# **MSc Robotics – Internship Assessment (202200120) [[1]](#endnote-2)** Ver. 2024.1 (Sep 2024)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Name:** |  | **Number:** |  |
| **Examiner / Research Group [[2]](#endnote-3)** |  |
| **Plagiarism check [[3]](#endnote-4)** | [ ]  | The report has been checked for plagiarism |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Strong points and suggestions for improvement [[4]](#endnote-5) [[5]](#endnote-6)** | **Grade[[6]](#endnote-7)**  |
| **Report – Written Communication (30%)** **7*** Problem statement
* Context and existing work
* Discussion and argumentation
* Results and conclusions
* Organisation and structure
* Clarity / Language
 |  |  |
| **Process and Attitude (40%) \* 8*** Work independently and goal-oriented under the guidance of a supervisor
* Take initiative
* Be flexible regarding problems / criticism
* Acquire (new) technical skills
* Demonstrate an adequate work attitude
* Have good interaction and communication skills
* Show adequate planning and organisation of work
* Deliver intermediate results (project plan, demo) showing progress w.r.t content and time – in case the workflow of MSc Robotics projects is used
 |  |  |
| **Scientific Quality / Contents (30%)** **[[7]](#endnote-8)*** Interpret problem and translate it to more concrete project specifications.
* Adequately realise the project \* [[8]](#endnote-9)
* Demonstrate an adequate level of technical insight \*
* Use an adequate level of Knowledge \*
* Show creativity \*
 |  |  |
|  | **Overall Grade [[9]](#endnote-10)** |  |
| **Formalities Completed** | To be filled in by the Internship Office | **❏** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date 2/3 meeting [[10]](#endnote-11)** |  |  | Return form to Internship Office EEMCS. |
| **Date report handed in** |  |  | Report is ***not*** published; therefore, it can be considered as confidential. |
| **Date of Assessment** |  |  |
|  |  |  | Attaching the company-supervisor form to this pdf is highly appreciated. |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment**  | **Name** | **Signature** |
| **Examiner** |  |  |

1. Relevant articles of the EER are A4.7, B4.5. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. Use for the research group abbreviations including faculty, see table 16 of EER-B for the list of research groups. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
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. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
4. Use additional empty pages if more space is needed for the elaboration. However, if doable, keep the form to 1 page. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
5. To be filled out after consultation with the external supervisor from the company. See also endnote 8. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
6. Round each to one decimal. Only the total grade must be ≥5.5 to pass.
Rubrics for suggestions for detailed grade interpretation yet to be formulated.
Generic indication of grades 4-10: 4: insufficient; 5: almost sufficient; 6: sufficient; 7: amply sufficient; 8: good; 9: very good; 10: excellent. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
7. For assignments with a strong design component, please assess the scientific aspects of the design. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
8. For starred items, input from company supervisor relevant here. Most notably the Process and Attitude. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
9. Overall grade based on subgrades, rounded to “halves” (5.5 *not* allowed). See EER article A4.7, a spreadsheet is available to compute this grade. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
10. See EER Article B4.5, Paragraph 4. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)