PO3 Blog Post: Assignment Guide & Rubric

Overview

PO3 is a blog post graded out of 16 points, and it counts for 20% of the final course grade. It is due **after** the prototype (PO2) and Demo Day (PO1), and it reflects on the whole project. It tells the story of your problem and your design process from start to finish, including what you learned at Demo Day.

Due: Dec 11, 2026

Format: a blog post built on any web platform, such as Canva or WordPress or Base4, etc.

The post is a polished version of your team notebook. It should address all of the feedback from your TAs and instructors, and it should be self-contained: a reader who has never seen your project should be able to follow it.

Who grades. A random TA grades PO3, not your theme's TA. Don't assume the grader knows your project or the feedback you received.

Individual grades. A student who contributed to PO3 receives the team grade. A student who did not contribute receives 0.

What to write

The post must cover the seven sections below, in this order. Use these headings so the grader can find each one.

#	Section	What to cover	Visuals to include
1	The Problem	The specific problem you focused on, and your motivation for choosing it	A photo, statistic, or quote that frames the problem
2	Stakeholders	The direct stakeholders (people who use or are affected by the solution) and the indirect stakeholders (people affected from a distance), and how each is affected	A stakeholder map
3	Contextual Inquiry	The methods you used (interviews, observations, literature review): who, how many, and how. Then 3–5 interesting new insights, each backed by evidence	Interview notes, affinity diagrams, observation photos
4	Initial Design Ideas	How you generated the first ideas, and which inquiry findings shaped them. Compare the tech (i.e., AI) and non-tech solutions, with the strengths and weaknesses of each	Sketches, storyboards, diagrams

#	Section	What to cover	Visuals to include
5	Design Iteration	How the designs evolved over the term, and why each change was made	Screenshots of each version, ideally side by side
6	Evaluation & Testing	Results of peer evaluation; feedback from peers and from organization representatives at Demo Day; the design changes you made in response	Before-and-after screenshots; a summary table of feedback and the resulting changes
7	Reflection	Whether the solution addressed the problem you set out to solve, what you learned about the design process, and what you would do differently next time	Optional: a final screenshot of the prototype

Reflection-focused sections

The post comes after the project, so Sections 6 and 7 should do more than summarize:

- **Section 6** should include the Demo Day feedback. Name specific comments, say who gave them (peers, judges, organization representatives), and say what you changed or would change in response.
- **Section 7** should be honest. Compare where you ended up with the goals you set at the start. Name the limitations, and give concrete changes you would make to your process, not generic lessons.

Length, visuals, and polish

- **Length:** 1,500–2,000 words plus 8–12 visuals, about an 8–10 minute read. Captions don't count toward the word total. Keep it tight; don't paste in the whole notebook.
- **Visuals:** choose them carefully. Every image should be labeled with a caption and referred to in the text. Don't paste every artifact.
- **Feedback addressed:** fix every issue the TAs and instructors raised in the notebook.
- **Self-contained:** define terms, and don't refer to class discussions or earlier deliverables that the reader hasn't seen.
- **Polished:** use clear writing, consistent formatting, and correct spelling and grammar.

Suggested length by section

Section	Words	Suggested visuals
1. The Problem	150–200	Photo, statistic, or quote framing the problem
2. Stakeholders	100–150	Stakeholder map
3. Contextual Inquiry	250–350	Interview notes, affinity diagram, observation photos

Section	Words	Suggested visuals
4. Initial Design Ideas	250–350	Sketches, storyboards, diagrams
5. Design Iteration	250–300	Screenshots of each version
6. Evaluation & Testing	200–300	Before/after screenshots, feedback summary table
7. Reflection	300–350	Optional final prototype screenshot
Total	**1,500–2,000**	**8–12 visuals**

Rubric

Each criterion is scored from 4 (Exemplary) to 1 (Beginning), or 0 if it is missing, then converted to points: **points = weight × (level ÷ 4)**. Reflection carries the most weight because the post is written after the project.

Criterion (pts)	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
1. The Problem (2)	Specific problem with a compelling, well-supported motivation and in-text citations followed by references	Clear problem and motivation; minor vagueness	Broad problem or weak motivation	Problem unclear or missing
2. Stakeholders (1)	Direct and indirect stakeholders identified, with how each is affected; a visual map	Both types listed with brief explanation	Only one type, or listed without explanation	Barely addressed
3. Contextual Inquiry (2)	Methods clearly described (who, how many, how); 3–5 genuinely new insights, each backed by evidence	Methods described; 3–5 insights, some obvious or weakly supported	Methods vague, or fewer than 3 insights	Little evidence of inquiry
4. Initial Design Ideas (2)	Clear link from inquiry findings to ideas; thoughtful tech vs. non-tech comparison of strengths and weaknesses; sketches or diagrams included	All parts present; comparison or artifacts somewhat thin	Weak link to inquiry; shallow comparison; few artifacts	Ideas listed with no rationale or artifacts
5. Design Iteration (2)	Clear story of how the designs evolved and why, with screenshots of each stage	Evolution shown with screenshots; some reasons	Iterations hard to follow; few screenshots	No visible evolution

Criterion (pts)	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
		missing		
6. Evaluation & Testing (2)	Peer and Demo Day feedback reported specifically, including from organization representatives; design changes clearly linked to findings	Feedback reported; changes described in general terms	Feedback vague; Demo Day feedback missing; few changes linked	Missing or superficial
7. Reflection (3)	Honest, evidence-based judgment of whether the problem was solved; insightful lessons about the process; concrete "what we'd do differently"	Thoughtful, with a few generic points	Brief, mostly generic, or overly positive	Missing or one line
Overall quality & feedback addressed (2)	Self-contained, appropriate length; well-chosen, captioned visuals; polished writing; all TA/instructor feedback addressed	Mostly polished; most feedback addressed	Uneven length or writing; some feedback ignored	Reads like a raw notebook; feedback not addressed

Score sheet

Criterion	Weight	Level (0–4)	Points
1. The Problem	2		
2. Stakeholders	1		
3. Contextual Inquiry	2		
4. Initial Design Ideas	2		
5. Design Iteration	2		
6. Evaluation & Testing	2		
7. Reflection	3		
Overall quality & feedback addressed	2		
Total	**16**		

Course grade contribution = (total ÷ 16) × 20%. Each rubric point is worth 1.25% of the course grade. For example, 12 / 16 earns 15%.

Team checklist

- ☐ All seven sections are included, in order, under clear headings
- ☐ Every piece of TA and instructor feedback on the notebook has been addressed
- ☐ 3–5 contextual inquiry insights, each backed by evidence
- ☐ Tech vs. non-tech comparison covers the strengths and weaknesses of both
- ☐ Screenshots show each design iteration
- ☐ Demo Day feedback is included, and each design change is linked to it
- ☐ Reflection judges honestly whether the problem was solved and names concrete changes to the process
- ☐ Every visual has a caption and is referred to in the text
- ☐ Someone outside the team has read the post to confirm it is self-contained
- ☐ Final proofread for spelling, grammar, and formatting