

Review on	Bachelor Thesis		
of			
with the title			
conducted from		until	
Graded by:			
Supervised by:			

Quality of the deliverables	30%	1.00
Objectives met		
Implementation quality		
Originality of Content	5%	1.00
Own ideas added		
Level of contribution with respect to related work		
Process & Work ethic	25%	1.00
Conceptual understanding		
Showing initiative		
Independence		
Time management		
Scientific methodology & Experimental design	15%	1.00
Validity		
Completeness		
Literature research	5%	1.00
Completeness and structure		
Recency and relevance		
Citation style and bibliography		
Manuscript	15%	1.00
Language quality		
Content quality		
Completeness		
Presentation	5%	1.00
Quality of slides and speech		
Quality of Q&A		
Scope		

Final Grade

1.00

	Bachelor Thesis	Master Thesis	Master Project
Quality of the deliverables	30%	30%	45%
Originality (Content)	5%	5%	5%
Process/Work ethic	25%	15%	25%
Scientific methodology & Experimental design	15%	15%	5%
Literature research	5%	10%	5%
Manuscript	15%	20%	10%
Presentation	5%	5%	5%
	100%	100%	100%

How to use this form: This form is used to grade various types of student projects. It has seven categories which are to be graded individually. The weight of each category is defined by the type of project. Each category has several sub-categories which are supposed to be considered if applicable. The weights of these sub-categories towards the grade of the entire category are at the discretion of the project supervisor, as they might vary from project to project. When grading the sub-categories, the statement in the table shown below which best describes any particular aspect of the project is to be selected and the grade is to be set accordingly to ensure consistency and comparability with respect to multiple projects over time.

