

Evaluation Matrix for Completed Cards

Instructions

This matrix is only to be used to evaluate submitted cards to be added to the Adele Carousel
 This document is not to be edited without prior authorisation from the Stakeholder Committee
 Use the Record of Evaluation of Cards in conjunction with this matrix to record your evaluation

SECTION 1 - Request Alignment

Criteria	0	1	2	3	Multiplier
Does the card contain imagery and messaging consistant with the initial request?	No - The card is surprisingly divergent from the initial request. There are no, or almost no points of commonality between the card that described in the original request and the card that we recieved.	There are large inconsistencies. Not only are there a large number of deviations but they are significant in nature. They have been delieved without justification for the deviation.	Mostly consistant. There are some divergences in either the textual content, imagery or messaging but for obvious reasons OR there is a larger divergence non-obvious divergence but delivered with solid justifications	Yes - The card recieved is exactly what was described in the initial request.	1
If changed, how reasonable is the new publish date OR if not changed is the date still reasonable?	Unachievable. The requested publish date is less than a week out	Extremely tight. The date is between 1 and 2 weeks from the submission of the initial request	Moderately achievable. The start date is 2-4 weeks from the initial publish date.	Achievable. The requested publish date is more than 4 weeks from the initial submission date.	1

If publish or removal dates have changed, how reasonable is the new removal date OR if not changed is the removal date still reasonable?	Unreasonable. The customer has requested that the card be on permanent rotation - completely against policy	Not very reasonable. The requested removal date is with one week of the start date or it is more than three months after the requested start date	Fairly Reasonable. The removal date is 1-2 weeks from the requested start date or between 2 to 3 months from the requested start date.	Reasonable. The requested removal date is between 2 weeks and 2 months of the requested start date	1
--	---	---	--	--	---

SECTION 2 - Content Evaluation

Criteria	0	1	2	3 Multiplier	
Does the card contain imagery or of content that is sexist	Yes, extremely sexist anti-female or anti-male language or imagery. Imagery is very unbalanced - erasing one gender OR appear to condone extreme stereotypical gender roles. Will certainly offend the general public.	Yes, problematic language that isn't intended to offend but it is unbalance and appears to endorse stereotypical gender roles. Very likely to cause offence in people who moderately care about the issue.	Yes but very minor. Imagery is not gender balanced but simply due to there being only one person in the shot or it is impossible to show multiple genders of equal power. May possibly offend people who care very deeply about gender issues	No, imagery is gender balanced and language is inclusive, OR gender is simply not an issue (eg system update) OR is for an approved gender related event in line with accepted public views (EG a seminar on equal pay)	1
Does the card contain imagery or of content that is racist	Yes, extreme racial stereotyping in language or imagery. Will definately cause offence to the general public.	Yes, racial stereotypes are subtly reinforced. Likely to cause offence in the the general public who are non-racist.	Yes but very minor. Imagery is not racially diverse. May cause offence in the people sensitive to racial diversity issues.	No, the imagery is racially diverse OR racial issue are simply not in evidence.	1

Evaluation Matrix for Completed Cards

Does the card contain imagery or of content that is ageist	Yes, clearly favours a particular age range for no apparent reason or in a manner that is likely to cause offence in the general population.	Yes, clearly favours one age over another though an argument could be made for why that is. Done in a manner that might offend the age ranges that have been excluded but is not overtly offensive.	Yes, selection of art or wording is seemingly OK but could be construed as ageist by someone who is looking to create a problem. eg an event photo where only young or only old people are shown.	No. Multiple ages are represented OR age is simple not an issue OR the content is only applicable to a particular age (eg aged health care, or a seminar on planning the last five years before retirement)
--	--	---	---	---

1

Does the card contain imagery or of content that is homophobic/anti-LGBTI+?	Yes. contains anti-LGBTI+ hate speech. Imagery suggestive of violence to LGBTI+ people. Would cause offence to the general public.	Yes, contains language critical or or dismissive of LGBTI+ people or concerns. Imagery could be easily construed as 'making fun of' LGBTI+ individuals or otherwise denigrating of them. Likely to cause offence to the majority of LGBTI+ individuals.	Yes, content contains material that is LGBTI+ specific and while not negative is badly handled OR uses LGBTI+ individual in an unthinking and stereotypical way. OR represents gender issues likely to trigger offence even when they are technically outside the LGBTI+ space (eg referring to someone as a 'sissy'). Likely to cause offence to people sensitive to LGBTI+ issues and concerns.	No. Content and imagery are completely devoid of gender and sexual preference material so the assessment does not apply OR the material is pro LGBTI+
---	--	---	---	---

1

Evaluation Matrix for Completed Cards

Does the card contain sexualised content?	Yes. Contains actual nudity of a sexualised nature. Would definitately cause offence to the general public	Yes, imagery is either highly sexualised of contains people in various states of undress (though not necessarily sexualised). OR Content text implies material or situations of a sexualised manner.	Yes, content could be construed as sexualised, if you were looking for it. Unlikely to offend anyone except the prudish.	No. Imagery and content is not sexualised at all.
---	--	--	--	---

