

Supporting Rubric Topmaster Nanoscience

Why these rubrics?

- Rubrics are aimed at making the assessment of student project more transparent, explicit and uniform.
- Rubrics can help in providing constructive feedback to students.
- Rubrics help students understand what is expected and what is meant by excellence.

Notes for supervisors:

- The rubric should not replace worded feedback helping the student to understand what aspects can be improved and how.
- The rubric should also be used for the midterm. Use it for supporting feedback and for making clear how things can be improved.

1. Research contents and scientific quality (50%)

a. Analysis of research question and problem formulation – question and formulation are clear

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student is not able to formulate the research question or formulate the problem.	Student is able to formulate a rudimentary research question and formulate the problem.	Student is able to formulate a research question and goal, but needs significant help to focus it and relate it to the performed research.	Student is able to formulate a research question and goal, and needs minor help to focus it and relate it to the performed research.	Student is able to formulate a clear research question and goal, and can relate it to the performed research.	Student is able to formulate a clear research question and goal, and can connect it with the performed research and place the goal in perspective.	Student is able to formulate a clear research question and goal, and can clearly connect it with the performed research and place the goal in an interdisciplinary perspective.

b. Literature research – is comprehensive

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student is not able to find literature on their own and assess the relevance to the project.	Student is able to find some literature, but needs significant help and cannot to assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to find literature, but needs some help to assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to find literature and needs only minor help to assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to find literature, assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to find literature, assess its relevance, quality, and meaning.	Student is able to find literature, assess its relevance, quality, and meaning. Literature includes both references relevant to the specific project and the broader context.

Research contents and scientific quality (50%)

c. Solution strategy (approach, methods, techniques) – is time-efficiently, clear relation to question

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Even basic tasks (e.g. simple derivations or measurements) are beyond the student's capabilities.	Tasks beyond the most basic ones (e.g. simple derivations or measurements) are beyond the student's capabilities.	Able to execute basic experiments / calculations / analysis with help from supervisor.	Able to execute basic experiments / calculations / analysis with only minor help from supervisor.	Able to execute moderately demanding experiments / calculations / analysis.	Show a great deal of independence in executing demanding experiments / calculations / analysis.	Hands-on skills are comparable to that of a proficient PhD student. Shows a real talent for lab work, coding, analytical derivations.

d. Quality, reliability and relevance of the results – results are analyzed well

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Results are unreliable, not usable. No indication of uncertainties, significant digits.	Some results are reliable/usable, but most cannot be trusted. Uncertainties, significant digits indicated but not fully correct.	Results are solid, can serve as the basis for further work. Uncertainties clearly indicated and correct.	Results are solid, can serve as the basis for further work. Uncertainties clearly indicated and correct.	Results are solid, and could be a modest addition to a publication. Uncertainties clearly indicated and correct.	Results can make a minor contribution to a scientific publication. Uncertainties clearly indicated and correct.	Results can make a significant contribution to a scientific publication. Uncertainties clearly indicated and correct.

Research contents and scientific quality (50%)

e. Interpretation of results – is thorough

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Unable to interpret results.	Unable to interpret results without significant help from supervisor.	Able to interpret results with substantial help from supervisor.	Able to interpret results with some help from supervisor.	Able to interpret results with minor help from supervisor.	Almost perfect and independent interpretation of results.	Maximum and fully independent interpretation of results.

f. Evaluation/discussion of results – strengths and weaknesses are identified

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Unable to evaluate the strength and weaknesses of results. The student cannot distinguish between main and secondary issues.	Unable to evaluate the strength and weaknesses of results without significant help from supervisor. Cannot distinguish between main and secondary issues.	Able to evaluate the strength and weaknesses of results with substantial help from supervisor. Can distinguish between main and secondary issues with significant help.	Able to evaluate the strength and weaknesses of results with some help from supervisor. Can distinguish between main and secondary issues with some help.	Able to evaluate the strength and weaknesses of results with minor help from supervisor. Can distinguish between main and secondary issues without help.	Almost perfect and independent discussion of the strength and weaknesses of results. Can clearly distinguish between main and secondary issues without help.	Maximum and fully independent discussion of the strength and weaknesses of results. Can distinguish fully between main and secondary issues without help.

