

Graduation Manual

**European Post Master in Urbanism
Academic Year 2018 – 2019**

Contents

	Introduction	3
1.0	Graduation process	
	1.1 Admission	4
	1.2 Mentors and mentor team composition	4
	1.3 Evaluations overview	4
	1.4 Graduation registration and assessment	5
	1.5 Detailed scheme per evaluation	
	- Evaluation 1	6
	- Evaluation 2	7
	- Evaluation 3	9
	- Evaluation 4	10
	- Evaluation 5	12
2.0	Particular circumstances	
	Quorum at evaluations	14
	• Absence of delegate of the Board of Examiners	
	• Absence of First mentor or mentor	
	• Problems in the appraisal	
3.0	Special qualification	14
	• Honourable mention	
	• Cum laude	
	Appendixes	
	Appendix 1 Subjects to be assessed per evaluation	
	Appendix 2 Graduation plan	
	Appendix 3 Reflection P4 and P5	
	Appendix 4 Manual delegate of the Board of Examiners	
	Appendix 5 Reference to official regulations	
	Appendix 6 Rubric assessment forms	

Introduction

This manual is based on the official regulations concerning graduating and is meant for students, mentors, delegates of the Board of Examiners and others who are involved in the graduation and corresponding evaluations. The manual is part of the official regulations and is sent to all students who enroll for a Master 3 studio at the start of the semester.

In the Academic year 2017-2018 a compulsory scan on plagiarism with the use of Turn-it In is introduced. Within the implemented system the students first get the possibility to do the check themselves and they have to hand in a final version of their thesis before the P4 presentation. The result of this plagiarism scan will be assessed by the involved mentors.

This manual contains important information about the setup of the graduation process. In chapter one you will find a scheme of the setup of the evaluations and a scheme explaining the responsibilities of all people involved per evaluation.

Chapter two contains information about the quorum, the appraisal, honourable mention and the “cum laude” regulation.

In the appendixes you will find among other things details on the subjects to be assessed, the graduation plan, reflection requirements and the references to official regulations which this manual is part of. For all students in the European Post - Master of Urbanism the EMMA rubric will be used for the assessment.

Starting the academic year 2016-2017 the digital graduation registration was commenced for the EMU graduates. All involved teachers have access to the information in the SharePoint application that is used for the registration. The registration includes personal information of the student, the composition of the mentor team, registration for the P2 and P5 and all the assessments.

Each semester Education and Student Affairs adds the names of the new enrolled students to this digital registration.

The involved coordinators, mentors and delegates of the board of examiners can add additional information and notes. For all graduates the First mentor is responsible for completing the digital assessment registration.

1.0 Graduation process

Subsection 1 Admission

- Students must have completed all credits from M1, M2 and from abroad (total 90 EC) to be allowed to join M4.
- The TU Delft marks should be registered in Osiris and for the exchange there should be at least a confirmation from the university that they passed all courses.

Subsection 2 Mentors and mentor team composition

After a student is admitted to the graduation, he / she is allocated in consultation with the semester coordinator:

- a first mentor;
- a second mentor;
- and a third mentor, from the University where the student did the exchange, chosen by the student.

This should be organized before the start of the graduation semester. Preferable this is arranged before the exchange semester.

The first and second mentor should be from different sections. The first mentor should be from the Urbanism department and has an appointment as Associate Professor or Assistant Professor. It is recommended to choose the first mentor from the EMU teaching staff.

Students can also count with the support of PhD candidates of the department of Urbanism as consultants.

Exceptions to these rules are allowed, with the approval of the semester coordinator, for example if the subject chosen by the student demands a First mentor outside of EMU teaching staff.

Subsection 3 Evaluations

In the course of the graduation process two obligatory progress reviews (P1 and P3) and three formal assessments (P2, P4 and P5) take place. All evaluations are to take place within the assigned periods, indicated in this manual. The location of all evaluations must be situated at the TU Delft Campus. An exception is made for P5 presentations in case a majority of the students of a cohort originate from one of the involved partner universities

Spring semester

Calendar week	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
Course week	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.10	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.10	4.11
2018	February			March			April			May			June			July					
Monday	11	18	25	4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	11	20	27	3	10	17	24	1
Tuesday	12	19	26	5	12	19	26	2	9	16	23	30	7	12	21	28	4	11	18	25	2
Wednesday	13	20	27	6	13	20	27	3	10	17	24	1	8	13	22	29	5	12	19	26	3
Thursday	14	21	28	7	14	21	28	4	11	18	25	2	9	14	23	30	6	13	20	27	4
Friday	15	22	1	8	15	22	29	5	12	19	26	3	10	15	24	31	7	14	21	28	5

	P1 Presentation
	P2 Application
	P2 Presentation
	P3 Presentation / Retake P2 (restriction)
	P4 Presentation / Retake P2 (failed)
	P5 Presentation / retake P4 (No Go)
	Submission of reports

Subsection 4 Graduation registration and assessment

For all students who are admitted to a Master EMU graduation, the Education and Student administration of the Faculty will create a basic digital graduation file. This includes student name, student number, student email address.

