Update grading guide and grading sheet of the master thesis

Based upon feedback from users and the Board of Examiners, some minor improvements have been implemented in version 1.1, which was released on 11 October 2021. See blue box on this page.

The MSc thesis grading guide (2013) and the accompanying grading sheet for AES and CIE have been updated, based on input from students, supervisors and educational advisors. The main changes are listed below.

Applicability

The new documents must be used:

- 1) For MSc thesis projects starting in the academic year 2021/2022
- 2) For already running MSc thesis projects with a final presentation in 2022 (or later)

The new documents <u>may</u> be used for already running MSc projects with a final presentation in 2021, but only if both the student <u>and</u> the assessment committee agree.

Changes in the grading sheet

- 1) <u>Sub-criterion grade range</u>: Grades for the sub-criteria are integers ranging from 1-10, instead of 5-10.
 - For grades <5 for sub-criteria (1-4), assessors choose a grade depending on the severity of the deficiencies, and add a justification on the grading sheet.
- 2) <u>Sub-criteria grades <5 can be compensated by other sub-criteria grades within a main criterion</u>, if and only if the following requirement is met (see point 3):
- 3) <u>All five main criteria grades should be 5.0 or higher</u> in order to pass the MSc thesis assessment. These five main criteria grades (A-E) are the average of their sub-criteria grades.
- 4) Precision of the five main criteria grades is 1 decimal (instead of 2 decimals).
- 5) A <u>written justification per main criterion grade is required</u>, such that the justification of the grading is clear to outsiders. The justification should include relevant background information on the process and presentation that influenced the grading. This is important for transparency towards the student, and for quality assurance (e.g. thesis review).

Based upon feedback from users and the Board of Examiners, some minor improvements have been implemented in version 1.1, which was released on 11 October 2021.

Functional improvements:

- 6) The mandatory plagiarism check was added to the grading sheet.
- 7) A brief manual for plagiarism check was developed (see manual for plagiarism check)
- 8) Number of mandatory committee members in the form reduced to 2 (see <u>Rules & Guidelines art. 23.3</u>).
- 9) Maximum number of committee members is increased to six.

Minor improvements:

- 10) Instructions are not included in print or pdf.
- 11) Grades can be selected from drop-down menu.
- 12) If grade cannot be calculated, is shows '--' instead of '####'.

Changes in the grading guide

- 1) The level of a 5 was rewritten: it reads now 'almost satisfactory' instead of the previous 'done almost nothing'. This ensures that students who receive a 6 are at pass level, and not 'better than a 5' (i.e. 'done more than almost nothing').
- 2) The level '<5' was added. Lecturers choose a grade (1-4) depending on the severity of the deficiencies, and add a justification on the grading sheet.
- 3) **Updated level descriptors**:
 - 1) The level of a 10 is now more realistic and at the level of (virtual) learning objectives.
 - 2) Descriptors are more realistic, match the subcriteria better and are more objective.
- 4) A few criteria were renamed, combined and reshuffled for the following reasons:
 - 1) Take into account feedback processing by adding a sub-criterion 'feedback processing'
 - 2) Increase logical division of sub-criteria over main assessment criteria, and logical (chronological) order of sub-criteria (skills before results)
 - 3) Increase consistency between name and descriptions of sub-criteria (especially for C)
 - 4) Reduce overlap between sub-criteria
- 5) A brief version of the grading guide was added to increase usability. It includes only levels <5, 5, 6, 8, and 10.
- 6) A description of all criteria and sub-criteria was added for clarity.

Update grading guide and grading sheet of the master thesis

The MSc thesis grading guide (2013) and the accompanying grading sheet (2016) for AES and CIE have been updated, based on input from students, supervisors and educational advisors. The main changes are listed below. The new grading guide and grading sheet can be downloaded here.

Applicability

The new documents must be used:

- For MSc thesis projects starting in the academic year 2021/2022
- For already running MSc thesis projects with a final presentation in 2022 (or later)

The new documents may be used for already running MSc projects with a final presentation in 2021, but only if both the student and the assessment committee agree.

