

Design Challenge Rubric

Team / Group: _____ Class Period: _____ Date: _____

Assessment type (circle one):

Self-assessment · Peer assessment · Teacher assessment

Category	1 Beginning	2 Approaching	3 Meets	4 Exceeds	Score
Design Process	Does not show evidence of EDP steps.	Shows some steps but skips criteria/ideation.	Defined criteria, generated multiple concepts, used matrix to select one.	Defined criteria precisely, generated 3+ distinct concepts, justified choice with data.	____/4
Custom CAD Part	No TinkerCAD model or unrelated to game.	Model exists but does not fit the game or has major sizing errors.	Designed an appropriate part in TinkerCAD, sized to fit the build.	Part is well-designed, clearly improves game, successfully integrated into the prototype.	____/4
Prototype	Game is not playable or not built.	Game is partially built; missing custom part or major structural issues.	A playable game built from cardstock/craft materials that integrates the custom part.	Game is well-crafted, clearly playable, and integrates custom part seamlessly.	____/4
Data and Iteration	No test data collected.	Some data collected but no evidence-based change was made.	Collected win-rate and profit data; made one evidence-based change and re-tested.	Robust data set; change is clearly justified by data; re-test confirms improvement.	____/4
Meets the RFP	Game does not address Pat's criteria.	Game meets 1–2 of the 5 RFP criteria.	Game meets 3–4 of the 5 RFP criteria.	Game meets all 5 RFP criteria.	____/4
Pitch and Teamwork	Pitch is missing or only one member presents.	Pitch is present but lacks structure or evidence; not all members speak.	Clear 3–5 min pitch; all members contributed; argued from data and design evidence.	Polished, persuasive pitch; all members contribute meaningfully; evidence is specific and compelling.	____/4

TOTAL SCORE: ____ / 24

Strengths:

Areas to improve: