**Appendix A: Group product – problem solution (accountability report and concept)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Insufficient | Sufficient | Excellent |
| Problem definition |  |  |  |
| * Problem description | The question or problem posed by the Gemeente Utrecht is not clearly described. | The question or problem posed by the Gemeente Utrecht is clearly described. | The question or problem posed by the Gemeente Utrecht is in-depth described. |
| * Context description | The context in which the problem and solution are situated is not clearly described. | The context in which the problem and solution are situated is clearly described. | The context in which the problem and solution are situated is in-depth described. |
| Solution |  |  |  |
| * Description of the target group | The target group is not well defined. | The target group is defined. | The target group is defined in-depth. |
| * Problem solution description | The solution for the posed problem is not clearly described. | The solution for the posed problem is clearly described. | The solution for the posed problem is in-depth described. |
| * Problem solution process | It is not clear how the chosen solution is favorable to other solutions. | The choice for this solution in favor of other solutions is described. | The process of dismissing ideas and choosing the solution is easy to follow and understand |
| * Foundation of the solution | The solution is not based on interaction with the target group or relevant literature. | The solution is based on interaction with the target group or relevant literature. | The solution is based on interaction with the target group and relevant literature |
| * Solution in the context | It remains questionable why the solution will work in the current context. | It is argued that the solution will work in the current context. | It is convincing that the solution will work in the current context. |
| Implementation |  |  |  |
| * Practical feasibility | It remains questionable whether the solution is practically feasible. | It is argued that the solution is practically feasible. | It is convincing that the solution is practically feasible. |
| * Financial feasibility | It remains questionable whether the solution is financially feasible. | It is argued that the solution is financially feasible. | It is convincing that the solution is financially feasible. |
| * Necessary steps to take | The steps necessary to implement the solution are not clearly described. | The steps necessary to implement the solution are clearly described. | The steps necessary to implement the solution are in-depth described. |
| General conditions |  |  |  |
| * Innovativeness | The solution is tried before in this context or has failed in a similar context. | The solution is not tried before in this context. | The solution is very new and innovative for this, and other, contexts. |
| * Attractiveness | The report is not actively and/or attractive written. | The report is actively and attractive written. | The report is actively and attractive written and encourages taking action. |
| * Wording | The wording is linguistically and/or grammatically incorrect. |  | The wording is linguistically and grammatically correct. |
| Presentation |  | | |
| * Content | The main message was difficult to follow. | The main message was easy to follow. | The main message was communicated in a clear and structured manner. |
| * Form | The visual used did not aid the main message. | The visuals used aided the main message. | The visuals used were very informative and lifted the presentation. |
| * Engagement | The presentation did not engage the audience. | The presentation engaged the audience. | The presentation captivated the audience. |
| General feedback |  |  |  |

**Scoring (both BA and MA, because of mixed groups):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Points** | **BA & MA** |
| 10 | 100% excellent |
| 9 | 20% sufficient, 80% excellent |
| 8 | 50% sufficient, 50% excellent |
| 7 | 80% sufficient, 20% excellent |
| 6 | 100% sufficient |
| 6 | less than 100% sufficient, provided that the insufficient is improved to sufficient |
| 5 | less than 100% sufficient, after improvement |

**Appendix B1: Group product – Individual contribution (+- 0.5 points) Peers**

Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Group name: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Assessed group member: …………………………………………………………………………………

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How would you describe your group member’s contribution to the final group product? |  |
| In my opinion, this group member did: | Less / equal / more\*  work compared to the rest of the group |
| What would you recommend to your group member to keep? (e.g., trait, attitude, knowledge contribution) |  |
| What would you recommend to your group member to change? (e.g., trait, attitude, knowledge contribution) |  |

\* Circle the relevant option**Appendix B2: Group product – Individual contribution (+- 0.5 points) Self**

Own Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Group name: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How would you describe your own contribution to the final group product? |  |
| In my opinion, I did: | Less / equal / more\*  work compared to the rest of the group |
| In my opinion, we deserve the following grade: | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10\* |
| Explain why you gave your group this grade. |  |

\* Circle the relevant option

**Appendix C: Individual product – Personal pitch**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Insufficient | Sufficient | Excellent | |
| Presentation skills |  |  |  | |
| * Vocal delivery | Use of voice lacks conviction. | It is nice to listen to the voice. | Use of voice is convicting. | |
| * Enthusiasm/ passion | There is little to none enthusiasm in the presentation. | The presentation is given in an engaging matter. | The listener becomes enthusiastic while listening to the presentation. | |
| * Body language and eye contact | Inappropriate body language for the presentation. | Appropriate body language for the presentation. | Body language is appropriate and used in an inspiring manner. | |
| Content |  |  |  | |
| * Introduction | There is not a clear and/or informative introduction. | There is a clear and informative introduction. | There is a strong informative conclusion that sparks attention. | |
| * Structure | There is not a clear structure. | There is a clear structure. | There is a clear structure and the presentation is easy to follow. | |
| * Concise | The information provided is superficial or lengthy. | The information provided is not superficial or lengthy. | The information provided is very to-the-point but still complete. | |
| * Personal strengths | The personal strengths and/or ambitions are not clearly described. | The personal strengths and/or ambitions are clearly described. | The personal strengths and/or ambitions are described in-depth. | |
| * Conclusion | There is not a clear and/or informative conclusion. | There is a clear and informative conclusion. | There is a strong informative conclusion that invites interaction. | |
| General conditions |  |  |  | |
| * Time | The presentation is longer than 2 minutes. |  | The presentation is around 2 minutes. | |
| * Professionalism | The presentation is not suited for the audience. | The presentation is suited for the audience. | The presentation is very suited for the audience. | |
| General feedback |  |  | |  |

**Scoring Personal pitch:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Points** | **BA** | **MA** |
| 10 | 20% sufficient, 80% excellent | 100% excellent |
| 9 | 50% sufficient, 50% excellent | 20% sufficient, 80% excellent |
| 8 | 80% sufficient, 20% excellent | 50% sufficient, 50% excellent |
| 7 | 100% sufficient | 80% sufficient, 20% excellent |
| 6 | 20% insufficient, 80% sufficient | 100% sufficient |
| 5 | 20%-40% insufficient | 20% insufficient, 80% sufficient |
| 4 | 50%-100% insufficient | 20%-40% insufficient |
| 3 |  | 50%-100% insufficient |

*Note*: a difference is made between Bachelor and Master students. As the course is officially on a masters’ level, bachelor students are scored more lenient.

**Appendix D: Individual product – Reflection journal**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Insufficient | Sufficient | Excellent |
| * Korthagen cyclus | Focused in reflection on one part of the cycle (Korthagen). | Reflected using the most of the cycle (Korthagen). | Reflected using the whole cycle (Korthagen). |
| * Bateson levels | Reflected only on one or the lower levels (Bateson). | Reflected on several different levels (Bateson). | Reflected on all levels (Bateson). |
| * Critical reflection | Reflected superficial. | Reflected neither superficial nor critically. | Reflected critically. |
| General feedback |  |  |  |

**Scoring:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Points** | **BA** | **MA** |
| **+0.5** | 33.3% - 100% excellent | 66.7% - 100% excellent |
| **+0** | 100% sufficient | 100% sufficient |
| **-0.5** | 66.6% - 100% insufficient | 33.3% - 100% insufficient |

*Note*: a difference is made between Bachelor and Master students. As the course is officially on a masters’ level, bachelor students are scored more lenient.