MUO-E3052
Designing for Services
(12 credits)
5.9.2023-18.10.2023

"A service is something that helps someone to do something.
That 'something' can be short and straightforward, like buying a chocolate bar, or it can be long and in multiple parts, like moving houses."

— Lou Downe, the author of Good Services

Course description

Designing for Services course addresses the application of design competence and engagement in the emerging topics of service design. The course typically has a **real-world partner and briefs**, and the topics typically address **transformations** (e.g., social, cultural, technological) in public organizations and the potential of collaboration and networking. The focus is on **holistic, human-centered, and co-design approaches**, as well as sense-making of complexity and organizational and networked relationships. The topic is approached and tackled through academic criticality and creative service design practice.

The course includes two integrated modes of **knowing and making**. The **knowing** mode focuses on the understanding of designing for service through a combination of lectures, literature, presentations, reflections, and workshops. The design project from the second mode serves as a learning platform for addressing both conceptual and practice-related topics. The students participate actively in lectures and workshops.

The second mode, **making**, focuses on applying and adjusting concepts and frameworks in practice with collaborative partners. This mode focuses on tools and methodologies applied in design for services. Students, divided into groups, aim to tackle given briefs collaboratively, and communicate their learning processes both in teams and individually. The students participate actively in teamwork assignments, and complete individual literature assignments and learning diaries.

"Service design is the activity of choreographing people, infrastructures, communication, and material components of service in order to create value for the multiple stakeholders involved."
-- Birgit Mager, President of Global Service Design Network, Service Design Professor

---

Learning outcomes

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
- **Recognize, explain, and apply** the key principles, methods, and concepts in service design practice and research.
- **Apply** co-design and service co-creation and differentiate their roles in the design process and outcomes.
- **Recognize and analyze** the strategic role of service design for innovation and organizational change.
- **Outline** networked systems and organizational structures for service design.
- **Create and justify** service design proposals that are based on creative collaborative exploration, and reflective evaluation of and with project partners, contexts, methods, and frameworks.

Course partner

Our partner in this course is the City of Espoo. The topical briefs are studied and tackled during the 7 weeks with the partners. More detailed information about the assignments will be shared at the beginning of the course.

Teaching team

Responsible teacher:
Martina Čaić
Assistant professor
martina.caic@aalto.fi

Responsible teacher:
Núria Solsona
University lecturer
nuria.solsona@aalto.fi

Teaching assistant:
Annukka Svanda
Doctoral student
annukka.svanda@aalto.fi

Assessment methods and criteria

Students must attend **at least 80%** of the face-to-face sessions (lectures, seminars, workshops, and presentations) to pass the course; students can miss a maximum of three contact teaching sessions without affecting their individual activity grade. To successfully pass the course, students need to fulfill the three mandatory course components which include:

Components			Relative weight
Individual	1	**Individual activity**	**10%**

	2	**Reflective diaries (RD)**
		   i. Reflective diary 1
		  ii. Reflective diary 2
		 iii. Reflective diary 3
			30%
			10%
			10%
			10%

Group	3	**Project work**
		   i. Midterm review presentation (pass/fail)
		  ii. Final presentation
		 iii. Final report
			60%
			10%
			25%
			25%

Grading scale:

5 = 91-100 %
4 = 81-90 %
3 = 71-80 %
2 = 61-70 %
1 = 51-60 %
fail to pass below 50 %

A!

1
Individual Activity
10%

One of the things that sets designing for services apart is the element of **co-creation** – the fact that services are produced and consumed simultaneously. Teachers fully expect the teaching and learning experience to be one of "co-creation" in the sense that they will work together to "co-create" your understanding of the topics we will discuss in class. Hence, your **presence, active participation, and co-creation** are viewed as essential. It does not ONLY refer to your physical presence, but to your participation and contribution during the discussions and the input and examples that you provide during the integration of theory and practice. Individual activity includes:

o   Attending sessions.
o   Being well-prepared (e.g., reading assigned literature before class; preparing and sharing materials to be discussed during tutorials).
o   Actively participating in lectures, discussions, workshops, and presentations.
o   Being present and engaged during guest lectures.
o   Raising questions and well-argumented critiques.
o   Letting teachers know if something was left unclear.

<u>After every session,</u> your participation will be evaluated by your teacher on a scale from 0 to 3. If you were absent, you will receive a zero (0) for that session.

