Developing grading criteria for AG2805

Josefin Wangel, 2016-05-10

Foreword

About this report

This report describes the development of grading criteria for the course AG2805 Sustainable Planning and Design, carried out through the course LH216V Develop the Learning Through Using Grading Criteria. My ambition when starting this process, was to develop more concrete and transparent grading criteria, to be used both in communication with the students, to make it more clear for them what we expect from them, and in communication with the team of teachers involved in the course to clarify what it is that they should look for when marking assignments. Inspired by my colleague Anna Björklund I would also like to try out using the grading criteria as a tool for formative assessment, through letting students use the criteria when peer-reviewing the work of other students.

Other revisions of the course design

When going through the course design as part of the process of developing the grading criteria, I identified two other issues that need to be dealt with. One, which at least initially could be handled through developing grading criteria, and one which demanded a re-alignment of the focus of the teaching and learning activities (TLA), and examination of one of the course components.

Emphasise interdisciplinary theory and practice through grading criteria
Since the course was first conceived, the interdisciplinary ambitions of the course and of the program have increased, leading up to a need for a slight revision of the course design. However, after scrutinizing the existing intended learning outcomes (ILOs) I concluded that it, at least for now, would suffice to clarify and institutionalise the 'new' emphasis on interdisciplinary theory and practice by specifying the ILOs through grading criteria. As a consequence, I however had to redesign the focus and form of a few of the teaching and learning, and examination activities. To next year I plan to change at least one of the ILOs (ILO 1) in order to make the interdisciplinary ambition of the course to be emphasised. This change will in turn demand a slight revision also of the grading criteria presented here, since these do not demand that the students can suggest interdisciplinary approaches to pass/get an E. Until I have updated the ILOs, the demonstration of interdisciplinary skills/insights is used as one of the grading criteria for achieving a C.

Deal with slippage through re-alignment
Going through the course I also identified a problem in the once well-designed constructive alignment, resulting from a gradual shift or "slippage" in the interpretation of one of the course components, SEM2. This course component was originally designed to correspond to ILO1, and has since the beginning of the course been known as the "discourse analysis part" of the course (due to the teaching and learning, and examination activities used). During the years the teachers being in charge of this part of the course have changed several times, and each new set of teachers have interpreted "discourse analysis" in their own way. This has lead to a situation where the teaching and learning activities as well as the examination of this course component now focus almost entirely on an issue that is not covered by ILO 1, or any other ILO. To deal with this I have suggested a modification of the distribution of ILOs across course components as well as the TLA and examinations used. SEM2 is now used to examine ILO 2, and ILO 1 is instead examined through TEN1.

The process of developing grading criteria

As a very first step for developing grading criteria, I mapped how the ILOs are examined today, and to what grade it is relevant to grade them (see Table 1, p. 3).

Then I looked through the grading templates for the different examinations from previous years to see what demands we had formulated for different grades. These templates had been developed partly in order to support equal marking of assignments (across teachers and students), and had also been used to provide feedback to the students. With the templates as a basis, and with the abovementioned needed revisions in mind (to emphasise interdisciplinarity and to re-align SEM2), I then started formulating the templates into grading criteria per course component and examination (see Appendix 1, p. 10).

To check for gaps or overlaps in relation to ILOs, I thereafter deconstructed and distributed the grading criteria across the different ILOs. The reason for why I started with criteria across examination forms instead of ILOs is that one of the major examinations in the course (and one of the minor) examines several ILOs, which made this way of working much more convenient. I also believe that the students have an easier time grasping what is demanded from them if the criteria are structured according to the examinations, and that teachers who are to grade an assignment also benefit from this way of presenting the criteria. Hence, I have chosen to include the requested table over criteria across ILOs as an appendix instead of as a 'main' deliverable (see Appendix 2, p. 11-12).

In crafting the formulations of the grading criteria, I had really good use of the examples provided via the LH2016V course web, as well as both theory and practical examples provided by Ekecrantz (2007)[1] and Bergqvist (2015)[2]. Especially fruitful were the examples on how to combine continuing ("kontinuerliga") criteria, which are based on a successively increasing quality of the same criteria (e.g. "sufficient analysis" "good analysis" – "excellent analysis"), and discrete criteria, which instead assess the presence of new capabilities.

Following this I developed a system for how to combine the grades from the four separate course components in the course, of which one is graded P/F and three are graded A-F (see p. 9). This system is more or less the same as we have been using previous years, however, with the grading criteria there is not longer any need (or reason) to make the combination through quantifying grades.

As a last step I integrated the grading criteria in the description of each of the course parts/components (see p. 5-8).

[1] Ekecrantz, Stefan (2007) Målrelaterade betyg. Att arbeta med betygskriterier och bedömning i sju grader. UPC-rapport 2007:1. Universitetspedagogiskt centrum, Stockholms universitet, Stockholm.

[2] Bergqvist, Johanna (2015) Att sätta praxis på pränt. En handbok i att skriva betygskriterier. Lunds universitet, Lund.

AG2805 Sustainable Planning and Design: Examination and Grading

AG2805 Sustainable Planning and Design is a 15.0 credit fulltime course, working as an introduction to the master's programme Sustainable Urban Planning and Design (SUPD). The course (as well as the program) is interdisciplinary in its nature, aiming to introduce students with backgrounds in different types of engineering, architecture, planning, environmental and social science and the humanities, to each others way of seeing, thinking and doing sustainable urban development. The course also aims at making the students reflect on the relationship between, on the one hand, sustainable *urban* development, and, on the other hand, sustainable development in general, or at a regional, national or global scale, but also to turn these insights into actionable knowledge.

Intended learning outcomes

To pass the course, the student should be able to:

1. Summarise, compare and critically discuss definitions of sustainable development and urban sustainable development;
2. Identify and apply planning and design methodologies that contribute to urban sustainable development, including tools for assessment;
3. Identify main characteristics of different city districts and analyse these in relation to urban sustainable development;
4. Identify and characterise main actors of urban sustainable development;
5. Creatively explore and critically analyse how planning and design can contribute to urban sustainable development of a city such as Stockholm– in short and long time perspectives;
6. Present proposals and analyses as text, drawings and/or illustrations as well as orally.

Note that not all of these ILOs are examined A-F; ILO 4 and 6 are examined only P/F. For ILO 4, the reason for not grading above E is that stakeholder analysis is a new concept and method for most students, and this course does not aim at more than introducing it to the students. For ILO 6 the reason for not grading above E is because presentation skills, however important, is not the key focus of the course.

Table 1. Grading of ILOs

	ILOs	E	D	C	B	A
1	Summarise, compare and critically discuss definitions of sustainable development and urban sustainable development;	x	x	x	x	x
2	Identify and apply planning and design methodologies that contribute to urban sustainable development, including tools for assessment;	x	x	x	x	x
3	Identify main characteristics of different city districts and analyse these in relation to urban sustainable development;	x	x	x	x	x
4	Identify and characterise main actors of urban sustainable development;	x				
5	Creatively explore and critically analyse how planning and design can contribute to urban sustainable development of a city such as Stockholm– in short and long time perspectives;	x	x	x	x	x
6	Present proposals and analyses as text, drawings and/or illustrations as well as orally.	x				

Structure of the course

The course is divided into four parts, each corresponding to a separately graded course component. As can be seen in Table 2, SEM1 examines ILOs 3-5; SEM2 examines ILO2; PRO1 examines ILOs 2-6; and TEN1 examines ILOs 1 and 5.

Table 2. In what course component are ILOs examined?

