

Assessment Criteria	Sub-criteria	Description - guidance
Introduction and Theory (≤20)	Technical grounding - System and organization context	Set the background for the problem domain, state-of-the-practice; answer the questions, 'why is this a challenging problem, why is it worth doing?' Set the context for the system-of-interest: business, domain, organization, technical, as-is situation, stakeholders
	Theoretical insight	Set the context for the problem domain - which state-of-the-art should contribute to studying this problem - literature review, body of knowledge, etc. Given the chosen goal, has the student done a thorough review of what has been done in that field, in order not to reinvent the wheel, to build on what is known and to give credit wherever it is due? What is the knowledge gap/contribution? <i>Set the context specific to the problem domain from method perspective, current way-of-working, possible solutions, expected benefits, positioning in current literature/state-of-art-or-practice.</i>
	Problem definition / problem framing / research questions	Write an explicit statement of the problem under investigation; the problem could be expressed as a hypothesis or research question; and possibly reformulated as goal with success criteria – depending on the topic. The formulation should be easy to understand by the reader. It should also cover limiting the problem space: <i>what is the system of interest, the system under design, the context, who are the stakeholders etc.</i>
Methods and Working Practice (≤25)	Research Method	How does the student plan to study this problem - stated in terms of research methods for data collection, analysis and evaluation; justification for selection and implementation of this research approach.
	Working practice	Attitude of the student to the work: did they plan before doing? Does the student adapt to the company way of working; and did the student have a sufficient academic mindset? Measure of the maturity of the student's work habits, and application of SE practice; e.g., how did the student keep stakeholders informed? What happened when there were delays? Rationale for the SE-methods applied.
	Degree of independence	The degree of judgement and independent thinking; e.g. originality of references in the thesis; the application of relevant methods; student possesses or acquires the necessary skills to plan and execute the research; actively includes company (and customer) stakeholders in the research, when appropriate.

Results and Discussion (≤35)	Project result	<p>The findings presented in the report should be linked to the theory and problem definition; they need to be succinct but explicit about what work was done, and then what was observed, computed, or resolved to reach an eventual 'solution' – i.e. answer the goal description given above, apply the research methods, etc. Industrial artifacts may be given as evidence in Appendices.</p> <p><i>Note: the challenge is that the results sometimes deal with the system-of-interest and the organization-of-interest but we especially look for generalization in terms of the Body of Knowledge, what others in comparable circumstances can learn from this. Hence a clear distinction between the specific *-of-interest results and the generic method/technique/tool/concept result is necessary!</i></p>
	Critical analysis	<p>If data was collected and analyzed, was it the correct data, is it being interpreted correctly, was it significant, (does the thesis discuss validity and reliability of the data); students need to recognize the value and limitations of their own work and contributions to knowledge.</p>
	Discussion	<p>Is there a discussion that ties the results to the theoretical groundings from the introduction; is there a clearly stated contribution to academia; is there a possible contribution to industry; is there a consideration of the greater implications of findings? Does the discussion consider suitability of the methods used and their effectiveness?</p> <p><i>Note: a major challenge is the balance between being modest and humble, in the event of limited accuracy and validity, and the need to be explicit and make the vague as tangible as possible. The intention of the discussion is for the student to demonstrate an understanding of this tension, and the appropriateness of the arguments and conclusions, and the value of observations for external readers.</i></p>
	Reflection	<p>Reflect on the results and process of the work accomplished. Consider whether a different approach to the same problem could have led to different results, especially when results are not as anticipated.</p>
	Thesis contributions / goal attainment / closure of the thesis	<p>Every report should contain closing statements that summarize the work done, and state explicit conclusions and future work?</p> <p><i>Note: a paper in a prestigious journal or conference is only accepted if it shows a clear contribution to the field or body of knowledge;; we expect reasonable contributions from our students, avoiding excessive repetitions in topic, approach and results from prior years' reports, etc.</i></p>
Presentation (≤15)	Formatting & language usage	<p>Assess that student has chosen an appropriate style guide (e.g. the INCOSE paper guide, academic journal, or company report guidelines) and Followed Consistently. Is the report/presentation organized in the appropriate sections? Is it cogent? Is it well supported by adequate and relevant figures, tables, and so on? Sometimes figures are not legible, or add very little. Students may be faced with multiple stakeholders / audiences, but should prepare their thesis in an academic style with academic rigor.</p>

<p>Oral examination (≤5)</p>	<p>Presentation in final exam</p>	<p>Evaluation of the student work is based primarily on the written report this 5% is only for the oral presentation aspects. Is the presentation cogent? Does the student show communication skills that get their message through to the audience? Does the student respond adequately to the questions posed by the examining committee?</p> <p>Conduct as a discussion with the student; does the student know more than what is in the report. In addition, do they demonstrated an ability to reason beyond the actual presentation?</p> <p><i>Note: in some circumstances, students could present material not given previously in their written report that answered critical questions for evaluators and thereby improve their grade – but with only 5% credit, this would apply only for evaluations that were very near a boundary.</i></p>
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--