RESEARCH (55% of final grade):

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7">Some of the grading categories might not be applicable in your research field or discipline. Therefore, you can omit non-applicable categories in the grading process, however in any case this should be discussed with the student PRIOR to grading</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Category</td><td rowspan="2">Criterion</td><td colspan="4">Score for criterion</td><td rowspan="2">Category score</td></tr>
<tr><td>Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)</td><td>Merit (7.0 - 8.0)</td><td>Pass (6.0 - 7.0)</td><td>Fail (< 5.0)</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Work attitude</td><td>A) Motivation</td><td>The student sees the research as their own and overcomes an occasional setback independently.</td><td>The student has made the project their own and occasional setbacks are overcome with help of the expert.</td><td>The student tends to be distracted easily and has given up once or twice.</td><td>The student needs to be reminded to do their work regularly by the supervisor.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>B) Initiative and new ideas</td><td>The student has a pro-active attitude to novel ideas, and comes up with relevant solutions, methods and idease in their internship.</td><td>The student has a pro-active attitude to novel ideas, and occasionally comes up with relevant solutions, methods and idease in their internship.</td><td>The student occasionally comes up with solutions, methods and idease in their internship, which are often based on supervisors' input.</td><td>The student displays an inactive attitude, and does not come up with solutions during their internship.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>C) Independence</td><td>The student is able to plan and perform their research independently. The student knows, however, when it is (un)necessary to contact the supervisor.</td><td>The student and supervisor plan the different tasks together; afterwards the student is able to adjust these plans themselves. The student occasionally decides small matters on their own, and mostly contacts the supervisor when input is necessary.</td><td>The supervisor plans out most of the tasks, the student is, however, able to perform them independently. The student does not make decisions about the research, or the student makes decisions on their own where the supervisor should have been consulted.</td><td>The supervisor plans out all tasks, and needs to check whether the tasks have been completed successfully. The student has poor decision making and does not know when to consult the supervisor.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>D) Self-reflection</td><td>The student critically reflects on their performance.</td><td>The student critically reflects on some parts of their performance.</td><td>The student critically reflects on their performance with help of the supervisor.</td><td>The student does not reflect on their performance, even when helped by the supervisor.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Dealing with scientific literature</td><td></td><td>The student is able to independently and systematically go through relevant literature. Occasionally the student brings new and relevant information to the attention of the supervisor.</td><td>The student is able to independently go through the literature after the supervisor has given some hints. The student deals with relevant papers most of the time. The student understands most of the information in the found papers.</td><td>The student is able to go through the literature, but the supervisor has to repeatedly help the student on their way. The supervisor has to explain the rationale and results of key papers.</td><td>The student is unable to go through the literature, does not know what information is relevant and repeatedly misunderstands concepts from papers despite input from the supervisor.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Implementing research</td><td>A) Experimental work</td><td>The student is able to set up and modify experiments to answer the research question, has thought about experimental considerations, limitations, and has executed the experiments as well as could reasonably be expected.</td><td>The student is able to work with existing experiments and can modify them slightly to answer the research question.The student has thought about experimental consideration and limitations, but hasn't grasped their implications. The experiments have been executed reasonably well, but occasionally avoidable errors have been made.</td><td>The student is able to work with existing experiments, but is not able to modify them/modify them while thinking about the implications. The experiments have been executed relatively well, but often avoidable errors have been made.</td><td>The student experienced difficulties when performing standardized experiments.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>B) Data analysis</td><td>The student has organised the data clearly and used appropriate statistical analyses to best answer the research question with thorough checks .</td><td>The student has organised the data and performed commonly used statistical analyses that are not always best suited to answer the research question. The checks on the analysis are not well thought through.</td><td>The student is able to organise the data, but the analysis of the data does hardly contribute to answering the research question. Moreover, the student needs extensive help when analysing data.</td><td>The student is unable to organise the data and even unable to perform basic analyses, even with help of the supervisor.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Optional: model development / Coding</td><td>The student is able to create a model from the ground up or add an important new part to an existing model. The model is modular and coding is clear for outsiders. Advanced validation methods have been used.</td><td>The student is able to make (major) modifications to an existing model. The modelling itself is reasonably efficient. Sometimes the student could have added better explanations to the code. The model has been validated using basic techniques.</td><td>The student is able to make minor modifications to an existing model. The modelling itself is inefficient with redundancy. The code itself is unclear and choices are not motivated. The model has hardly been validated and errors occur occasionally.</td><td>The student is unable to use an existing model. The model is not validated and errors occur often and lead to wrong conclusions with regards to the research question.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

