Game Design Document Project Rubric

#### **Criteria 1: Creativity and Originality**

| **Score** | **Criteria** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Exceptional | The game concept demonstrates exceptional creativity and originality, offering innovative ideas and features. |
| 4 | Strong | The game concept is creative and original, introducing unique elements that set it apart from typical platformers. |
| 3 | Satisfactory | The game concept is somewhat creative but may borrow familiar elements. Some originality is evident. |
| 2 | Limited | The game concept lacks significant creativity, relying heavily on familiar platformer tropes and mechanics. |
| 1 | Insufficient | The game concept is generic, lacking creativity and originality. |

#### **Criteria 2: Comprehensiveness of GDD**

| **Score** | **Criteria** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Exceptional | The GDD is comprehensive, covering all aspects with exceptional clarity. It demonstrates a deep understanding of game design principles. |
| 4 | Strong | The GDD is thorough, covering all required elements with clarity. The document effectively communicates the game concept and design. |
| 3 | Satisfactory | The GDD is adequate, covering most essential elements with satisfactory clarity. Some areas may need further detail or clarification. |
| 2 | Limited | The GDD lacks depth and detail, missing crucial information about game mechanics, player experience, or other key aspects. |
| 1 | Insufficient | The GDD is incomplete, lacking essential information and providing little insight into the proposed game. |

#### **Criteria 3: Presentation Skills**

| **Score** | **Criteria** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Exceptional | The concept presentation is engaging, visually appealing, and effectively communicates the essence of the game. |
| 4 | Strong | The presentation is well-structured, with clear visuals and effective communication of the game concept. |
| 3 | Satisfactory | The presentation is adequate, but there may be some issues with clarity or engagement. Visuals are present but could be improved. |
| 2 | Limited | The presentation lacks engagement, and visuals may be unclear or irrelevant to the game concept. |
| 1 | Insufficient | The presentation is poorly structured, lacks visuals, and fails to effectively communicate the game concept. |

#### **Criteria 4: Collaboration**

| **Score** | **Criteria** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Exceptional | Team members collaborate seamlessly, leveraging diverse skills and perspectives. Communication and teamwork were exceptional. |
| 4 | Strong | Team collaboration was strong, with effective communication and the integration of diverse perspectives. |
| 3 | Satisfactory | Collaboration was satisfactory, but there were some communication challenges, and not all perspectives were fully integrated. |
| 2 | Limited | Collaboration was limited, with notable communication challenges and minimal integration of diverse perspectives. |
| 1 | Insufficient | Team members did not effectively collaborate, resulting in poor communication and a lack of integration of diverse perspectives. |

#### **Criteria 5: Adaptability**

| **Score** | **Criteria** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | Exceptional | The team demonstrated exceptional adaptability, incorporating feedback to iteratively improve the game concept. |
| 4 | Strong | The team showed strong adaptability, making effective use of feedback to refine and enhance the game concept. |
| 3 | Satisfactory | The team demonstrated satisfactory adaptability, incorporating some feedback to make iterative improvements to the game concept. |
| 2 | Limited | The team's adaptability was limited, with minimal incorporation of feedback and limited iterative improvements. |
| 1 | Insufficient | The team did not demonstrate adaptability, failing to incorporate feedback or make meaningful iterative improvements to the game concept. |