Also the blank assessment forms for the P1 till P4 evaluations are made available (after the introduction of the EMMA assessment). Till then the paper assessment forms are used by the mentor and they will be sent to the Board of Examiners after each assessment to be uploaded in the student's graduation file.

It is the responsibility of the First mentor to keep the registration. After each evaluation the filled-in assessment form must be sent to the student. A copy of EMMA assessment forms is automatically sent at the same time as when the form is saved, to the other mentors and the delegate of the Board of Examiners.

For coordinators and mentors: users' manuals for different parts of the graduation registration are available on the start page of the digital registration. Significant changes in the registration system are announced on the start page of the system. For all questions on the digital registration you can contact the Secretariat of Education and Student Affairs.

Subsection 5 Detailed scheme per evaluation

Evaluation 1 Compulsory progress review

Goal	Assess whether the student’s working method and progress guarantee he / she will be able to meet the requirements for the P2 in time
Where	Reserved room
When	Week 3.2
Structure	Presentation: minimum 15 minutes and maximum 30 minutes Questions: 15 minutes
Assessors	First mentor Second mentor Third mentor (optional)
Subjects of assessment	Draft research design Planning and progress of graduation process
Method of assessment	Assessment is based on the P1 assessment criteria of the chosen track; the mentor gives the student a positive or negative indication regarding planning and progress of the final project
Method of assessment registration	The assessment is registered on the P1 assessment form; the conclusion is registered on the digital assessment form as well
Consequence of assessment	The student proceeds; if necessary the mentor advises the student concerning his working method and pace

P1 responsibilities	
Preparation	
Action	Responsible
Make student file in SharePoint Graduation Registration	Education & Student Affairs
Register students First mentor in Graduation administration	Semester coordinator
Schedule day, time and location and inform student and mentor team	Semester coordinator
15 minutes before start presentation: hang drawings of project or design and if necessary install digital presentation	Student (See appendix 1 for the description of required products)
The evaluation	
Action	Responsible
Draft research design, planning of graduation process	Student (See appendix 1 for the description of required products)
Assess student progress and fill in “P1 assessment form”	First mentor, Second mentor
Determine date for P2 presentation	First mentor, Second mentor
Completion	
Action	Responsible
Check registration at the assessment form; use notes, advise and make agreements	First mentor
Within 2 days after P1; send the assessment form to the student, with email button on the assessment form	First mentor

Evaluation 2 Formal assessment

Goal	The base for passing the P2 should be that the belief is that the student can graduate in the quarter following the P2 period with a satisfactory result
Where	Reserved room by O&S scheduling department
When	Week 3.7 according to the academic graduation calendar
Admission conditions	Enrollment for and admission to the P2 presentation is only possible if students have all credits for semesters 1, 2 and 3 Deadline: week 3.4
Structure	Presentation: standard 30 minutes; afterwards minimum 15 minutes questions and appraisal;
Assessors	First mentor, second mentor, third mentor (optional) and the delegate of the Board of Examiners
Required quorum	First mentor, one other mentor and the delegate of the Board of Examiners
Subjects of assessment	Graduation plan (see Appendix 2), provisional research and analysis (result), (see Appendix 1 for exact definitions)
Method of assessment	Assessment is based on the P2 assessment criteria; the conclusion of the assessment is: passed, restriction or failed
Method of assessment registration	The assessment and conclusion are registered on the P2 assessment form in the digital Graduation Registration
Consequence of assessment	At result "passed", the chance to graduate within the time frame is realistic; at assessment result "restriction" the student does a retake within two weeks; at result "failed", the retake is in the next P2 period.
Restriction	At result "restriction" the assessors are convinced that a realistic chance exists the student will be able to pass the P2 by making a restoration assignment within two weeks, in that case the restriction is described at the P2 assessment form; the First mentor agrees a date and time for the retake with the student, the second mentor and the delegate of the Board of Examiners in order to solve the restriction; if the restriction isn't solved with this retake, then the rule stated under "failed" applies
Failed	If a retake based on a restriction as described above isn't achievable, or the student didn't lift the restriction, the student has to retake the P2 in week 4.5 (same week as regular P4 presentations).

P2 responsibilities	
	Preparation
Action	Responsible
Register in SharePoint the scheduled days and times for the student's P2 evaluations; deadline according Academic Graduation calendar	Semester coordinator
Register P2 location if in own studio or own reserved room	Semester coordinator
Check whether student meets the admission conditions and register in SharePoint; inform student by email on result admission assessment	Student Administration Office with the secretary of the Board of Examiners
Allocate delegate of the Board of Examiners and register, delegate of the Board of Examiners and substitute in SharePoint	Secretary Education and Student Affairs
Allocate second and third mentors and register in SharePoint for each student, one month before start P2 period at the latest. The appointed mentors must be connected with different sections. Only by exception, and agreed by the Board of Examiners based on a motivated request, two mentors of the same section, but different scientific fields may be appointed. Conditions: • two different scientific fields; • the motivated request is sent to the Board of Examiners at the P2 registration deadline at the latest; • motivation include "why meaningful for this student"	Semester coordinator