	ILOs	Part 1 (SEM1)	Part 2 (SEM2)	Part 3 (PRO1)	Part 4 (TEN1)
1	Summarise, compare and critically discuss definitions of sustainable development and urban sustainable development;				x
2	Identify and apply planning and design methodologies that contribute to urban sustainable development, including tools for assessment;		x	x	
3	Identify main characteristics of different city districts and analyse these in relation to urban sustainable development;	x		x	
4	Identify and characterise main actors of urban sustainable development;	x		x	
5	Creatively explore and critically analyse how planning and design can contribute to urban sustainable development of a city such as Stockholm– in short and long time perspectives;	x		x	x
6	Present proposals and analyses as text, drawings and/or illustrations as well as orally.			x	

Course parts elaborated

In this section the four course parts are more fully introduced, with a focus on ILOs examined, key teaching and learning activities, formative and summative assessment, and grading criteria. An overview of the grading criteria for the different examinations can be seen in Appendix 1 (p. 10), and across the different ILOs in Appendix 2 (p. 11-12).

Part 1: Small project work

Part 1 is a small project work, carried out in groups, and examines ILOs 3-5 using a P/F grading scale. In the project work the students are asked to identify key characteristics and sustainability issues of a specific city district, suggest concrete proposals for how planning and design could deal with these issues, and identify key stakeholders. The project work is presented orally at a final critique, and written in terms of a PowerPoint presentation.

Formative assessment (for feedback, not graded)
Formative assessment is provided through a tutoring session.

Summative assessment (for examination and grading)
The summative assessment is made based on the oral and written PowerPoint-presentation, using the following grading criteria:

Grading criteria Part 1: Small Project Work (SEM1, 3.0 credits, P/F)
For P: Identifies main characteristics of the area. Identifies at least four sustainability problems in the area. Proposal addresses at least one of identified sustainability problem. Proposal identifies main actors and discusses a few barriers to change. At least one sustainability problem that cannot be addressed by the proposal is discussed.

Part 2: Methods bonanza

Part 2 comprises a series of lectures and exercises on methods for planning and design. It examines ILO 2, using an A-F grading scale. Four methods are introduced: 1) travel diaries and interviews; 2) qualitative cost-benefit analysis; 3) stakeholder analysis; and 4) discourse analysis. These methods are all useful in the project work, following after Part 2. Each method is introduced by a short lecture, after which the students apply the method through an exercise in smaller groups. The exercise is to be reported in individual 'lab-reports'. The lab-reports are not assessed, but function as a basis for peer-to-peer learning, and as preparation for the examination.

Formative assessment

Formative assessment is provided in seminars, one per method, in which students first peer-review two other student's lab-reports, after which the tutor holds a Q&A session for the entire class.

Summative assessment

The summative assessment is made based on an individual essay, written after all methods have been introduced, in which the student is asked to describe and reflect on the methods introduced. The essay is assessed using the following criteria:

Grading criteria Part 2: Essay (SEM2, 3.0 credits, A-F)				
E	D	C	B	A
Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods, with a few misunderstandings. For each method, provides relevant examples of situations when it would be useful.	All requirements for E, and at least half of additional requirements for C.	Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods **without misunderstandings**. **Identifies key similarities and differences**. For each method, provides relevant examples of situations when it would be useful. **Provides at least one relevant examples of when a combination of two or more methods would be useful.**	All requirements for C, and at least half of requirements for A.	Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods without misunderstandings. Identifies key similarities and differences, **also from the perspective of power**, and **discusses these in terms of strengths and weaknesses in relation to concrete examples**. Provides at least **two** relevant examples of when a combination of two or more methods would be useful.

Part 3: Big project work

Part 3 comprise a larger project work. Part 3 examines ILOs 2-6, using an A-F scale (ILOs 4 and 6 are however only graded P/F). In the project work, students are to develop a planning and design proposal that, if implemented, would substantially contribute to an increased sustainability of an urban area. The project work is divided into four main phases, each of which comprise about five working weeks: 1) Establishing the baseline and formulating the challenge; 2) Identifying solutions and alternatives; 3) Crafting the proposal; and 4) Finalising and revising. The project work is presented orally at a final critique, as well as at a poster exhibition, typically placed in the area the course has been working with and opened by a vernissage to which local actors are invited.

Formative assessment
Formative assessment is provided at tutoring seminars in peer groups, one per phase, where tutors and peers provide feedback.

Summative assessment
The summative assessment is made based on the project report, using the following grading criteria:

Grading criteria Part 3: Big Project Report (PRO1, 6.0 credits)				
E	D	C	B	A
Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, based on readily available data. Methods are described. The future narrative and design proposal are clearly related, with some mismatches. Proposal identifies main actors. The proposal builds on reference-projects, but does not go beyond this to any extent. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is indicated. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are indicated. Report and poster are easy to read, without major flaws, and gives a clear account of the project.	All requirements for E, and at least half of additional requirements for C.	Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, also **based on new data, generated either through own investigations or processing of data**. Methods are described **and argued fo**r. The future narrative and the design proposal **clearly fit together like a whole**. Proposal identifies main actors. The proposal builds on reference-projects, **and goes beyond these to some extent**. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is **clearly argued for**. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are **comprehensively analysed, using at least one established method**. **Synergies and conflicts are identified**.	All requirements for C, and at least half of requirements for A.	Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, also based on new data, generated either through own investigations or processing of data. Methods are described, argued for **and clearly related to one another**. The future narrative and the design proposal clearly fit together like a whole. The future narrative includes **at least two different writing styles**, and the design proposal is provided in **at least two different scales**. Proposal identifies main actors. The proposal is well researched and **clearly goes beyond the reference-projects**. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is clearly argued for **and nuanced in terms of the distribution of costs and benefits**. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are comprehensively analysed, using at least **two different established methods**. Synergies and conflicts are identified, and **ways of dealing with conflicts are discussed**.

Part 4: Home Exam

Part 4 comprises a home exam and examines ILOs 1 and 5 using an A-F scale. The home exam asks the student to describe, compare and critically discuss definitions of sustainable urban development and sustainable development, and how they relate to each other. Students are also asked to reflect on the project work, with a focus on identifying strengths and weaknesses in relation to a number of predefined themes/focal points.

Formative assessment
No formative assessment is provided for this course moment.

Summative assessment
The summative assessment is made based on the home exam, using the following grading criteria:

Grading criteria Part 4: Home exam (TEN1, 3.0 credits)				
E	D	C	B	A
Describes key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can mitigate these. Sketches the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development. Indicates awareness of context and/or discourse. The discussion is to some extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature.	All requirements for E, and at least half of additional requirements for C.	Describes key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design **can work together to** mitigate these. **Provides a comprehensive account on** the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development. **Clearly demonstrates** awareness of context **and** discourse. **The discussion is to a large extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature.**	All requirements for C, and at least half of requirements for A.	Describes **and critically discusses** key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can work together to mitigate these, and **reflects on strengths and weaknesses**. Provides a comprehensive account on the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development, **and critically discusses this**. Clearly demonstrates awareness of context and discourse. The discussion is to a large extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature, which exceeds the mandatory readings.

Combining grades

The course gives a total of 15.0 credits (A-F), and comprises four different, separately graded, course components:

- SEM1, 3.0 credits, P/F
- SEM2, 3.0 credits, A-F
- PRO1, 6.0 credits, A-F
- TEN1, 3.0 credits, A-F

Grades for the separate course moments are awarded according to the grading criteria presented previously (also available in Appendix 1). The final grade for the course is a weighted combination of the grades for SEM2, PRO1 and TEN1 (the grade for SEM1 does not influence the final grade since it is graded P/F).

First the two course moments SEM2 and TEN1 are combined through weighting (see below "1.Weighting"). Even though they correspond to the same number of credits (3.0), TEN1 is given a slightly higher weight than SEM2 because it examines two of the ILOs (ILO 1 and 5), while SEM2 only examines one (ILO 2). Since TEN1 is examined later in the course, this way of weighting also provides the possibility to reward learning that takes place after SEM2 has been examined.

