

Company	Fail	Low	Medium	High	Outstanding
Added value to the company Company has to measure the level of impact and estimated benefit for the organization.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> There is no visible or clearly observable added value.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The application of the work will be local or departmental.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The work has been done most at a divisional or functional level.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The application of the work will affect more than one area of the organization in a cross-functional manner.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The definition of the objective, the work approach, and the results can be defined as global.
Personal contribution Company has to measure the personal contribution of the student as analyst, his/her vision and the difficulty for the company to reach the same conclusions internally.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> There is no visible personal contribution whatsoever.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The student is putting order in a known problem. The output of the project was expectable and is easy recognisable. Conclusions are obvious and just add order to a known problem.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The skills, knowledge, perspective and intellectual capacities of the student are an alternative for the company. The company is covering a need that could cover by itself, and the main value is based on the time spent.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The skills, knowledge, perspective and intellectual capacities of the student add value and complement the company. The company is covering a need that could not cover by itself.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The skills, knowledge, perspective and intellectual capacities of the student are something totally valuable for the company. The company is potentially increasing or improving its results clearly because of the intervention.
				Total marks (*) (between 2 and 10)	

Reasoning

Tutor	Fail	Low	Medium	High	Outstanding
Personal contribution Company has to measure the personal contribution of the student as analyst, his/her vision and the difficulty for the company to reach the same conclusions internally.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> There is no visible personal contribution whatsoever.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The student is putting order in a known problem. The output of the project was expectable and is easy recognisable. Conclusions are obvious and just add order to a known problem.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The skills, knowledge, perspective and intellectual capacities of the student are an alternative for the company. The company is covering a need that could cover by itself, and the main value is based on the time spent.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The skills, knowledge, perspective and intellectual capacities of the student add value and complement the company. The company is covering a need that could not cover by itself.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The skills, knowledge, perspective and intellectual capacities of the student are something totally valuable for the company. The company is potentially increasing or improving its results clearly because of the intervention.
Student commitment Tutor has to measure the level of independency of the student, his/her effort, regularity and interest.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> Student is completely dependent and waits until deadlines to work on the project.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Student is dependent working on the project pushed by meetings or tutor reviews.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Student has a moderate independency and works with regularity. He/she shows interest and demands tutor's advice.	4 mark <input type="checkbox"/> Student is independent and constant. He/she shows interest and demands tutor's advice frequently with not clear criteria.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Student is completely independent and works with regularity on the project. He/she shows interest and demands tutor's advice with criteria when necessary.
				Total marks (*) (between 2 and 10)	

Reasoning

Tutor	Fail	Low	Medium	High	Outstanding
Added value to the company Tutor has to measure the level of impact and estimated benefit for the organization.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> There is no visible or clearly observable added value.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The application of the work will be local or departmental.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The work has been done most at a divisional or functional level.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The application of the work will affect more than one area of the organization in a cross-functional manner.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The definition of the objective, the work approach, and the results can be defined as global.
Level of difficulty Tutor has to measure the difficulty to find and gather data and the degree of ambiguity of the information sources.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> There are no information sources and the work is based mainly in personal opinions.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The data have to be gathered. Information exists, and there are clear sources. Only a systematic process to search and collect information is required. Some examples are public data sources, Google search or the same company web.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The data have to be built. Despite the information exist or there are clear sources this has to be processed. Building the information implies a process of elaboration. Some examples are concurrence webs, or private reports.	4 mark <input type="checkbox"/> The data have to be deducted. There is a process of researching, evaluating and defining criteria. Information is not already processed. There is not a clear source even if private, confidential or expensive. Some examples are expert interviews or surveys.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The data have to be created. Information does not exist and has to be generated by experiential investigations. Some examples are group observation, role playing or simulations.
Structure / model Tutor has to measure the structure and accuracy of the model.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> The work is inconsistent and shows contradictions between statements presented in different parts.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The work is consistent and there is correspondence between title (promise) and work (deliverable).	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> There is a clear connection between the different parts of the work. All of them complement each other building a reasonable conceptual model.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> There is a professional approach with an evaluation of resources and difficulties. The work is potentially applicable by the organization.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> There is an application plan with a forecast on results or organizational impact.
				Total marks (*) (between 3 and 15)	

Reasoning

Date:

(*) Each criteria weigh 10% of the final grade.

Tribunal presentation	Fail	Low	Medium	High	Outstanding
Communication It is about how it is presented. Capacity to attract the attention of the audience making the presentation engaging and clear. Capacity to present a story that enraptures the audience. It implies an emotional connection during the presentation.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is incomprehensible, unordered and confusing.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is comprehensible but tedious. Presenter mostly reads slides with text.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is well structured with a clear sequence of elements. Nevertheless, the approach is too rational, monotonous, too much technical and plenty of data.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is attractive and follows a story with an introduction, theme explanation and closure. Slides use multimedia. Presenter uses body language, voice inflexions, enthusiasm and conviction.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Use of narrative techniques, examples, stories that make the presentation something familiar, close or even personal and emotional.
Message It is about what it is explained. Capacity to clear determine the exact objective of the presentation and accomplish expectations. It implies a clear understanding of the problem.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> There is neither a clear objective nor a conclusion.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The purpose of the presentation is clear, but the development is ambiguous and the closure indefinite.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The introduction clearly states the topic of the presentation. The body is well defined and develops the project. Nevertheless, closure is inaccurate or poorly explained.	4 mark <input type="checkbox"/> The objective, body and conclusion are clear but the presentation rush and there is a feeling of insufficient development.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The objective shows benefit for the organization. The body builds the content extensively. Conclusion clarifies and summarize accurately. The message demonstrates consistency and well-structured project.
Q&A Capacity to answer questions solving doubts in a concise and precise way. It implies a deep understanding of contents.	1 mark <input type="checkbox"/> Questions are not answered.	2 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Questions are answered in a general manner. Answers are vague or inaccurate.	3 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Questions are answered referring back to the presentation contents without adding new information.	4 marks <input type="checkbox"/> Questions are answered adding new material, perspective or information in a way that complement the presentation.	5 marks <input type="checkbox"/> The answers of questions open new lines of explanation. Instead of just adding new pieces of information, they could be developed becoming completely new parts of the presentation
				Total marks (*) (between 3 and 15)	

Reasoning

Date:

(*) Each criteria weigh 10% of the final grade.