P2 responsibilities	
Schedule P2 for admitted students; scheduled presentations will be part of the Staff Members timetables on My Timetables	Scheduling department
Hand in the research and graduation report at the Board of Examiners, First mentor, mentors en delegate of the BoE at least one week before P2	Student
Read and assess the Graduation report	Mentors and the delegate of the Board of Examiners
15 minutes before start, hang drawings of project or design and if necessary install digital presentation	Student (See appendix 1 for exact definition for preparations for this evaluation)
Check mentor team composition and sign for approval	EMU Programme director
The evaluation	
Action	Responsible
Act as chairman	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Present graduation plan, plan, draft research results and draft of graduation project using digital presentation and/or drawings	Student (See appendix 1 and 2 for exact products for this evaluation)
Questioning the own academic field	All mentors
Evaluate academic level of students presentation and mentors questions	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
The appraisal	
Action	Responsible
Act as chairman	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Determine final judgment	First mentor, mentors, delegate of the Board of Examiners
Determine if the student must be advised to consult an academic counsellor	First mentor, mentors, delegate of the Board of Examiners
Fill in P2 assessment form and register the conclusion on the P2 assessment form	First mentor
Completion	
Action	Responsible
Inform the student of assessment and make arrangements for re-take (restriction) if necessary	First mentor
Complete assessment form with own notes within two workings days	Second mentor, third mentor and delegate of the Board of Examiners
Check assessment form and send it to student by email, using the button on the assessment form	First mentor
Check whether assessment form is filled in correctly; undertake action if items are missing	Board of Examiners
Register completion P2 in students SPR in Osiris	Student Administration Office (SAO)

Evaluation 3 Compulsory progress review

Goal	Survey whether the student's working method and progress guarantee he or she will be able to meet the requirements for the P4 in time
Where	Reserved room
When	Week 3.10
Structure	Presentation: minimum 15 minutes and maximum 30 minutes Questions: 15 minutes
Assessors	First mentor (compulsory) Second mentor (compulsory) Third mentor (optional)
Subjects of assessment	Content and progress plan of graduation project, draft reflection
Method of assessment	Assessment is based on the P3 assessment criteria of the chosen track; the mentors give the student a positive or negative indication concerning plan and progress graduation project; also feedback on the draft reflection is given
Method of assessment registration	The assessment and conclusion are registered on the P3 assessment form in the digital Graduation Registration
Consequence of assessment	The student proceeds; if necessary the mentor advises the student concerning his working method and rate

P3 responsibilities	
Preparation	
Action	Responsible
Schedule day, time and location and inform student and mentor team. NOTE: Do not schedule in P2, P4 or P5 period	First mentor
Register scheduled date in digital graduation administration	First mentor
Hand in draft reflection at First mentor	Student
15 minutes before start evaluation, hang design or project drawing and if necessary install digital presentation	Student (see appendix 1 for exact definition for required products for this evaluation)
At the evaluation	
Action	Responsible
Present graduation plan, plan, graduation project and reflection	Student (see appendix 1 for exact description of required products for this evaluation)
Fill in "P3 assessment form", determine conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES – student made enough progress to register for nominal P4 • NO – student didn't make enough progress for nominal P4 Register feedback on student's draft reflection	First mentor
Determine and register if the student should consult the academic counsellor	First mentor
Document the conclusion on the P3 assessment form	First mentor
Completion	
Action	Responsible
Inform the student of assessment; advice on progress	First mentor
Check registration at the assessment form; use notes, advise and make agreements	First mentor
Within 2 days after P3; send the assessment form to the student, with email button on the assessment form	First mentor
Register completion P3 in student's SPR in Osiris	Student Administration Office (SAO)

Evaluation 4 Formal assessment

Goal	Assessment whether content of academic fields and presentation meet the requirements to admit the student to the final public presentation (P5)
Where	Class room, instruction room or lecture hall
When	At week 4.5 according to academic graduation calendar
Admission requirements	Student has finished all educational components
Structure	15 minutes for student's preparation Maximum 30 minutes presentation 15 minutes questions 15 minutes appraisal
Assessors	First mentor Second mentor Third mentor (optional) Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Required quorum	First mentor One other mentor Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Subjects of assessment	All graduation products / subjects, including the final reflection (See Appendix 3)
Method of assessment	Assessment is based on the P4 assessment criteria; the mentors give the student a positive (GO) or negative (NO-GO) judgment on the graduation project
How is the assessment registered	The assessment and conclusion are registered on the P4 assessment form in the digital Graduation Registration
Consequence of assessment	A positive judgement at P4 (GO) guarantees the student will obtain at least a grade 6 for all academic fields (including all forms of presentation) and also as end mark at the final presentation (P5); if a student fails to meet the requirements he obtains a NO GO; in case a student doesn't appear at the P4 evaluation or withdraws in advance, this will be registered as "withdrawal" at the assessment form; this withdrawals and in case the students doesn't apply for a P4 nominal after passing the P2, this will be counted as a NO GO result This applies for every P4 period according to the academic graduation calendar; the mentor assesses whether the student should be referred to a student counselor; after a second NO GO the student is given a binding advice to consult a student counselor; the First mentor uses the assessment form, field "Academic counselor"; after a third NO GO the student is basically no longer offered any guidance or supervision
Retake	At a result "NO GO" the retake will be held in the next P5 period. The P5 will be done in week 1.1 of the new academic year or earlier if mentors and delegate are available during the holiday.

P4 responsibilities	
Preparation	
Action	Responsible
Arrange with mentors and delegate of the Board of Examiners a preferred date and half-day within the defined P4 period with all involved	Semester coordinator
Fill in the P4 hard copy application form and collect signatures from all mentors and the delegate of the Board of Examiners; submit the completed form before deadline according to graduation calendar to Servicepunt	Semester coordinator
Collect P4 forms at Service point and register P4 applications in the digital graduation registration	Secretary Education and Student Affairs Faculty of Architecture
Check whether student meets the admission requirements; discuss check on admission requirements and check mentor team approval; inform the student on the result of the admission check	Student Administration Office (SAO) with the Secretary of the Board of Examiners
Schedule P4	Education and Student Affairs scheduling
Send P4 products to mentors and delegate of the Board of Examiners: at least 1 week for P4 date	Student
Send final reflection to Board of Examiners, mentors and delegate of the Board of Examiners	Student
15 minutes before start evaluation, hang design or project drawings and if necessary install digital presentation	Student (see appendix 1 for exact definition for required products for this evaluation)

P4 responsibilities	
The evaluation	
Action	Responsible
Act as chairperson	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Present research result / graduation project and reflection using digital presentation and drawings	Student (See appendix 1 for exact description of the products for this evaluation).
Verify title graduation project; the title registered in the digital graduation registration will be on the diploma supplement and in the repository	First mentor
Questioning the own academic field	All mentors
Assess academic level of students' presentation and questions of the mentors	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
The private appraisal	
Action	Responsible
Act as chairperson	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Determine final judgment	First mentor, other mentors, delegate of the Board of Examiners
Determine if the student must be advised to consult an academic counsellor	First mentor, other mentors, delegate of the Board of Examiners
Document the assessment and conclusion on the digital assessment form	First mentor
If result "Go": determine P5 date and day part and register P5 date in Sharepoint	First mentor, other mentors, delegate of the Board of Examiners
Completion	
Action	Responsible
Inform the student of assessment; in case of a Go inform student also on requested P5 day and day part	First mentor
Fill in own field of P4 assessment form for presence, involved academic fields and own notes within two working days	Second mentor, third mentor and delegate of the Board of Examiners
Check assessment form and send it to student by email, using the button on the assessment form	First mentor
Appoint readers from 2 universities (other than the one where students went for exchange) part of the EMU consortium (UPC, IUAV, KU Leuven)	EMU Coordinator
Check whether assessment form is filled in correctly; undertake action if items are missing	Board of Examiners
Register completion P4 in students SPR in Osiris	Student Administration Office (SAO)

Evaluation 5 Public final presentation

Goal	Public final presentation and assessment graduation project
Where	Class room, instruction room or lecture hall at Faculty of Architecture, or at one of the consortium universities depending on the number of participating students.
When	Week 4.10
Admission requirements	Student has finished all educational components with exception of P5 assessment. Student has digitally handed in all required graduation products at TU Delft repository and delivered the P5 report to all mentors, readers and delegate at least one week before the P5; First mentor has taken care of complete registration in the digital graduation file, including registering all assessments
Structure	15 minutes for student's preparation 30 minutes presentation 15 minutes questions 15 minutes appraisal 15 minutes announcing the results and graduation ceremony
Assessors	First mentor Second mentor Third mentor Both readers from the other universities (not mandatory) Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Required quorum	First mentor One other mentor Assessment of both readers (if not present at the evaluation) should be available before the presentation. Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Subjects of assessment	Research / graduation project and final reflection
Method of assessment	Assessment is based on the P5 assessment criteria; the mentors give the student a mark for all involved academic fields, presentation and an end mark
How the assessment is registered	The assessment and marks are registered on the P5 assessment form
Consequence of assessment	All parts should be rewarded with at least the mark 6.0 and the end mark should also be 6.0 or higher; student is graduated and subsequently receives his or her Master diploma

P5 responsibilities	
Preparation	Responsible
Register a preferred date and half-day within the defined P5 period with all involved; should be done at P4	First mentor
Check whether P5 date is registered for all students who passed P4	Secretary Education and Student affairs
Check whether student meets the admission requirements. If yes deliver diploma to E&SA BK	Student Administration Office (SAO) and CSA
Inform student on admission, procedure and P5 obligations	Secretary Education and Student Affairs
Schedule P5	O&S scheduling
Print student's blank P5 mark list	Secretary Education and Student affairs
Collect the diploma, student's P5 mark list on the day of the P5 at Secretariat O&S	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Determine whether embargo on graduation work is desired. If yes: Apply a request: see Forms .	Student and First mentor
Digitally store the graduation project at TU Delft repository at the latest at day of the final presentation; compulsory documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduation plan (P2) • Final reflection report (P4) • Presentation P5 • Graduation research report • Set of final drawings (if applicable) 	Student
15 minutes before start evaluation, hang design or project drawings and install digital presentation	Student (See appendix 1 for exact definition for required products for this evaluation)