Rubrics for evaluating individual activity:

Grade	Criteria
Outstanding Contributor (3)	The student contributes a lot reflecting exceptional interest and thorough preparation. Ideas are constructive and provide major insights and fruitful direction for the class. Arguments are generally well substantiated and presented. Overall, the student demonstrates openness to receive and discuss course information and actively engages in all in-class activities, tutorials, and assignments.
Active participant (2)	The student is active with some contributions in class that show preparation and interest. Ideas are constructive and important. Arguments are well substantiated. Overall, the student demonstrates openness to receive and discuss course information in most of the in-class activities, tutorials, and assignments.
Non-participant (1)	The student was present but with an absent attitude and non-constructive contributions. Overall, the student demonstrates a lack of interest in receiving and discussing course information and almost no motivation to take part in various in-class activities, tutorials, and assignments.
Absent (0)*	The student missed the session.

In case you know you will miss a session, please email your teachers to let them know in advance. This will help teachers in organizing project work, workshops, and literature reflections.

A!

2
Reflective Diary
30%

Reflective diaries (RD 1, 2, & 3) are documents in which you write about **what you have learned, questions that have arisen, problem points, and other contemplation**. A reflective diary is individual, it includes reporting on your thinking and personal reflections from your project work, readings, and course activities from the previous two weeks.

Purpose:

The purpose of the reflective diary is to guide your learning process and to help you realize your own **critical reflections**; to document and reflect on your learning process considering the **course lectures, guest lectures, readings, workshops, and other individual and group activities**. This enables you to become better aware of what you have learned and helps you keep your eyes open and raise your awareness of your own subjective experiences related to the course topic. A reflective diary presents the teaching team with your own account of your progress and learning throughout the course. Therefore, it is important to share **your reflections on your learning, and insights on lectures and literature, instead of merely listing a summary of what happened.**

What should be included in Reflective Diaries?
o   Your learnings, main takeaways, possible tensions, and reflections on:
  ▪   Readings: Academic articles assigned for a two-week period (you should reflect on all the academic articles from the previous two weeks)
  ▪   Project work: your learnings from your project work activities and design process
  ▪   Personal critical reflections: your critical reflections, questions, and insights from the learning process. Their relations to ongoing activities and the bigger picture.
o   You are also encouraged to build each diary entry on the previous reflective diary

Guiding questions:
o   What have you learned? Did you get any new insights while reading the literature?
o   How do you see different topics, readings, and project parts coming together?
o   How do new insights relate to things you have learned earlier (e.g., in previous courses?)
o   Which topics, methods, and readings did you find useful or maybe not so useful?
o   Take a stand. Argue clearly. Do not just say you like or dislike something. Reflect: Why?
o   Was something left unclear? Did something confuse you? Describe these so that we can discuss them in class. Be specific.

Format:
o   MS Word or PDF.
o   English language (please use spelling and grammar check).
o   Use of appropriate citation and referencing to articles (e.g., APA referencing style).
o   You can also add images, mind-maps, drawings, sketches, quotations, etc.; just make sure to include image captions.
o   Text length: 1000 – 1300 words per diary.
o   File name: FirstName_LastName_RD# (e.g., Martina_Caic_RD1)

Deadlines:
o   **Reflective Diary 1 (10%):** Friday 15.09. by 20:00 via MyCourses
o   **Reflective Diary 2 (10%):** Friday 29.09. by 20:00 via MyCourses
o   **Reflective Diary 3 (10%):** Friday 20.10. by 20:00 via MyCourses

Evaluation: You can find the rubrics in **Appendix A**

3
Project Work
60%

Introduction to Project Work
Every year students receive a real case from the City of Espoo formulated as a project brief. Students are divided into teams to work on the given challenge throughout the course.

The aim of Project Work is for teams to put into practice the design process, human-centered design tools and methods within the context of services as students work together with the client (partner) and the other stakeholders that the teams find suitable to involve. Guidance on the project work is provided in contact teaching sessions with weekly group tutorials, and tools and methods lectures.

The course is structured following the design process that each team should follow (please see the Course Overview on p. 14). We strongly recommend that teams follow the indicated timeframe.

