Project Evaluation: Design Assessment (DA)

The checklists indicate project elements where your 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 checklist.) Your score by category appears in the Project Evaluation to the right.

Project Evaluation

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

Evaluation Criteria: Content

\# Memos are framed properly, provide appropriate context & discussion of the project, & request appropriate action regarding the accompanying project.

\# Title communicates the document's purpose & identifies the Object of Study (OoS).

\# Executive summary effectively distills the document: frames the purpose, identifies the OoS, & distills the design analyses & conclusions.

\# Overview previews the purpose, focus, and structure of the document.

\# Description of OoS is appropriately developed: establishes the context & purpose of the OoS, describes its significant features & functions.

\# Description of OoS effectively integrates appropriate figures & tables.

\# Description built with language that describes rather than evaluates the design.

\# Heuristic Analysis introduces & frames an appropriate evaluation standard.

\# Heuristic Analysis effectively applies that evaluation standard to assessing the OoS.

\# Heuristic Analysis effectively & appropriately integrates figures & tables.

\# UX Analysis effectively describes & contextualizes the study, explaining its set up & focus.

\# UX Analysis effectively reports study results, including highlights from resulting data, & data-driven conclusions about the usability of the OoS.

\# UX Analysis effectively& appropriately integrates figures & tables.

\# Lessons learned emphasize the design elements & user experiences of the OoS that contribute to understanding & assessing its quality & usability.

\# Lessons learned build on the analyses presented & the author's experience with the OoS.

\# Appendices are properly framed & signaled in the main document, & provide appropriate content.

\# Figures & tables signaled appropriately from the discussion in text.

\# Figures & tables titled/captioned effectively.

\# Discussion supported by concrete, specific evidence throughout.

\# DA content is consistently well organized.

\# In-text citations handled properly, & works cited complete, consistent.

Evaluation Criteria: Design

\# Memos meet format/layout expectations for the genre.

\# DA establishes & maintains a strong, consistent visual logic.

\# DA is presented in a professional page design that effectively coordinates text, figures, & tables.

Evaluation Criteria: Professionalism

\# Submission includes the required, properly labeled files in appropriate formats posted to the designated location.

\# Memos demonstrate consistent professionalism & attention to detail.

\# DA demonstrates consistent professionalism & attention to detail.

\# Written content is grammatically sound.

\# Written content is stylistically appropriate (economical, direct), & utilizes audience-appropriate terminology.

Evaluation Criteria: Revision

\# Final submission demonstrates effective response to feedback on prototype.

\# Final submission represents continued, effective development of content & refinement of design.

Evaluation Criteria Key

1 exemplary, minor flaws only
2 strong, much more successful than not
3 evident, would benefit from more revision
4 particularly weak, needs significant work
5 missing or greatly misunderstood
na does not apply to this submission