

ART 448 — Project Rubric

ChargeOn Call — EV Mobile Repair Website Prototype (Figma: Sketch → Wireframe → High-Fidelity)

Purpose

This rubric evaluates applied UX reasoning, process visibility, and interface craft across the full workflow (sketch → wireframe → high-fidelity). A visually polished final is not sufficient on its own; credit is earned by showing decisions, iterations, and validation.

Submission Integrity

- Required artifacts: sketches (2 distinct concepts), wireframes (desktop + mobile, 3 pages), high-fidelity screens (desktop + mobile, 3 pages), clickable prototype, 1-page rationale, and usability test notes.
- Missing required phases caps the maximum grade for affected criteria, regardless of final polish.
- AI is allowed only within the assignment's stated limits. If AI is used, include an AI Use Note (tool, purpose, representative prompt, and what you changed). Undisclosed or out-of-scope AI use may receive a zero for impacted portions.

Scoring Scale

- Exemplary: client-ready, defensible decisions, clear process evidence.
- Proficient: requirements met with minor gaps in clarity, craft, or justification.
- Developing: partial completion, weak rationale, or usability/craft issues that impede the experience.
- Insufficient: missing requirements, minimal process evidence, or unusable/unsupported design decisions.

Evaluation Criteria (100 pts)

1) Sketch Phase: Exploration & Hierarchy (10 pts)

- Exemplary (9-10): Two clearly different layout concepts for Home (desktop + mobile) that prioritize urgent vs. planned users; strong hierarchy, obvious CTAs, and labeled trust signals.
- Proficient (7-8): Two concepts provided; hierarchy and CTA placement mostly clear; some missed opportunities for task prioritization or trust cues.
- Developing (4-6): Limited exploration (concepts too similar) or unclear hierarchy; CTAs/trust signals not convincingly planned.
- Insufficient (0-3): Missing sketches or sketches are too vague to evaluate layout decisions.

2) Wireframes: Information Architecture & Mental Models (15 pts)

- Exemplary (13-15): Desktop + mobile wireframes for Home/Services/Book show predictable patterns, scannable sections, and clear wayfinding aligned with user expectations.
- Proficient (10-12): All required wireframes present; IA mostly clear; minor navigation or hierarchy friction.
- Developing (6-9): Wireframes exist but IA is confusing, sections feel arbitrary, or users would struggle to find key tasks.
- Insufficient (0-5): Missing required pages or wireframes are incomplete/non-functional.

3) Booking Flow: Forms, Validation, Errors, and Recovery (12 pts)

- Exemplary (11-12): Booking/request flow includes clear labels, helper text, sensible field order, at least one validation/error state, and a clear confirmation state; prevents common mistakes.
- Proficient (8-10): Flow works and includes required states; minor clarity or recovery issues.
- Developing (5-7): Flow is present but error handling/labels are weak; friction or ambiguity in critical steps.
- Insufficient (0-4): Missing required states (error/confirmation) or flow is confusing/unusable.

4) UX Laws Applied: Evidence-Based Decisions (8 pts)

- Exemplary (7-8): Design choices explicitly map to UX laws (e.g., Hick, Fitts, Gestalt, Von Restorff, Jakob) and are visible in the work (not just named).

- Proficient (5-6): Several decisions are tied to UX laws; connections are mostly accurate but occasionally superficial.
- Developing (3-4): Mentions laws but application is vague, incorrect, or not visible in the design.
- Insufficient (0-2): No credible connection between UX principles and design decisions.

5) UI System: Components, Consistency, and Scalability (12 pts)

- Exemplary (11-12): Clear mini design system (type scale, colors, spacing, buttons, form fields, cards) used consistently; components support reuse and maintainability.
- Proficient (8-10): System is mostly consistent; a few component or spacing inconsistencies.
- Developing (5-7): Inconsistent styles; components not clearly defined; system feels improvised.
- Insufficient (0-4): No coherent system; visual choices appear copied or random without integration.

6) High-Fidelity Screens: Visual Hierarchy & Clarity (15 pts)

- Exemplary (13-15): Final screens are readable, professional, and conversion-focused; hierarchy supports top tasks; content is scannable; trust signals are integrated appropriately.
- Proficient (10-12): Polished screens with minor hierarchy/readability issues; overall usable.
- Developing (6-9): Visual clutter, weak hierarchy, or readability issues that reduce usability.
- Insufficient (0-5): Screens are incomplete or hinder task completion.

7) Prototype Quality: Flow, Interaction, and System Status (8 pts)

- Exemplary (7-8): Prototype reliably demonstrates Home → Book → Confirmation with clear navigation states; includes at least one feedback/system-status moment and an error example.
- Proficient (5-6): Prototype functions with minor broken links or missing microinteraction clarity.
- Developing (3-4): Prototype is partially clickable but key flow breaks or is unclear.
- Insufficient (0-2): Prototype missing or does not demonstrate required flow.

8) Accessibility & Inclusive Design Basics (7 pts)

- Exemplary (6-7): Meets accessibility basics: readable type, sufficient contrast for key text/CTAs, reasonable tap targets, and clear error messaging.

- Proficient (4-5): Mostly accessible with minor issues (contrast, tap sizes, dense text).
- Developing (2-3): Multiple accessibility concerns that would block users (contrast, tiny text, unclear states).
- Insufficient (0-1): Accessibility ignored; design is difficult for many users.

9) Usability Testing & Iteration Evidence (8 pts)

- Exemplary (7-8): Documents a quick usability test (task prompts + observations) and shows specific iterations made based on findings.
- Proficient (5-6): Testing documented with some changes made; iteration is present but limited.
- Developing (3-4): Testing is minimal or generic; changes are not clearly tied to findings.
- Insufficient (0-2): No testing evidence or fabricated/vague results.

10) Professionalism: Figma Organization, Rationale, and Disclosure (5 pts)

- Exemplary (5): Figma file is cleanly organized (pages/frames labeled), exports are present, rationale is concise and specific, and AI Use Note/process evidence is complete when applicable.
- Proficient (4): Organization and rationale are clear with minor omissions.
- Developing (2-3): Disorganized file or weak rationale; missing pieces of documentation.
- Insufficient (0-1): Hard to review; missing documentation/disclosure.

Score Summary Grid

Sketch Phase: Exploration & Hierarchy	10	
Wireframes: Information Architecture & Mental Models	15	
Booking Flow: Forms, Validation, Errors, and Recovery	12	
UX Laws Applied: Evidence-Based Decisions	8	
UI System: Components, Consistency, and Scalability	12	
High-Fidelity Screens: Visual Hierarchy & Clarity	15	
Prototype Quality: Flow, Interaction, and System Status	8	
Accessibility & Inclusive Design Basics	7	
Usability Testing & Iteration Evidence	8	
Professionalism: Figma Organization, Rationale, and Disclosure	5	
TOTAL	100	0