IxD210 Term Project Phase I Critique

March 19 2014

Scoring Rubric

| **Item** | **Excellent (3)** | **Good (2)** | **Poor (1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| System Diagram & Summary | Completed and insightful and visually creative | Completed and makes sense | Has significant logical flaws, or dubious or unsupported assumptions or is not clearly relevant to the problem space. |
| Interview Quotes or notes & Photo Essay | Particularly thorough or deep or captures insight in an unusually powerful way | Completed and visually compelling, captures key points | Message is unclear or incomplete, visuals fail to support the key points |

### (score of 0 if item is not complete)

| **Item** | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (2-3)** | **Poor (1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Presentation | Extremely high quality experience in terms of storytelling, visual appearance or communication style. | Presentation is well organized, smoothly presented and effectively explains the system context, actors and challenges. Higher scores for better visual design and narrative flow. | Presentation is disorganized, or unrehearsed or fails to provide sufficient context for evaluating the work. |

Group 1

| Student | Presentation  (0-4) | System Diagram & Summary  (0-3) | Interview Quotes/Notes & Photo Essay  (0-3) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ankita Akerkar |  |  |  |
| Maha Almadhi |  |  |  |
| Kelly Stuckey |  |  |  |
| Shue Wong |  |  |  |
| Gina Knox |  |  |  |
| William Felker |  |  |  |
| Lana Choi |  |  |  |
| Treyce Meredith |  |  |  |
| Shawn Park |  |  |  |
| Eli Bornstein |  |  |  |
| Andy Martinez |  |  |  |
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| Presentation | Extremely high quality experience in terms of storytelling, visual appearance or communication style. | Presentation is well organized, smoothly presented and effectively explains the system context, actors and challenges. Higher scores for better visual design and narrative flow. | Presentation is disorganized, or unrehearsed or fails to provide sufficient context for evaluating the work. |

Group 2

| Student | Presentation  (0-4) | System Diagram & Summary  (0-3) | Interview Quotes/Notes & Photo Essay  (0-3) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Analicia Barros |  |  |  |
| Charnell McQueen |  |  |  |
| Anna Szumowski |  |  |  |
| Mikelis Krumins |  |  |  |
| Tarang Gala |  |  |  |
| Kirk Draheim |  |  |  |
| Rachel Rosenson |  |  |  |
| David Schrimp |  |  |  |
| Adam Lukasik |  |  |  |
| Brett Killoran |  |  |  |