BACHELOR PSYCHOLOGY & TECHNOLOGY

BACHELOR END PROJECT (BEP) FINAL FORM

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING AND INNOVATION SCIENCES

Student Information

Student Name: _____

ID-Number: _____ Date: _____

Title Project: _____

TU/e First Assessor Name: _____

Second Assessor Name: _____

Internship PhD: *if relevant* _____

Professional Skills: *if applicable* Planning and Organizing: Writing:

Grade Interim Report	Grade Final Report	FINAL GRADE AWARDED (expressed in 0.5 grades)
20%	80%	

If there is significant difference between grades of the first assessor and the second assessor, the final grade is the average grade of the first assessor and the second assessor.

Signatures

Only sign the form when it is complete. Do not make any further changes after signing.

_____ Signature First Assessor

_____ Signature Second Assessor

For the best performance, fill and save the form in Adobe Acrobat (Reader). Saving before filling via another reader might corrupt the fields.

USER MANUAL OF THE BEP RUBRIC

Ideally, the bachelor end project (BEP) should demonstrate that a student has achieved all the learning goals of Psychology and Technology (PT) bachelor programme at a sufficient level before awarding the diploma. This way the quality of the student and the value of the PT bachelor diploma can be guaranteed. However, the learning outcomes of the PT programme are phrased in terms of ACQA[1] competences, whereas main deliverable is the bachelor thesis, which should meet scientific standards. This rubric for the bachelor end project (BEP) thesis is designed to make the relation between the two as explicit and transparent as possible.

The rubric is designed with the following goals in mind:

- The rubric makes sure that all learning outcomes are represented in the form of ACQA[1] competences, while still being as concise as possible.
- In addition, the relation between the actual deliverables of the BEP is made explicit by listing the features of the bachelor thesis, the writing skills and process that can be used to assess a given competence (first column).
- In accordance with the recommendations of the visitation committee, the engineering knowledge and skills are made explicit. The engineering skills and knowledge should reflect the student's abilities in his or her chosen specialization track (ICT, Living or Robotics).
- By making the criteria for grading explicit, the assessments from different teachers should be more homogeneous and counteract different practices. For junior teachers it should be easier to assess a given bachelor thesis. Given that there is a wide variety between research topics of the BEP, the criteria for excellence should NOT be read as an exhaustive list, but as guidelines for interpreting the more abstract competences.
- The rubric is a formative feedback instrument that teachers can use to give feedback about the performance of the student. Each competence can be rated from Failed, via Insufficient to Excellent.
- The comment boxes are crucial for explaining why a certain competence was rated high or low.
- The rubric can also be used as a summative grading instrument. Both the first assessor and second assessor can assign partial grades for the report, process and writing skills.
- To enable independent assessments (mandatory), separate tick boxes and comment boxes are provided for the second assessor in sections A, B and C.

Usage:

- No "Failed" (1-4 band, marked with red) assessments are allowed in order to pass.
- The competences should be weighted roughly equally
- The sections of the report should be weighted roughly equally: Introduction + Title page, Methods, Results, Discussion, Engineering and ethics (10% each).
- The writing style should roughly make out 20%, so that the report corresponds to roughly 70% of the final grade
- The process is about 30% of the final grade.
- Teachers can deviate from these guidelines provided that they explain why they used a different weighting scheme.
- Providing a motivation is mandatory.
- Second assessor fills the boxes provided in Sections A, B and C; the second assessor signs the form digitally. Section D should be filled by the first assessor.
- First assessor assesses report/project and completes the form. The first assessor signs the form digitally.
- First assessor emails completed and digitally signed form to CSA IEIS CSA.IEIS@tue.nl

---

1 Following the ACQA competence areas (Meijers, Overveld, and Perrenet, 2005), the intended learning outcomes of the BSc program are specified in terms of knowledge and skills of the graduates.

