



university of
applied sciences

Company supervisor feedback form graduation project

ICT & CT
Information Technology Bachelor Emmen

Version 2023-2024-1.0

Student name:	Student number:
Graduation project company:	Company supervisor:
Company location:	Graduation project period:
Name & signature of 1st examiner:	Name & signature of 2nd examiner:
Date:	Name & signature company supervisor:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Instructions Company Internship Supervisor Feedback Form.....	3
2	Company Supervisor Feedback Form graduation project	4
3	Company supervisor's remarks	5
Appendix 1	Dublin descriptors	6
Appendix 2	Internship Assessment Factors	7
Appendix 3	Professional performance	8

1 INSTRUCTIONS COMPANY INTERNSHIP SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK FORM

Specify your (advisory) assessment by ticking the coloured box in the feedback form (next page) that reflects the student's current performance level.

The coloured boxes are indicative of the grade. Yellow indicates that the student performs at the level expected of a new Bachelor of ICT.

The meaning/grade distribution of the colours in this respect is as follows:










<4	4 - 5,4	5,5 – 6,9	7 - 8,4	>=8,5
----	------------	--------------	------------	-------

Specify your assessment by marking an 'X' in the box behind the component. Write any additional comments under 3: *Company supervisor's remarks*.

Mark any non-applicable components with an 'X' in the N/A field.

Besides completing the X-list the company supervisor is requested to briefly describe the student's performance under 3: *Company supervisor's remarks*.

2 COMPANY SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK FORM GRADUATION PROJECT ¹

Feedback based on the Dublin Descriptors:								
Dublin descriptor 1: Knowledge and understanding								n.v.t.
Demonstrable knowledge	Unsatisfactory						Satisfactory	
Consulting specialist literature	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Theoretical understanding	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Practical understanding	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Dublin descriptor 2: Applying knowledge and understanding								
Professionalism	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Reasoning	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Solving problems	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Methodical approach	Disordered						Well-ordered	
Monitoring progress (planning)	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Originality	Little						Much	
Creativity	Little						Much	
Work discipline (meeting commitments)	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Independence	Wait-and-see attitude						Enterprising	
Quality of the work performed/products delivered	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Quantity of the work performed/products delivered	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Value of the achieved results	Low						High	
Cost-conscious approach	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Dublin descriptor 3: Formation of judgement								
Collecting data	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Interpreting (Analysis and implementation)	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Formation of judgement	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Dublin descriptor 4: Communication								
Ability to express oneself verbally when dealing with specialists	Awkward						Articulate	
Ability to express oneself verbally when dealing with non-specialists	Awkward						Articulate	
Ability to express oneself in writing when dealing with specialists	Sloppy						Polished	
Ability to express oneself in writing when dealing with non-specialists	Sloppy						Polished	
Functional cooperation (Cooperation)	Awkward						Articulate	
Positive but critical attitude	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Timely feedback	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Dublin descriptor 5: Learning skills								
Learning to learn	Unsatisfactory						Good	
Feedback on the delivered product and performance:								
								n.v.t.
Complexity/level of the graduation project	Low						High	
Usability of the delivered product for the organization	Low						High	

¹ The feedback form is based, among other things, on the *Dublin descriptors*. An explanation is provided in Appendix 1.

3 COMPANY SUPERVISOR'S REMARKS²

Company supervisor's initials:

² Appendices 2 and 3 contain guidelines in support of your remarks. Appendix 2 contains an explanation relating to the assessment factors of the intern based on the *domain description Bachelor of ICT*. Appendix 3 contains an explanation relating to the intern's professional performance.

APPENDIX 1 DUBLIN DESCRIPTORS

	Bachelor's qualifications
Knowledge and understanding	<p>The (future) bachelor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has <i>demonstrable knowledge</i>, understanding and skills in a field of study, building on the preceding level; Generally performs at a level that requires knowledge of the latest developments in the field of study, supported by <i>specialised literature</i>...
Applying knowledge and understanding	<p>The (future) bachelor has the ability to apply said knowledge, understanding and skills so as to perform on a professional level. More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Professionalism</i> is evidenced by a methodical, project-based and/or problem-driven approach, whilst solutions to issues are viewed from several professional perspectives. <i>Reasoning</i> is evidenced by a logical structure (cause & effect chain) in recognisable steps when formulating a line of reasoning. <i>Solving problems</i> is evidenced by the level of creativity, the feasibility of solutions and the choice of alternatives.
Formation of judgement	<p>The (future) bachelor has the ability to collect and interpret relevant data and from that data form an opinion that is also based on social and ethical considerations. More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Data</i> is collected in a purposeful fashion with a view to the goal, completeness and a balanced distribution. <i>Interpreting</i> is evidenced when the (future) bachelor processes the collected data and can explain the importance of the data. <i>Formation of a judgement</i> is ultimately evidenced by the opinion that is formed on the basis of the data and which can be deduced logically from the data. The considerations mentioned recur explicitly and consistently.
Communication	<p>The (future) bachelor has the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicate about information, ideas and solutions with <i>specialists and non-specialists</i>. This is evidenced, among other things, by the extent to which findings, ideas and solutions are translated into understandable, logical terms and into a logical and coherent argument. <i>Cooperation</i> with others in a <i>multidisciplinary</i> and/or international environment, meeting the requirements of participating in an organisation.
Learning skills	<p>The (future) bachelor's learning skills are sufficient for taking a post-graduate course with a high level of self-sufficiency. The (future) bachelor's skills are sufficient to carry out the internship assignment with a reasonable amount of self-sufficiency and within a short-term time frame. (<i>Learning to learn</i>)</p>

