COMD 1127: Project 3 Essay (30%)

Student:

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

		Un	Insatisfactory 🗲									
	Category	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Research depth	(20 points): the thoroughness and depth of the research conducted on the selected typographer/designer; the variety and quality of sources utilized										
2	Analysis	(20 points): the ability to analyze and interpret the significance of the typographer's work within the context of typography and design history; insightful connections and critical thinking										
3	Originality & creativity	(10 points): the original and creative approaches demonstrated in the essay, such as unique insights, perspectives										
4	Personal voice	(10 points): student's unique take on the designer/typographer and personal reflection										
5	Content clarity	(10 points): the clarity and coherence of the essay's content, including the organization of ideas, accuracy, and logical flow										
6	Writing quality	(10 points): the overall quality of writing, including grammar, spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure; effectiveness to communicate the intended message										
7	Citation	(10 points): the accuracy and completeness of citations and referencing throughout the essay; proper attribution of sources and adherence to Chicago Manual Style										
8	Adherence	(10 points): the overall fulfillment of assigned requirements outlined, including length and formatting										
		Final grade (out of 100)						1				

Feedback:

Final grade (out of 100)

COMD 1127: Project 3 Presentation (30%)

Presenter:

Торіс:\_\_\_\_\_

		Unsatisfactory										<ul> <li>Excell</li> </ul>		
	Category	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1	Content	Accuracy: ensure the content provides accurate information about the chosen typographer's life, work, and impact												
2		<b>Research:</b> evaluate the breadth and depth of research conducted, considering the variety and relevance of sources utilized (5-7 resources)												
3		<b>Analysis:</b> assess the presenter's analysis or critical response of the typographer's style, innovations, and techniques												
4	Presentation	<b>Organization:</b> evaluate the presentation's clarity, coherence, and logical flow of information												
5		<b>Visual engagement:</b> assess the effectiveness of visuals, slides, and other aids in engaging the audience and enhancing understanding												
6		<b>Engagement:</b> evaluate the presenter's ability to engage the audience through clear speech, confidence, interaction, and engaging/creative techniques												
7		<b>Use of examples:</b> assess the effectiveness of examples presented during the presentation												
8	Brochure	<b>Execution:</b> evaluate technical aspects such as design layout, composition, printing quality, and attention to detail												
9		<b>Information accessibility:</b> assess how effectively the brochure communicates information about the typographer and their work												
10		<b>Aesthetics:</b> evaluate the visual appeal, creativity, and coherence of the brochure's design with respect to the chosen typographer's style												

Final grade (out of 100)

Feedback:

Student:

\_\_\_\_\_

COMD 1127: Project 3

**Designed Essay (40%)** 

Topic:

## CRITERIA Verv Good Excellent Good Marginal Unsatisfactory Unacceptable • Did not present during final PRESENTATION. Solicited informative materials Solicited informative Utilized appropriate research Initiative to utilize resources Initiative to utilize PARTICIPATION beyond expectations. materials. materials. effectively was marginal. resources effectively was critique. & PROFESSION-• Professional, well-structured ·Professional, well-structured •Solicited basic research to Little or no fact gathering on not satisfactory or below Submission late. ALISM and exceptional delivery. and interesting delivery. enhance presentation. the topics. expectations. • Did not meet project 20 Exceptional public speaking •Great public speaking skills Professional and interesting •The delivery was Evidence of investigation and requirements. skills and ability to explain and ability to explain concepts. unprofessional or poorly research was not clear or deliverv. •Final work is carefully Good public speaking skills. below expectations. concepts. structured. Final work is well presented. presented, visually Final work is carefully •Below average public •Did not research the facts. visually comprehensive, and comprehensive, and neatly presented. speaking skills. ·Poor delivery. neatly organized. organized. Partial in-class engagement. • Final work is not mounted; •Sloppy presentation. work is disorganized. Excellent in-class •Full in-class engagement. engagement, punctuality and Lack of in-class participation. peer support. PROCESS & •Went above and beyond to •Very good research. Utilized appropriate research Initiative to utilize resources Initiative to utilize •Very little or no research and RESEARCH research new ideas. Solicited informative materials materials. effectively was marginal. resources effectively was process work provided. 20 Solicited informative materials in the process work to • Solicited informative materials • Little or no fact gathering on not satisfactory or below in the process work beyond enhance project. in the process work to the topics. expectations. expectations. Brought personal ideas, enhance project. •No demonstration of process Evidence of research was not Brought personal ideas, experimentation, and Brought some personal clear or below expectations. work. experimentation, and information. ideas and did some basic Information presented was information. •Completion of interim experiments. misleading to the audience or mostly inaccurate. deadlines. CONCEPT & • Overall concept is above and •Overall concept meets •Overall concept meets •Overall concept somewhat Project does not meet Very little or no concept DEVELOPMENT objective or design scope beyond design scope. objective and design scope objective and design scope meets objective and design development submitted. 20 Professional level concept verv well. criteria. well. scope. Concept does not meet • Professional level concept is •Concept is marginally creative •Not a professional level is exceptionally creative and Professional level concept is standard level or concept is concept, lacks creativity and original - critical thought is creative and original - critical creative and original - critical and original - concept lacks completely off point. evident in concept. thought is evident in concept. thought is evident in concept. critical thought. originality - concept lacks Did not complete interim Interim participation and work Interim participation and work Good evidence of ideation • Did not complete interim critical thought. deadlines. Did not complete interim is beyond expectation. is excellent. and brainstorming. deadlines. Exceptional evidence of Very good evidence of •Little evidence of ideation and deadlines. ideation and brainstorming. ideation and brainstorming. brainstorming. •No evidence of ideation and brainstorming. **EXECUTION** •Design demonstrates •Design demonstrates •Design is basic in its level of •Design lacks a sufficient level •Very little or no organization. Design demonstrates 40 exceptional creativity, design excellence in creativity, creativity, design skill, and creativity, design skill, and of creativity, design skill, and design skill, and professional skill, and highly professional professional quality work. professional quality work. professional quality work. guality work. quality work. •Technique meets standard for •Technique is marginal for the •Technique is poor and does Technique is exceptional, Technique is very good, the following criteria: following criteria: not meet standard for the exceeds standard for the exceeds standard for the technical skill technical skill following criteria: following criteria: following criteria: overall appeal overall appeal · technical skill technical skill technical skill personal voice · personal voice overall appeal overall appeal •All facts are precise. · More than a few overall appeal · personal voice personal voice personal voice Submission instructions were inconsistencies or errors in Several errors, below program •All facts are precise and All facts are precise. followed accurately. the information. standard. explicit. Submission instructions were All deliverables submitted. Submission shows major Submission instructions were •Submission instructions were followed accurately. inaccuracies. not followed. followed accurately. All deliverables submitted. One deliverable is missing. •Two or more deliverables are •All deliverables submitted. missing. GRADE: