

**Assessment form for mid-term evaluation (4 pages):**

Version 1 March 2021-CvdW/KdJ

**Top Master NanoScience Small Research Project and Symposium (WM007-13, 13 ECTS)****\*Indicative assessment based on performance in the first 2-3 months.**

Student:	Student number:	Date:
Title:		
Name supervisor (first examiner):          Name daily supervisor (if appl., e.g. PhD student or postdoc):	Name course coordinator: prof. C.H. van der Wal Signature course coordinator (wet signature): not applicable	
Signature supervisor:	Signature student:	

**Indicative final grade (see instructions at last page):**

**\*For the actual final grade the student can only pass the assessment if all subgrades (part 1-4) are graded with at least 5.5.** If one or more of the subgrades (1-4) are lower than 5.5, the student is offered a remediation trajectory after which a second assessment takes place.

**Instructions to the supervisor and student for processing this form:**

- Please fill in this form together.
- This form should serve as basis for providing feedback to the student on her/his performance in the small research project, at the mid-term evaluation, as a basis for advice on improving performance where possible.
- The dates for scheduling this will be communicated. The form is nearly identical to the form for the final assessment. As much as possible, provide a preliminary grade on all items on the form. For some items, you can tick the column 'not yet applicable'.
- After discussing the feedback and form with the student, please give the form to the student. The student should then make a pdf scan and email it at the same time to
  - you (as 1st examiner),
  - course coordinator: c.h.van.der.wal@rug.nl, and
  - programme coordinator: escnanoscience@rug.nl
- **Note:** A daily supervisor has no formal role in the assessment, but it is customary to consult the daily supervisor present for grading advice.

<b>Guideline for the grades:</b> 1-5: (very) poor performance 5: not good enough to pass this (part of the) course 6: just good enough to pass this (part of the) course 7: average work, as expected 8: clearly better than average, still room for improvement 9: much better than average, minor room for improvement, really very good 10: cannot be improved upon, outstanding, surprising	Fail ( $\leq 5$ )	Just good enough (6)	Average work (7)	Better than average (8)	Much better than average (9)	Outstanding (10)	Not yet applicable
<b>1. Research performance and scientific quality (22,2 %)</b> <i>Including the assessment of the research as evidenced by the log book/lab journal and regular discussions. The structure and format of the logbook is assessed in part 3.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of research question and problem formulation – question and formulation are clear</li> <li>Literature research - is comprehensive</li> <li>Solution strategy (approach, methods, techniques) – is time-efficiently, clear relation to question</li> <li>Quality, reliability and relevance of the results – results are analyzed well.</li> <li>Interpretation of results - is thorough.</li> <li>Evaluation/discussion of results – strengths and weaknesses are identified.</li> <li>Formulated conclusions or realized design – conclusions respond accurately to question/formulation</li> <li>Scientific depth and use of theoretical knowledge during the work – uses sufficient theoretical background</li> </ol>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Fail (≤5)	Just good enough (6)	Average work (7)	Better than average (8)	Much better than average (9)	Outstanding (10)	Not yet applicable
<b>3. Quality of logbook notes and related presentations (22,2%)</b> <i>Concerns: log book/lab journal, research documentation.</i> <i>Not including the assessment of discussion based contents. The contents is assessed in part 1.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Structure – log provides good insight into performed experiments and raw data are well ordered</li> <li>b. Wording – is clear, effective, unambiguous</li> <li>c. Presentation of results – figures and tables summarize relevant data and lay-out is functional, clear relation between message and illustrations</li> <li>d. Notes make it possible to reproduce experiments – notes are sufficient and clear</li> <li>e. ...</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indicative grade part 3:							
Justification of grade part 3:							
<b>4. Oral presentation (e.g. group talk) (33,4%)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Structure of the talk – talk is well structured and clearly presented</li> <li>b. Contents, scientific depth – summarizes appropriate information, uses sufficient theoretical framework</li> <li>c. Clarity and persuasiveness of the message/conclusions (separating main and side issues) – message/conclusions is/are well formulated and logically structured – clear argumentation</li> <li>d. Presentation, style of delivery, wording, explanation of content – presentation and pronunciation is clear and friendly, vocabulary is sufficient</li> <li>e. Use of audio-visual means, quality of the slides – advanced use of presentation tool</li> <li>f. Discussion, adequate answering of questions – responds accurately</li> <li>g. Own contribution is clearly indicated</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indicative grade part 4:							
Justification of grade part 4:							

<b>Indicative final grade:</b> The final grade is the weighted average of the grades of parts 1 to 4 (weight factors 2, 2, 2, 3 respectively, different weight factors can be applied when motivated below here). <b>Note:</b> for the actual final grade every partial grade must be $\geq 5.5$ .  <b>Supervisor: Please fill in the indicative final grade, yes/no on schedule, justification below and sign on the front page.</b> <b>Student: please fill in your reflection below and sign on the front page.</b>		<b>Indicative final grade:</b>
On schedule to finish small research project on time?	Yes	NO. Reason:
Reflection and remarks student about first part of small research project:	Student:	
Justification, suggestions on performance to focus on improving and final remarks on mid-term assessment:	Supervisor:	