

Card Mashup Prototype: Project Rubric & Standards

Course Code: 113605 | Pathway: Digital Design & Game Development (CIP 36.0113.00)

Assignment Summary: Students design an original non-digital card game by re-contextualizing and mashing up card decks from previously played games (*Uno*, *Standard Playing Cards*, *Go Fish*, *Rook*, *Clue*, *Life*). Students establish game structure, rulebooks, victory conditions, and core loops without needing new physical art assets.

1. Relevant Kentucky KDE Course Standards Met

KDE Standard #	Standard Title & Description	Assignment Application
Standard #2	Explore non-digital games.	Analyzes and re-purposes card decks from tabletop games (Uno, Rook, Playing Cards) into a new prototype.
Standard #20	Explore the components of game structure.	Defines turn intervals, action phases, and overall engine structure in the new game loop.
Standard #23	Create rules for a game.	Drafts a complete, unambiguous written rulebook detailing setup, turn actions, and restrictions.
Standard #24	Compare conflict and outcomes.	Establishes player-vs-player or cooperative tension and outcome resolution mechanics.
Standard #25	Develop objectives and outcomes for a game.	Clearly defines primary player goals and end-game conditions.
Standard #27	Explain in-game economies, motivators, and reward systems.	Structures card resource management, hand drafting, or currency trade-offs.
Standard #34	Compare and contrast categories of game mechanics.	Selects specific mechanics (e.g., set collection, trick-taking, deduction, drafting) to drive play.
Standard #35	Research victory condition mechanics of a game.	Designates explicit win/loss conditions (e.g., points threshold, last player standing, elimination).
Standard #36	Discuss the relationship between game mechanics, complexity, and interaction.	Balances rule complexity against strategic depth during pod playtesting.
Standard #37	Incorporate game mechanics into a game.	Combines card elements from two or more distinct games into a functional hybrid system.
Standard #38	Explain basic logic statements such as if/then and cause/effect.	Translates card effects (e.g., 'If suit matches, Then draw 2') into logical player choices.

2. 100-Point Project Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Exemplary (21-25 pts)	Proficient (16-20 pts)	Developing (10-15 pts)	Novice (0-9 pts)
----------	-----------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------

1. Component Mashup & Integration Standards #2, #37	Seamlessly integrates card elements from 2+ games into a original, unified system. Re-contextualizes suit/rank/action values creatively.	Combines components from 2 games effectively. Card functions are clear and logical within the new game setup.	Uses components from multiple games, but mechanics feel disjointed or rely heavily on original game rules.	Copies an existing card game with minimal or no original mashup changes. Components conflict.
2. Rulebook & Logic Flow Standards #23, #25, #38	Rulebook is exceptionally clear, thorough, and unambiguous. Explicitly details setup, turn order, if/then conditions, and edge cases.	Rulebook covers setup, turn structure, and win conditions clearly. Minor ambiguities in rare edge cases.	Rulebook is incomplete or confusing in key areas. Requires verbal explanation from designer during play.	Rules are unwritten, highly contradictory, or lack clear turn structure and logic.
3. Core Loop & Mechanics Synergy Standards #20, #34, #35, #36	Core loop (Input Action Output Feedback) is tight and engaging. Mechanics create compelling choices and clear victory conditions.	Core loop is well-defined. Mechanics function smoothly with clear victory conditions and meaningful player choices.	Core loop is repetitive or stagnant. Mechanics lack tension or lead to frequent runaway winner scenarios.	No identifiable core loop. Victory conditions are missing or unattainable. Gameplay breaks down.
4. Playtest Balance & Iteration Log Standards #24, #27	Demonstrates extensive playtesting. Balance (luck vs. skill) is tuned. Documents peer feedback and iterative rule revisions clearly.	Game is well-balanced for pod play. Incorporates peer playtest feedback into documented rule refinements.	Game is played but exhibits severe balance issues (overpowered cards/first-player advantage). Limited documented revisions.	No evidence of playtesting or rule revision. Game fails to function during pod rotation.