

Evaluation sheet - kexjobbsuppsats

Authors:.....

Report:.....

1. Title and abstract

- a. The title clearly describes the report (3)*
- b. The abstract reflects the content of the report (3)

2. Introduction

- a. Problem (research question) is clearly specified and easy to identify; project aim and specific objectives are explicitly stated. (3)
- b. Research question (including the assumptions made and intended contributions) is well scoped/delineated against the presented background (context) and its relevance is well motivated (expectations regarding potential implications). (3)

3. Background

- a. Student demonstrates solid familiarity with the relevant state of the art and theoretical background; most significant literature sources and materials are selected and properly referred to. (3)
- b. Background information is coherent (not too verbose) and relevant to the project (relevant research is summarised to provide the context). (3)

4. Methods

- a. Selection of methods and proposed approaches are well motivated. (3)
- b. Only relevant (used in the project) methods are clearly described and adequately referenced. (3)
- c. Methods are correctly used, the methodological content is technically sound. (3)

(*) Each criterion is assigned points from the interval 0 – max (max=2 or 3). In particular, it is suggested that
a) for criteria with the maximum 2 points, the following interpretation is used:
2p -> A-B 1p -> C-E 0p -> F (completely lacking, not fulfilled)
b) for criteria with the maximum 3 points, the following interpretation is used:
3p -> A 2p -> B-C 1p -> D-E 0p -> F (completely lacking, not fulfilled).

5. Results (objective observations)

- a. Results obtained by the student are clearly laid out in a logical structure and adequately documented/illustrated (graphs, diagrams, etc.); only the obtained results are presented. (3)
- b. Appropriate and technically correct data analyses have been conducted. (3)

6. Discussion and conclusions (subjective analysis and perspective)

- a. Most important results are highlighted and critically evaluated (only the results shown explicitly) in light of the assumptions and limitations of the reported study. (3)
- b. Project outcome is interpreted or discussed in a broader context (taking into account the state of the art and pointing out potential implications); the claims are reasonable, well grounded and supported by the results. (3)
- c. Conclusions are reasonable, to the point and consistent with the findings. (3)

7. Overall characteristics of good-quality written presentation

- a. The report is a coherent and focused entity driven by specific questions - it is demonstrated that the project aims have been addressed; the content is coherent with the research question (problem); (3)
- b. Presentation style is well adjusted to the target reader. (2)
- c. All tables and figures are referred to in the text and are supported by informative captions as well as correct descriptions (axes, headers, units etc.). (2)
- d. Content is well structured and the language of the report is clear and complies with technical/engineering/academic standards. (3)
- e. Spelling, grammar and formatting are on a sufficiently high level. (2)

Total number of points:...../ 54

Evaluator:.....

() Each criterion is assigned points from the interval 0 – max (max=2 or 3). In particular, it is suggested that*
a) for criteria with the maximum 2 points, the following interpretation is used:
2p -> A-B 1p -> C-E 0p -> F (completely lacking, not fulfilled)
b) for criteria with the maximum 3 points, the following interpretation is used:
3p -> A 2p -> B-C 1p -> D-E 0p -> F (completely lacking, not fulfilled).