Research contents and scientific quality (50%)

Formulated conclusions or realized design – conclusions respond accurately to question/formulation

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Unable to arrive at valid conclusions or working design.	Unable to arrive at valid conclusions or working design.	Hardly able to arrive at conclusions or working design. Important conclusions missing or some invalid conclusions still present.	Able to arrive at conclusions or working design with some help from supervisor.	Able to arrive at valid conclusions or working design with minor help from supervisor. All conclusions present are valid.	Almost perfect and formulation of conclusions or working design, all conclusions supported, little room for additional conclusions.	Maximum and fully independent formulation of conclusions or construction of working design, all conclusions supported, no room for additional conclusions.

Scientific depth and use of theoretical knowledge during the work – uses sufficient theoretical background

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student is not able to present the theoretical background of relevance to the project.	Student need significant help to present the theoretical background of relevance to the project and explain it's meaning.	Student is able to present the theoretical background, but needs significant help to assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to present the theoretical background and needs only minor help to assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to explain the theoretical background, assess its relevance and meaning.	Student is able to explain the theoretical background , assess its relevance, quality, and meaning.	Student is able to explain the theoretical background , assess its relevance, quality, meaning and limitations.

Research contents and scientific quality (50%)

Quality of lab journal and other documentation of research – log provides good insight into performed experiments and raw data are well ordered

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
The lab book / code / derivations are poorly registered hindering re-use.	Documentation of lab book/ code/ derivation is incomplete.	Documentation of lab book/ code/ derivation allows for reconstruction of the work process, and support reproducibility in most cases.	Documentation of lab book/ code/ derivation allows for reconstruction of the work process, and support reproducibility.	Documentation of lab book/ code/ derivation is well organized to allow reconstruction and reproduction of the work.	Documentation of lab book/code/ derivation is well organized and allow for reconstruction and reproduction of all aspects of the work.	Documentation of lab book/ code/ derivations is optimized for reliable reconstruction and reproduction of the work

Level and quality of contents of the report - summarizes appropriate information, uses sufficient theoretical framework

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student is not able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework on their own.	Student is only able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework at a very rudimentary level.	Student is only able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework with significant help from supervisor.	Student is able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework at a very with some important elements missing.	Student is able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework at a very with some minor elements missing.	Student is able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework at a very complete way.	Student is able to summarize the work and explain the needed theoretical framework at a very complete and very clear way.

Management of research (25%)

Independence – asks for relevant support (not depending!), prepares well for meeting

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Needs constant supervision, support. Has trouble following the directions of the supervisor.	Needs constant supervision, support. Has trouble following the directions of the supervisor.	Requires daily supervision, needs to be told what to do; follows the directions competently, does not realize when to ask for help.	Requires regular supervision, but not on a day-to-day basis. Initiates meetings, approaches people. Not systematic in asking for help when indeed needed.	Requires some supervision, but works largely independently. Asks sometimes for help/ expert input when required for the research quality and/or efficiency.	Requires little supervision, executes research with some independence, has input to the research direction. Often realizes when to ask help/ expert input when required for the research quality and/or efficiency.	Requires (almost) no supervision, executes research independently, yet realizes when to ask help/ expert input when required for the research quality and/or efficiency. Student shows ownership of the project.

Initiative, being solution-oriented – organizes most aspects of own work well

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student does not show initiative and waits for the supervisor to tell what to do.	Student only infrequently show initiative and waits for the supervisor to tell what to do.	Student organize own work on a daily basis and shows some initiative but often waits for the supervisor to tell what to do.	Student organize own work on a weekly basis and often shows initiative but sometimes waits for the supervisor to tell what to do.	Student organize own work on a bi-weekly basis and frequently shows initiative without waiting for the supervisor to tell what to do with minor interference needed.	Student organize own work on in a strategic way and frequently shows initiative without waiting for the supervisor to tell what to do or need of interference.	Student demonstrate complete ownership of the project and organize all aspects of own work without any need of interference from supervisor.

Management of research (25%)

Self-critical – reflects well on execution

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student is not able to reflect on own performance at all.	Student is either much critical of own work or not critical at all resulting in very slow progress as data are unreliable or unnecessarily discarded.	Student is either too critical of own work or not critical enough resulting in slow progress as data are often unreliable or unnecessarily discarded.	Student is some times either too self-critical of own work or not critical enough resulting in slower progress as data are occasionally unreliable or unnecessarily discarded.	Student is self-critical of own work and able to improve upon the execution of work.	Student is self-critical of own work and able anticipate and avoid making mistakes.	Student is self-critical of own work and reflect on own strengths and weaknesses and place this in a bigger picture.