P5 responsibilities	
The evaluation	
Action	Responsible
Act as chairperson	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Present research result / graduation project and reflection using digital presentation and drawings	Student (see appendix 1 for exact definition for required products for this evaluation)
Questioning the own academic field. Determine whether student improved final project based on remarks made at P4	All mentors
Assess academic level of students' presentation and questions of the mentors	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
The appraisal	
Action	Responsible
Act as chairperson	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Fill in the P5 assessment form: Complete with notes to specify the strong and weaker parts.	First mentor
Determine the mark for all academic fields, presentation and end mark	All mentors and delegate of the Board of Examiners
Register all marks at the P5 assessment form	First mentor
Register all marks on student's paper mark list	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Open diploma envelop and determine if student graduated "Cum Laude"	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Determine whether the student will be rewarded with an honorable mention (for conditions see chapter 2)	First mentor, other mentors, delegate of the Board of Examiners
Completion	
Action	Responsible
Welcome student and public to diploma ceremony	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Inform the student of assessment results and address on the process, content of graduation project and the method of working	First mentor
Hand over the paper mark lists to student	First mentor
Hand out diploma	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
Sign diploma two sided	Student
In case of a (possible) Cum Laude diploma: return extra diploma directly after the P5 to O&S secretary	Delegate of the Board of Examiners
At Honourable Mention: Draft a written motivation and send it to O&S secretary within five working days; also add a copy to the graduation file	First mentor
Day after the P5: Check assessment form and send it to student by email, using the button on the assessment form	First mentor
Check whether assessment form is filled in correctly; undertake action if items are missing	Board of Examiners
Unsubscribe as TU Delft student, via Studielink Remember to unsubscribe for TU Delft via Studielink in the month of your graduation. You will be unenrolled from the 1st of the next month. If you do not unenrol in time you are required to pay tuition fees for another month. Unenrolling retroactively is not possible. Tuition fee refunds Under certain circumstances the tuition fee can be partly refunded. See website Central Student Administration -	Student
Register P5 result in Osiris	Student Administration Office (SAO)
After student uploaded graduation documents at TU Delft repository: send diploma supplement to student address	Student Administration Office (SAO)
Archive students graduation registration	Student Administration Office (SAO)

2.0 Particular circumstances

Quorum at evaluations

A quorum is required for the graduation evaluation to be valid.

Quorum for P2, P4 and P5: First mentor, one other mentor and delegate of the Board of Examiners

- Absence of delegate of the Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners appoints delegate of the Board of Examiners and substitute delegate of the Board of Examiners for all evaluations. If the delegate of the Board of Examiners will be unable to attend an evaluation he asks the substitute to replace him and informs the Secretary of the Board of Examiners on this replacement. The deputy delegate of the Board of Examiners is registered in the digital graduation registration.

- Absence of First mentor or mentor

If it is known in advance that the First mentor or other mentor will be unable to attend, a presentation must be held for that mentor prior to the evaluation. The assessment and signature of the mentor concerned must be written down in a letter. This letter must be given to the delegate of the Board of Examiners in a closed envelope. At the appraisal this assessment will be taken into account by the other mentors for determining the final assessment.

At unexpected absence there will be looked by the First mentor and other present mentors for an exam authorized deputy within the same academic field.

The Secretariat of the Board of Examiners is also informed by the First mentor or delegate of the Board of Examiners about this absence. The evaluation should preferably be continued and the final assessment should be determined after hearing the absent mentor.

The determination for a GO / NO GO or the registration of the marks on the final mark lists only takes place after consulting the absent mentor by phone. If this isn't possible final judgment at the P4 is postponed at the P5 a "pass" is registered for the involved academic field. In both cases a meeting with the absent mentor takes place on the shortest possible term, to determine a final conclusion. At doubt or on request of the student, it may be decided that an extra presentation must be held.

- Problems in the appraisal

It may occur that the appraisal doesn't lead to an assessment. The delegate of the Board of Examiners informs the student on this situation and explains the applied procedure and the corresponding terms. Subsequently he collects the presented products and presents the problem to the chairman of the Board of Examiners. The chairman of the Board of Examiners will reconvene the mentor team and the delegate of the Board of Examiners for a reappraisal, which he will chair, in which he will attempt to achieve consensus. In the event of failing he will make a final decision.

3.0 Special qualifications

Honourable mention¹

On intercession of the mentor and approval of the delegate of the Board of Examiners the predicate Honourable Mention may be attached to the examination result. The condition for this is that the examinee achieved a final mark 8.5 or higher for the graduation project.

The student is informed on the Honourable Mention at the diploma ceremony. The written Honourable Mention will be handed over to the student within two weeks after the final presentation.

In case of particular circumstances or exceptional characteristic an Honourable Mention is only possible after agreement from the Board of Examiners.

Cum Laude²

The student graduates his Master exam 'cum laude' if he meets the following conditions:

- the weighted average of the results of the Master courses not including the Master final Project is at least 8.0 or higher
- the final mark for the public final presentation is at least 8,0 or higher
- and the Master program is completed within 2 academic years and one semester.

In that case a note 'cum laude' is made on the student's diploma.

¹ The complete system is described in Article 37 of the Rules and Regulations of the Exam Committee.