APPENDIX 2 INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FACTORS

	Criteria
Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Methods, techniques and/or tools</i>: described, choice justified, suitable for the assignments, correctly applied? • <i>Quality of operation and management</i>: properly organised? Required continuity ensured? Transferable: Management responsibilities and procedures described? All the consequences of change proposals for exploitation and continuity of the product assessed? • <i>Quality of the process</i>: implemented according to plan, professional choices made and justified? Checked in the interim whether operational and management plan meet guidelines, requirements and wishes?
Analysing (research)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Methods, techniques and/or tools</i>: which analysis/research methods have been used and are they described properly? Is the choice justified, suitable for the assignment and applied properly? Are the analysis/research questions suitable for and consistent with the problem definition/assignment? Does the sum of the sub-questions correspond with the key question? Is the development methodology in accordance with the research into the requirements and the context? Was relevant and current literature used in relation to the assignment? Is international literature being used? • <i>Quality of the analysis/research</i>: current situation described and desired situation mapped out? Context analysed (target group/user, content, company)? Is obtained information sufficient and relevant to the goal? Interpreted on the basis of the analysis/research questions? Research questions answered and conclusions drawn? Clear reporting/presentation of the results and how they were achieved? Clear conclusions, recommendations? Action plan drawn up, categorised, prioritised and geared to the assignment? • <i>Quality of the analysis/research process</i>: implemented according to plan, adequately documented? Checked in the interim whether the research is conducted in a manner that meets the initial question and research methods?
Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Methods, techniques and/or tools</i>: sufficiently described, alternatives considered, choice justified, suitable for the assignment and properly applied? • <i>Quality of advice</i>: based on analysis/research results and suitable for the problem definition, professionally substantiated, clear and convincingly presented? Proposals made for follow-up? • <i>Quality of the advisory process</i>: performed according to plan, alternatives considered, feasibility assessed, support created?
Designing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Methods, techniques and/or tools</i>: sufficiently described, alternatives considered, choice justified, suitable for the assignment and properly applied? • <i>Quality of the design</i>: complies with wants and needs, consistent, how innovative is it? Sufficiently documented and suitable for realisation by third parties? Functional design and/or transfer document? • <i>Design process</i>: according to plan, professional design choices made, justified and adequately documented? Alternative design solutions investigated and considered? Interim designs evaluated in consultation with the client and/or target group?
Realising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Methods, techniques and/or tools</i>: sufficiently described, choice justified, suitable for the assignment and properly applied? • <i>Quality of the realisation</i>: product realised in accordance with the design and applicable guidelines? Quality requirements imposed and secured? Product introduced? Product transferable? • <i>Quality of the realisation process</i>: implemented according to plan, professional realisation choices made and justified? Checked in the interim that product meets design, guidelines, requirements and wishes?
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Methods, techniques and/or tools</i>: described, choice justified, suitable for the assignment and properly applied? Feasible roadmap drawn up? Targets systematically formulated and used for each evaluation component? Geared to regular situations, exceptions and borderline situations? • <i>Evaluation results</i>: checked whether the realised system or product meets the formulated requirements and whether it has achieved the initial objective? Results clearly presented? Conclusions drawn? Proposals for improvement formulated? Deviations analysed? • <i>Quality evaluation process</i>: conducted according to plan, professional choices made and justified? Was the evaluation operationally feasible (measurable, testable, etc.) and economically sound (i.e., evaluation components forceful enough and number of components no more than necessary)?

APPENDIX 3 PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

	Criteria
Communi- cating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Communicates correctly, both verbally and in writing:</i> goal and target group oriented, gets the message across with the correct structure, style, and usage. Tests whether the target group has got the message. Usage is grammatically correct and spelling is correct. Has the ability to distinguish matters of primary and minor importance.
Working sys- tematically	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Preparation:</i> Action plan worked out in sufficient detail? Project method: approach described and justified? Realistic planning? Milestone products: specifically defined? • <i>Quality of implementation and evaluation:</i> proceeded in accordance with action plan? Project method actively adopted? Progress of the project phases described and justified? Milestone products achieved according to plan? Results described and substantiated? Reference to action plan and to the problem formulated in that action plan? Progress monitored and quality evaluated? Kept to planning? Milestone products achieved according to plan? Any deviations to above points justified?
Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Working arrangements:</i> consults on division of tasks and makes relevant agreements, coordinates the execution of his/her own tasks with team members, sticks to agreements? • <i>Personal contribution:</i> makes meaningful contribution during meetings, takes responsibility for the (multidisciplinary) cooperation, calls upon the expertise of others if necessary, shares knowledge and experience with team members?
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Explanation, justification and reflection:</i> domain competencies and indicators exemplified, justified and reflected in his/her own professional practice? Points requiring improvement stated? Already working on improvements? Searched actively for sources of knowledge and open to other views and opinions?