

Pages 1–3 must be archived with the written report

BSc Internship Molecular Sciences
Assessment

Degree programme

Student name

Student number

Title project

ec

Start date

End date

Date report

Supervision

Supervisor:

2nd reviewer^a

Research group / Institute:

Research group / Institute

Assessment by the supervisor

The assessment is based on your own observations, and additionally on observations by others involved, provided you have been able to substantiate them (in case you have been unable to observe certain aspects of the student's performance, please state 'not applicable').

Competence	Description	Assessment ^b	Grade ^c
Competence in scientific discipline(s)	<i>Has basic knowledge of the relevant field, is able to reflect on standard methods (under guidance), is able to propose adjustments</i>		
Competence in doing research	<i>Is able to contribute (under guidance) to the development of scientific knowledge in the discipline</i>		
Competence in design and integration of research plans	<i>Is able to design and integrate research plans (under guidance), has creativity and basic experimental skills</i>		
Scientific approach	<i>Is able to use the research results to develop the knowledge in the field (under guidance)</i>		
Basic intellectual skills	<i>Is able to reflect on his/her own thinking, is able to take a standpoint (under guidance) with regard to scientific arguments</i>		
Competence in cooperating and communicating	<i>Is able to communicate verbally and in writing about research and solutions to problems with colleagues and non-colleagues</i>		
Social context	<i>Is able to consider (under guidance) the consequences of scientific acting on the environment and sustainable development, chooses a role as a professional in society</i>		
Overall grade competences			

^a The 2nd reviewer is a staff member belonging to a different research group (*leerstoelgroep*), and does not take part in the mid term evaluation.

^b Give a short commentary or advice for the benefit of the student.

^c Grades 4-10. Half grades are possible (e.g. 7.5). 4 or 5 = insufficient, 6 = sufficient, 7 = satisfactory, 8 = good, 9 = very good, 10 = excellent

Pages 1–3 must be archived with the written report

Written report	Description	Assessment ^a	Grade ^b
Quality	See points of attention (<i>vide infra</i>)		

Points of attention for written report

	Not applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent
1 Overall quality of the layout	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Quality of figures and tables	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Quality of the abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 Quality of the introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 Justification of the scientific problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Justification of the research design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 Description of the research materials and methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 Description of the results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 Description of the data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 Scientific quality of the discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 Correct citations / references	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 Overall writing skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Oral presentation	Description	Assessment ^a	Grade ^b
Quality	See points of attention (<i>vide infra</i>)		

Points of attention for oral presentation

	Not applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent
1 Overall quality of the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Quality of the introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Justification of the scientific problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 Justification of the research design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 Description of the research materials and methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Description of the results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 Description of the data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 Scientific quality of the discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 Correct citations / references	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 Overall oral communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Final assessment	Grade supervisor	Grade 2 nd reviewer	Average grade	Weight	Product
Overall grade competences		NA		× 70%	
Grade written report ^c				× 20%	
Grade oral presentation ^{c,d}				× 10%	
Final grade (sum of products)					

Date:

Signature supervisor:

^a Give a short commentary or advice for the benefit of the student.^b Grades 4-10. Half grades are possible (e.g. 7.5). 4 or 5 = insufficient, 6 = sufficient, 7 = satisfactory, 8 = sgood, 9 = very good, 10 = excellent^c In case the difference between the two grades is bigger than 0.5 pts, both staff members have to reach consensus on the grade.^d If the 2nd reviewer cannot attend the presentation (e.g. internships outside the university), only the grade of the supervisor is required.

Pages 1–3 must be archived with the written report

BSc Internship Molecular Sciences
Assessment

Degree programme

Student name

Student number

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Title project

	ec
--	-----------

Assessment by the 2nd reviewer^a

The assessment is based on your own observations, provided you have been able to substantiate them (in case you have been unable to observe certain aspects of the student’s performance, please state ‘not applicable’).

Written report	Description	Assessment ^b	Grade ^c
Quality	See points of attention (<i>vide infra</i>)		

Points of attention for written report

	Not applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent
1 Overall quality of the layout	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Quality of figures and tables	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Quality of the abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 Quality of the introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 Justification of the scientific problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Justification of the research design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 Description of the research materials and methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 Description of the results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 Description of the data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 Scientific quality of the discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 Correct citations / references	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 Overall writing skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Oral presentation	Description	Assessment ^{b,d}	Grade ^{c,d}
Quality	See points of attention (<i>vide infra</i>)		

Points of attention for oral presentation

	Not applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent
1 Overall quality of the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Quality of the introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Justification of the scientific problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 Justification of the research design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 Description of the research materials and methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Description of the results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 Description of the data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 Scientific quality of the discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 Correct citations / references	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 Overall oral communication skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Date:

Signature 2nd reviewer:

^a The 2nd reviewer is a staff member belonging to a different research group (*leerstoelgroep*).

^b Give a short commentary or advice for the benefit of the student.

^c Grades 4-10. Half grades are possible (e.g. 7.5). 4 or 5 = insufficient, 6 = sufficient, 7 = satisfactory, 8 = good, 9 = very good, 10 = excellent

^d If the 2nd reviewer cannot attend the presentation (e.g. internships outside the university), only the grade of the supervisor is required.