

Client Project Analysis and Comparison Rubric

Criterion	Exemplary (Full Credit)	Proficient (Mid Range)	Developing (Lower Range)	Insufficient / Common Issues	Points
Summary of the Other Project (10 pts)	9–10 pts – Clearly and concisely explains the other team’s client need, target learners, core scenario, and main user tasks/interactions. A reader who did not see the presentation could accurately understand what the project is and who it is for.	7–8 pts – Describes the project’s core idea, client need, and target learners with minor gaps or slight vagueness. Overall purpose and audience are still understandable.	4–6 pts – Provides a basic description of the project but leaves out key elements (e.g., target learners, client need, or main tasks). The reader gets only a partial or fuzzy picture.	0–3 pts – Description is extremely brief, inaccurate, or missing. Common issues: only repeats the title; does not identify client or learners; unclear what the project actually does.	/10
Alignment with Client Goals and Learners (15 pts)	14–15 pts – Clearly identifies the client goals and learning/training objectives and analyzes how well the project’s interactions, feedback, and structure support those goals. Thoughtfully considers whether the project is appropriate and accessible for the target learners, using specific examples from the demo.	11–13 pts – Identifies client goals and learner goals with generally accurate analysis. Discusses alignment with some specific examples, but may not fully explore accessibility or learner needs.	7–10 pts – Mentions goals at a high level but analysis is mostly descriptive (“what it does”) rather than evaluative (“how well it meets goals”). Limited or vague reference to target learners.	0–6 pts – Little or no attempt to connect the project to client or learner goals. Common issues: focuses only on surface features; does not mention learning/training objectives or target audience.	/15
Design and Technical Decisions (15 pts)	14–15 pts – Provides a thoughtful analysis of interaction design, UI/UX, feedback, and key technical decisions (e.g., how interactions are implemented, how errors are handled). Uses specific moments from the demo to illustrate strengths/weaknesses and connects design/technical choices to the user experience.	11–13 pts – Discusses design and some technical aspects with at least a few concrete examples. Analysis may emphasize one area (design or technical) more than the other but still shows understanding of how choices affect the experience.	7–10 pts – Describes features (menus, buttons, graphics, etc.) but gives limited analysis of why those choices matter or how they affect the experience. Comments are general (“UI was good/bad”) with few specifics.	0–6 pts – Minimal or no discussion of design or technical decisions. Common issues: only lists that the project “looked good” or “had bugs” without details; analysis not clearly tied to design or implementation.	/15
Comparison to Your Own Project (15 pts)	14–15 pts – Offers a balanced, honest comparison that clearly explains similarities and differences in goals, target learners, interactions, and design/technical choices. Identifies	11–13 pts – Provides a clear comparison with several good points about differences and similarities, but may be less detailed or slightly one-sided.	7–10 pts – Comparison is present but vague or mostly one-dimensional (e.g., “theirs looked better”). Limited	0–6 pts – Little or no comparison. Common issues: only describes one project; focuses solely on “better/worse” judgments	/15

Client Project Analysis and Comparison Rubric

Criterion	Exemplary (Full Credit)	Proficient (Mid Range)	Developing (Lower Range)	Insufficient / Common Issues	Points
	specific strengths of the other project and of their own, and articulates meaningful lessons learned that could improve future work.	Identifies at least some concrete strengths/lessons from the other project.	discussion of lessons learned or how those lessons could inform future work.	without explanation; does not identify lessons.	
5. Critical Takeaways (5 pts)	5 pts – Clearly explains what they would do differently if starting their own project again, based on what they observed. Shows a shift in perspective on designing for a real client and real learners, grounded in concrete insights.	4 pts – Describes at least one reasonable change or takeaway, but explanation is brief or only partially tied to specific observations.	2–3 pts – Mentions a takeaway (“work harder,” “plan more”) but it is vague, generic, or not clearly linked to the analysis in Part 1.	0–1 pt – No meaningful takeaway or reflection. Common issues: statement is missing, extremely short, or purely superficial.	/5

