

MDPhar Presentation Rubric - Literature Review Presentation

Conditional items*

I. Style requirements	The presenting student is clearly visible on video and is audible via their microphone	Go / No Go
II. File submission	The presentation (link to Google Slides or PowerPoint file) is turned in prior to the presentation	Go / No Go
III. Assessment	The final grade must be a 5.5 or higher and a maximum of 1 failing grade in one category is allowed.	Go / No Go

Criterion	Unsatisfactory (1, 3 or 5)	Satisfactory (6 or 7)	Good (7.5 or 8.5)	Excellent (9 of 10)
Content (30%)	Context, concepts, or reasoning are <i>hardly</i> explained or substantiated. Or: <i>no</i> clear and critical review of the literature review is provided	Context, concepts, and reasoning are <i>reasonably</i> explained and substantiated (incl. references) <i>A reasonable</i> overview of the literature review is presented, but it could be more critical	Context, concepts, and reasoning are <i>mostly</i> well explained and substantiated (incl. references) <i>A mostly</i> clear and critical review of the literature review and key aspects is presented	Context, concepts, and reasoning are <i>well</i> explained and substantiated (incl. references) <i>A clear</i> and <i>critical</i> review of the literature review and key aspects is presented
Structure and cohesion (25%)	The structure of the presentation and connection between parts are unclear and illogical or the story is <i>very hard</i> to follow	The structure of the presentation and connection between parts are <i>reasonably</i> clear and logical and the narrative is <i>reasonably</i> easy to follow	The structure of the presentation and connection between parts are <i>predominantly</i> clear, logical and the narrative is <i>predominantly</i> easy to follow	The structure of the presentation and connection between parts are <i>clear</i> , <i>logical</i> and the story is <i>easy</i> to follow
Design & data presentation (25%)	The slides are <i>hardly</i> clear or <i>do not</i> support the story or there is <i>hardly any</i> use of visual aids or data are <i>not</i> well presented	The slides are <i>reasonably</i> clear and support the story with <i>reasonable</i> use of visual aids and <i>reasonably</i> clear presentation of data	The slides are <i>mostly</i> organized and support the story with <i>mostly</i> good use of visual aids and <i>mostly</i> clear presentation of data	The slides are <i>organized</i> and support the story with <i>good</i> use of visual aids and <i>clear</i> presentation of data
Presentation duration (5%)	The presentation is much shorter or longer than the stated goal (>2 min.)	The presentation duration is up to 2 min shorter or longer than the stated goal	The presentation duration is up to 1 min shorter or longer than the stated goal	The presentation duration is equal to the stated goal
Discussion (15%)	Questions are <i>barely</i> answered or there is a <i>disproportionate</i> contribution of group members to the discussion	Questions are answered <i>reasonably</i> well and there is a <i>reasonably</i> proportionate contribution of group members to the discussion	Questions are answered <i>knowledgeably</i> and there is a <i>proportionate</i> contribution of group members to the discussion. Group members make a visible effort to keep the discussion going.	See good. <i>Good</i> connections are made with other relevant sources of information

Method for overall assessment

The average final grade of the presentation is determined from the grades on the above assessment criteria (rubrics) taking into account the indicated weighting factors.

* All the conditional items must be met, otherwise your presentation cannot be graded (items I and II), or will be graded with a failing grade (item III)

Remark related to publication

The rubrics presented here are a translation of the original Dutch version that was used in the MDPhar course.

MDPhar Presentation Rubric - Video pitch

Conditional items*

I. Style requirements	The video meets the technical requirements from the assignment; e.g., the quality of the recording is such that facial expressions and hand gestures are clearly visible and the student can be clearly understood.	Go / No Go
II. Duration	The total duration of the video pitch is between 3:00 and 4:00 (min:sec)	Go / No Go
III. Transcript	A transcript (text) of the video pitch is present, which contains the personal learning goal and references. No plagiarism has been committed.	Go / No Go
IV. Video Format	The video file format is according to the specifications and the file is uploaded in duplicate to FeedbackFruits for teacher feedback and peer review	Go / No Go
V. Assessment	The weighted final grade must be a 5.5 or higher and only a maximum of 1 assessment criterion may be scored as unsatisfactory.	Go / No Go

Criterion	Unsatisfactory (1, 3 or 5)	Satisfactory (6 or 7)	Good (7.5 or 8.5)	Excellent (9 of 10)
Message & alignment with target audience (20%)	The audience is <i>hardly being</i> engaged in the story and/or the message is <i>not</i> tailored to the target audience	The audience is <i>reasonably being</i> engaged into the story and the message is <i>reasonably</i> tailored to the target audience	The audience is <i>well</i> being engaged in the story and the message is <i>primarily</i> tailored to the target audience	The audience is <i>well</i> being engaged in the story in a <i>creative</i> way and the message is <i>well</i> tailored to the target audience
Argumentation (20%)	The standpoint is <i>unclear</i> or not scientifically substantiated (sources) or the case is only presented from one side	The standpoint is <i>reasonably</i> clear and scientifically substantiated (with sources), and the case is presented <i>somewhat</i> from multiple angles	The standpoint is <i>mostly</i> clear and scientifically substantiated (with sources) and the case is <i>largely</i> presented from multiple angles.	The standpoint is <i>clear</i> and scientifically substantiated (with sources) and the case is presented from <i>multiple</i> angles.
Voice (20%)	Speaks (much) too softly, too fast/slowly, or very monotonously	<i>Is reasonably</i> audible, has <i>reasonable</i> pace and intonation	<i>Is predominantly</i> audible, has a <i>predominantly</i> good pace and good intonation	<i>Is well</i> audible, has <i>good</i> pace and intonation
Language (20%)	There is <i>mostly</i> unprofessional or unscientific language or uses frequent filler words	There is <i>reasonable</i> professional language, but it is still occasionally a bit unscientific with possibly still using filler words	There is <i>predominantly</i> professional and scientific language, with only an occasional filler word	There is <i>professional</i> and <i>scientific</i> language and no distracting filler words
Nonverbal communication (20%)	<i>Incorrect</i> or <i>distracting</i> use of nonverbal communication (hand gestures, facial expressions, camera contact, reading aloud) or has an unprofessional demeanor	Makes <i>reasonable</i> use of supportive nonverbal communication (such as hand gestures, facial expressions and contact with the camera) to support the story and draw the audience into the narrative	Makes <i>predominantly</i> good use of supporting nonverbal communication (such as hand gestures, facial expressions and contact with the camera) to support the story and draw the audience into the narrative	Makes <i>good</i> use of supporting nonverbal communication (such as hand gestures, facial expressions and contact with the camera) to support the story and draw the audience into the narrative

Method of overall assessment

The average final grade of the video pitch is determined using the partial grades on the above assessment criteria (rubrics) taking into account all the weighting factors.

* All the conditional items must be met, otherwise your video pitch will not be graded (items I-IV), or will be graded with a failing grade (item V)

Remark related to publication:

The rubrics presented here are a translation of the original Dutch version that was used in the MDPhar course.

MDPhar Reflection Rubric – Reflection Assignments

Conditional item

Submit	A serious attempt must be turned in for each of the 5 reflection assignments, otherwise the assignment will be graded with an NVD. If one or more assignments are assessed with a fail, this results in a fail for the total of all reflection assignments. In that case it is not possible to pass the course.	Go / No Go
---------------	---	------------

Assessment of individual assignment

Unsatisfactory (0 points)	Moderate (1 point)	Satisfactory (2 points)	Good (3 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reflection cycle has not been completed. • Something has been handed in, but no concrete answers are given to the questions raised. • Or: one or more answer fields is/are left blank. • The personal learning goal was not described according to SMART rules (see reflection assignment 1 or 2). • Or: there is no concrete review of the learning experience and learning goal. • Either video or (peer) feedback are not used for reflection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reflection cycle is not fully completed despite all fields being filled in. • There is an occasional attempt to answer a question, but answers are overall <i>mostly</i> superficial and not concrete. • The learning goal is described but the action plan is missing or unclear. • There is some “looking back”, but no related to the experience and the learning goal. • Videos and/or feedback are hardly used in reflection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reflection cycle is completed to some extent. • All the questions were answered <i>somewhat</i> concretely and reflected <i>relatively</i> seriously. • The learning goal is formulated according to SMART rules (see reflection assignment 1-2) including a concrete action plan. • While looking back, a link is made to the personal learning goal. • Videos and/or (peer) feedback are used <i>somewhat</i> during reflection. • Here and there things are still somewhat <i>one-sidedly</i> highlighted (e.g., only positive or negative). • Links are made between the various reflection assignments that reflect personal learning progress and the learning goal is adjusted if needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All questions were <i>mostly</i> answered in a concrete manner and indicate <i>serious</i> reflection. • There is/are realistic, challenging personal SMART learning goals formulated with a concrete action plan. • It describes what was learned from looking back and links are made to the experience and personal learning goal. • The reflection addresses experience, actions taken, feedback received, videos, what is already going well but also what is still difficult and what the student has learned. • Personal learning goals are evaluated for the future and a new learning goal, including an action plan, are formulated.

Method of overall assessment

Each reflection assignment will be graded using the rubric above. You can earn 0, 1, 2 or 3 points per assignment. So, in total there are 5x3=15 points to be earned. Summing up the points for the various reflection assignments and then dividing by 1.5 results in your grade for the reflection part of the course (see also the conversion table on the next page). At least 9 points are needed in total to pass the reflection part.

Remark related to publication

The rubrics presented here is a translation of the original Dutch version that was used in the MDPhar course.

MDPhar Academic Writing Rubric - Literature Review

Conditional items*

I. Spelling	No or fewer than 3 spelling and/or grammatical errors are present per page	Go / No Go
II. Format Requirements	All components and appendices are present, and the report abides to the word limit requirements	Go / No Go
III. References	The bibliography is consistent and contains the correct information per reference type (see ACS guidelines in the manual)	Go / No Go
IV. Plagiarism	There is no plagiarism (see guidelines in assignment)	Go / No Go
V. Assessment	A maximum of two subcategories are scored as inadequate, and the total weighted average grade is 5.5 or higher	Go / No Go
VI. Feedback	Accountability for processing (peer) feedback is present and clearly articulated	Go / No Go

	Subcategory	Unsatisfactory(1,3,5)	Satisfactory (6 or 7)	Good (7.5 or 8.5)	Excellent (9 of 10)
Content, structure and argumentation	1. Summary (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several components are of insufficient quality or absent and are barely connected to each other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summary contains <i>most</i> items from the report which are <i>somewhat</i> interconnected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summary contains the <i>main</i> items from the report and is written according to the "hourglass model" and the sections flow together <i>predominantly</i> smoothly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" The summary is stimulating and invites to further reading
	2. Introduction (7,5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some components are missing or <i>barely</i> introduced Or is <i>not</i> written in funnel form The purpose of the text is missing or unclearly articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains most components that are <i>reasonably</i> introduced Is written <i>somewhat</i> in funnel form (see checklist) The purpose of the text is <i>somewhat</i> clearly articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction contains all the major components that are <i>mostly</i> well introduced The introduction is <i>written</i> in funnel form The purpose of the text is <i>clearly</i> articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" All parts are <i>well</i> introduced
	3. Content (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides <i>barely any</i> (correct) comparisons between drugs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides <i>reasonably</i> substantively correct comparisons between drugs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides predominantly substantively correct comparisons between drugs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" Provides substantively <i>accurate, current, and critical</i> comparisons between drugs on all relevant components
	4. Discussion (7,5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is <i>missing</i> or not well worded The funnel shape is <i>barely</i> present Many parts are missing or <i>barely</i> fitting in with the rest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains a <i>reasonably</i> worded conclusion The inverted funnel shape is present, but could be more evident The discussion contains <i>many</i> important parts, <i>fairly</i> consistent with the rest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion includes a well-articulated conclusion The discussion is written in reverse funnel form The discussion contains <i>most</i> of the <i>important</i> parts that are <i>mostly</i> consistent with the rest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" The discussion is a <i>critical</i> review and provides relevant next steps
	5. Reasoning (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoning is <i>unclear</i> or not scientifically reasoned Claims and numbers are <i>barely</i> substantiated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoning is <i>reasonably</i> clear and scientifically reasoned Claims and numbers are <i>reasonably</i> substantiated and put into context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoning is <i>mostly</i> clear and scientifically reasoned Claims and numbers are <i>mostly</i> substantiated and put into context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoning is clear and scientifically reasoned Claims and numbers are <i>substantiated</i> and put in context

Coherence	6. Coherence within text, paragraphs, and sentences (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole report has an <i>illogical</i> order or is <i>unstructured</i> The report contains <i>unnecessary</i> repetitions Each part is <i>barely</i> connected to the rest The flow of sentences is <i>insufficient</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole report has a <i>reasonably</i> logical order, but this can be improved The report still contains unnecessary repetition <i>at times</i> Each part is <i>reasonably</i> connected to the rest The flow of sentences is <i>reasonable</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole report is <i>predominantly</i> in a logical order, both at the text and paragraph level, making the report a clear whole The report contains <i>hardly any</i> unnecessary repetitions Each section is <i>predominantly</i> connected to the rest through signaling words, reference words and connecting sentences The flow of sentences is <i>mostly</i> good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole report is in a <i>logical</i> order and the report is pleasant to read The report contains <i>no</i> unnecessary repetitions Each component is <i>correctly</i> connected to the rest The flow of sentences is good, making the report pleasant to read
Language	7. Dutch language (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mainly</i> complicated or inaccessible writing style <i>Mainly</i> incorrect translations (anglicisms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Reasonably</i> concise and accessible writing style <i>Reasonably</i> correct translations (few anglicisms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mainly</i> concise and accessible writing style Correct translations (no anglicisms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" Appealing writing style; invites to further reading
	8. Scientific language (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language <i>does not</i> match the target audience and is <i>hardly</i> scientific (mostly contains colloquialisms or is old-fashioned) <i>Mainly</i> passive and inaccessible writing style <i>Mainly</i> inconsistent use of verb tenses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language fits the target audience <i>reasonably</i> well and is <i>reasonably</i> scientific <i>Reasonably</i> active and accessible writing style Verb tenses are used <i>fairly</i> consistently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of language matches the target audience and is <i>predominantly</i> scientific (modern, objective and without colloquialisms) <i>Mainly</i> active and accessible writing style Verb tenses are <i>predominantly</i> used consistently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" The language is scientific
References	9. Reference use (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Little</i> use of primary and secondary scientific literature Or references are <i>usually</i> not in the right place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Reasonable</i> use of primary and secondary scientific literature References are <i>fairly</i> well placed in the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Predominantly</i> primary and secondary scientific literature is used References are <i>mostly</i> in the right place in the text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" <i>Mainly</i> relevant and primary scientific literature is used
Layout	10. Layout text (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more criteria are of insufficient quality, resulting in unclear formatting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Reasonably</i> clear formatting of paragraphs Paragraphs are <i>reasonably</i> indicated Paragraphs have <i>reasonable</i> titles, but <i>sometimes</i> do not cover the load An appropriate layout was used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear formatting of paragraphs (visibility) Paragraphs are mostly well labeled Each paragraph has a <i>clear</i> title that covers the content of the paragraphs. Appropriate layout (such as cover page) was used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See "good" Paragraphs are <i>properly</i> labeled An appealing layout has been used

	11. Figures and tables (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Barely</i> correct presentation or description of figures and tables • Or the report is <i>barely</i> visually supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reasonably</i> correct presentation and description of figures and tables, including references • The report is <i>reasonably</i> visually supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Correct</i> presentation and <i>mostly</i> clear description of figures and tables with <i>correct</i> references • The report is <i>predominantly</i> visually supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clear</i> description of figures/tables with <i>correct</i> references • The report is <i>well</i> supported visually
--	------------------------------------	--	--	---	---

Remark related to publication

The rubrics presented here are a translation of the original Dutch version that was used in the MDPhar course.

