

| | Insufficient (<6) | Sufficient (6-7) | Satisfactory (7-8) | Very Good (8-9) | Excellent (9-10) |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Thesis (50%) | | | | | |
| Scientific Quality and Depth 1. Quality 2. Interpretation, verification, and reliability (including record keeping and reporting) 3. Conclusions, Critical Attitude | 1. Depth/quality does not supersede that of simple practical assignments. 2. No sufficient verification and/or interpretation of the results. Work is not reliable and cannot be communicated to the outside world. 3. The conclusions are unconnected to the results. | 1. Depth/quality are sufficient. 2. Findings are treated as straightforward and unproblematic. No or only minimal verification of results. Some results may not withstand a more thorough analysis. 3. Conclusions have sufficient link with results. | 1. Depth/quality are good, but results are not sufficient for publication. 2. Interpretation and verification have been carried out but are mechanical. Results are reliable. 3. Conclusions are clearly based on the results. | 1. Depth/quality is very good, and results can be a useful starting point for publication. Fulfilled most of the potential of a research project. 2. Purposeful/conscious interpretation and verification of the results. Results are reliable. 3. The conclusions are clear, and there is critical reflection on the results. | 1. Depth/quality is excellent and results that can be directly used for publication. 2. Purposeful and detailed interpretation and verification of the results. Results are reliable and robust. 3. The conclusions are a clear, critical reflection on the results and are extrapolated to a wider context. |
| Originality | Did not verify or extend knowledge, data, or methods. | Modest contribution to knowledge, data, or methods. | Extends existing knowledge, data, and/or existing methods. | Contributions to methods, data, insights and/or understanding. | New original methods, insights and/or understanding. |
| Methodology and Experiment 1. Methodology and Experiment Design 2. Methodology and Experiment Support* *) Support: This refers to the underpinnings of the methods and experiments, such as the description of an experimental setup or data collection with hypothesis and evaluation criteria, a mathematical proof, or a theory underlying a statistical experiment etc. | 1. Methodology/Experiment design shows minimal understanding of scientific process or has not been developed appropriately. Unsystematic or no validated use of method and design that fails to address many factors. 2. Offers simplistic, undeveloped, or cryptic support and explanation for methods, design, and/or output; inappropriate or off-topic generalisations; faulty assumptions; and/or errors of fact. Hypothesis not defined. | 1. Methodology/Experiment design shows sufficient understanding of scientific process and is adequate for the research problem. The description is sufficient for documentation, but too poor to enable reuse of methods/repetition of experiments. Comprehension limited to the problem at hand. 2. Offers some support that may be dubious, too broad or obvious. Details are too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to support the methods/experiment, or inappropriately repetitive. Hypothesis provided. | 1. Methodology/Experiment design shows understanding of scientific process and is adequate for the research problem. The description enables repetition of experiments/validation of results. Comprehension limited to the problem at hand. 2. Offers solid but less original reasoning to justify the methods/design. Assumptions are not always recognised or made explicit. Contains sufficient details and examples. Hypothesis clearly stated. | 1. Methodology/Experiment design shows clear understanding of scientific process. Choice of methods/experiments reflected on and validated to match the problem. The description enables repetition of experiments/validation of results. Incorporates different viewpoints. 2. Offers solid and original reasoning to justify the methods/design. Assumptions recognised and made explicit. Contains details and examples. Sharply defined hypothesis. | 1. Methodology/Experiment design shows mastery of scientific process and intimate understanding of the problem. Choice of methods/experiments critically reflected on and validated to match the problem. The description enables repetition of experiments/validation of results, and the methods can be reused for different problems. Incorporates different viewpoints. 2. Substantial, logical, and concrete development of ideas. Assumptions are recognised and made explicit. Sharply defined hypothesis. Details are germane, original, and convincingly interpreted. Methods/experiments placed in broader scientific context. |
| Problem Description | Problem/research question not defined. Essential details | Problem/research question defined/described but has too | Problem/research question appropriately described. | Clear and concise problem statement/research question. | Sharply defined problem/research question. All |

| | Insufficient (<6) | Sufficient (6-7) | Satisfactory (7-8) | Very Good (8-9) | Excellent (9-10) |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | missing | many/few details. | | | information available. |
| Organisation, Structure and Clarity | Unclear organisation and/or organisational plan is inappropriate to convey ideas and/or no transitions. Structure and/or coherence needs considerable improvement. | Some signs of logical organisation to convey ideas. Transitions are abrupt, illogical, and/or ineffective. Readable, but coherence is lacking. | Transitions are generally appropriate. However, sequence of ideas could be improved. | Logical organisation and structure. Sequence of ideas is effective. Transitions are smooth and effective. Thesis could be published as a paper with editing. | Logical organisation and structure. Sequence of ideas is highly effective. Transitions are smooth and effective. Thesis could be published as a paper with very little editing. |
| Sources and Literature Review | No depth to literature review. Fails to use sources and/or overuses quotations or paraphrasing and/or uses source material without acknowledgement. | Limited depth and use of earlier academic material. Missing literature. Uses relevant sources but, long quotations and paraphrases replace own ideas and/or inconsistently referenced. | Provides scientific context and places it appropriately in relation to existing literature. Adequate depth and use of earlier academic materials. Uses sources to support, extend, and inform the writer's own development of ideas. Appropriately uses quotes and citations. | Scientific context includes comprehensive literature references. Use of literature beyond those provided by supervisors. Uses sources to support, extend, and inform, but not substitute for writer's own development of ideas. Combines material from a variety of sources. Always cites appropriately and marks quotation/paraphrasing. | Excellent placement in broader research area. Contributes various sources beyond those provided by supervisors. Uses sources to support, extend, and inform, but not substitute for writer's own development of ideas. Skilfully combines material from a variety of sources. Always cites appropriately and marks quotation/paraphrasing. |
| Clarity of Writing: Style and Language | Superficial and stereotypical language. Oral rather than written language patterns predominate. Mechanical and usage errors so severe that writer's ideas are difficult to understand. | Sentences show little variety and/or are simplistic or overly complicated. Diction is somewhat immature; relies on clichés. Tone may have some inconsistencies in tense and person. Repeated weaknesses in mechanics and usage. Pattern of flaws. | Sentences show some variety and clarity, but control of language is uneven. Diction is accurate, appropriate, less advanced. Tone is appropriate. Grammar and syntax are correct with very few errors in spelling or punctuation. | Sentences are varied, clear, and employed for effect. Diction is precise, appropriate, using advanced vocabulary. Tone is mature, consistent, suitable for topic and audience. Grammar and syntax are correct with very few errors in spelling or punctuation. | Sentences are varied, clear, and employed for effect. Diction is precise, appropriate, using advanced vocabulary. Tone is mature, consistent, suitable for topic and audience. Essentially error free. Evidence of superior control of diction. |
| Project Execution (30%) | | | | | |
| Professional Skills 1. Independence, Initiative, 2. Response to feedback, Communication & Collaboration | 1. Unable to work independently. 2. Unable to incorporate feedback or collaborate. Communication inefficient. | 1. Detailed instructions required, though to some extent able to work independently. 2. Incorporates feedback. | 1. Expected level of independence. 2. Generally asked advice and approached supervisor to discuss research. | 1. Mostly independent. Demonstrates significant initiative. 2. Asked relevant and innovative questions during meetings. | 1. Nearly fully independent and takes regularly initiative. 2. Not only relevant and innovative questions during meetings but approached also other researchers. Full collaborator, beyond the expectations for a student. |

| | Insufficient (<6) | Sufficient (6-7) | Satisfactory (7-8) | Very Good (8-9) | Excellent (9-10) |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Management Skills 1. Productivity 2. Planning, Project, and Time management | 1. Productivity very low 2. Passive attitude and/or cuts corners. Periods of absence without reason. Poor time management. Thesis not received at deadline. | 1. Completed project with minimal effort; marginal commitment. 2. Time spent barely sufficient. Trouble keeping deadlines. Thesis just on time. | 1. Adequate productivity and positive attitude. 2. Able to plan ahead and account for contingency. Keeps agreed milestones. | 1. Better than average productivity and positive attitude. 2. Can revise planning as needed and keeps to agreed steps towards completing deadlines. Focus on well-prioritised tasks without losing the plot. | 1. Outstanding productivity and positive attitude. 2. Professional approach. All steps towards completing thesis essentially on time. |
