Form 3 - Research Master's Psychology: Research Internship Grade

Title of research internship: _____

Number of EC: _____

Student name: _____

Student ID card number: _____

Course code: _____

Note. Course codes for the research master internship per specialization can be found at the bottom of this page.

Date of submission: _____

Eligible supervisor: _____

OVERALL PROCESS JUDGMENT SUPERVISOR: (*see Supervisor Process Evaluation*)	
OVERALL PRODUCT JUDGMENT SUPERVISOR: *(see Supervisor Product Evaluation)*	
FINAL GRADE: • If the process grade and the product grade are both 5.5 or higher, than the final grade is the average of the two grades, rounded to halves. • If either the process grade or the product grade is lower than 5.5, the final grade is an insufficient grade (i.e., the average of the two grades but with a maximum of 5.0).	

Location: **Date:** **Signature supervisor:**

_____ _____ _____

Please fill in the final grade at CANVAS, using the Speedgrader in Modules - 'Final Research Master's Internship report' and attach a scan of this signed grading form along with the process and product evaluations. Only grades with complete forms will be processed in SIS.

Research internship course codes Research Master Psychology:

- Brain & Cognition: 7205RMPIXY
- Clinical Psychology: 7205RMKIXY
- Developmental Psychology: 7205RMOIXY
- Psychological Methods: 7205RMMIXY
- Social Psychology: 7205RMSIXY
- Work & Organizational Psychology: 7205RMAIXY

Supervisor Process Evaluation

Components	Feedback[1]
Effort: During literature search, data collection, data analyses, and writing the research proposal and internship report	*Overall, the student worked hard and well-structured throughout the research internship, including:* *- Taking initiative (e.g., in searching literature, collecting data, data analyses)* *- Being well-prepared for the meetings* *- Pro-actively dealing with (potential) problems* *- Active cooperation with other group members* *- Logging activities (e.g., keeping track of what has been done during literature search, data collection, data analyses)* *- Showing insight in own effort and performance and taking adjustments*
Own scientific input and analysis:	*Overall, the student provided a personal contribution and scientific input in the various project phases, well-understood the literature, design, materials, and results, was able to quickly pick up feedback, and no extra feedback/meetings were needed.*
Constructive handling of feedback: On literature search, data collection, data analyses, and writing the research proposal and internship report	*Overall, the student constructively responded to feedback, showing a learning orientation. The student processed the feedback well in the subsequent products. The student was able to translate feedback on one part to other parts.*
Planning: Taking responsibility for the planning, meeting deadlines, and clear communication	*Overall, the work pace of the student was good, including keeping to the planning, meeting deadlines, and keeping to appointments. The student took responsibility for the project and the planning. The student attended the meetings and showed up on time. The student displayed clear and timely communication.*
Ethical behavior and scientific integrity: Ethical handling of participants and data, adhering to data storage protocol	*Overall, the ethical conduct of the student was good, including:* *- Responsible attitude in data collection process (towards participants)* *- Ethical handling of the gathered data* *- Adhering to the privacy guidelines in handling the data* *- Adhering to the data storage protocol*

		Justification[2]
Process grade	*GRADE*	*The grade reflects the overall quality of the process in terms of the points above. These points can be summarized as follows: The student put in effort during the entire process, provided scientific input, handled feedback well, worked according planning, behaved ethically, and gave a high quality presentation. See rubric.*

[1] Please delete the text in grey italics and type in your feedback. The points listed in gray italics serve as a checklist to base your feedback on. Feel free to give feedback in this column only on those points you judge to be relevant for clarification. Do not give subgrades on these components, just provide one overall process grade.

[2] Please provide a grade from 1 to 10, using the rubric. Please replace the text in grey italics by a justification of your assessment; the text displayed in grey is a brief summary of what should be assessed or a checklist for your assessment.

Supervisor Product Evaluation

Sections	Feedback[3]
Research proposal Sections 2 and 3: Quality of reasoning leading up to RQ and hypotheses	*Overall, the relevance of the current RQ is coherently and convincingly argued, based on relevant existing empirical and theoretical work, including:* *- Clarity and coherence of description of broad relevance of core elements of RQ* *- Clarity of explanation of relevant terms* *- Representativeness, clarity and coherence of description of prior research* *- Relevance of description of prior research to current RQ* *- Relevance of described theory for RQ* *- Clarity and coherence of the evaluation of existing studies, theory and their relation to the current RQ*
Research proposal Sections 4 and 5: Quality of reasoning leading up to design and sampling plan	*Overall, the study design and analysis plan is clearly described in sufficient detail, and coherently related to the stated RQ, hypotheses and expectations, including:* *- Correct and precise description of materials, participants and procedure* *- Sampling plan is sufficiently explained (e.g., power and number of participants)* *- Design and measurement are adequately justified*
Results section: Coherence of description of data analysis and results	*Overall, the data analysis is coherent and clearly described, in sufficient detail, and coherently related to the stated design and procedure, including:* *- Clear and comprehensive description of descriptive statistics* *- Clear and comprehensive description of test statistics* *- Adequately justified choice of analysis (e.g., statistical tests)* *- Description of results is consistent with assumptions and expectations in the sampling plan* *- The extent to which relevant statistical assumptions have been met is clearly described*
Discussion section: Quality of reasoning leading up to conclusions; Quality of reasoning in discussion	*Overall, the conclusions are coherently and convincingly argued, based on the main findings and relevant theoretical work, including:* *- Clear and comprehensive overview of main findings* *- Conclusions that follow logically from the main findings* *- Conclusions are evaluated by a thorough consideration of relevant limitations ("ifs and buts"), alternative interpretations* *- Wider implications (for the field in general, or practical implications) are clearly stated, where relevant* *The report is written such that a potential successor on the project is able to learn from the approach taken, and will be able to avoid certain mistakes or profit from any insights that were gathered.*

Criterion		Justification[4]
Scientific reasoning	*GRADE*	*The grade reflects the overall quality of the internship in terms of the points above. These points can be summarized as follows: The internship contains a well-argued and relevant RQ, which is tested in a fitting and coherent design and which results in a coherent and well-argued conclusion based on clearly described empirical research. See rubric.*
Use of language	*GRADE*	*The grade reflects to overall quality of the language and writing*

[3] Please delete the text in grey italics and type in your feedback. The points listed in gray italics serve as a checklist to base your feedback on. Feel free to give feedback in this column only on those points you judge to be relevant for clarification. Do not give grades on these sections, just provide an overall product grade for scientific reasoning and one for use of language and writing style.

[4] Please provide a grade from 1 to 10, using the rubric. Please replace the text in grey italics by a justification of your assessment; the text in grey italics is a brief summary of what should be assessed or a checklist for your assessment.

and writing style		*style, based on the following aspects (see Rubric): Quality of grammar and spelling, Use of APA references, Academic style (i.e., clear, concise, precise), Well-structured paragraphs (i.e., use of headings, topical sentences and connecting phrases, singular focus).*
Product grade	*GRADE*	Consists of 67% Scientific reasoning + 33% Language use and style (each should be at least a 5.5 for student to pass).