² The complete system is described in Article 36 of the Rules and Regulations of the Exam Committee

Appendix 1 – Subjects to be assessed per evaluation**General:**

- All products must reflect an academic attitude: evidence based, logical, critical.
- All products must reflect a professional attitude: presented using the appropriate media at appropriate scales.
- At the P5 examination the master thesis report / design will be graded on the subjects of the studio, being the main academic, second (and third) discipline, oral, written and visual presentation. In addition an overall grade will be given.

Note: Consult your mentor for the exact interpretation of the requirements.

EMU

P1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary thesis plan. • Abstract or Review paper (250-500 words) • Presentation P1
P2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduation Plan based on template (see appendix 2) • Presentation and P2 report, which includes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thesis Plan; ○ Text for Graduation Orientation.
P3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft reflection (see appendix 3) • Progress research / analysis / design
P4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation P4, • P4 report (including reflection) • Final reflection (see appendix 2 and 3)
P5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final presentation • Final report showing research, analysis and design (including reflection)

Each graduation plan should contain at least a short text/answer to the following questions:

Reflection
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the relation between your graduation (project) topic and the main research fields addressed on EMU? 2. What is the relevance of your graduation work in the larger social, professional and scientific framework?

Content of Graduation plan

Graduation Plan

The graduation plan consists of at least the following data/segments:

Personal information	
Name	
Student number	
Address	
Postal code	
Place of residence	
Telephone number	
E-mail address	
Graduation committee	
Main mentor	(name and specialisation)
Second Mentor	(idem)
Title	
Title of the graduation research	
Research	
Problem Statement and relevance	
What is the scientific problem that will be solved / investigated? Why is it important? Discuss: the value of the graduation research in the larger social and scientific framework	
Research questions and scope	
Define the main research questions that you plan to answer.	
Background information and related work	
Overview of all topics related to your main research question.	
Methodology	
A description of the methodology you plan to use to answer your research questions.	
Time planning	
A scheme of the division of the workload of the graduation research in the timeframe. The submitted Graduation document might be rejected if the planning is unrealistic.	

A format for the Graduation plan is available on-line, see: [Graduation Plan](#).

Appendix 3 – Reflection P3 and P4

At the P3 the student has to hand in the draft reflection.

The First mentor assesses whether the reflection meets the criteria below and touches upon the below mentioned aspects.

At P4 a final reflection must be included as a distinct part of the written graduation report / thesis (a separate chapter/appendix).

In the reflection the student uses a short substantiated explanation to account for the preliminary results of the research and design in the graduation phase (product, process, planning). The choice of method (how) and argumentation (why) which preceded the research, was a part of your study plan – the reflection must contain an answer to the question of how and why the approach did or did not work, and to what extent. The aim of the reflection is to look back and see:

- if your approach worked
- your understanding on the “how and why”
- your reflection upon the feedback that was given by your mentors
- how you have translated the feedback into your work
- how you’ve learned from your own work.

Finally, the student has to look ahead and describe how the final part of the graduation period will be filled in.

Depending on the graduation (project) topic, reflection on the following aspects should be included (you may choose in which order; please follow the written instructions of your MSc track / graduation lab wherein the following aspects are integrated). The reflection should be in the form of a text, with diagrams and sketches for purposes of illustration and clarification.

Aspect 1

the relationship between research and design.

Aspect 2

the relationship between your graduation (project) topic and the main research fields addressed on EMU.

Aspect 3

Elaboration on research method and approach chosen by the student in relation to the methodical line of inquiry of EMU, reflecting thereby upon the scientific relevance of the work.

Aspect 4

Elaboration on the relationship between the graduation project and the wider social, professional and scientific framework, touching upon the transferability of the project results.

Aspect 5

Discuss the ethical issues and dilemmas you may have encountered in (i) doing the research, (ii, if applicable) elaborating the design and (iii) potential applications of the results in practice.

Appendix 4 – Manual delegate of the Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners has prepared an instruction for the delegate of the Board of Examiners. This document is available for teaching staff and will be sent to all delegates every academic year.

Appendix 5 – Reference to official regulations

Subject	Registered at	Article
Archiving graduation project and results	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 18, subsection 2, 5, 6
Master final project	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 23
Composition of the assessment committee for Master Thesis Project	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 24
Appointment of delegate of the Board of Examiners	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 5, subsection 4
Working method of the assessment committee	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 25
Official date of Master final project result	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 26
Pass and fail rules	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 29
The predicate designation “cum laude” for Master degree audits	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 32
“Honourable mention”	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 33
Publication graduation work in TU Delft repository	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 18, subsection 5
Possibility for embargo on work in repository	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 22, subsection 6
Degree certificate and supplement	Rules and Guidelines of the Board of Examiners	Article 34

EMMA feedback and assessment tool

Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, TU Delft
Augustus 2017

ABOUT EMMA

EMMA is a feedback and assessment tool for academic graduation projects of the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment. It has been developed to improve the transparency and justification of our assessments and the feedback students receive during the graduation phase.

