**Graphic Design Project Grading Rubric** (Sample Courtesy of Allison Goodman, 2014)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Narrative Sequence** 1/3rd of project grade | | | | category grade | *2.4* | | |
| overall descriptions/categories | **0** | | **1 - Ineffective** | **2 - Progressing** | **3 - Effective** | | **4 – Highly Effective** |
| **point of view (pov) and use of motif:** | *failure to turn in completed work and/or failure to meet the minimal requirements outlined in level 1* | | lacking interest, weak, unable to attract | present but not fully utilized **√** | clear, applicable to topic | | fully engaging throughout booklet |
| **visual prediction and resolution** | absent and/or noticeably unresolved | present but sometimes inconsistent **√** | successful narrative arc | | seamless narrative experience |
| **photo selection & editing; text/image relationships** | unremarkable, not in support of pov or motif | predictable and/or successful but without delight **√** | attractive and in support of narrative | | innovative and attractive |
| **rhythm, pacing, orientation, density & visual distribution** | indistinguishable and/or, not in support of pov or motif | intermittently successful, not fully in support of pov or motif | in full support of pov **√** | | flawless |
| **final output** | incomplete and/or technically compromised to the point of distraction | all elements included and in order, but lacking re: paper, printout and/or binding | achieves acceptable technical competence **√** | | technical output complements the design in every way |
| **Typography** 1/3rd of project grade | | | | category grade | *2.66* | | |
| overall descriptions/categories | **0** | **1 - Ineffective** | | **2 - Progressing** | **3 - Effective** | **4 – Highly Effective** | |
| **connection of typographic approach to narrative** | *failure to turn in completed work and/or failure to meet the minimal requirements outlined in level 1* | lacking and/or unclear | | evident but not uniformly successful | successful connection of type to narrative **√** | extremely strong editorial quality in the typographic approach | |
| **editorial differentiation and organization** | typographic choices lack visual hierarchy | | unclear and/or inconsistent hierarchy | present and consistent visual hierarchy **√** | obvious and useful visual hierarchy | |
| **technical practices** *(including but not limited to leading, rags, type density, tracking, hanging quotations, column width(s), etc*.) | does not meet baseline acceptability | | emerging successful practices but not consistent **√** | competent technical practices | excellent technical workmanship | |
| **Documentation, Workflow, Participation** 1/3rd of project grade | | | | category grade | *2.33* | | |
| overall descriptions/categories | **0** | **1 - Ineffective** | | **2 - Progressing** | **3 - Effective** | **4 – Highly Effective** | |
| **documentation/ weekly workbook** | *failure to turn in completed documentation and/or failure to meet the minimal requirements outlined in level 1.* | work missing, organization lacking, analyses incomplete and/or uninformative | | work complete but organization lacking, analyses are perfunctory **√** | content complete and organized, analyses are self-reflective and informative | content complete and organized at a level that informs all viewers, analyses are thoughtful and informative | |
| **workflow** | no/little weekly progress/effort, homework often not ready at start of class, work-in-class (wic) underutilized, critique points not integrated into weekly progress | | inconsistent weekly progress, homework not consistently ready at start of class, wic under-utilized, critique points are not fully integrated into weekly progress | weekly effort is evident, homework preparation is complete and ready at the start of class, wic is utilized, thoughtful response to critique is evident in the work **√** | weekly progress is robust and well-prepared for critique, progress is made during wic, thoughtful response to critique is evident and enhanced by additional investigation. | |
| **participation** | classroom presence non-committal / critique participation not forthcoming / personal presentations do not show a full understanding of the project itself. | | classroom presence is perfunctory, critique participation is minimal/ personal presentations lack commitment to work. **√** | classroom presence is beneficial overall, participation in critiques is thoughtful, personal presentations show an understanding and commitment to the work. | classroom presence beneficial overall, participation in critiques is topical, thoughtful, and in the interest of progress, personal presentations are meaningful additions to the work itself. | |
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