Pages 1–4 must be archived with the written report

Sc Internship Molecular Sciences id term evaluation	Degree	Degree programme							
udent name		- 1			Stu	ıdent n	umbe	r	
le project		_						ec	<u> </u>
art date End	date					Da	te repo	ort	
pervision		_							
pervisor:		2nd r	eviewer	.a					
search group / Institute:		Resea	arch gro	up / Ins	titute				
sessment of the student's professional attitud	e and activities d	uring t	his inte	ernship)*				
		ple							
		Not applicable	Insufficient	nt	Satisfactory		poc	Ħ	
		арк	ıffic	Sufficient	sfac	þ	Very good	Excellent	
		Not	Insu	Suf	Sati	Good	Ver	Ĕ	
Interest in scientific context of research topic									
2 Acquisition of topic-specific knowledge									
3 Use of literature									
1 Thoroughness in the design of research activities									
Efficiency and organisation skills									
5 Practical skills									
7 Interaction with colleagues									
3 Self-sufficiency in research activities									
Attendance, participation and enthusiasm									
Scientific quality of presentations									
Quality of slides of presentations									
2 Verbal presentation skills nese 12 issues are selected from the list of academic compe	tancas as formulatad	on the F	□ inal Acce	□ scement t	□ form				
lese 12 issues are selected from the list of academic compe	tences as formulated	on the r	IIIdi Asse	ssinent	101111				
verall mid term assessment									
ong points:									_
ints requiring improvement:									
te:									
ic.									
nature supervisor:									
nature supervisor:									

^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.

Pages 1–4 must be archived with the written report

MSc Internship Molecular Sciences Final assessment	Degree program	nmme
Student name		Student number
Title project		ec
Start date	End date	Date report
Supervision		
Supervisor:	2nd re	eviewer ^a
Research group / Institute:	Resea	arch 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	Has a thorough mastery of the relevant		
scientific	field, is able to reflect on standard methods		
discipline(s)	and to question these, is able to propose		
	adjustments		
Competence in	Is able to independently contribute to the		
doing research	development of scientific knowledge in the		
	discipline		
Competence in	Is able to independently design and		
design and	integrate research plans, has creativity and		
integration of	extensive experimental skills		
research plans			
Scientific	Is able to document independently the		
approach	results of research with a view to		
	contributing to the development of		
	knowledge in the field, and is able to		
	publish these results (under guidance)		
Basic intellectual	Is able to independently critically reflect on		
skills	his/her own thinking, is able to take a		
	standpoint with regard to a scientific		
	argument in the field		
Competence in	Is able to communicate verbally and in		
cooperating and	writing about research and solutions to		
communicating	problems with colleagues and non-		
	colleagues		
Social context	Is able to analyse the consequences of		
	scientific thinking and acting on the		
	environment and sustainable development,		
	chooses a place as a professional in society		
0			
Overall grade com	petences		

^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

Nritt	ten report	Description	Assessment ^a							Grade ^b
Qualit	•	See points of attention	1.00000							0.0.0
	-,	(vide infra)								
		•								•
	Doints of atton	tion for written report								
	Points of atten	tion for written report		e						
				Not applicable	Ħ		≥		-	
				jld	Insufficient	Sufficient	Satisfactory		Very good	ent
				t ap	JĘ.	ĘĊ	isfa	рс	<i>∞</i>	Excellent
				No	Insi	Suf	Sat	Good	Ver	EXC
1	Overall quality of	f the layout								
2	Quality of figures	and tables								
3	Quality of the ab	stract								
4	Quality of the int	roduction								
5		ne scientific problem								
6		ne research design								
7	Description of th	e research materials and r	nethods							
8	Description of th									
9	Description of th									
10		of the discussion								
11	1 Correct citations / references									
12	Overall writing sl	kills								
Oral	presentation	Description	Assessment	<u>.</u> a						Grade ^b
Qualit	•	See points of attention								Grade
Zuum	. y	(vide infra)	'							
		() -)	I							I
	Points of atten	tion for oral presentati	on							
				ple			>			
							_		po	±
				olica	ent	Ħ	¥			_
				applica	fficient	cient	facto	70	80	≝
				ot applica	ısufficient	ufficient	atisfacto	роо	ery go	xcelle
1	Overall quality of	f the presentation		□ Not applicable	Insufficient	3 Sufficient] Satisfactory	_ Good	Very good	¹ Excellent
1 2		f the presentation								
2	Quality of the int	roduction								
2 3	Quality of the int Justification of th	roduction ne scientific problem								
2 3 4	Quality of the int Justification of the Justification of the	roduction ne scientific problem ne research design	nethods							
2 3 4 5	Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th	roduction ne scientific problem ne research design e research materials and r	nethods							
2 3 4 5 6	Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th Description of th	roduction ne scientific problem ne research design e research materials and r e results	nethods							
2 3 4 5 6 7	Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th Description of th Description of th	roduction ne scientific problem ne research design e research materials and r e results e data analysis	nethods							
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th Description of th Description of th Scientific quality	roduction ne scientific problem ne research design e research materials and r e results e data analysis of the discussion	nethods							
2 3 4 5 6 7	Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th Description of th Description of th	roduction ne scientific problem ne research design e research materials and r e results e data analysis of the discussion / references	nethods							

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 produ	cts)	•	•		

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. in internships outside the university), only the grade of the supervisor is required.

Pages 1–4 must be archived with the written report

MSc Asse	Internship Mole essment 2 nd revie	ecular Sciences ewer		Degree	e progra	ımme				
Stuc	lent name				\neg		Г	Studen	t num	ber
Title	project						L	l		ес
The		e nd reviewer ^a ed on your own observati e certain aspects of the stu							n case	you have
Writ	ten report	Description	Assessment	b						Grade ^c
Qual	•	See points of								
		attention (vide infra)								
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Overall quality of Quality of figures Quality of the ab Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th Description of th Description of th	s and tables stract troduction ne scientific problem ne research design re research materials and re results re data analysis of the discussion		a a a a a a a a a not applicable	a a a a a a a a a Insufficient	Company Company Control of Company Com	a caractery	poo9	O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a
12	Overall writing sl									
				6.4					1	
	presentation	Description	Assessmer	nt ^{<i>v,a</i>}						Grade ^{c,d}
Qual	ity	See points of attention (vide infra)								
	Points of atten	tion for oral presentati	ion							
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Overall quality or Quality of the int Justification of th Justification of th Description of th Description of th Scientific quality Correct citations Overall oral com	f the presentation troduction ne scientific problem ne research design e research materials and r e results e data analysis of the discussion / references		agi	armer of the property of the p	aweiver	s communication of the contraction of the contracti	poo9	o o o o o o o very good	o o o o o o o Excellent
Date	•			Sigi	iatule 2	reviewe	1.			

 $[^]a$ 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. in internships outside the university), only the grade of the supervisor is required.