Assessment plan for the curriculum of the Master's Track Science Business and Policy, 2026-2027

Track director: dr. Saskia Grooters
Date advice Board of Examiners: 21 April 2026
Submission date Faculty Board:

Introduction

This assessment plan is a systematic description of the testing and assessment modes for all study components in the curriculum of the Master's track *Science, Business and Policy* that is part of the following master degree programmes:

- MSc Artificial Intelligence
- MSc Astronomy
- MSc Biomedical Sciences
- MSc Biology
- MSc Chemical Engineering
- MSc Chemistry
- MSc Computational Cognitive Science
- MSc Computing Science
- MSc Energy and Environmental Sciences
- MSc Marine Biology
- MSc Mathematics
- MSc Medical Pharmaceutical Sciences
- MSc Physics

The plan is based on the assessment policy of the Faculty of Science and Engineering, as set out in the FSE Quality Assurance Manual and the protocol setting out the duties and powers of the Faculty's Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners EES/SEC is responsible for the control of the execution of the assessment policy of the Track Science Business and Policy on matters that concern all students, see Faculty Regulations.

Note: In this assessment plan, there is a distinction between the Track SBP and the SBP curriculum (Table 1):

1. The **track** Science Business and Policy comprises the two-year master degree programme (60 ECTS domain specific curriculum plus 60 ECTS SBP curriculum).
2. The Science Business and Policy **curriculum** comprises the two SBP courses and SBP Work Placement (total of 60 ECTS)

Table 1: Overview of the track Science, Business and Policy. The domain specific elements are planned in consultation with the degree programme, the SBP specific elements are scheduled in the second year of the track. Domain specific research skills are entry requirement for the SBP Work Placement.

Track Science Business and Policy	
Year 1	Degree programme domain specific elements: Including Research Skills*
Year 2	**SBP curriculum:** • Introduction Science and Business (10 ECTS) • Introduction Science and Policy (10 ECTS) • Work Placement (40 ECTS)

* Usually, a research project of 30-40 ECTs or another defined part of the research skills training, as specified in the Master degree programme's Teaching and Examination Regulations appendices.

The assessment plan for the track Science Business and Policy consists of the following parts:

1. the vision on assessment of the Track Science Business and Policy
2. the assessment guidelines of the Track Science Business and Policy
3. the learning outcomes of the Track Science Business and Policy
4. descriptions of the study components, as set out in the appendices to the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2026-2027 of the degree programmes offering the track
5. descriptions of the content of each study component in Ocasys, the online course catalogue. The following elements are relevant in this context:
    - objectives
    - description of content
    - lecturers
    - assessment mode(s) and calculation of final mark
    - mode(s) of instruction.
6. an overview of the examiners and a detailed assessment mode for each study component as set out in the appendices to the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2026-2027.
7. the relationship between the study components and the detailed learning outcomes for each competence area.
8. the method of regular evaluation

Parts 4 and 5 are not included in this document. For the descriptions of the study components, see the Appendices to the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2026-2027 for the degree programme in which the Science, Business and Policy-tracks is offered. Descriptions of the content of each study component can be found in Ocasys, the online course catalogue (https://www.rug.nl/ocasys).

1. Vision on assessment

The key aim of the SBP track **is to offer students a distinct career perspective of applying their scientific expertise** - most notably in business and policy - rather than pursuing a traditional academic research career. Students acquire an in-depth base of scientific knowledge and skills through the disciplinary part of their Master's programme, e.g., Mathematics. By following the SBP-track, students are equipped with the skills to - on this scientific base - apply their expertise by providing science advice, by contributing to policy and governance, and by designing solutions for challenges in a variety of organisations, both governmental and non-governmental and companies.

