

Example Assessment Form for a Project Proposal Artificial Intelligence

Graduate School of Natural Sciences

****Note that the project proposal assessment form must be filled in online (Osiris Docent -> Case). This form serves as an example to print and discuss with the student or other supervisors. Please *do not* send paper or scanned copies of this form to the coordinator or student administration.****

Student	
First and last name	
Student number	
Email address	
Name of master's programme	Artificial Intelligence (AINM)
Research Project	
Project title	
Course code	INFOMAI1
Number of EC	14

Assessment of the project process

		Not Applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Very Good	Excellent
independence in execution of the project		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
independence in writing the report/proposal		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
planning and meeting deadlines		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
communication		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
integrity and responsibility		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
critical and reflective attitude		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Explanation							

Assessment of the project report (thesis) or proposal

		Not Applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Very Good	Excellent
structure and clarity of presentation		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
discussion of related work and context		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
completeness and correctness of arguments		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
English usage		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
general appearance (layout, figures and tables, etcetera)		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Explanation							

Assessment of the project results

		Not Applicable	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Very Good	Excellent
quality of the results		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
quantity of the results		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
difficulty of the project		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Explanation							

Grade	
Grade	V (Voldoende – Satisfactory), ONV (ONVoldoende – Unsatisfactory) or AANV (AANVullende Toets – Extension)
Extra motivation if appropriate	
Experts If internal or external experts have been consulted, please note them here	
Name and title	
Affiliation	
Email address	
Name and title	
Affiliation	
Email address	

Explanation of Assessment Form

Research projects are judged on four criteria: results, report, presentation and process. For each of these criteria there are several subcriteria, which are scored on the following scale:

Not Applicable
Insufficient
Sufficient
Good
Very Good
Excellent

Note: Students are expected to be able to do good work when they reach the phase of doing a master thesis project, and the score “good” thus represents what can be expected from a normal student; it does not imply above-average results.

Please fill out the form completely, and also write a brief explanation for each of the four criteria. This explanation should state the main strong points and/or the points that can be improved; it need not discuss all subcriteria.

The scores and the overall performance with respect to each of the criteria together determine the final grade for the graduation project.

Rubrics

Process			
Criteria	Insufficient	Sufficient-Good	Very Good-Excellent
Independence in execution			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No input and little commitment to the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposes new valid directions of research based on previous results. Has creative ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Owns" the project. Proposes new relevant directions of research Student has original, creative ideas.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on supervisor for correct interpretation of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides correct analysis interpretation of results at later stages of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides correct analysis and interpretation of results from the start of the project. Recognises implications.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to place research into perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion in the light of (recent) literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stays on top of recent literature.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to master techniques and tools related to the project. Fails to apply techniques independently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Masters required techniques and tools. Applies techniques independently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has excellent technical skills. Finds and masters new technical approaches. Improves existing procedures.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many feedback sessions are required. Minimal improvement based on feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular feedback sessions were needed. Feedback led to reasonable improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consults experts outside the group in consultation with supervisor. Finds relevant new literature. Designs large parts of the project. Excellent response to feedback.
Independence in writing			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relies on supervisor's instructions only. Content superficially handled; depth is lacking. Many feedback sessions are required. Minimal improvement based on feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes initiative (initially) after stimulation. Part of ideas/content conceived independently. Regular feedback sessions needed. Feedback led to reasonable improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains creative elements. Content is provided independently. The amount of feedback needed was minimal. Response to feedback yielded excellent improvements.
Planning and meeting deadlines			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to meet deadlines. Fails to keep appointments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets most deadlines. Keeps appointments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sets own deadlines and adheres to them. Schedules appointments when necessary.
Communication			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hardly participates in discussions. Is messy or unprepared for meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates in discussions. Comes prepared for meetings Sometimes uses the time available to solve simple issues that could have been done alone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is critical during discussions. Occasionally leading in discussion. Is well prepared for meetings and uses the time available well
Integrity and responsibility			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invalid analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is correct and insightful.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thinks he/she is the only worker in the group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes (needs of) colleagues into account. Communicates with colleagues, e.g. to share equipment, knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knows when to ask questions. Makes positive contributions to the group. Accepts, communicates and learns from own failures.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data manipulated or left out.** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate, reliable and trustworthy. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows awareness of confidentiality of information. 	
Critical and reflective attitude			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-reflection is absent. Critical attitude is absent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows self-reflection and has critical attitude towards (published) research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical attitude is based on intellectual depth and profundity.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loses motivation when research fail(s). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looks for different approaches until result is obtained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perseveres, but knows when to stop.

