

# Final Assessment Form | MSc Thesis Project | CoSEM | EPA | MOT

Nominal graduation project with Start, Kick-Off Meeting, Green Light meeting and Defence

Project weeks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
events	S			KO													GL				D

For more information please check **step 4: Graduation** on the [TPM Graduation Portal](#)

Student information	
Student name	
Student number	
Study programme	<input type="checkbox"/> CoSEM <input type="checkbox"/> EPA <input type="checkbox"/> MOT
HPM	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

Composition of the graduation committee ( <a href="#">more information</a> )	
Chair (=authorised signatory)	Section:
First supervisor	Section:
Second supervisor	Section:
Advisor (optional)	
External supervisor (optional advisor)	
External supervisor (optional advisor)	

Plagiarism scan and thesis title	
<input type="checkbox"/> Scanned for plagiarism	Explanation 'similarity' scan (Ouriginal/ Turnitin):
Thesis Title:	

Marking and declaration by authorised signatory (=chair)		
Course code:		
Final Grade:		
<b>Defence date:</b> <i>Note: This date must match the defence date on the Green Light form: this date is indicated on the diploma.</i>		
Only in case of <b>cum laude diploma</b> : <input type="checkbox"/> Cum laude diploma has been awarded (please tick if applicable). Herewith the authorised signatory declares that the final grade is at least 8,5. <i>Note: please ensure the diploma that has not been awarded to the student will be returned to the Servicepoint TPM.</i>		
Name authorised signatory:	Date of signature:	Signature authorised signatory:

- To be sent by the authorized signatory to the Study Programme Administration ([SPA-TBM@tudelft.nl](mailto:SPA-TBM@tudelft.nl)) immediately after the graduation presentation.
- Only complete forms will be processed.

## Assessment MSc thesis

Student name:

Student number:

**! Please use the 'MSc Thesis Assessment Guide TPM' and circle the applicable cells within the diagram**  
**! Do not only refer to the comments on the Green Light form. Please reflect on those comments.**

### A. Research quality

### B. Research skills

### C. Reporting quality

### D. Quality of oral defense

### Additional comments that support the final grade

### General Criteria for graduation at CoSEM, EPA and MOT

- the work contains an analytical component
- the work is multidisciplinary in nature
- the work focusses on a technical domain or application

### Criteria for graduation at CoSEM

The aim of CoSEM master thesis projects is to design solutions for large and complex contemporary socio-technical problems. This requires the consideration of technical, institutional, economic and social knowledge.

CoSEM students employ methods, tools and techniques for creatively designing and assessing the impact of technical solutions in complex socio-technical systems which contain both effective (process) management strategies and system engineering approaches to deal with technological complexity and the management of stakeholders with widely diverging interests. CoSEM students have chosen a technological domain which is clearly visible in their thesis. Thesis projects take both public and business values into account and look at the physical system as well as the actor network, confronting not only technical challenges, but also management and ethical choices.

For CoSEM the following criteria would be considered to indicate a 'typical' CoSEM thesis:

- the work has clear design and/or engineering components
- the design has a clear technology component and technical issues are addressed
- both process management strategies and system engineering approaches are addressed
- complex design/engineering issues are dealt with in a systematic and creative way
- CoSEM methods, tools and techniques for creatively designing and assessing the impact of technical solutions in organisations are used
- the subject covers values originating from both the public and private domains

### Criteria for graduation at EPA

The work reports on the quality of decision-making regarding grand societal challenges, while taking into account the socio-economic and/or political environment in which they are embedded.

For EPA the following criteria would be considered to indicate a 'typical' EPA thesis:

- the work is analytical in character,
- the work exhibits both a systems and a multi-actor perspective,
- EPA methods and techniques for problem analysis and exploration are used systematically and (conceptual) modeling and/or simulation techniques have been employed,
- the subject is related to Grand Challenges, aims to inform decision-makers, and is relevant in the public (policy) domain or on the interface between public and private domains.

### Criteria for graduation at MOT

Management of Technology graduates learn to explore and understand how firms can use technology to design and develop products and services that contribute to improving outcomes, such as customer satisfaction, corporate productivity, profitability and competitiveness.

For MoT the following criteria would be considered to indicate a 'typical' MoT thesis:

- the work reports on a scientific study in a technological context (e.g. technology and strategy, managing knowledge processes, research & product development management, innovation processes, entrepreneurship)
- the work shows an understanding of technology as a corporate resource or is done from a corporate perspective
- students use scientific methods and techniques to analyze a problem as put forward in the MOT curriculum

# MSc Thesis Assessment Guide TPM

version: September 2018

Student name:	Student number:
---------------	-----------------

**Final Assessment:** please use this guide when grading a TPM Master Thesis in order to gain a clear understanding of the assessment.

The applicable criteria can be marked digitally.

Submitting this guide is required.

Grading									
Assessment criteria	Indicative %	Sub criteria							
			Unsatisfactory	5 Nearly satisfactory	6 Satisfactory	7 More than satisfactory	8 Good	9 Very good	10 Excellent
<b>A. Research quality</b>	70%	Research problem and objective	Underdeveloped problematization	Mismatch between problematization and objective	Adequate problem statement	Well-defined problem statement	Well-analysed problem statement	Innovative problem analysis	Outstanding problem analysis with novel objective
		Literature review and theoretical perspective	Incomprehensive	Reproduction of theory with limited relevance to the research problem	Reproduction and application of relevant theory to the research problem	Elaboration of theory based on known positions in literature	Evaluation and integration of theory into a novel perspective	Synthesis of existing theories into innovative perspectives	Significant contribution to academic literature
		Research framework/model	No conceptual or theoretical discussion of any value	Mismatch with theoretical perspective or research problem	Adequate and appropriate to the research context	Sound framework in the context of evaluated literature	Innovative framework that reflects state-of-the-art	Innovative framework that adds insights into state-of-the-art	Significant addition to the state-of-the-art
		Research methods	Not well addressed	Unsystematically used	Competently used but not well argued	Well elaborated and appropriate presentation of methodological issues	Very well discussed and limitations addressed	Innovative use of existing methods resolving some of their limitations	Development of a method beyond the state-of-the-art
		Analyses of data	Mere description, no analysis	Underdeveloped analysis	Straightforward but superficially presented	Straightforward and well presented	Well-argued interpretation of findings	In-depth analysis and good reflection on findings	Sophisticated and brilliantly argued interpretation of the findings
		Conclusion	Not related to the research problem	Vaguely linked with research problem	Adequate connection between research problem and conclusion	Adequate discussion of the research outcomes	Well-discussed and analysed research outcomes	Very good discussion and analyses of research outcomes	Excellent discussion and analysis of research outcomes
		Reflection on societal/managerial relevance	Not addressed	Vaguely addressed	Sufficiently described	Well described	Clearly discussed and analysed	High awareness of implications of study	Exceptional awareness of implications of study
		Academic reflection	Not addressed	Vaguely addressed	Sufficiently described	Well described	Clearly discussed and analysed	Offers new academic insights	Contribution to academic debate
		EPA, MoT, CoSEM perspective	No link to programme	Unclear link to programme	Fragmented use of study perspectives in analyses, methods and solutions	Perspectives used purposefully	Insightful use of perspectives	Clear and specific identification and integration of perspectives	Outstanding integration and application of perspectives
<b>B. Research skills</b>	15%	Originality and own contribution	Unable to execute a prescribed research plan	Partly able to execute a prescribed research plan	Following a prescribed research plan	Occasional initiative to modify research plan	Independent definition of the research design	Definition of an original and innovative research design	Surprising and innovative research design
		Planning	Intense supervision needed <b>and</b> exceeded nominal project time significantly	Intense supervision needed <b>or</b> exceeded nominal project time significantly	Very regular supervision needed <b>or</b> did not keep planned targets	Regular steering and supervision needed, nominal project time	Independent planning within nominal project time	Very independent planning, with good progress	Independent researcher, with smart time allocation
		Responsibility and managing relationships	No responsibility shown; difficulty connecting with people	Little responsibility shown and limited ability to function in a team	Responsibilities taken and adequate team player	Responsibilities taken and pro-active approach	Demonstrated leadership skills	Demonstrated leadership and gained commitment from key experts	Excellent leadership
<b>C. Reporting quality</b>	10%	Reporting clarity and English proficiency	Underdeveloped	Nearly acceptable	Acceptable	Adequate	Well-structured and well written	Very well-structured and proficient in writing	According to high academic standards
		Referencing and data presentation	Underdeveloped	Nearly acceptable	Acceptable	Adequate	Carefully documented and presented	Carefully documented and innovative data presentation	According to high academic standards
<b>D. Quality of oral defence</b>	5%	Presentation of research	Unclear and incoherent	Superficial	Acceptable and straight forward	Good overview of the research	Convincing	Inspiring and insightful	Up to highest standards
		Q&A	Poor	Difficulty answering questions	Acceptable but not always confident	Confident	Convincing and well argued	Inspiring discussion	Academic debate level