The result from this weighting is then combined with the grade for PRO1 (which examines ILOs 2-6). For this final combination, the two results are assigned the same weight (see "2.Combination"), this because they comprise the same number of credits (3.0+3.0 and 6.0 respectively), and are seen as equally important. In this way it does not become possible to substitute theoretical knowledge (SEM2 and TEN1) with practical knowledge (PRO1) or the other way around. To achieve a high grade, advanced capabilities in both theory and practice must thus be demonstrated.

1.Weighting (W)

SEM2/TEN1	A	B	C	D	E
A	A	B	B	C	D
B	A	B	C	C	D
C	B	B	C	D	D
D	C	C	C	D	E
E	D	D	D	E	E

2.Combination (for final grade)

PRO1/W	A	B	C	D	E
A	A	B	B	C	D
B	B	B	C	C	D
C	B	C	C	D	D
D	C	C	D	D	E
E	D	D	D	E	E

Appendix 1. Grading criteria across examinations (and course components)

	Part 1: Project work (SEM1, 3 credits, P/F)	**Part 2: Methods bonanza essay** (SEM2, 3 credits, A-F)	**Part 3: Big project work** (PRO1, 6 credits, A-F)	**Part 4: Home exam** (TEN1, 3 credits, A-F)
A	Identifies main characteristics of the area. Identifies at least four sustainability problems in the area. Proposal addresses at least one of identified sustainability problem. Proposal identifies main actors and discusses a few barriers to change. At least one sustainability problem that cannot be addressed by the proposal is discussed.	Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods without misunderstandings. Identifies key similarities and differences, **also from the perspective of power**, and **discusses these in terms of strengths and weaknesses in relation to concrete examples**. Provides at least **two** relevant examples of when a combination of two or more methods would be useful.	Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, also based on new data, generated either through own investigations or processing of data. Methods are described, argued for **and clearly related to one another**. The future narrative and the design proposal clearly fit together like a whole. The future narrative includes **at least two different writing styles**, and the design proposal is provided in **at least two different scales**. Proposal identifies main actors. The proposal is well researched and **clearly goes beyond the reference-projects**. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is clearly argued for **and nuanced in terms of the distribution of costs and benefits**. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are comprehensively analysed, using at least **two different methods**. Synergies and conflicts are identified, and **ways of dealing with conflicts are discussed**.	Describes **and critically discusses** key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can work together to mitigate these, and **reflects on strengths and weaknesses**. Provides a comprehensive account on the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development, **and critically discusses this**. Clearly demonstrates awareness of context and discourse. The discussion is to a large extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature, which exceeds the mandatory readings.
B		All requirements for C, at least half of requirements for A.	All requirements for C, at least half of requirements for A.	All requirements for C, at least half of requirements for A.
C		Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods **without misunderstandings**. **Identifies key similarities and differences**. For each method, provides relevant examples of situations when it would be useful. **Provides at least one relevant examples of when a combination of two or more methods would be useful.**	Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, also **based on new data, generated either through own investigations or processing of data**. Methods are described **and argued fo**r. The future narrative and the design proposal **clearly fit together like a whole**. Proposal identifies main actors. The proposal builds on reference-projects, **and goes beyond these to some extent**. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is **clearly argued for**. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are **comprehensively analysed, using at least one method**. **Synergies and conflicts are identified**.	Describes key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design **can work together to** mitigate these. **Provides a comprehensive account on** the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development. **Clearly demonstrates** awareness of context **and** discourse. **The discussion is to a large extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature.**
D		Fulfills all requirements for E, and at least half of the additional requirements for a C.	Fulfills all requirements for an E, and at least half of the additional requirements for a C.	Fulfills all requirements for an E, and at least half of the additional requirements for a C.
E		Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods, with a few misunderstandings. For each method, provides relevant examples of situations when it would be useful.	Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, based on readily available data. Methods are described. The future narrative and design proposal are clearly related, with some mismatches. Proposal identifies main actors. The proposal builds on reference-projects, but does not go beyond this to any extent. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is indicated. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are indicated. Report and poster are easy to read, without major flaws, and gives a clear account of the project.	Describes key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can mitigate these. Sketches the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development. Indicates awareness of context and/or discourse. The discussion is to some extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature.

