


1.4 AMSIB thesis assessment and grading form 2019-2020

Student name:	Gjovan Shpati
Student number:	500789226
Title of thesis:	Optimizing Supply Chain Through the Implementation of BI: The case of Agna Group
Assessor:	R.J.W. Janssen
Assessor's signature:	
Supervisor:	Einholz, D. (Duco)
Supervisor's signature:	NA
Date:	29 June 2020
Grade for the written part of the thesis (part A; weight = 80%)	3.7 → repair as per thesis guide before August 17 th , 2020
Grade for the presentation/defense of the thesis (part B; weight = 20%)	NA
FINAL THESIS GRADE (part A + part B = 80% + 20% = 100%)	NA

PART A – Assessment and grading of the written part of the thesis

The structure, layout, organization, English language level and international character of the thesis are considered as prerequisites for the thesis to be assessed. These criteria have to be graded with a pass for the thesis to be assessed. All other criteria of part A need to be graded at least 5.5 to allow the student to proceed to the presentation/defense of the thesis.

Prerequisites	Pass/Fail
Does the research cross international borders?	unclear
Structure of the thesis.	p
Thesis layout and organization.	p
Use of business English.	p

In line with the AMSIB thesis vision, the following learning goals (LG) have been formulated for the thesis programme.

LG #	The student can:
1	Execute an analysis of a real business problem, with an international dimension, to arrive at a SMART main research question.
2	Evaluate relevant business theories, in relation to the main research question, to formulate and justify sub questions.
3	Select and develop applicable research methodologies, which are in line with the relevant business theories, to execute the research.
4	Execute the research according to the methodology and present relevant findings.
5	Examine the findings by using the relevant business theories.
6	Justify the answers to the research questions, based on the examination of the findings.
7	Develop relevant recommendations, taking into account organisational and financial consequences.
8	Describe the process and outcomes of the research in a report that is well structured and written in business English.
9	Defend the process and outcomes of the research in a presentation to an (un)informed audience.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Concerning the 4.0-5.4 and 7.0-8.4 grade range: please interpolate the content of the adjoining columns using your professional judgement.
2. All five *main* criteria of part A of the *AMSIB thesis assessment and grading form* need to be graded at least 5.5 before the student can proceed to the presentation/defence of the thesis. A grade for a *sub* criterion within these five main criteria can be insufficient, as long as the average grade for each main criterion is sufficient.

Main criterion: Problem Analysis (Weight: 10%)						
Sub criteria	1.0 - 3.9	4.0 - 5.4	5.5 - 6.9	7.0 - 8.4	8.5 - 10	GRADE
Problem description and analysis	There is no adequate problem description. The analysis is very superficial or absent. The analysis misses the point. There is none or hardly any evidence/data. The problem/opportunity is not related to an international issue.	4	The problem is correctly identified, described and explained and has an international dimension. The analysis is clear and supported with evidence and data. Conclusion(s) follow logically from the analysis.		The problem description is insightful, concise and convincing, and includes an international aspect. Eloquent, concise and in-depth analysis is thoroughly supported by evidence and data. Convincing conclusions are supported well with arguments.	
Company description, importance/urgency of problem	No clear picture of the company is provided. The relevance of the problem is hardly/not addressed. There is no/little relevant background. The knowledge gap and/or urgency are not or incorrectly addressed.	4	The main characteristics of the company relevant to the problem are provided. The relevance of the problem is addressed. Important parts of relevant background are presented.		The importance of problem for the company is explained with solid arguments. Relevant background is provided comprehensively. The gap is identified very convincingly in a specific and in-depth manner. The urgency/importance of solving the problem/exploiting the opportunity is well supported with arguments and neatly formulated.	
Attributes of Main Research Question (MRQ)	The MRQ misses the point and/or is not smart in any way. There is serious doubt whether answering the MRQ will help solve the problem.	5.4	The MRQ is SMART and based on the problem analysis and addresses a relevant issue, i.e. it is likely to help solve the problem.		The MRQ is precise, SMART, strategic and open ended; answering the MRQ is key to solving the problem or using the opportunity.	
Coherence and cohesion	Multiple serious inconsistencies are present. There is considerable lack of internal logic. The problem analysis is hard to follow.	5	The chapter presents a basically consistent and plausible line of thought. There are few minor inconsistencies in details only.		The sections are well-connected in a logical, very convincing flow without any inconsistencies. The text is comprehensive.	
					AVERAGE GRADE FOR THE CRITERION:	4.6

