

NAME

DUE

SCORE

OUT OF

1718 SEMB Master Project 2: Design Research

CRITERIA	RATINGS				POINTS
<p>🕒 MP2-1.1 Integration of Expertise Areas</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts Excellent: Are able to apply and demonstrate the integration of all expertise areas to their design research process and deliverables and to argue how their deliverables contribute (new) knowledge to/confirm knowledge of at least one expertise area.</p>	<p>2 pts Good: Need minor guidance to apply and demonstrate the integration of all expertise areas to their design research process and deliverables .and to convincingly explain how these areas are considered and addressed. Demonstrates advanced level of integration of the expertise areas.</p>	<p>1 pts Sufficient: Need guidance to apply and demonstrate the integration of at least four expertise areas to her design research process and deliverables and to argue how their deliverables contribute (new) knowledge to/confirm knowledge of at least one expertise area.</p>	<p>0 pts 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 research process and deliverables and is able to argue how and their deliverables contribute/confirm (new) knowledge to/of at least one expertise area.</p>	
<p>🕒 MP2-1.2 Design and Research Processes</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts Excellent: Individually manages the design research process for a complex real-life challenge, individually 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 Good: Manages the design research 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 Sufficient: Manages the design research 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 Insufficient: Needs guidance to manage the design research process for a real-life challenge and despite the coaching she does not choose the appropriate methods and tools when conducting design (research) activities. Approach demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.</p>	

NAME

DUE

SCORE

OUT OF

CRITERIA	RATINGS			POINTS	
<p>🌀 MP2-1.3 Demonstrator</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts Excellent: The demo or research prototypes were especially crafted for their specific purpose and roles in the acquisition of knowledge or the creation of value and the prototype(s) make a strong contribution in itself, according to external experts/reviewers.</p>	<p>2 pts Good: The demo or research prototypes were especially crafted for their specific purpose and roles in the acquisition of knowledge or the creation of value and the prototype(s) make a strong contribution in itself.</p>	<p>1 pts Sufficient: The demo or research prototypes were especially crafted for their specific purpose and roles in the acquisition of knowledge or the creation of value.</p>	<p>0 pts Insufficient: The demo or research prototypes were not especially crafted for their specific purpose and roles in the acquisition of knowledge or creation of value.</p>	
<p>🌀 MP2-2.1 Presenting</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts Excellent: At least two of the areas: - Attractive and enjoying: impressive presentation that can get commitment from stakeholders or audience; - Can direct attention and interest of audience; or - Personal and innovative presentation-style.</p>	<p>2 pts Good: - Attractive and enjoying: impressive presentation that can get commitment from stakeholders or audience; - Can direct attention and interest of audience; or - Personal and innovative presentation-style.</p>	<p>1 pts Sufficient: Tells a convincing story targeted at a professional audience and directs structure and content of the presentation.</p>	<p>0 pts Insufficient: Does not tell a convincing story targeted at a professional audience and/ or direct structure and content of the presentation.</p>	

NAME

DUE

SCORE

OUT OF

CRITERIA	RATINGS			POINTS	
<p>🕒 MP2-2.2 Reporting and Dealing with Scientific Information</p> <p>view longer description</p> <p>threshold: 1</p>	<p>3 pts Excellent: Independently draws a clear and professional picture of the design (research) challenge. Provides a clear description of different perspectives and potential approaches. Arguments choices that have been made. Uses references to external sources correctly. There is external evidence (investor support, company feedback or reviewer comments) for at least one of the three aspects: - The financial viability of a business plan; - The product being taken further by a company; - The ability to publish the design research results.</p>	<p>2 pts Good: Independently draws a clear and professional picture of the design (research) challenge. Provides a clear description of different perspectives and potential approaches. Arguments choices that have been made. Uses references to external sources correctly. The coach and examiner could argue for: - The financial viability of a business plan; - The product being taken further by a company; - The ability to publish the design research results.</p>	<p>1 pts Sufficient: Independently draws a clear and professional picture of the design (research) challenge. Provides a clear description of different perspectives and potential approaches. Arguments choices that have been made. Uses references to external sources correctly.</p>	<p>0 pts Insufficient: Despite coaching she does not draw a clear and professional picture of the design challenge - and/or provides an unclear description of different perspectives and potential approaches - does not argument choices that have been made or provides illogical or inadequate arguments. Uses references to external sources incorrectly.</p>	
Total points: 0					