MDPhar Teamwork Competency Framework (version 2021)

Competence	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced	Expert
Individual competence: -Motivation -Professional functioning -Decisiveness and Perseverance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not know what motivates me; OR I do not know what challenge/task/appointment I find interesting • I can hardly function as an independent professional (e.g. I hardly take initiative in picking up new tasks and responsibilities, etc.) • I am decisive; BUT I don't implement decisions OR I have difficulty with setbacks in completing a task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I somewhat know what motivates me; OR I somewhat know what challenge/task/appointment I find interesting • I can work somewhat as a professional with support (e.g., reminders are sometimes needed to complete tasks, prioritize regarding deadlines, inform of stakeholders & progress, etc.) • I am decisive AND work to complete a task; I have difficulty with setbacks in completing a task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I clearly know what motivates me; AND I clearly know what challenge/task/appointment I find interesting • I can function largely as an independent professional (e.g., proactively engaged; reasonably able to prioritize); AND I request support with targeted questions (e.g., about task execution, etc.) • I am decisive AND I work to complete a task; AND I can persevere in completing a task despite some setbacks (e.g., by working with others to come up with alternative approaches) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I clearly know what motivates me; AND I clearly know what challenge/task/appointment I find interesting; AND I know how to inspire others with my enthusiasm • I can function largely as an independent professional (e.g., proactively engaged; able to prioritize well); AND I ask for and offer targeted support to others (e.g., about performing tasks, about deadlines, informing stakeholders & progress, etc.) • I am decisive AND I work to complete a task; AND I can persevere in completing a task despite multiple setbacks (e.g., coming up with alternative approaches on my own); AND I learn from experiences to avoid setbacks

Competence	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced	Expert
<p>Group Competence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect - Dealing with emotions & behavior - Giving & receiving feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have difficulty showing respect and am hardly open to people different from myself; OR I have difficulty communicating with people from different backgrounds (e.g. personality, interaction style, occupation, culture) • I have difficulty understanding others' emotions and behavior; OR I have difficulty understanding that emotions can play a role in group interaction • I have difficulty giving constructive feedback (e.g., concrete, actionable); OR I have difficulty reflecting on feedback from the group or personal experiences (e.g. characterized by barely trying to understand, analyze and give meaning to feedback) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I respect others by communicating openly with people of similar backgrounds (e.g. personality, interaction style, occupation, culture) • I understand that emotions and behaviors play a role when interacting with others • I can provide somewhat constructive feedback (e.g., concrete, actionable); And I can reflect somewhat on feedback from the group or personal experiences (e.g., characterized by somewhat trying to understand, analyze and make meaning of feedback) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am aware of specific social and contextual differences and respect others by communicating openly with people from similar backgrounds (e.g. personality, interaction style, occupation, culture) • I understand that emotions and behavior play a role in group interaction; AND I can tolerate negative emotions and non-assertive behavior for a short period of time • I can provide clear constructive feedback (e.g., concrete, actionable); AND I can reflect on feedback from the group or personal experiences in a structured way (e.g., characterized by somewhat trying to understand, analyze and make meaning of feedback); BUT I am struggling to formulate the next step 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am aware of specific social and contextual differences and respect others by communicating openly with people from different backgrounds (e.g. personality, interaction style, occupation, culture) • I understand that emotions and behaviors play a role in group interaction; AND can tolerate negative emotions and non-assertive behaviors so that I can discuss them (e.g., 1-on-1) and offer suggestions for professionalization • I can provide clear constructive feedback (e.g., concrete, actionable); AND I can thoroughly and structurally reflect on feedback and experiences (through understanding, analysis, and meaning); AND formulate conscious choices and actively implement those

Competence	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced	Expert
<p>Managing group processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roles - Leadership and switching - Decision-making type and negotiation during phases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I cannot adopt a different (professional / Belbin) role in a collaboration even if the group situation demands it • I never take a leadership role AND do not give direction to group activities • I barely participate in the decision-making process (e.g., by asking questions, sharing information) despite tasks and responsibilities potentially being important during negotiations about the follow-up process (e.g., about tasks, points of view or strategies or process) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am willing to experiment with a different professional (Belbin) role for the benefit of the group • I can assume a leadership role BUT I hardly take into account professionals in the group (e.g. autocratic or authoritarian); AND I have difficulty switching between applicable styles • I participate in the decision-making process (e.g. by asking questions, sharing findings & information); OR I can organize the clear decision-making process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can vary between professional (Belbin) roles for the benefit of the group • I can adopt a leadership role that reasonably considers professionals in the group (e.g., serving or coaching) BUT I have difficulty switching between applicable styles despite different individual needs • I participate in the decision-making process (e.g., by asking questions, sharing findings & information); AND I can simultaneously organize the decision-making process clearly; AND I can somewhat apply principles and techniques for negotiation when working out the follow-up process (e.g., about tasks, points of view or strategies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can vary between professional (Belbin) roles for the benefit of the group; AND I can align the professional roles of team members (e.g., by group contract) so that combined competencies are utilized • I can assume a leadership role that takes well into account professionals in the group (e.g., serving or coaching); AND I can switch well between applicable styles when I see a need for it in individuals • I participate in the decision-making process (e.g., by asking questions, sharing findings & information); AND I can clearly organize the decision-making process; AND I can properly apply principles and techniques for negotiation when working out the follow-up process (e.g., about tasks, points of view or strategies)

