**SEGMENT PROTOTYPE (FALL 2014)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Team/Game: Total Score (75% Base):** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ENGINE** |  |  | **GAME PLAY** |  |
| No graphics at all, or no movement at all, or either graphics or physics system not integrated | -30% |  | No game play is demonstrated | -10% |
|  | Only basic game play (damage, audio triggers, etc.) | -5% |
| Missing fundamental features (data-driving, sharing objects, container solution, math library, etc.) | -10% |  | Some real game play, but not a full segment | -2% |
|  | Full segment of prototyped gameplay is functional | +0% |
| Missing basic graphics features (models/sprites, skybox/background, animations, level content, etc.) | -10% |  | One prototype segment proven not to work | +1% |
|  | Multiple types of segments proven not to work | +2% |
| Missing basic debugging output, drawing, performance viewing, asserts, etc. | -10% |  | One prototype segment proven to be engaging | +2% |
|  | Full episode prototype proven to be engaging | +5% |
| Missing collision detection or forces (if needed) | -10% |  | Game play shown is of a type not commonly seen | +1% |
| Networking or AI system is not integrated | -10% |  | Game play shown is innovative in a minor way | +2% |
| Missing basic collision response (if needed) | -5% |  | Game play shown is innovative in a major way | +5% |
| Missing basic lihting or sprite scaling/rotation | -5% |  | Prototype has some epic moments (+1% each) |  |
| Missing necessary advanced graphics features (multiple shaders, full animations, complex models) | -2% |  | Narrative used well in prototype (+1% or more) |  |
|  | Visuals used well in prototype (+1% or more) |  |
| Missing necessary advanced physics features (stacking, rotations, ropes, constraints, IK, etc.) | -2% |  | Audio used well in prototype (+1% or more) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Character control is not fully working with physics | -2% |  | **TESTING** |  |
| Missing basic multiplayer (if needed) | -2% |  | No gameplay testing done with game engine | -5% |
| Missing necessary advanced AI features | -2% |  | Some gameplay testing done with game engine | -2% |
| All necessary engine features are working | +0% |  | One formal gameplay testing session done | +0% |
| Stability is okay and performance isn’t terrible | +1% |  | Multiple external formal gameplay testing sessions | +1% |
| Stability is good and performance is okay | +2% |  | Formal gameplay testing done every week | +2% |
| Art pipeline is fairly easy for devs to use | +0% |  | Has a gameplay recording and playback system | +1% |
| Art pipeline is fairly easy for non-devs to use | +1% |  | Has an automated gameplay testing system | +1% |
| Art pipeline is slick and very easy for anyone to use | +2% |  | Has unit tests for major systems | +1% |
| Engine has advanced graphics features (+1% each) |  |  | Team does regular code reviews | +1% |
| Engine has advanced physics features (+1% each) |  |  |  |  |
| Engine has advanced AI features (+1% each) |  |  | **TEAM and PRESENTATION** |  |
| Engine has advanced network features (+1% each) |  |  | Appears fragmented and without confidence | -5% |
| Engine has advanced debug tools (+1% each) |  |  | Appears unrehearsed and unpolished | -2% |
| Other advanced engine features (+1% each) |  |  | Decent presentation, but could be a lot better | +0% |
|  |  |  | Appears well rehearsed and very polished | +1% |
| **CONTENT EDITOR** |  |  | Did not assess risks at all | -5% |
| Lots of content is still hard coded | -10% |  | Did not prioritize or only superficially assessed risks | -2% |
| Some content is still hard coded | -5% |  | Prioritized risks and only missing a few major ones | +0% |
| Only one or two small things are still hard coded | -2% |  | Accounted for and prioritized all major risks | +1% |
| Level editor (or dynamic content code) not working | -2% |  | Has no plan at all, just a list of features | -5% |
| Level editor (or dynamic content code) is working | +0% |  | Has a basic plan with some major holes | -2% |
| Multiple levels can be saved, edited, and loaded | +1% |  | Has a decent plan with at most one major hole | +0% |
| Level editor has lots of features and capabilities | +1% |  | A solid, realistic plan with no major holes | +1% |
| Level editor has a good UI and is fairly easy to use | +1% |  | Additional team and presentation modifiers |  |
| An in-game property editor is working | +1% |  |  |  |
| Other advanced editor features (+1% each) |  |  | **Team Size/Pre-made Engine/2D vs. 3D Modifiers** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Notes:** |