

Technical and Professional Proficiency

Group Components (25%)

Game Engine Implementation (7%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Game Opens Without Modification (7%)	Game opens flawlessly without any code or file structure modification in the chosen game engine. Project setup is exemplary with clear documentation.	Game opens without modification but may have minor setup inconsistencies or require basic clarification.	Game opens with minimal modifications needed. Some setup issues present but easily resolved.	Game requires significant modification to open or run. Major setup problems exist.

Requirements Analysis and User Stories (6%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Requirements Gathering (3%)	Comprehensive requirements gathering with clear documentation. All stakeholder needs identified and prioritised effectively.	Good requirements gathering with most needs identified. Minor gaps in documentation or prioritisation.	Basic requirements gathering completed but lacks depth or has some missing elements.	Inadequate requirements gathering with significant gaps or poor documentation.
User Story Creation (3%)	Excellent user stories following industry standards (As a... I want... So that...). Stories are well-defined, testable, and properly prioritised.	Good user stories with proper format and most elements well-defined. Minor issues with clarity or prioritisation.	Basic user stories created but may lack proper format, clarity, or complete acceptance criteria.	Poor user stories with significant format issues, unclear requirements, or missing elements.

Game Design and Development (7%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Meets Requirements (4%)	Game fully meets all specified requirements with additional features	Game meets most requirements with minor omissions. Good overall	Game meets basic requirements but may have some missing features or	Game fails to meet several key requirements or has significant

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
	that enhance the experience. Excellent attention to detail.	implementation quality.	implementation issues.	implementation problems.
Game Engine Utilisation (3%)	Excellent use of chosen game engine features and best practices. Code demonstrates deep understanding of the platform.	Good use of game engine with proper implementation of most features. Shows solid understanding.	Basic use of game engine with some features properly implemented. Understanding is adequate.	Poor use of game engine with significant issues in implementation or understanding.

Deployment and Demonstration (5%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Itch.io Demo (5%)	Professional deployment on itch.io with excellent presentation, clear instructions, and polished user experience. Game runs flawlessly.	Good deployment with clear presentation and instructions. Game runs well with minor issues.	Basic deployment completed but may have presentation issues or minor technical problems.	Poor deployment with significant issues, unclear presentation, or major technical problems.

Individual Components (25%)

Code Contribution (10%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Git Commits Quality and Quantity (5%)	Excellent commit history with frequent, meaningful commits. Clear commit messages following best practices. Demonstrates consistent contribution throughout project.	Good commit history with regular commits and mostly clear messages. Shows steady contribution to the project.	Adequate commit history but may have periods of inactivity or unclear commit messages. Basic contribution evident.	Poor commit history with infrequent commits, unclear messages, or minimal contribution to the project.

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Lines of Code Contributed (5%)	Substantial, meaningful code contribution that significantly impacts the project. Code quality is excellent with proper structure and documentation.	Good code contribution with solid quality and proper implementation. Makes meaningful impact on project success.	Adequate code contribution but may lack depth or have quality issues. Contribution is present but limited.	Minimal code contribution with poor quality or little impact on the project outcome.

Code Review and Testing (8%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Code Review Quality (4%)	Excellent code reviews with detailed, constructive feedback. Reviews demonstrate deep understanding of code quality, security, and best practices. Well-documented in GitHub issues.	Good code reviews with helpful feedback and suggestions. Shows solid understanding of code quality. Properly documented.	Basic code reviews completed but may lack depth or constructive feedback. Documentation is adequate.	Poor code reviews with minimal feedback or understanding. Documentation is inadequate or missing.
Play Testing and Feedback (4%)	Comprehensive play testing with detailed, actionable feedback. Testing covers edge cases and user experience aspects. Excellent documentation in GitHub issues.	Good play testing with useful feedback and proper documentation. Testing covers main functionality well.	Basic play testing completed but feedback may lack detail or actionability. Documentation is adequate.	Minimal play testing with poor feedback quality or inadequate documentation.