Comments on Problem Analysis	
<p>Comments about what to improve:</p> <p>Opportunity analysis does not provide any insight why this is an opportunity for the AGNA group. Inventory waste drops out of the sky without any analysis what the potential root cause of the problem is. The waste is <0.5% of operational costs or revenue. Is this high/low compared to..?</p> <p>Which supply chain, what bottle necksand perhaps which sub-company (fig 1.1).</p>	<p>Comments about what is good:</p>

<p>The MRQ does not specify the “when”.</p> <p>Author refers to waste as a % of profit but should this not be a % of total cost/revenue as waste is actually a cost? Furthermore, aggregate numbers are for the (diversified) AGNA group.</p> <p>Evidence or data to support argumentation for “How can Agna s.a optimize its <u>supply chain</u> operations by <u>implementing BI</u> to limit its inventory waste <u>by 30%?</u>” not provided.</p>	
---	--

Main criterion: Theoretical Framework (Weight: 15%)						
Sub criteria	1.0 - 3.9	4.0 - 5.4	5.5 - 6.9	7.0 - 8.4	8.5 - 10	GRADE
Validity, reliability and relevance of sources	Most of the reviewed literature is irrelevant to the research problem. Most of the main sources used to create the framework are not academic (e.g. blogs, websites, magazine articles, etc.).		The reviewed sources are directly relevant to the core of the research problem. There is no thorough overview of various academic perspectives. A variety of sources are used but the level of difficulty is low (handbooks, management journals).	5.5	All the reviewed sources are directly relevant to the research problem. A solid overview of various academic perspectives is presented. A wide variety of sources is used, all of which are academic (peer-reviewed journal articles and specialist scholarly books).	
Literature analysis	Models are presented as theoretical information. Little/no understanding of theoretical concepts/assumptions is shown.	5	A generic, high level understanding of theoretical concepts is evident. Relevant literature is summarized rather than critically evaluated. Models are not discussed alongside theoretical information.		The student critically analyses, reviews and uses the existing knowledge to build and/or extend the theoretical framework.	
Theoretical foundation of the research	There is no theoretical or conceptual foundation laid out for the research. Core concepts to the research problem are not discussed.	4	The created theoretical foundation is general as not all the relevant variables are clearly indicated. The selected theoretical perspectives are not always well integrated with the research problem.		The theoretical foundation is logically flawless and based on numerous theoretical sources. The proposed theoretical foundation is specific and all relevant variables have been clearly identified. The theoretical concepts and assumptions discussed in the chapter are well integrated and connected with the research problem.	
Sub questions and coherence	There is no logical relation between the theoretical framework and some sub questions. Most of the sub questions are not derived explicitly from the theory.	4.5	Relevant and logical sub questions have been derived explicitly from the selected theory.		Relevant and logical sub questions have been derived explicitly from the selected theory and are clearly aligned with the investigated variables.	
					AVERAGE GRADE FOR THE CRITERION:	4.8

Comments on Theoretical Framework	
<p>Comments about what to improve:</p> <p>No evidence of the development of a relevant theoretical framework including selection of “variables” that will yield answers to a set of specific SQ’s that will eventually address the MQ. Please also see observations under “Problem Analysis”</p> <p>What is the added value of figure 2.2</p> <p>Selection and justification of theory (framework) insufficient.</p>	<p>Comments about what is good:</p>

Sub questions are not clearly derived from theory. Given the MRQ a logical SQ would be the analysis of the supply chain (of company xxx within AGNA group) as waste reduction is a focus. SQ2 seems to indicate that the business case for BI is already present but is not provided in the problem analysis. Role of SQ3 in relation to theory and MRQ?	
--	--

Main criterion: Research Methodology (Weight: 15%)						
Sub criteria	1.0 - 3.9	4.0 - 5.4	5.5 - 6.9	7.0 - 8.4	8.5 - 10	GRADE
Data collection methods	The data collection design (primary and secondary) is highly imprecise and/or confusing, which enables no/little replicability of the research. The validity and reliability of the data collection methods are doubtful/not addressed.	3	All of the data collection methods and the use of primary and secondary sources of data are sufficiently explained, which enables replicability of most of the research. The validity and reliability of the data collection methods are addressed and the methods are likely to render reliable data.		All of the data collection methods and the use of primary and secondary sources of data are explained in depth, which enables full replicability of the research. The validity and reliability of data collection methods are grounded in the recommended textbook for the business research course.	
Selection of research methods and data analysis methods	Most of the selected research methods and research design do not correspond well to the research questions. There is no justification of the research methodology. Data analysis methods are not addressed.	3	Most of the selected research methods and research design correspond to the research questions. All data analysis methods are explained, some of them – superficially.		The selection of the methods is supported by strong argumentation. All the selected research methods and research design correspond well to the research questions. The selection of research methods stands out due to strong arguments and justification. All data analysis methods are explained in depth.	
Research ethics	Ethical issues are not addressed. Parts of the research are not ethically sound.	3	Ethical issues are addressed in a general manner. All parts of the research are ethically sound.		All relevant ethical issues are addressed in depth. All parts of the research are ethically sound.	
Coherence and cohesion	There is a lack of coherence, cohesion and transparency in the presentation of data collection and analysis methods.	5	Most parts of the chapter are logically connected and transparently presented.		All parts of the chapter are logically connected and transparently presented.	
					AVERAGE GRADE FOR THE CRITERION:	3.5