| Experimental & Analytical Skills | Very limited research skills. | Able to complete research without intervention, albeit major help was needed. | Able to complete research without intervention and little help was needed. | Reliable and project-oriented forward thinking with little need for supervision. | Essentially fully independently performed high level research. |
| Preparation, Methodology and Structured Approach | Unable to complete without intervention. Project failure caused by difficulty to follow correct procedures. | Limited creativity. Long time to learn new research skills and can still improve. | Able to learn new skills adequately. Making decisions on their own was difficult. | Innovative. | Innovative. Connections beyond original boundaries. |
| Presentation (20%) | | | | | |
| Content | Vague and unclear for the audience. Presentation lacks detail and does not support conclusions. Irrelevant information presented. No quotations used or inappropriately used. | Only experts can follow. Presentation has sufficient detail to support the conclusions. Quotations used appropriately. | Most key concepts are explained. Presentation has the right level of detail to support the conclusions and to understand the content. Problem clearly presented. Quotations used appropriately. | All key concepts are correctly explained. Presentation has the right level of detail to support the conclusions and to understand the project outcomes. Placed in context of field and problem. Information sources noted and quoted appropriately. | All key concepts well explained. Presentation has the right level of detail to support the conclusions and to understand the project outcomes. Placed in wider academic context. Information sources noted and quoted appropriately, and used to good effect. |
| Clarity, Style and Structure | Presentation is unstructured and chaotic. Illogically ordered and incoherent thought stream. No introduction or conclusion. | Structure serves to present information but is minimal. Some parts are not in logical order and links are not clear. At times coherent, although focus and coherence lost for a large part. Introduction and conclusion lacking. | Somewhat puzzling storyline but brings message across. Parts logically ordered, but links are not always clear. Coherent thoughts but loses focus at times. Introduction and conclusion provided but lack clarity. | Clear storyline that brings message across. Logical order of and clear links between parts. Coherent, focused thoughts. Clear introduction and conclusion. | Clear storyline that brings message across and engages audience. Logical order of and clear links between parts. Coherent and focused thoughts. Engaging introduction and reinforcing conclusion that. |
| Visual Aids | No or improper use of visual aids. | The visualisation matches the presentation but detracts at times. Used pictures are generic. | The visualisation supports the presentation. Used pictures are generic at times. | The visualisation is clear and supports the presentation. Pictures are not generic but add to the presentation. | The visualisation provides a creative support for the presentation. Illustrations are carefully chosen/crafted to drive the story forward and. |

| | Insufficient (<6) | Sufficient (6-7) | Satisfactory (7-8) | Very Good (8-9) | Excellent (9-10) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| Delivery | Inappropriate use of articulation, inflection, tone or gestures. Presentation way too long or short. Cannot adequately give the presentation. | Little use of articulation, inflection, tone and gestures used. Pacing frequently off. Vocal dynamics flat or distracting at times. Needs to regularly check notes. Uses fill words/sounds often. | Articulation, inflection, tone and gestures used but not to always to good effect. Pacing needs improvement. Vocal dynamics flat or distracting at times. Fluency hampered at times by use of notes or fill words/sounds. | Good use of articulation, inflection, tone and gestures. Easy to listen to. Well-paced presentation. Vocal dynamics support content. Fluent with little dependence on notes. | Deliberate use of articulation, inflection, tone and gestures. Easy to listen to. Perfect pacing. Vocal dynamics support content. Fluent with no dependence on notes. |
| Defence | Inadequate or wrong responses to questions. Unable to hold any discussion on subject. | Correct responses to questions, but argumentation weak. Discussion on subject remains shallow and flawed. | Correct responses to questions with adequate argumentation. Able to hold a discussion on the subject, albeit shallow. | Good answers with discussion. Able to hold a discussion of some depth on the subject. | Knowledgeable answers that show mastery of subject. Able to hold a deep and mature discussion on the subject. |