

Playtest #2 Reflection – Client Project

Criterion	Exemplary (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Developing (3 pts)	Insufficient / Common Issues (0–2 pts)	Points
Summary of Feedback	Clearly explains what feedback was received about goal clarity, usability, and technical issues. Distinguishes key points (what testers liked, what confused them, where problems occurred) in the group's own words.	Feedback summary is generally clear but somewhat surface-level; mentions what testers said but does not fully separate goal clarity, usability, and technical issues.	Feedback is vague, overly general, or only mentions one aspect (e.g., just bugs) without giving enough detail to be useful.	Feedback summary is missing, extremely brief, or simply repeats “they liked it/didn’t like it” with no specifics. Common issue: one sentence that does not show what was actually said.	/5
Planned Improvements & Alignment with Goals	Identifies at least two specific changes the team will make (or seriously consider) before the final demo. Each change is clearly linked to playtest feedback and to improving learning/client goals (e.g., clearer instructions for the learner, better alignment with objectives).	Identifies at least one specific change and hints at a second; there is some connection to feedback and to learning/client goals, but the explanation is brief or partially implied.	Mentions changes in a very general way (“fix bugs,” “improve UI,” “make it smoother”) with little detail, or only lists one vague change; connections to goals are unclear.	No meaningful planned improvements described. Common issue: “We will keep working on it” or “we plan to polish it” with no concrete actions.	/5
Insight or Project Pivot	Clearly describes a new insight, clarification, or adjustment the group discussed as a result of the playtest (for example, rethinking the order of steps, the way goals are presented, or how success is checked). Shows reflection on what they learned about their design or process.	Describes some insight or adjustment, but it is brief or not fully developed; shows some reflection but does not go very deep into how the playtest changed their thinking.	Insight/pivot is minimal (“we need more time”) or mostly repeats the feedback itself without explaining how the team's understanding changed.	No meaningful insight or pivot described. Common issue: reflection stops at “they said we should fix bugs” with no higher-level takeaway.	/5
Clarity and Professionalism	Reflection is well-organized, readable, and uses complete sentences. Tone is professional; grammar and spelling issues are minor or rare. Document includes group name, simulation title, and playtest date.	Reflection is mostly clear and professional, with a few minor organization or grammar issues; header information may be missing one item but overall is understandable.	Reflection is somewhat disorganized or rushed; multiple grammar/mechanics issues or missing header information make it harder to follow.	Reflection is unclear, very informal, or difficult to read due to frequent errors or a lack of structure. Common issue: bullet fragments only, little narrative, or missing group/project identification.	/5

Comments: