

Simulation Proposal Rubric (Detailed)

Criterion	Exemplary (10)	Proficient (7-9)	Developing (4-6 pts)	Insufficient / Common Issues (0–3 pts)
Problem Statement	Clearly explains client needs; includes enough context that an outsider can understand the situation. Explicitly identifies target learners & briefly notes safety/sensitivity issues & how they affect design.	Need and context are mostly clear; target learners are mentioned but sensitivities or design implications are only briefly addressed.	Need is vague or missing important context; target learners are unclear; sensitivities are not considered or only implied.	Very short, confusing, or missing key elements. Common issues: missing details, vague need, no context, no mention of targets
Project Goals	Goals are concrete & measurable, clearly related to what the client wants learners to be able to do . Mentions at least one standard/procedure/manual or SME the team expects to consult to ground content.	Goals are mostly clear and related to the client; a source/standard or SME is mentioned but not well connected to specific goals.	Goals are broad, vague, or partially unrelated to the client’s stated needs; little or no mention of how domain content will be grounded.	Goals are missing/do not describe what learners should be able to do. Ex: “teach safety” with no specifics.
Scene & Interaction Design	Clearly describes the environment, key objects, and what users will see and do. Interactions obviously support the project goals and learner tasks.	Scene and interactions are mostly clear and generally aligned with goals, but some important details are underdeveloped or missing.	Scene is hard to visualize, or several interactions do not clearly support the goals.	Minimal, confusing, or missing description. Ex: generic “there will be a room and buttons” with little detail.
Technology Constraints	Lists planned hardware and software (e.g., Unity, Meta Quest, desktop) and briefly explains why they fit the project; notes at least one realistic limitation or risk.	Tools/platforms are listed and generally appropriate; limitations/risks are mentioned only briefly.	Tools are incomplete, mismatched to the goals, or not clearly tied to the project needs.	Technology choices are missing/incorrect. Ex: “we will use VR” with no specifics, or tools the team cannot actually access.
Milestones & Timeline	Breaks project into clear phases (e.g., prototype, first playable, playtest, polish) with realistic dates and brief descriptions of the work in each phase. Shows a logical path from idea to deliverable.	Phases and dates are mostly clear; some phases are vague or not well tied to concrete work, but the overall plan is workable.	Timeline exists but is too broad, unrealistic, or missing key phases (e.g., no time for playtesting or integration).	Timeline is very vague, inconsistent with course length, or missing. Ex: everything due at the end, no sense of iteration.
Team Roles	Every team member has a defined primary role (client liaison, lead programmer, UI, Art, GDD). Roles are specific & clearly connected to milestones/tasks; note if roles will rotate.	Most roles are clear and appropriate; some responsibilities overlap or are described only briefly.	Roles are listed but very general; it is hard to tell who is responsible for what.	Roles are missing, incomplete, or unrealistic for the project. Ex: everyone listed as “developer”.
Statement of Work (SOW)	SOW clearly states all major deliverables and their approximate due dates; scope is realistic for the course and aligned with the rest of the proposal. Uses professional, client-facing language.	SOW is mostly clear but misses a few details (e.g., vague dates) or slightly over/underestimates scope.	SOW is vague, incomplete, or not well aligned with the goals and timeline (e.g., promises more than is feasible).	SOW is missing or too unclear to be useful. Ex: “we will make a full game” with no concrete deliverables.
Client Questions	Lists 3–5 specific, open-ended questions that would help clarify content accuracy, learner needs, or design direction; clearly shows critical thinking.	Questions are helpful but general; at least one clearly connects to goals/ content/ learner experience.	Too few questions or mostly yes/no questions that do not move the project forward.	Questions are missing or not meaningful. Ex: questions about things addressed in the prompt.
Professional Presentation	Proposal is well-organized with clear headings and consistent formatting; tone is professional; grammar and spelling errors are rare or minor.	Generally clear/ readable; a few formatting or language issues, but they do not interfere with understanding.	Formatting/tone makes reading hard (bad alignment, casual language); noticeable grammar/ mechanics issues.	Very informal, poorly formatted, or difficult to follow due to frequent errors. Ex: missing headings, heavy slang.

Simulation Proposal Rubric (Condensed)

Criterion	Exemplary (10)	Proficient (7-9)	Developing (4-6)	Insufficient / Common Issues (0-3)	Grade
Problem Statement	Clear need + context; target learners + sensitivities named and tied to design.	Need/context mostly clear; target learners named; sensitivities only briefly noted.	Vague need or missing context; learners unclear; no real sensitivity consideration.	Very short/confusing; missing key info; no sense of who it's for.	
Project Goals	Concrete, measurable goals tied to client; at least one planned standard/source/SME.	Goals mostly clear and relevant; source/SME mentioned but weakly tied.	Broad/vague goals; little/no grounding in domain content.	Goals missing or don't say what learners should be able to do.	
Scene & Interaction Design	Environment + key actions clearly described; interactions support goals.	Scene and interactions understandable; some details underdeveloped.	Hard to visualize; several interactions not clearly goal-aligned.	Minimal or confusing description; "room with stuff" level detail.	
Technology Constraints	Tools/platforms appropriate; at least one realistic limitation/risk noted.	Tools listed and generally appropriate; limitations only briefly noted.	Tools incomplete or poorly matched to project needs.	Tools missing/incorrect; no concrete plan for platform.	
Milestones & Timeline	Clear phases with realistic dates; idea → prototype → playtest → refine is visible.	Phases/dates mostly clear; some vagueness but workable.	Very broad or unrealistic timeline; missing key phases (e.g., playtest).	Vague or absent timeline; everything bunched at end.	
Team Roles	Every member has specific role(s) tied to tasks/milestones; rotation noted if used.	Most roles clear; some overlap or light description.	Roles generic; unclear who owns what.	Roles missing/unrealistic; "everyone is developer" only.	
Statement of Work (SOW)	Concrete deliverables + dates; scope realistic and aligned with proposal.	Mostly clear SOW; minor gaps or slight scope mismatch.	Vague/incomplete SOW; poor alignment with goals or timeline.	SOW missing or too fuzzy to guide work.	
Client Questions	3-5 specific, open-ended questions that clearly move project forward.	Questions helpful but somewhat general; at least one strong.	Too few or mostly yes/no questions with limited value.	Questions missing or trivial/redundant.	
Professional Presentation	Well-formatted, professional tone; minimal errors.	Generally clear; a few format/grammar issues.	Sloppy formatting or informal tone; noticeable errors.	Hard to read; highly informal; frequent errors.	
				Total	

Comments: