# Final Assessment Form

## MSc Thesis Project CoSEM | EPA | MOT

**Please send the scanned form immediately after the Graduation Presentation to Study Programme Administration (SPA): SPA-TBM@tudelft.nl.**

| **Student information** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student name: | | Student number: | E-mail: | |
| Study Programme: | ☐ CoSEM | ☐ EPA | ☐ MoT | ☐ HPM |

| **Composition of the Graduation committee** | | |
|---|---|---|
| First supervisor | | Section: |
| Second supervisor | | Section |
| Chair (= first/second supervisor) | | |
| Advisor (optional) | | |
| External supervisor (optional advisor) | | |
| External supervisor (optional advisor) | | |

| **Plagiarism scan and thesis title** | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Scanned for plagiarism | Explanation 'similarity' scan (Ouriginal): |
| Thesis title: | |

| **Marking and declaration** | | **Signature authorised signatory** |
|---|---|---|
| **Final grade:** | Course code: Choose course code | **Name:** |
| | ☐ **Designation 'cum laude'** (please tick if applicable). | **Date:** |
| **Date Graduation Presentation:** | Herewith the **authorised signatory** (Chair/UHD according to list) declares that the requirements have been met for the designation 'cum laude'. | **Signature:** |

# Assessment MSc thesis

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

**! Please use the 'MSc Thesis Assessment Guide TPM' and mark 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 organisations which contain both effective 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

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

version: September 2018

**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** |
| **A. Research quality** | 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. Research skills** | 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 **and** exceeded nominal project time significantly | Intense supervision needed **or** exceeded nominal project time significantly | Very regular supervision needed **or** 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 |
| **C. Reporting quality** | 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 |
| **D. Quality of oral defence** | 5% | Presentation of research | Unclear and incoherent | Superficial | Acceptable and straight forward | Good overview of the | 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 |