## School of Industrial Design, MFA Midpoint Review: Thesis Outcomes Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>DOES NOT Meet Midpoint Review Expectations</th>
<th>MEETS Midpoint Review Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Present an original thesis concept worthy of the MFA degree | • Concept taken or borrowed from someone else  
• Concept may start with an object or existing product  
• Unclear how idea could be expanded  
• Repeat topic or redesign | • Concept developed solely by the student  
• Concepts starts with an awareness or an observation of an opportunity  
• Has a story, intent, voice, insight, point of view and personal vision  
• May get into a new area in a known way, or a known area in a new way  
• May have some ambiguity in potential solutions | |
| Demonstrate the feasibility of their thesis project | • Product or potential product is not realistic  
• Project is only theoretical  
• Little or no consideration for manufacturing, engineering, distribution, production, marketing  
• Student shows uncertainty in how to proceed | • Presents an ID opportunity or contribution  
• If not buildable now, realistic expectation that it can be built in the defined future  
• Student knows what the next steps are and who they will work with to realize the project  
• Demonstrated ability to execute project  
• Show awareness of manufacturing, engineering, distribution, production, marketing  
• Defines a market (or reason why defining a market is not relevant | |
| Explain the relevance of their project to their professional goals | • Student can’t articulate professional vision or personal goals  
• Professional goals don’t connect with the project  
• Past projects don’t relate to thesis project  
• No connections between industry practice/knowledge and the project proposal | • Thesis has potential to demonstrate mastery in specific areas of IF which is aligned with student’s personal goals  
• Student confidently articulates professional goals.  
• May incorporate previous degree of expertise into proposal | |
| Clearly define the problem/opportunity, hypothesis, main objectives, and product requirements and/or conditions in their project brief | • Presents narrow view of issue, problem defined is very obvious  
• Opportunities are not a big enough “bite”  
• Unclear about role of ID in their project proposal  
• Cannot bridge research to opportunities  
• Problem statement & hypothesis are not aligned  
• Reader/listener left wondering what it all means | • POV demonstrates vision for future  
• Identifies tangible target market, creates new market or new experiences/services from research insights  
• Addresses secondary need – something not obvious at first glance  
• Hypothesis includes objective analysis of information  
• Research validates problem statement and conclusion is clearly linked to research insights  
• Has a strong argument validated with primary research | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>DOES NOT Meet Midpoint Review Expectations</th>
<th>MEETS Midpoint Review Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conduct adequate research and communicate findings using appropriate supporting materials | • Data is old, irrelevant or copied  
• Uses only one source or doesn’t seek out personal experiences & field research  
• “Research” is really only a personal point of view or input from friends  
• No analysis  
• Conclusion does not derive from objective research  
• Doesn’t bring personal POV to research  
• Student hasn’t extracted meaning from raw information/data | • Research creates new knowledge and tells us something we don’t already know  
• Demonstrates an understanding of what’s been done in the past, what exists now, and what can be done in the future  
• Includes evidence of observational research  
• Uses multiple sources and includes citations (footnotes, bibliography)  
• Creates infographics like 2x2’s and Venn diagrams  
• Includes all appropriate Institutional Review Board forms in journal.  
• Includes relevant statistics/provocative quotes  
• Creates generative tools for contexts & interviews |
| Produce work that demonstrates proficiency in branding, graphics, drawing, rendering, 3D modeling, and model making | • Presentation does not aesthetically coincide with journal.  
• Graphics do not communicate data clearly.  
• Drawing perspective is incorrect.  
• 3d models are geometric and form development is lacking.  
• Models lack craftsmanship. | • Presentation, journal, additional materials are cohesive.  
• Graphics are legible, colorful and engaging.  
• Drawings show nicely executed final drawings and quick iterations.  
• 3d model shows complex curves and indicates materials and processes  
• Models are executed well enough to be evaluated for form and function. |
| Give clear and concise professional presentations (verbal and visual) | • Poor spelling and grammar  
• Student lacks confidence and does not project voice.  
• Presentation exceeds 20 minutes.  
• Graphics are difficult to understand and branding does not visually align with journal. | • Well dressed and prompt.  
• Good narrative or story.  
• Confident and articulate.  
• Receptive to feedback and questions.  
• Documents feedback. |
| Accurately present their ideas in writing | • Poor spelling and grammar  
• Journal is not a detailed explanation of presentation.  
• Journal does not include entire scope of project (prep, research, design and implementation) | • Comprehensive  
• Balance of visuals and text  
• Journal includes the various iterative steps required for an innovative design solution. |