Vision: the assessment is based on the following principles:

1. Assessment should aim on assessing and covering the SBP learning goals, that are focused on professional preparation;
2. The modes of assessment should be transparent to both teachers and students and match the nature of the course unit; (written exams, reports, oral presentation, field work);
3. The assessment of assignments and individual education includes extensive feedback, to help the students reflect on their performance and work on specific points that require improvement;
4. The various academic skills should be assessed;

2. Assessment guidelines

Guidelines for assessment quality:

1. Graded assignments have criteria in the form of Rubrics, which are available at the start of the course and used in providing feedback. Rubrics are designed in collaboration with the PIE team and calibrated with the SBP team.
2. The four-eyes principle applies for grading course assignments
3. For grading, the Work Placement two SBP examiners determine the grade using the input of the work place instructor and the assessment of the scientific content by the examiner of the degree programme. Students that fail the scientific part fail the Work Placement.
4. If a student does not pass a course unit, remedial work can be done, which is to be handed in at a date given in the Teaching and Examination Rules (TER). In general, reworking the work handed in will lead to a maximum grade of 6 because of the additional feedback received. For higher marks, a new assignment (i.e., on a new topic) needs to be produced. This assures a fair and level playing field in which students have similar chances and have to work within the same constraints (e.g., deadlines, access to support).

3. Learning outcomes of the degree programme

The learning outcomes of the track Science Business and Policy adhere to the objectives for the Graduates of the Science, Business and Policy track[1]:

	Learning Outcomes At the end of the programme,
1	Getting acquainted with other fields of knowledge • Graduates are able to write an independent advice with concepts from business administration, innovation management, public administration, policy sciences, and Science and Technology studies.
2	Personal development • Graduates are able to show leadership that fits their personality and the needs of the group. • Graduates will have the skills to do project work in a group and alone. • Graduates have insight in their own strengths and challenges.
3	Bridging fields of knowledge • Graduates are able to understand and to handle (business and policy) perspectives of others. • Graduates are able to create synergy from multiple domains.
4	Applying in social context • Graduates are able to judge their own discipline critically and in context to other disciplines and society. • Graduates are able to find a balance between the individual interest and the group interest. • Graduates are able to act as a science adviser in an ethical way. • Graduates know how to implement innovations in a sustainable way.
5	Effective communication • Graduates are able to communicate in an effective way to target groups. • Graduates are able to evaluate their advice so that it is implementable.
6	Overall Science advising

[1] S. Grooters, E.L. Zaal, and M. P. Gerkema (2021). Science, Business, and Policy: A long-term reflection on multidisciplinary work-based learning in a master's track for societal integration of science. Tuning Journal for Higher Education Volume 8(2) 119-164, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18543/tjhe-8(2)-2021pp119-164.

	• Graduates will be able to consider their role(s) in science advising critically.

The learning outcomes of the Track Science Business and Policy are at level 7 of the Netherlands Qualification Framework (NLQF) outcomes for Master degree programmes (see Table 2). The only learning outcome that is not covered in the SBP curriculum is: 'Successfully completes, independently, fundamental research based on methodological knowledge'. This research learning outcome is achieved within the research skills training part of the programme, as mentioned previously (Table 1).

Table 2. Relation between the learning outcomes of the curriculum Science Business and Policy and the Netherlands Qualification Framework (NLQF) learning outcomes for Master degree programmes (level 7). The learning outcomes of level 7-degree programmes fall within the context of 'an unknown, changeable living and or working environment with a high degree of uncertainty, also international' [2]. The NLQF learning outcomes are compared to the previously used Dublin descriptors in the second column.

NLQF learning outcome	Previous Dublin descriptor	The graduate:	SBP outcomes
1. Knowledge	Knowledge and understanding	Possesses particular specialised and advanced knowledge of an occupation, knowledge domain and or field of science and at the interface between the different occupations, knowledge domains and or fields of science.	1,3
		Possesses a critical understanding of a range of theories, principles and concepts, including the most important ones of an occupation, knowledge domain and or field of science.	3
		Possesses extensive, detailed knowledge and critical understanding of some important current issues, topics and specialties related to an occupation, knowledge domain and or field of science.	1
2. Applying knowledge	Applying knowledge and understanding/ Making judgements	Reproduces, analyses, integrates and applies professional and scientific knowledge in a range of contexts, and uses it to handle complex matters. This knowledge is the basis of original ideas and research.	1
		Uses the acquired knowledge at a higher level of abstraction. Thinks conceptually. Develops and deepens arguments.	1
		Successfully completes, independently, fundamental research based on methodological knowledge.	
		Provides an original contribution to the development and application of ideas, often in the context of research.	2,3,4
		Recognises the limitations of own knowledge and or of existing knowledge in professional practice, in the knowledge domain and or at the interface of different professions and or knowledge domains and takes action to address this.	2,6
		Evaluates and carries out complex professional or scientific tasks.	1,2,4,6

[2] According to the learning outcomes of the *NLQF qualifications*

3. Problem-solving skills	Applying knowledge and understanding/ Making judgements	Identifies and analyses unpredictable complex problems in professional practice and or in the knowledge domain and solves these problems in a tactical, strategic and creative way.	1,2,3,4,5,6
		Contributes to a (scientific) solution of complex problems in professional practice and or in the knowledge domain by identifying and using data.	3,4,6
4. Learning and development skills	Learning skills	Realises personal development, mostly autonomous and based on intrinsic motivation.	2,6
5. Information skills	Communication skills	Critically collects and analyses in responsible way broad, in-depth and detailed scientific information on a range of theories, principles and concepts of and related to a professional and or knowledge domain as well as information on some important current subjects and specialties related to an occupation and or knowledge domain and presents this information in a scientific way.	*1,3,4,5*
6. Communication skills	Communication skills	Communicates in a targeted way with peers, colleagues, supervisors and or relevant other, specialists and nonspecialists, supervisors and clients, appropriately to the scientific and professional community, using conventions which are relevant.	5
		Adjusts communication to the objective and the target group.	3,5
7. Responsibility and independence	Making judgements	Works with peers, colleagues, specialists and non-specialists, supervisors and or relevant other, in an unknown but changeable living and or working environment with a high degree of uncertainty, also international.	*2*
		Carries responsibility for the results of own activities, work and or study and for the work results of others.	2,5
		Carries responsibility for the management of unpredictable processes and professional development of people and groups.	2,3,5
		Formulates opinions based on incomplete and or limited information, taking into account social, scientific and ethical responsibilities related to the application of own knowledge and opinions.	1,2,3,4,5,6

6. Overview of assessment methods, test moments for course units, and examiners

The assessment of the degree domain specific elements of the degree programmes that offer the Science Business and Policy track is described in the assessment plans of the degree programmes. The SBP curriculum elements are assessed by SBP examiners in the case of the two courses. The SBP Work Placement is defined in consultation with an examiner of the degree programme who is also responsible for the guidance and assessment of the scientific part of the Work Placement. If the student does not pass the scientific part of the assignment -as judged by the examiner of the degree programme- the student fails the Work Placement (see assessment form including Rubric appendix 1).

Examiners with a specific role within the SBP curriculum are appointed by the Board of Examiners EES/SEC applying the rules of the faculty for such appointments. The list of examiners for the Science Business and Policy track is:

- dr. S. Grooters
- dr. M. van Rijssel
- M.J. van den Nieuwenhof-Schilstra MSc
- J. Zevenberg MSc
- dr. M.K. de Boer
- dr. J. Krooneman
- dr. J.C. Graver
- drs. M.R. Berger
- dr. G.A.H. Laugs
- N. Alberts-Visscher MSc
- drs. M.K. van Genne
- P.C. Vogelaar MSc
- drs. M.D.D. Westerhof

Table 3. Overview of the course elements in the curriculum Science Business and Policy
** Formal First examiner, ** Formal Second examiner*
**** Written Exam (WE), Report (R), Presentation (P), Assignment (AST)*

