Master project evaluation form

The evaluation committee provides a score based on the criteria and specifications given below. The final grade is calculated from the weighted average of these scores:

A	B	C		Overall
2* ( ) +	1* ( ) +	2* ( )	* 2/5 =	

Each partial grade goes from 1 to 5 and that the overall grade goes from 1 to 10, with a grade of 5 needed to pass.

_____ _____

Name and signature Committee Member 1

_____ _____

Name and signature Committee Member 2

_____ _____

Name and signature Committee Member 3

A: The quality of the written project report

1: The report is incomprehensible. It does not meet the minimal criteria for scientific writing.
2: The report is difficult to read and not well-organized. Only after complete rewriting and restructuring a publication of the text could potentially be considered.
3: The report is more or less clear but could be published only after major revision.
4: The report is well-written and well-organized. It could be published after minor revisions.
5: The report is very well-written and very well-organized. The state of the art is correctly assessed. In terms of its quality and scientific writing it could be published as it stands in an international journal in the context of the thesis' research line.

Here the evaluation committee should take into account how much effort was needed to reach the quality of the text. For example: Suppose the texts of two students both qualify for grade 4 according to the above criteria. Further suppose that the text of the first student required only a moderate level of correction by the supervisor, whereas the text of the second student required many iterations of extensive corrections. In this case the evaluation committee can consider to rate the report of the first student with 4 and the report of the second student with 3. Furthermore, the evaluation committee should take into account the degree to which the student actively and independently studied the literature underlying the thesis. Here, the inclusion of only 15 references that the student actually read and understood can be more valuable than the inclusion of 100 references of which the student has only heard of.

Grade A:
Comments:

B: The quality of the oral project report

1: The oral project report was incomprehensible. It did not meet the minimal criteria for a scientific presentation.

2: The oral project report was difficult to follow. Only after complete re-organization a presentation at an international conference as contribution of a junior member of the research community could potentially be considered.

3: The oral project report was more or less clear but could be presented at an international scientific conference as contribution of a junior member of the research community only after major revision.

4: The oral project report was well-organized and well-presented. After some improvements the oral project report could be presented at an international scientific conference as contribution of a junior member of the research community.

5: The oral project report was very well-organized and very well-presented. The slides or possible other means of presentation were clear and elaborated. Therefore, they complemented the oral presentation very well. The actual oral presentation was clear. In this form it could be presented at an international scientific conference as contribution of a junior member of the research community in the context of the thesis' research line.

Grade B:
Comments:

C: The student's contribution to the outcome of the project

1: The student made absolutely no contribution and showed no initiative. The student did not work independently nor showed any coherent organization of the work.
2-4: Please intrapolate between the extremes specified in 1 and 5.
5: The student made very substantial contributions to solve the task of the thesis. The student managed to work independently but also to communicate the work with his colleagues and the supervisor. The student organized the work on the thesis very well.

Here the evaluation committee should take into account that a partial solution of a very difficult and challenging problem can be as valuable as the full solution of a relatively easy problem. Furthermore, it is important that students who join the research group just for the period of the thesis (group A) should the have the exact same chances compared to students that had an ongoing association to the research group already before the start of their thesis (group B). In particular, work that students of group B did before beginning the master thesis might be reflected in the written thesis report. Thereby the overall contribution of students of the group B can be more substantial than the one of students of group A. This however, should not lead to any disadvantage for students of the group A. In effect the evaluation committee should either only take contributions into account that where made during the thesis or normalize the amount of contributions by the time the student had to make them.

The criterion that the student 'managed to work independently but also to communicate the work with his colleagues and the supervisor' should be interpreted as follows: Initially the supervisor and student should jointly divide the overall thesis project into smaller work packages. The student should then accomplish these work packages independently, or, as the case may be, in collaboration with other members of the group. Upon completion of individual work packages the student should again coordinate with the supervisor to plan subsequent steps. The opposite of 'independent working' is given if a student requires the supervisor to pre-process and work out each and every detail of the thesis project. The opposite of 'communicating work' is given if a student is asked to report on the progress on intermediate steps but fails to do so. The details of the interaction between the student, supervisor and research group will depend on the research line as well as on the structure and context of the research group. In general, the supervisor will inform the student of what type of collaboration is required for a successful completion of the thesis work.

For this criterion the supervisor will provide the initial assessment to the evaluation committee which will then jointly agree on a final assessment. This final assessment will also consider the student participation in the tutoring sessions based on the feed back from the tutoring sessions' coordinator.

Grade C:
Comments:

Additional merit

In case the student contributed to scientific posters, talks, or articles (to be) published in international journals or (to be) presented at international conferences, this can be taken into account as a positive aspect in determining the grades for the criteria A-C. The student does not necessarily have to be the principal author of this contribution. It is sufficient if the student's contribution resulted in a co-authorship.

Different Master students will work in different research contexts. In different research contexts different forms of publishing are used, work is published with different frequencies and on different time scales. Therefore, some students will not have the opportunity to contribute to any publication during the thesis work. Importantly, this does not imply that the work of these students is less qualified. These students should by no means have any disadvantage against those students that can contribute to publications. In other words: Also students that cannot contribute to publications should have the same chance to reach very high grades as those students that can.