Presentation			
Criteria	Insufficient	Sufficient-Good	Very Good-Excellent
<i>Structure</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question absent, unclear or lacks focus. Relation between different parts of presentation is unclear The line of thought is unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question clear and focused. Line of thought mostly clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question is motivated and clearly stated Audience is guided through the parts of the presentation The line of thought is easy to follow and supported by the structure.
<i>Content</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor explanation of results. Discussion lacks essential issues. References for claims are missing. Poor choice of main points to present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good explanation of results. Valid discussion. Some important claims are not referenced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent mastery of subject. Clear concise explanation of results. Critical in depth discussion. Key claims are referenced. Made a good choice of what to present and what to leave out.

<i>Quality of slides/media</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides contain too much or too little details, are hard to read or too cluttered. • Poor use of the chosen means of presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slides require explanation. • Proficient use of the chosen means of presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informative and well thought slides. • Very good use of the chosen means of presentation
<i>Presentation skills</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited eye contact with audience. • Body language is annoying/distracting. • Incapable of continuing adequately after an error. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular eye contact with the audience. • Body language is adequate. • Errors have only little impact on the presenter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Captures the audience. • Body language is constructive / effective. • Continues in an adequate manner after errors.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaks either too fast or too slow. • Insufficient English. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable pace. • Reasonable proficiency in English. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good pace. • Fluent in English.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too long/too short (+/- 25%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate time schedule (+/- 10%) 	
<i>Suitability for the audience</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loses attention of the audience. • Too difficult/easy for audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gets attention of the audience. • Compatible with audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains constant attention of the audience. • Pitched at the correct level
<i>Ability to cope with questions</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate answers to raised questions. • Inadequate response to critique. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can answer most of the questions raised. • Adequate response to critique. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct answers to questions raised • Can value critique/suggestions.
<i>Context</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little or no motivation or contextualization of the research question (Relevance unclear) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance is clear for the immediate area or research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of research is introduced and research question/results are

			put in good context within the broad area.
--	--	--	--

Report/Proposal			
Criteria	Insufficient	Sufficient-Good	Very Good-Excellent
<i>Structure and clarity</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete or inaccurate overview of literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate overview of relevant literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete concise overview of relevant literature
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question absent or lacks focus. • Relevance research question unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question well defined and focused. • Relevance of research question clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantiated research question with clear focus. • Research question has the potential to contribute useful new knowledge to the field.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The line of thought is unclear. • Text is badly structured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line of thought mostly clear. • Structure supports legibility of text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The line of thought is easy to follow and supported by the structure.
<i>Discussion of related work</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to place research topic in context. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Places research topic in context within the immediate area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Places research topic in context within the area.
	Referral is insufficient, inconsistent, incomplete or incorrect.** References cannot be retrieved.	Referral is complete and correct. Correct application of a single referencing system. References can be traced.	(Key) references have been found independently.
<i>Completeness and correctness of arguments</i>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many claims and conclusions remain unsubstantiated • Limitations and caveats are not indicated • Limitations and caveats are not indicated • Minimal improvement based on feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback led to reasonable improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All claims and conclusions are well substantiated • Limitation and weaknesses of methods are clearly stated • Response to feedback yielded excellent improvements.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical attitude is absent or is not well founded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows critical attitude towards (published) research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical attitude is based on intellectual depth and profundity.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data manipulated or left out. ** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate, reliable and trustworthy. 	
<i>English usage</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style too wordy or too concise. • Disturbing spelling or grammar mistakes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and style enable understanding of the information. • No errors present detected by spellcheckers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and style support legibility of the document. • Writing flows smoothly.
<i>General appearance</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discernible organization. • Looks messy. • The layout is poorly related to the structure of the text. • Text structure does not adhere to conventions in the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decently organised. • Is readable. • Useful layout. • Text is mostly structured according to standards in the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organised. • Pleasant to the eye. • the layout helps to discern the structure of the text. • Text is structured according to standards in the field.

Results (aspects that go into the thesis)			
Criteria	Insufficient	Sufficient-Good	Very Good-Excellent
<i>Quality of results</i>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trivial or flawed • Invalid analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct and supported • Analysis is correct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains creative elements • Results are of added value to the community and innovative • Analysis is correct and insightful
<i>Quantity of results</i>			
	Less than the expected and agreed upon workload	Corresponds to the expected and agreed upon workload	More than the expected and agreed upon workload
<i>Difficulty of the topic</i>			
	Scope and depth of required knowledge and skills is less than that of an average master student	Scope and depth of required knowledge and skills is that of an average master student	Scope and depth of required knowledge and skills is higher than that of an average master student