

Instructions for the assessment committee:

1) Complete all yellow cells (will turn light blue)

2) Complete the grades for all 21 subcriteria (integers between 1 and 10), based on the description in the grading guide (see tab 2, or tab 3 for a brief version).

- In case of subgrades <5, choose grade 1–4 based upon the severity of the deficiencies and add a justification.

- Students can only graduate if the grades for assessment criteria A–E are all 5.0 or higher, and if their weighted average is 5.75 or higher.


3) For criteria A–E, add relevant background information on the process (A–D) and presentation (E) that influenced the grading. The justification of the grading should be clear for outsiders who only read this grading sheet and the thesis.

4) Print or save this grading sheet as a pdf file and send it to the student and os-citg@tudelft.nl (ESA CEG). ESA CEG will archive this grading sheet and enter the grade in Osiris.

Plagiarism manual and all graduation related forms:

<https://www.tudelft.nl/en/student/ceg-student-portal/education/master/forms-master>

Master Thesis grading sheet MSc Civil Engineering (February 2024 v2.0)



Student name:		Assessment committee (chair):	
Student number:			
Date:		Assessment committee (other members):	
MSc programme:			
Track:			
Title Master thesis:			
Did the assessment committee check the plagiarism scan of the final report for fraud?	Yes. The committee detected or suspects fraud and will report this to the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners will decide whether there was fraud and whether the student can receive a grade.		

Please send this form (pdf) to the secretariat of Education and Student Affairs: OS-CITG@tudelft.nl

Assessment criteria (%)	Criteria / subcriteria	Grades / subgrades	Justification/background information of criteria grades A–E
25%	A. Scientific approach	--	Justification / background information
A. Scientific approach	Theoretical profundity		
	State of the art description and literature study, identified research gap or design assignment		
	Research/design methodology choice & execution		
	Scientific argumentation		
	Critical attitude and judgement, (societal) impact		
20%	B. Quality of result/product	--	Justification / background information
B. Quality of result/product	Creativity: new ideas		
	Experimental/modelling/ design skills		
	Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge		
	Utilisation (answering research/design question)		
20%	C. Behavioural competencies	--	Justification / background information
C. Behavioural competencies	Project management & efficiency		
	Communication		
	Independence		
	Feedback processing		
20%	D. Quality of written report	--	Justification / background information
D. Quality of written report	Quality of abstract		
	Structure and consistency		
	Writing style and language		
	Quality of layout, (technical) drawings, and figures		
	Referencing		
15%	E. Quality of oral presentation and defence	--	Justification / background information
E. Quality of oral presentation and defence	Speaker quality		
	Clarity and structure of presentation		
	Quality of presentation material		
	Answering of questions		
Additional remarks			
Thesis grade		The Board of Examiners will decide whether the student can receive a grade.	
Signed on:			
by chair:			
[insert signature]			

Average:

criteria grades incomplete

Guide for determining Master Thesis grading (2024)

Applicable to the MSc Civil Engineering degree programme

[Click this link to download a print version \(pdf\)](#)

