Master in Digital Culture
and Emerging Media

GUIDELINES FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE FINAL PROJECT

DiCEM | Guidelines for the Master's Degree Final Project

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

The 15 ECTS of the Master's Final Project have to be passed through the submission of a work in order to show the student's academic skills. The project has also to be presented in a public dissertation session in front of a Committee made up of three scholars (plus, optionally, a representative of the corresponding Master's degree partner, in the case of MFPs oriented to 'challenges' proposed by external partners).

1.1. Objective
The Master's Final Project has the objective to prove the intellectual maturity and the academic skills of the student. It has to be an original project, as a result of **personal or in-group work** of the student(s) under the guidance of a supervisor.

1.2. Advisor
The Master's Final Project is carried out under the monitoring of a supervisor, which is **assigned to the student(s) by the coordinator during the second term**. Eligible supervisors are the researchers and professors who give teaching in the Master, the doctors of the Department, doctors of UPF as co-supervisor with a doctor from the Master/Department, or doctors outside UPF as co-supervisor with a doctor from the Master/Department.

1.3. Submission's Deadline
The project is due to be submitted in **June** (the specific date will be announced to the students in due course). Delays won't be admitted. All the students which won't deliver or pass the Master's Final Project will be able to register it in the next academic year, provided that they

fulfil the requirements about continuity and number of calls. Please note this involves a fees surcharge.

1.4. Language
English, Spanish and Catalan are accepted, both for the written document and the oral presentation (public defence).

1.5. Dissertation (public defence)
The Project will be defended publicly in front of an assessment committee made up of three doctor lecturers (plus, optionally, a representative of the corresponding Master's degree partner, in the case of MFPs oriented to 'challenges' proposed by external partners). The dissertation will take place in July (the exact days will be notified through email during the academic year). The period between the delivery and the public dissertation won't be in any case inferior to fifteen days.
In the case of group projects, each relevant section of the presentation must be clearly assigned to one (and only one) of the members of the group, as the main author of the section (see below the guidelines on the individual signing of sections in the final project document).

1.6. Publication of the Project
Projects awarded with the excellent mark (greater than or equal to 9) will be published in RECERCAT, the Catalan digital research repository, for public dissemination. Students must attach the related permission when delivering the project.

1.7. Submission documentation
To be delivered to the Secretary of the Department of Communication:
> **1) Form for the delivery of the Master's Final Project** (get the form at the Master's website)
> **2) One PDF copy of the main document of the Master's final project** stating in the subject "TFM Name-Family name" (40 Mb maximum), to be uploaded to the Moodle platform.
> **3) Other/additional materials** (see point 2.3, below)
> **4) Permission to publish the project in the Catalan Digital Research Repository (RecerCat)[1]**

In the case of group projects, certain sections of the document must be signed individually by one (and only one) of the members of the group, as the main author of the section. See more details in "Modalities of the Master's Final Project".

1.8. Assessment
The final evaluation of the dissertation will be done through the presentation and oral defence of it. The examination committee will be made up of three doctors (plus, optionally, a representative of the corresponding Master's degree partner, in the case of MFPs oriented to 'challenges' proposed by external partners). The committee will issue a grade that will have to take into account the following elements:

---

[1] Free distribution and sharing of the project are encouraged, through open access platforms and creative commons permissions.

- **Quality of the project (75% of the final grade)**
- **Oral presentation (25% of the final grade)**

In the quality of the project, the committee will also take into account the evaluation of the tutor about the working process. This includes for each student: participation in tutoring sessions (physical or virtual), and compliance to the working plan and timing.

In the case of group projects, the final grade will meet the following specificities:
- **Overall assessment of the project**, according to the parameters indicated above ('quality of the project' + 'oral presentation'), with a weight of **50% of the final grade** for each member of the group (common group grade, shared by all members)
- **Individual assessments of each member**, regarding the specific part(s) led by the individual student, with a weight of **50% for the final grade** of the student.

Numeric assessment: individual vs group projects

Individual project

Quality of the project	75%*	Final mark of the student
Oral presentation	25%	

Group project >> how to do the individual evaluation

Group assessment	Overall quality of the project	75%**	Group mark	50%	Final mark of the student
	Oral presentation	25%			
Individual assessment	Quality of the specific work led by this student		Individual mark	50%**	

► See also the assessment rubrics below (section 7).