Course	**ECTS**	**Assessment methods*** **	**Does (part of the) assessment have a formative function?**	**Test moment(s)** (E.g., mid-term, continuous assessment, exam week, etc.)	**First examiner* Second examiner****
Introduction Science and Business	10	R, WE, P, AST	Yes	WE, after 3 weeks R end after 7 weeks P, AST at the end	dr. S. Grooters* M.J. van den Nieuwenhof-Schilstra MSc **
Introduction Science and Policy	10	R, WE, P, AST	Yes	WE, after 3 weeks R end after 7 weeks P, AST at the end	dr. S. Grooters* J. Zevenberg MSc **
Work Placement Business and Policy	40	R, P, AST	Yes	R, P, AST at the end, see also Table 4 for all (formative) assessments	dr. S. Grooters* dr. M. van Rijssel* M.J. van den Nieuwenhof-Schilstra MSc* J. Zevenberg MSc* dr. M.K. de Boer* dr. J. Krooneman* dr. J.C. Graver* drs. M.R. Berger* dr. G.A.H. Laugs * N. Alberts-Visscher, MSc* drs. M.K. van Genne* P.C. Vogelaar MSc* drs. M.D.D. Westerhof*

Table 4: Involvement of supervisors in assessment SBP Work Placements at the different assessment moments. # refer to criteria of the Rubric used for assessment (appendix 1).

Assessment moment	Science Supervisor Examiner Degree Programme	Workplace Supervisor	SBP Tutor 1st SBP Examiner	2nd SBP Examiner
December: **Assignment** (contract)	Go/no Go	Go/no Go	Go/ no Go	
January: **Plan of Action**	Formative Pass/Fail (Go/no Go)	Formative Pass/Fail (Go/no Go)	Formative Pass/Fail (Go/no Go)	only if no Go
April: Mid-term week **Performance** **Mid-term report**	Formative	Formative Formative	Formative Formative	
June: **Personal Portfolio** **Concept report**	Formative	Formative	Formative	Pass/Fail
July: Conference **Presentation** **Report**	Pass/Fail Input: overall Assessment #3: Fail = overall Fail	Input: overall especially # 5A+B: Fail = overall Fail	Pass/Fail Assessment overall	Assessment report

7. Relationship between course units and details of the learning outcomes

The learning outcomes of the track Science Business and Policy adhere to the overall learning outcomes of the degree programmes with emphasis on the application of the disciplinary knowledge and skills. To make sure that the research outcomes of the degree programme can be met, research skills training within the degree programme (usually a research project (30-40 ECTS)) is an entry requirement for the Work Placement so the focus can be on the application of science.
In addition to that, an examiner of the degree programme is involved in the Work Placement to guide and guard the scientific part of the Work Placements in Science Business and Policy (see Table 4).

Most of the learning outcomes of the curriculum Science Business and Policy are explicitly assessed in the assignments of the three SBP-specific elements (Introduction Science and Business, Introduction Science and Policy, Work Placement). The complexity of the assignments increases from the first course to the second course and the Work Placement which makes it possible to use the same Rubric for assessment of most of the learning outcomes.
In addition to the Rubric, the acquaintance with the fields of Business and Policy (learning outcome 1) is tested in the two courses with a written exam. Furthermore, both the Presentation and the Personal portfolio need to be a pass to be able to pass the Work Placement to cover all learning goals at the end of the curriculum (see assessment moments in Table 4).

For the relation between the learning outcomes of the Track Science Business and Policy and the SBP Rubric that is used for assessment of the assignments in the two SBP courses and the Work Placement see appendix 2.

8. Regular evaluation

The Board of Examiners EES/SEC is responsible for the control of the execution of the assessment policy of the Track Science Business and Policy on matters that concern all students, see Faculty Regulations. The Programme Committee Biomedical Science oversees the quality of the SBP curriculum. The curriculum of the track Science Business and Policy adheres to visitation cycle of the life science programmes. The last report of this evaluation can be found here. The next visitation is due to take place in 2027.
Evaluation of the assessment of the SBP course elements will be executed by the BoE EES/SEC and shared in the BEM, evaluation of the assessment of the Work Placements will be executed in consultation with the BoE involved.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Assessment form Work Placement including Rubric
- Appendix 2 Relation between the learning outcomes of the curriculum Science Business and Policy and the SBP Rubric