			Grading						
Assessment Criteria	%	Sub-criteria	<5*	5	6	7	8	9	10
A. Scientific approach	25%	Theoretical profundity	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, identified research gap or design assignment	Insufficiently related thesis work to existing literature, research gap or design assignment fully suggested by supervisor	Related thesis work to existing literature, research gap or design assignment for biggest part suggested by supervisors	Only just related thesis work sufficiently to the current state of the art and existing literature, research gap or design assignment defined after instruction of supervisors	Related thesis work sufficiently to the current state of the art, and used some new literature, research gap or design assignment defined in collaboration with supervisors	Related thesis work well to the current state of the art, and used new relevant literature, had an important role in defining the research gap or design assignment	Related thesis work very well to the current state of the art, and used a significant amount of new, relevant literature, for biggest part defined the research gap or design assignment	Positioned the thesis work clearly to the current state of the art, and performed a thorough literature study. Fully defined the research gap or design assignment
		Research/design methodology choice & execution	Followed methodology suggested by the supervisor without providing own input, demonstrated insufficient understanding; Was insufficiently able to execute the prescribed methodology	Followed methodology suggested by the supervisor without providing own input, demonstrated almost sufficient understanding; Almost executed the prescribed methodology	Followed methodology suggested by the supervisor without providing own input, demonstrated sufficient understanding; Execute the prescribed methodology	Provided adequate own input to extend/modify the methodology or to suggest an alternative methodology; OR adequately followed and well understood a sophisticated methodology suggested by the supervisor which the student could not have devised independently; Executed the methodology well	Provided significant own input into the followed methodology; OR effectively executed and demonstrated a solid understanding of a sophisticated methodology suggested by the supervisor, displaying growing independence in conceptualization. Executed the methodology well	The followed methodology and approach were essentially selected and defined by the student; OR Proficiently executed and demonstrated a nuanced understanding of a sophisticated methodology suggested by the supervisor, displaying a higher level of independence in conceptualization. Executed the methodology very well	Problem formulation, followed methodology, and approach were selected and defined by the student; OR Exceptionally executed and showcased an advanced understanding of a sophisticated methodology suggested by the supervisor, independently developing and applying innovative concepts. <i>Executed the methodology excellently</i>
		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, (societal) impact	Showed far too limited critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact	Showed too limited critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact	Showed limited critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact	Showed sufficient critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact, limited critical attitude towards literature and specialists	Showed good critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact, reasonable critical attitude towards literature and specialists	Showed good critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact, and towards literature, and specialists	Showed very good critical attitude and judgement towards own results and their (societal) impact, and towards literature, and specialists
B. Quality of result/product	20%	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
		Experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented insufficient experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented almost sufficient experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented just sufficient experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented sufficient experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented good experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented very good experimental/modelling/design skills	Presented excellent experimental/modelling/design skills
		Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge	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
		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
C. Behavioural competencies	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; 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
		Communication	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
		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. Quality of written report	20%	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	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
		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)
		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
		Quality of layout, (technical) drawings, and figures	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures are insufficiently supporting the written text	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures are almost adequately supporting the written text	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures just are adequately supporting the written text	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures are adequately supporting the written text	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures are attractive and informative, supporting the written text and its intelligibility	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures are attractive and informative, supporting the written text and its intelligibility well	Layout, (technical) drawings, and figures very are attractive and informative, supporting the written text and its intelligibility very well
		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
E. Quality of oral presentation and defence	15%	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
		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
		Quality of presentation material	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
		Answering of questions	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.

Description of criteria and sub-criteria of the Guide for determining Master Thesis grading (2024)

%	Sub-criteria	Description
A. Scientific approach		Profundity of your research
25%	Theoretical profundity	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, identified research gap or design assignment	To what extent you clearly positioned the thesis work to the current state of the art, and performed a thorough literature study.
	Research/design methodology choice & 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, (societal) impact	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)
20%	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/design 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
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; How much work you got done within the available time (28 hours per EC).
	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
D. Quality of written presentation		Quality of your final report
20%	Quality of abstract	To what extent you have captured the essence of your work in a concise and clear abstract.
	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.
	Quality of layout, (technical) drawings, and figures	To what extent your layout, (technical) drawings and figures are supporting the written tekst.
	Referencing	To what extent your sources are acknowledged in a clear, consistent and conscientious manner.
E. Quality of oral presentation and defence		Quality of your final presentation
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, supporting 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.

Student name:	Test Student	Assessment committee (chair):	
Student number:	1234567		Me The Chair
Date:	09 February 2024	Assessment committee (other members):	
MSc programme:	CIE		Myself The Committee Member
Track:	Water Management		I The Committee Member
	Title Master thesis:		Just Me, Myself and I
	Did the assessment 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: OS-CITG@tudelft.nl

Assessment criteria (%)	Criteria / subcriteria	Grades / subgrades	Justification/background information of criteria grades A–E
-------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	---

<div>25%</div> <div>A. Scientific approach</div>	A. Scientific approach	6.4	Justification / background information
	Theoretical profundity	7	The judgement was only focussed on own work, and not related to what other authors wrote on the topic.
	State of the art description and literature study, identified research gap or design assignment	6	
	Research/design methodology choice & execution	8	
	Scientific argumentation	7	
	Critical attitude and judgement, (societal) impact	4	

<div>20%</div> <div>B. Quality of result/product</div>	B. Quality of result/product	5.0	<div>Justification / background information</div> <p>The product was useable up to some extent, but since the quality of the work was low, we basically need a student to redo the project.</p>
	Creativity: new ideas	7	
	Experimental/modelling/ design skills	5	
	Use/verification/validation of methods/data/knowledge	3	
	Utilisation (answering research/design question)	5	

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

<div>20%</div> <div>D. Quality of written presentation</div>	D. Quality of written presentation	5.6	Justification / background information
	Quality of abstract	6	<p>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.</p>
	Structure and consistency	6	
	Writing style and language	5	
	Quality of layout, (technical) drawings, and figures	5	
	Referencing	6	

E. Quality of oral presentation and defence	15%	E. Quality of oral presentation and defence	8.5	Justification / background information
		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	

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 2024
by chair:	Me The Chair
Me the Chair	