BACHELOR END PROJECT (BEP) FINAL EVALUATION FORM

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING & INNOVATION SCIENCES

A. Competent in Scientific Disciplines

Introduction

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Critical analysis of literature in the technology domain. – Critical analysis of literature in the psychology domain.	Role of theory is not clear. Literature used is (partly) irrelevant and/or insufficient to answer the research question.	Role of theory is insufficiently clear. Literature is only partially relevant.	The main theoretical concepts and their relations are defined and linked to the research question/ aim.	The main theoretical concepts and their relations are clearly defined and linked to the research question/aim.	The research question/aim is reformulated in theoretical terms. The main theoretical concepts and their relations are clearly defined.	The research question/aim is reformulated in theoretical terms. The main theoretical concepts and their relations are clearly defined. The theoretical framework combines two or more bodies of relevant literature.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Methods

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Accurate description of technological systems and components. – Accurate description of relevant theories, models and research methods. – Accurate description of research design, experimental set-up, data collection procedure.	No structured descripton of the research method and instruments.	Some steps of the research method are listed, but the approach is not reproducible.	The steps of the research method are listed the accuracy is limited.	Steps of the research method are listed and basically explained.	Steps of the research method are listed and explained in detail.	Extensive steps of the research method are listed and explained in great detail.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

A. Competent in Scientific Disciplines

Discussion

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– In depth reflection of the technological aspects of the relevant technology domain. – In depth reflection of literature of the psychology domain, and the impact on the user. – In depth reflection on research methods.	No critical reflection on the research. Reflection only touches trivial or very general points of criticism.	Student identifies only some possible strenghts and weaknesses and/or points at strenghts and weaknesses which are in reality irrelevant or non-existent.	Student indicates main strenghts and weaknesses in the research.	Student indicates main strenghts and weaknesses in the research and is able to weigh their impact on the main results relative to each other.	Student indicates all strenghts and weaknesses in the research and weighs them relative to each other. Furthermore, (better) alternatives for the research methods used are indicated.	Student is not only able to identify all possible strenghts and weaknesses in the research and weighs them relative to each other, but is also able to indicate which strenghts and weaknesses affect the conclusions the most. Furthermore, (better) alternatives for the research methods used and suggestions for future research are indicated.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Engineering and Ethics

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Accurate description of relevant mathematical/ statistical/programming methods. – In depth reflection mathematical/statistical/ programming methods.	The student is not able to apply her/his engineering skills.	The engineering skills are too limited and/or there are doubts about the validity and reliability of the data and the methods to process the data.	Engineering skills are not very extensive but applied correctly. The validity and reliability of the data and the methods to process the data are sufficient.	Engineering skills are correctly applied. The validity and reliability of the data and the methods in which the data have been processed are adequately displayed and justified.	High-quality engineering skills are correctly applied. The validity and reliability of the data and the methods in which the data have been processed are adequately displayed and justified.	High-quality engineering skills are correctly applied and extensive collection of data. The validity and reliability of the data and the methods in which the data have been processed are meticulously displayed and justified.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

B. Competent In Doing Research / Designing

Introduction

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Research question(s) follow logically from the analysis of the literature, and the hypotheses are testable assumption that provide answers to the research question(s). – Design problem follows logically from the analysis of the core concepts of psychological and technological literature.	There is no description of the research problem leading to a clear problem statement.	Poor description of the research problem. There is no relation to the research question/ aim or the literature does not match the problem. Relevance of the research is not clear.	There is a broad research problem and it is connected with relevant literature to the research question/ aim. The relevance of the research is described.	There is a clear research problem and it is connected with relevant literature to the research question / aim. The relevance of the research is described. Gap in the literature is identified.	There is a clear and concise research problem which is clearly connected to the research question/aim. The relevance of the research is substantiated. Scope and boundaries of the research are well defined.	There is a clear, concise and original research problem which is clearly connected to the research question/aim. The student substantiates the scientific and societal relevance of the research. Scope and boundaries of the research are well defined.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Methods

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Research design (experiment / simulation / model) is able to answer the hypotheses and research question formulated in the introduction. – Knowledge on technological requirements for human-technology interactions are integrated in the (re-) design of (requirements for) products or systems.	The chosen research method(s) and instrument do not correspond to the problem statement.	Most of the chosen research method(s) and instruments do not correspond well to the problem statement.	The research approach is mostly adequate (one or more suitable research methods) corresponding to the problem statement.	The research approach is adequate. The chosen research method(s) and instruments correspond to the problem statement and are based on literature.	The research approach is adequate. The chosen research method(s) and instruments correspond to the problem statement and are based on literature. The chosen research approach is justified by the student.	The research approach is adequate and thoroughly considered. Choices are clearly justified from the perspective of the problem statement and literature. The research approach stands out because of originality and/or complexity.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