Appendix 1 Assessment form

Master track Science, Business and Policy

university of groningen / faculty of science and engineering

Assessment form for:

To be jointly filled in and agreed on by first and second examiner

Student information

Student name(s)	
Student number[1]	
Programme[1]	
Workplace/Project client	
Title Project	
Date of submission	(enter date)
Name 1st examiner (SBP staff)	
Name 2nd examiner (SBP staff)	
Name science supervisor[1] (FSE staff)	
Name work place supervisor[1] (guest, external)	

[1]*only fill in for work placement*

Grade[2]:

–

[2]*For the work placement, the grade is rounded to the nearest 0.5.*

Passing requirements fulfilled:

- ☐ Personal Portfolio is completed
- ☐ Plagiarism scan is satisfactory
- ☐ Report is uploaded in repository[1]

Signature 1st examiner:

Date of grading: (enter date)

Signature 2nd examiner:

Date of grading: (enter date)

SBP Grading Rubric

Instruction for graders:
- Select a box only if criteria from lower grade are met. If student is between two grades, tick two boxes (resulting in 0.5 grade).
- When a grade lower than five is appropriate, please select grade from the dropdown list in the <5 column.
- Add a short justification of the grade for each criterion in the column 'Grade justification'.

Authors:
Drs. S. Grooters, M.J. van den Nieuwenhof-Schilstra, MSc

Unrounded grade: -

		Version: 05 September 2024 Criteria	<5	*Remember* 5: fail	*Understand* 6: satisfactory	*Apply* 7: good	*Analyse* 8: very good	*Evaluate* 9: excellent	*Create* 10: outstanding			Grade justification
1	A	**Report:** - Language use - Structure - Layout & design		The report is ill-written with many errors in structure, language and layout. ☐	The report is understable in general. However, a detailed look shows unclarities and errors. Colloquial, yet basic structure is present. ☐	The report is easy to read, clear question and conclusion. Contains a basic executive summary. A basic structure is present. Would still benefit from some final editing. ☐	The report is a clear and has a logical and fluent structure. It includes fully explained graphs and tables, and a clear and concise executive summary. Language-use and layout are professional. ☐	The report makes an additional impression (e.g. clear figures, excellently guided read). The report shows creativity and does not include any superfluous content and is flawless with regards to its level of English/Dutch. ☐	Totally blown away by the outstanding quality of the report. ☐	-	-	
	B	**Approach:** - Research questions - Choice of methods - Societal relevance		The research questions are present, but unclear. The student uses core concepts, but they are vague, incomplete or not correctly applied to the project. Societal relevance is absent or unclear. ☐	The research questions present. The student uses core-concepts, but sometimes incorrectly, superficially, or improperly linked to research questions. Societal relevance is described on a basic level. ☐	The research questions are clear and the student applies relevant core-concepts to answer the research questions. Societal relevance is considered and appropriately integrated into the project. ☐	The research questions are clear and logical and the student extensively analyses the project, by making use of well considered core-concepts. Societal relevance is thoroughly explored and linked to the project. ☐	The research questions are clear and innovative and the student can solve an innovation project, by making creative use of new theoretical concepts (either developed by him/herself or from other sources). . Societal relevance is highly integrated into the project. ☐	Totally blown away by the quality of the approach. ☐	-		