Changes in the grading sheet

- 1) Sub-criterion grade range: Grades for the sub-criteria are integers ranging from 1-10, instead of 5-10.
 - For grades <5 for sub-criteria (1-4), assessors choose a grade depending on the severity of the deficiencies, and add a justification on the grading sheet.
- 2) Sub-criteria grades <5 can be compensated by other sub-criteria grades within a main **<u>criterion</u>**, if and only if the following requirement is met (see point 3):
- 3) All five main criteria grades should be 5.0 or higher in order to pass the MSc thesis assessment. These five main criteria grades (A-E) are the average of their sub-criteria grades.
- 4) Precision of the five main criteria grades is 1 decimal (instead of 2 decimals).
- 5) A written justification per main criterion grade is required. The justification of the grading should be clear for outsiders based solely on reading the grading sheet and the thesis. Therefore, the grading sheet needs to include relevant background information on the process and presentation that influenced the grading. This is important for transparency towards the student, and for quality assurance (e.g. thesis review).

Changes in the grading guide

- 1) The level of a 5 was rewritten: it reads now 'almost satisfactory' instead of the previous 'done almost nothing'. This ensures that students who receive a 6 are at pass level, and not 'better than a 5' (i.e. 'done more than almost nothing').
- 2) The level '<5' was added. Lecturers choose a grade (1-4) depending on the severity of the deficiencies, and add a justification on the grading sheet.
- 3) Updated level descriptors:
 - 1) The level of a 10 is now more realistic and at the level of (virtual) learning objectives.
 - 2) Descriptors are more realistic, match the subcriteria better and are more objective.
- 4) A few criteria were renamed, combined and reshuffled for the following reasons:
 - Take into account feedback processing by adding a sub-criterion 'feedback processing'
 - 2) Increase logical division of sub-criteria over main assessment criteria, and logical (chronological) order of sub-criteria (skills before results)
 - 3) Increase consistency between name and descriptions of sub-criteria (especially for C)
 - 4) Reduce overlap between sub-criteria
- 5) A brief version of the grading guide was added to increase usability. It includes only levels <5, 5, 6, 8, and 10.
- 6) A description of all criteria and sub-criteria was added for clarity.

Guide for determining Master Thesis grading (2021) Applicable to the MSc Civil Engineering and MSc Applied Earth Sciences degree programmes