B. Competent In Doing Research / Designing

Results

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Statistical tests are adequate and valid for answering the hypotheses. – Figures and Tables are informative, well-explained and clearly show the relevant information. – Design decisions are adequately justified concerning the interaction between the user and the system or product.	No analysis and/ or interpretation. Claims cannot be checked. There is no description of the research results or the presented results do not logically follow from analysis.	Results follow broadly from analysis but without interpretation.	Correct analysis. Results follow from analysis. Analysis and interpretation are superficial.	Correct analysis. Results follow logically from analysis. Results are presented clearly and organized, factual and with interpretations.	Correct and thorough analyses of the data. Results follow logically from analysis. The results are presented clear and well- organized, factual and with interpretations, and in relation with the research questions.	Advanced and original analyses of the data. The results follow logically from analysis. The results are presented clear, very well-organized and factual. The meaning of the results is described and explained in detail. Tables and figures are well integrated in the line of argumentation.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Research methods and results are well positioned with respect to the literature. – Scientific impact and usefulness of the results are clearly described. – Adequate (design) recommendations for stakeholders. – In depth reflection on design requirements. – In depth reflection on knowledge, methods and concepts from both the technological and psychological domains.	No or very weak conclusions. Not based on data analysis and not linked to the research questions.	Some conclusions are drawn providing only partial answers to the research question. Conclusions merely repeat results or conclusions are not substantiated by results or relevant literature.	Conclusions are based on analysis and linked to the research question. The research questions are answered.	Conclusions are based on analysis, linked to the research questions, and substantiated by results and relevant literature. Implications are formulated based on results.	Conclusions are based on analysis, clearly linked to the research questions, and well substantiated by results and relevant literature. Conclusions are formulated exactly. Implications are formulated based on results.	Conclusions are based on analysis, clearly linked to the research questions, and very well substantiated by results and relevant literature on a higher level. Conclusion are formulated exactly, concise and grouped in a logical way. Identifies the scientific contribution of the research as well as implications.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

B. Competent In Doing Research / Designing

Engineering and Ethics

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Experimental research is conducted according the ethical guidelines of psychological user research. – Mathematical/statistical/ programming designs are adequate for addressing the research question/ design problem.	No or very limited psychological theories and concepts are applied to real world applications. The ethical guidelines for conducting research were not sufficiently taken into acccount.	Very limited psychological theories and concepts are applied and/or no attempt is made to apply them to real world applications. The ethical guidelines for conducting research were not sufficiently taken into acccount.	Few psychological theories and concepts were correctly applied to real world applications. The ethical guidelines for conducting research were taken into acccount.	Psychological theories and concepts were correctly applied to real world applications, and the ethical guidelines for conducting research were taken into acccount.	Clear recommendations are given for stakeholders based on psychological theories and concepts, and the ethical guidelines for conducting research are discussed and developed.	Recommendations for stakeholders are well-formulated, advanced and original. They are given for stakeholders based on psychological theories and concepts, and the ethical guidelines for conducting research are discussed and developed.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION A /B REMARKS

First Assessor

Partial Grade

Second Assessor

Partial Grade

C. Writing Style

A Scientific Approach

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Report adheres to scientific standards for reporting like APA. Mathematical/statistical/ programming methods and results are reported according to scientific standards. – Argumentation is logically sound, and arguments are based on evidence and deductive reasoning. – Adequate description of scientific impact on related (multidisciplinary) scientific domains. – Scope and level of detail is adequate for the targeted scientific communities.	No line of reasoning or rudimentary argumentative structure. Ideas are unconnected. Claims are repeated rather than developed.	There is a rudimentary argumentative structure. Claims are that are developed are only weakly supported by evidence.	Argumentative structure is evident and satisfactory. Claims are regularly supported by valid, reliable evidence from credible sources.	Argumentative structure is evident and satisfactory. Claims are usually supported by valid, reliable evidence from credible sources.	Argumentative structure is clearly evident. Claims are supported by reliable, valid evidence from credible sources.	Reader can easily follow the line of reasoning. Argumentative structure is clearly evident. Claims are supported by reliable, valid evidence from credible sources and effectively synthesized in a very convincing manner.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

