core features.	Only a few non-core elements are implemented.	Good focus, only a couple non-core elements are implemented.	Excellent focus, only 1 or 2 non-core elements were added.	Outstanding focus, all non-core elements cut.
	5. Has it been playtested?		No playtesting.	Some playtesting was undertaken, but not riguriously.	The game was playtested often, but the feedback received did not impact either the design or the implementation.	The game was playtested and the feedback received was noted for the development of the final game.	The game was playtested and the feedback received was incorporated to improve upon either the design and the implementation.	The game was playtested and the feedback received was incorporated to significantly improve upon both the design and the implementation.
Group — Implementation	1. Game environment	6	No particular environment created, or only a simple plane is used.	An environment was created which has some different shapes to it. Collisions and environmental physics are not set up properly.	The environment is well set up with geometry that makes sense and collisions and physics work.	The environment shows some thought behind the design and hints at future developments.	Excellent environment, all works as intended and plays a big part in gameplay.	Outstanding environment, intuitive for the player to navigate and easily extendable for the full game.
	2. Player interaction, e.g. controls, actions, interface		No player interaction, the player can't actually do anything, or controls not set up as keyboard & mouse, or the game is not single-player.	The player can interact with the game with basic functionality, but things don't quite work as intended, several bugs present. The game doesn't use the new Input System.	Good player interaction, largely works as intended, but it was not all implemented correctly.	Player interaction implemented correctly.	The player can easily interact with the game, smooth and natural interactions.	Great and intuitive player interaction, with special attention paid to accessibility.
	3. Other game elements, e.g. NPCs		No other game elements.	There are few other elements in the game, but they don't have a purpose.	There are few other elements which have a minimum impact on the game, or were not implemented correctly.	There are some other elements with some impact on the game.	The other elements are a part of the game and support the overall design well.	Other game elements are perfectly implemented and round-up gameplay to enhance the player experience.
Group — Project Quality	1. Tidy projects (assets & scene hierarchy)	5	Very disorganised, includes many unused files. The scene hierarchy sees all objects in the scene, with no attention to names or order either.	Disorganised project, with some unused files. Some effort to name and order objects in the scenes for easier access.	The project is mostly well organised. Some unused files are still present, but put away from the rest. Scenes have objects well-named and ordered, but not properly organised in the hierarchy.	A well organised project.	Excellent organisation, makes implementation clearer.	Outstanding organisation, significantly enhances implementation.
	2. Script quality and documentation		Scripts are unintelligible and undocumented.	Scripts are hard to understand and are not well organised, but include some short comments.	Scripts are mostly well organised, with some minor issues, or lacking clear documentation.	Clear scripts and well documented.	Excellent scripting and documentation.	Outstanding scripting and documentation practices.
	3. Assets references & README file included with how-to-play instructions		No README file included, no assets referenced.	README file included. Instructions on how to play are quite vague. Most assets are properly referenced.	>	>	>	README file included, instructions on how to play are clear and all assets are referenced.
	4. Submitted on Github & Github pages		Project uploaded directly on QMPlus instead of Github.	>	>	>	>	Project submitted on Github, and is accompanied by build on Github pages
	5. Gameplay video		No gameplay video submitted	Video shows the unity project, but no aspects of gameplay, and no voiceover	Video shows the unity project, but no aspects of gameplay. Voiceover explans the concept.	Video shows some gameplay, but not explained.	Video shows gameplay and the gameplay is explained.	Video shows gameplay, and the gameplay is explained, as well as the concept behind the game hinted at through the prototype.
	6. Follows one of the given designs or makes reasonable changes. Good plan going forward		The game's design is different to those given and not approved by teaching staff. No plan for future developments is included.	The project follows one of the designs, but makes some changes that don't make sense in the context, or are not well scoped. A plan is included for the rest of the development, but is not complete.	The project follows one of the designs, or changes make sense. The development plan is complete, but unrealistic.	The project follows one of the designs, or changes make sense. Good development plan.	The project follows one of the designs, and changes are informed by playtesting. Excellent development plan.	The project follows one of the designs, and changes are informed by playtesting to significantly improve upon the design. Outstanding development plan.