						Grading			
Assessment Criteria	%	Sub-criteria	<5*	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Theoretical profundity of student	Insufficiently reproduced and applied some directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks	Almost reproduced and applied some directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks	Reproduced and applied most directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks	Reproduced and applied all directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks	Reproduced and applied most directly and indirectly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks, and some directly relevant scientific literature	Reproduced and applied most directly and indirectly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks, and a number of directly relevant scientific literature	Reproduced and applied all directly and indirectly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks, and most directly relevant scientific literature
		State of the art description and literature study	Insufficiently related thesis work to existing literature	Related thesis work to existing literature	Only just related thesis work sufficiently to the current state of the art and existing literature	Related thesis work sufficiently to the current state of the art, and used some new literature	Related thesis work well to the current state of the art, and used new relevant literature	Related thesis work very well to the current state of the art, and used a significant amount of new, relevant literature	Positioned the thesis work clearly to the current state of the art, and performed a thorough literature study
A. Scientific approach	25%	Research/design plan & execution	the supervisor;	Followed methods and approaches suggested by the supervisor; Almost executed a prescribed research/design plan	Followed methods and approaches suggested by the supervisor; Executed a prescribed research/design plan	Occasionally took initiative to extend/modify the research/design plan or to suggest an alternative method or approach; Executed the research/design plan well	Provided significant own input into research/design plan or the followed method & approach; Executed the research/design plan well	Research/design plan, followed method, and approach were essentially selected and defined by the student; Executed the research/design plan very well	Problem formulation, research/design plan, followed method, and approach were selected and defined by the student; Executed the research/design plan excellently
		Scientific argumentation	Most statements have <u>no</u> argumentation	Most statements have minimal argumentation	Most statements have minimal but sufficient argumentation	Most statements have sufficient argumentation	Most statements have good argumentation, using some state-of-the-art literature	All statements have good argumentation, using some state-of-the-art literature	All statements have good argumentation, using mostly state-of-the-art literature
		Critical attitude and judgement	Showed far too limited critical attitude and judgement towards own results	Showed too limited critical attitude and judgement towards own results	Showed limited critical attitude and judgement towards own results	Showed sufficient critical attitude and judgement towards own results, limited critical attitude towards literature and specialists	Showed good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, reasonable critical attitude towards literature and specialists	Showed good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, literature, and specialists	Showed very good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, literature, and specialists
		Quality of abstract	Essence of work insufficiently captured	Essence of work almost captured	Essence of work just captured	Essence of work adequately captured in a reasonably concise and clear abstract	concise and clear abstract	Essence of work very well captured in a concise and clear abstract	and clear abstract
		Creativity: new ideas	Made too little contribution to the project, and it is not original	Made almost sufficient contribution to the project, but it is not really original	Made a contribution to the project, but it is not really original	Made a contribution to the project, it is partially original	Made at least one original contribution to the project, not initiated or thought of by the supervisor	Made at least one significant and original contribution to the project, not initiated or thought of by the supervisor	Made several significant and original contributions to the project, not initiated or thought of by the supervisor
B. Quality of	2504	Experimental/modelling skills	Presented insufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented almost sufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented just sufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented sufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented good experimental/modelling skills	Presented very good experimental/modelling skills	Presented excellent experimental/modelling skills
result/product	25%	Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge	Insufficiently verified, validated, and used provided methods/data/knowledge, or did not consider their limitations	Verified, validated, and used provided methods/data/knowledge, but did <u>not</u> describe some important limitations	Verified, validated, and used provided methods/data/knowledge, and described most important limitations	Verified, validated, and used provided methods/data/knowledge, and described all important limitations	Verified, validated, and used existing/generated methods/data/knowledge, and took most important limitations into account	Verified, validated, and used existing/generated methods/data/knowledge, and took all important limitations into account	Verified, validated, and used existing/generated methods/data/knowledge, and took all limitations into account
		Utilisation (answering research/design question)	Research/design question insufficiently answered by results/products, project owner can hardly utilise results/products, even after large improvements	Research/design question partially answered by results/products, project owner can almost utilise half of the results/products after large improvements	Research/design question partially answered by results/products, project owner can utilise half of the results/products after some improvements	Research/design question sufficiently answered by results/products, project owner can utilise the majority of the results/products after small improvements	Research/design question answered well by results/products, project owner can utilise the majority of the results/products after small improvements	Research/design question answered well by results/products, almost all results/product can be utilised by project owner after minimal improvements	Research/design question fully answered by results/products, all results/product can be utilised by project owner as is
