

### Assessment, what we look for:

- Red thread (logically structured project/report)
- Use of syllabus (and sources, and preferably in combination with sources and models you find yourself, but so that the topic is recognizable ...)
- ...including especially principles for value creation, applied in demonstrator/prototype, including using AI, cf. Rogers pp 69-17
- Proper understanding and use of models (according to Rogers and syllabus); e.g. that the competition model is at the right (high) level of abstraction/has a broad perspective, draws in all forms of offers that cover the same need ... and
- Generally, all over project and report quality; overall impression plus details e.g. do links to prototype work well etc.? (Bonus; if it has something about follow-up of the innovation/site, dashboard etc.).

In this, last formative feedback we focus on improvement potentials. That means that in general what we do not comment on, you can perceive as OK, as expected according to learning goals. This does not mean that you should not go through it all, at least once more, and revise to make sure the red thread and all over project and report quality is the best possible!

### Final report:

There will only be internal sensoring/grading this year ... (but right to complain, and get a new “blind” assessment, through exam office if one feels the assessment is not fair, even after grounding has been given. Beware that such complaint *may* move the grade both ways – or it can stay unchanged...). The way we use grading can be read as

OK, as expected according to learning goals = C (normally the median grade at university level). The most important things are in place.

Acceptable but with some weaknesses = D-E

Above the expected level: = B, A; ditto, but to a very high degree!

But see also the grading rules at UiA: [https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2005-06-22-833/KAPITTEL\\_3#%C2%A712c](https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2005-06-22-833/KAPITTEL_3#%C2%A712c)

### Trial report:

Common shortages that give room for improvements before final report (des 12<sup>th</sup>): For several reports ...:

- The reader has a hard time understanding the narrative, what is the report all about (e.g. digital platforms as a business model, exemplified by our project, that is ... (a couple of sentences!))
- Theory is rendered but not related to own projects. Give us a short flash of what you have used/ where – not on all design principles but the most important for your case
- These will both give a better float in the narrative and report!
- The competition picture (value trainlines) is too narrowly defined in many reports, only comprising concept very similar to one's own – Think about everything that satisfies the same type of needs with the end-customer, but perhaps in very different ways (different value-propositions), use drawings if that is easier than diagrams!
- Speaking of value propositions, ref. Rogers pp 69-71; It is a good idea to give us a table with the different categories as rows and applications (if any) in your concept (keywords, with longer explanations in the text)

Beware that all data/personas should be mockups/fictitious – have a disclaimer together with your links to prototypes etc.

## **Gruppe 2 GradeUp**

### To the report:

Common “red thread”:

Well-structured report. The topic is clear, and the order follows methodological requirements.

Syllabus use:

The group shows use of several central models, but parts of the syllabus are somewhat linked overall. The presentation could have been more connected to Rogers' strategy domains.

Value creation and AI:

Used as a matching tool, but not very concrete in the prototype. The value creation model could have been more explicitly linked to digital network effects.

Model use:

The competition perspective seems narrow based on the excerpts, with room for more asymmetric understanding of competition (YouTube study channels, Discord, AI tutors). The competition model could have included more asymmetric actors.

Overall impression:

The report is good and with well employed models. It is a bit too long (31 pages not counting preface and references/enclosures) – consider revising and shortening the longest text blocks! The report lacks some depth in AI and value creation. AI can probably be applied give much support to both learners and tutors, (ref. platform delivered values) this is something that will probably develop over time ...

Let's then look at the prototype website. It looks nice but the value proposition for students and call for action might be clearer! Some “top-of-mind” suggestive ideas to strengthen the value proposition and give it some “punch”;

E.g.:

Headline:

“Boost Your Grade. Book a Tutor Who Just Took Your Course.”

Subheadline:

“On-demand peer tutoring by verified students. Choose your subject, pick your time, get the help you need — all with the flexibility your schedule demands.”

Here are some ideas based on best practices for value propositions:

- Emphasize *what's in it for the student* (pain relief + gain) — e.g., “get unstuck”, “boost grades”, “study smarter”.
- Use language that resonates with students (relatable, informal, energetic).
- Highlight what differentiates/why choose your platform vs other tutoring options.
- Make the benefit concrete (e.g., faster results, flexible schedule, peer tutors who just passed the course).
- Possibly include a social proof or metric (“95% of students improve their grade”, “book in under 60 seconds”).
- Keep it concise and front-and-center so someone reads it in around 7 seconds.

Other potential ways to target students (both university & upper-secondary) who want help, but also want flexibility and relatable tutors (do not do all, but here are some options):

Option A (Benefit-focused):

“Struggling with an exam tomorrow? Get help from peer tutors who just passed that course. Book instantly, study smarter, boost your grades.”

Option B (Outcome + Differentiator):

“Prepped by someone who knows your syllabus. Instant bookings. Real results. Join the GradeUP community of students getting better grades together.”

Option C (Casual & Relatable):

“Stop googling endless tutorials. Grab a tutor who’s been there, done that. Flexible, friendly, results driven. GradeUP makes it easy.”

Or something else ... (use your own wording you can probably do better than our proposals