Independent group work activities
The following activities are mandatory for each team to conduct independently and will not be submitted for evaluation separately:
- **Planning**
- **Data collection**
- **Data analysis**
- **Intervention development**

Project work submissions
Mandatory but not evaluated/graded:

- **Provotype (Deadline 06.09):**
  On one hand, this assignment is a team-building exercise. On the other, its purpose is to generate discussion with your partners about the project brief on Wednesday 6th of September. Provotyping is related to prototyping but it aims at provoking and even agitating. Provotypes, in general, distance us from the current situation by projecting speculated imaginative futures by posing questions or proposing extreme solutions that uncover implications, factors, or perspectives that are worth discussing.

  The format of this assignment is open (artefact, reference image, sound or video, and role-play). The provotype presentation should last max. 5 min (Further instructions on Day 1)

- **Preliminary research plan Peer presentation (Deadline 11.09, noon):**
  This activity aims to help teams plan their research at the start of the course. This plan will contain the research goals, identify the relevant actors to be involved, and the data collection methods. It is called *preliminary,* as it can change and adapt to the research needs. (Further instructions on MyCourses > Submissions)

Mandatory and evaluated/graded (detailed descriptions in the following pages):
- **Mid-Term Review presentation (10%)**
- **Final presentation (25%)**
- **Final report (25%)**

A!

3

Project Work

60%

Mid-Term Review presentation (10%)
This is a mid-point check-in that happens on the third week of the course for each team to present <u>unfinished work in progress </u>to partners, peers, and the teaching team.

At this stage, teams should have finalized their data collection and have a set of emerging insights that narrow the intervention area.

Purpose
The purpose of the presentation is to validate with your partners the type of intervention needed, based on your research and emerging analysis.

This presentation is specifically designed to involve your Espoo partners in the design process so that together you can decide on the direction of the project, as well as get guidance from your teaching team and peers.

What should be included in the Mid-Term presentation?
- Your understanding of the project brief, framing, and perspectives.
- Research sample and research methods.
- Research data: evidence and documentation (fieldwork photographs, quotes from interviews, facts or figures from desktop research…).
- Emerging analysis (unfinished), such as findings, themes, patterns, or insights.
- Intervention type that is justified with the above. Focus on the **what,** not the **how**!
- Visualizations that help to communicate these as you see fit (customer journey, stakeholder maps, personas…).

Format
- 15 min. oral on-site presentation.
- It is up to the team to decide who presents (be mindful of time!). Note that attendance is mandatory, and that active participation will be assessed as usual. Non-presenters are expected to contribute during feedback with the partners and teaching team.
- You can use any format to present live (incl. video, and audio files).
- Submission on MyCourses must be in a PDF with the file name: Group_#_MidTerm (e.g., Group_1_MidTerm).

Deadline:
- **Mid-Term Review (PDF):** <u>Friday 22.09,</u> by 17:00h via <u>MyCourses</u>

Evaluation (pass/fail)
The team will get a pass (10% of the project work) by presenting in the Mid-Term presentation on Friday 22.09. A team not presenting on that day will be graded as a fail (i.e., will lose 10% of the project work).

A!

3

Project Work

60%

Final presentation (25%)
Final presentation marks the end of the course in the 7th week when all teams present the results of the project and design process in front of partners, peers, and the teaching team.

Purpose
This presentation is specifically designed to get feedback from your partners, teaching team, and peers. The purpose is for teams to handover their projects to their partners and help them to move the project results further by presenting a compelling story about what needs to be designed and why.

What should be included in the Final presentation?
- Summary of your design process.
- Data collection (research sample, methods, analysis…).
- Narration and synthesis of your findings supported with literature references and research evidence (documentation of fieldwork, facts from desktop research, quotes from interviews).
- A visual example of your proposed design intervention to improve the service, justified according to your findings (storyboard, customer journey, visualization, a touchpoint, scenario…).
- Further development or implementation considerations (e.g., who should make this happen in the organization? what roles are needed).

Format
- 15 min. oral on-site presentation (audience on-site and online).
- It is up to the team to decide who presents (be mindful of time!). Note that attendance is mandatory, and that active participation will be assessed as usual. Non-presenters are expected to contribute during feedback with the partners and teaching team.
- You can use any format to present live (incl. video, and audio files).
- Submission on MyCourses must be in a PDF with the file name: Group_#_FinalPresentation (e.g., Group_1_FinalPresentation)

Deadline:
- **Final Presentation (PDF):** Tuesday 17.10, by 17:00h via MyCourses

Evaluation: You can find the rubrics in **Appendix B**

A!

3

Project Work

60%

Final report (25%)
The final report is a document reporting on the project from start to end. It does not report all the activities that the team conducted, but the most relevant phases of the design process, with the appropriate information and evidence.

The target audience for this document is your partner, other relevant stakeholders, and their teams.

Purpose
The purpose of the Final report is to create a standalone, synthesized, and well-organized documentation of the project so that if your partners want to use your results or research further they have all they need to do so.

What should be included in the Final report?
- Cover with Title (the team/brief), students' names, remember to add the Aalto logo, City of Espoo logo, Designing for Services, Department of Design, and your email contacts.
- Executive summary: executive summary (1 Page): It summarizes your proposal in such a way that conveys what it is, why it is relevant, for whom, by whom, and the benefit it provides to tackle your challenge.
- Research: Your research sample, approach, and the methods used, (e.g., your interpretation of the brief/problem and perspectives involved).
- Analysis: Synthesis of your findings supported with literature references and research evidence (documentation of fieldwork, facts from desktop research, quotes from interviews).
- Description of the intervention (solution) – scenario / customer journey / service evidence / scenario / visualizations (i.e., illustrate the concept through visualization, blueprinting highlighting different stakeholder roles as appropriate).
- Considerations for further development/implementation (e.g., service or organizational roles, development roadmap,...).
- You can include attachments if needed.

Format
- Approx. 15-20 A4 Pages portrait orientation
- Submission on MyCourses must be in a PDF with the file name: Group_#_FinalReport (e.g., Group_1_FinalReport)

Deadline:
- **Final Report (PDF):** Friday 20.10, by 17:00h via MyCourses

Evaluation: You can find the rubrics in **Appendix C**

Course workload estimation

324 hours (12 credits) require full-time work during the course and include:

Contact teaching	**64 hours**
Project teamwork	**135 hours**
Independent literature study	**70 hours**
Personal reflection	**25 hours**
Learning diary assignment	**30 hours**
TOTAL	**324 hours = 12 credits**

Detailed course schedule

Time	Place	Session content	Teachers	Readings per week
WEEK 1				
<u>Tuesday</u> 05.09.2023 9.15-12	F102	*(i) Course Intro* *(ii) Project briefs* *(iii) Introduction to the preliminary research plan* *(iv) Groups/Team-building*	Martina Čaić Annukka Svanda	**Make sure to read these articles <u>before Friday's session</u>:** 1) Patrício, L., Fisk, R. P., Falcão e Cunha, J., & Constantine, L. (2011). <u>Multilevel service design: from customer value constellation to service experience blueprinting</u>. *Journal of Service Research, 14*(2), 180-200
<u>Wednesday</u> 06.09.2023 13.15-16.00	Q202	**ESPOO MEETING**	ALL + Espoo partners	2) Polain, A., Løvlie, L., Reason, B. (2013). <u>Types of experience. In Service design: From insights to implementation</u>
<u>Friday</u> 08.09.2023 9.15-12.00	U358	*(i) How to read academic literature?* *(ii) Zooming in and out. Framing your challenge at the right level* *(iii) Practical exercise*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	
WEEK 2				
<u>Tuesday</u> 12.09.2023 13.15–17.00	F101	*(i) Conducting fieldwork* *(ii) Methods sharing café* *(iii) Preliminary research plan presentation and feedback session*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Make sure to read these articles before…** **Tuesday's session:** 1) Vink, J., & Koskela-Huotari, K. (2022). <u>Building reflexivity using service design methods</u>. *Journal of Service Research, 25*(3), 371-389.
<u>Wednesday</u> 13.09.2023 13.15–16.00	U405a	*(i) Guest lecture* *(ii) Service-Dominant Logic*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Wednesday's session:** 2) Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016). <u>Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic</u>. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 44*(1), 5-23.
<u>Friday</u> 15.09.2023 09.15–12.00	M202	*(i) Fieldwork lessons learned (alumni presentation)* *(ii) Peer reflections on weekly readings*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	
DEADLINE(S): Preliminary Research Plan – Monday (11.09) by noon via MyCourses / Reflective Diary 1 – Friday (15.09) by 20:00 via MyCourses				

