

1718 SEMB Master Project 1: Design

CRITERIA	RATINGS				POINTS
<p>🕒 MP1-1.1 Integration of Expertise Areas</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts</p> <p>Excellent: Are able to apply and demonstrate the integration of all expertise areas to their design process and deliverables and convincingly explains how all expertise areas are considered in the designed system. Demonstrates integration of at least three expertise areas on an advanced level.</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>Good: Need minor guidance to apply and demonstrate the integration of all expertise areas to their design process and deliverables and is able to convincingly explain how these areas are considered and addressed. Demonstrates integration of at least two expertise area on an advanced level.</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>Sufficient: Need guidance to apply and demonstrate the integration of at least four expertise areas to her design process and deliverables and is able to convincingly explain how these areas are considered and addressed. Demonstrates integration of at least one expertise area on an advanced level.</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>Insufficient: (Despite coaching) there is too little evidence that she can apply and demonstrate the integration of at least four expertise areas to their design process and deliverables and cannot convincingly explain how these areas are considered and addressed. Is not able to demonstrate the integration of at least one expertise area on an advanced level.</p>	
<p>🕒 MP1-1.2 Design and Research Processes</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts</p> <p>Excellent: The group manages the design process for a complex real-life challenge, chooses the appropriate methods and tools to conduct design research activities. All elements of the design (research) methodology are appropriately and critically developed.</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>Good: The group manages the design process for a real-life challenge but needs guidance to choose the appropriate methods and tools to conduct design research activities. Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed and understood.</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>Sufficient: he group manages the design process for a real-life challenge but needs guidance to choose the appropriate methods and tools to conduct design research activities. Is aware of underlying knowledge and the methodology is recognizable.</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>Insufficient: The group is unable to manage the design process for a real-life challenge without guidance. Despite the coaching the group does not choose the appropriate methods and tools when conducting design (research) activities. The approach demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.</p>	
<p>🕒 MP1-1.3 Demonstrator</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>Good: - Well-engineered; - Fully experiential; or - With high communication potential (museum-quality).</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>Sufficient: The group develops a robust prototype that features (part of) an intelligent system; and/or provides a clear experience (of a service) for the considered stakeholders.</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>Excellent: There is appreciation from external experts for at least one of the three aspects:- Well-engineered; - Fully experiential; or - With high communication potential (museum-quality).</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>Insufficient: The group does not develop a robust prototype that features (part of) an intelligent system; and/or does not provide a clear experience (of a service) for the considered stakeholders.</p>	

NAME

DUE

SCORE

OUT OF

CRITERIA	RATINGS				POINTS
<p>🕒 MP1-2.1 Reflecting</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts</p> <p>Excellent: She writes a very clear and structured reflection. The description, analysis and evaluation of [important topics] are included. Missed opportunities for learning are included as well. The reflection demonstrates insight and leads to the right intentions for learning that logically follow from the analysis and evaluation. The reflections are in-depth and expresses a critical attitude. There are hardly opportunities missed for more in-depth reflection or being (more) critical. She presents evidence for all relevant statements.</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>Good: She writes a very clear and structured reflection. The description, analysis and evaluation of [important topics] are included. Missed opportunities for learning are included as well. The reflection demonstrates insight and leads to the right intentions for learning that logically follow from the analysis and evaluation. The reflections are deep but could have been more in-depth. In general, the reflection expresses a critical attitude but some opportunities for being critical are missed. She presents sufficient evidence for her statements.</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>Sufficient: She writes a clear and structured reflection. The description, analysis and evaluation of [important topics] are included. Missed opportunities for learning are included as well. The reflection demonstrates insight in the fore-mentioned topics and leads to intentions for learning that logically follow from the analysis and evaluation. The reflections though are now and then superficial and could have been deeper and more critical and statements should be evidenced more.</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>Insufficient: She writes a reflection that lacks clarity and structure. The description, analysis and evaluation of the [important topics] are lacking, too limit or too superficial. The reflection demonstrates too little insight in the fore-mentioned topics and leads to intentions for learning that do not always follow from the analysis and evaluation.</p>	
<p>🕒 MP1-2.2 Cooperating</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts</p> <p>Excellent: Constructive atmosphere in the group, members share ideas and collaboration advances the work of the group. Group members bring-out the best in each other.</p>	<p>2 pts</p> <p>Good: Constructive atmosphere in the group, members share ideas and suggestions and collaboration advances the quality of the work. Individual members do not build upon each other's knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>1 pts</p> <p>Sufficient: Constructive atmosphere in the group, members share ideas and suggestions. Quality of deliverables is a product of the contribution of individual group members. Collaboration did not advance the quality of the work.</p>	<p>0 pts</p> <p>Insufficient: No constructive atmosphere in the group and collaboration does not help the team move forward.</p>	
					Total points: 0