*: This 75% of the qualification (in individual projects) will include the assessment of the advisor on the work process.

**: Regarding group projects, both the 75% of the group assessment on "overall quality of the project" and the 50% of the individual assessment will include the assessment of the advisor on the work process (thus, assessment on the work process both regarding the group as a whole and individually).

1.9. Committee
The Committee will be formed by the supervisor of the project (as chair of the committee) + two doctors chosen by the Coordinator of the programme and the Dept. of Communication (plus, optionally, a representative of the corresponding Master's degree partner, in the case of MFPs oriented to 'challenges' proposed by external partners).

2. FORMAL REQUIREMENTS

2.1. Cover and first page
All types of final project must include:

1) Cover page with:
- Title of the work
- Author's name(s)
- Supervisor's name
- Date: Academic Year 20--/--
- The name of the collection and of the Department: "Final Project of the MA in Digital Culture and Emerging Media, Department of Communication"
- Name and logo of the University: Universitat Pompeu Fabra

2) First page with:
- Modality of the work: (A) Basic research (specify: journal article / research dissertation / PhD proposal) // (B) Applied / practice-based research // (C) Challenge-oriented project
- Abstract: maximum 150-word length in the same language of the project
- Keywords: a list of keywords about the content, with a maximum length of 200 characters

2.2. Format of the digital document and submission
The digital document must be in a PDF format. This file's size must be inferior to 40 Mb. This document must be uploaded via the corresponding virtual space of Aula Global (Moodle platform).

2.3. Other contents and digital materials produced
If the project involves the development of other materials such as a digital prototype, etc., they must gather them in a Drive folder and include a clearly visible link to it in the written document. If suitable, the students can include a "read me" file in the folder, in order to clarify how to open or access to the prototype or the corresponding digital material.

3. SUPERVISION PROCESS

The Supervisor's role is to assist the student in the development of a suitable project and methodology. Students must agree with the supervisor on the most suitable points of contact (office, video-meeting, email) and a timetable for delivery of draft chapters and for working sessions. The supervision process will consist of three working sessions where the supervisor

will assist in the project design, point in the direction of useful sources and references, provide feedback and advice for initial drafts (including single chapters, interview guides, etc.), and comment once upon final drafts of dissertations. These (at least) there working sessions with the advisor are mandatory for the student(s) and they must be proactive in contacting their supervisor to arrange them, as well as in defining a schedule and a working plan, delivering drafts, etc. They must also be properly prepared for each supervision session, and submit their best work to the supervisor, even if the material is 'in draft'. Not expect the supervisor to correct spelling and grammatical mistakes or to do proofreading.

Not only the 'final result' but also the implication of the student(s) in the working sessions with the supervisor, how they make the most of the feedback and the overall dedication and rigour in the work process will be taken into account in the final assessment of the project (see point 1.8 and section 7).

4. MODALITIES OF THE MASTER'S FINAL PROJECT

There are three basic modalities eligible for the Master's degree final project. Students must adhere to one type:
   (A) Basic research and PhD proposals
   (B) Applied or practice-based research
   (C) Challenge-oriented projects (proposed by partners)

Modality A includes research dissertations, journal articles and PhD proposals (PhD proposals can be oriented either towards basic research or applied / practice-based research).
In modality B, the following types of proposals are expected: proposals related to creative experimentation with new digital media, including projects that mix theory/research and development of digital narrative/art scripts, design proposals and/or prototypes; projects aimed at cultural dissemination that incorporate and apply pre-existing research in a creative and original way; *design-based research* projects that document the iterative process as a research process; projects oriented to participatory action research.
Regarding modality C, in each edition of the master's degree, the students will be informed of the proposed challenges through the website. These challenges are to be carried out in groups (2-3 people; see specificities on the website).

