Final Assessment Master Project

Student name	:	Student ID	: ....
Specialization	:	Course ID	: ....
Title of thesis	: ....
	....
Supervisor	: ....
Daily supervisor	: ....
Second reviewer	: ....

Research:

Thesis:

Presentation:

Research	excellent	good	satisfactory	sufficient	insufficient	n.a.
Quality						
Theoretical knowledge						
Technical skills						
Independence / initiative						
Original contribution						
Working attitude						
Accuracy						
Cooperation with others						
Master thesis						
Abstract						
Context						
Contents						
Defining the subject/scientific question						
Use of literature						
Structure						
Lay-out						
Presentation						
Context						
Contents (quality, level)						
Media use						
Quality of narrative style						
Discussion (answering questions)						

Supervisor   Second reviewer   Overall

Research (3/6):   Research (3/6):

Thesis (2/6):   Thesis (2/6):

Presentation (1/6):   Presentation (1/6):

Pre-assessment results *******************************

Final Grade ************************

This thesis contains an Artifact Appendix (mandatory for CSec).
(See https://github.com/vusec/vu-forms-and-templates)

This thesis has been checked for plagiarism.
(See https://secure.urkund.com/account)

Names and signatures
date: Amsterdam, …………………………………

………………………..   ………………………..
Supervisor   Second reviewer

Clarification of the terms

Research training

Quality:	was the work carried out with care? Were the results interpreted correctly?
Theoretical knowledge:	did the student acquire the knowledge needed to carry out the project?
Technical skills:	did the student show good experimental, programming and/or mathematical skills?
Independence/ initiative:	did the student take initiatives of his/her own to carry out the project, and could he/she make progress in the (temporary) absence of close supervision?
Original contribution:	did the student make an original contribution to the project?
Working attitude:	how was the overall working attitude of the student?
Accuracy:	did the student work accurately? And, if relevant, were the experiments carried out safely, and were environmental issues well respected?
Cooperation:	did the student actively participate in work discussions? How was the cooperation with other group members during the research? How were the student's communicative skills?

Thesis

Abstract:	Does the abstract contain all elements (scientific question and main conclusions) and is it written in a clear way?
Context:	was the subject placed in a correct scientific context, with proper referencing of the prior work? If applicable, was the relevance for society well recognised (technological aspects, ethical aspects, historic context, or environmental aspects). Is the description of the context readable for a non-expert in the field?
Contents:	does the thesis give an accurate and precise description of the subject? In case of a master's thesis: has the contribution of the student been indicated explicitly?
Scientific question:	did the student properly describe the scientific question and was this question answered in a clear way?
Use of literature:	Is the quality and quantity of the literature sufficient? Is the literature cited adequately in an accurate list of references?
Structure:	Is the thesis clearly written and structured? Do the abstract and the concluding section contain the important results obtained, and is there a discussion of possible future work?
Lay-out	Is there a proper use of figures and graphs? Was the overall layout appealing? Is the use of the language basically correct as to grammar and spelling?

Presentation

Context:	was the research placed in a correct scientific context, with proper referencing of the prior work? Is the description of the context understandable for a non-expert in the field?
Contents:	does the presentation give an accurate and precise description of the work? Has the contribution of the student been indicated explicitly? Was the scientific question presented clearly?
Media use:	did the student correctly use slides, powerpoint, animations, etc.?
Quality of narrative style:	how was the narrative style of the student, including the nonverbal communication?
Discussion / defence:	were the questions answered correctly?