

QA Playtest Webform & Tester Scoring Rubric

Unit 1: Peer Playtesting, Game Loop Analysis & QA Documentation | CTE Game Design & Development

QA Role Overview: In game development studios, Quality Assurance (QA) Testers analyze game prototypes, verify rulebook clarity, identify systemic loops, and provide constructive, actionable feedback to game designers. In this assignment, students act as QA Testers evaluating a peer's non-digital game prototype.

PART 1: QA Playtest Feedback Webform Questions

This webform collects structured playtest data from the QA Tester to be shared directly with the Game Designer to guide iterative revisions.

Section & Focus	Webform Question / Field Prompt	Field Type & Purpose
1. General Info	• Tester Name & Pod # • Game Designer / Pod Name • Game Title Analyzed	Short Text Identifies tester and game author.
2. Rulebook Completeness	Q1: Rulebook Clarity & Completeness Does the rulebook clearly explain setup, player turns, and victory conditions without requiring oral explanation? What rules were missing, ambiguous, or confusing?	Long Text Paragraph Evaluates documentation clarity.
3. Core Loop Identification	Q2: Core Loop Identification Define what you observed as the game's Core Loop using the 4-step framework: • <i>Gather / Input</i>: What do players receive/draw at turn start? • <i>Decide / Action</i>: What choices can players make? • <i>Expand / Output</i>: How does the board/state change? • <i>Confront / Feedback</i>: How do players interact or resolve conflict?	Structured Long Text Verifies systemic loop identification.
4. Win / Lose Conditions	Q3: Objectives & End State What is the exact win condition? What is the lose or game-over trigger? Was the game end state clear and satisfying to achieve?	Long Text Paragraph Analyzes objective definition.
5. Mechanics & Component Mashup	Q4: Component Integration Which card sets were mashed up (e.g., Uno + Playing Cards)? Did the mashup create interesting strategic choices, or did components feel mismatched?	Long Text Paragraph Evaluates mechanic synergy.
6. Balance & Edge Cases	Q5: Game Flow & Edge Cases (Bugs) Did any player get stuck, overpowered, or eliminated too quickly? Did you encounter any scenario where the rules gave no clear answer (a bug)?	Long Text Paragraph Identifies logic gaps & balance.
7. Constructive Advice	Q6: Designer Recommendations What is ONE rule change or tweak you recommend to improve game flow, player agency, or balance?	Long Text Paragraph Provides actionable feedback.

PART 2: QA Tester Scoring Rubric (100 Points Total)

This rubric evaluates the student in their role as a **QA Tester** based on the thoroughness, technical accuracy, and constructive quality of their webform submission.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary (21-25 pts)	Proficient (16-20 pts)	Developing (10-15 pts)	Incomplete (0-9 pts)
Rulebook & Documentation Analysis <i>(25 Points)</i> Evaluates ability to critique game rule clarity, setup logic, and identify missing/confusing rules.	Thoroughly analyzes rulebook clarity. Identifies specific missing rules, ambiguous setup steps, or unclear mechanics with precise citations to the text.	Accurately evaluates rulebook clarity. Identifies main gaps or confusing instructions with clear descriptions.	Provides superficial feedback on rules (e.g., 'it was clear' or 'it made sense') without pointing out specific gaps or ambiguities.	Fails to analyze rule documentation or leaves rulebook feedback blank.
Core Loop & Systemic Breakdown <i>(25 Points)</i> Evaluates ability to break down the game into its 4-step core loop (Input, Action, Output, Feedback).	Correctly identifies and articulates all 4 steps of the game's core loop with high accuracy, explaining how player choices drive state changes.	Identifies the core loop and covers most steps accurately, demonstrating solid understanding of the game's engine.	Misidentifies the core loop or only describes turn actions without recognizing systemic inputs, outputs, or feedback.	Fails to define the core loop or provides inaccurate information.
Win/Lose Conditions & Edge Cases <i>(25 Points)</i> Evaluates identification of objectives, end states, game balance, and edge case 'bugs'.	Precisely defines win/lose conditions and identifies specific edge cases, logic deadlocks, or balance issues encountered during play.	Clearly states win/lose conditions and notes general balance issues or flow bottlenecks.	Vaguely states win conditions; fails to notice or report edge cases, deadlocks, or rule gaps.	Inaccurate or missing description of win/lose conditions.
Constructive QA Feedback & Tone <i>(25 Points)</i> Evaluates quality of designer recommendations and adherence to workplace CTE feedback standards.	Provides highly actionable, specific rule tweaks. Maintains a professional, encouraging QA tone following CTE Constructive Criticism standards.	Offers clear, constructive recommendations that would improve game flow or balance.	Suggestions are vague (e.g., 'make it more fun') or unhelpful for design iteration.	Unconstructive, critical without solutions, or missing feedback.

Relevant Kentucky KDE CTE Standards Met:

• Standard #20: Components of game structure | • Standard #23: Game rule evaluation & revision | • Standard #24: Conflict and outcomes analysis
 • Standard #25: Objectives and win/lose conditions | • Standard #34 & #37: Mechanics & component synergy | • CTE Career Readiness: Constructive Criticism, Written Communication & QA Professionalism