The starting point of EMMA is the practical experience and the philosophical statement that (1) knowledge is two-fold: part is tacit, part can be made explicit, (2) knowledge takes place on different levels: the whole (or 'gestalt') exceeding the sum of its parts, and (3) coherence in end results meaning 'projects having their own rules' (customisation). Therefore EMMA focusses on the essence of design and research projects. It gives an overview of all essential aspects, which should be part of design and research projects. At the same time, EMMA enables tracks and studios to clarify the emphasis naturally following from the character of the studio and project at hand.

EMMA is meant to be used both as an assessment tool – to clarify the assessment; and as a feedback tool – to discuss the project with the student. It enables feedback and assessment regarding the essential aspects and the studio specific emphasis and way of working – during the graduation project and in particular at the P2. At the final assessment (P5) EMMA should be used during the deliberation as an extra to check on the marks and the corresponding standard.

EMMA has been developed by: ir. E.J.G.C. van Dooren, ir. M.H. Meijs, ir. R.J. Nottrot, ir. T.C. Homans, ir. C.M. Calis, ir. P.H.M. Jennen, ir. K.F.L. Zigterman, mr. F.A.M. Hobma (MBE), ir. P.G. Teeuw (BT), dr.ir. I. Bobbink (LA), ir. K.P.M. Aalbers (U), dr. J.L. Heintz (red.) and other educational staff. EMMA was piloted in the Architecture track in spring 2015-2016. In 2016-2017, EMMA was further developed and 'translated' to the other tracks. EMMA will be used in all tracks of the MSC programme Architecture, Urbanism and Building Sciences from fall 2017-2018.

P5 CRITERIA (ALL TRACKS)

DESIGN & RESEARCH – What is presented will be assessed on coherence, significance, elaboration, correctness and innovativeness – both on main line and on aspects.	Result
What is presented displays a minimal level of coherence and significance, correctness and elaboration.	6
What is presented is adequately coherent and significant. On the main issues it is correct and complete and on some aspects examined in greater depth.	7
What is presented is coherent and significant. On the main issues it is correct, thorough and complete. It is on all relevant aspects elaborated in greater depth or there is a degree of innovation or elegance.	8
What is presented is coherent and significant. It is correct, thorough, complete and elaborated on all relevant aspects. It displays a degree of depth and precision and a degree of innovation or elegance.	9
What is presented is coherent, significant, and innovative. It is correct, thorough, complete and elaborated on all aspects. It is characterized by great depth, precision and elegance.	10

PRESENTATION – What is presented will be assessed on the degree to which it is clear, intelligible, reflective and engaging – both on main line and on aspects.	Result
The presentation displays a minimal level of clarity, intelligibility and reflection.	6
The presentation is sufficiently clear and intelligible. It explains the main line and some aspects with sufficient presentational means. There is some argumentation and reflection. As listener you are more or less engaged by it.	7
The presentation is clear, intelligible and elegant. It explains the main line and aspects with relevant presentational means. There is argumentation and reflection. As listener you are engaged by it.	8
The presentation is clear, intelligible and elegant. It explains the main line and aspects with a complete set of relevant presentational means. There is good argumentation and reflection. As listener you are really engaged by it.	9
The presentation is clear, intelligible and elegant. It explains the main line and aspects with a complete set of presentational means characterized by accuracy and precision. There is profound argumentation and reflection, also in the sense of positioning in a broader context. As listener you are really engaged by it.	10

Final mark

The final mark is the average, or may deviate from the average depending on the extent to which the whole does (or not) exceed the sum of its parts, or due other exceptional qualities of the work.

ASSESSMENT P1-P4 (ALL TRACKS)

P	DESIGN & RESEARCH:	Assessment	P Result
P1	Regarding to the end-criterion: "What is presented, will be assessed on coherence, significance, elaboration, correctness and innovativeness – both on main line and on aspects."	That what is presented is promising.	:)
		In what is presented issues are still missing.	:S
P2	Regarding to the end-criterion: "What is presented, will be assessed on coherence, significance, elaboration, correctness and innovativeness – both on main line and on aspects."	That what is presented is sufficient to go on.	Passed
		That what is presented is insufficient on this moment.	Retake
		That what is presented is insufficient to go on.	Failed
P3	Regarding to the end-criterion: "What is presented, will be assessed on coherence, significance, elaboration, correctness and innovativeness – both on main line and on aspects."	That what is presented is on track.	:)
		In what is presented issues are still missing.	:S
P4	Regarding to the end-criterion: "What is presented, will be assessed on coherence, significance, elaboration, correctness and innovativeness – both on main line and on aspects."	That what is presented is sufficient or more than sufficient in all disciplines.	Go
		That what is presented is insufficient in one or more disciplines.	No Go
		The student has withdrawn from P4.	Withdrawal

P1-P4 list with detailed explanation of the overall criterion for design and research
Check the aspect(s) to which the student has to pay extra attention

EMU European Post-master's in Urbanism

Design

You have to pay extra attention to presence, development and profoundness of:	Check box if applicable
Coherence: internal consistency, integration, essence, concept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Significance: ethical, socio-cultural and/or scientific relevance, value, meaning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elaboration: extensiveness, degree of detail of all aspects	<input type="checkbox"/>
Correctness: accuracy, efficacy, and evidence-based	<input type="checkbox"/>
Innovativeness: personal interpretation, creativity, new, unexpected, unique situation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge and know-how: effective study and use, processing of precedents and principles	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exploration: openness, discovering and investigation, analysis and testing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reflection: careful consideration, evaluation, effects, comparing and positioning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation: clarity, intelligibility, reflection and being engaged by it as a listener	<input type="checkbox"/>

