Evaluation Form Master’s Thesis

(0) Guidelines for completing these forms

Each of the aspects is evaluated by **marking the appropriate level** (NS, S, D, GD or GGD) **with a cross** (X). These are then **combined into a single overall grade** (0-20). The levels are defined as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Abbreviation** | **Explanation** | **Grade Fork** |
| NS | Insufficient  The thesis has **severe shortcomings** because, for instance, the most important analyses display major flaws or because the student is not capable of clarifying or interpreting the results. The written text contains too many mistakes and is poorly edited. | < 10/20 |
| S | Sufficient  **Poor quality** but acceptable because there are not severe shortcomings that undermine the work too much. The work may be too shallow, lack content or contain may mistakes. The student is capably of clarifying but not to a great extent.  **Acceptable** thesis. The work and analyses are not very thorough, the proposed solutions do not go beyond standard methods and/or data collection. There are several shortcomings but the main conclusions are valid. The student is capable of clarifying and interpreting. | 10/20 – 11/20  12/20 |
| D | Distinction  **Good** thesis in which the basic requirements of a sound scientific analysis have been met but not without shortcomings. The student shows that he or she has obtained sufficient insight into the subject matter and is capable of framing his or her work in the state of the art. | 13/20 – 14/20 |
| GD | Great Distinction  **Very good** thesis which contains a thorough scientific analysis and shows its creator’s inventiveness, initiative and originality. There may be limited shortcomings but the student shows a sound understanding of the subject matter. The results are discussed in a consistent fashion and are framed well within the state of the art. It is clear that the student has worked in an independent manner. | 15/20 – 16/20 |
| GGD | Greatest Distinction  **Excellent** thesis in which the scientific solutions to the problem display considerable inventiveness and mastery of the subject matter. Flawless save a couple of details. The student is capable of effortlessly answering questions that probe a deeper insight into the matter. It is clear that the student has worked in a very independent manner and has taken considerable initiative.  **Outstanding** : The Master’s thesis is at the level of scientific paper. | 17/20 – 18/20  19/20 – 20/20 |

Each Master’s thesis is read and evaluated by **the promoter(s)** and **two assessors**. This evaluation is done by promoter(s) and evaluators using form (1).

The promoter(s) evaluate(s) the student during the semester using form (2).

The jury as a whole evaluates the presentation and oral defence of the student using form (3).

Each overall grade on each of the three forms **must** be accompanied by a comment.

Contributions of partial grades:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Text** |  |  | **Presentation and Defence** | **Process Evaluation** |
| Promoter(s) | Assessor1 | Assessor2 | Committee | Promoter(s) |
| 30% | 15% | 15% | 20% | 20% |

The final grade of each student is fixed during the discussion at the end of each session.

Master student’s name :

Academic year :

(1) Evaluation of the Written Text of the Master’s Thesis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NS** | **S** | **D** | **GD** | **GGD** |
| 1. Literature study and citing (the state of the art in the scientific literature is accurately described, with special attention for the relevant theories and concepts) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Formulation of goals (the research goals or hypotheses are formulated in an objective and scientifically correct way – they naturally flow from the subject’s framework) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Structure of the text and methodology (the setup and methods have been described in detail – they are suited to test the hypotheses or answer the research questions) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Scientific accuracy (the data analysis methods have been correctly applied and lead to supported statements on the starting points of the research or the hypotheses) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Discussion and conclusions (the results are discussed in a consistent way, linked to the research goals and the relevant literature – the student is capable of summarizing the findings in clear conclusions) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Multidisciplinary (the multidisciplinary dimensions and approach of the research topic is sufficiently addressed, multidisciplinary insights, conclusions and recommendations are offered) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Language and style (the text is carefully and concisely edited and written in a scientific style with the appropriate jargon – the results have been structured well and presented clearly, taking into account completeness and accurateness) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8. Overall grade** |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments :

Date :

Promoter’s or assessor’s name :

Promoter’s or assessor’s signature :

Master student’s name :

Academic year :

(2) Process Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NS** | **S** | **D** | **GD** | **GGD** |
| 1. Acquiring and applying technical skills (the student quickly becomes adept at using a new technique and is subsequently capably of using it more or less independently) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Personal initiative (the student regularly launches his or her own initiatives which lead to results and contributes considerably to all aspects of the thesis) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Efficiency, reliability and punctuality at organizing, planning and processing (the student works independently, considering the level of difficulty of the subject – he or she respects planned appointments with promoter and/or supervisors) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Critical sense (the student asks questions about what he or she read in the literature in a scientifically sound way and knows the limitations of the techniques he or she is working with) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5. Overall grade** |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

Date :

Promoter’s name :

Promoter’s signature :

Master student’s name :

Academic year :

(3) Evaluation of the Presentation and Defence

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NS** | **S** | **D** | **GD** | **GGD** |
| 1. Quality of the presentation (the presentation is well structured, clear and respects the time limit – the student uses the appropriate language) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Quality of the defence (the student responds convincingly to the questions – the answers display insight, are well structured and link to the obtained results) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3. Overall grade** |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

Date :

Jury chair’s signature :