MSc Thesis Assessment Rubric (v. 2020.03.03)

Criteria	Evaluation			course syllabus	Examiner Comments & Examples
	Excellent	**Fair**	**Subpar**		
Structure/ Chapters and Sections	The report follows a clear structure, relevant for the problem at hand. The contents of the chapters and sections accurately reflect their titles.	The structure is generally clear, with some minor questions about the match between contents and chapter/section title. Other minor misses.	The structure chosen misses or mixes together certain chapters that should be present as such. The contents of certain sections should be in others.		
Introduction & Justification	Clearly describes a gap/lacuna in existing knowledge.	Identifies or hints at a gap/lacuna in existing knowledge.	No gap/lacuna in existing knowledge is identified or described.	A1-4, B2	
	Thesis topic is clearly presented and justified. Research questions are clearly identified.	The importance of the thesis topic is addressed. Research questions listed, lack details.	Topic seems trivial or lacking any motivation. No research questions mentioned.		
	Contributions claimed are relevant, have the potential of be of general use, and could result in a paper.	Contributions are listed. The work makes some advance in the area.	No contributions are mentioned, wrong contributions are claimed, or the work does not seem to make any.		
For work carried out in pairs	Division of work is clearly specified, both when it comes to writing and the practical parts.	Division of work is not very clear, most parts being declared as being done "together".	No division of work is given, it's impossible to tell who did what in the thesis, or the work is seems to be very imbalanced.	A6	
Background & Research Methodology	All the information given in the background is necessary, relevant and clearly connected to the thesis.	The given background is sufficient in extent and relevance. Relation to the thesis is stated in general.	Incomplete or overly extended background, with no explanation w.r.t. relevance and relation to the thesis.	C, D?	
	Uses state-of-the-art method(s)/ approach, clearly described and motivated.	Description of method/approach is present, although somewhat incomplete.	Method/approach is inappropriate, obsolete or unclearly described.		
	The method(s) are faithfully followed in practice. Discrepancies between the theory and practice are motivated.	The work roughly seems to follow the method/approach described in theory.	The work follows a totally different approach than the one described in the method. No reasons for this are given.		

Criteria	Evaluation			course syllabus	Examiner Comments & Examples
	Excellent	**Fair**	**Subpar**		
Results, Analysis, Discussion	Experimental setup is clearly described and motivated. The results are presented in a meaningful way.	Experimental setup described and motivated. The results are presented in just the right amount of detail.	The experimental setup is not clear, the choices are not motivated. The results, if listed, are presented in too much/little detail.	A5-7, B	
	Data is analysed in a concise and relevant way. Interesting results are exposed and explained.	The analysis is present, however without much depth or focus on interesting details.	The analysis is lacking or focuses on irrelevant properties. Outliers are not identified.		
	Extensive discussion inferred from the results, linking back to the research questions and hypotheses.	Discussion around the results with limited references back to the research questions/ hypotheses.	Minimal or no discussion of the results. Does not relate back to the research questions/hypotheses, or faulty claims		
Broader Impact (e.g. in Pop-Sci)	Touches upon societal and ethical issues/impact of the work.	Mentions related societal and ethical issues, with minor misses.	Does not mention societal and ethical impact/issues.	G2-3	
Written Communication (report, Pop-Sci)	Proper spelling, grammar, paragraphing, structure. Concise and clear, for the right target audience.	Minor issues in spelling, grammar, structure. Clear in general, focused on the right details.	Serious issues in spelling, grammar, structure, presentation of argument. Focuses on non-relevant details. Lacks overview.	E	
Oral Communication (presentation)	Well organized, outstanding slides, focused. Professional handling of questions and comments.	Mostly well thought out slides, good presentation skills. Able to answer professionally most questions.	Poorly organized, unfocused, difficult to understand slides. Unable to reasonably answer questions or tackle comments.	E	
Previous Work, References, Citations	Relevant prior work of quality is described and compared to the work presented in this thesis.	Relevant prior work is mentioned and described; relation to the current thesis is not explicitly stated.	Very limited prior work is briefly mentioned or poorly described. No relation to the context of the thesis is made.	F	
	Key papers are referred to in the right places (5+ papers).	Some key paper is missing. Some references are questionable.	Key papers are missing. Refers mainly to questionable sources (wiki, blogs,…).		
	Proper and consistent formatting of the reference list.	Minor inconsistencies in the formatting of the reference list	Multiple and serious inconsistencies in formatting of reference list. (e.g. url only)		

Notes:
1. This document is a work in progress — suggestions for improvements are very much welcome (talk to Flavius about this).
2. The examiner should select (circle) the evaluation that matches the closest with the thesis contents.
3. The examiner should also motivate the choice of evaluation by commenting in the respective row, especially for **Subpar** or **Fair** selections.
4. Some of the learning outcomes are best checked by consulting the supervisor: e.g. A3, A6, C1, C2, D…

5. Domain specific criteria are not included in this document! It is up to each examiner to add more rows addressing specific criteria. Alternatively, the comments could include such information. An advantage of using standard Rubrics is the possibility to compare theses from different groups.
6. The comments boxes might be too small to write anything extensive - use a pointer/numbering system to refer to specific comments in a separate list. Make sure to save the list and the Rubrics together for future reference.