4. Development of skills		The student has skills on a scientific level and if they discover that a certain skill is lacking they are able to increase these skills or technique on their own.	The student has sufficient skill to see the research through, and can increase needed skills or techniques with a little help from the supervisor/others.	The student has adequate skills to complete the research, but the supervisor needed to actively step in to help the student develop these.	Skills in regard to the research are not sufficient and the student is unable to improve them even with the supervisor's help.	
5. Interaction with supervisor	A) Preparation for meetings	The student is very well prepared during meetings with the supervisor, has brought results of individual experiments/shows parts of a model. The student almost always takes the lead during meetings.	The student is well prepared during meetings with the supervisor, has brought results of individual experiments/shows parts of a model, but does not always fully grasp what they need to discuss. The student takes the lead during meetings about as often as the supervisor.	The student is prepared relatively well most of the time, but occasionally does not go into meetings with a clear goal. When discussing experiments/models the student often does not know what to discuss and the supervisor needs to take the lead.	The student is not prepared most of the time, and when discussing experiments/models they do not know what they are talking about. The student has a very passive attitude to these meetings.	
	B) Communication level	The student is always able to communicate on a scientific level with the supervisor.	The student is able to communicate on a scientific level with the supervisor most of the time, but occasionally the supervisor has to explain jargon.	The student is often able to talk on a scientific level with the supervisor, however jargon is regularly wrong and the supervisor has to explain things more than occasionally.	The student is hardly able to communicate on a scientific level with the supervisor and even when jargon is explained, the student still does not understand or use it.	
	C) Implementation of feedback	Expert's comments are weighed by the student and asked for when needed. The student also asks feedback from other staff members or students, and sees comments as base for discussion.	The student incorporates most of the comments of the expert, but ignores some comments without sufficient arguments.	The student has only occasionally weighed the feedback and often feedback has not been implemented in the right way. The expert needs to act as an instructor and constantly needs to suggest solutions for problems.	The student does not pick up suggestions and ideas of the expert. Implementation has not been well thought through/feedback has been disregarded often without explanation.	
6. Role in the research group	A) Attitude during seminars and lab meetings	The student actively participates in discussions and asks relevant scientific questions in appropiate situations.	The student occasionally participates in discussions and asks relevant, appropiate scientific questions.	The student sometimes participates in discussions and only rarely asks relevant scientific questions. The student sometimes misses meetings without valid reasons.	The student does not participate in discussions. The student views going to these meetings as mandatory and misses them often without valid reasons.	
	B) Interaction with other team members	The student interacts with other team members in a meaningful way, shows interest in their research and takes up on their feedback.	The student occasionally interacts with other team members in a meaningful way, shows some interest in their research and takes up on some of their feedback.	The student sometimes interacts with other team members in a meaningful way, hardly shows interest in their research and takes up a little of their feedback.	The student does not interact meaningfully with other team members, shows no interest in the research of others and disregards suggestions from others.	
7. Completion of the internship	A) Transfer of data/ specimens	Data and specimens have been organised in such a way that another student/researcher can continue working without any effort even after a long time has passed.	Data and specimens have been organised well, but another student/researcher needs extensive familiarisation before they can work with them.	Data and specimens have been organised well for the most part, however gaps in documentation/collection are present and the student's successor needs to do quite a bit of work to familiarise themself with the data/specimens.	Data and specimens have not been organised well, are missing altogether. It's difficult for the student's successor to properly work with the data/specimens.	
	B) Documenting protocols/annotating code	Protocols have been made in such a way that other lab members can repeat experiments/techniques effortlessly. Code has been annotated in such a way that it is clear why certain choices were made and it's easy to adjust the coding thanks to the annotation.	Protocols have been made in such a way that with some effort other lab members can repeat experiments/techniques. Code has been annotated that it is often clear why choices were made and it's mostly easy to adjust the coding thanks to the annotation.	Protocols have been made in such a way that they are difficult to reproduce by other lab members. Code has hardly been annotated and is so vague that it becomes difficult to adjust the coding.	The student has not written protocols even though he developed new/modified existing techniques. Code has not been shared at the end of the internship or annotation is completely lacking.	
Feedback:						

REPORT (grade is (mean of two reviewers) 35% of final grade):

General requirements	Layout	Clear layout in accordance with peer-reviewed articles in the field. Citations are in a correct and consistent style throughout the review.				
	Own work	All sources are named. The review article is written in own words and free from plagiarism.				
Category	**Criterion**	**Score for criterion**				**Category score**
		Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	**Merit (7.0 - 8.0)**	**Pass (6.0 - 7.0)**	**Fail (< 5.0)**	
1. Summary		The summary contains information about the relevancy of the research, some background information, clearly describes the research problem and used methods, highlights the most important results and clearly states the conclusion and its implications. It is written in such a way that the importance of the research becomes immediately apparent and the reader is invited to start reading the rest.	The summary contains all the basic parts necessary (relevancy, background, research question, methods, most important results and conclusion), and highlights some of the most important results/some unimportant results too. The conclusion is well stated, but its implications are not well described.	The summary contains all the basic parts necessary (relevancy, background, research question, methods, most important results and conclusion), but does not highlight the most important parts of the report well. Implications of the conclusion are described.	The summary does not contain all the basic parts necessary and discourages the reader to read the report at all.	
2. Introduction		The introduction contains all the elements necessary to understand the executed research, but no more. The introduction gives a clear overview over relevant papers and logically leads to a current question in the field. The objective of the research is clearly stated and actually helps answering the stated question.	The introduction contains enough material necessary to understand the executed research, but some irrelevant information is given. The introduction gives a mostly clear overview over relevant papers, and leads to a current question in the field, though this does not become immediately apparent. The objective is well stated, helps answering the stated question, but could have further been refined.	The introduction contains barely enough material necessary to understand the executed research, but at the same time contains considerable irrelevant information. The introduction forcibly leads to a current question in the field. The stated objective of the research is correctly stated, but could have connected better to outstanding questions in the field.	The introduction is lacking in background information, yet contains a lot of irrelevant information. The introduction is not connected to a current question in the field. The objective of the research is not well-stated and the connection to the question is unclear.	
3. Materials and methods		Description of the practical work (experiments/modelling/analysis) is written to-the-point and in such a way that someone else can exactly reproduce the research. Methodological considerations are well explained.	Description of the practical work (experiments/modelling/analysis) is written mostly to-the-point, however some details are missing making exact replication of the research difficult. Methodological considerations are explained in some detail.	Description of the practical work (experiments/modeling/analysis) is present, though some parts are missing, making parts of the research irreproducible. Methodological considerations are seldom explained.	Description of the practical work is missing/lacking severely. Methodological considerations are not explained.	
4. Results	A) Written text	The written text can be completely understood without looking at the figures/tables. The text explicitly refers back to the objectives of experiments and it is clear which part of the results deal with which question. Only the highlights of the results have been shown	The written text can mostly be understood without looking at the figures/tables. The text refers back to the objectives of experiments and it is clear which part of the results deal with which question most of the time. All highlights of the results have been shown alongside some irrelevant results.	The written text can be understood in some places without looking at the figures/tables, and completely when they are included. The text occasionally refers back to the objectives and it is occasionally clear which part of the results deal with which question. It is unclear why some results were described in the text, while other more important results were not.	The written text cannot be understood without looking at the figures/tables and even when they are taken into account, some parts are unclear. The text does not refer back to objectives and it is unclear which part deals with which question. The described results are a mixed bag at best.	

	B) Figures/tables	The figures/tables can be completely understood without looking at the text. They are made in such a way that they are acceptable in a peer-reviewed paper, meaning that the right type has been chosen and that they are easy to read and the descriptions are complete.	Almost all of the figures/tables can be understood without looking at the text. Some of the figures are made in such a way that they are acceptable in a peer-reviewed paper, but sometimes the wrong type is used and some are hard to read. Descriptions are not always complete.	Most of the figures/tables can be understood without looking at the text. Only a few figures are made in such a way that they are acceptable in a peer-reviewed paper. Others employ the wrong type and are often hard to read. Descriptions are hardly ever complete.	Few/none of the figures/tables can be understood without looking at the text. None of the figures are made in such a way that they are acceptable in a peer-reviewed paper. The wrong type of figure/table is often used, they are hard to read and descriptions are never complete/completely missing.	
5. Discussion	A) Embedding of data in scientific context	Discussion is a complete description of the results embedded in relevant literature.	Discussion is almost a complete description of the results in context of relevant literature.	Discussion is an incomplete description of the results in context of relevant literature.	The results are hardly discussed in the context of relevant literature.	
	B) Limitations of research	Limitations of the research and the effect(s) of said limitations on the results have been clearly described. Improvements to the research have been mentioned and are viable. Methodological errors have not been discussed.	Limitations of the research have been well described, but their effect(s) on the results have not been discussed as thoroughly. Improvements to the research have been mentioned, but are not always viable. Some methodological errors have been discussed.	Limitations of the research are reasonably well described, but their effect(s) on the results have not/insufficiently been described. Improvements to the research are only occasionly mentioned. A lot of methodological errors have been discussed.	Only some limitations of the research are described, their effect(s) on the results have not been described. Only trivial improvements to the research are mentioned. Mostly/solely methodological errors have been discussed.	
	C) Conclusion	The conclusion is well linked to objective of the research and encompasses all results. The conclusion logically follows from the presented data and the comparison between data and literature.	The conclusion is well linked to the objective of the research and encompasses most of the results. The conclusion flows mostly logically from the presented data and the comparison between data and literature.	The conclusion is linked to the objective of the research, but does not encompass all the results. The conclusion is not completely substantiated by the presented data and the comparison between data and literature.	The conclusion is drawn, but is not well linked to the objective of the research. The conclusion is not substantiated by the presented data and the comparison between data and literature.	
	D) Future directions of research	Recommendations for future research are well-linked to the conclusion, original and extensive enough for a new project.	Recommendations for future research are linked to the conclusion, mostly repeat existing research.	Recommendations for future research are flimsily linked to the conclusion and are trivial.	There are no recommendations for future research that is linked to the conclusion.	
6. Writing skills	A) Structure of the report	Higher and lower level hierarchy is logical. Ordering of the sections is logical. All information occurs at the right place.	Main structure is correct and the lower level hierarchy is logical in most places. Ordering of the different sections is mostly logical.	Main structure is correct, but lower level hierarchy of sections is illogical in places. Some sections have overlapping functions leading to ambiguity in the report.	The main structure is incorrect in some places. Placement of material is illogical in many sections.	
	B) Clarity of the arguments	The textual quality of the report is such that it could be acceptable in a peer-reviewed journal.	Formulations in the report are unambiguous and exact, as well as concise.	Formulations in the report are predominantly unambiguous and exact. The report could have been written more concisely or more elaborately.	Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording occur regularly and it affects the interpretation of the report	
	C) Readability	There are no obvious spelling and grammar mistakes. All sentences have an unambiguous function. The writing style is scientific and coherent.	There are no obvious spelling and grammar mistakes. Almost all sentences have an unambiguous function. The writing style is scientific and coherent.	The writing style varies a lot.	The sentences are full of spelling and grammar mistakes / Most sentences do not have an unambiguous function.	
Feedback:						

