

GAT 210 STRATEGY GAME RUBRIC (SPRING 2014) - 20% of your overall grade

Student Name:

Total Score (75% Base):

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Turned in late (final grade is halved)	x½
Requires a resubmission (-5% per day)	
Box missing game/student/section name, email address, or the semester and year (-10% each)	
Box missing Digipen Copyright	-20%
Any documents missing student name (-5% each)	
Box is unprofessional	-2%
Box is Portfolio ready	+2%

PLAYER EXPERIENCE

No attempt to engage players or create a meaningful experience	-10%
Limited player engagement	-5%
Players have some meaningful strategic choices	+0%
Strategy elements are trivial or uninteresting (easily 'solved')	-5%
Strategy elements are non-trivial and have some depth/interest.	+1%
Strategy is highly engaging	+2%

FINAL GAME RULES

No game rules actually submitted	-40%
Not actually a Strategic game at all	-20%
DigiPen copyright information is missing	-10%
So complex it is difficult to comprehend	-10%
Not primarily a strategy game	-10%
Overly complex, unclear, or confusing	-5%
Setup instructions don't work	-5%
Cannot be finished due to rules issues	-5%
Does not have a description/list of the components	-2%
Terminology used is inconsistent	-2%
Rules are poorly organized	-2%
Major holes in rules (-5% each)	
Minor holes in rules (-1% each)	
Typos or poor grammar (-1% each)	
Rules are fairly clear and understandable	+0%
Rulebook is portfolio ready	+1%
Has decent examples of how to play	+1%
Rules are very clear and easy to understand	+2%

COMPONENTS

Components are missing	-10%
Components are poor quality or hard to use	-5%
All components are included with submission	+0%
Components are high-quality and/or enhance the play experience	+1%

CONCEPT AND DESIGN DOCUMENTS

No previous versions or concept documents included	-40%
At least one previous version, but no WHY description on changes	-20%
Design goals description is simplistic or minimal	-10%
Design changes description is simplistic or minimal	-10%
Design goals description is very weak	-5%
Design changes description is very weak	-5%
Typos or poor grammar (-1% each)	
Design goals and changes descriptions are decent	+0%
Descriptions are well organized and very clear	+1%
Design document is extensive and detailed	+2%
Design changes description is extensive and detailed	+2%
Interesting insights in the analysis of previous versions (+1% each)	
Additional versions of the game decently described and analyzed (+1% per additional version)	

GAME ANALYSIS

No playtesting or lab notes	-40%
Playtesting analysis is simplistic or minimal	-10%
Lots of playtesting data is missing	-5%
Playtesting analysis is very weak	-5%
Some playtesting data is missing	-2%
Playtesting analysis is weak	-2%
Typos or poor grammar (-1% each)	
Playtesting data and analysis are decent	+0%
Data and analysis are very well-presented	+1%
Playtesting data is extensive and detailed	+2%
Playtesting analysis is extensive and detailed	+2%
Interesting insights in the analysis of playtesting data (+1% each)	

MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS

No mathematical analysis done at all	-5%
Very basic mathematical analysis done	+0%
Interesting mathematical analysis done (+1% for each interesting mathematical insight/WHYs)	

THEME

Theme is very inappropriate for game	-2%
Decent theme or no theme at all	+0%
Very interesting or fun theme	+1%

Notes: