

Competence Rubric: Framing & Strategizing

Definition: the competence of digital designers to effectively frame or reframe design challenges in complex contexts and devise strategies to create added value for people, organizations and society.

Framing & Strategizing - Entry indicators
Note: no particular grading is done at the entry. All the following indicators are necessary and sufficient to be admitted to the programme.
Explain relevant multiple references from literature in the context of simplified design challenges.
Analyzes and explains a simplified design challenge and proposes how to manage and successfully complete this challenge for a client.
Formulates his/her design decisions, and provides a rationale based on field & desk studies
Describes and explains current practices within the digital design domain at the object level from a strategic perspective.
Explains and demonstrates how his work builds upon characteristics of digital technology.

Framing & Strategizing - Midterm indicators				
At the Midterm level, all indicators of this competence refer to “simplified design challenges.” Projects and assignments from the first semester are of this level of complexity.				
Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student applies scientific references (e.g. books, scientific papers...) to explain his/her design decisions.	The references are not from relevant scientific literature, or they do not explain the student’s design decisions.	The student applies few relevant references. A rationale for the choice is provided, but is not fully convincing.	The student applies relevant references and can explain why he/she chose them. The references clearly support the proposed design.	The student applies relevant references and can explain why he/she chose them. The references clearly support the proposed design. The student shows a clear personal interest in what he/she discusses, and goes beyond what would have been necessary for his/her design.
The student explains how he/she considered all stakeholders	The student is not able to analyze and explain how a simplified design	The student can analyze and explain how a simplified design challenge was	The student can analyze and explain how a simplified design challenge was	The student can analyze and explain how a simplified design challenge was

specified in a design brief.	challenge was completed.	completed. However, some of the stakeholders specified in the brief are not satisfyingly considered in this explanation.	completed for all stakeholders specified in the brief.	completed for all stakeholders specified in the brief. He/she also presents a plan of how the project might be extended beyond the project brief.
The student relates his/her design decisions to user research.	The student cannot relate his/her design decisions with user research.	The student explains his/her design decisions in relation to user research, but this is principally desk-based (e.g. no in-person interaction with users).	The student explains his/her design decisions in relation to user research that includes both some desk-based activities (e.g. literature review) and some field activities (e.g. interviews, on-site observation, shadowing...).	The student explains his/her design decisions in relation to user research that includes both desk and field activities. The student shows a clear personal interest in what he/she discusses, and goes beyond what would have been necessary for his/her design.
The student relates his/her design decisions to technical considerations.	The student is not able to relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations.	The student can relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations. However, the decision is not optimal within the scope of the project (e.g. the student might have considered different technological solutions)	The student can relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations that are grounded in relevant, recent developments in digital technologies.	The student can relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations that are grounded in relevant, recent developments in digital technologies. The student shows a clear personal interest in what he/she discusses, and goes beyond what would have been necessary for his/her design.

Framing & Strategizing – Exit indicators

At the Exit level, all indicators of this competence refer to both “simplified design challenges” and “complex design challenges.” The final project in the second semester is an example of a complex design challenge. For each indicator, students must refer to at least one complex design challenge; secondary examples may also come from simplified design challenges.

Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student applies multiple scientific references (e.g. books, scientific	The references are not from relevant scientific literature, or they	The student applies few relevant references and	The student applies relevant references and can explain why	The student applies relevant references and can explain why

papers...) to explain his/her design decisions.	do not explain the student's design decisions.	can explain why he/she chose them.	he/she chose them. The references clearly support the proposed design.	he/she chose them. The references clearly support the proposed design. The student shows a clear personal interest in what he/she discusses, and goes beyond what would have been necessary for his/her design.
The student explains how he/she considered all stakeholders, including the client, from a design brief.	The student is not able to analyze and explain how a complex design challenge was completed.	The student can analyze and explain how a complex design challenge was completed. However, some of the stakeholders specified in the brief are not satisfyingly considered in this explanation, or the client's expectations were not satisfyingly managed.	The student can analyze and explain how a complex design challenge was completed for all stakeholders specified in the brief. He/she also explains how the client was successfully managed and which trade-offs were necessary to mediate between client and stakeholders.	The student can analyze and explain how a complex design challenge was completed for all stakeholders specified in the brief, and managing the client. He/she also presents a plan of how the project might be extended beyond the project brief.
The student relates his/her design decisions to user research	The student cannot relate his/her design decisions with user research.	The student explains his/her design decisions in relation to user research, but this is principally desk-based (e.g. no in-person interaction with users).	The student explains his/her design decisions in relation to user research that includes both some desk-based activities (e.g. literature review) and some field activities (e.g. interviews, on-site observation, shadowing...).	The student explains his/her design decisions in relation to user research that includes both desk and field activities. The student shows a clear personal interest in what he/she discusses, and goes beyond what would have been necessary for his/her design.
The student relates his/her design decisions to technical considerations.	The student is not able to relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations.	The student can relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations. However, the decision is not optimal within the scope of the project (e.g. the	The student can relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations that are grounded in relevant, recent developments in digital technologies.	The student can relate his/her design decisions to technical considerations that are grounded in relevant, recent developments in digital technologies. The

		student might have considered different technological solutions).		student shows a clear personal interest in what he/she discusses, and goes beyond what would have been necessary for his/her design.
--	--	---	--	--

Competence Rubric: Reflection & Awareness

Definition: A competence of digital designers to reflect on design process and its outcomes, iteratively explore the design field and construct a vision as a (digital) designers.

Reflection & Awareness - Entry indicators
Note: no particular grading is done at the entry. All the following indicators are necessary and sufficient to be admitted to the programme.
Explains three relevant economic, social and technological trends and developments for digital design.
Describes and explains three cases of his/her portfolio in terms of the team performance and individual contributions at the operational level.
Describes and explains his role and relevance as a digital designer in the context of the added value of his work.
Can critique a design artifact, identifying strengths and weaknesses
Explains and demonstrates at least 10 significant design decisions (from the portfolio) and relates these to reflection, research activities, and testing.

Reflection & Awareness - Midterm indicators				
At the Midterm level, all indicators of this competence refer to “simplified design challenges.” Projects and assignments from the first semester are of this level of complexity.				
Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student identifies relevant economic, social, and technological trends that shape his/her work.	The student cannot situate his/her work in the socio-cultural context or current news about digital technologies	The student describes some economic, social, and technological trends that are somehow related to his/her work.	The student describes the relevant economic, social, and technological trends that shape his/her work. He/she can reflect critically on whether his/her work reinforces those trends, or is opposed to them.	The student describes the relevant economic, social, and technological trends that have an effect on his/her work. He/she expresses a reasoned personal opinion on them, and is eloquent in reflecting critically on whether his/her work reinforces those trends, or is opposed to them.
The student reflects upon his/her individual	The student cannot provide a synthetic	The student describes his/her role in a team for	The student describes his/her role in a team for	The student describes his/her role in a team for

<p>contributions to a team.</p>	<p>description of his/her role and his/her relevance in a team.</p>	<p>multiple design cases.</p>	<p>multiple design cases. He/she provides a reflective critique of that role, and identifies what could be improved.</p>	<p>multiple design cases. He/she provides a reflective critique of that role, and identifies what could be improved. The student is aware of team dynamics and can identify what should the team do to improve.</p>
<p>The student can articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude.</p>	<p>The student is not able to articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude.</p>	<p>The student mentions elements of his/her ethics and values in design, but is not able to synthesize them in his/her own coherent professional vision.</p>	<p>The student can articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude.</p>	<p>The student can articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude. The student is also eloquent in connecting his/her professional vision to concrete examples in the real world, either positive or negative.</p>
<p>The student can critique a design artifact.</p>	<p>The student cannot critique a design artifact</p>	<p>The student can critique a design artifact. However, the critique is not satisfyingly connected to the socio-cultural context of the artifact.</p>	<p>The student can critique a design artifact, also considering its socio-cultural context.</p>	<p>The student can critique a design artifact, also considering its socio-cultural context. The student is also eloquent in relating the critique to his/her own practice (e.g. identifying inspiring elements, highlighting similarities or differences with his/her work...)</p>
<p>The student can critically self-assess the outcomes of his/her work (e.g. deliverables, artifacts..) in a way that leads to practical plans for further improvement.</p>	<p>The student cannot self-assess the outcomes of his/her in a way that leads to plans for further improvement.</p>	<p>In the context of a simplified design challenge, the student critically self-assesses the outcomes of his/her work. The student can point at a general</p>	<p>In the context of a simplified design challenge, the student critically self-assesses the outcomes of his/her work in a way that leads to practical plans for</p>	<p>In the context of a simplified design challenge, the student critically self-assesses the outcomes of his/her work in a way that leads to practical plans for</p>

		direction for improvement, but the plan is vague.	further improvement.	further improvement. The student is also eloquent in explaining the strong and weak points of his/her work, and clearly connects this explanation to his/her plans for improvement.
--	--	---	----------------------	---

Reflection & Awareness – Exit indicators

At the Exit level, all indicators of this competence refer to both “simplified design challenges” and “complex design challenges.” The final project in the second semester is an example of a complex design challenge. For each indicator, students must refer to at least one complex design challenge; secondary examples may also come from simplified design challenges.

Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student compares different relevant economic, social, and technological trends that shape his/her work.	The student cannot identify and compare trends that affect his/her work.	The student describes some economic, social, and technological trends that are somehow related to his/her work.	The student describes different relevant economic, social, and technological trends that shape his/her work. The student can compare them, and explain the relation between them and his/her work.	The student describes different relevant economic, social, and technological trends that shape his/her work. The student can compare them, and explain the relation between them and his/her work. The student is also eloquent in articulating a personal opinion on those trends.
The student reflects upon his/her individual contributions to a team over multiple projects.	The student cannot provide a synthetic description of his/her role and relevance in a team over multiple cases.	Over multiple cases of increasing complexity, one of which is a complex problem, the student describes his/her role in the team, pointing at his specific contributions.	Over multiple cases of increasing complexity, one of which is a complex problem, the student describes his/her role in the team, pointing at his specific contributions. The student can reflect critically on the process he/she followed, and identifies what could be improved.	Over multiple cases of increasing complexity, one of which is a complex problem, the student describes his/her role in the team, pointing at his specific contributions. The student can reflect critically on the process he/she followed, and identifies what could be improved.

				The student can also examine critically his/her process in the context of the team, and reflects on it.
The student can articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude.	The student is not able to articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude.	The student mentions elements of his/her ethics and values in design, but is not able to synthesize them in his/her own coherent professional vision.	The student can articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude.	The student can articulate his/her professional vision in terms of values, ethics and attitude. The student is also eloquent in connecting his/her professional vision to concrete examples in the real world, either positive or negative.
The student can produce a comparative critique of more design artifacts.	The student cannot produce a comparative critique of more design artifacts.	The student can produce a comparative critique of more design artifacts. However, the critique is not satisfyingly connected to the socio-cultural context of the artifacts.	The student can produce a comparative critique of more design artifacts, also considering their socio-cultural contexts.	The student can produce a comparative critique of more design artifacts, also considering their socio-cultural contexts. The student can reflect on how his/her own practice might benefit from the insights gained through that critique.
The student can critically self-assess the outcomes of his/her work in ways that concretely lead to further improvement.	The student cannot self-assess the outcomes of his/her work. Plans for further improvement are unfocused or unrealistic.	The student critically self-assesses the outcomes of his/her work. The student can describe how he/she made plans for improvement, and acted upon them. The actual improvements are, however, not very significant.	The student critically self-assesses the outcomes of his/her work. The student can describe how he/she made plans for improvement, and acted upon them. The student can finally re-assess his/her revised work.	The student critically self-assesses the outcomes of his/her work. The student can describe how he/she made plans for improvement, and acted upon them. The improvement of the student's work is particularly noteworthy. The student can finally

				re-assess his/her revised work.
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------

Competence Rubric: Concepting & Ideation

Nicolai

Definition: A design competence to generate concepts and ideas in socio-technical ecosystems involving users, content and business strategies.

Concepting & Ideation - Entry indicators
Note: no particular grading is done at the entry. All the following indicators are necessary and sufficient to be admitted to the programme.
Translates insights gathered through desk & field research into design opportunities and concepts.
Demonstrates 5-7 cases of design work with clear descriptions of the design problem, solution and rationale.
Explains how to take into account users, content- and business strategies in developing ideas and concepts.

Concepting & Ideation - Midterm indicators				
At the Midterm level, all indicators of this competence refer to “simplified design challenges.” Projects and assignments from the first semester are of this level of complexity.				
Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student explains the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed.	The student cannot satisfyingly explain an iterative process of concepting and research	The student can explain the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed. However, only one concept is presented.	The student can explain the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed. The student presents one main concepts and other secondary ones.	The student can explain the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed. The student presents one main concepts and other secondary ones. The student reflects critically on his/her choices in developing or discarding certain concepts.
The student explains how his/her own process has improved over time.	The student cannot show an improvement in process	Considering examples from his/her own work, the student shows and explains an improvement in	Considering examples from his/her own work, the student shows and explains an improvement in	Considering examples from his/her own work, the student shows and explains an improvement in

		his/her own process. However, critical reflection is lacking	his/her own process, and reflects critically on his/her own progress so far.	his/her own process, and reflects critically on his/her own progress so far. The student also identifies elements to improve, and outlines a plan to do so.
The student provides a rationale for selecting a certain concept over others that he/she developed.	The student cannot satisfyingly explain a rationale for selecting a specific concept.	The student can explain the rationale for selecting a specific concept. However, the choice seems somehow trivial (e.g. the discarded concepts are clearly weaker...)	The student can explain the rationale for selecting a specific concept. The discarded concepts are also well explained, and the student can make an argument for his/her choice.	The student can explain the rationale for selecting a specific concept. The discarded concepts are also well explained, and the student can make an argument for his/her choice. The student can reflect critically on his/her choices.

Concepting & Ideation – Exit indicators

At the Exit level, all indicators of this competence refer to both “simplified design challenges” and “complex design challenges.” The final project in the second semester is an example of a complex design challenge. For each indicator, students must refer to at least one complex design challenge; secondary examples may also come from simplified design challenges.

Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student explains an iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed	The student cannot satisfyingly explain an iterative process of concepting and research	The student can explain the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed. However, only one concept is presented.	The student can explain the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed. The student presents one main concepts and other secondary ones.	The student can explain the iterative process of concepting and research that he/she followed. The student presents one main concepts and other secondary ones. The student reflects critically on his/her choices in developing or discarding certain concepts.

<p>The student explains how his/her own process has improved over time</p>	<p>The student cannot show an improvement in process</p>	<p>Considering simplified and complex design challenges, the student shows and explains an improvement in his/her own process. However, critical reflection is lacking</p>	<p>Considering simplified and complex design challenges, the student shows and explains an improvement in his/her own process, and reflects critically on his/her own progress so far.</p>	<p>Considering simplified and complex design challenges, the student shows and explains an improvement in his/her own process, and reflects critically on his/her own progress so far. The student also identifies elements to improve, and outlines a plan to do so.</p>
<p>The student provides a rationale for selecting a specific concept over others that he/she developed.</p>	<p>The student cannot satisfyingly explain a rationale for selecting a specific concept.</p>	<p>The student can explain the rationale for selecting a specific concept. However, the choice seems somehow trivial (e.g. the discarded concepts are clearly weaker...)</p>	<p>The student can explain the rationale for selecting a specific concept. The discarded concepts are also well explained, and the student can make an argument for his/her choice.</p>	<p>The student can explain the rationale for selecting a specific concept. The discarded concepts are also well explained, and the student can make an argument for his/her choice. The student can reflect critically on his/her choices.</p>

Competence Rubric: Creating & Crafting

Definition: The design competence to use relevant methods and technologies to create innovative digital solutions.

Creating & Crafting - Entry indicators
Note: no particular grading is done at the entry. All the following indicators are necessary and sufficient to be admitted to the programme.
Is aware of different materials and technologies, describes their main characteristics, and provides multiple examples of their use in digital design
Is aware of different tools, describes their main characteristics, and provides multiple examples of their use in digital design
Referring to a specific case, describes and explains which aesthetic trends and conventions were used
Is familiar with multiple design research methods, and can explain their characteristics and how to apply them
Plans an iterative design process for himself/herself (with milestones, deliverables, expected outcomes, contingency plans...)
Can present intermediary steps and derives insight from these intermediary steps.

Creating & Crafting - Midterm indicators				
At the Midterm level, all indicators of this competence refer to “simplified design challenges.” Projects and assignments from the first semester are of this level of complexity.				
Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student explains the technical choices involved in the execution of his/her work.	The student explains his/her choices but provides superficial reasoning, resorts to unchallenging defaults or is unaware of alternatives. The student shows no process.	The student explains his/her choices and provides satisfactory reasoning, is somewhat aware of alternatives.	The student explains his/her choices and provides good reasoning, is well aware of alternatives and has a demonstrable process where he/she can suggest other possible executions of the work.	The student presents a well researched process with various trials in her process, and is capable of discerning the best execution. The student shows commitment to go beyond what is necessary.
The student discusses the influence of making in the design process.	The student presents a haphazard approach to making, or shows	The student presents executions of the work that are lacking in	The student demonstrates good making skills, carries out designs with attention to	The student presents a well researched process

	no interest at all in prototyping his/her work, going no further than the concepting stage.	engagement with the material or technology used. He/she doesn't seem to derive any design insights from the execution of the work.	detail in the craft involved. Discerns good from bad approaches to making something and derives insights from the making process that help fine-tuning her designs.	with various trials in his/her process, and is capable of discerning the best execution. The student shows commitment to go beyond what is necessary.
The student shows an open process with multiple intermediary steps, each executed in a way that gives some degree of coherence to said process.	The student presents an opaque process, it is difficult for the assessor to determine how the student arrived at certain conclusions. The process is incongruous.	The student presents a semblance of a process with some documentation and some intermediary steps, but it is not clear to an external assessor or client to determine how conclusions were drawn from that evidence.	The student present a solid process involving various iterations, trials and errors, presenting abundant evidence. The process is well documented and communicates with clarity how the work evolved.	The student presents outstanding process documentation that transmits confidence in the students process. It is clear to clients and assessors how the student operates as a designer.
The student shows awareness of aesthetic trends, technical and design conventions.	The student presents a subpar product. The decision making process is decoupled from the problem domain, doesn't seem to know what's out there and how other professionals have addressed similar challenges before.	The student presents awareness of what is out there, and how similar challenges have been addressed before. Understands conventions, trends and current techniques but doesn't really apply them.	The student demonstrates solid understanding of the problem domain and uses the conventions of his/her trade and applies them where relevant.	The student demonstrates command of the techniques and conventions of his/her trade, can apply them where suitable and can break away from them, and innovate when the existing conventions do not suit his/her style.

Creating & Crafting – Exit indicators

At the Exit level, all indicators of this competence refer to both “simplified design challenges” and “complex design challenges.” The final project in the second semester is an example of a complex design challenge. For each indicator, students must refer to at least one complex design challenge; secondary examples may also come from simplified design challenges.

Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student explains the technical choices involved in the	The student explains his/her choices but provides	The student explains his/her choices and	The student explains his/her choices and provides good	The student presents a well researched process

execution of his/her work.	superficial reasoning, resorts to unchallenging defaults or is unaware of alternatives. The student shows no process.	provides satisfactory reasoning, is somewhat aware of alternatives.	reasoning, is well aware of alternatives and has a demonstrable process where he/she can suggest other possible executions of the work.	with various trials in her process, and is capable of discerning the best execution. The student shows commitment to go beyond what is necessary.
The student discusses the influence of making in the design process.	The student presents a haphazard approach to making, or shows no interest at all in prototyping his/her work, going no further than the conceiving stage.	The student presents executions of the work that are lacking in engagement with the material or technology used. He/she doesn't seem to derive any design insights from the execution of the work.	The student demonstrates good making skills, carries out designs with attention to detail in the craft involved. Discerns good from bad approaches to making something and derives insights from the making process that help fine-tuning her designs.	The student presents a well researched process with various trials in his/her process, and is capable of discerning the best execution. The student shows commitment to go beyond what is necessary.
The student shows an open process with multiple intermediary steps, each executed in a way that gives some degree of coherence to said process.	The student presents an opaque process, it is difficult for the assessor to determine how the student arrived at certain conclusions. The process is incongruous.	The student presents a semblance of a process with some documentation and some intermediary steps, but it is not clear to an external assessor or client to determine how conclusions were drawn from that evidence.	The student present a solid process involving various iterations, trials and errors, presenting abundant evidence. The process is well documented and communicates with clarity how the work evolved.	The student presents outstanding process documentation that transmits confidence in the students process. It is clear to clients and assessors how the student operates as a designer.
The student shows awareness of aesthetic trends, technical and design conventions.	The student presents a subpar product. The decision making process is decoupled from the problem domain, doesn't seem to know what's out	The student presents awareness of what is out there, and how similar challenges have been addressed before. Understands conventions, trends and current	The student demonstrates solid understanding of the problem domain and uses the conventions of his/her trade and applies them where relevant.	The student demonstrates command of the techniques and conventions of his/her trade, can apply them where suitable and can break away from them, and innovate when the

	there and how other professionals have addressed similar challenges before.	techniques but doesn't really apply them.		existing conventions do not suit his/her style.
--	---	---	--	---

Competence Rubric: Self-Directed Learning

Definition: A competence of digital designers to critically evaluate their own competences, design portfolio, learning styles and strategies to identify further learning opportunities.

Self-Directed Learning - Entry indicators
Note: no particular grading is done at the entry. All the following indicators are necessary and sufficient to be admitted to the programme.
Autonomously formulates a realistic plan for improving his/her own professional network and connection with the design community
Autonomously formulates specific learning goals and a feasible plan for obtaining these goals.
Describes and explains his role, value and relevance as a digital designer in terms of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
Able to critically evaluate his own work and is capable to point out how this work can be improved.

Self-Directed Learning - Midterm indicators				
At the Midterm level, all indicators of this competence refer to “simplified design challenges.” Projects and assignments from the first semester are of this level of complexity.				
Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners.	The student does not participate in communities of practitioners.	The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners.	The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners. Shares his/her work to his/her peers, solicits feedback, and describes the input that he/she received from members of the community.	The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners. Shares his/her work to his/her peers, solicits feedback, and describes the input that he/she received from members of the community. The student takes an active role in a community (e.g. not only attending meetings and receiving feedback, but also organizing, leading, moderating...).
The student reflects on his/her	The student cannot articulate	The student reflects on the learning	The student reflects on the	The student reflects on the learning goals

progress towards specific learning goals-	his/her learning goals	goals he/she achieved, and on the process leading there. However, the student struggles to put them in a broader perspective and to formulate his/her next logical goals for the near future.	learning goals he/she achieved, and on the process leading there. The student autonomously formulates learning goals for the near future, and discusses his/her motivation.	he/she achieved, and on the process leading there. The student autonomously formulates learning goals for the near future, discusses his/her motivation, and is particularly pragmatic in providing a realistic plan to reach those goals.
The student provides examples of cooperation within a team.	The student cannot articulate his/her role, relevance and added value in team of designers. If there were issues within the team, the student has not made a concrete attempt to resolve them.	The student provides examples of teamwork. If there were issues within the team, the student explains the steps taken to resolve them. However, critical reflection on the student's role and contribution in relation to various teammates is lacking.	The student provides examples of teamwork. If there were issues within the team, the student explains the steps taken to resolve them. The student discusses constructively similarities & differences between himself/herself and colleagues.	The student provides examples of teamwork. The student presents significant examples of team cooperation and, if necessary, conflict resolution. The student discusses constructively similarities & differences between himself/herself and colleagues. The student explains how his/her professional attitude evolved to cooperate better with colleagues.

Self-Directed Learning – Exit indicators

At the Exit level, all indicators of this competence refer to both “simplified design challenges” and “complex design challenges.” The final project in the second semester is an example of a complex design challenge. For each indicator, students must refer to at least one complex design challenge; secondary examples may also come from simplified design challenges.

Indicator	Insufficient (0 - 5.4)	Sufficient (5.5 - 6.9)	Good (7 - 8.4)	Excellent (8.5 - 10)
The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners.	The student does not participate in communities of practitioners.	The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners.	The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners. Shares his/her work to his/her peers, solicits feedback, and describes the input that he/she	The student describes his/her participation in communities of practitioners. Shares his/her work to his/her peers, solicits feedback, and describes the input that he/she received from

			received from members of the community.	members of the community. The student takes an active role in a community (e.g. not only attending meetings and receiving feedback, but also organizing, leading, moderating...).
The student reflects on his/her progress towards specific learning goals-	The student cannot articulate his/her learning goals	The student reflects on the learning goals he/she achieved, and on the process leading there. However, the student struggles to put them in a broader perspective and to formulate his/her next logical goals for the near future.	The student reflects on the learning goals he/she achieved, and on the process leading there. The student autonomously formulates learning goals for the near future, and discusses his/her motivation.	The student reflects on the learning goals he/she achieved, and on the process leading there. The student autonomously formulates learning goals for the near future, discusses his/her motivation, and is particularly pragmatic in providing a realistic plan to reach those goals.
The student provides examples of cooperation within a team.	The student cannot articulate his/her role, relevance and added value in team of designers. If there were issues within the team, the student has not made a concrete attempt to resolve them.	The student provides examples of teamwork. If there were issues within the team, the student explains the steps taken to resolve them. However, critical reflection on the student's role and contribution in relation to various teammates is lacking.	The student provides examples of teamwork. If there were issues within the team, the student explains the steps taken to resolve them. The student discusses constructively similarities & differences between himself/herself and colleagues.	The student provides examples of teamwork. The student presents significant examples of team cooperation and, if necessary, conflict resolution. The student discusses constructively similarities & differences between himself/herself and colleagues. The student explains how his/her professional attitude evolved to cooperate better with colleagues.