ART 418 - BUSINESS OF DESIGN

SMB Rebranding Grading Rubric

OVERVIEW & PURPOSE

This rubric evaluates both **business reasoning** and **design craft** for a professional rebrand case study. Total: **100 points**. Submitters are responsible for the accuracy of any claims and the integrity of their process documentation.

PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Exemplary: Work is client-ready, strategically defensible, and shows strong craft and iteration.

Proficient: Meets expectations with solid reasoning and execution; minor gaps in rigor or polish.

Developing: Partial completion or weak justification; noticeable craft/process issues.

Insufficient: Missing requirements or lacks credible reasoning/craft; not usable in a professional context.

SCORING SUMMARY (100 POINTS)

1) Brand Audit & Problem Definition — 15 pts

2) Competitive Landscape & Positioning — 15 pts

3) Concept Development & Iteration — 15 pts

4) Logo Craft & Functionality — 20 pts

5) Brand System & Applications — 15 pts

6) Business Rationale & Case Study Communication — 15 pts

7) Professional Standards, Process Evidence, and AI Disclosure — 5 pts

RUBRIC DESCRIPTORS

1) Brand Audit & Problem Definition — 15 pts

Exemplary (13–15): Evidence-based audit of the current brand; specific issues tied to audience and business impact; crisp problem statement.

Proficient (10–12): Relevant observations with some evidence; mostly clear problem statement; reasonable linkage to goals.

Developing (6–9): Mostly opinion-based or generic; limited evidence; weak connection to audience/business needs.

Insufficient (0–5): Minimal audit or unclear claims; no meaningful problem definition.

2) Competitive Landscape & Positioning — 15 pts

Exemplary (13–15): Competitor scan identifies patterns and white space; positioning is specific, defensible, and differentiated.

Proficient (10–12): Competitors are relevant; some pattern recognition; positioning is mostly clear.

Developing (6–9): Competitors listed with little analysis; positioning is generic; weak differentiation.

Insufficient (0–5): Little/no competitor work; positioning absent or copycat.

3) Concept Development & Iteration — 15 pts

Exemplary (13–15): Multiple distinct directions; clear iteration and refinement logic; decisions are explained and tested.

Proficient (10–12): More than one direction; some iteration; rationale present but light.

Developing (6–9): Few concepts; limited iteration; decisions feel arbitrary.

Insufficient (0–5): Single idea with minimal development; no evidence of process.

4) Logo Craft & Functionality — 20 pts

Exemplary (18–20): Strong form/typography; scalable and legible; works in 1-color; distinctive and appropriate; clean file construction.

Proficient (14–17): Well-crafted with minor issues (spacing/kerning/simplification); works in most contexts.

Developing (8–13): Noticeable craft issues; legibility/scaling problems; limited versatility.

Insufficient (0–7): Poor construction; confusing or derivative; fails basic usage scenarios.

5) Brand System & Applications — 15 pts

Exemplary (13–15): Applications convincingly prove the identity works; coherent system choices; mockups feel realistic for the SMB.

Proficient (10–12): Applications are relevant; system mostly coherent; some weak executions.

Developing (6–9): Applications feel generic; system inconsistent; mockups don't support the strategy.

Insufficient (0–5): Few/no applications; no system thinking.

6) Business Rationale & Case Study Communication — 15 pts

Exemplary (13–15): Clear, persuasive before/after story; decisions tied to audience/market goals; writing and hierarchy are client-ready.

Proficient (10–12): Rationale understandable with some business linkage; presentation mostly clear.

Developing (6–9): Rationale relies on taste; weak organization; unclear or unsupported claims.

Insufficient (0–5): Hard to follow; no defensible argument.

7) Professional Standards, Process Evidence, and AI Disclosure — 5 pts

Exemplary (5): Complete process evidence; ethical sourcing; AI Use Note included (if used) with tools, purpose, representative prompts, and what changed.

Proficient (4): Process evidence present; AI disclosure mostly complete.

Developing (2–3): Minimal process evidence; incomplete AI disclosure or unclear authorship.

Insufficient (0–1): No process evidence; missing disclosure when AI was used; integrity concerns.

DEDUCTIONS & INTEGRITY NOTES

- Missing required deliverables or incorrect format: deduct as appropriate based on what is missing.

- Misleading claims (invented facts, fake citations, fabricated competitor information): may result in major deductions and/or a required redo.

- Unauthorized or undisclosed AI use (when limited): treated as an academic integrity issue per course policy.