

**Thesis assessment grading scheme MSc - Faculty of EEMCS**

Name student:

Student number:

<i>Please circle what is applicable</i>		<b>≤5 (fail)</b>	<b>6 (sufficient)</b>	<b>7 (satisfactory)</b>	<b>8 (good)</b>	<b>9 (very good)</b>	<b>10 (excellent)</b>
<b>1. Quality of work</b>	Research method/design	Unsystematic and/or no validated use of research and design methodologies. Insufficient explanation.	Adequate use of research and design methodologies. Limited explanation.	Adequate use of research and design methodologies. Explained and justified.	Use of the right research and design methodologies. Well-explained and well justified.	Profound and critical use of research and design methodologies. Very clear and validated design.	Excellent demonstration of research and design methodologies.
	Application/development of theory	Does not relate theory to the performed project.	Has difficulties applying theory to the performed project.	Sufficiently applied theory in the performed project.	Has applied theory to the performed project.	Has applied theory well to the performed project.	Has integrated existing theory from different fields or sources into a new and original theoretical description/new design.
	Interpretation of the results	No sufficient interpretation and verification of the results. Conclusions are unconnected to the results and no verification of the results has been carried out.	Findings are treated as straightforward and unproblematic. No or only minimal verification has been carried out. Conclusions have sufficient link with results.	Findings are treated as straightforward and unproblematic. Verification has been carried out. Conclusions are based on the results.	Uses techniques for interpretation and verification in a mechanical way. Conclusions are based on results in a clear way.	Good interpretation and verification of the results. The conclusions are based on the results in a clear way and are extrapolated to a wider context.	Detailed interpretation and verification of the results. The conclusions are based on the results in a clear way and are extrapolated to a wider context.
	Scientific significance	Work done is not reliable and cannot be communicated to the outside world.	Work done has minimal scientific significance and should be checked and possibly redone before results can be communicated to the outside world.	Work done has some scientific significance. Work should be checked before it can be included in external reports or publications.	Results can be communicated without hesitation to the outside world. Work has contributed to a conference paper, a journal publication or a patent.	We are proud to communicate the results to the outside world. The work had directly led to a conference paper, a journal publication or a patent.	We are proud to communicate the results to the outside world. Work had directly led to a publication in a high ranked journal or a patent.
	Remarks						
<b>2. Performance</b>	Critical attitude	Does not show a critical attitude towards own results.	Has limited critical attitude towards own results.	Has a sufficiently critical attitude towards own results, limited critical attitude towards literature and specialists.	Has a sufficiently critical attitude towards own results, literature and specialists.	Has a critical attitude towards own results, sufficient critical attitude towards literature and specialists.	Has a critical attitude towards own results, literature and specialists.
	Creativity	Has not attempted to make an original contribution to the project.	Has not really made any original contribution to the project.	Has had at least one original contribution to the project not initiated or thought of by the supervisor.	Has come up with several original ideas, design options and/or concepts not initiated or thought of by the supervisor.	Has come up with many original ideas, design options and/or concepts not initiated or thought of by the supervisor.	Has surprised us all with some brilliant new ideas, design options and/or concepts, both in breadth and depth.
	Initiative	Student shows no initiative at all.	Student randomly picks up some initiatives and/or new ideas suggested by others (e.g. supervisor).	Student occasionally takes initiative, together with the supervisor, to extend or modify the research/design plan or to suggest an alternative method or approach.	Student takes initiative at multiple occasions to give his/her own input for the research/design plan or the followed method and approach.	Major parts of the research/design plan, followed method and approach were essentially initiated, selected and defined by the student.	Problem formulation, research/design plan, followed method and approach were essentially all initiated, selected and defined by the student.