4.1. SPECIFICATIONS ON MODALITY 'A': BASIC RESEARCH AND PHD PROPOSALS

In the basic research modality, students must choose a specific typology, from among the following options:
   ● **Research dissertation** (basic research)
   ● **Journal article** (basic research)
   ● **PhD proposal** (oriented either to a PhD project of basic or applied/practice-based research)
PhD proposals must be individual. **Regarding the modalities of 'research dissertation' and 'journal article', alongside with the individual option, group projects of 2 students can be accepted.**

• Research dissertation

This consists of a research work delivered in the form of a typical research paper. It shall include the following sections:

> **a) Introduction and objectives.** Introduction to the topic chosen and the research objectives. Justification of its importance, novelty and/or academic relevance.
>
> **b) Theoretical framework** (in group projects this section must be signed individually by the main author)
>
> **c) Literature review** (in group projects this section must be signed individually by the main author)
>
> **d) Research design.** Specification of objectives (general + specific); research problem, research questions and/or hypotheses; introduction to the methodological framework.
>
> **e) Methodology**, specifying method(s), the way they are going to be applied, research techniques and the particular tools to be used.
>
> **f) Results** (in group projects this part must be signed individually by the main author; if it includes several subsections, each one of them must be signed individually by the main author)[2]
>
> **g) Conclusion** / **discussion**
>
> **h) Reference list**

Annex: in group projects, an annex must be added: 'personal considerations on the individual contributions'. Every student must write a 300-600 words summary and personal reflection on his/her most significant contributions to the work (not necessarily limited to the sections explicitly signed as the main author).

Length: between 6,000 and 10,000 words (references included; appendixes not included).

• Journal article

This consists of a research work with the same features as the previous type but delivered in the form of a journal article. **The journal must be an indexed journal with peer review** (preferably included in the Scopus, WoS o ERIH+ databases). To this end, students must select an academic journal for publication in accordance with the supervisor. For the sake of providing context to the assessment committee, this type of dissertation must have attached an **introduction to the paper including:**

- **Full name and website address of the journal** to which the paper will be submitted
- **Aims and scope of the journal** where the paper will be submitted (you can just copy their aims and scope)
- **Indexing**: specify in which databases the journal is indexed and any other relevant detail, such as the quartile or impact factor of the journal if available.

---

[2] Although certain sections must be signed individually, by the main author/responsible for that part of the work, all students of a given group are supposed to work on various areas and aspects of the project, collaborating throughout the whole process in many ways. A group project must be build upon team work and all students are co-responsible for every section, regardless of the specification of a main author in some of them, in order to facilitate individual assessment.

- **Adequacy of your paper to the journal** (why your contribution will be of interest for this journal)

In the case of group projects, every student must sign individually at least one of these sections: theoretical framework; literature review; results (the results section can have several subsections, and each one of them can be signed individually)[2].

Annex: in group projects, an annex must be added: 'personal considerations on the individual contributions'. Every student must write a 300-600 words summary and personal reflection on his/her most significant contributions to the work (not necessarily limited to the sections explicitly signed as the main author).

Length: Follow the journal instructions (plus add one page maximum with the above-requested details about the journal).

• PhD proposal

This consists of a research proposal devised to expand later as a doctoral thesis. **This type of dissertation does not involve the collection of data nor the production of results, discussion or conclusion, since its aim is to design a future PhD research**. It must include at least the following sections:

> **a) Introduction and objectives.** Introduction to the topic chosen and the research objectives. Justification of its importance, novelty and/or academic relevance.
> **b) Research design**. Specification of objectives (general + specific); research problem, research questions and/or hypotheses; introduction to the methodological framework.
> **c) Theoretical framework**
> **d) State of the question / literature review**
> **e) Methodology**, specifying method(s), the way they are going to be applied, research techniques and the particular tools to be used.
> **f) (Optional) Connection with the Department of Communication** (recommended if you intend to apply for this Department's PhD Program)
> **g) Timeline** of execution of the project
> **h) Bibliography**

The PhD proposal might be **oriented either towards basic research or applied research** / **practice-based research**.

Length: between 4,000 and 8,000 words.

4.2. SPECIFICATIONS ON MODALITY 'B': APPLIED OR PRACTICE-BASED RESEARCH

Projects of this modality can be carried out **individually or in group**, maximum 3 members (**group work is encouraged**). In case of group projects, the final evaluation will include both an individual mark (50%) and a group, shared mark (50%).

This type of project will result in a final document with two clearly differentiated blocks, one related to the theoretical and research work, and another related to the script and design of the creative proposal.