Accuracy – description of what was done and outcome is accurate

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Student is not able to describe what was done and the outcome of performed work is not accurate.	Student is able to describe what was done in a rudimentary way, the outcome of performed work is not accurate.	Student is able to describe what was done with significant help, the outcome of performed work is mostly accurate.	Student is able to describe what was done with help, the outcome of performed work is accurate.	Student is able to describe what was done, and access the accuracy.	Student is able to describe what was done in a clear manner, and estimate accuracy and error bars.	Student is able to describe what was done in a clear manner, and estimate accuracy error bars, and suggest improvements.

Management of research (25%)

Planning and meeting deadlines – plans well and communicates about changes

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Planning was not followed, necessary changes in planning were not made.	Planning was not followed, necessary changes in planning were not made.	Project finished with minor delay. Student took some responsibility for ensuring planning was met.	Project finished on time (within reasonable limits), partially due to supervisor.	Project finished on time (within reasonable limits) without intervention of supervisor.	Student actively engages to finish the project on time, all deadlines met.	Student ensures that project is finished on time. Any changes in planning initiated by student. Deadlines are met.

Collaboration – contributes socially and professionally to work environment

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Cannot function in a team/research group; communication very difficult.	Cannot function in a team/research group; communication very difficult.	Forms collaboration with daily supervisor only.	Forms collaboration with daily supervisor and communicates with first examiner.	Forms a fruitful collaboration with some members of the group.	Initiates collaborations within the research group, easily interacts with all group members.	Initiates collaborations within the research group and beyond, easily interacts with all group members and demonstrates curiosity about other projects/ helps colleagues.

Management of research (25%)

Data Management – stored data is described appropriately

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
No data or overwhelming amounts of unfiltered data are stored. Data are not appropriately documented.	Limited data or overwhelming amounts of unfiltered data are stored. Data are not appropriately documented.	Most appropriate data are stored, but some additional data are stored as well. Limited documentation.	Appropriate data are stored, with minor elements missing or minor additional data stored as well. Some documentation.	Appropriate data are stored, with very minor elements missing. Documentation allows identifying all data.	Appropriate data are stored, with no elements missing. Documentation easily allows identifying all data and connecting with thesis.	All appropriate data are stored, with no omissions. Documentation easily allows identifying all data and the means to redo the analysis and figures are readily available.

Report format and writing (12,5%)

Structure – is clear and logical and contains a comprehensive abstract

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Badly structured, sections appear to be missing and/or order is not logical. Level of detail not appropriate in large part of the thesis.	Badly structured, sections appear to be missing and/or order is not logical. Level of detail not appropriate in large part of the thesis.	Overall structure mostly logical.	Overall structure correct & logical, but lower-level structure is not fully correct. Some sections have overlapping functions, leading to ambiguity in placement of information. Level of detail inappropriate in places (information either missing or irrelevant).	Overall structure correct & logical, but lower-level structure is not fully correct. Level of detail inappropriate in places (information either missing or irrelevant).	Ordering of chapters and sections logical, each section has a clear and unique function.	Logical ordering of chapters/sections, including correct hierarchy. Each section has a clear and unique function. All information occurs at the right place and level of detail appropriate throughout.

Wording – is clear, effective and unambiguous

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Unclear how results were obtained.	Mostly unclear how results were obtained.	Methods and analysis described in a manner that supervisor(s) can understand, but hardly accessible to others in the field.	Methods and analysis described and clear to experts in the field but not to a general physics audience.	Methods and analysis described, but either some information is missing, redundant, or unclear.	Description of methods and analysis is appropriate, complete, and clear. Enough information provided to reproduce the results, some redundancy, however.	Description of methods and analysis is appropriate, complete, and clear. Enough information provided to reproduce the results, but there is no redundancy.

