# IxD Systems: Food System Critique

Thank you so much for attending this critique. In addition to the comments and insights you provide during the critique, I’d very much appreciate your help in grading the students.

If you fill out this form for the presentations you view, I will use the information to supplement my own evaluation. Your scores and comments will be confidential and I will have complete responsibility for the final grades I assign.

Thank you!

Tim Sheiner

## Grading Rubric

Please use the rubric below to assign scores to the presentations that you view.

| Category | Score: 1 | Score: 2-3 | Score: 4 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Observation** | Cursory inclusion of research into concept. Questionable or poorly supported assumptions. Lack of time and care devoted to research portion of project. | Good alignment between the observational reports and conceptual model. Evidence of thoroughness in investigating the problem space and identifying the relevant elements and relationships. Support for the choice of perspective used for viewing the problem space. | Evidence of significant self-directed research. Clear and explicit description of how observations led to insights and decisions. Understanding of the limitations of the observations, clarity regarding assumptions and their risks. |
| **Synthesis** | The concept and structure presented do not follow from the presented research, pieces of the concept do not support one another, little or no representation of flow and feedback, lack of clarity about entity relationships and influence. | Representation of the problem space in a coherent and consistent model. Good alignment between the implications of the several diagrams used to explain the design concept. Clarity about entities and relationships, flows and feedback. | The conceptual presentation is insightful, the identified elements and relationships teach meaning that exists in the system but is not at all obvious to a casual observer, system complexity is rendered manageable via a simple, parsimonious and actionable model. |
| **Communication** | The presentation is not completed with care or does not contain all the required pieces. Presentation is sloppy, disorganized or otherwise unconsidered. Lack of preparation or coordination make it hard to understand the concepts, assumptions and structure of the design. | The presentation is easy to understand and the connection between the expression and the underlying model is at all times clear. Information architecture is manifest in labeling and structure. Workflows are consistent with use cases and the system model. Visual design is attractive and appropriate. Communication was taken seriously, materials prepared with care and delivery was rehearsed | The presentation is exceptional in terms of elegance, clarity and emotional resonance. There is near perfect alignment between the shared needs, the mental model and the expression of these concepts in the visual design, layout and flow. Evidence of significant preparation to ensure that design intent is represented in the presentational narrative. |
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