

CRITERIA	<b>SUPERIOR</b> [exceeds expectations] 20-18	<b>GOOD</b> [norm for assignment] 17-15	<b>FAIR</b> 14-12	<b>JUST ENOUGH</b> 11-9	<b>POOR [8-0]</b> [Not reflective of expected coursework]
<b>All-or-nothing category</b> Each team member present and on time? <b>(this is the only individually-graded category)</b>	On time and present				No – not on time <u>or</u> not present
<b>Design composition, potential for usability</b> Team used Design Thinking interview as the basis for their design as evidenced by addressing the user's primary need; team created something in the FabLab; team's FabLab creation is something user can actually examine; team can explain what they would do differently if time permitted (evidence of process)	Team superiorly addressed user's primary need with superior depth; team created something unique in the FabLab; team's FabLab creation is something user can actually examine; team can explain with complete honesty and confidence what they would do differently if time permitted; design's potential is more than plausible and we all wish we'd thought of it	Team more than proficiently addressed user's primary need; team created something in the FabLab; team's FabLab creation is something user can actually examine; team can explain with adequate confidence what they would do differently if time permitted; design's potential is plausible and we all wish we'd thought of it	Team proficiently addressed user's primary need though depth of analysis might be lacking; team created something in the FabLab; team's FabLab creation is something user can actually examine though there may be evidence of effort; team can explain with some assurance what they would do differently if time permitted; design's potential is plausible but might be lackluster	Team may or may not have proficiently addressed user's primary need though depth of analysis might be lacking; team created something in the FabLab but user may not be able to examine it or there is not depth of thought; design's potential is not plausible but it exists	Team did not proficiently address user's primary need; depth of analysis might be lacking; team did not create anything in FabLab so we cannot comment on design
<b>Presentation and professionalism: organization, adherence to UD principles</b> Presentation itself is Universally Designed to the greatest extent possible; all content is addressed (see checklist below)	<b>(20-18)</b> Presentation itself is Universally Designed to the greatest extent possible; all content is well-addressed:  _collaborators' names _user's name _user's role _project title _problem statement _UD principles by name/# _solution (the thing)	<b>(17-15)</b> Presentation itself is Universally Designed to an adequate extent; all content is well-addressed:  _collaborators' names _user's name _user's role _project title _problem statement _UD principles by name/# _solution (the thing)	<b>(14-12)</b> Presentation itself is not Universally Designed, all content is was addressed but not thoroughly:  _collaborators' names _user's name _user's role _project title _problem statement _UD principles by name/# _solution (the thing)	<b>(11-9)</b> Presentation itself is not Universally Designed, all content is was not addressed:  _collaborators' names _user's name _user's role _project title _problem statement _UD principles by name/# _solution (the thing)	<b>(8-0)</b> Presentation itself is not Universally Designed, most content was not addressed  _collaborators' names _user's name _user's role _project title _problem statement _UD principles by name/# _solution (the thing)
<b>Real-time communication, investment in solution</b> At least one person from team is able to confidently explain the design; if user is present, real time feedback from user is acknowledged; team can answer questions in Q & A from classmates and instructor	Team is able to explain with superior confidence the design they created for user; team may cite class material; team is clearly invested in user's satisfaction with design as evidenced by the ability to answer Q & A questions	Team is able to explain with excellent confidence the design they created for their user; team may cite class material; team is clearly invested in user's satisfaction with design as evidenced by the ability to answer Q & A questions	Team is able to explain proficiently the design they created for user; team is invested in user's satisfaction as evidenced by the ability to sufficiently answer Q & A questions	Team is challenged to explain the design they created for user or may be challenged to take the assignment seriously; team seems mildly invested in user's satisfaction as evidenced by the ability to somewhat answer Q & A questions	Team appears not to have taken assignment seriously as is evidenced by inability to explain design, to answer questions, and/or to listen to feedback from user or others in Q & A

Professor Laurel will bring a rubric for each group – no need to print it out

**Note:** Q & A occurs after each presentation. We will discuss things like “What made you choose this need as the primary need?” and “If you could do something differently, what would it be?” and “If you re-designed the creation, what would you change?” among other things.

CHECKLIST – INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING IN PRESENTATION

- Your presentation should be created with UD principles in mind. For example, if a video is included, make sure there are captions; if you are using slides, make sure they are legible; if you are speaking, please speak loud enough so all can hear.
- collaborators’ names
- user’s name
- user’s role (participant or patron of the arts?)
- project title - please give your project solution a title (e.g. Laurel’s Modular Chair)
- Design Thinking problem statement – this is the problem you are solving (e.g. Laurel needs a way to...)
- identification of *at least two* Universal Design Principles your solution addresses (include name and number of principal)
- solution (this is the thing you create in the FabLab)