Individual — Project Management	1. Commits every week (or reasonable frequency)	5	No commits, no evidence of use of version control.	Few commits only just before the deadline, no proper use of version control.	A couple of commits, but could have used version control better.	Some commits throughout the project so far, or several conflicts due to improper use of version control.	Appropriate number of commits throughout the project and evidence of good use of version control.	Oustanding use of version control, with weekly commits and good management of the project.
	2. Weekly participation in playtesting (either showing game or playing others')		No participation in playtesting.	Participation in 1 of the playtesting sessions.	Participation in 2 of the playtesting sessions.	Participation in most playtesting sessions, showing their group's game, or playing some others.	Participation in all playtesting sessions, showing their group's game and playing some others.	Participation in all playtesting sessions, showing their group's game, and also playing 5 or more others.
Total (prototype)		30						

			%	0-49% Poor	50-59% Satisfactory	60-69% Good	70-79% Very Good	80-89% Excellent	90-100% Outstanding
Final Game	**Group**	**Environment**		1. Level geometry setup, and/or use of terrain (where appropriate)		Inappropriate use of terrain, or poor construction of environment, missing colliders or correct delimitation of the play area.	Some terrain is used, but the scale and level of detail is not appropriate. Level geometry is inappropriately simple/complex. Some bugs present.	Mostly bug-free and appropriate use of terrain and/or level geometry.	Very good construction of environment, with no bugs. If terrain is used, this is scaled appropriately and fits within the context of the scene.	Excellent construction of environment, with highly detailed terrain and level geometry, fitting within the game. Only minor flaws.	Outstanding construction of environment and/or use of detailed terrain, with no percievable flaws.
			8	2. Level design	No thought put behind the level design.	Some thought was put into level design, but it seems slightly random.	Good level design, but does not influence gameplay at all.	Very good level design, with some key areas evident.	Excellent level design in one level, highlighting some gameplay elements and influencing the play experience.	Outstanding level design across all levels / parts of the game, which greatly enhances gameplay.
				3. Level variations (across multiple zones/scenes)	Monotonous simple levels.	Some variation, but it is hard to distinguish between levels/parts of the game.	Good variation, but not sufficient to clearly distinguish and remember the differences between the levels/parts of the game.	Very good variation, but following a clear unsurprising pattern.	Excellent variation between the different levels or parts of the game.	Outstanding differentiation between the different levels or parts of the game, with clear stand-out elements.
		Gameplay features		1. Player controls	No player controls.	The player can control interactions with the game, but controls are not natural. Many bugs.	Controls mostly work as the player might expect.	Very good controls, in line with player expectations. Only minor issues.	Excellent player controls which allow for a smooth play experience.	Very clear, smooth, natural and bug-free player controls, with accessibility patterns behind them, significantly enhancing the play experience.
			16	2. Interactions with entities or environment, such as combat or collectible items	No interactions available.	Very simple interactions available, few mechanics or systems implemented, or implemneted incorrectly. Many bugs.	Simple interactions available, but they mostly work, with some occasional bugs.	A more complex system was implemented to allow for advanced interactions with the game, mostly bug-free.	Several complex systems/mechanics were implemented, to allow for advanced interactions with no bugs.	Outstanding implementation of a large variety of complex mechanics, greatly enhancing the playing experience. No percievable bugs.
				3. Other gameplay features, e.g. NPC behaviour, PCG	No other gameplay features.	Very simple other gameplay features implemented, or not implemented correctly. Some conflicts with player interaction, negatively impacting play, some bugs.	Simple gameplay features were implemented correctly, but they do not necessarily enhance the player's interactions or experience. Some bugs.	A few other gameplay features were implemented correclty, supporting the player experience.	Excellent implementation of several other gameplay features, supporting the player interactions.	Outstanding implementation of other gameplay features which greatly support the player's interactions and general experience.
				4. Difficulty modes	No difficulty modes.	Only one parameter is changed to adjust game difficulty, but this does not make a large difference.	Good implementation of 2 modes, with few parameters changed to make the game easier/harder.	Good implementation of several difficulty modes, with several parameters chosen to adjust, but which don't impact gameplay much.	Excellent implementation of several difficulty modes, with clear changes in several parameters.	Outstanding implementation of difficulty modes, with a focus on accessibility, with clear changes but little effect to the overall player experience.
