

Student name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student number: \_\_\_\_\_ Your name: \_\_\_\_\_ u/z number: \_\_\_\_\_

**General Performance (65%)**

**FIRST ASSESSOR:** you should score all categories. If a daily supervisor is involved other than you, please score all three categories with help of the daily supervisor. It is important that your name is on the form and that you agree with the evaluation.  
**SECOND ASSESSOR:** you should score only the report and presentation (if relevant).

**EXTERNAL INTERNSHIP:** If the external daily supervisor is approved examiner (check this with student), they can upload the form with all categories scored. The RU/RUMC examiner then only needs to fill out the scores for the report and oral presentation

	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Excellent
<b>1) Knowledge and understanding</b>				
a. Knowledge	Did not read all recommended material. Unable to summarize literature or justify choices.	Read recommended material... Mostly able to summarize literature.	... and additional sources for more understanding... Able to summarize literature...	... and additional sources for broader orientation. ... and defend/justify literature choices.
b. Understanding	Misunderstanding of project goal. No partaking in discussions.	Understanding of project goal... Passive in discussions: some understanding shown.	... and milestones... Contributed to discussions: able to show understanding and ask clarifying questions.	... and main challenges. Contributed to discussions: understanding and interest shown.
<b>2) Applying knowledge and understanding</b>				
a. Lab skills	Unable to use techniques/models unsupervised. Worked unsafe, unclean and/or unstructured.	Able to use techniques/models after instruction... Worked safely and somewhat tidy.	... then quickly able to use them independently... Worked safely and tidy.	... and modify/optimize protocols.
b. Organisation (Time management)	Time-inefficient, unaware of time management. Frequent unnecessary delays/repeats.	Aware of need for time management... Good short-term (day-base) planning...	... making plans with supervisor's help. ... and week-base planning...	Worked towards making/adjusting own planning. ... showing oversight of project status/progress.
c. Research design	Experiments not performed according to research design made by supervisor.	Followed the supervisor's research design. Able to suggest possibilities for further research...	... and able to suggest methods/analyses for experiments...	... and able to suggest which experiments should be done.
<b>3) Making judgements</b>				
a. Critical reflection and progress control	No reflection/reorientation, unrealistic ideas about project status, unclear research focus.	Able to give fairly realistic reflection on current status when asked.	Realistic reflection on current status before going on to next experiment...	... also being critical towards results.
b. Initiative and creativity	No initiative, direct instructions needed. No solutions offered.	Showed some initiative, much help needed. Limited creativity, solutions at times unrealistic.	Showed initiative and some independence. Able to suggest solutions that worked earlier.	Showed initiative, little help needed. Solutions mostly realistic and creative.
<b>4) Lifelong learning skills</b>				
a. Involvement, independence and perseverance	Project seen as assignment. Lack of commitment. Very sensitive to setbacks.	Some interest/enthusiasm for the project. Progress relied on supervisor. With help, able to overcome minor setbacks.	Some intrinsic motivation. Progress relied mostly on supervisor. Independently able to overcome minor setbacks...	Intrinsically motivated. Worked towards independence. ... and somewhat larger setbacks.
b. Reflection and handling of feedback	Difficulties identifying own strengths/weaknesses. Feedback often ignored.	Able to identify some strengths/weaknesses. Feedback was mostly considered.	Able to identify strengths/weaknesses... Feedback was usually considered...	... and to utilize help/feedback to improve them. ... and actively sought.
<b>5) Communication</b>				
a. Communication and cooperation	Lacking preparations for meetings. Meetings regarded as task.	Usually prepared for meetings. Able to learn from group meetings...	Well prepared, communication usually clear... ... to ask for help and clarification...	... showing understanding of jargon. ... and willing to share results.
b. Data handling and data management	Data unstructured, student clarification needed. Lab journal incomplete, replication impossible.	Data structured... Lab journal only lacking small details.	... consistent and clear. Lab journal complete, main findings clear.	... and optimized for future users. ... and repetition by others directly possible.
Comments:				Suggested grade:

**Report (25%)**

**FIRST ASSESSOR:** you should score all categories. If a daily supervisor is involved other than you, please score all three categories with help of the daily supervisor. It is important that your name is on the form and that you agree with the evaluation.  
**SECOND ASSESSOR:** you should score only the report and presentation (if relevant).

