

# UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

## MSc in Electrical Engineering – Thesis Assessment (191211219)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Student Name:</b>   |  |
| <b>Student Number:</b>   |  |
| <b>MSc Specialization:</b>   |  |
| <b>Research group(s) to which credits will be allocated (including division):</b>                |  |
| <b>Confidential?</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| <b>Period of confidentiality (if applicable, in years, not longer than 5 years)<sup>1</sup>:</b> |  |

| <b>Assessment Criteria</b>   | <b>Grade and notes</b> |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Scientific Quality (50%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interpret problem and translate it to more concrete research questions or design specifications.</li><li>• Find and study relevant literature and HW/SW tools and critically assess their merits.</li><li>• Work in a systematic way and document findings effectively.</li><li>• Work in correspondence with the level of the elective courses.</li><li>• Original work of sufficient depth, relevant to the chair.</li></ul>   |                        |
| <b>Organization, planning, collaboration (20%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Work independently and goal oriented under the guidance of a supervisor.</li><li>• Seek assistance if required and beneficial for the project.</li><li>• Benefit from the guidance of your supervisor by scheduling regular meetings, providing progress reports and initiating topics to be discussed.</li><li>• Organize work by making a project plan, executing it, adjusting it when necessary, handling unexpected developments and finish in time.</li></ul> |                        |
| <b>Communication (30%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Write a Master thesis that motivates the work in a context, communicates the work and its results in a clear, well-structured way to peers.</li><li>• Give a MSc presentation with similar qualities than the thesis targeting both fellow-students and chair-members.</li></ul>  |                        |
| <b>Final Grade based on 50-20-30 % weighting:</b>  |                        |

<sup>1</sup> If a confidentiality period of more than 5 years is necessary, consent from the programme director is required.

# UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

| <b>Committee members</b>    | <b>Name</b> | <b>Signature</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| <b>1. Chair</b>             |             |                  |
| <b>2. External examiner</b> |             |                  |
| <b>3. Third examiner</b>    |             |                  |
| <b>4. Fourth examiner</b>   |             |                  |

*Only the examiners in the committee are required to sign this form.*

**Date of the examination:**

# UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

## Scientific Quality (50%)

- 4: there are errors or omissions that could have easily been prevented by using standard theory at the level of (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 courses, but this has not led to new insights.
- 7: work has been done at the level of the elective 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 courses, and new insights have been gained that are useful in the chair's current research. Maybe (in time) publishable.
- 9: theoretical treatment goes beyond the level of the elective courses, and the result is very useful for research in the chair and can (eventually) be used for a non-trivial publication.
- 10: Brilliant results. The beginning of a new research theme in the chair.

## Organization, planning, collaboration (20%)

- 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 by him/herself.
- 9: The assignment and planning were defined by the student and the project was executed according to the planning.
- 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..

## Communication (30%)

- 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 advice 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: 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.