		Non-playable features		1. Player-adjustable parameters (e.g. sound settings, input sensitivity)	No changes available.	The player can adjust one parameter, but this doesn't always work as intended.	The player can adjust few parameters.	The player can adjust several parameters, which make a difference to the player experience.	The player can adjust many parameters, which significantly improves the player experience.	A complex set of parameters can be changed by the player in an easy and intuitive manner.
				2. Menus, e.g. intro, end, pause, options, story, credits	No menus.	One basic menu is included.	Simple start and end menus are implemented.	Several simple menus are implemented, or few which are customised for the game.	Several menus are implemented, customised for the game.	Outstanding and creative use of several intuitive and easy-to-use menus, putting accessibility first.
			8	3. Splash screens, cut-scenes and scene transitions	No splash screens, cut-scenes or scene transitions.	>	Splash screens, cut-scenes and/or scene transitions were implemented, but there are some major issues.	Splash screens, cut-scenes and/or scene transitions were implemented, but there are some minor issues.	>	Good use of splash screens, cut-scenes and scene transitions where appropriate.
				4. Loading/saving of games, checkpoints, persistence	No data management.	Information is maintained between scenes, but no other data management present.	Meets the "Satisfactory" criteria, and additionally maintains information between play-throughs.	Meets the "Good" criteria, and additionally implements full saving/loading of games.	Meets the "Very Good" criteria, and additionally saves player progress throughout the game with checkpoints.	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.
				5. GUI / HUD	No HUD.	The amount of information presented on the screen is not appropriate to the game (either too much, or too little).	The amount of information is appropriate, but not presented clearly.	The amount of information is appropriate and presented clearly.	Excellent display of information, with the player's attention clearly directed; intuitive and smooth experience in understanding the information presented.	Outstanding HUD, clear and intuitive to the player, enhancing the play experience and putting accessibility first.

Section			Criteria	Pts						
Final Game	**Group**	**Audio & Visuals**	1. Sound effects, 3D sounds and background music	8	No audio.	Few sounds are used, but either do not work correctly or are not suitable to the game or situations presented.	Some sounds are used, which work correctly but do not add much to the play experience.	Several different types of sounds are used and highlight different moments or interactions appropriately.	A wide variety of sounds are used throughout the game.	Outstanding use of a wide variety of sounds within the game, significantly enhancing the player experience.
			2. Lights, reflections and shadows		Only Unity default light.	Only the Unity default light is used, but it has been customised.	Few different types of lights are used, but their placement seems slightly random.	Some lights are used, with shadows or reflections customised as well. Ambient lighting has also been adjusted.	Several lights are used, with shadows and reflections customised, well-placed within the level to highlight different areas appropriately.	Outstanding use of lights, shadows and reflections, setting an appropriate atmosphere for the game.
			3. Cameras, possibly multiple and/or dynamic, and post-processing		Only Unity default camera.	One static camera is used which has some customisations.	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).	Dynamic or multiple cameras are correctly used to display all information to the player.	Meets the "Very Good" criteria, and additionally uses some post-processing effects which alter the look of the game.	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. Particle effects and animations		No particles or animations.	Some simple particle effects and/or animations were created, but there are some major issues.	Some simple particle effects or animations were created, which work correctly.	Appropriately complex particle effects or animations were created.	Excellent use of both particle effects and animations where appropriate.	Outstanding use of particles and animations to bring up a dynamic and lively look to the game.
			5. Good use of materials and standard/non-standard shaders		Only Unity default materials/textures.	A material/texture was created and reused for the objects in the game.	Several simple materials/textures were created.	Several complex materials/textures were created and appropriately used throughout the game.	Meets the "Very Good" criteria, and additionally appropriately uses shaders to customise the game look further.	Outstanding and creative use of materials and shaders to polish the look and feel of the objects in the environment.