2	A	**Scientific Depth & Quality** - Wikipedia vs. Harvard -Quality of literature		The report contains information from irrelevant fields or essential information is incomplete. References are frequently incomplete. ☐	The report contains information from relevant knowledge-domains, but is superficial at times or contains some irrelevant sources. References are sometimes incomplete. ☐	The report contains relevant information with sufficient depth in order to act as the foundation of the innovation-advice. Well referenced. ☐	The report contains a critical analysis of relevant information. The choices of methods used for the analysis are clear and underpinned. Reference for both pro and contra are thorough and relevant. ☐	The report contains a critical analysis of the whole field with minimal redundancies. ☐	Totally blown away by the scientific depth and quality. ☐	-	-	
	B	**Scientific Relevance** - Novelty science - Scientific argumentation		The scientific review is insufficient. The scientific argumentation of the project is unclear or not fitting. ☐	A scientific review is present, but it is at times superficial or contains irrelevant information. ☐	A scientific review is present. And the scientific knowledge is applied to the argumentation within the project. ☐	A critical scientific review is present and extensively applied to the argumentation of the project. ☐	The scientific field is valorised from multiple points of view. The student is able to design new ideas for the valorisation of scientific knowledge. ☐	Totally blown away by the scientific relevance, novelty and argumentation. ☐	-		
3	A	**Internal analysis:** - Organisational awareness - Resources & capabilities - Ambition, strategy & culture		An internal analysis of the client's organisation is lacking or does not supercede the level of merely repeating general information about the organisation. ☐	An internal analysis of the client's organisation is present, but is very superficial, contains irrelevant information or is not properly linked to the goal of the project. The student identifies capabilities and resources. ☐	The internal analysis of the organisation contains mostly information which is relevant to the project goal, but is at times a bit obvious. The student has a clear insight in capabilities and resources. ☐	The internal analysis of the organisation contains only information that is relevant to the project goal. The student can adequately assess the organisations capabilities and resources, and link this to strategic considerations. ☐	The internal analysis includes a critical review of the client's organisation. The argumentation is optimally alligned to the organisation's strategy and shows creative elements. ☐	Totally blown away by the analysis of the internal environment of the organisation. ☐	-	-	
	B	**External analysis:** - Business/Policy context - Market/Policy landscape - Stakeholder power/influence		An analysis of the external environment of the organisation is lacking or does not supercede the level of merely stating general information. ☐	An analysis of the external environment is present, but is very superficial contains irrelevant information or is not properly linked to the goal of the project. The student identifies relevant external context of the project. ☐	The analysis of the external environment of the organisation contains mostly information which is relevant to the project goal, but is at times a bit obvious. The student has a clear insight in the external context of the project. ☐	The analysis of the external environment contains only information that is relevant to the project goal. The student can adequately assess the project's external context and link this to strategic considerations. ☐	The external analysis includes a critical review of the external environment of the client's organisation. The argumentation is optimally alligned to the organisation's strategy and shows creative elements. ☐	Totally blown away by the analysis of the external environment of the organisation. ☐	-		

