University of Zurich UZH

**Department of
Business Administration**

University of Zurich
Prof. Dr. Helmut Dietl
Chair for Services & Operations Management
Plattenstrasse 14
CH-8032 Zurich
Phone +41 44 634 53 11
www.business.uzh.ch/de/research/profes-
sorships/som.html

Guide to Assessing Written Work

The categories and questions listed serve as guidelines for evaluating written work at the
Chair of Services & Operations Management:

Student name	
Title of the work	
BA or MA Thesis	

CONTENT evaluation		Grade
1. *Task (approx. **10%**)* *Has the task been understood? Have all essential aspects been recorded? Is the overarching technical context clear?*		
2. *Thematic limitation (approx. **10%**)* *Has the author made thematic delimitations, which ones? Are important aspects lost? Is a possible reduction to certain main aspects well founded? Are the working hypotheses reasonable?*		
3. *Literature and data evaluation (approx. **10%**)* *Has the literature, data and other sources been sufficient, satisfactory, fully evaluated and processed?*		
4. *Solution approach, methodology (approx. **20%**)* *What specialist knowledge does the author show in forming a solution approach? Are different methods discussed, compared with each other? Is the choice of a specific method justified? How was the topic dealt with? (empirical/theoretical;*		

referring, comparative, evaluating (literature work); own studies, surveys; experimental)		
5. ***Solution, structure*** *(approx.* ***20%***) Is the structure of the processing logical and balanced? Are individual issues solved? Does the elaboration correspond to the agreed topic? Are there imbalances between structure and presentation? Is the argument complete, objective, and factually correct?*		
6. ***Personal contribution*** *(approx. 20%) Is there any significant personal contribution in the area of task definition, solution approach and methodology? What significance does the topic have for the status and further development of the research field? What is the degree of difficulty of the work?*		
FORMAT evaluation		**Grade**
Linguistic style and presentation *(approx.* ***10%***) Is the line of thought clear and logically structured? Is the terminology technically correct and the linguistic expression appropriate? Is the comprehensibility supported by meaningful examples, illustrations, clear graphics and meaningful tables? Is the legibility/clarity promoted by a good structure of the work?*		

Are all sources used in the text completely and correctly mentioned in the bibliography? *Are figures, graphs, tables, etc. completely counted and labeled?* *Are the "Guidelines for the Design of Scientific Papers" followed?*		
Comments		
Overall Rating		**Grade**