		External asset integration	1. Good, not excessive, use of appropriate external assets, well-integrated into the project	5	Excessive or inappropriate use of external assets.	>	>	External assets are used, but are not quite fitting within the game, or are not quite fully integrated with the rest.	>	Good, not excessive, use of appropriate external assets, well-integrated into the project.
		Project Quality	1. Tidy projects (assets & scene hierarchy)	10	Very disorganised, includes many unused files. The scene hierarchy sees all objects in the scene, with no attention to names or order either.	Disorganised project, with some unused files. Some effort to name and order objects in the scenes for easier access.	The project is mostly well organised. Some unused files are still present, but put away from the rest. Scenes have objects well-named and ordered, but not properly organised in the hierarchy.	A well organised project.	Excellent organisation, makes implementation clearer.	Outstanding organisation, significantly enhances implementation.
			2. Script quality and documentation		Scripts are unintelligible and undocumented.	Scripts are hard to understand and are not well organised, but include some short comments.	Scripts are mostly well organised, with some minor issues, or lacking clear documentation.	Clear scripts and well documented.	Excellent scripting and documentation.	Outstanding scripting and documentation practices.
			3. Assets references & README file included with how-to-play instructions		No README file included, no assets referenced.	README file included. Instructions on how to play are quite vague. Most assets are properly referenced.	>	>	>	README file included, instructions on how to play are clear and all assets are referenced.
			4. Submitted on Github & Github pages		Project uploaded directly on QMPlus instead of Github.	>	>	>	>	Project submitted on Github, and is accompanied by build on Github pages
			5. Gameplay video		No gameplay video submitted	Video shows the unity project, but no aspects of gameplay, and no voiceover	Video shows the unity project, but no aspects of gameplay. Voiceover explans the concept.	Video shows some gameplay, but not explained.	Video shows gameplay and the gameplay is explained.	Video shows gameplay, and the gameplay is explained, as well as the concept behind the game hinted at through the prototype.
			6. Follows one of the given designs or makes reasonable changes. Good plan going forward		The game's design is different to those given and not approved by teaching staff. No plan for future developments is included.	The project follows one of the designs, but makes some changes that don't make sense in the context, or are not well scoped. A plan is included for the rest of the development, but is not complete.	The project follows one of the designs, or changes make sense. The development plan is complete, but unrealistic.	The project follows one of the designs, or changes make sense. Good development plan.	The project follows one of the designs, and changes are informed by playtesting. Excellent development plan.	The project follows one of the designs, and changes are informed by playtesting to significantly improve upon the design. Outstanding development plan.
		Report	1. Playtesting records	10	No playtesting.	Some playtesting was undertaken, but not riguriously.	The game was playtested often, but the feedback received did not impact either the design or the implementation.	The game was playtested and the feedback received was noted for the development of the final game.	The game was playtested and the feedback received was incorporated to improve upon either the design or the implementation.	The game was playtested and the feedback received was incorporated to significantly improve upon both the design and the implementation.
			2. Research		No features included which are based on independent research.	A feature is listed and some related sources cited, but the connection is not clear.	Some features are listed with a clear rationale and review of several articles. Some errors in implementation or not a clear impact on the play experience.	Some features are listed with a clear rationale and review of several articles. Some errors in implementation or not a clear impact on the play experience.	Excellent use of research in implementing an innovative feature in the game.	Outstanding use of research to enhance the player experience with several innovative features.
	Individual	**Project Management**	1. Commits every week (or reasonable frequency)	5	No commits, no evidence of use of version control.	Few commits only just before the deadline, no proper use of version control.	A couple of commits, but could have used version control better.	Some commits throughout the project so far, or several conflicts due to improper use of version control.	Appropriate number of commits throughout the project and evidence of good use of version control.	Oustanding use of version control, with weekly commits and good management of the project.
			2. Weekly participation in playtesting (either showing game or playing others')		No participation in playtesting.	Participation in 1 of the playtesting sessions.	Participation in 2 of the playtesting sessions.	Participation in most playtesting sessions, showing their group's game, or playing some others.	Participation in all playtesting sessions, showing their group's game and playing some others.	Participation in all playtesting sessions, showing their group's game, and also playing 5 or more others.
Total (final game)				70						
Total (module)				100						