EVALUATION FORM MASTER'S DISSERTATION FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE Master of Science in Engineering: Architecture, Master of Science in Urbanism and Spatial Planning Name student Title master's dissertation Dissertation advisory committee Date

Instructions for use

Pass				Fail		
Excellent (18-20)	Very good (16-17)	Good (14-15)	Sufficient (10-13)	Insufficient (8-9)	Weak (0-7)	

Competences

This competence needs to be evaluated here
This competence can be evaluated here
This competence should not be evaluated here

Assessment 'process' by the dissertation advisory committee Assessment 'exam' by the assessment committee Assessment 'product' by both committees

		PROCESS	PRODUCT	EXAM
	Relative weight	30	30	40
1 Independently search for relevant and up-to-date information and critical				
Parameter	•			
Research				
Processing & critical analysis				
2 Formulate a research question, starting from a complex scientific proble issue within the own discipline.				
Insight into the problem statement Formulation of the research question				
3 Apply a creative and/or innovative, appropriate research methodology.				
Organizational skills and application				
Quality of the methodology				
Quality of the methodology				
4 Integratively apply advanced knowledge of the own discipline.				
Applying knowledge				
Implementation				
5 Design-oriented and integrative problem-solving thinking at various scal	es and under			
uncertain and conflicting constraints.				
Conceptual problem-solving thinking				
Dealing with uncertainty				
6 Critically interpret and validate own results, write them down, summarize				
communicate them through various media, including orally and in English	, while substantiating			
the decisions made.				
Justifying the choices made				
Critical analysis				
Clear communication				
7 Work and collaborate in a professional manner.				
Organisation and time management				
Attitude				
8 Reflect on the own research topic and chosen methodology from various perspectives such as sustainability, international context, and ethical implications.				
Pritically reflect on the own thinking and actions, handle feedback and the limits of the own competencies in a conscious and responsible manner.				
•				
Handling feedback				
Critical view of one's own performance				
10 Scientific integrity and ethical conduct.				
Scientific integrity				
Ethical behavior				
	Partial marks*			

Qualitative feedback**	Global mark***			

^{*}No automatic calculation

^{**}If the mark on any of the three evaluation categories or on any of the underlying evaluation criteria is lower than 10/20, a clear justification is required.

^{***} If the mark on one of the three evaluation categories is 8/20 or less than 8/20, the dissertation advisory committee and the assessment committee can conclude, by consensus, that the student can no longer pass the entire master's dissertation. If that is the case, and if the final mark according to weighting factors is 10/20 (or more), the final mark will be reduced to the highest failing mark, 9/20. If these special conditions apply, a specific argumentation and a fair justification is required based on the final competences of the master's dissertation.