

## RPW210 Rhetoric, Culture, & Power

### Evaluation: Design for a Better World (DBW) project

---

The checklists indicate project elements where your final submission meets expectations, and if applicable, where it still could benefit from further development or continued refinement. (The key to the evaluative comments is included below the checklists.) Your score by category appears in the Project Evaluation to the right.

#### Evaluation Criteria: Content

- eval** Memos are framed properly, provide appropriate context & discussion of the project, & request appropriate action regarding the accompanying project.
- eval** Title effectively frames the essay, & is accompanied by author's name.
- eval** Introduction draws readers in, introduces the problem, & prepares readers for the essay that follows.
- eval** Discussion identifies the problem, explores its complexity, & frames its impact.
- eval** Discussion effectively applies articulation mapping to understanding the problem—explores how analysis of the problem in human terms, of the things people do, say, think, & believe reflect the values we might associate with the problem in the 3 core areas (e.g., thoughts & actions, impact, humanity).
- eval** Discussion proposes appropriate strategies for addressing the problem.
- eval** Each potential solution is identified by name, & followed by explanations of how it might address the problem. Discussion includes how each solution element fits Norman's criteria for good design: meaningful, sustainable, human-centered.
- eval** Discussion frames how we might assess progress in addressing the problem.
- eval** Submission effectively combines the Wicked Problems and Sustainable Solutions essays into a coherent whole.
- eval** Essay is well organized.
- eval** Essay draws effectively on external resources to support discussion.

#### Project Evaluation

Total Points (400 possible)	score
Content (120 points possible)	score
Inquiry (120 points possible)	score
Professionalism (80 points possible)	score
Revision (80 points possible)	score

#### Evaluation Criteria: Quality of Inquiry

- eval** The discussion achieves the overarching objective of demonstrating complexity for both the problem identified & the solutions proposed.
- eval** The discussion reflects the author's willingness & ability to go beyond obvious interpretations of the problem, & to explore fresh perspectives on addressing it.

#### Evaluation Criteria: Professionalism

- eval** Submission includes the required, properly labeled files in the appropriate formats & posted to the designated location(s).
- eval** Memos demonstrate consistent professionalism & attention to detail.
- eval** DBW demonstrates consistent professionalism & attention to detail.
- eval** Written content is grammatically sound.
- eval** Written content is stylistically appropriate (economical, intelligent, engaging), & utilizes audience-appropriate terminology.

#### Evaluation Criteria: Revision

- yes** Final submission demonstrates effective response to feedback on prototype version.
- eval** Final submission represents continued, effective development & refinement of content throughout the project process.

---

#### Evaluation Criteria Key

- yes** evident and at least generally successful
- nm** evident, but needs more attention
- pw** evident, but particularly weak
- no** not evident, or missing entirely
- na** does not apply to this submission