UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MSc Robotics – MSc-Thesis Project Assessment (202200122) [1]

Version 2024.2 (Oct 2024)

Student Name		**Number**	
Specialisation		**Profile**	
Research group(s) [2]			
Plagiarism check [3]	☐ The report has been checked for plagiarism		
Confidential?	☐ No ☐ Yes	**Period of confidentiality** [4]	

Assessment Criteria [5]	**Strong points and suggestions for improvement** [6]	**Grade**[7]
Communication (30%): **10% presentation, 20% report** • Give a MSc presentation with similar qualities as the thesis, targeting both fellow students and research-group members. • Write a Master thesis that motivates the work in a context and communicates the work and its results in a clear, well-structured way to peers.		
Organisation, planning, collaboration (20%) Work independently and goal-oriented under the guidance of a supervisor. • Seek assistance if required and beneficial for the project. • Benefit from the guidance of your supervisor by scheduling regular meetings, providing progress reports, and initiating topics to be discussed. • Organize work by making a project plan, executing it, adjusting it when necessary and handling unexpected developments, and finish in time. • Deliver formal intermediate results (project plan, demo) showing progress w.r.t content and time.		
Scientific Quality (50%) [8] • Interpret the problem and translate it to more concrete research questions or design specifications. • Find and study relevant literature and hardware/software tools and critically assess their merits. • Work in a systematic way and document findings effectively. • Work in correspondence with the level of the elective courses. • Original work of enough depth, relevant to the research group.		
Date (DD-MM-YYYY):	**Overall Grade** [9]	

Committee	**Name**	**Signature** [10] [11]
1. Chairperson		
2. External Examiner		
3. Member		
4. Member		

Rubric for Communication	
4	The report was essentially written by the supervisors. The supervisors did not recognize the work in the presentation. In some cases, questions were not understood, even after reformulation and wrong answers were given.
5	Several report versions have been necessary. The final version is not coherent and contains serious spelling and grammatical errors. Presentation was badly structured. Some of the answers during the Q&A session were incorrect.
6	Several versions of the report have been necessary to arrive at an acceptable result. The structure needs some improvements, but the quality of the content is sufficient. The presentation made sense to the supervisors, but others had a hard time following it. Most of the questions were answered correctly but some were not addressed appropriately.
7	The structure of the report was determined in consultancy with the supervisors and limited advise concerning readability was given. The presentation was a valid representation of the work. Some answers during the Q&A session could have been answered in a better way.
8	The structure of the report was mainly determined by the student. Some changes were required in formulations, charts, etc. The presentation was enjoyable for both experts and others. Questions were answered well in almost all cases.
9	The structure of the report was completely determined by the student and only marginal corrections concerning readability were needed. The presentation gave new insights to both experts and non-experts. In the Q&A session, the questions were answered well.
10	The report was made essentially without relevant feedback by the supervisors. The presentation was given with great style, clarity and effectiveness. The Q&A session convincingly showed that the student masters the subject matter with strong argumentations.

Rubric for Organization, planning, collaboration	
4	The supervisors have tried to give guidance to the process, but this has apparently been ignored by the student.
5	The supervisors have tried to give guidance to the process, but the student has not picked this up.
6	Significant guidance has been necessary, and the supervisors have had to raise these issues before action was taken.
7	Guidance has been necessary, but this has been sought by the student.
8	The student showed a lot of initiative, was able to adjust his/her own schedule, and figured out most practical issues him/herself.
9	The assignment and planning were defined by the student and the project was executed according to the planning. Meetings were mainly to inform the supervisors.
10	The assignment was initiated, defined and planned by the student. The project was executed according to the planning and unexpected events did not lead to delays. The candidate contributed to the work of other students as well.

Rubric for Scientific Quality	
4	There are errors or omissions that could easily have been prevented by using standard theory at the level (elective) master courses.
5	There are errors or omissions that could have been prevented by using standard theory at the level of the (elective) master courses.
6	Work has been done at the level of the (elective) master courses, but this has not led to new insights.
7	Work has been done at the level of the (elective) master courses, and this has had a clarifying effect in the area of the assignment.
8	Work has been done at the level of the (elective) master courses, and new insights have been gained that are useful in the chair's current research. Additional (fundamental) theory has been used from literature/external sources.
9	Theoretical treatment goes beyond the level of the (elective) master courses, and/or cross-disciplinary insights have been used. The result is very useful for research in the chair and can (eventually) be used for a non-trivial publication.
10	Brilliant results. More could not be expected from any MSc student. The beginning of a new research theme in the chair.

Endnotes on next page

[1] Relevant articles of the EER are A3.11, A4.7, B4.7

[2] This determines to which research group(s) the credits for supervision are allocated. Use abbreviations including faculty, department, and research group, as used in the UT Peoples Pages and in Table 16 of EER-B. Include a division (in %%) if the allocation is not equal divided over the UT research groups. The group of the external examiner gets 0 %.

[3] Required! Suggested tool is *TurnItIn* (https://www.utwente.nl/en/educational-systems/about-the-applications/plagiarism-check/). In case of suspicion of fraud, send a report to the examination board including the plagiarism check results. They investigate further and decide on potential penalties.

[4] Default is *Not* confidential, so public. Confidential default period is 2 years but do specify that. If a confidentiality period of more than 5 years is necessary, consent from the programme director is required. See EER A3.11.

[5] Order is the suggested order to fill in the motivation and subgrades.

[6] Use additional empty pages if more space is needed for the elaboration. However, if doable, keep the form to 1 page.

[7] Round each to one decimal. *All* partial grades must be ≥5.5 to pass. See rubrics for suggestions for detailed grade interpretation. See EER B4.7.18.
General indication of grades 4-10: 4: insufficient; 5: almost sufficient; 6: sufficient; 7: amply sufficient; 8: good; 9: very good; 10: excellent.

[8] For assignments with a strong design component, please assess the scientific aspects of the design.

[9] Overall grade computed from subgrades, rounded to “halves” (5.5 *not* allowed). See EER A4.7 and B4.7.18. A spreadsheet is available to compute the grade.

[10] Only the examiners in the committee are required to sign this form.

[11] Submit this form to the Educational-Affairs Office (BOZ), or via your secretariat (if that is your local procedure).
Have this done within a week after the presentation and assessment, provided the student has submitted all relevant documentation and data. See EER B4.7, Paragraphs 19 and 20.