

**Advertising Media Planning**  
ADV 4300, Fall 1999, Kent Lancaster

Accountability in Advertising Media Planning and Evaluation

Project 3 Evaluation Scale

**Interpretation of Numerical Grades for Sections 1-9**

**5 = excellent section.** Your comparison of sophisticated and naïve approaches was comprehensive and accurate. You were liberal in your use of specific examples from the printouts to accentuate your arguments and implications for media planning.

**4 = above average section.** Your comparison of sophisticated and naïve approaches was above average. Most of your information was accurate, although you did not offer the depth of analysis necessary for a "5" rating. You could have used a few more examples from the printouts to better accentuate your arguments and implications for media planning.

**3 = average section.** Your comparison of sophisticated and naïve approaches was average. Although you completed the section, you did the bare minimum. You used few, if any, specific examples from your printouts, and/or not all of your statements were accurate.

**2 = below average section.** Your comparison of sophisticated and naïve approaches was below average. You made a number of inaccurate statements, and/or you did not refer at all to the printouts to substantiate your arguments.

**1 or 0 = weak or missing section.** Your comparison of sophisticated and naïve approaches was weak, inaccurate or non-existent.

**Interpretation of Numerical Grades for Sections 10 and 11**

Items 10 and 11 pertain to report quality and computer-based media analyses. The same five-point scale shown above is used, but obviously without comparison of naïve and sophisticated approaches.