

Assessment protocol Master theses CEM / CME

This protocol was set up to support the assessment of master theses within the MSc-programmes Civil Engineering & Management (CEM) and Construction Management & Engineering (CME).

The assessment of the master thesis takes place after the public colloquium and the discussion / questioning afterwards. This is done in a short, closed meeting of the master thesis committee (the student is not present at this meeting). The assessment is performed by the university members of the master thesis committee. External members have an advisory-vote. At the assessment, several aspects are taken into account (as described below and in Appendix 1). Appendix 2 presents profiles for final grading that indicate how the quality of the master thesis as a whole can be translated into a final grade. The list of aspects for assessment and the profiles for final grading offer guidelines for a more equalized assessment of master theses and offer clarity to the student about the way he or she will be assessed. The aspects for assessment and the grading profiles were set up according to the learning goals of the master thesis and (partially) on the final qualifications of the MSc-programmes.

Regarding the assessment aspects, four main aspects are distinguished:

1. With respect to content: quality of research or design
2. Report
3. Working process during master thesis project
4. Oral presentation and defence

Appendix 1 lists all aspects within these four main categories. When assessing a master thesis, the committee will address these four main aspects and determine the strong and weak points of the student's work on each of these main aspects. This is registered by the main supervisor on the **Assessment Form MSc-thesis CEM/CME**. Subsequently the committee determines the final grade for the master thesis according to the final grading profiles (see Appendix 2).

After determination of the final grade, the master thesis committee announces the final grade to the student and presents the feedback on the assessment form orally to the student during the final public assembly.

Appendix 1 Aspects for assessment

1) *With respect to content; quality of research / design*

- insight in subject matter
- depth (detailed elaborations, use of literature)
- insight in coherence between different parts of the research project
- reasoning / argumentation of conclusions (are research questions clearly stated and answered?)
- relevance (scientifically, but also applicability in practice) (being able to put research into its context)
- creativity / inventiveness: extent to which the student independently introduces new concepts
- extent to which the research is innovative (contribution to new knowledge / contribution to a concrete product, design or model)

NB When the research has a balanced focus on technique and management, this will be valued positively. When this is not (or to a lesser extent) the case, this does not have to lead to a negative influence on the assessment.

2) *Report*

- composition, structure
- consistency
- clarity/sharpness of formulations
- readability
- editing, lay out
- images and tables (usefulness, added value)
- references to literature

3) *Working process during master thesis project*

- attitude
- independence
- commitment/enthusiasm
- cooperation
- communication skills
- incorporation of feedback
- functioning within the organisation where the project is carried out
- student's attitude during progress meetings (active / passive)
- the extent to which the original research proposal has been met and reasons for alterations (keeping up with a work planning, follow up on appointments made)
- time needed to finish master thesis

4) *Oral Presentation and defence*

- content (what is included / not included in the presentation; is the message coming across?)
- insight in subject matter
- structure / outline presentation
- care of details / neatness
- answering questions / discussion / defence
- captivating way of presenting (verbal capabilities, posture)

Appendix 2 Profiles for final grading

5. insufficient

The research and / or report are insufficient and the student was strongly directed by his or her supervisors. Weak points can clearly be pointed out. The student did not show an academic attitude. On average, the student scores 'insufficient' on all aspects for assessment.

6: sufficient

With respect to content, the research was conducted sufficiently. The report is mediocre. Weak points can clearly be pointed out, but are compensated by aspects on which the student performs better. The student has shown little input of his own and was strongly directed by his or her supervisors. On average, the student scores 'sufficient' on all aspects for assessment.

7: amply sufficient

With respect to content, a solid piece of research was delivered. The report is carefully edited. Either the research process or the mastery of subject matter leaves room for improvement. The supervisors clearly had a steering influence on the final product. The student scores at least 'sufficient' on all aspects for assessment and 'good' on some aspects.

8: good

With respect to content, the research was set up in a solid way and was carried out accurately. The report is carefully edited regarding language as well as lay out. The student has worked independently and was able to put forward his or her own initiatives. Guidance given by the supervisors was minimal. On average, the student scores 'good' on all aspects for assessment.

9: very good

The research is innovative and can be converted to an article for a renowned (scientific) magazine without putting in too much effort. With respect to content, the research is very solid with some points that can clearly be pointed out as strong. The report is carefully edited and shows that the student disposes of good writing skills. The student's own input and independence are large. The student clearly stands above subject matter and is able to defend his or her statements in discussions well. The student scores at least 'good' on all aspects for assessment and 'very good' on some aspects.

10: excellent

The student functions at the level of an expert in the field. With respect to content, the research is very good, with some points that can be clearly pointed out as excellent. The student is very capable of conducting research independently. The report and the presentation show that the student disposes of very good communication skills (written and oral). The student scores 'very good' on all aspects for assessment.

RETURN THIS FORM TO BOZ!

Assessment Form MSc-thesis CEM / CME

Name student:

Student number:

Course code:

Main supervisor ('Afstudeerdocent'):

Date:

Final grade:

Signature main supervisor:

criterion	What went well?	What could have been improved?
Content (quality of research or design)		
Report		
Working process during project		
Oral Presentation and defence		