Block I: General foundations, theory and research. This block should include the following sections (this is adaptable to the particularities of the project according to the tutor's criteria, but it is understood that most of these aspects should be addressed in some way):

a) **General introduction to the project**, clearly explaining the theory/research dimension and the applied or practice-based dimension, and the interrelationships between the two dimensions

b) **Theoretical foundations** (in group projects this section must be signed individually, by the main author)

c) **Literature review / state of the art** (including experimental/creative references, if applicable) (in group projects this section must be signed individually, by the main author)

d) **Methodology** (including methodology for research/analysis and regarding production/creation processes)

e) **Results** (in group projects this part must be signed individually by the main author; if it includes several subsections, each one of them must be signed individually by the main author)

f) **Discussion/conclusions**

Block II: Creative production: script and design. Contents related to script and/or *design document* type, which show the ideation and creative planning of the proposed piece(s) of work. According to the particularities of each project, the tutor will guide students in the details of the structure and format of this block. In the event that more than more than one student has participated in this part of the project, it is important that each individual sign at least one section of this block, as the lead author[3], in accordance with the tutor's considerations.

Appendix: On the prototype. If the work includes a prototype, this specific section must be added, with the following information:

● **Introduction/clarifications on the fit and meaning of the prototype** in the whole work

● **Technical characteristics** of the prototype

● **Link to a Drive folder**, previously created by the student/s, which must include the following items:

  ● An **executable file of the prototype, or a link to the piece** (if accessible online) (this executable or link to the prototype needs to be clearly identifiable). If a special program or app is needed to run the prototype, a "read me" file should be added giving the appropriate explanations, and if necessary the download links that can facilitate access.

  ● **Annex material (optional).** Depending on the characteristics of the project, the student (or group of students), in agreement with the tutor, will be able to add in the Drive folder other

---

[3] The specification of certain sections as sections that must be signed individually, by the main author/responsible for that part of the work does not mean that all students are supposed to work on various areas and aspects of the project, collaborating throughout the process in many ways. A group project must be build upon team work and all students are co-responsible of every section, regardless of the specification of a main author in some of them, to facilitate individual assessment.

productions that are considered relevant as a result of the work.

In the case of projects oriented to participatory / action research, the Block II is not necessary, and it may be replaced by other types of content, to be assessed with the tutor (for example, a report on the actions/interventions, in a researcher/s diary format or similar).

Annex: in group projects, an annex must be added: 'personal considerations on the individual contributions'. Every student must write a 300-600 words summary and personal reflection on his/her most significant contributions to the work (not necessarily limited to the sections explicitly signed as the main author).

Length: between 4,000 and 10,000 words.

4.3. SPECIFICATIONS ON MODALITY 'C': 'CHALLENGES'

In each edition of the master's degree, the students will be informed of the proposed challenges through the website. Modality C projects will be basic research or applied / practice-related research (mainly the latter), proposed by partners of the master's degree (codesigned by these partners and the master's coordinator). Regarding the features of the final document, the same indications as in the previous sections will apply to them, according to the type of project (basic research / applied or practice-based research). Likewise, the projects of modality C can comprise some variants or specific nuances, that will be indicated in the project proposal (**see the corresponding document of challenge proposals at the Master degree's website**).

These projects are to be carried out **in group (2-3 people)**, and **the students will be able to express their interest in participating in one of them (individually** -groups will be formed later by the master's coordinator-).

5. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

During **December**, on the dates specified by the master's degree coordinator, students must **send their MFP proposals (or express their interest in joining a challenge-oriented project -modality C-)** through an **online form**, which will be available through the master's degree website and/or via Moodle or email contact.

6. ORAL PRESENTATIONS PROCEDURE

Members of the committee:

- **A chair (the supervisor of the final project to be assessed, who won't participate in the public assessment but only in the final, private deliberation)**
- **Two more members** (two doctors selected by the coordinator & the department) (plus, optionally, a representative of the corresponding Master's degree partner, in the case of MFPs oriented to 'challenges' proposed by external partners)

Procedure:

The oral presentations will be conducted according to the following procedure:

1) Welcome by the commission's chair

2) Student(s)'s presentation (15-20' for individual projects // 20-30' for group projects)

3) Comments by the two members of the committee (not the chair -supervisor of the project-) (15' // 15-20' for group projects)

4) Student's final discussion (5' // 5-10' for group projects)

5) Deliberation by the committee (10' // 10-15' for group projects)

There will not be a public grade notification at the end of the act; it will be notified to the student a few days later by the Secretary.