	20%	Project management & efficiency	Insufficient initial project planning; Did not meet deadlines; Could insufficiently adjust scope upon request, even with ample help; Insufficient work done within the available time	Almost sufficient initial project planning; Almost met main deadlines; If necessary, adjusted scope of project upon request with help; Almost did what was needed within the available time	Sufficient initial project planning; Met main deadlines; If necessary, adjusted scope of project, upon request with help; ust did what was needed within the available time	Good initial project planning; Met main and most other deadlines; If necessary, adjusted scope of project fairly well on own initiative with some help; Reasonable amount of work done within the available time	Good initial project planning; Met all deadlines; If necessary, adjusted scope of project in time, on own initiative, with little help; Good amount of work done within the available time	own initiative in time, without help;	Very good initial project planning; Met all deadlines; If necessary, adjusted scope of project very well on own initiative in time, without help; Excellent amount of work done within the available time
C. Behavioural		Communication	Communicated insufficiently about the project or required resources		Communicated just adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors		Communicated adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors	Communicated effectively about project updates and required resources with supervisors and other experts	Communicated very effectively about project updates and required resources with supervisors and other experts
competencies		Independence	Needed too much guidance and supervision: If needed, did not ask for help	Needed a little too much regular guidance and supervision; If needed, frequently asked for help too late/early	Needed very regular guidance and supervision; If needed, sometimes asked for help too late/early	Performed well with regular guidance and supervision; If needed, usually asked for help in time	Worked independently, with little guidance and supervision; If needed, usually asked for help in time	Needed no guidance and little supervision; If needed, asked for help in time	Needed no guidance; If needed, always asked for help in time
		Feedback processing	Processed feedback insufficiently after being instructed to do so, did not extrapolate the feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed feedback after being instructed to do so, <u>but did not</u> extrapolate the feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed feedback, and partially extrapolated the feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed feedback partially in a critical manner, and partially extrapolated the feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed most feedback in a critical manner, and extrapolated most feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed feedback in a critical manner, and extrapolated most feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed all feedback in a critical manner, and extrapolated feedback to other areas of thesis work
D. Overlike of consider	15%	Structure and consistency	Structure, text flow and presentation insufficiently logical, inconsistent, and implicit; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text illogical	Structure, text flow and presentation partially logical but inconsistent or implicit; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text unbalanced	Structure, text flow and presentation partially logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text sometimes unbalanced	Structure, text flow and presentation in general logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text usually balanced	Structure, text flow and presentation mostly logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text balanced	Structure, text flow and presentation logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text balanced (publishable quality)	Structure, text flow and presentation very logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text always balanced (publishable quality)
D. Quality of written presentation		Writing style and language	Insufficiently concise, clear, and unprofessional; Too many language errors that get in the way of understanding	Almost sufficiently concise, clear and professional; More than a few language errors that get in the way of understanding	Just sufficiently concise, clear and professional; Few language errors that get in the way of understanding	Sufficiently concise, clear and professional; Almost no language errors that get in the way of understanding	Generally concise, clear and professional; No language errors that get in the way of understanding, few typos	Almost always concise, clear and professional; No language errors that get in the way of understanding, very few typos	Concise, clear and professional; No noticeable language errors, no typos
		Referencing	Sources are insufficiently acknowledged and are incomplete	Sources are acknowledged but are not yet complete	Most important sources are acknowledged, but not in a consistent manner	All important sources are acknowledged, usually in a consistent manner	Almost all sources are acknowledged in a clear and consistent manner	All sources are acknowledged in a clear and consistently manner	All sources are acknowledged in a clear, consistent, and conscientious manner
	150/	Speaker quality	Difficult to follow, no enthusiasm, insecure	Usually possible to follow with a little effort, lacks enthusiasm, quite insecure	Possible to follow with a little effort, demonstrates some enthusiasm, a little insecure	Usually easy to follow, demonstrates some enthusiasm, sometimes a little insecure	Easy to follow, quite enthusiastic, usually convincing	Easy to follow, enthusiastic, convincing	Easy to follow, enthusiastic, very persuasive
E. Quality of oral									
presentation and	15%	Clarity and structure of presentation	Insufficiently clear presentation	Presentation made the subject, project and main results almost clear	Presentation made the subject, project and main results just clear	Presentation made the subject, project and main results clear	Presentation made the subject, project and main results clear in a structured way	Presentation made the subject, project and main results clear in a nicely structured way	Presentation made the subject, project and main results clear in an excellently structured way
presentation and defence	15%		Insufficiently clear presentation Presentation material insufficiently supporting the story			results clear			

^{*} In case of sub-criteria <5, choose a grade of 1–4 based upon the severity of deficiencies, and add a justification in the grading sheet.

Guide for determining Master Thesis grading (2021) - brief version

Theoretical profundity of student applied some directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks.	d and applied most dindirectly relevant to the level of MSc and some directly scientific literature and to the level of MSc textbooks, and most directly relevant scientific directure.
Theoretical profundity of student applied some directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. Theoretical profundity of applied some directly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks are level of MSc textbooks. The level of	d indirectly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks, and and some directly most directly relevant scientific
State of the art description and literature study State of the art description and literature study State of the art description and literature study Ilterature study State of the art description and literature existing literature literature literature State of the art description and literature study A contract of contract of the state of current state o	
the art and existing literature — used new	Positioned the thesis work clearly to the current state of the art, and relevant literature Positioned the thesis work clearly to the current state of the art, and performed a thorough literature study
suggested by the supervisor; suggested by the supervisor; research/	nificant own input into design plan or the research/design plan, followed method, and approach were selected and defined by the student;
Was insufficiently able to execute a Almost executed a prescribed Executed a prescribed prescribed research/design plan research/design plan Executed the prescribed research/design plan research/design plan research/design plan	research/design plan Executed the research/design plan well excellently
argumentation argumentation sufficient argumentation sufficient argumentation	ements have good All statements have good n, using some state-of- argumentation, using mostly state- art literature of-the-art literature
Critical attitude and judgement towards and judgement towards own results resu	d critical attitude and showed very good critical attitude towards e and specialists showed very good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, literature, and specialists
Eto	and a self-and to a
Quality of abstract Essence of work insulincently Essence of work almost captured Essence of work just captured reasonable	ork well captured in a y concise and clear abstract Essence of work perfectly captured in a concise and clear abstract least one original Made several significant and
Creativity: new ideas Made too little contribution to the project, and it is not original Made almost sufficient contribution to the project, but it is not really original Made a contribution to the project, but it is not really original Made a contribution to the project, but it is not really original initiated original	r thought of by the project, not initiated or thought of supervisor by the supervisor
Experimental/modelling skills Presented insufficient Presented almost sufficient Presented just	sented good Presented excellent ntal/modelling skills experimental/modelling skills
Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge and used provided methods/data/knowledge, provided methods/data/knowledge, exist methods/data/knowledge or did not consider their limitations but did not describe some and described most important and took most	ralidated, and used Verified, validated, and used ng/generated existing/generated (data/knowledge, methods/data/knowledge, ti important limitations and took all limitations into account
important limitations limitations in Research/design question partially Research	n/design question Research/design question fully
Utilisation (answering research/design question) Utilisation (answering research/design question) research/design question) Insufficiently answered by answered by results/products, answered by results/products/products/products/products/produc	ell by results/products, answered by results/products, vner can utilise the all results/product can be utilised
	the results/products by project owner as is all improvements
Insufficient initial project planning; Almost sufficient initial project Sufficient initial project planning; Good initial	al project planning; Very good initial project planning;
planning	all deadlines; y, adjusted scope of
help; wit Insufficient work done within the Almost did what was needed within Just did what was needed within Good amoun available time the available time the available time	h little help; in time, without help; it of work done within Excellent amount of work done available time within the available time
20% Communication Communication about project updates and required about project updates and required about project updates and required project updates and requ	ted adequately about dates and required s with supervisors and other experts Communicated very effectively about project updates and required resources with supervisors and other experts
Needed too much guidance and supervision; If needed, did not ask for help loo late/early help too late/early help too late/early help too late/early Processed feedback insufficiently Processed feedback after help a Process	ependently, with little Needed no guidance; and supervision; ually asked for help in If needed, always asked for help in time time
after being instructed to do so, did not extrapolate the feedback to other areas of thesis work most feedb	most feedback in a processed all feedback in a critical manner, and extrapolated feedback ack to other areas of thesis work to other areas of thesis work
Structure, text flow and Structure, text flow and Structure, text flow and Structure.	re, text flow and Structure, text flow and
	mostly logical, explicit presentation very logical, explicit l consistent; and consistent; alin & side issues over nd main text balanced appendices and main text always
unbalanced unbalanced sometimes unbalanced sometime	balanced (publishable quality)
unprofessional; and professional; profession	ofessional;
Sources are insufficiently Sources are acknowledged but are wous important sources are acknowledged but are acknowledged, but not in a acknowledged but are complete.	all sources are All sources are acknowledged in a dged in a clear and clear, consistent, and conscientious istent manner manner
Difficult to follow, Usually possible to follow with a Possible to follow with a little effort, Ear	sy to follow, Easy to follow,
Speaker quality	e enthusiastic, enthusiastic,
insecure quite insecure a little insecure usua	lly convincing very persuasive n made the subject, Presentation made the subject, main results clear in a project and main results clear in an
Presentation made the subject, project and main results almost clear presentation project and main results almost clear project and main results almost project and main results almost project and main results almost project and main results project and main results just clear presentation project and main results project and main results just clear presentation project and main results just clear presentation project and main results just clear presentation made the subject, project and main results almost project and main results almos	uctured way excellently structured way
15% Insufficiently clear presentation Insufficiently clear pre	

Description of criteria and sub-criteria of the Guide for determining Master Thesis grading (2021)