Comments on Research Methodology

<p>Comments about what to improve:</p> <p>3.2 “using qualitative and quantitative research” (p20) – not specified 3.3 “qualitative primary and secondary research” idem</p> <p>Quantitative & qualitative data collection not specified, data analysis method not addressed.</p> <p>Data collection design not specified, validity, reliability & research ethics not addressed. Data analysis method(s) not specified.</p> <p>Two interviews specified as “primary qualitative and quantitative research” (p22) without further specification and addressing validity etc.</p> <p>No actual research base specified.</p>	<p>Comments about what is good:</p> <p>Figure 3.3 interesting but unreadable.</p>
---	---

Main criterion: Results and Analysis (Weight: 40%)						
Sub criteria	1.0 - 3.9	4.0 - 5.4	5.5 - 6.9	7.0 - 8.4	8.5 - 10	GRADE
Presentation versus analysis	The presentation of findings provides no relevant information about respondents and sources, and is not (always) distinguishable from analysis.	3	The information about respondents is incomplete. Presentation of findings is separate from analysis.		The clear presentation of findings includes details about respondents and sources and is distinguished from the analysis.	
Analysis quality	The analysis of findings is shallow and incomplete.	3	The analysis of findings favours some information and ignores other.		There is an in-depth objective analysis of the findings, that uses appropriate tools.	
Reliability and validity	No attention is paid to the reliability and validity of the results.	3	Reliability and validity are addressed but not convincingly/correctly.		There is a complete and correct evaluation of reliability and validity.	
Coherence and cohesion	Throughout the chapter(s) it is unclear which findings led to answers to sub questions.	3	There are (preliminary) conclusions linked to sub questions, but their justification is incomplete.		Preliminary conclusions are clearly linked to sub questions and justified.	
AVERAGE GRADE FOR THE CRITERION:						3

Comments on Results and Analysis

<p>Comments about what to improve:</p> <p>Interviews (transcript) seem to lack depth. Validation not addressed Base and value for/of Table 1 unclear (validity).</p> <p>4.1 p22 first para data missing. Reference of interview not according to APA standard.</p> <p>Unclear where the “qualitative and quantitative research (p20)” is presented and analysed.</p> <p>The presentation of findings provides no relevant information about respondents and sources. The analysis of findings is shallow and incomplete. No attention is paid to the reliability and validity of the results.</p> <p>This part is seriously insufficient.</p>	<p>Comments about what is good:</p>
---	-------------------------------------

Main criterion: Conclusions and Recommendations (Weight: 20%)						
Sub criteria	1.0 - 3.9	4.0 - 5.4	5.5 - 6.9	7.0 - 8.4	8.5 - 10	GRADE
Conclusions	<p>Conclusions are not drawn or are highly general, with no/weak link to the theory and findings.</p> <p>No/partial answers are given to the main research question and sub questions.</p>	4	<p>Most conclusions are formulated clearly, supported by theory and findings, with some limitations.</p> <p>Sufficient support and average answers to the main research question and sub questions.</p>		<p>All conclusions are insightful, concise, and exhaustively based on theory and findings.</p> <p>Thorough argumentation and convincing answers are given to the MRQ and sub questions.</p>	
Recommendations and added value to the company, including Ethics, Responsibility and Sustainability (ERS)	<p>Recommendations and implications are not provided or are of no/little value to the company and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The implementation plan/cost-benefit analysis are absent or of little value.</p> <p>No to little evidence of ERS-based recommendations.</p>	4	<p>Most recommendations are formulated clearly and realistically, providing some added value and considering most of the implications to the company or other stakeholders.</p> <p>General but no in-depth implementation plan/cost-benefit analysis is present.</p> <p>There is moderate evidence of ERS-based recommendations.</p>		<p>All recommendations are SMART and original, potentially being of considerable value to the company, and their implications are thoroughly considered.</p> <p>In-depth and realistic implementation plan/cost-benefit analysis are present, serving as a roadmap to be executed by the company or other stakeholders.</p>	

