University of Antwerp

Assessment form Master thesis Computer Science: Feasibility study

Student:

Academic Year:

Promotor:

Jury member:

Jury member:

Assistant:

Title:

Score awarded:

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the problem described precisely?	
Is the applied technique described precisely?	
Is the technique's application to the problem described precisely? (Is the experiment —the prototype— described clearly?)	
Are conclusions being drawn? (Which of the techniques' steps are *useful*? Which steps need to be improved or even replaced?)	

If the thesis committee answers “no” on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question “why a feasibility study” answered convincingly? (Is it clear that the problem is relevant, the technique innovative and the application reasonable?)	
Is there a summary of applicable techniques? (Is there information about several alternatives, apart from the applied technique?)	
Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of experiment? (Is there an explanation why the problem example is representative? Is there more information about the applied technique as a function of the problem?)	
Can the experiment be repeated? (Are enough details given so that outsiders could replicate the experiment?)	
Are the conclusions convincing? (Is the problem presented in a sufficiently abstract way so that the conclusions are also relevant for other problems?)	

If the thesis committee answers “no” on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

University of Antwerp

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	
Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	
Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	

If the reading committee answers “no” on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	

If the reading committee answers “no” to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine-grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained criteria

Clarity (text):	
Presentation (defense):	
Independence:	
Workload:	