WEEK 3				
<u>Tuesday</u> 19.09.2023 13.15–17.00	U406a	*(i) Reporting Research analysis* *(ii) Examples of deliverables* *(iii) Tutorials*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Make sure to read these articles before Tuesday's session:** 1) Proximity Design Research (2014). <u>Afford TWO, Eat ONE</u>. Financial Inclusion in Rural Myanmar.
<u>Wednesday</u> 20.09.2023 13.15–16.00	Q202	*(i) Guest lecture* *(ii) Value Network Mapping* *(iii) Peer reflections on weekly readings*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	2) Secomandi, F., & Snelders, D. (2011). <u>The object of service design</u>. *Design Issues*, 27(3), 20-34.
<u>Friday</u> 22.09.2023 09.15–12.00	M202	**ESPOO MID-TERM PRESENTATIONS & FEEDBACK**	ALL + Espoo partners	

DEADLINE(S): Mid-Term Presentations – Friday (22.09) during regular session / submission of the presentation PDF via MyCourses by 17:00

WEEK 4				
<u>Tuesday</u> 26.09.2023 13.15–17.00	F101	*(i) Guest lecture* *(ii) Value Proposition Canvas; Choosing your intervention (exercise)* *(iii) Tutorials*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Make sure to read these articles before …** **Wednesday's session:** 1) Bitner, M.J., Ostrom, A.L., & Morgan, F.N. (2008). <u>'Service Blueprinting: A Practical Technique for Service Innovation'</u>, *California Management Review*, *50*(3), 66-94. (focus on 66-83)
<u>Wednesday</u> 27.09.2023 13.15–16.00	Q202	*(i) Service Blueprinting*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	
<u>Friday</u> 29.09.2023 09.15–12.00	M202	*(i) Guest lecture prof. Josina Vink* *(ii) Peer reflections on weekly readings*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Friday's session:** 2) Vink, J., Koskela-Huotari, K., Tronvoll, B., Edvardsson, B., & Wetter-Edman, K. (2021). <u>Service ecosystem design: Propositions, process model, and future research agenda.</u> *Journal of Service Research, 24*(2), 168-186. 3) <u>Watch System Thinking introduction (video) by Idil Gaziulusoy (available on MyCourses)</u>

DEADLINE(S): Reflective Diary 2 – Friday (29.09) by 20:00 via MyCourses

WEEK 5				
Tuesday 03.10.2023 13.15–17.00	F101	*(i) Customer experience* *(ii) Tutorials*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Make sure to read these articles before…** **Tuesday's session:** 1) Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96.
Wednesday 04.10.2023 13.15–16.00	Q202	*(i) Service Innovation and automatization* *(ii) Guest lecture*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	
Friday 06.10.2023 09.15–12.00	Q101	*(i) Digital Experience prototyping* *(ii) Peer reflections on weekly readings*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**Wednesday's session:** 2) Huang, M. H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Engaged to a robot? The role of AI in service. *Journal of Service Research*, 24(1), 30-41.
WEEK 6				
Tuesday 10.10.2023 13.15–17.00	F101	Tutorial day; book a group slot	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	**READ ONE:** 1) Deserti, A., & Rizzo, F. (2014). Design and organisational change in the public sector. In *Design Management in the era of disruption* (pp. 2293-2313). DMI (Design Management Institute).
Wednesday 11.10.2023 13.15–16.00	Q202	*(i) Final Presentation and Final report* *(ii) Guest lecture*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona	2) Kurtmollaiev, S., Fjuk, A., Pedersen, P. E., Clatworthy, S., & Kvale, K. (2018). Organizational transformation through service design: the institutional logics perspective. *Journal of Service Research, 21*(1), 59-74.
Friday 13.10.2023	–	**NO CONTACT TEACHING**	–	
DEADLINE(S): Final Presentations – (Tuesday 17.10) during regular session / submission of the presentation PDF via MyCourses by 17:00				
WEEK 7				
Tuesday 17.10.2023 13.15–17.00	F101	**FINAL PRESENTATIONS**	ALL + Espoo partners	**NO READINGS THIS WEEK**
Wednesday 18.10.2023 13.15–16.00	F102	*(i) Reflections / Feedback* *(ii) Wrapping-up deliverables*	Martina Čaić Núria Solsona Annukka Svanda	
DEADLINE(S): Reflective Diary 3 - Friday (20.10) by 20:00 via MyCourses Final Report, Peer evaluations - Friday (20.10) by 17:00 via MyCourses				

Note: The above outline and procedures in this course are subject to change at the teachers' discretion. Students will be informed about possible changes in a timely manner.