**EXTERNAL INTERNSHIP:** If the external daily supervisor is approved examiner (check this with student), they can upload the form with all categories scored. The RU/RUMC examiner then only needs to fill out the scores for the report and oral presentation

	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Excellent
<b>6) Report presentation</b>				
a. Language, vocabulary and writing style	>6 mistakes/page, hard to comprehend. Writing unclear: too colloquial/elaborate.	>3 mistakes/page, grammar comprehensible. Writing mostly clear, in spite of colloquialisms...	>1 mistake/page, grammar smooth. ... scientific and to the point, few colloquialisms...	(Nearly) flawless. ... near level of MSc thesis.
b. Layout visuals (figures, tables)	Figures irrelevant, not self-explanatory. Layout inconsistent	Figures support text, not all self-explanatory... Layout mostly consistent.	... most plot types well chosen... Layout consistent and clear...	... plot types well chosen, figures self-explanatory. ... and appealing.
<b>7) Structuring</b>				
a. Main sections	Abstract, Experimental incomplete. Appendices irrelevant or under/overutilized. Discussion missing or trivial. Conclusion doesn't follow from results.	Abstract, Experimental complete... Appendices mostly relevant... Discussion mentions strengths/weaknesses... Conclusion logically follows from results...	... concise and clear... ... no misplaced information ... (mostly) explains them... ... and reflects on goals.	... and appeal/allow easy replication. ... and used to improve readability of main text. ... fully explains them and their implications. Discussion and conclusion precise and concise.
b. Substructure and paragraphs	Structuring at all levels (report sections, within sections and paragraphs) confusing or missing.	Substructuring of main sections clear, but at paragraph level at times confusing or missing.	Substructuring clear and focussed. Most paragraphs focussed...	Substructuring suits the narrative. All paragraphs focussed.
<b>8) Critical thinking/evaluation</b>				
a. Motivation	Central problem/question not clearly introduced.	Central problem clearly introduced...	... relevance explained...	... and context from literature given.
b. Reflection on literature	Context of literature not taken into account.	Literature placed into context.	Literature sources compared to each other.	Literature sources conflicting with each other or with findings are discussed.

Student name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student number: \_\_\_\_\_ Your name: \_\_\_\_\_ u/z number: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>c. Justification of research design</b>	No clear overview of general strategy. Specific methods not justified.	General strategy and experimental methods mentioned, not explained.	Strategy and experimental methods superficially explained. Analysis methods mentioned.	Strategy and analysis methods clearly explained and justified.
<b>d. Reflection on own results</b>	Results merely described. Methods never evaluated/questioned. No reflection of own quality of work.	Most results interpreted... Methods examined when results unexpected... Reflection often biased by expected outcome.	... and connected. ... all methods examined. Reflection mostly unbiased.	Implications of results clearly summarized. Clear overview of quality of methods. Reflection unbiased.
<b>9) Argumentation</b>				
<b>a. Substantiation</b>	Key references missing. Claims not supported by literature. Controls/benchmarking not suggested.	Most refs from supervisor, mostly in right places. Most claims supported by literature... Control experiments / benchmarking suggested...	Own refs added. Most refs relevant, not missing... Claims supported by literature... ... and implications discussed.	... and used to support/defend arguments. ... considering differences/limitations. Some control experiments / benchmarking done.
<b>b. Coherency of narrative/story</b>	No clear line of argumentation from introduction to results/discussion and conclusions. Main achievements not emphasized.	Line of argumentation present... Some side steps and contractions. Main achievements clearly emphasized.	... (mostly) clear... Report internally consistent... Outlook given...	... and focussed. ... and coherent. ... and alternative theories discussed.
<b>Comments:</b>				<b>Suggested grade:</b>

**Presentation (10%)**



**FIRST ASSESSOR:** you should score all categories. If a daily supervisor is involved other than you, please score all three categories with help of the daily supervisor. It is important that your name is on the form and that you agree with the evaluation.  
**SECOND ASSESSOR:** you should score only the report and presentation (if relevant).