					There are ERS-based conclusions and recommendations. The student discusses thoroughly and addresses the main issues and challenges associated with ERS.	
Limitations of the presented research and suggestions for future investigations	There is no/little discussion of both research limitations and possibilities of future research.	5	There is a general discussion of both research limitations and possibilities of future research.		There is a thorough and concise discussion of both research limitations and possibilities of future research, providing clear reasons for the suggested directions of future research.	
Coherence	<p>There is no link between research questions, results and conclusions.</p> <p>There is no link between recommendations and conclusions.</p> <p>There are serious flaws in the integration of the main points.</p>	3	<p>Most conclusions are well-linked to research questions and substantiated by results.</p> <p>Recommendations are mostly well-linked to conclusions.</p> <p>There is adequate integration of the main points in a competent but basic summary.</p>		<p>There is a clear link between research questions and conclusions, which are ordered in a logical way.</p> <p>Recommendations are flawlessly linked to the conclusions.</p> <p>There is an excellent integration of the main points in a competent and persuasive summary.</p>	
AVERAGE GRADE FOR THE CRITERION:						4

Comments on Conclusions and Recommendations	
<p>Comments about what to improve:</p> <p>Conclusions and recommendations are not drawn on findings from valid research (if any). As such this part is insufficient.</p>	<p>Comments about what is good:</p>

EVALUATION OF THE PREREQUISITES

Assessment criteria for the evaluation of the thesis structure (all the criteria need to be satisfied)

Chapters of the thesis	Descriptions of the assessment criteria	Pass/Fail
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chapter starts with an introduction and ends with the structure of the thesis. The problem analysis and the main research question are addressed. 	p
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chapter starts with an introduction and ends with a theoretical framework which results in the formulation of sub-questions. The body of the chapter contains relevant theoretical perspectives that are discussed in a natural and logical order. 	p
Chapter 3: Research Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chapter starts with an introduction and ends with a summary of the chapter. There is a logical order in the presentation of the research methods used for the study. 	p
Chapter 4 and onwards: Data Presentation and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chapter starts with an introduction and ends with a summary of the chapter. There is alignment between the presentation of data analysis and findings and research methods presented in chapter 3. 	p
Conclusions and Recommendations (could be presented in two separate chapters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The chapter contains a summary of the key findings, answers to the sub questions and the main research question, practical implementation of recommendations and description of the limitations of the research. Presentation of conclusions and recommendations follow a logical order. 	p
Final verdict:		p

Assessment criteria for the evaluation of the thesis layout and organization (all the criteria need to be satisfied)

The thesis should be failed for Layout and/or Organisation if any of the requirements listed below are not met more than once within three consecutive pages of the text.

Criterion	Descriptions of the assessment criteria*	Pass/Fail
Organisation (compulsory elements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Front cover or title page: should contain title, name of the author, student number, month and year of writing, name of the educational institution Executive summary Table of contents (automated): should contain sections and subsections using decimal numbers, full titles of all chapters and sections, references to the notes, reference list, appendices to be listed separately Main body of the thesis: numbered chapters All new chapters should start on a new page Conclusions Recommendations Reference list and in text referencing: includes both "in text referencing" and "Reference list" (note: please be careful with automatic referencing). A reference list without references in the text is of no value. Reference list should follow APA format. In the main text, the student should refer to the source by mentioning the name(s) of author(s) and year of publication(s) No more than 18,000 words (with 10% grace) Appendices: should have numbers and a clear and concise title should be given to each Appendix 	p

Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables and figures: the student should refer to tables and figures in the text. Number each table and figure with chapter number and then in ascending chronological order. Give each table and figure a brief, independently understandable title. For each table/figure taken from another source, the source must be placed beneath the table/figure • Headings: start section titles and subtitles with a capital letter, but do not capitalize each word. Never place a colon at the end • Paragraphs: start a new paragraph by leaving a line blank between this the new paragraph and the previous paragraph • Quotes: short quotes can be written with quotation marks in the main text • Numbering: use decimal numbers when numbering sections (e.g. the first sub-section of Chapter 2 will be given number 2.1) • Font and line spacing: use a neutral and business-like font (e.g. Calibri, Arial, Times New Roman) and the font size should be 11. • Spacing: use line spacing 1.15-1.5 • Page numbering: should be applied for the final product. The cover and title page should not be numbered. • Spaces: leave a space after a punctuation mark but not before one. • Layout of body of text: justified (aligned) 	Fail
General stylistic points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers: numbers below twenty should be written using letters and also round numbers from twenty onward (e.g. eighty) should be written using letters • Numbers denoting chapter numbers, dates, weight, percentages and amount of money require numerals. The student should make sure that s/he uses commas and decimal points correctly: commas to separate thousands and decimal point before decimals (e.g.: € 510,763.45) 	p
Final verdict:		Fail