%	Sub-criteria	Description
	A. Scientific approach	Profundity of your research
	Theoretical profundity of student	To what extent you reproduced and applied all directly and indirectly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks, and most directly relevant scientific literature.
	State of the art description and literature study	To what extent you clearly positioned the thesis work to the current state of the art, and performed a thorough literature study.
25%		To what extent you yourself selected and defined the problem formulation, research/design plan, followed method, and approach; and to what extent you excellently executed the research/design plan.
	Scientific argumentation	To what extent all of your statements have good argumentation, using state-of-the art literature.
	Critical attitude and judgement	To what extent you have showed a critical attitude and judgement towards your own results, literature, and specialists.
	B. Quality of result/product	Quality of your results (research or design)
	Quality of abstract	To what extent you have captured the essence of your work in a concise and clear abstract.
	Creativity: new ideas	To what extent you have made several significant and original contributions to the project (not initiated or thought of by your supervisor).
25%	Experimental/modelling skills	To what extent you presented experimental/modelling skills that are at master level.
	Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge	To what extent you have verified, validated and used existing or newly generated methods/data/knowledge, and took all limitations into account.
	Utilisation (answering research/design question)	To what extent your research or design question is fully answered by the results or products, and if these results or products can be utilised by the project owner as is.
	C. Behavioural competencies	Project management and communication skills, and independence
	Project management & efficiency	The quality of your initial project planning; To what extent you have met all deadlines; If necessary, to what extent you have adjusted the scope of your project on your own initiative, in time, and to what extent you needed help with that; How much work you got done within the available time (28 hours per EC).
20%	Communication	To what extent you communicated effectively about project updates and resources that you required, with supervisors and other experts
2070	Independence	To what extent you needed guidance and steering; To what extent you asked for help in time, if needed
	Feedback processing	To what extent you processed feedback in a critical manner, and extrapolated feedback to other areas of thesis work
D.	Quality of written presentation	Quality of your final report
	Structure and consistency	To what extent your structure, text flow and presentation are logical, explicit and consistent; To what extent the division of main & side issues over your appendices and main text is balanced and of publishable quality.
15%		To what extent your writing style and language is concise, clear and professional; and to what extent there are language errors or typos that are noticeable and get in the way of understanding.
	Referencing	To what extent your sources are acknowledged in a clear, consistent and conscientious manner.
E. Q	uality of oral presentation and defence	Quality of your final presentation
		To what extent your presentation is easy to follow, enthusiastic, and persuasive.
15%	Clarity and structure of presentation	To what extent your presentation made the subject, project and main results of your project clear in a structured way.
15 /6	Quality of presentation material	To what extent your presentation material is attractive, supports the story and its intelligibility.
	Answering of questions	How well you answer questions of on your final presentation in depth and to the point, and provide your audience with new insight.

Master Thesis grading sheet Civil Engineering & Geosciences (2021 v1.1)



Student name:	Test Student	Assessment committee (chair):
Student number:	1234567	Me The Chair
Date:	24 June 2021	Assessment committee (other members):
MSc programme:	AES	Myself The Committee Member
Track:	Environmental Engineering	I The Committee Member
	Title Master thesis:	Just Me, Myself and I
Did the assess	sment committee check the plagiarism scan of the final report for fraud?	Yes. The committee does not have any suspicions for fraud.

Please send this form (pdf) to the secretariat of Education and Student Affairs: $\underline{\text{OS-CITG@tudelft.nl}}$

Assessment criteria (%)	Criteria / subcriteria	Grades / subgrades	Justification/background information of criteria grades A—E
25%	A. Scientific approach	6.4	Justification / background information
	Theoretical profundity of student	7	
approach	State of the art description and literature study	6	
fic ap	Research/design plan & execution	8	The judgement was only focussed on own work, and not related to what other authors wrote on the topic.
Scientific	Scientific argumentation	7	additions wrote on the topic.
A. 9	Critical attitude and judgement	4	
25%	B. Quality of result/product	5.0	Justification / background information

25%	B. Quality of result/product	5.0	Justification / background information
t	Quality of abstract	5	
:/ prod	Creativity: new ideas	7	
result	Experimental/modelling skills	5	The product was useable up to some extent, but since the quality of the wor was low, we basically need a student to redo the project.
lity of	Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge	3	was low, we basically freed a student to redo the project.
B. Qual	Utilisation (answering research/design question)	5	
_			

20%	C. Behavioural competencies	5.8	Justification / background information
	Project management & efficiency	2	
ioural	Communication	10	The student took too much time to finish the project. The student
C. Behavioural competencies	Independence	Indonondoneo	communicated about this very well and in a timely manner, and worked independently. The student did not process feedback on their own initiative.
8 ن	Feedback processing	3	

EXAMPLE

15%	D. Quality of written presentation	5.7	Justification / background information
of n	Structure and consistency	6	
uality or itten entatio	Writing style and language	5	Many references were only added after explicit comments from the supervisor. The writing style is quite informal, in spite of this having been pointed out a
D. Qւ wr prese	Referencing	6	couple of times to the student. The student needed help to create the structure.

15%	E. Quality of oral presentation and defence	8.5	Justification / background information
ıl fence	Speaker quality	8	
of oral	Clarity and structure of presentation	9	Student presented very enthusiastically and managed to convey the message
Quality tation a	Quality of presentation material		both to the lay audience as well as the expert audience. Answered the questions - even ones outside the scope of the project - very proficiently.
E. Q esenta	Answering of questions	9	
ď			

Additional remarks

Student could have achieved a lot more, if they had spent more time on the project. The presentation was very high quality and demonstrated the potential of the student.

Thesis grade	6.0
Signed on: 24 June 2021	

by chair: Me The Chair

Me the Chair