Appendix 2. Grading criteria across ILOs

This table shows the grading criteria for the different ILOs across the different course components ("Parts") and their respective examination.

ILOs	Part	E	D	C	B	A
1 Summarise, compare and critically discuss definitions of sustainable development and urban sustainable development;	TEN1	Sketches the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development. Indicates awareness of context and/or discourse.		**Provides a comprehensive account on the** relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development. **Clearly demonstrates** awareness of context **and** discourse.		Provides a comprehensive account on the relationship between sustainable urban development and sustainable development, **and critically discusses this.** Clearly demonstrates awareness of context and discourse.
2 Identify and apply planning and design methodologies that contribute to urban sustainable development, including tools for assessment;	SEM2	Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods, with a few misunderstandings. For each method, provides relevant examples of situations when it would be useful.		Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods **without misunderstandings**. **Identifies key similarities and differences**. For each method, provides relevant examples of situations when it would be useful. **Provides at least one relevant examples of when a combination of two or more methods would be useful.**		Explains the basic characteristics of all introduced methods without misunderstandings. Identifies key similarities and differences, **also from the perspective of power**, and **discusses these in terms of strengths and weaknesses in relation to concrete examples**. Provides at least **two** relevant examples of when a combination of two or more methods would be useful.
	PRO1	Methods are described. Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are indicated.		Methods are described **and argued for.** Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are **comprehensively analysed, using at least one method. Synergies and conflicts are identified.**		Methods are described, argued for **and clearly related to one another.** Effects of the proposal on social and ecological sustainability are comprehensively analysed, **using at least two different methods.** Synergies and conflicts are identified, **and ways of dealing with conflicts are discussed.**
3 Identify main characteristics of different city districts and analyse these in relation to urban sustainable development;	SEM1	Identifies main characteristics of the area. Identifies at least four sustainability problems in the area.				
	PRO1	Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, based on readily available data. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is indicated.		Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, **also based on new data, generated either through own investigations or processing of data.** The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area **is clearly argued for.**		Identifies main characteristics and key sustainability problems of the area, also based on new data, generated either through own investigations or processing of data. The relevance of the proposal in relation to the area is clearly argued for **and nuanced in terms of the distribution of costs and benefits**.

4	Identify and characterise main actors of urban sustainable development;	SEM1	Proposal identifies main actors		
		PRO1	Proposal identifies main actors.		
5	Creatively explore and critically analyse how planning and design can contribute to urban sustainable development of a city such as Stockholm– in short and long time perspectives;	SEM1	Proposal addresses at least one of identified sustainability problem.		
		PRO1	The future narrative and design proposal are clearly related, with some mismatches. The proposal builds on reference-projects, but does not go beyond this to any extent.	The future narrative and the design proposal **clearly fit together like a whole**. The proposal builds on reference-projects, **and goes beyond these to some extent**.	The future narrative and the design proposal clearly fit together like a whole. **The future narrative includes at least two different writing styles, and the design proposal is provided in at least two different scales.** The proposal is well-researched and **clearly goes beyond** the reference-projects.
		TEN1	Describes key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can mitigate these. The discussion is to some extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature.	Describes key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can **work together to** mitigate these. **Clearly demonstrates awareness of context. The discussion is to a large extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature.**	Describes **and critically discusses** key issues for sustainable urban development. Provides relevant and concrete examples of how urban planning and design can work together to mitigate these, and **reflects on strengths and weaknesses**. Clearly demonstrates awareness of context. The discussion is to a large extent based on and makes reference to relevant literature, which exceeds the mandatory readings.
6	Present proposals and analyses as text, drawings and/or illustrations as well as orally.	PRO1	Report and poster are easy to read, without major flaws, and gives a clear account of the project.		