ORAL PRESENTATION (grade (mean of two reviewers) is 10% of final grade):

Category	Criterion	Score for criterion				Category score
		Distinction (8.0 - 10.0)	**Merit (7.0 - 8.0)**	**Pass (6.0 - 7.0)**	**Fail (< 5.0)**	
1. Content	A) Reasoning	The used arguments are clear and connections between observations and (small) conclusions are easy to follow and logical.	The used arguments are often clear and connections between observations and (small) conclusions are occasionally easy to follow and logical.	The used arguments are occasionally clear and connections between observations and (small) conclusions are difficult to follow and sometimes illogical.	The used arguments are unclear and connections between observations and conclusions are difficult to follow.	
	B) Depth	The presentation has a clear message, is on the right level for the audience and the student acts on signals that things are not completely understood by the audience.	The presentation has a main message, is mostly on the right level for the audience, but the student does not act on signals that the audience does not completely understand the story.	The main message of the presentation hardly comes through, the level is only occasionally right for the audience.	The main message is lacking and the level of the presentation is not taken into consideration.	
2. Structure		The presentation is structured in such a way that it is easy for the audience to follow the common thread through the story. It is clear what is essential and what is a "extra" information.	The presentation is mostly structured in a way that helps the audience follow the common thread. The difference between essential and "extra" information is not always evident.	The presentation is structured as such that it takes the audience a bit of effort to follow the common thread. The difference between essential and "extra" information is only occasionally clear.	There is no clear structure in the presentationa and therefore very hard to follow the common thread.	
3. Graphical presentation		The lay-out of the slides is clear. There is a good balance between text and images. Figure/tables are easy to read and units are discernible from a distance too. The student has put extra effort in the graphical presentation with for example functional animations and/or scaling of graphical elements.	The lay-out is clear. There is a relatively good balance between text and images. Most figures are easy to read, but units are sometimes too small.	The lay-out is mostly clear. There are slides that use too much/little text. Some of the figures are vague. Ineffective usage of tables vs. figures.	Lay-out distracts from the presentation.	
4. Presentation skills		The student spoke pleasantly and clearly, and captured the attention of the audience at all times.	The student spoke clearly, and had the attention of the audience most of the time.	The student spoke clearly most of the time, didn't hold the attention really well and occasionally read from the slides.	The student was unable to articulate clearly, they didn't have the attention of the audience and read from the slides.	
5. Discussion and answering questions		The student is able to answer questions appropriately, to the point and clearly, but also clearly states the limits of their knowledge. In answering questions the student shows an overview over the field and the context of their research.	The student is able to answer most questions, but not always appropriately, to the point or clearly. The student does not seem to clearly know the limits to their knowledge and sometimes overstates conclusions. In answering questions the student shows a partial overview over the field and the context of their research.	The student is able to answer some of the questions, usually in a less than to the point or clear way. The student shows limited knowledge beyond the direct scope of their research.	The student is only able to answer questions where they explain parts of the presentation again and does not engage with information beyond the scope of their own research.	
6. Timing		Duration of the presentation was perfect in context of the topic and audience.	Duration of the presentation was suitable in context of the topic and audience.	Duration of the presentation was not completely suitable for the topic and audience (e.g. too long or too short).	Duration of the presentation was not suitable in context of the topic and audience (e.g. much too long or short).	
Feedback:						