

Learning Outcomes		fail	6	7	8	9	10
1. Scientific knowledge & understanding	Scientific knowledge	Cannot relate the scientific content of the project to scientific knowledge at the level of MSc textbooks	Can discuss and explain the scientific content of the project at the level of MSc textbooks	Can discuss and explain the scientific content of the project at the level of review or tutorial papers	Can discuss and explain the scientific content of the project at the level of research papers	In between adjacent descriptions	Can discuss and explain the scientific content of the project at the level of advanced scientific papers
	Application of scientific knowledge	Is not or hardly able to apply relevant scientific knowledge to the research question(s) of the project	Can, with some difficulty, apply relevant scientific knowledge to the research question(s) of the project	In between adjacent descriptions	Can independently apply established scientific knowledge and methods in resolving the research question(s)	In between adjacent descriptions	Can independently apply state of the art scientific knowledge to the research question(s) of the project
2. Method and approach	Personal contribution (should have higher weight)	Has major difficulties in executing a prescribed research program, using methods and approaches suggested by the supervisor	Has executed a prescribed research program, following methods and approaches suggested by the supervisor	In between adjacent descriptions	Has contributed significant new, useful ideas and methods to the research	In between adjacent descriptions	Has independently contributed ideas and/or methods that were essential for obtaining significant results from the research
	Communication	Did not or seldom communicate the progress of the project with the supervisor	Communicated about the progress of the project with the supervisor only at the initiative of the supervisor.	In between adjacent descriptions	In consultation with the supervisor actively sought for contacts and advice and used these effectively in the research	In between adjacent descriptions	Communicates very clearly and stimulates an interactive atmosphere which benefits the student and the people in the research environment
	Use of scientific literature	Needed essential support in using literature suggested by the supervisor	Has, with some help, effectively used literature suggested by the supervisor in the research	In between adjacent descriptions	Has found significant literature relevant to the project and can discuss and explain its content	In between adjacent descriptions	Has independently performed a thorough literature study and used this effectively in the research
	Critical attitude	Never or hardly questions correctness and relevance of own results, which gives rise to serious doubts concerning their validity	Is critical to some of the own results, but this is not a general attitude. Results should always be checked.	In between adjacent descriptions	Can evaluate the reliability of own results, questions the reliability of results from literature or specialists. Own results are generally reliable.	In between adjacent descriptions	Critically evaluates the reliability of own results, can evaluate reliability of results from literature or specialists. Own results are reliable.
	Time planning	Is hardly able to make a planning, even with help; seldom meets deadlines	Can plan the research (in time and scope) with help; regularly misses deadlines	In between adjacent descriptions	Can make a planning (time & scope) and is open about targets which are not met; seldom misses deadlines	In between adjacent descriptions	Can make a planning and adapt this planning and/or the scope flexibly to the course of the research. Never misses deadlines
	Experimental/computer skills	Is hardly capable of independently performing experimental/computer tasks learned in the program And required for the research	Is capable of performing experimental and/or computational tasks learned in the program, Needs significant help for the tasks required in the research	Can, with some help, perform experimental and/or computational tasks at a level sufficient for completing the research	Can independently learn and apply experimental/computational methods in solving the research question	In between adjacent descriptions	Has successfully extended/improved/combined existing experimental and/or computer tools
3. Report	Technical quality of the report	Report does not fulfil basic requirements concerning structure and clarity or contains large scientific errors	Report fulfils basic requirements concerning structure and clarity and is free of large scientific errors	In between adjacent descriptions	Report is clear and well-structured, contains no significant errors	In between adjacent descriptions	Report is free of scientific errors and fulfils all requirements in terms of contents, structure and clarity
	Readability of the report (disregarding parts mainly (re-)written by others)	Report is very difficult to read and fails to deliver the main message	Report is difficult to read and it is difficult to follow the arguments and distil the message conveyed	Report is readable and, with some effort, arguments and messages can be extracted	Report is well readable and most arguments and messages have been clearly described	Report is well readable and arguments and messages are all very clear	Engaging to read; guides the reader to new insights or clarifies difficult concepts
4. Presentation and defence	Quality of the presentation	Lay audience nor experts could extract useful information from the talk; presentation lacked structure and use of visual aids was poor	Audience could extract only little useful information, the structure was not apparent. The use of visual aids did not help in conveying the message	In between adjacent descriptions	Audience got the main message; presentation structure was clear and use of visual aids helped getting the message across	In between adjacent descriptions	Aided by a very good structure and use of visual aids, the presentation kept the audience engaged and conveyed interesting ideas
	Depth of argumentation in oral defence and after presentation	Is not able to provide basic arguments in response to questions	Is able to provide basic arguments, but no detailed argumentation	In between adjacent descriptions	Detailed argumentation for most questions, interesting scientific meeting	In between adjacent descriptions	Lively scientific meeting; candidate handled questions like an expert
5. Competences	Level of English, spoken and written	Is not able to write and speak English at an adequate level for a scientific/technical environment	Is able to speak and write in English at an adequate level for a scientific/technical environment	In between adjacent descriptions	Comfortable in communicating in English, spoken and written	In between adjacent descriptions	Perfect use of academic English (including technical terms) in written and spoken communication
	Independence and responsibility	Needs continuous steering and supervision, takes no responsibility for the project	Needs very regular steering and supervision, takes sufficient responsibility to complete the project	In between adjacent descriptions	Can work independently, needs some steering or supervision, takes responsibility for most parts of the project	In between adjacent descriptions	Needs very little steering and supervision, takes full responsibility for the project
	Dealing with criticism	Non-responsive to criticism, or responds to criticism in an defensive and counter-productive way, or gets demotivated by criticism	Weakly responsive to criticism, sometimes responds to criticism in a defensive way, or loses motivation by criticism	In between adjacent descriptions	Can handle criticism in a positive way	Uses criticism to improve him/herself	Is actively seeking for criticism to improve him/herself

Note:

For each category, 6 levels are given, corresponding to a grade ranging from 'insufficient' to 10

The final grade is based on the sub-grades of the different categories, but it is not an average with fixed weights assigned to those categories.

In this form, the item 'personal contribution' is calculated with double weight relative to other items.

When a grade does not have a description, it denotes an 'in-between' of two adjacent descriptions