**Appendix 2: UT supervisor's assessment of the internship**

*To be completed by the internal UT supervisor*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student’s name: |  |
| Student number: |  |
| Organisation: |  |
| Internship hours: |  |
| UT supervisor: |  |

**Assessment by the internal UT supervisor**

This assessment form to assess the Master’s Psychology programme internship is comprised of 2 components that are weighted for determining the grade for the internship as follows:

**Internship product (weight: 50%) and Professional behaviour/functioning (weight: 50%)**

Per component, each criterion should be assessed with a round number. Each criterion carries equal weight. The numbers per component will be rounded up to half-numbers. The final grade for the internship is a (rounded off) whole number: the average of the two components.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Internship product (50%)** | | | **Assessment (1.0-10.0):** | | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| *<6 = Unsatisfactory, 6 = Adequate, 7 = More than adequate, 8 = Good, 9 = Very good, 10 = Excellent* | | | | | | |
| **Introduction:**  **Criteria:**   * The research/design problem was concretely specified and the social relevance of the research/design problem was clearly indicated * The relevant key concepts and theories have been described and the significance for the research/design problem is clearly indicated * The chosen approach has been substantiated in accordance with the research/design problem, the theoretical key concepts and preconditions that exist in practice | | | | | | 🞎 Excellent  🞎 Good but room for improvement  🞎 Quite some room for improvement  🞎 Not applicable |
| **Approach and outcomes**  **Criteria:**   * The chosen research method(s), instruments and/or design approaches have been substantiated in accordance with the research/design problem, the theoretical key concepts and preconditions that exist in practice * The chosen approach has been documented in an adequate and transparent manner * The (design) approach has been applied adequately * The outcomes of the project have been documented in an adequate manner * If applicable: The analyses, proposed analyses or set-up of a formative or summative evaluation are correct and a logical result of the research/design problem | | | | | | 🞎 Excellent  🞎 Good but room for improvement  🞎 Quite some room for improvement  🞎 Not applicable |
| **Discussion**  **Criteria:**   * The approach and the results have been critically assessed in the discussion and conclusion, resulting in an interpretation of the significance of the outcome of the project and an answer to the research/design problem * The recommendations are relevant, concrete, feasible, and a logical result of the discussion of the project | | | | | | 🞎 Excellent  🞎 Good but room for improvement  🞎 Quite some room for improvement  🞎 Not applicable |
| **Written report**  **Criteria:**   * The report’s content is logical and consistent with a focused accountability for the research or design process * The APA norms for scientific reporting were applied correctly. The use of language is correct, an academic style of writing was used and the style of reporting fits the expectations of the internship organisation | | | | | | 🞎 Excellent  🞎 Good but room for improvement  🞎 Quite some room for improvement  🞎 Not applicable |
| **Internship product**  **Criteria:**   * The internship product that was designed answers the research/design problem as formulated in the internship plan * The internship product makes a useful contribution to a (partial) solution of a relevant psychological research/design topic * The internship product fulfils a perceived need on the part of the organisation and has potential for use * The relevant key concepts and theories have been described and the significance for the research/design problem is clearly indicated * The intern adopted a systematic, scientifically responsible working method in elaborating upon the internship project. | | | | | | 🞎 Excellent  🞎 Good but room for improvement  🞎 Quite some room for improvement  🞎 Not applicable |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |
| 1. **Professional behaviour/ functioning (50%)** | | | **Assessment (1.0-10.0):** | | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| *<6 = Unsatisfactory, 6 = Adequate, 7 = More than adequate, 8 = Good, 9 = Very good, 10 = Excellent*  **Criteria:**   * The intern planned the internship and the internship product independently and proactively * The intern introduced themself proactively to the organisation and familiarise with the organisation * The intern’s work was meticulous and quality-conscious, whereby the agreements made were kept * The intern able to formulate good (SMART) learning goals for the internship period in the particular internship organisation * The intern able to deal with and process feedback on their own actions * The intern proved being capable of adjusting the process in the event of any stagnations * The realisation of the internship project was due to the intern’s own initiative, insight and application * The intern was able to draw conclusions about the personal fit with the specific work field * The intern was able to formulate consequences for their own further work field orientation | | | | | | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |  |
| **Final assessment**  Total (add components 1 and 2)/2 = (rounded) half grade | | | | **Final Grade (1.0-10.0):**   |  | | --- | |  | | | |
|  | | | | | |  |
| **Comments:**  *What compliment and/or advice would you give this intern for the future?* | | | | | | |
| Date: |  | Signature of the UT supervisor: | | |  | |