SBP Grading Rubric

Instruction for graders:
- Select a box only if criteria from lower grade are met. If student is between two grades, tick two boxes (resulting in 0.5 grade).
- When a grade lower than five is appropriate, please select grade from the dropdown list in the <5 column.
- Add a short justification of the grade for each criterion in the column 'Grade justification'.

Authors:
Drs. S. Grooters, M.J. van den Nieuwenhof-Schilstra, MSc

Unrounded grade: -

		Version: 05 September 2024 Criteria	<5	*Remember* 5: fail	*Understand* 6: satisfactory	*Apply* 7: good	*Analyse* 8: very good	*Evaluate* 9: excellent	*Create* 10: outstanding			Grade justification
4	A	**Integration** **- Connection Science & Business/Policy (i.e. knowledge domains)** **- Strategic implications**		The report contains information from different knowledge domains, however integration is missing. Strategic implications are missing, irrelevant, or unclear. ☐	The report contains information from different knowledge domains, but the integration is incomplete. Strategic implications are basic. ☐	The report contains an integration of information from different knowledge domains. Strategic implications are present and generally well-explained. ☐	The report contains an integration in which the essence/worth of the information is explained clearly and logically. Strategic implications are thoroughly considered and connected to the project goals. ☐	The report contains a clear integration which leads to new insights based on a logical analysis. Strategic implications are highly relevant, very creative, and drive innovative ideas. ☐	Totally blown away by the integration of science and business/policy. ☐	-	-	
	B	**Conclusion & Advice** **- Conclusion & discussion** **- Feasibility & implementation** **- Societal implications**		Conclusions are unclear or unsupported. Advice and discussion are missing, unrealistic or link with conclusion is absent. Societal implications are not considered. ☐	Conclusions and discussion are provided but may lack depth or clarity. Advice is not logically derived from conclusions. Feasibility and implementation are addressed, but details are sparse. Societal implications are mentioned superficially. ☐	The conclusions and discussion are clear. Advice is derived from conclusions and feasible. Implementation is practical and grounded in the project' s findings. Societal implications are considered and relevant. ☐	Conclusions are well-supported, very well discussed and logically lead to realistic advice, with clear, practical implementation plans. Societal implications are explored in depth. ☐	The conclusions offer innovative and creative advice. Discussion is critcal and comprehensive. Implementation plans are detailed and strategic, with significant consideration of societal impacts. ☐	Totally blown away by the conclusion, discussion and advice. ☐	-		
5	A	**Project Management:** **- Stakeholder management** **- Communication** **- Planning**		The student fails to manage the project, lacks communication skills, cannot maintain a project timeline or manage stakeholders. ☐	The student can manage their project on a basic level, but occasionaly needs redirection from supervisors. The student reports to project stakeholders, or is mainly reactive in communication. ☐	The student demonstrates clear control over the project and communicates effectively with stakeholders. Planning is generally well-executed. ☐	The student manages the project smoothly, communicates proactively, and handles stakeholder relations effectively. Planning is comprehensive and well thought out. ☐	The student creatively anticipates challenges and adjusts project plans accordingly. Communication is strategic and proactive, with excellent stakeholder engagement. ☐	Totally blown away in all aspects of project management. ☐	-	-	
	B	**Professional consultancy** **- Integrity** **- Employeeship** **- Added value of advice for client**		The student shows unprofessional behavior or lacks integrity. Their advice is irrelevant, impractical or is of no added value to the client. ☐	The student adapts to a professional environment but needs significant supervision. The advice is somewhat relevant on a basic level and contains elements that are of value to the client. ☐	The student demonstrates appropriate professional behavior and functions well in a team. Their advice is useful and well-targeted. ☐	The student is a valued member of the team, consistently demonstrating professionalism. Their advice is well-founded and valuable to the client. ☐	The student excels in collaboration, with professional integrity, creativity and thoughtful, strategic advice that greatly benefits the client. ☐	Totally blown away by the professional behaviour of the student. ☐	-		

Average before rounding: -

Disclaimer:
- This rubric is filled in by the SBP-staff. All rubrics are filled in by minimum of two SBP examiners.

- For SBP work placements, the grades for criteria 2 A&B are based on input of the science supervisor (examiner of disciplinary program), The grade for criteria 5 B is based on input from the work placement provider (client).

- A pass is given when total score is ≥5,5 as well as for all 5 individual criteria (for each color: criteria (A+B)/2 ≥5.5)

- For projects in the Introduction to Science and Business/Policy courses: read 'student' as 'students'. SBP examiners grade all criteria,

Overall feedback:

Please enter overall feedback here.

Appendix 2. Relation between the learning outcomes of the Track Science Business and Policy and the SBP Rubric.

SBP learning outcomes	Criterium SBP Rubric	
1. Acquainted with other fields of knowledge	3A. Internal analysis:	Organizational awareness Resources & capabilities Ambition, strategy & culture
	3B. External analysis:	Business/Policy context Market/Policy landscape Stakeholder power/influence
2. Personal development	5A. Project management:	Stakeholder management Communication Planning
3. Bridging fields of knowledge	4A. Advice:	Conclusion & discussion Feasibility & implementation Societal implications
4. Applying in social context	1B. Approach:	Research questions Choice of methods Societal relevance Scientific Depth & Quality
	2A. Scientific Depth & Quality:	Wikipedia vs. Harvard Quality of literature
	2B. Scientific Relevance:	Novelty science Scientific argumentation
5. Effective communication	1A. Report:	Language use Structure Layout & design
	5B. Professional consultancy:	Integrity Employee ship Added value of advice for client
6. Overall Science advising	4B. Advice:	Conclusion & discussion Feasibility & implementation Societal implications