



TECH 931 Energy Systems in the Developing World

Amy Banzaert

This file contains material adapted from MIT course SP.775 *D-Lab Energy*. It may contain references to the MIT version of the course that will need to be removed or revised before use in other contexts. For a list of frequently-occurring references, or more information about this document, please consult the SUTD Project Intranet at <http://web.mit.edu/sutd>

This file and its contents are provided under license from MIT and its faculty, under the terms of the MIT-SUTD Collaboration. Any derivative use of this material, including excerpts, remixing, and adaptations, should cite this source as follows:

Banzaert, Amy. Course materials for TECH 931, Energy Systems in the Developing World. MIT-SUTD Collaboration, 2011.

D-Lab: *ENERGY*

Overall Grade	GRADE/100
Timeliness	TIME/10
• exactly on time or just a bit short	9-10
• somewhat short or long	6-8
• excessively short or long	0-5
Preparation	PREP/15
• clearly well-prepared	15
• a bit rough	10-14
• very unprepared and disorganized	0-10
Looks-Like Prototype	LOOKS/20
• outstanding: aesthetically pleasing, form follows function	19-20
• good: decent aesthetics with some room for improvement	16-18
• weak: minimal aesthetics	10-15
• non-existent	0
Works-Like Prototype	WORKS/20
• outstanding: function matches design specifications extremely well and operates well	19-20
• good: decent function with some room for improvement	16-18
• weak: works sort-of	10-15
• does not function or non-existent	0
Presentation	PRES/25
• outstanding: clear explanation of project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps	24-25
• good: decent explanation of most of the following: project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps	20-23
• weak: missing key presentation parts or very unclear	0-19
Questions	QUES/10
• outstanding: responded to questions thoughtfully and clearly	9-10
• good: responded to questions relatively thoughtfully and clearly	7-8
• weak: responded to questions defensively or without thought	0-6

Overall Grade	GRADE/100
Timeliness	TIME/10
• exactly on time or just a bit short	9-10
• somewhat short or long	6-8
• excessively short or long	0-5
Preparation	PREP/10
• clearly well-prepared	9-10
• a bit rough	6-8
• very unprepared and disorganized	0-5
Prototype	LOOKS/25
• outstanding: aesthetically pleasing, form follows function, function matches design specifications extremely well and operates well	24-25
• good: decent aesthetics and function with some room for improvement	20-23
• weak: minimal aesthetics and minimal function	0-19
Presentation	PRES/25
• outstanding: clear explanation of project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps	24-25
• good: decent explanation of most of the following: project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps	20-23
• weak: missing key presentation parts or very unclear	0-19
Questions	QUES/10
• outstanding: responded to questions thoughtfully and clearly	9-10
• good: responded to questions relatively thoughtfully and clearly	7-8
• weak: responded to questions defensively or without thought	0-6
Poster	POS/10
• outstanding: clear overview of project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps; well laid out; good use of photos, text, and white space	9-10
• good: decent overview of project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps; use of photos, text, and white space	7-8
• weak: unclear project motivation and community partner needs, current implementation, next steps; poorly laid out; limited use of photos, text, and white space	0-6
1-minute presentation	MIN/10
• outstanding: engaging, compelling, clear project overview, well-rehearsed	9-10
• good: somewhat engaging, compelling, project overview, rehearsed	7-8
• weak: not engaging, unclear project overview, not rehearsed	0-6

Overall Grade	GRADE/100
Abstract	TIME/10
• outstanding summary, representative photo included	9-10
• good summary, representative photo included	7-8
• weak summary, no photo	1-6
• nonexistent	0
Problem Statement	PREP/10
• very clear problem statement, well-defined, includes community partner details	9-10
• somewhat clear problem statement, includes community partner details	7-8
• weak problem statement, minimal community partner details	1-6
• nonexistent	0
Design Specifications	LOOKS/10
• outstanding: appropriate specs that are well-defined and matched to community needs	9-10
• good: decent specs that are pretty well-defined and somewhat matched to community needs	7-8
• weak: poor specs that are poorly defined and poorly matched to community needs	1-6
• nonexistent	0
Design Concepts & Selection Process	PRES/10
• outstanding: range of concepts presented, clear explanation of concepts, and clear, sensible selection process	9-10
• good: a reasonable set of concepts presented, decent explanation concepts, and somewhat sensible selection process	7-8
• weak: few concepts presented, unclear explanation, weak selection process	1-6
• nonexistent	0
Detailed Design Description	QUES/15
• outstanding: design well-described, design decisions clear, excellent pictures and drawings, clear and appropriate calculations, excellent instructions	14-15
• good: design described, design decisions relatively clear, pictures and drawings, calculations, decent instructions	12-13
• weak: design poorly described, design decisions unclear, weak pictures and drawings, weak calculations, weak instructions	10-11
• nonexistent	0-9
Experiments & Results	POS/10
• outstanding: clear explanation of experimental methodologies and results; experiments were ideal for the design process open questions	9-10

• good: explanation of experimental methodologies and results; experiments were appropriate for the design process open questions	7-8
• outstanding: weak explanation of experimental methodologies and results; experiments were not appropriate for the design process open questions	1-6
• nonexistent	0
Discussion of Design Match to Specifications	MIN/10
• outstanding: clear link from design to specs, shortfalls well-identified	9-10
• good: link from design to specs, shortfalls identified	7-8
• weak: limited link from design to specs, shortfalls not identified	1-6
• nonexistent	0
Community Partner Receipt and Follow-Up Discussion	MIN/15
• outstanding: strong discussion of how design has been received by community partner, clear follow-up needs and associated plan	14-15
• good: good discussion of how design has been received by community partner, follow-up needs and associated plan included	12-13
• weak: unclear discussion of how design has been received by community partner, follow-up needs and associated plan unclear or limited	10-11
• nonexistent	0-9
Writing Practices	MIN/10
• outstanding: cohesive and clear document, well-edited, sources cited properly	9-10
• good: cohesive document, editing evident, sources cited	7-8
• weak: un-cohesive document, editing poor, some sources not cited	0-6

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

EC.711 D-Lab: Energy
Spring 2011

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.