Report format and writing (12,5%)

Presentation of results – figures and tables summarize relevant data and lay-out is functional, clear relation between message and illustrations

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Layout is messy, font type/size not appropriate. Most graphs/tables do not have correct labels and units, are messy and confusing. Captions are not informative nor meaningful.	Layout is consistent. All graphs and tables have a short caption.	Layout is consistent and neat. All graphs and tables have meaningful captions, labelling, and units.	Layout is consistent and neat. All graphs and tables have meaningful captions, labelling, and units. Graphs are clear, including use of colour, symbols, and lines.	Layout is consistent and polished. Graphs and tables (including their captions) are, after minor modification, of publishable quality.	Layout is consistent, polished, and professional. Graphs and tables (including their captions) are of publishable quality, with minimal modification.	Layout is consistent, polished, and professional. Graphs and tables (including their captions) are of publishable quality, without modification.

Language aspects - style, spelling, grammar – minor mistakes

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Many of the formulations are incorrect or inaccurate, making it difficult to interpret. Many typos, spelling & grammar mistakes. English is incorrect and very hard to read.	Many of the formulations are incorrect or inaccurate, making it difficult to interpret. Many typos, spelling & grammar mistakes. English is incorrect and very hard to read.	Formulations are correct and mostly clear. Quite a few spelling and grammar mistakes on every page.	Formulations in text are clear and reasonably precise. English is mostly correct. Not more than 2-3 spelling and grammar mistake per page (on average).	Formulations in text are clear and exact, as well as concise. English is correct and pleasant to read. Not more than one spelling and grammar mistake per page (on average).	Formulations are clear and easy to follow. Text is close to publishable. Few spelling and grammar mistakes.	Formulations are at the fully professional level, unambiguous, easy to follow, and a pleasure to read. Very few spelling and grammar mistakes.

Report format and writing (12,5%)

References – list is complete, relation to content is logical, distinction between own work and referenced work is clear

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
<p>Very few/none of the claims in the text and figures from the literature are suitably referenced. A large fraction of the references is inconsistent, incomplete, or not appropriate. Formatting is not according to the standards of the field.</p>	<p>Few of the claims in the text and figures from the literature are suitably referenced. A significant fraction of the references is inconsistent, incomplete, or not appropriate. Formatting is mostly not according to the standards of the field.</p>	<p>Quoting of references is haphazard, incomplete, or simply wrong. Literature is outdated. Formatting of references is not always according to standards of the field.</p>	<p>Most literature is up-to-date and quoted in the right context, somewhat consistent and nearly complete. Formatting is according to the standards of the field.</p>	<p>Most claims in the text and figures from the literature are suitably referenced. Most references are consistent, complete, and appropriate. Formatting is according to the standards of the field</p>	<p>Most claims in the text and figures are suitably supported by the literature referenced. Almost all references are consistent, complete, and appropriate. Formatting is entirely according to standards of the field.</p>	<p>All claims in the text and figures are suitably supported by the literature referenced. Literature reflects state-of-the-art, is consistent, complete, and appropriate. Formatting of all references is entirely according to the standards of the field.</p>

Oral presentation (12,5%)

Structure of the talk – talk is well structured and clearly presented

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Organization is haphazard; audience can follow only with great effort. Arguments are not clear.	Overall presentation is organized, but sequence is difficult to follow; and/or some unimportant side issues were highlighted.	Overall presentation is organized, but a few minor points are confusing.	Presentation is generally clear and well organized. Listener can follow the line of reasoning	Presentation is very clear, logical, interesting, with clearly delineated themes and ideas.	Presentation fascinates the listener by the way the themes and ideas are presented.	Presentation could be delivered at a scientific conference.

Contents, scientific depth – summarizes appropriate information, uses sufficient theoretical framework

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Themes and ideas are disjointed; Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete	Explanations of concepts and theories are correct but minimal; and/or some errors were noticeable.	For the most part, explanations of concepts and theories are accurate. Minor errors due to oversight were noticeable.	Speaker provides accurate and generally complete explanations of key concepts and theories, audience recognizes any errors to be the result of nervousness.	Speaker provides accurate and complete explanations of key concepts and theories. Applications of theory illuminate issues.	Key concepts and theories are perfectly clear, correct, and complete. It is clear what the outcomes mean in a broader context	All explanations of key concepts and theories are perfectly clear, correct, and complete. Presenter took extra steps to help audience understand. It is clear what the outcomes mean in a broader context

Oral presentation (12,5%)

