



JUDGING RUBRICS

GDD | Judging Criteria

Criteria	Level 1 (10 Points)	Level 2 (20 Points)	Level 3 (30 Points)	Level 4 (40 Points)	Level 5 (50 Points)
Documentation					
How well does the GDD document the creative process that led to the final submitted game?	The GDD lacks significant amounts of documentation, and what has been submitted is lacking in any kind of significant detail.	The GDD lacks significant amounts of documentation in many key areas, and is missing a large amount of detail.	The GDD presents a passable documentation of the finished product, but is still lacking in a number of critical areas.	The GDD presents an above average documentation of the finished product, yet is lacking in a small number of critical areas.	The GDD presents a comprehensive documentation of the finished product, and covers all of the critical areas of the game's development.
Supporting Material					
How well do graphics, images, sketches, concept art, maps, and scripts support the documentation?	The GDD does not feature images, concept art, or scripts, and the textual documentation is unsupported with developmental materials.	The GDD features some images, concept art, or scripts, yet these are undeveloped, insubstantial, and do not support the textual documentation.	The GDD features a range of images, concept art and scripts which often support the textual documentation.	The GDD features a mostly comprehensive set of developmental images, concept art, and scripts which support the documentation in many key areas.	The GDD features a comprehensive library of developmental images, concept art and scripts which make a case for the design decisions taken during the creation of the game.
Thematic Consideration					
How to what extent does the GDD identify the consideration of the competition theme taken throughout the development of the game?	Thematic considerations are not at all present in the GDD. There is very little evidence of the theme as a consideration in the proposed game.	The competition theme is addressed, but not in a great level of detail. Links between the proposed game and the theme are minimal or unclear.	The competition theme is addressed in an adequate level of detail. Links between the proposed game and the theme are present, but are not strongly detailed.	The competition theme is addressed in a well-detailed manner. Links between the proposed game and the theme are strong, and are explored to a high level of detail.	The competition theme is thoroughly addressed, with an excellent level of detail. Links between the proposed game and the theme are clear and strong, and documented to an excellent standard of detail.
Execution					
How closely does the GDD mirror the finished product?	The finished game is not represented by the GDD that was submitted.	The finished game is largely not represented by the GDD, although some of the development work does remain in the submitted game.	The finished game is mostly represented by the GDD, although there are a number of elements which are not represented in the documentation.	The finished game is clearly the result of the planning which took place in the GDD, although there remains a number of undocumented features.	The finished game represents a clear execution of the GDD, which is a document supporting the design decisions taken during the creation of the game.

TOTAL

/200



Game | Judging Criteria

Criteria	Level 1 (10 Points)	Level 2 (20 Points)	Level 3 (30 Points)	Level 4 (40 Points)	Level 5 (50 Points)
Functionality					
<p>Does the game work?</p> <p>Can the game be run on any system without crashes or glitches?</p> <p>Has it been bug tested?</p>	The game has significant glitches, it crashes, it cannot run, or it has not been compiled correctly.	The game has glitches, frequently crashes, or has similar technical problems which make it difficult to experience without intrusive bugs.	The game has some glitches, may crash and has a number of bugs which still need to be fixed, but it is largely stable	The game is marred by minor glitches and bugs, but these are rare, and do not impact negatively on the game's performance.	The game has been successfully tested and is currently bug free.
Visual Design					
<p>What does the game look like?</p> <p>Is the visual style consistent and appealing?</p>	The game does not use an identifiable, consistent, and appealing visual design.	The game has the beginnings of a consistent visual design, but it is inconsistent and unappealing.	The game uses a mostly consistent visual design which is occasionally appealing.	The game uses a consistent visual design throughout which is appealing.	The game's visual design is consistent, and demonstrates a thorough understanding of graphic design.
Gameplay					
<p>How successful is the game's ludology?</p> <p>Are goals and objectives clear?</p> <p>Are game mechanics successful?</p>	The game's goals are not clearly defined, not achievable, the objective of the game cannot be determined, or the gameplay is nonsensical and unfinished.	The game's goals are difficult to understand, although some may not be achievable, and the game's overall objective is somewhat unclear.	The game's goals are reasonably clear, but there is some confusion around the purpose and method of play that the game uses.	The game's goals are mostly clear, but there are some elements of play that are confusing, unfinished, or do not easily correlate with overall game objectives.	The game's goals are clear, focused, and players can easily understand how the game is meant to be played. Game mechanics are professionally designed.
Technical Competency					
<p>Is the game competently programmed?</p> <p>Does the game's use of programming language demonstrate competence and skill?</p>	The game's programming is overly simplistic and/or responsible for a range of issues pertaining to design, functionality, or gameplay.	The game's programming does not damage the functionality of the game, but there are problems with the design and execution of the game's code.	The game's programming is competent, with the game demonstrating a medium level of technological competence.	The game's programming is sophisticated and professional, but a number of minor technical issues are still presented in the finished version.	The game demonstrates a professional-quality technical achievement in coding, scripting, or programming. There are no glitches, and the game's technical design is elegant and functional.
Engagement					
<p>Is the game fun to play?</p> <p>Does the game work as a game?</p> <p>Do the game's different elements fuse into an engaging and fun whole?</p>	The game is not fun to play – it is confusing, unappealing to look at, broken or non-functional, or has a visual style which is unappealing and inconsistent.	The game is largely not fun to play. While there are elements of it which could be considered engaging and fun, the game is harmed overall by poor implementation.	The game is engaging. It is reasonably fun to play, the visual design is mostly consistent, and it is competently programmed.	The game is highly engaging. It is fun to play, blends competent visual design with solid programming and mechanics, but minor issues must be addressed.	The game is extremely engaging. It is very fun to play, blending strongly realised game mechanics with a consistently appealing visual design and solid programming
Representation of Theme					
<p>Does the finished game respond to or address the competition theme?</p> <p>Is there a degree of creativity in the response?</p>	<p>The game does not respond to, or address, the competition theme.</p> <p>The theme is not given any relevance in the finished game, and is largely absent from the end product.</p>	<p>The game makes a very limited effort to respond to or address the competition theme, with little degree of creativity displayed.</p> <p>The theme is of limited relevance to the finished game, and hard to identify.</p>	<p>The game has made a recognisable effort to respond to, or address, the competition theme, but in a very basic, straightforward or literal manner.</p> <p>The theme is relevant to the finished game, however this relevance is not strong and at times is hard to identify.</p>	<p>The game has made a high level of effort to respond to, or address, the competition theme, with a moderate degree of creativity or creative interpretation.</p> <p>The theme is very relevant to the finished game, with room for minor improvements. The theme is readily identifiable.</p>	<p>The game has made an excellent effort to respond to the competition theme, and displays a high level of creativity in this response.</p> <p>The theme is highly relevant to the finished game, easily identifiable and exceptionally well addressed.</p>

TOTAL /300
COMBINED TOTAL /500