

## 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 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 criterion**, 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**, 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 [Rules & Guidelines art. 23.3](#)).
- 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 criterion,** 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:
  - 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.

## 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
<b>A. Scientific approach</b>	25%	<b>Theoretical profundity of student</b>	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
		<b>State of the art description and literature study</b>	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 very well to the current state of the art, and used new relevant literature	Related thesis work 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
		<b>Research/design plan &amp; execution</b>	Followed methods and approaches suggested by the supervisor: Was insufficiently able to execute a prescribed research/design plan	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 very 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
		<b>Scientific argumentation</b>	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
		<b>Critical attitude and judgement</b>	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, literature, and specialists	Showed good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, 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
<b>B. Quality of result/product</b>	25%	<b>Quality of abstract</b>	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	Essence of work well captured in a reasonably concise and clear abstract	Essence of work very well captured in a concise and clear abstract	Essence of work perfectly captured in a concise and clear abstract
		<b>Creativity: new ideas</b>	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>Experimental/modelling skills</b>	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
		<b>Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge</b>	Insufficiently verified, validated, and used provided methods/data/knowledge, or did <u>not</u> 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
		<b>Utilisation (answering research/design question)</b>	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
<b>C. Behavioural competencies</b>	20%	<b>Project management &amp; efficiency</b>	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: Just 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	Good initial project planning: Met all deadlines: If necessary, adjusted scope of project well on own initiative in time, without help: Large amount of work done within the available time	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
		<b>Communication</b>	Communicated insufficiently about the project or required resources	Communicated almost adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors	Communicated just adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors	Usually communicated 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
		<b>Independence</b>	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
		<b>Feedback processing</b>	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, but did <u>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
<b>D. Quality of written presentation</b>	15%	<b>Structure and consistency</b>	Structure, text flow and presentation insufficiently logical, inconsistent or implicit: Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text illogical	Structure, text flow and presentation partially logical, explicit and consistent: 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 always balanced (publishable quality)	
		<b>Writing style and language</b>	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, very few typos	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
		<b>Referencing</b>	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 consistent manner	All sources are acknowledged in a clear, consistent, and conscientious manner
<b>E. Quality of oral presentation and defence</b>	15%	<b>Speaker quality</b>	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
		<b>Clarity and structure of presentation</b>	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
		<b>Quality of presentation material</b>	Presentation material insufficiently supporting the story	Presentation material almost adequately supporting the story	Presentation material just adequately supporting the story	Presentation material adequately supporting the story	Presentation material attractive, supporting the story and its intelligibility	Presentation material attractive, supporting the story and its intelligibility well	Presentation material very attractive, supporting the story and its intelligibility very well
		<b>Answering of questions</b>	Insufficiently answered basic questions	Had difficulties answering basic questions in a reasonable way	Answered basic questions in a reasonable way	Answered basic and some more advanced questions well	Answered basic and most more advanced questions well	Answered advanced questions in depth and to the point	Answered questions very well, with new insights gained during discussion

\* 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

Assessment Criteria	%	Sub-criteria	Grading				
			<5*	5	6	8	10
<b>A. Scientific approach</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>Theoretical profundity of student</b>	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 most directly and indirectly relevant theory at the level of MSc textbooks, and some 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
		<b>State of the art description and literature study</b>	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 well to the current state of the art, and used new relevant literature	Positioned the thesis work clearly to the current state of the art, and performed a thorough literature study
		<b>Research/design plan &amp; execution</b>	Followed methods and approaches suggested by the supervisor;  Was insufficiently able to execute a prescribed research/design plan	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	Provided significant own input into research/design plan or the followed method & approach;  Executed the research/design plan well	Problem formulation, research/design plan, followed method, and approach were selected and defined by the student;  Executed the research/design plan excellently
		<b>Scientific argumentation</b>	Most statements have no argumentation	Most statements have minimal argumentation	Most statements have minimal but sufficient argumentation	Most statements have good argumentation, using some state-of-the-art literature	All statements have good argumentation, using mostly state-of-the-art literature
		<b>Critical attitude and judgement</b>	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 good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, reasonable critical attitude towards literature and specialists	Showed very good critical attitude and judgement towards own results, literature, and specialists
<b>B. Quality of result/product</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>Quality of abstract</b>	Essence of work insufficiently captured	Essence of work almost captured	Essence of work just captured	Essence of work well captured in a reasonably concise and clear abstract	Essence of work perfectly captured in a concise and clear abstract
		<b>Creativity: new ideas</b>	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 at least one 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>Experimental/modelling skills</b>	Presented insufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented almost sufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented just sufficient experimental/modelling skills	Presented good experimental/modelling skills	Presented excellent experimental/modelling skills
		<b>Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge</b>	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 not describe some important limitations	Verified, validated, and used provided methods/data/knowledge, and described most 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 limitations into account
		<b>Utilisation (answering research/design question)</b>	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 answered well by results/products, project owner can utilise the majority of the results/products after small improvements	Research/design question fully answered by results/products, all results/product can be utilised by project owner as is
<b>C. Behavioural competencies</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>Project management &amp; efficiency</b>	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; Just did what was needed 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	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
		<b>Communication</b>	Communicated insufficiently about the project or required resources	Communicated almost adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors	Communicated just adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors	Communicated adequately about project updates and required resources with supervisors	Communicated very effectively about project updates and required resources with supervisors and other experts
		<b>Independence</b>	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	Worked independently, with little guidance and supervision; If needed, usually asked for help in time	Needed no guidance; If needed, always asked for help in time
		<b>Feedback processing</b>	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, but did not extrapolate the feedback to other areas of thesis work	Processed feedback, 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 all feedback in a critical manner, and extrapolated feedback to other areas of thesis work
<b>D. Quality of written presentation</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>Structure and consistency</b>	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 mostly logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text balanced	Structure, text flow and presentation very logical, explicit and consistent; Division of main & side issues over appendices and main text always balanced (publishable quality)
		<b>Writing style and language</b>	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	Generally concise, clear and professional; No language errors that get in the way of understanding, few typos	Concise, clear and professional; No noticeable language errors, no typos
		<b>Referencing</b>	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	Almost all sources are acknowledged in a clear and consistent manner	All sources are acknowledged in a clear, consistent, and conscientious manner
<b>E. Quality of oral presentation and defence</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>Speaker quality</b>	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	Easy to follow, quite enthusiastic, usually convincing	Easy to follow, enthusiastic, very persuasive
		<b>Clarity and structure of presentation</b>	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 in a structured way	Presentation made the subject, project and main results clear in an excellently structured way
		<b>Quality of presentation material</b>	Presentation material insufficiently supporting the story	Presentation material almost adequately supporting the story	Presentation material just adequately supporting the story	Presentation material attractive, supporting the story and its intelligibility	Presentation material very attractive, supporting the story and its intelligibility very well
		<b>Answering of questions</b>	Insufficiently answered basic questions	Had difficulties answering basic questions in a reasonable way	Answered basic questions in a reasonable way	Answered basic and most more advanced questions well	Answered questions very well, with new insights gained during discussion

\* 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.

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

%	Sub-criteria	Description
<b>A. Scientific approach      Profundity of your research</b>		
25%	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.
	Research/design plan & execution	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>B. Quality of result/product      Quality of your results (research or design)</b>		
25%	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).
	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.
<b>C. Behavioural competencies      Project management and communication skills, and independence</b>		
20%	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; <b>How much work you got done within the available time (28 hours per EC).</b>
	Communication	To what extent you communicated effectively about project updates and resources that you required, with supervisors and other experts
	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
<b>D. Quality of written presentation      Quality of your final report</b>		
15%	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.
	Writing style and language	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.
<b>E. Quality of oral presentation and defence      Quality of your final presentation</b>		
15%	Speaker quality	To what extent your presentation is easy to follow, enthusiastic, and persuasive.
	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.
	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.



**EXAMPLE**

15%		<b>D. Quality of written presentation</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>Justification / background information</b>
<b>D. Quality of written presentation</b>		Structure and consistency	6	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 couple of times to the student. The student needed help to create the structure.
		Writing style and language	5	
		Referencing	6	

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

<b>Additional remarks</b>	
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.	

<b>Thesis grade</b>	<b>6.0</b>
---------------------	------------

<b>Signed on:</b> 24 June 2021
<b>by chair:</b> Me The Chair
Me the Chair