Competence	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced	Expert
<p>Creation and execution of planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goals, priorities, and adaptation - Views on planning & progress - Dealing with uncertainty and change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have difficulty formulating goals and priorities • I have no overview of the progress of myself or the team • I do not create a planning; OR my intention is a perfect and tight planning; AND I never adjust my schedule despite the situation demanding a change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can formulate both personal and team goals and priorities. • I have an overview of my own progress; AND sporadic overview of team progress (e.g., through team meetings) • I know that a planning is functional (giving an overview of goals, tasks, responsibilities, etc); AND I know that there is some uncertainty in planning before beginning implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can formulate both personal and team goals and priorities; AND I can align them well with each other • I have an overview of my own progress; AND I can track the team's progress for a simple project (e.g., by creating a simple Gantt Chart) • I know that a planning is functional (giving an overview of goals, tasks, responsibilities, etc); AND I know that there is some uncertainty in the planning before beginning implementation; AND I adjust the schedule if the situation requires a change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can formulate personal and team goals and priorities; AND I can align them well; AND I can adopt an adaptive strategy in response to progress and change • I have an overview of my own progress; AND I can track the team's progress for a complex project (e.g., by creating a comprehensive Gantt Chart that combines priorities with a (time) deadline and division of labor) • I know that planning is functional (giving an overview of goals, tasks, responsibilities, etc); AND I know that there is some uncertainty in the schedule beforehand with the implementation to begin; AND I adjust the planning if the situation calls for a change; AND I reflect on the causes in order to make a better planning for a new project

Competence	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced	Expert
Communicating: - Listening - Presenting - Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have difficulty listening to others (e.g., in context of poster, presentation, interviews, group process) • I have difficulty persuading the audience (e.g., because the message in presentation or poster is not thought through); OR the presentation behavior is not aligned with the message • I have difficulty independently shaping the structure, visualization, and argument structure of a written text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I sometimes listen (e.g., in context of poster, presentation, interviews, group process); BUT my responses can be even more responsive to my conversational partner's input by using conversational techniques • I can somewhat persuade my audience (e.g., because the structure in presentation or poster is reasonably understandable); AND presentation behavior is somewhat aligned • I have basic writing knowledge and experience, BUT I need support for shaping structure, visualization, and argument building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I listen well (e.g., in context of poster, presentation, interviews, group process); AND my responses reasonably connect with conversation partners (e.g., using conversational techniques to some extent) • I can persuade the audience clearly (e.g., because almost no explanation of the presentation or poster is needed); AND I have reasonably tailored my presentation behavior to the message • I have extensive knowledge and experience in writing; AND I can independently shape structure, visualization, and argument construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I listen well (e.g., in context of poster, presentation, interviews, group process); AND my responses connect well with conversation partners; AND I make good use of both verbal and non-verbal techniques (e.g., because there is (almost) tangible connection and trust) • Can persuade the audience clearly (e.g., because almost no explanation of the presentation or poster is needed); AND I have tailored my presentation behavior well to the message; AND know how to enthuse the audience • I have extensive knowledge and experience in writing; AND I can independently design structure, visualization, and argument construction; AND I can support others in doing so

Remarks

The Framework is based on European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework¹

The framework presented here is a translation of the original Dutch version that was used in the MDPhar course.

¹ European Commission. (2018). *EntreComp: The European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.2767/88978>