The total time for each oral presentation cannot exceed 50 minutes in the case of individual projects, and 75 minutes regarding group projects.

7. ASSESSMENT RUBRIC (committee)

Dissertation assessment
MA in Digital Culture and Emerging Media

**RUBRIC FOR FINAL PROJECTS OF <u>BASIC RESEARCH AND PHD PROPOSALS</u>
(MODALITY 'A' -can also be used for certain modality C projects-)**

Reviewer	

Project identification				
Author(s)				
Title				
Supervisor				
Date of defence				
Type of project	Research dissertation	Journal article	PhD proposal	Modality C ('challenge' oriented to basic research)

Recommended grade (0 to 10)	
Comments for the student:	
Date:	

► If it is a group project, please pay attention to the student's specification and specific contents to be evaluated in each part.

Assessment criteria: VW: Yes, very well / S: yes, sufficiently (but not with excellence) / N: No at all or not enough / DA: It doesn't apply

1. Rationale, research design and general overview				
► If it is a group project, in this section the group will be assessed as a whole				
	VW	S	N	DA
Does the work have clear and relevant/interesting objectives and research questions/hypotheses? Is there a clear focus/direction throughout the text? Is the text coherent overall (particularly in terms of the relationship between the objectives/questions and the rest of the sections)?				
Is the research well-motivated and justified within the academic domain of studies in digital culture and new media, and the general topics and aims of the MA in Digital Culture and Emerging Media?				
Is the research design (particularly the methodology) properly explained and justified, as well as consistent with the objectives and research questions?				
Is there a reasonable, well-structured and clear presentation of ideas and arguments? Does the report include all the required and suitable sections?				
Comments:				

2. Theoretical framework				
► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student responsible for this part of the work	**Name of the student:**			
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the work based on a suitable theoretical framework?				
Is the theoretical framework an original or innovative contribution of the work, to a certain extent? (e.g.,				

proposing insightful connections between different theoretical sources, exploring new theoretical territories, or trying to conceptualise non-consolidated research objects)				
Does the work include a sufficient number of relevant, and reliable academic references regarding the theoretical framework?				
Comments:				

3. Literature review, state of the art				
► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student (only one) responsible for this part of the work	**Name of the student:**			
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the work well grounded in a suitable review of the literature / state of the art? (qualitative assessment)				
Does the work include a sufficient number of relevant, suitable and up-to-date references, regarding the literature review / state of the art?				
Comments:				

4. Results.

► Please fill in one of the following modules for each student who signs the 'results' section or certain parts of it.

4.1. Analysis / results (I)	
► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the specific content/section evaluated here	**Name of the student:**
	Specific content/section:

	VW	S	N	DA
Has the methodology been applied correctly, according to the presentation of the results (with respect to the evaluated part)?				
Are the results (of this part of the work) presented clearly in a way that is consistent with the objectives, questions and theoretical framework of the work?				
Comments:				

4.2. Analysis / results (II)

► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the specific content/section evaluated here	Name of the student: Specific content/section:

	VW	S	N	DA
Has the methodology been applied correctly, according to the presentation of the results (with respect to the evaluated part)?				
Are the results (of this part of the work) presented clearly in a way that is consistent with the objectives, questions and theoretical framework of the work?				
Comments:				

4.3. Analysis / results (III)

► **If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the specific content/section evaluated here**	**Name of the student:** **Specific content/section:**			
	VW	S	N	DA
Has the methodology been applied correctly, according to the presentation of the results (with respect to the evaluated part)?				
Are the results (of this part of the work) presented clearly in a way that is consistent with the objectives, questions and theoretical framework of the work?				
Comments:				

5. Discussion/conclusions and original contributions

► **If it is a group project, in this section the group will be assessed as a whole**