	Interaction with peers/ superiors	Is hardly able to interact with peers and superiors.	Has difficulty interacting with peers and superiors.	Sufficient interaction with peers and superiors.	Good interaction with peers and superiors.	Very good interaction with peers and superiors.	Outstanding interaction with peers and superiors.
	Planning	Is not able to make and execute a project plan.	Is able to make and execute a project plan with some help from the supervisor.	Is able to make and execute a project plan.	Is able to make and execute a good project plan.	Very good time planning. Student can adapt project plan as circumstances change.	Excellent project plan. Project time was not exceeded, not even in cases of unexpected circumstances.
Remarks							
<b>3. Report</b>	Content	Report shows no coherence of content.	Report shows sufficient coherence of content.	Report fulfils all requirements in terms of content.	Good report in terms of content.	Very good report in terms of content.	Excellent report in terms of content.
	Form	Structure needs considerable improvement. General presentation of the content (text and figures) not very effective.	Structure need some improvement. General presentation of the content (text and figures) is sufficient.	Structure is acceptable. General presentation of the content (text and figures) is satisfactory.	Clear structure. Good presentation of the content (text and figures).	Well-structured document. General presentation of the content (text and figures) is effective.	Very well-structured document. General presentation of the content (text and figures) is very effective.
	Quality of writing	Poorly expressed. Document contains serious spelling and grammatical errors.	Reasonably expressed argumentation. Document contains some spelling and grammatical errors.	Sufficiently expressed argumentation. The document contains little spelling and grammatical errors.	Expressed and formulated well. Document has a nice flow. Document contains only minor spelling and grammatical errors.	Expressed and formulated very well. Document has a smooth flow with sufficient transitions. Document is without any spelling and grammatical errors.	Excellent expressed and formulated report. Document has a smooth flow with effective transitions. Spelling and grammatically error free.
	Independence in writing	The report required substantial input from the (principal) supervisor(s).	The report required considerable input from the (principal) supervisor(s).	The report required significant input from the (principal) supervisor(s).	The report required some input from the (principal) supervisor(s).	The report required limited input from the (principal) supervisor(s).	The report required minimal input from the (principal) supervisor(s).
	Remarks						
<b>4. Presentation &amp; defence</b>	Content	Presentation lacks detail and does not support conclusions. Irrelevant information presented.	Presentation lacks detail, and is just enough to support conclusions.	Presentation has sufficient detail to support conclusions.	Presentation has a good level of detail to support conclusions.	Presentation has a good level of detail to support the conclusions and to understand the recommendations.	Presentation has the right level of detail to support the conclusions and to understand the recommendations.
	Form	Presentation is unstructured and chaotic. No (proper) use of visual aids.	Logical structure of presentation is poor. Improvements to the structure should be made. Use of visual aids can be improved.	Logical structure of presentation is reasonable but needs some improvement. Sufficient use of visual aids.	Presentation has good logical structure, the essentials are separated from the ancillary. Good use of visual aids.	Presentation has very good logical structure, the essentials are clearly separated from the ancillary. Good use of visual aids.	Presentation has excellent logical structure, the essentials are very well separated from the ancillary. Perfect use of visual aids.
	Performance	Poorly expressed and formulated. Unclearly presented. Audience was ineffectively addressed.	Expression and formulation can be improved. Not always clearly presented. Audience was reasonably well addressed.	Expressed and formulated adequately. Most of the time clearly presented. Audience was sufficiently addressed.	Well expressed and formulated. Clearly presented. Audience was well addressed.	Very well expressed, formulated and clearly presented. Audience was well addressed and engaged.	Expressed, formulated and presented with great style, clarity and effectiveness. Audience was very well addressed and engaged.
	Defence	Weak argumentation. Some questions got wrong answers.	Sufficient argumentation. A few questions did not get fully answered.	Satisfying argumentation. A few questions could benefit from more thoughtful or complete answers.	Satisfying argumentation. Well answered questions. Not always complete.	Sound argumentation. Well answered questions.	Strong argumentation. Perfectly answered questions: thoughtful and complete answers.
	Remarks						