Grading overview	< 2	2	3	4	4.5	5	5.5	6
	Failed	Failed	Failed	Satisfactory	Decent	Good	Very good	Excellent
				Passable performance with significant shortcomings. An achievement that fulfills the average standard despite deficiencies.	Generally good performance with multiple shortcomings. An achievement that fulfills the average standards.	Generally good performance with minor shortcomings. An achievement that surpasses the average standards.	Outstanding performance with minor shortcomings. An achievement that surpasses largely the average standards.	Outstanding performance with no shortcomings. A particularly outstanding achievement.
Quality of the deliverables (e.g., software implementation, survey implemented)								
Objectives met	None of the objectives were met.	Only a small subset of the objectives were met, the results are not useful by themselves.	The objectives were only partially met, not even covering bare minimum of the topic.	The objectives were only partially met, covering only the bare minimum of the topic.	Most required objectives were met.	All required objectives were met.	Very good and new results have been achieved, covering and in some cases even exceeding all of the expected.	Particularly good and new results have been achieved that go beyond the expected. The results could be published at a scientific conference with little to no additional effort.
Implementation quality (testing with unit tests/pilot, reusability)	There is no implementation.	There is no working implementation of any of the relevant components.	A partial implementation was produced which can only be used with considerable effort.	A working implementation of the fundamental aspects of the topic was produced which can be used with only minor effort.	A working implementation of the main aspects of the topic was produced which can be used with little to no effort.	A solid and complete implementation was produced which can be used with little to no effort.	A complete and properly tested implementation was produced which can be used with no effort.	The implementation is complete and of professional quality with high test coverage and documentation.
Originality (Content)								
Own ideas added	No ideas added.	Ideas limited to reformulating already existing work.	Ideas are new but the execution/formulation is incomplete.	Ideas are heavily based on an already existing idea and add but a small and limited piece to the overall approach.	New and original ideas that rely only partially on already existing work.	New and original idea achieved independently of any particular approach.	The original contribution introduced new and useful aspects that were previously not taken into consideration.	The original contribution is novel, introduced new aspects and is formalized in such a way that it lends itself for future extension.
Level of contribution with respect to related work	No contributions made.	Contribution is incomplete and/or not directly applicable to the problem domain.	Contribution is outperformed by already existing methods.	Contribution is outperforming existing methods in at least one relevant case.	Contribution is outperforming existing methods in multiple relevant use cases.	Contributed is outperforming existing methods in the majority of cases.	Contribution is outperforming existing methods in all but a few border cases.	Contributed solution is significantly outperforming existing approaches across all use cases.
Process/Work ethic								
Conceptual understanding	Concepts were not studied appropriately.	There is a clear misunderstanding of fundamental concepts and there are large knowledge gaps.	Applied concepts and methods incorrectly.	The basic concepts were partly learned, applied and explained, but some inconsistencies were found.	Most of the basic concepts were correctly learned, applied and explained.	Most of both basic and advanced concepts were correctly learned, applied and explained.	All basic and advanced concepts were correctly learned, applied and explained.	The knowledge acquired and demonstrated throughout the project went beyond the expectations of the project.
Showing initiative	All of the time the student needed micromanagement from the supervisor.	Most of the time the student needed micromanagement from the supervisor.	Some of the time the student needed micromanagement from the supervisor.	The student reacted to the supervisor's ideas and procedural suggestions appropriately.	The student brought new ideas and suggestions sporadically.	New ideas and suggestions on how to proceed next were actively proposed towards the end of the project.	New ideas and suggestions on how to proceed next were actively proposed throughout the project.	There was a clear (individual/team) leadership in the execution of the project.
Independence	The work needed constant help to be accomplished.	The work needed constant help to be accomplished.	The work needed constant help to be accomplished.	After a long adaptation phase, the work was accomplished with some degree of independence, but it required a considerable amount of help from the supervisor.	The student managed to accomplish the work on their own many times, with some help from the supervisor.	The student managed to accomplish the work on their own most of the times all throughout the project, with limited help from the supervisor.	The student accomplished the work on their own, reaching out to the supervisor when it was needed.	The student did an outstanding independent job.
Time management	The timeplan by the supervisor was ignored.	Intermediate deadlines were missed and the work was rushed unsuccessfully at the end.	There was no regular time management.	The student(s) partly followed the timeplan defined by the supervisor.	The student(s) followed the timeplan defined by the supervisor most of the times.	The student proposed and followed a self-defined timeplan most of the times.	The student proposed and followed a self-defined timeplan consistently.	The student proposed and followed a timeplan consistently, updating things when necessary and delivering results ahead of deadlines.
Scientific methodology/Experimental design								
Validity (evaluation measures, steps in the experimental design)	Nothing was done to check validity, there was no clear experimental design.	Basic experimental design is incomplete.	Basic experimental design is present, but results are not measured in a proper way	Basic experimental design is present, some (not validated) measures were applied to the results	Basic experimental design is present, some (not validated) measures were applied to the results, results were minimally interpreted or interpreted incorrectly.	Basic experimental design is present, validated measures were applied and results were interpreted correctly.	All needed steps were in the experimental design, validates measures were used and results were interpreted correctly and place into context.	Method and results interpretation is at the level that the work could be published (including limitations, comparison with related-work and future work suggestions).