C. Writing Style

Competent In Co-Operating And Communicating

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Writing is clear and to the point, and the scope and level of detail is adequate for the targeted scientific communities. - The main story line is clear and the report is well-structured."	The report badly structured. Main structure is incorrect and/or placement of material in different chapters illogical in many places. Chapters are seperate entities and are not connected to each other. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information is given).	Main structure is incorrect and/ or placement of material in different chapters illogical. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information is given).	The main structure is correct, but lower level hierarchy of sections is not always logical in places. Most sections have a clear and unique function. The connection of parts could be improved. Level of detail inappropriate in a number of places (irrelevant information is given).	The main structure is correct, and the lower level hierarchy of sections is logical. Most sections have a clear function. The connection of parts could be improved. Level of detail inappropriate in a number of places (irrelevant information is given).	Well-structured: each section has a clear function and the hierarchy of sections is correct. Most parts of the paper connect well to each other. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate throughout.	Well-structured: each section has a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordering of sections is logical. All parts of the paper connect well to each other. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate throughout.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

C. Writing Style

Competent In Co-Operating And Communicating

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– The English language is of high quality without spelling and grammar mistakes. The language is formal and avoids colloquial language.	The report is characterized by bad readability and academic writing style. Formulations in the text are often incorrect. Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording occurs regularly inhibiting a correct interpretation of the text. Unbalanced use of text, (not useful) graphs, tables, graphs or graphics and appendices in many places.	The report is hard to read and the writing style is not very academic. Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording occurs regularly and wordings can still be improved much. Not all graphs, tables, appendices are useful.	The report is properly readable. An academic style of writing is used. Formulations in the text are predominantly clear and exact. The paper could have been written more consicely. Appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics and appendices.	The report is easy to read and an academic style of writing is used. Formulations in the text are clear and exact. Length and the use of text, tables, graphs and graphics and appendices are appropriate.	The report is characterized by a very good and professional style of writing. Academic conventions with regard to style of writing, lay-out and finishing are followed meticulously. Clever use of tekst, tables, graphs and graphics and appendices, enhancing understanding and adding interest.	The report is characterized by a very good and professional style of writing. Academic conventions with regard to style of writing, lay-out and finishing are followed meticulously. Clever use of tekst, tables, graphs and graphics and appendices, enhancing understanding and adding interest.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Second Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION C REMARKS

First Assessor — Partial Grade

Second Assessor — Partial Grade

D. Process / Work Attitude

Competent In Doing Research / Designing

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Ability to develop and execute a research plan (with supervision). – Ability (with supervision) to identify and analyze problems typical for human-technology interaction from a technological and psychological perspective. – Ability to develop and execute (under supervision) a sound plan for formulating design requirements. – Ability (with supervision) to merge knowledge, methods and concepts of the technological and psychological domains.	Despite all guidance, the student is not able to organize the research. The planning is without any detail (only phasing), not feasible and/or back-up strategies are lacking. Unnecessary work is done due to bad or unchanged planning. Urgencies and importance of aspects are not recognized (despite the supervisor repeatedly addressed them).	Despite all guidance, the student is limited in organizing the research. The planning is with limited detail, not feasible and/or back-up strategies are lacking. Bad or unchanged planning leads to extra work. Urgencies and importance of aspects are not fully recognized.	Needs some guidance to organize the research project according to the planning. The planning is somewhat concrete (contains phases and milestones) and feasible. Back-up strategies are sufficiently thought out. Plan adapted with help of the supervisor. Urgencies and importance of aspects is not always recognized. The supervisor needs to address some priorities.	Needs little guidance to organize the research project according to the planning. The planning is concrete (contains phases and milestones) and feasible. Back-up strategies are adequate. Plan adapted with help of the supervisor. Urgencies and importance of aspects is not always recognized. The supervisor needs to address some priorities.	Individually organizes and manages the research project according to the (adapted) planning and shows own initiative. The planning is concrete and feasible. Updates during the project are processed clearly, back-up strategies are well thought out. Urgencies and importance of aspects are recognized and priorities are set.	Individually organizes and manages the research project according to the (adapted) planning and undertakes action if needed (own initiative, in good cooperation). The planning is concrete (contains milestones and specifications of all activities for each of the phases of the research) and feasible. Updates during the project are processed clearly, back-up strategies are very well thought out. Urgencies and importance of aspects are recognized, priorities are set.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. Process / Work Attitude

Basic Intellectual Skills

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– A reflective attitude, with an ability to critically reflect (with supervision) on own thinking, decision making, and professional behavior. – A critical mindset and the ability to ask constructive questions regarding the basic problems in the field. – Ability to read and write scientific texts and evaluate argumentations. – Ability to think in abstract terms, including the ability to use and modify formal models of basic phenomena and processes in the domain.	Lack of reflection (too minimal and only backward looking) on own thinking, decision making and professional behavior. Viewpoints and interpretations are missing or not supported with arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided. No indication of how the student will use the insights and skills gained.	Limited reflection (too few and mostly backward looking) on own thinking, decision making and professional behavior. Viewpoints and interpretations are sparse or not supported with arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided. Poor indication of how the student will use the insights and skills gained.	General reflection on own thinking, decision making, and professional behavior. Viewpoints and interpretations are supported with arguments. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable. The student has generalized statements regarding how the reflection will direct future actions or beliefs.	Concrete reflection on own thinking, decision making, and professional behavior. Viewpoints and interpretations are well supported with arguments. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable. The student has concrete statements regarding how the reflection will direct future actions or beliefs.	In-depth reflection on own thinking, decision making, and professional behavior, but there is still room for improvement. Viewpoints and interpretations are insightful and mostly supported with arguments. Clear examples are provided, as applicable. The student provides concrete plans for further action or reflection for a specific purpose such as developing skills, improving self-understanding or refining belief systems.	In-depth reflection on own thinking, decision making, and professional behavior. Viewpoints and interpretations are insightful and well supported with arguments. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable. The student provides concrete plans for further action or reflection for a specific purpose such as developing skills, improving self-understanding or refining belief systems.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. Process / Work Attitude

Competent In Co-Operating And Communicating

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Awareness of differences in work practices between scientific disciplines. – Ability to work in (multidisciplinary) teams of engineers and academic peers.	Not punctual for meetings, being often absent or too late or, if present, not (or minimal) prepared and/or participating actively. Unprofessional communication with the supervisor and other parties involved. Does not inform about absence, progress and problems.	Not punctual for meetings, sometimes being absent or too late or, if present, not (or minimal) prepared and/or participating actively. Often unprofessional communication with the supervisor and other parties involved. Often does not inform about absence, progress and problems.	Usually punctual for meetings, sufficiently prepared (agenda and supporting documentation), and mosttimes honoring agreements. Could sometimes participate more actively during meetings/ discussions. Is respectful and clear in communication with the supervisor and other parties involved. Informs about problems.	Mostly punctual for meetings, adequately prepared (agenda and supporting documentation), and honoring agreements. Is respectful and clear in communication with the supervisor and other parties involved. Informs about problems.	Always punctual for meetings, well prepared (detailed agenda, supporting documentation, creates minutes of the meeting, follows up the agreed actions) and always honoring agreements. Informs in a professional, pro-active and constructive way. The collaboration with all of the involved was defined by its pleasant and practical nature and regularly featured substantive discussion.	Always punctual for meetings, very-well prepared (detailed agenda, supporting documentation, creates detailed minutes of the meeting, follows up the agreed actions) and always honoring agreements. Informs in a professional, pro-active and constructive way. The collaboration with all of the involved was defined by its pleasant and practical nature and regularly featured substantive discussion of a high degree.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. Process / Work Attitude

Competent In Co-Operating And Communicating

	1-4	5	6	7	8	9-10
– Societal and ethical impacts are clearly described. – Discussion reflects understanding of the different roles of engineers and related professionals in society.	No or unsupported recommendations.	Recommendations are too limited and/ or the presented recommendations do not logically follow from results.	Recommendations follow from results, but are superficial.	Recommendations are clear and follow logically from results. Recommendations are superficailly linked to the scientific debates. The implications for stakeholders are mentioned in the conclusion.	Clear, well-formulated, and advanced recommendations for stakeholders. Recommendations follow logically from results. Recommendations are linked to the scientific debates.	Recommendations for stakeholders are well-formulated, advanced and original. Recommendations follow logically from results. Recommendations are linked to the scientific debates in the field of HTI.
First Assessor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION D REMARKS