Team Communication (7%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Communication Frequency and Quality (4%)	Excellent communication with frequent, meaningful interactions. Demonstrates strong collaboration skills and proactive problem-solving.	Good communication with regular updates and collaboration. Shows solid teamwork skills.	Adequate communication but may have gaps in frequency or depth. Basic collaboration evident.	Poor communication with infrequent or superficial interactions. Limited collaboration demonstrated.

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Documentation of Communication (3%)	Comprehensive screenshots and documentation of team communication stored properly in GitHub repository. Excellent organisation and accessibility.	Good documentation with most communications captured and properly stored. Well-organised.	Basic documentation of communications but may have some gaps or organisational issues.	Poor documentation with significant gaps or improper storage of communication records.

Code Quality and Best Practices (Individual) - 20%

Naming Conventions (3%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Files, Variables, Methods, Classes	Exceptional naming throughout codebase. Names are descriptive, consistent, and follow industry standards. Perfect adherence to language-specific conventions.	Good naming with minor inconsistencies. Most names are clear and follow conventions with occasional lapses.	Adequate naming but some unclear or inconsistent names present. Basic adherence to conventions.	Poor naming with many unclear, inconsistent, or non-standard names throughout the codebase.

Idiomatic Programming (3%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Language and Game Engine Usage	Exceptional use of programming language idioms and game engine features. Code demonstrates mastery of platform-specific best practices.	Good use of language idioms and engine features with minor deviations from best practices.	Basic use of language and engine features but misses opportunities for idiomatic solutions.	Poor understanding of language idioms and engine features. Code appears foreign to the platform.

Algorithmic Efficiency (3%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Algorithm Design and	Excellent algorithmic choices with optimal	Good algorithmic approach with	Basic algorithmic approach that	Poor algorithmic choices with

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Performance	time and space complexity. Code demonstrates deep understanding of performance implications.	mostly efficient solutions. Minor performance issues may exist.	works but may have inefficiencies or missed optimisation opportunities.	significant inefficiencies or performance problems.

Code Architecture (4%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
SOLID Principles and Design Patterns	Exceptional application of SOLID principles and appropriate design patterns. Code is highly modular, maintainable, and extensible.	Good application of design principles with proper modularity. Minor violations of SOLID principles may exist.	Basic modularity present but limited application of design principles. Some coupling or cohesion issues.	Poor modularity with significant violations of design principles. High coupling and low cohesion evident.

File Documentation (2%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Header Comments	Every file has comprehensive header comments explaining purpose, functionality, and author. Comments are professional and informative.	Most files have good header comments with clear purpose and author information. Minor gaps in documentation.	Basic header comments present but may lack detail or have inconsistent formatting across files.	Missing or inadequate header comments in many files. Poor documentation standards.

Code Formatting (2%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Consistent Formatting	Perfect code formatting throughout with consistent indentation, spacing, and style. Professional presentation.	Good formatting with minor inconsistencies. Code is generally well-presented and readable.	Basic formatting present but inconsistent styles or presentation issues affect readability.	Poor formatting with significant inconsistencies, making code difficult to read and unprofessional.

Code Cleanliness (3%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
No Dead or Unused Code	Codebase is completely clean with no dead code, unused variables, or commented-out sections. Excellent maintenance standards.	Very clean codebase with minimal dead code or unused elements. High maintenance standards evident.	Generally clean but some dead code or unused elements present. Basic maintenance evident.	Significant amounts of dead code, unused variables, or commented-out sections. Poor maintenance practices.

Git Usage (Individual and Group) - 10%

Group Component (5%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
GitHub Project Board/Issues	Exceptional use of GitHub project management tools. Consistent, organised use throughout project duration with comprehensive issue tracking and board management.	Good use of project board and issues with regular updates. Minor gaps in consistency or organisation.	Basic use of GitHub tools but irregular updates or limited organisation. Some project management evident.	Minimal or poor use of GitHub project management tools. Little evidence of organised development workflow.

Individual Component (5%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Commit Message Quality	Excellent commit messages that clearly reflect functional requirement changes. Perfect adherence to naming conventions with descriptive, professional messages.	Good commit messages with clear context and proper formatting. Minor inconsistencies in convention adherence.	Basic commit messages that provide some context but may lack detail or consistent formatting.	Poor commit messages with unclear context, inconsistent formatting, or insufficient detail about changes.

Documentation (Group) - 10%

Meeting Participation (3%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Attendance and Engagement	Excellent attendance and active participation in all group meetings with IT and Design learners. Demonstrates strong collaboration and engagement.	Good attendance with regular participation. Minor absences or limited engagement in some meetings.	Basic attendance and participation but may have several absences or minimal engagement.	Poor attendance or participation. Frequently absent or disengaged from group meetings.

Meeting Documentation Quality (7%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Meeting Notes Completeness	Comprehensive meeting notes covering all required elements: date/time, attendees, focus, discussions, decisions, task assignments with deadlines, and follow-up actions. Professional documentation standards.	Good meeting notes covering most required elements with clear organisation and professional presentation. Minor gaps in detail.	Basic meeting notes present but may lack some required elements or have organisational issues. Adequate documentation.	Poor meeting notes with significant missing elements, unclear organisation, or unprofessional presentation.
Rotating Note-taking	Perfect rotation of note-taking responsibilities among all group members with clear evidence of shared responsibility.	Good rotation with most members taking turns. Minor imbalances in responsibility distribution.	Basic rotation evident but some members may have taken notes significantly more or less than others.	Poor rotation with unequal distribution of note-taking responsibilities or unclear evidence of sharing.

Game Development Meetup Report (Individual) - 10%

Content Quality and Depth (6%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Speaker Information and Roles	Comprehensive coverage of speakers and their roles with insightful analysis of their contributions to the meetup.	Good coverage of speakers and roles with clear identification and basic analysis.	Basic coverage of speakers and roles but may lack detail or analysis.	Poor coverage with minimal information about speakers or their roles.
Learning and New Insights	Exceptional reflection on new learning beyond course content. Demonstrates deep engagement and critical thinking about game development concepts.	Good reflection on new learning with clear connections to personal development and course gaps.	Basic reflection on learning but limited depth or connection to broader game development understanding.	Poor reflection with minimal evidence of learning or engagement with new concepts.
Personal Impact and Reflection	Outstanding personal reflection addressing all required questions with depth, honesty, and insight. Shows significant self-awareness and career reflection.	Good personal reflection covering most questions with adequate depth and self-awareness.	Basic personal reflection but may lack depth in some areas or miss some required reflection points.	Poor personal reflection with superficial responses or missing key reflection elements.
Professional Insight	Excellent analysis of career paths, industry insights, and professional development opportunities discussed at the meetup.	Good analysis of professional aspects with clear understanding of industry insights and career implications.	Basic analysis of professional elements but limited depth or connection to career development.	Poor analysis with minimal professional insight or career reflection.

Writing Quality and Academic Standards (4%)

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
Word Count and Structure	Report meets 1000-word guideline with excellent structure, flow, and organisation. Professional	Report meets word count with good structure and organisation. Minor issues with	Report approximately meets word count but may have structural or organisational	Report significantly under/over word count with poor structure and organisation.

Criteria	A (80-100%)	B (65-79%)	C (50-64%)	D/E (0-49%)
	presentation throughout.	flow or presentation.	issues affecting readability.	
Grammar and Spelling	Exceptional grammar and spelling throughout. Professional writing standards with no errors.	Good grammar and spelling with minor errors that don't affect readability.	Basic grammar and spelling but several errors present that may affect professional presentation.	Poor grammar and spelling with numerous errors that significantly impact readability and professionalism.
APA 7th Edition Compliance	Perfect APA 7th edition formatting for all references and in-text citations. Demonstrates mastery of academic writing standards.	Good APA formatting with minor errors in citation or reference formatting.	Basic APA formatting attempted but several errors in citations or references present.	Poor or missing APA formatting with significant errors or absence of proper citations.