Design – track-specific aspects EMU

You have to pay extra attention to the development of your design with respect to:	Check box if applicable
Spatial aspects: such as the composition of structure and space, landscapes, networks and systems, material and atmosphere, time and transformations, relations between scales	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contextual and environmental aspects: such as site-specificity, process, ecology, climate design, water management, urban metabolism and response to the surroundings in terms of shape, composition and mass.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategic (planning) aspects: planning systems and cultures, governance, political situation, decision making process, stakeholders, phasing and implementation strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Functional and technological aspects: such as land-use, program, requirements, accessibility and connectivity, 'new technologies'	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socio-cultural aspects: such as social, cultural, ethical, historical, philosophical, economical aspects – in particular sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/>

Research

You have to pay extra attention to presence, development and profoundness of:	Check box if applicable
	<input type="checkbox"/>

Coherence: internal consistency, integration, essence, concept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Significance: ethical, socio-cultural and/or scientific relevance, value, meaning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elaboration: extensiveness, degree of detail of all aspects	<input type="checkbox"/>
Correctness: accuracy, efficacy, and evidence-based	<input type="checkbox"/>
Innovativeness: personal interpretation, creativity, new, unexpected, unique situation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge and know-how: effective study and use, processing of precedents and principles	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exploration: openness, discovering and investigation, analysis and testing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reflection: careful consideration, evaluation, effects, comparing and positioning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation: clarity, intelligibility, reflection and being engaged by it as a listener	<input type="checkbox"/>

Research (continuation)

You have to pay extra attention to the development of your research with respect to:	Check box if applicable
Abstract: summary, main line	<input type="checkbox"/>
Problem statement and research question: formulation objective, context, main and sub-questions and theoretical scope problem	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research method: description and appropriateness of research method(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results: outcomes research, order, formulation and processing all relevant data	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusion: direct answer on research question(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: reflection on research method, data and answer in a broader context, such as position in society or academic debate and possible relation with design	<input type="checkbox"/>

EMMA GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Coherence	The product is consistent. It is the degree of internal integration of the end product, to what extent main line and elaboration of all aspects form a consistent whole. It is a quality, concept or essence, in the sense of the sum being more than all its aspects.
Significance	Relevance, meaning. It has quality and value in relation to a wider context. It is deepening a focus, a design vision or research question in relation to the professional, scientific, 'designerly', historical, philosophical, ethical and / or socio-cultural context. It is well-argued.
Elaboration	Development, fleshing out, extensiveness. It addresses a relevant number of aspects and the degree to which they are resolved. It is the extent to which both detail aspects and main line are worked out, also in relation to each other.
Correctness	Accuracy, efficacy, and evidence-based. The information, facts and deployed design / research techniques and tools make sense. They are based on or emerging from accepted (professional) knowledge and know-how, and they make sense in relation to each other. Innovative methods and new knowledge developed or applied in the project must be grounded and substantiated either empirically or theoretically.
Innovativeness	Creativity, original contribution, personal interpretation, holding the attention or interest of, as by beauty or excellence. Design and research products vary in this respect from coming up with a 'craftsman's piece of work' in a specific, unique, complex, vague and open-ended situation to an innovative aspect or artefact, in the sense of surprising and unfamiliar combinations and unexpected ideas.
Knowledge and know-how	All kind of professional well-established knowledge and experience, in the form of theory, principles, patterns and tools. It is effective precedent study, interpretation and processing to come up with a qualitative good product in a specific unique situation at hand. In the end the product itself increases the professional culture of knowledge and know-how.
Exploration	Studying, generating alternatives, testing, trial-and-error, trial-and-reflection. It includes the whole palette of looking over from different perspectives, thinking out of the box, investigating knowledge and new developments, to learning about an issue at hand by experimenting.
Reflection	Careful consideration, arguing, thinking thoroughly and critically. Observation, comparison, evaluation, valuing, and positioning aspects in relation to each other and in a broader context. Reflection takes place on different scales: on making decisions as part of the process of coming up with a design or research product, on the personal way of working and on positioning the product in relation to a broader professional, scientific, ethical, historical, philosophical, social, cultural context.
Presentation	Explanation and reflection on all relevant issues, regarding main line (focus, significance and innovativeness) and all relevant aspects of design / research products (elaboration and correctness). Aspects are: clarity of structure, readability of text, drawings and schemes, appropriateness of reasoning and arguments, positioning your personal way of working and design/research product in relation to a broader professional, scientific, historical, philosophical, socio-cultural context. Including the use of adequate presentational means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to express the aspects and scale levels of the design product: a set of different, complementary means, such as 2- and 3-dimensional sketches, spatial, functional and technical drawings on all relevant scales (such as perspectives, plans, sections, facades, details), models and oral text. - to express the research product: oral and written text, schemes, tables and drawings to illustrate.