Unit:	**Storytelling and Narrative Development**	Name :	**Ethan Southall**
Level :	**5**	**Mark:**	**63**
Assignment No:	**1**	**Marker :**	**Charlie Hargood**
Hand in date:	12/11/2018	**Q A :**	**Vedad Hulusic**
Dyslexia Marking Guidelines to be used : No			

Marker Feedback

Ethan you have submitted your design document for your Twine adaptation of Little Red Riding Hood. The submission is mostly to specification however the text in your story graph is under the specified size.

You have demonstrated a range of game narrative best practice and theory in this document including plot arcs, character archetypes, and structural patterns. These are on the whole accurately applied as well. There is however an issue with regards to the level of depth that you approached some of these areas. For example in your plot arc some key features such as your dramatic question and dramatic reversals are missing. Similarly your characters make good use of archetypes but are somewhat light of characterisation.

Again your explanation and justification of your design decisions are broadly good. You also give a good justification for your use of a technology platform. However to aspire to a higher assessment you need to increase the depth with which you approach this and consider the efficacy of your design. For example your pacing looks ok on the outside – but the tiny vague graph to support it is nearly impossible to read and the text doesn't really explain your delivery. Similarly why do we pace in this way? Why might we make use of archetypes? What is the desired effect on the reader of your design?

Your story graph (though hard to read) demonstrates a well-designed interactive narrative with great potential. However your explanation is again a bit descriptive. You identify key patterns and modular choice – but don't really explore why these are important or the ultimate impact of these decisions. There is also a slight confusion over the narrative paradox – the explanation of techniques you (briefly) give are a part of agency management but the narrative paradox itself is a different phenomena. Indeed – on that matter – describing the wider issues surrounding agency (such as the narrative paradox).

The report on the whole is well written – however your diagrams/figures need work – the text in the graph is too small, and your pacing graph is nearly illegible and needlessly hand drawn. There are also some problems with references – missing parts (such as Suckling and Walton) or missing whole references (such as the narrative paradox).

Submission grading against marking scheme on following page

SUMMARY FEEDBACK COMMENT:

Ethan this is a good submission that shows promise and you demonstrate a good overview understanding of the content on this course. However to improve you need to work on the depth with which you approach these ideas considering why we apply these ideas and the impact on the design.

3 Feed Forward Suggestions:

(i) **Revisit the ideas you have made use of in this document and consider why we make use of these and what the impact is on the design.**

(ii) **Revisit the work on the 3 act structure and characterisation – there are some features missing in this report such as dramatic questions and reversals.**

(iii) **Specifications and presentation of diagrams matter – don't throw away marks by making errors here.**

SIGNED (Marker): *CHargood* **Date: 28/11/18**

Interactive Narrative Design - Highlights in Red indicate where student has met level

0-39%	**K**	• Student demonstrates no (or extremely limited) recollection of relevant theory or best practice • Any theory or best practice recalled is not applied to the story
	I	• Story design decisions are entirely or nearly entirely unexplained and unjustified
	S	• The narrative is either not interactive, or the interactivity and agency has been entirely unmanaged.
	T	• The design document is entirely, or nearly, incoherent and badly written • The submission is not to specification • References are absent or inaccurate
40-49%	**K**	• Student demonstrates some recollection of relevant theory and best practice but it is incomplete and/or contains multiple errors • Theory recalled is applied to the story inaccurately and/or in an incomplete manner
	I	• Design decisions are partially explained and justified but not in a way that is convincing of their efficacy
	S	• Student has demonstrated limited consideration for interactivity and agency but there are problems and/or it unlikely to be effective and/or it is unmanaged
	T	• While coherent the structure and writing in the document is of poor quality and the design is not clear • The specification has been mostly followed but with some problems • References are present but have multiple errors or gaps
50-59%	**K**	• Student demonstrates an adequate recollection of theory and best practice but there are minor errors or gaps in their knowledge • Theory recalled is applied to the story adequately, but not in a way that demonstrates depth of understanding
	I	• Design decisions are explained and justified adequately but there is a lack of critical consideration of the effect of these decisions
	S	• Student has designed an adequate interactive narrative with some consideration for agency and interactivity that is managed with limited efficacy
	T	• Report writing is adequate but lacking in structure and/or use of clear tables/diagrams/figures to support it. • Submission is to specification • References are correct
60-69%	**K**	• Student demonstrates a complete recollection of relevant theory and professional practice with no or only negligible errors or gaps • Theory is applied to the story elegantly in a way that demonstrates a deeper understanding of both the ideas and their effect on story design
	I	• Design decisions are fully described and justified along with critical consideration of their efficacy
	S	• Student has an effective design for an interactive narrative with a justified consideration for reader agency and how this can be managed that demonstrates a deeper understanding of the relevant issues.
	T	• Report writing is good and makes use of structure and/or use of clear tables/diagrams/figures to support it. • Submission is to specification • References are correct
70-79%	**K**	• Student demonstrates a complete recollection of relevant theory and professional practice, and goes beyond this to show wider study of relevant ideas and concepts • Theory is applied to the story elegantly in a way that demonstrates a deeper understanding of both the ideas and their effect on story design
	I	• Design decisions are fully described and justified along with critical consideration of their efficacy. Furthermore the student demonstrates consideration of alternatives and a deeper understanding of the impact on the story.
	S	• Student has designed an excellent interactive narrative that shows great consideration for reader agency and interactivity. Their design shows a deep understanding of relevant issues and clearly explains how they have been effectively addressed in their own approach.
	T	• Report writing is very good and makes use of structure and/or use of clear tables/diagrams/figures to support it in a way that communicates clearly and enhances the case made. • Submission is to specification • References are correct
80-100%	**K**	• Student demonstrates recollection and wider study of relevant theory and professional practice beyond the expectations of this unit. • Student has applied theory in a way that demonstrates a deep understanding of a broad set of concepts, their impact of the efficacy of interactive narrative, and the limitations and strengths of these ideas.
	I	• Student demonstrates justification and critical consideration of design decisions for their interactive story beyond the expectations of this unit. Critically appraising efficacy, alternatives, impact on the story, the limitations of different approaches, and the wider digital narrative poetics at play.
	S	• Student has designed an exception piece of interactive narrative beyond the expectations of the unit. Agency, interactivity, and a deep understanding of relevant issues and how they may be addressed are all considered. The student also demonstrates novelty in their own solution to these problems.
	T	• Report writing is excellent and makes use of structure and/or use of clear tables/diagrams/figures to support it in a way that communicates clearly and enhances the case made. The report is also novel in the way it communicates its content, going beyond unit expectations in documenting the design. • Submission is to specification • References are correct