

RPW245 Journalistic Writing & Research

Evaluation: Publication Design (PD)

The checklists indicate project elements where your submission meets expectations, and if applicable, where it still could benefit from further development or continued refinement. (The key to the evaluative comments is included below the checklist.) Your score by category appears in the Project Evaluation to the right.

Evaluation Criteria: Content

- # Memos are framed properly, provide appropriate context & discussion of the project, & request appropriate action regarding the accompanying project.
- # Publication space effectively accommodates all required content.
- # Author pages present publishing team members effectively & appropriately.
- # Previous issues are appropriately archived, beginning with the NC2 submission.

Evaluation Criteria: Design & Delivery

- # Memos meet format and layout expectations for the genre.
- # Publication space is professionally designed, usable, & appropriate to journalistic publishing.
- # Navigation is logical, effective, & functional.
- # Publication space is aesthetically pleasing, & conveys a sense of thematically visual coherence & consistency.

Evaluation Criteria: Professionalism

- # Submission includes the required, properly labeled files in appropriate formats posted to the designated location.
- # Submissions demonstrate consistent professionalism & attention to detail.
- # Written content is grammatically sound.
- # Written content is stylistically appropriate (economical, direct), & utilizes audience-appropriate terminology.

Project Evaluation

| Total Points (200 possible) | # |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Content (60 points possible) | # |
| Design (60 points possible) | # |
| Professionalism (40 points possible) | # |
| Revision (40 points possible) | # |

Evaluation Criteria: Revision

- # Final submission demonstrates effective response to feedback on prototype.
 - # Final submission represents continued, effective development of content & refinement of design.
-

Evaluation Criteria Key

- 1 exemplary, minor flaws only
- 2 strong, much more successful than not
- 3 evident, would benefit from more revision
- 4 particularly weak, needs significant work
- 5 missing or greatly misunderstood
- na does not apply to this submission

Notes. ###