First Assessor

Partial Grade

E. Skills

Planning&Organizing

	POOR	SUFFICIENT	GOOD
Planning and organizing the research	Despite all guidance, is the student not able to organize the research. The planning is without any detail (only phasing), not feasible and/or back-up strategies are lacking. Unnecessary work is done due to bad or unchanged planning. Urgencies and importance of aspects is not recognized (despite the supervisor repeatedly addressed them).	Needs some guidance to organize the research project according to the planning. The planning is somewhat concrete (contains phases and milestones) and feasible. Back-up strategies are sufficiently thought out. Plan adapted with help of the supervisor. Urgencies and importance of aspects is not always recognized. The supervisor needs to address some priorities.	Individually organizes and manages the research project according to the (adapted) planning and undertakes action if needed (own initiative, in good cooperation). The planning is concrete (contains milestones and specifications of all activities for each of the phases of the research) and feasible. Updates during the project are processed clearly, back-up strategies are very well thought out. Urgencies and importance of aspects are recognized, priorities are set.
	☐	☐	◉

Grade PRV Planning (PO, SUF, GO)	Explanation (obligatory)

E. Skills

Writing Skills

	POOR	SUFFICIENT	GOOD
Quality of the message / Line of reasoning	No line of reasoning or rudimentary argumentative structure. Ideas are unconnected. Claims are repeated rather than developed. Few objections are addressed and maybe misrepresented. Claims are not or rarely supported by reliable evidence from credible sources, making the report unconvincing.	Argumentative structure is evident and satisfactory. Objections are taken seriously and typically addressed fair-minded. Claims are regularly supported by valid, reliable evidence from credible sources, making the report for the most part convincing.	Reader can easily follow the line of reasoning. Argumentative structure is clearly evident. Objections are taken seriously and addressed in a fair-minded way with great skill. Claims are supported by reliable, valid evidence from credible sources and effectively synthesized in a very convincing manner.
	☐	☐	☐
Structure	The report is badly structured. Main structure is incorrect and/or placement of material in different chapters is illogical in many places. Chapters are separate entities and are not connected to each other. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information is given).	The main structure is correct, but lower level hierarchy of sections is not always logical in places. Most sections have a clear and unique function. The connection of parts could be improved. Level of detail is inappropriate in a number of places (irrelevant information is given).	Well-structured: each section has a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordening of sections is logical. Parts of the paper connect well to each other. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate throughout the report.
	◉	☐	☐
Readability	The report is characterized by bad readability and academic writing style. Formulations in the text are often incorrect. Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording occurs regularly inhibiting a correct interpretation of the text. Unbalanced use of text, (not useful) graphs, tables, graphs or graphics and appendices in many places.	The report is properly readable. An academic style of writing is used. Formulations in the text are predominantly clear and exact. The paper could have been written more concisely. Appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics and appendices.	Well-structured: each section has a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordening of sections is logical. Parts of the paper connect well to each other. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate throughout the report.
	☐	☐	☐

E. Skills

Writing Skills

	POOR	SUFFICIENT	GOOD
Grammar/spelling	Grammar (word order, verb tenses) vocabulary (correct choice of words, no repetitive words) and textual mechanics (spelling, punctuation, capitalization) errors so numerous that they make the paper almost impossible to understand (seriously distract the reader and impede meaning). English incorrect and very hard to read.	Grammar, vocabulary and/or textual mechanical errors present, but at acceptable quantities and not seriously impeding the reader. English basically correct and readable.	Excellent grammar, vocabulary and textual mechanics (very few or no errors). English fluent and pleasant to read.
	☐	☐	☐
Referencing	The student is often inconsistent in references in the text and/or reference list, or often references are lacking.	The student is sometimes inconsistent in references in the text and/or reference list, or a few times references are lacking.	The student uses one format for references in the text and the reference list. The reference list is complete. There are no mistakes.
	☐	☐	☐
Layout	The title page and/or table of content are lacking or incomplete. Headings are missing, inconsistent or unclear. Tables and figures are incomplete.	The title page and table of content are incomplete. Headings are inconsistent or unclear. Tables and figures are incomplete.	A title page, table of content, clear and consistent headings and complete tables and figures are included.
	☐	☐	☐
Tailored to target group (academic layman level)	The report is not tailored to the target group (academic layman level).	Parts of the report are not tailored to the target group (academic layman level).	The report is tailored to the target group (academic layman level).
	☐	☐	☐

Grade PRV Writing Skills (PO, SUF, GO)	Explanation (obligatory)