

Team's Project Evaluation

This project work corresponds to 60% of the evaluation and grade.

In the evaluation, we will look at the following criteria:

- The holistic understanding of the case and the big picture;
- finding design opportunities through application of various means including empathic understanding of users & partners;
- the strength of the concepts and argumentation of the insights;
- project communication (presentations/documentation)

The final grade is calculated following the below criteria. In the grades 3–5 of the table, the previous standard of quality is included in the next.

| Criteria | Below average (1 - 2) | Average (3) | Above average (4 - 5) |
|--|--|---|--|
| Holistic understanding of the case and the big picture of the project brief | The project presented does not work within the given constraints – there are no arguments or conscious decisions provided. | The team choices clearly reflect an understanding of the brief, including the partner's drivers and intended goals. The project has developed within the given constraints, outlining the context, and the argument demonstrates understanding of service design as well as the context and decisions. | The team provides a critical perspective on the original brief horizons and agendas. The re-frame of the brief considers the wider context in society and in the future. The argumentation benefits from literature and deeper understanding of the role of service co-creation and service design. |
| Application of research methods, including empathic understanding of users and partners involved in the service | The team has not engaged with the key stakeholder groups involved. Inappropriate use of research and design methods. Design opportunities don't demonstrate empathy with the key stakeholder groups. | The team has engaged with the key stakeholder groups by using justified co-design and other research methods appropriately. Opportunities show empathy with the identified stakeholders. | The team identified, engaged and uncovered relevant needs from the partner and their stakeholders. The team creatively explored/adapted the use of co-design methods to their research participants and setting. |
| The strength of the solution and argumentation based on the research insights | The research insights lack in-depth analysis. The solution does not build on the identified research findings. | The solution is consistent with the research findings. Evidence from research clearly supports the team's argumentation for the identified design opportunities. Appropriate selection and application of service design tools demonstrate application of the key principles in service design practice and research. | The solution demonstrates in-depth understanding of the topic and the systemic context. The solution is presented with tangible examples, and it considers the stakeholder's real context. The argumentation elaborates on the benefits for stakeholders and partners. It includes clear next steps, such as tools or recommendations for the partner to implement the project. The solution argumentation is supported with theory and research demonstrating the ability to apply the key principles and concepts in service design practice and research. |
| Communication and documentation of the process | There is a lack of research evidence, which creates inconsistencies with the project decisions and argumentation. Writing and visual material contain errors, such as typos. | The design process is well-structured and well-documented with fieldwork pictures and other project materials. It includes well-written descriptions of the process. Co-design and service design terms and concepts are used adequately. | Additional references to literature support the team's own reflections. |