1

Is the card political in nature. Could there be reputational damage to Defence or the APS for failing to maintain a non-political stance?	High Risk, the card is actively promoting any political party. EG a \$5000 a plate fund raiser for a political party to be held in the ADC Mess. Or hosting a rally for any political party on Defence land/facilities. Also includes anything to do with extremist political views of any type.	Medium Risk. The card could be seen as promoting a bias towards one political party or another, OR actively denegrating a political party without necessarily showing favour to another. Likely to cause public comment but not necessarily public outrage.	Low risk. Card mentions politically charged issues but without aligning to a particular party. EG a Seminar on climate change. Unlikely to cause public comment by the media but may attract the interest of, and comments from, political figures opposed to the content of the card.	No. No political message at all.
---	--	---	--	----------------------------------

1

Evaluation Matrix for Completed Cards

Does the content contain any material that could be seen as religious presecution?	Yes. It actively denegrates or blames a particular religion for supposed evils OR its demonises the members of any religion OR incites violence against any religion OR uses crass humour to lampoon members of any religion. Likely to offend the general population.	Yes. It contains material that promotes a particular religious viewpoint as the 'true' religion. It implies or even overtly states that other religions are less true. Likely to cause offence in members of the excluded religions. May offend some of the general population.	Yes. It contains positive representation of one religion or religious observance with no attention paid to other religions. Only considered to be 'religious persecution' in that it does not address the concerns of the other religions or the non-religious. EG an advertisement for a Christmas Party. It is only likely to offend people who are particularly senistive to the religious persecution issue.	No. There is no religious content at all OR it is actively inclusive of all religions, including the non-religious.
--	--	---	--	---

1

Is the content likely to cause reputational damage to Defence if it were to be released publically - excluding the specific situations above? This is a catch-all for hot button topics that cannot be foreseen at the time this evaluation matrix was created.	High Risk.	Medium Risk	Low Risk.	No, there is no risk that the card will cause any reputational damage to defence.
---	------------	-------------	-----------	---

1

Provenance of content: Has the requestor shown that they have the necessary rights for any imagery or words that are on the card OR have provided satisfactory evidence of a Copyright exception under Australian Law?	No - the imagery or text is clearly been stolen and used without permission (eg a Peanuts cartoon or a photo from yesterday's news)	No - We cannot determine the provenance of some of the content and the requester is not providing the necessary clarifications	n/a	Yes - All text & imagery is accounted for
--	---	--	-----	---

1

SECTION 3 - Execution of development

Criteria	0	1	2	3 Multiplier
Is the card well designed in terms of colour	No. Clashing colours adhering to no known colour palette theory have been used. Applied with no underlying justification.	Colour use is not well executed but it isn't obviously clashing colours. Some attempt at palette design was attempted but wasn't successful OR use of colour is at odds with the content. EG using red, green and white for a Halloween Party advertisement or Black and Orange palette for a Christmas Party advertisement.	Mostly done well. A well designed palette was used but at least one element has been added (such as an image) that has not been colour-matched to the rest of the card.	Yes a well designed palette of co-ordinated colours was used and images have an appropriate LUT applied OR a clear justification/business case is supplied for using an 'unprofessional' application of colour - ie company colours, doing it for effect which is consistent with the rest of the card etc. EG a card advertising child minding using an image finger painted by a child.

1

Evaluation Matrix for Completed Cards

Use of whitespace (negative space)	Poor. Template elements and card workflows were ignored and the white space is either non-existent or lopsided or there is text unintentionally overlayed on other text.	Moderately effective use of white space. The template elements have been inexpertly modified impacting on the placement of objects and through that the white space.	Relatively OK. While not absolutely perfect the use of white space is good enough that it doesn't overly impact on the aesthetics of the card.	White space is well used and balanced. The template recommendations and workflows have obviously been adhered to.	1
Legibility, Spelling & Grammar	Poor. There are spelling errors AND there are grammatical errors AND the choices surrounding the use of text make the text illegible or almost illegible.	Problems exist. Spelling errors or grammatical errors are evident.	The legibility is not great and could be improved but the spelling and grammar use are fine.	No issues at all	1
Does the finished card use a base template well?	No, creation of the card appears to be from scratch without any use of an approved template, and would fail to pass the template evaluation process	No, the creation of the card appears to use heavily modified template which undermines the template's ability to convey its message.	Somewhat OK. A base template has been used but the standards and workflow have not been adhered to. The card however has not been compromised and is still able to convey its message.	Yes, the card uses one of the approved templates from the correct category and adheres to the standards required of that template OR the card has been obviously produced by a professional graphic designer and would likely pass the template evaluation process.	1