Post-Mortem Rubric

Criterion	Exemplary (Full Credit)	Proficient (Mid Range)	Developing (Lower Range)	Insufficient / Common Issues	Points
Original Goals vs. Final Outcome (10 pts)	9–10 pts – Clearly explains original client, learner, and technical goals and thoughtfully evaluates how well the final project met each. Identifies which goals were met, partially met, or not met and provides specific reasons (e.g., scope, time, unexpected constraints).	7–8 pts – Describes goals and briefly compares them to the final outcome. Discussion may focus on a subset of goals or be slightly general, but still shows a reasonable understanding of where the project ended up.	4–6 pts – Mentions goals and final outcome but analysis is shallow or mostly descriptive (“we mostly met our goals”) with few specific examples or explanations.	0–3 pts – Little or no discussion of original goals or how they compare to the final result. Common issues: lists features without connecting them to goals; reflection is missing or extremely brief.	/10
Team Process and Roles (10 pts)	9–10 pts – Clearly describes team roles (e.g., client liaison, programmer, designer, etc.) and how work was actually distributed. Analyzes what worked well (communication, scheduling, collaboration) and where the team struggled or pivoted, with specific examples. Reflects on how the process affected the final result.	7–8 pts – Describes roles and general team process with some attention to strengths and challenges, but may be uneven or lack detail in one area. Still gives a reasonable picture of how the team functioned.	4–6 pts – Provides a basic description of who did what, but little analysis of process, communication, or how the team handled difficulties. Reflection is limited or mostly descriptive.	0–3 pts – Minimal or no discussion of roles or team process. Common issues: claims “we all did everything” with no detail; avoids discussing challenges; gives no insight into how the team actually worked.	/10
Use of Feedback (5 pts)	5 pts – Clearly identifies key pieces of feedback from playtests and clients/instructors and explains which changes were made as a result. If some feedback was not implemented, gives sensible reasons. Shows understanding of feedback as part of an iterative process.	4 pts – Mentions a few pieces of feedback and at least one change made in response, but does not fully explain the reasoning or choices.	2–3 pts – References feedback in general terms (“we got feedback and fixed bugs”) with limited specifics on what changed or why.	0–1 pt – Little or no mention of feedback or changes. Common issues: suggests they ignored feedback or cannot recall any specific comments.	/5
Learning and Professional Growth (10 pts)	9–10 pts – Articulates specific technical skills (e.g., engine features, scripting, debugging, version control) and non-technical skills (e.g., client communication,	7–8 pts – Describes several skills or understandings gained, with some connection to future work, though the discussion may	4–6 pts – Mentions learning or skill gains in general terms (“I learned more about Unity”) without many specifics	0–3 pts – Minimal or no discussion of learning or growth. Common issues: focuses only on grades;	/10

Post-Mortem Rubric

Criterion	Exemplary (Full Credit)	Proficient (Mid Range)	Developing (Lower Range)	Insufficient / Common Issues	Points
	scoping, teamwork, time management) gained through the project. Clearly connects these skills to future professional or academic goals and reflects on changes in confidence.	be less detailed or slightly repetitive. Shows evidence of growth.	or connections to future goals.	states “I didn’t learn much” without reflection.	
Future Plans and Recommendations (5 pts)	5 pts – Offers clear, realistic priorities for one more major iteration and provides a thoughtful explanation of whether they would continue developing the project (and why). Gives at least one concrete piece of advice for future teams tackling similar client projects.	4 pts – States reasonable plans or preferences (continue/not continue) with a brief explanation and at least one general recommendation for future teams.	2–3 pts – Provides minimal or vague plans (“we would polish it more”) and limited advice for future teams.	0–1 pt – No meaningful future plans or recommendations. Common issues: leaves this section blank or responds with one very short sentence.	/5