Assessment criteria for the evaluation of Business English (all the criteria need to be satisfied)

Criterion	Descriptions of the assessment criteria*	Pass/Fail
Business English is used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of proper terminology specific to the relevant field of research is evident. • Simpler language forms appear occasionally only as alternatives to proper business jargon. 	p
The thesis is written in a professional style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethical and unoffending language is used throughout the thesis. • The thesis is written in a formal style. • The text is concise (not wordy). • The text is explicit without vague and ambiguous words or formulations. 	p
Varied sentence constructions are used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both simple and complex sentences are used in the thesis. • A wide range of cohesive devices (e.g. linking words, such as thus, however, although, besides, etc.) is adequately used. 	p
There are few to no linguistic errors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The thesis should be failed for Business English if any of the types of language errors listed in the Appendix of the Thesis Assessment and Grading form appears more than once within three consecutive pages of the text. For the Appendix, see document 1.7 (Appendix Grading criteria English) 	pp
Final verdict:		

Conclusion part A:

Main assessment criteria	Assessment/grade	Weight
Problem analysis:	4.6	10%
Theoretical framework:	4.8	15%
Research methodology:	3.5	15%
Results and analysis:	3	40%
Conclusions and recommendations:	4	20%
Grade for the written part of the thesis:	3.7	100%

The grade for the written part of the thesis counts for 80% of the final thesis grade.

PART B – Assessment and grading of the presentation/defence of the thesis

All criteria of part B need to be graded at least 5.5 for the student to pass the thesis.

Assessment scale:	The assessment criterion is not or hardly achieved.	The assessment criterion is partly achieved or visible at a basic level with hardly any relevance.	The assessment criterion is achieved, and is visible at a relevant to consistent level.	The assessment criterion is achieved, and is visible at a coherent to in-depth level.	The assessment criterion is achieved, and is visible at a comprehensive to publishable level in terms of justification or construction.
Prerequisite options:	Fail		Pass		
Grade options:	1.0 – 3.9	4.0 – 5.4	5.5 – 6.9	7.0 – 8.4	8.5 – 10.0

Assessment criterion:	Description of the criterion at bachelor level:	Grade:
Structure of the presentation (learning goal: 9; weight: 25%).	The presentation is structured, concise and to the point. The layout is clear. Text, tables and graphs have been used. Smart transitions from thesis to slides are displayed. The presentation is focused and comprehensive.	
Comments about what to improve:		Comments about what is good:

Assessment criterion:	Description of the criterion at bachelor level:	Grade:
Presentation skills (learning goal: 9; weight: 25%).	The student displays stage presence. The student delivers a relaxed, lively and concentrated presentation. The student displays a verbal command of business English. The student displays how to use slides to support storytelling. The student pays attention to time management and the time balance between sections.	
Comments about what to improve:		Comments about what is good:

Assessment criterion:	Description of the criterion at bachelor level:	Grade:
Thesis defense and answering questions (learning goal: 9; weight: 25%).	<p>The student is able to freely discuss the contents of the thesis and to place the thesis in the context of current scientific literature and practical applications.</p> <p>The student demonstrates a mastery of content, application and implications.</p> <p>The students answers questions in a professional way.</p>	
Comments about what to improve:		Comments about what is good:

Assessment criterion:	Description of the criterion at bachelor level:	Grade:
Reflection (learning goal: 9; weight: 25%).	The reflection demonstrates the ability of the student to question biases, stereotypes, preconceptions, and/or assumptions in order to define new modes of thinking as a result. The student is able to reflect on programme-related competencies.	
Comments about what to improve:		Comments about what is good:

Conclusion part B:

Assessment criterion	Grade	Weight
Structure of presentation:		25%
Presentation skills:		25%
Thesis defense and answering questions:		25%
Reflection:		25%
Grade for the presentation/defence of the thesis:		100%

The grade for the presentation/defense of the thesis counts for 20% of the final thesis grade.