Course Overview

	What is the problem to solve?			What needs to be designed to solve it?			
	Week 1	**Week 2**	**Week 3**	**Week 4**	**Week 5**	**Week 6**	**Week 7**
Design process	Immerse into the topic, and get an understanding of the project brief. Frame your perspective and plan your research.	Conduct research from key actors to gain insights from the selected perspectives.	Finalize research. Define your design intervention based on findings. Validate with partners on the Mid-Term Review.	Finalize analysis, synthesize research from multiple sources and define your intervention further.	Visualize an example of how the intervention improves the service. Define key elements for adoption and development.	Document, justify, and present your proposal with evidence from the research and literature.	Present your research and proposal. Submit your deliverables. Reflect on your design process.
Independent group work activities	*Planning*		*Research analysis*		*Prepare presentation materials*		
		Data collection		*Intervention development*			
Readings	Patrício et al. (2011) Polaine et al. (2013, Chapter 7, p. 132-137)	Vink & Koskela-Huotari (2022) Vargo & Lusch (2016)	Secomandi & Snelders (2011) Proximity design Report (2014)	Vink et al. (2021) Bitner et al. (2008)	Lemon & Verhoef (2016) Huang & Rust (2021)	Deserti & Rizzo (2014) Kurtmollaiev et al. (2018)	
Lectures (tools & methods)	Customer Journey, Stakeholder maps	User research, Participatory methods	Service blueprint, Analysis & Reporting	Service ecosystem design, Value Proposition Canvas	Prototyping, Service Innovation and automatization, AI Ethics	Measuring impact	
Deadlines	Provotype (06.09)	Preliminary research plan (11.09) Reflective Diary 1 (15.09)	Mid-Term Presentation (22.09)	Reflective Diary 2 (29.09)			Final Presentation (17.10); Reflective Diary 3 (20.10); Final Report (20.10)

Appendix A

Reflective Diary RUBRICS

Criteria	Weight	Poor (0-1)	Good (2-3)	Excellent (4-5)
Reflection on learning and course content	**70%**	The reflective diary (RD) does not include insights on individual weeks, mandatory literature, activities in project work, and lectures. RD mainly includes summaries of the things discussed during the course and lacks student's personal and critical reflections. RD is not written in the student's own words and lacks a holistic perspective. RD shows only glimpses of what the student has learned over the course.	The reflective diary includes insights and knowledge communicated with references to the course literature, lectures as well as links to the activities in project work. RD includes personal and critical reflections on course topics, readings, and group work. RD is written in the student's own words and somewhat connects to their previous design experience. RD shows learning over the duration of the course.	The reflective diary includes insights and critical reflections demonstrating skills to explain and apply the key principles and concepts in service design practice and research and making references to previous knowledge. RD includes personal and critical reflections but also provides constructive feedback on how to improve the course. RD is written in the student's own words and meaningfully connects to their previous academic and practical experience. RD shows active and deep learning over the duration of the course.
Other	**30%**	The reflective diary was not delivered in time. RD is incomplete or has poor language (grammar and spelling check missing). No citations and references are included in the document.	The reflective diary was delivered in time. RD has occasional typos and language inconsistencies. Citations and references are present but not consistently used throughout the document.	The reflective diary was delivered in time. RD is free from language mistakes. Citations and references are present and consistently used throughout the document.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

Responsible use of AI-generative tools and guidelines for correct use of AI-generative tools (lecture):

- If AI-generated text has been presented as the student's own written response, there are no grounds to evaluate the assignment. In this case, the student will receive no points.
- If AI-generated text has been used and the student describes how, what and/or why AI-based technology has been used to do the assignment, plus the student reflects on the text from an AI-generative tool as an additional source of input for the reflective diary, the student's work will be evaluated using the rubrics in Appendix A.

