ASSESSMENT FORM BACHELOR ASSIGNMENT AT

Version 14 July 2021, BEX-AT

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Name student	
Student no.	
Course code	202000670
B-Assignment committee	Chairperson: Daily supervisor: External member: Additional member(s):
Date	
Signatures Bachelor Assignment Committee:	

GRADE & MOTIVATION		
Category	What went well / what could be improved*	Grade
Scientific content (quality of research or design)		40% 1 decimal
Communication: Report & Presentation		30% 1 decimal
Organization		30% 1 decimal
Final Grade		In all cases except the two below, round the average to the nearest .0 or .5. • An average of 5.3 or 5.4 is not rounded to 5.5 but to 5.0. • An average of 5.5, 5.6, or 5.7 is not rounded to 5.5 but to 6.0.

* Please substantiate your grade for each item, by indicating what the student did well on the item (tops) and what could be improved and how (tips). The descriptions in the appendix can be used as inspiration. Please write in English.

ASSESSMENT STANDARDS FOR THE BACHELOR ASSIGNMENT

These guidelines for the assessment of the Bachelor Assignment have the following purpose:

- **Support for students**. The document shows the students what is expected.
- **Support for examiners.** The document provides the examiners with guidelines for the assessment, which should lead to consistent justification and final grades.
- **Harmonization.** Students should be assessed on the same terms.
- **Accountability**. The board of examiners is responsible for the quality of assessments within the bachelor program. Also, assessment standards are required for accreditation of the program.

Assessment standards

Starting point for the **assessment standards** are the learning objectives of the bachelor assignment. The learning objectives are organized into 3 categories that are assessed separately: *scientific quality, communication and organization*. This grouping allows the examiners to put emphasis where appropriate.
The weights and minimum grade for the three categories in the final grade are:

A. **Scientific quality** 40% (minimum grade 5.5)
B. **Communication** 30% (minimum grade 5.0)
C. **Organization** 30% (minimum grade 5.0)

For a pass the weighted average of the categories should be ≥5.5, and not more than one category grade should be <=5.5 and all category grades should have at least the minimum value.

Learning Objectives

The main objective of the BSc Assignment is for the student learning to apply a suitable research methodology under supervision. More specifically the student is able to:

1. **Perform technological research at BSc-level**: has the basic knowledge and skills for doing research in Advanced Technology; problem analysis, theoretical and experimental approach, execution and analysis of the results (*Scientific quality*);
2. **Communicate with specialists in the chosen field and other stakeholders**: can write a scientific report, give an oral presentation and defend the research (*Communication*);
3. **Can organize the work**: is self-sufficient in organizing the work, can collaborate with specialists in the chosen field and other stakeholders (*Organization*);

Assessment Guidelines and grade harmonization

Starting point for the grade harmonization is the official meaning of the grades: 1: very bad, 2: bad, 3: very insufficient, 4: insufficient, 5: almost sufficient, 6: sufficient, 7: amply sufficient, 8: good, 9: very good, 10 : excellent
The bachelor assignment is executed in a research chair. Under supervision a bachelor student should be able to transform a complex problem into specific research questions, formulate an approach to solve the problem and execute this.
In order to avoid 'grading the suggestions of the supervisor', the amount of work that goes into suggestions and corrections is taken into account, assuming this gives a good indication of the quality of the students' own input.
A BSc Assignment is considered to be part of the ongoing work in a research group. The daily supervisor is member of the group and has the role of both supervisor and assessor. The amount of supervision and feedback that is needed to arrive at a good result can be taken as an indication of the quality of the work.

In the following table we give the assessment criteria including a description of possible student performance and accompanying grade. These should be used as a guideline in the assessment process.

Duration of the assignment

The assignment has a nominal workload of 15 EC which is equal to 10 weeks fulltime work. The result of the work should be assessed in relation to the amount of time put in the assignment.

How to use the assessment form

The form should be filled out in English. This can be done on paper or digitally. Don't forget to include the date and student number! The signed form can be sent digitally to BOZ-AT (BOZ-AT@utwente.nl) for further processing. The student should also receive a copy of the assessment form.

A. SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Grade	A 1. Research or Design Process and Research Question
=< 5	The student showed no real understanding of the different research/design steps to be taken and how these relate to one another. No explanation of the different steps of the research/design. Outcomes of one step are often not used as input for the next step. The research question was not clear.
6	Most of the research/design steps are applied correctly at the right moment, some of these are explained in sufficient detail. Outcomes of one step are often used as input in next step. Research question is sufficiently clear, somewhat linked to theory.
7	All research/design steps are applied correctly and explained appropriately. Outcomes follow logically from the different research/design steps. Research question is clear, properly linked to theoretical framework.
8	All research/design steps are applied very well and explained in detail, showing good comprehension of the research or design methodology. Outcomes follow logically from the different research/design steps. Research question is very clear, based in a well elaborated theoretical framework.
9	All research/design steps are applied very well and explained in detail, some of these beyond Bachelor level, showing very good comprehension of the research or design methodology. Deviations from standard procedures are explained very well. Research question is very clear, based in an extensively elaborated theoretical framework that goes beyond the Bachelor level.
10	All steps of the research/design process executed beyond the Bachelor level. The student approached all steps critically, substantiating very well why alterations had to be made. Research question is very clear, based in an extensively elaborated theoretical framework that goes well beyond the Bachelor level.
Grade	**A 2. Use of theory and methods**
=< 5	Theory is missing, not consistent and/or not really used. No substantiation of methods used. No new relevant findings from the project.
6	There is a link to theory from one discipline. Some explanation of why certain methods are used. Some minor new insights follow from the project.
7	There is a proper link to a theoretical framework. Chosen methods are explained, applicability of used methods is substantiated. Some new insights for practice follow from the project.
8	Critical view on literature and appropriate research/design methods, including substantiated adaptation to own situation. Relevant findings for practice, some new insights for theory follow from the project.
9	Critical view on literature and appropriate research/design methods, including substantiated adaptation to own situation. Relevant findings for practice, new insights for theory follow from the project. Results and methods are almost suitable for publication in a national journal.
10	Critical view on literature and appropriate research/design methods, including substantiated adaptation to own situation and proposals for adaptation of theories or models. Relevant findings for practice and new insights for theory follow from the project. The results and methods are suitable for publication in a (inter)national journal.

B. COMMUNICATION

Grade	B 1. Report
=< 5	Lack of structure in the report. Language is not academic. Lay out makes the report hard to read. Reference is missing or incorrect. Many language errors (spelling, grammar)
6	Some structure in the report. Language is almost academic. Lay out does not support the message. Some reference is included. Only minor language errors.
7	Structure and lay out are appropriate for the message. Language is academic. References are according to standard. No language errors.
8	Good structure in the report, helps in understanding the main message. Language is appropriate for multiple audiences. Lay out supports the message very well. Referencing is according to standards.
9	Very clear structure and lay out in the report, makes it easy to read and understand the main ideas and messages. Language is at good academic level, referencing is according to standards in the field of research.
10	Excellent report, both in structure and lay out. Tone, level and display of the content could be appropriate for possible publication in journal.
Grade	**B 2. Presentation**
=< 5	Lack of structure in the presentation. Not clear what the main topic of the presentation was. Response to questions from the audience was incorrect or not clear.
6	Reasonable structure in the presentation. Main message was clear for supervisors, less clear for the rest of the audience. Response to questions from the audience was mostly appropriate.
7	Structure and lay out of the presentation are appropriate for the message. Language is academic. Response to questions from audience was sufficient.
8	Structure and lay out of the presentation are good and support the message. Language is understandable for multiple audiences. Response to questions from audience was good.
9	Structure and lay out of the presentation are very good and support the message very well. Language is easy to understand for everybody in the audiences and is entertaining. Response to questions from audience was very good.
10	Structure and lay out of the presentation are excellent. Language is easy to understand for everybody in the audience, was entertaining and everybody felt involved. Response to questions from audience was excellent, showing a complete understanding of the material.

C. ORGANISATION & COOPERATION

Grade	C 1. Guidance and project management
=< 5	The student needed support for almost everything, feedback given was not really used. The student showed (almost) no development in their organisational skills.
6	The student needed support on important moments, did use some of the feedback. The student took some initiative, and showed some development in their organisational skills.
7	The student needed some support, and asked for this themselves. Feedback given was used. The student took initiative and asked questions, was in control of their project most of the time.
8	The student needed almost no support and took initiative. Feedback given was incorporated in an appropriate way. The student figured out most practical issues by themselves and adapt their own planning when necessary.
9	The student worked very independent and informed the supervisors appropriately. The student was able to realize their own planning with almost no adaptation necessary.
10	The student worked very independently and informed the supervisors at all times. The student was in full control of their own project the whole time.
Grade	**C 2. Social skills and cooperation**
=< 5	The student did not take initiative and communicated poorly with the supervisors. Cooperation with others was lacking.
6	Cooperation with others was mostly sufficient. The student took some initiative, communication with supervisors was mostly sufficient and mostly on time.
7	Cooperation with others was very sufficient. The student took initiative and asked questions, the communication with the supervisors was sufficient and always on time.
8	Cooperation with others was good. The student asked critical questions, took initiative and informed the supervisors well and when necessary in advance.
9	The student initiated critical issues and discussions in the research, and cooperated very well with others. Communication with supervisors was very good.
10	The student initiated discussion about critical issues in the research, challenged the supervisors and cooperated excellent with others. Communication with supervisors was excellent.