	VW	S	N	DA
Is the discussion about the results properly related to the objectives/questions of the project? Are the findings interpreted in an interesting and coherent way in accordance with the theoretical framework and the literature review?				
Does the project have an inventive, particularly insightful aspect? Does it represent progress with respect to previous works, and make a genuine, original contribution to the corresponding scientific/professional area?				
Comments:				

6. Formal aspects				
► **If it is a group project, in this section the group will be assessed as a whole**				
	VW	S	N	DA
Are the grammar, spelling, and punctuation of the dissertation correct (facilitating the understanding of the written discourse)?				
Does the project make correct use of citations in the text?				
Does the dissertation meet the formal characteristics outlined in the final project guidelines (like extension limit)?				
Comments:				

Clarifications for the numeric assessment: individual vs group projects

Individual project

Quality of the project	75%*	Final mark of the student
Oral presentation	25%	

Individual evaluation related to a group project

Group assessment	Overall quality of the project	75%**	Group mark	50%	Final mark of the student
	Oral presentation	25%			
Individual assessment	Quality of the specific work led by this student		Individual mark	50%**	

*: This 75% of the qualification (in individual projects) will include the assessment of the advisor on the work process.

**: Regarding group projects, both the 75% of the group assessment on "overall quality of the project" and the 50% of the individual assessment will include the assessment of the advisor on the work process (thus, assessment on the work process both regarding the group as a whole and individually).

* * *

Dissertation assessment
MA in Digital Culture and Emerging Media

RUBRIC FOR FINAL PROJECTS OF <u>APPLIED OR PRACTICE-BASED RESEARCH</u> (MODALITIES 'B' AND 'C)

Reviewer	

Project identification		
Author(s)		
Title		
Supervisor		
Date of defence		
Type of project	Modality B: Applied or practice-based research proposed by the student(s)	Modality C: Challenge-oriented projects

Recommended grade (0 to 10)	
Comments for the student:	
Date:	

► If it is a group project, please pay attention to the student's specification and specific contents to be evaluated in each part.

Assessment criteria: VW: Yes, very well / S: yes, sufficiently (but not with excellence) / N: No at all or not enough / DA: It doesn't apply

1. Rationale, research design and general overview

► **If it's a group project, in this section the group will be assessed as a whole**

	VW	S	N	DA
Does the work have clear and relevant/interesting objectives and research questions/hypotheses? Is there a clear focus/direction throughout the text? Is the text consistent overall (particularly in terms of the relationship between the objectives/questions and the rest of the sections)?				
Is the research well-motivated and justified within the academic domain of studies in digital culture and new media, and the general topics and aims of the MA in Digital Culture and Emerging Media?				
Is the research design properly explained and justified, and consistent with the objectives and research questions? Is the methodology suitable? In particular, is the relationship between research and creation (or action) clearly explained and justified?				
Is there a reasonable, well-structured and clear presentation of ideas and arguments? Does the report include all the required and suitable sections?				
Comments:				

2. Theoretical framework

► **If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student (only one) responsible for this part of the work**	Name of the student:		
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the work based on a suitable theoretical framework?				
Is the theoretical framework an original or innovative contribution of the work, to a certain extent? (e.g., proposing insightful connections between different theoretical sources, exploring new theoretical territories, or trying to conceptualise non-consolidated research objects)				

Does the work include a sufficient number of relevant, and reliable academic references regarding the theoretical framework?				

Comments:

3. Literature review / state of the art

► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student (only one) responsible for this part of the work	Name of the student:			
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the work well grounded in a suitable review of the literature / state of the art? (in projects with a creative emphasis, a good section of creative/artistic references may compensate for lesser theoretical/research references)				
Does the work include a sufficient number of relevant, suitable and up-to-date references, regarding the literature review / state of the art?				
Comments:				

4. Results.

► Please fill in one of the following modules for each student who signs the 'results' section or certain parts of it.

4.1. Results (I)

► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the specific content/section evaluated here	Name of the student: Specific content/section:

	VW	S	N	DA
Has the methodology been applied correctly according to what is observed in the presentation of the results (with respect to the evaluated part)?				
Are the results (of this part of the work) presented in a clear way that is consistent with the objectives, questions and theoretical framework of the work?				

Comments:

4.2. Results (II)

► **If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the specific content/section evaluated here**	**Name of the student:** **Specific content/section:**			
	VW	S	N	DA
Has the methodology been applied correctly, according to the presentation of the results (with respect to the evaluated part)?				
Are the results (of this part of the work) presented in a clear and coherent way with the objectives, questions and theoretical framework of the work?				

Comments:

4.3. Results (III)

► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the specific content/section evaluated here	Name of the student: Specific content/section:			
	VW	S	N	DA
Has the methodology been applied correctly, according to the presentation of the results (with respect to the evaluated part)?				
Are the results (of this part of the work) presented in a clear way that is consistent with the objectives, questions and theoretical framework of the work?				
Comments:				

5. Production / creative work

► **Please fill in one of the following modules for each student who signs a specific part within Block II of the project's document ('creative production').**

5.1. Production / creative work (I)				
► **If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the content/part of the creative work evaluated here** (e.g., script, a specific part of a script, prototype development, etc.)	Name of the student: Specific content/part:			
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the meaning and value of the creative piece (or the specific part evaluated) clearly contextualized and justified in the context of the research project?				

Has this work (or the specific part evaluated here) been planned intelligently and creatively in relation to the project objectives? Is it innovative? Does the proposed work have the potential to generate an original/valuable contribution (in terms of knowledge, promoting interesting academic/cultural debate…)?				
In case of a prototype, please make a general assessment of its technical, design and development merits.				
Comments:				

5.2. Production / creative work (II)

► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the content/part of the creative work evaluated here (e.g., script, a specific part of a script, prototype development, etc.)	Name of the student: Specific content/part:			
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the meaning and value of the creative piece (or the specific part evaluated) clearly contextualized and justified in the context of the research project?				
Has this work (or the specific part evaluated here) been planned intelligently and creatively in relation to the project objectives? Is it innovative? Does the proposed work have the potential to generate an original/valuable contribution (in terms of knowledge, promoting interesting academic/cultural debate…)?				
In case of a prototype, please make a general assessment of its technical, design and development merits.				

Comments:

5.3. Production / creative work (III)

► If it is a group project, please specify the name of the student and the content/part of the creative work evaluated here (e.g., script, a specific part of a script, prototype development, etc.)	Name of the student: Specific content/part:			
	VW	S	N	DA
Is the meaning and value of the creative piece (or the specific part evaluated) clearly contextualized and justified in the context of the research project?				
Has this work (or the specific part evaluated here) been planned intelligently and creatively in relation to the project objectives? Is it innovative? Does the proposed work have the potential to generate an original/valuable contribution (in terms of knowledge, promoting interesting academic/cultural debate…)?				
In case of a prototype, please make a general assessment of its technical, design and development merits.				
Comments:				

6. Discussion/conclusions and original contributions

► If it is a group project, in this section the group will be assessed as a whole

	VW	S	N	DA
Is the discussion about the results properly related to the objectives/questions of the project? Are the findings interpreted in an interesting and consistent way in accordance with the theoretical framework and the literature review?				
Does the project have an inventive or particularly insightful aspect? Does it represent progress with respect to previous works, and make a genuine, original contribution to the corresponding scientific/professional area?				
Comments:				

7. Formal aspects

► If it is a group project, in this section the group will be assessed as a whole

	VW	S	N	DA
Are the grammar, spelling, and punctuation of the dissertation correct (facilitating the understanding of the written discourse)?				
Does the project make correct use of citations in the text?				
Does the dissertation meet the formal characteristics outlined in the final project guidelines (like extension limit)?				
Comments:				

Instructions for the numeric assessment: individual vs group projects

Individual project

Quality of the project	75%*	Final mark of the student
Oral presentation	25%	

Group project >> how to do the individual evaluation

Group assessment	Overall quality of the project	75%	Group mark	50%	Final mark of the student
	Oral presentation	25%			
Individual assessment	Quality of the specific work led by this student		Individual mark	50%**	

*: This 75% of the qualification (in individual projects) will include the assessment of the advisor on the work process.

**: Regarding group projects, both the 75% of the group assessment on "overall quality of the project" and the 50% of the individual assessment will include the assessment of the advisor on the work process (thus, assessment on the work process both regarding the group as a whole and individually).