Appendix B

Final Presentation RUBRICS

	Weight	Poor (0-1)	Good (2-3)	Excellent (4-5)
Quality of the project work	**50%**	Deployment of tools and methods are doubtful. The research and solution are inconsistent. The proposed solution is not relevant to the case. The benefits of the solution are not clear.	Good deployment of tools and methods. Research and intervention are consistent. The proposed solution is relevant to the project brief. The benefits of the solution could be better articulated. The solution considers some aspects for adoption (use or delivery).	Excellent deployment of tools and methods. The team provides relevant insights to the project brief. The proposed intervention has clear benefits for the partner and stakeholders involved. The benefits are well argued. The solution is realistic, as it considers many important aspects for adoption (use and delivery).
Synthesis & Storytelling	**20%**	There is a lack of structure. The presentation content appears unorganized and difficult to understand. It is hard to navigate. Information is presented with no conclusive interpretation or clear narrative. There is a lack of synthesis.	The presentation is mostly well-structured. Navigation of slides, such as titles helps to follow the presentation. There is a clear narrative, with well-synthesized information. The deployment of visual elements could do a better job in engaging the audience to relate to the presented research and solution.	The presentation is very well-structured. Slide titles are descriptive and self-explanatory. Compelling story. Has a clear storyline, consistent throughout the presentation. Very well synthesized information. Service design tools and methods and other visualizations are used to elicit empathy, clarify complexity, or provide tangible examples. The presentation is persuasive.

Knowledge of the subject matter	**15%**	Students do not have a good grasp of the content and show no knowledge about the project brief. Students use words and terms that they do not fully understand and make crucial mistakes.	Students have a good grasp of the content and show good knowledge about the project brief. Students within the team understand mostly all terms within the presentation. The use of certain terms shows confusion or inconsistency.	Students within the team demonstrate full knowledge and understanding of the project brief. Students are fluent in using project-specific and service design terms. Students make an effort to use language that the client can relate to.
Ability to answer questions	**15%**	The team cannot address basic questions. Answers are not consistent with the presentation and contradict some of the information presented.	The team addresses most questions with correct information and references. Answers are consistent with the presentation and information presented.	The team answers all questions with accurate information. The team has a good command of the conversation, able to constructively build on comments and facilitate an insightful dialog.

Appendix C

Final Report RUBRICS

Criteria	Weight	Poor (0-1)	Good (2-3)	Excellent (4-5)
Understanding of the project brief	**20%**	There is a lack of understanding of the case and the bigger picture. The project results do not work within the given constraints. Re-frame of the brief lacks justification.	Re-frame reflects a good understanding of the case. The project meets the partner's intended goals. The project has developed within the given constraints. There is a little challenge in the given perspective of the project brief.	The team provides a critical perspective on the given brief. The re-framing of the brief considers the big picture and contexts. The argumentation benefits from literature and a deeper understanding of the role co-creation and value of service design.
Research & Analysis	**20%**	The team has not engaged with the key stakeholder groups involved. The selection of research methods is doubtful. Superficial insights, the research lacks an in-depth analysis.	The team has engaged with varying stakeholder groups with relevant research methods. Insights are mostly well-articulated. Design opportunities are not always clear.	The team identified and engaged relevant stakeholder groups with appropriate research methods. Insights are well-articulated and lead to relevant design opportunities.

Intervention	20%	The intervention does not address the original brief. The solution does not build on the identified research findings. There are no visual examples of the intervention and it remains abstract. It is not clear how the intervention will solve the identified issues/possibilities.	The intervention is relevant to the project brief. The benefits of the solution could be better articulated. The solution considers some aspects for adoption (use or delivery). Visual examples of the intervention support the solution well and make it tangible.	The intervention is relevant to the project brief and is consistent with the research findings. Tangible examples, help demonstrate the value of the solution. Benefits for stakeholders and partners are well-justified. The solution is realistic, as it considers the adoption of stakeholders (use and delivery).
Process argumentation and synthesis	**20%**	Writing is confusing and contains errors, such as typos. Descriptions are generic and not connected to the work. There is a lack of synthesis. Descriptions are lengthy and contain unnecessary details. Incorrect use of terms.	Well-written report. The design process is well-structured. Descriptions contain too many details. There is a lack of synthesis. Terms are used adequately.	Well-written report. The design process is described with all the important details. Well-synthesized design process. Terms are used adequately.
Documentation	**20%**	There is a lack of research evidence and literature references. Citation and referencing of text and images (including AI-generated text and images) are lacking or are not consistently used.	Literature references and research evidence (text and images) are used correctly to document the process and support argumentation. Citation and referencing of text and images are deployed correctly.	Literature references and research evidence (text and images) are used excellently to document the process and support argumentation. Additional visuals, such as graphs are used to support communication. Citation and referencing of text and images are deployed correctly.