**EXTERNAL INTERNSHIP:** If the external daily supervisor is approved examiner (check this with student), they can upload the form with all categories scored. The RU/RUMC examiner then only needs to fill out the scores for the report and oral presentation

	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Excellent
<b>10) Presenter</b>				
<b>a. Verbal</b>	Unpleasant pace, long pauses without purpose, limited vocabulary, or unclear pronunciation.	Pace sometimes awkward, some long pauses. Functional vocabulary and clear pronunciation.	Mostly pleasant pace, some long pauses. Broad vocabulary...	... pauses serve purpose. ... near-fluent language.
<b>b. Non-verbal</b>	Highly insecure, distracting from presentation. Little use of proper timing, intonation, etc.	Moderately insecure/stressed, barely distracting. Some use of variation in timing, intonation, etc.	Insecurity/stress not distracting. Clearly using variation in timing, intonation, etc...	Confident and relaxed, able to guide audience. ... adding value to the talk.
<b>11) Support</b>				
<b>a. Layout visuals (figures, tables) and slides</b>	Slides cluttered and unstructured. Figures irrelevant or not self-explanatory. Layout inconsistent.	Slides clear, but sometimes poorly structured. Figures support talk, not all self-explanatory... Layout mostly consistent...	Slides are consistently structured. ... mostly self-explanatory... ... consistent and clear...	Slide structure supports talk. ... self-explanatory. ... and appealing.
<b>b. Text slides</b>	Regular mistakes in spelling and/or grammar. Text distracting: over/underused.	Few mistakes in spelling and grammar. Text occasionally excessive.	Almost no mistakes in spelling and grammar. Text used conservatively, yet clear...	(Nearly) flawless. ... and brings out main message.
<b>c. Structure of presentation</b>	Overall order confusing. Information density varies greatly.	Overall order logical... Information density occasionally incorrect.	... but not over-emphasized... Information density mostly correct.	... and attention paid to transitions. Information density appropriate throughout.
<b>12) Critical thinking/evaluation</b>				
<b>a. Motivation</b>	Central problem/question not clearly introduced.	Central problem clearly introduced...	... relevance explained...	... and context from literature given.
<b>b. Justification of research design</b>	No clear overview of general strategy. Specific methods not justified.	General strategy and experimental methods mentioned, not explained.	Strategy and experimental methods superficially explained. Analysis methods mentioned.	Strategy and analysis methods clearly explained and justified.
<b>c. Reflection on own results</b>	Results merely described. Methods never evaluated/questioned. No reflection of own quality of work.	Most results interpreted... Methods examined when results unexpected... Reflection often biased by expected outcome.	... and connected. ... all methods examined. Reflection mostly unbiased.	Implications of results clearly summarized. Clear overview of quality of methods. Reflection unbiased.
<b>13) Argumentation</b>				
<b>a. Coherency of narrative/story</b>	No clear line of argumentation from introduction to results/discussion and conclusions. Main achievements not emphasized.	Line of argumentation present... Some side steps and contractions. Main achievements clearly emphasized.	... (mostly) clear... Report internally consistent... Outlook given...	... and focussed. ... and coherent. ... and alternative theories discussed.
<b>b. Defence during questions</b>	Answers to even obvious questions inaccurate. Uncertainties or considerations not discussed.	Answers to obvious questions mostly accurate. Uncertainties/considerations hardly discussed.	Answers to questions often accurate... Some uncertainties/considerations discussed.	... and to the point. Relevant uncertainties discussed.
<b>Comments:</b>				<b>Suggested grade:</b>

<b>General comments (mandatory):</b>	<b>Suggested overall grade:</b>
	<b>Final grade:</b>

n/a