Clarity and persuasiveness of the message/conclusions (separating main and side issues) – message/conclusions is/are well formulated and logically structured – clear argumentation

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Loses audience's attention due to lack of clarity. Audience does not know why the research has been done. Focus is on side issues.	Often loses audience's attention due to lack of clarity. Audience does not know why the research has been done. Focus is on side issues and main issue only occasionally discussed.	Occasionally loses audience's attention due to lack of clarity. Mostly unclear why the research has been done. Focus is on main issues but side issues are often distracting from the main story.	Keeps audience's attention and the story is clear an logical most of the time. Mostly clear why the research has been done. Focus is on main issues but side issues are occasional distracting from the main story.	Audience is guided through the logical arguments. It is clear why the research has been done. Focus is on main issues and side issues are rarely distracting from the main story.	Audience is guided through the logical arguments, which are clearly explained. It is clear why the research has been done. Focus is on main issues and side issues are no distracting from the main story.	The logic of the of the presentation is clear throughout and follow a clear and well formulated path making even the most challenging part understandable for the full audience.

Presentation, style of delivery, wording, explanation of content– presentation and pronunciation are clear and friendly, vocabulary is sufficient

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
The presentation is too elementary or too sophisticated for the audience including fellow students. Inappropriate vocabulary is used. Student is challenging to understand.	Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for the Audience including fellow students. Inappropriate vocabulary is used.	Level of presentation is barely appropriate, occasionally unclear, difficult to understand.	Level of presentation is generally appropriate and can be understood by fellow students. Correct choice of words but audience must put forth effort to listen, poor pronunciation.	Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience. Well spoken but occasionally difficult to understand.	Level of presentation is clearly appropriate for the audience. Presentation is a planned storytelling, paced for audience understanding.	Level of presentation ideally adapted to the audience; wording and pacing kept the audience totally captivated.

Oral presentation (12,5%)

Use of audio-visual means, quality of the slides – advanced use of presentation tools

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Slides are overcrowded or contain too much text. Student reads the slides. Graphs add no value to presentation or are unreadable. Presentation clearly too short or too long.	Slides are mostly overcrowded or contain too much text. Graphs add little value to presentation. Presentation clearly too short or too long.	Slides, graphs, and illustrations hard to read, with confusing or unclear elements or too much information is included. Presentation slightly too short or too long.	Slides, graphs, and illustrations somewhat difficult to read. Some material is not supported by visual aids. Presentation too long due to technical reasons	Slides, graphs, and illustrations contribute to the quality of the presentation. Font size is readable. Appropriate information is included. Student stays on time.	Slides, graphs, and illustrations perfectly readable, clearly enriching the presentation. Student stays on time	Slides, graphs, and illustrations perfectly clear to read, adding new elements with respect to the thesis. Student stays on time.

Discussion, adequate answering of questions – responds accurately

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
Unfamiliar with the subject matter, unable to answer questions.	Basic understanding of the material, but mastery not evident.	Generally comfortable with the material, able to answer most questions on a basic level.	Well-versed in the subject, able to answer all/most questions in some detail.	Overall command of the subject, responds to questions with further explanation.	Strong command of the subject, responds to questions, in some cases bringing in new elements not treated in presentation.	Outstanding command of the subject, responds to questions, bringing in new elements not treated in presentation.

Oral presentation (12,5%)

Own contribution is clearly indicated

Very Poor (<5)	Not Good Enough (5)	Just Good Enough (6)	Average/As Expected (7)	Clearly better than Average (8)	Much better than Average (9)	Cannot be improved upon (10)
<p>It is not clear at all what the student has done and what was done by other group members or what is taken from literature.</p>	<p>It is somewhat clear what the student has done. There are no references to sources of figures and data used but not generated by the student.</p>	<p>It is somewhat clear what the student has done and what was done by others. There are references to sources of some figures and data used but not generated by the student.</p>	<p>It is mostly clear what the student has done and what was done by others. There are references to sources of most figures and data used but not generated by the student.</p>	<p>It is clear what the student has done and what was done by others. There are references to sources of figures and data used but not generated by the student.</p>	<p>It is clear what the student has done and what was done by others and the importance of these contributions are acknowledged. There are references to sources of figures and data used but not generated by the student.</p>	<p>The student has made an extra effort to acknowledge and discuss the contributions of others and their importance.</p>