Completeness (e.g., missed data analysis step, control group etc.?)	No clear scientific methodology was followed.	Research questions are not formulated, some experiment and analysis is done but poorly.	Research questions are formulated but not answered, experiments and analysis were done poorly.	Parts of the research question are not answered, but subparts are discussed in a complete manner.	Research questions were formulated and answered using experiments and analysis in a limited matter.	All important components of the research were present (RQs formulated, correct measures and analyses performed). Small details were missing.	All important components of the research were present and executed well.	All components of the research were present and executed expertly.
Literature research								
Completeness and structure	No literature research was conducted.	Incomplete and unstructured literature research was conducted.	Research was conducted on the minority of problem aspects and is lacking structure.	Research was conducted on the majority of problem aspects and are structured properly.	All aspects of the problem were covered by at least one paper and show appropriate structuring.	All aspects of the problem were researched and discussed by referencing multiple papers in a structured fashion.	Extensive, well-structured discussion of all problem aspects of the current project, featuring a complete picture of the area of research.	The problem domain was researched and properly structured in its entirety and extended to a discussion of related aspects in other areas.
Recency and relevance	No relevant literature references.	Only irrelevant and dated publications cited.	The papers found are either lacking recency or relevance for the thesis/project.	The papers found are relevant for the project and there is a link of related work in this area to the student's thesis/project work.	Recent and relevant publications found, the selection is properly motivated and linked to the project, but a majority of papers are irrelevant and/or dated.	The majority of the papers are recent and/or relevant publications for the conducted research, properly motivated and linked to the student's work for the thesis/project.	All papers are recent and contain relevant information for the research that was conducted. Choices are properly motivated and links to the student's project/thesis work.	Recent and relevant papers were extended by including publications from new areas relevant to the conducted research. All choices are well-motivated and link to the student's project/thesis work.
Citation style and bibliography	Citations and bibliography are missing.	No style applied, neither to the citations nor the bibliography.	Citation incomplete and/or bibliography is missing information.	Citation complete and bibliography is not lacking any information.				
Manuscript								
Language quality (typos, sentence structure, ...)	Many typos, no clear structure, impossible to understand etc.	Many typos, no clear structure, somewhat hard to understand	Many typos, bad sentence structuring, some misinterpretation because on language use.	Quite some linguistic mistakes, but does not negatively influence understandability.	Few linguistic mistakes, including incorrect sentence structure, otherwise understandable.	Minor typos, otherwise correct language use (spelling, sentence structure, etc.)	One or two linguistic mistakes (typos, sentence structure), otherwise correct language use.	The text is free of mistakes.
Content quality (coherent story, structure, clarity, interesting, ...)	No clear story line, uninteresting, no structure.	No clear story line, uninteresting, some structure but not logical.	Story not subsectioned properly, sections not logically leading to the next.	Somewhat clear storyline, not very coherent but gets the message across.	Somewhat clear storyline, linking between sections is missing.	Clear storyline, coherent story and structure. Not very engaging.	Clear storyline, coherent story and structure.	Very interesting read, very clearly structured, outstanding writing work.
Completeness (all sections with proper content)	All sections are missing	Most sections are missing	Some important sections are missing	All sections are present, but minimally executed.	All sections are present, but some information is missing (i.e., cannot be read as a standalone work)	All sections are present, no important information is missing.	All sections are present and explained. Can be read in a standalone manner.	All sections are present and explained thoroughly. Can be read in a standalone manner.
Presentation								
Quality of slides and speech (supports story, clarity, terminology)	There is no presentation.	The slides do not follow an appropriate structure, their content is unreadable and there is no story being told.	The slides contain some sort of structure but their content is of low quality (i.e., unclear, missing results incomplete slides, typos, only blobs of text ...).	The slides contain a satisfactory structure and they partially convey a consistent story. There is still room for improvement in terms of the design of the slides and the speech is slightly misaligned with the slides.	Most of the slides are clear, and the story is correctly conveyed.	All the slides were very clear, use the correct terminology and concepts were introduced appropriately.	The slides conformed to all the guidelines in the book "Presentation Zen". Slides and speech are very clear and the pace of the presentation was very appropriate.	The slides were particularly good, clear and original and they provide a really useful complementary resource to the speaker.
Able to answer questions	There was no time for questions.	Questions were not correctly understood.	Most of the questions posed were not answered successfully (i.e., the answer was unrelated, confusing or inaccurate).	Half of the questions were successfully answered (i.e., clear and accurate).	Most of the questions were successfully answered (i.e., clear and accurate).	All questions were answered satisfactorily.	All questions were answered with a very concise and solid answer, backed up by results.	The answers to all questions were particularly good, showing deep knowledge, new ideas, and high quality scientific judgment.
Scope	There is no presentation.	The presentation is missing many of the standard elements in a scientific presentation (i.e., motivation, problem addressed, related work, solution, evaluation/analysis, conclusions).	The presentation is incomplete and missing some of the standard elements in a scientific presentation (i.e., motivation, problem addressed, related work, solution, evaluation/analysis, conclusions).	The presentation contains the standard elements in a scientific presentation (i.e., motivation, problem addressed, related work, solution, evaluation/analysis, conclusions), but the level of detail is some of them is not adequate (i.e., it is hard to identify what was done, how it was done, and why).	The presentation contains the standard elements in a scientific presentation (i.e., motivation, problem addressed, related work, solution, evaluation/analysis, conclusions), and in most of the slides the level of detail is adequate (i.e., it is easy to identify what was done, how it was done, and why).	The presentation contains the standard elements in a scientific presentation (i.e., motivation, problem addressed, related work, solution, evaluation/analysis, conclusions), and in all the slides the level of detail is adequate (i.e., it is easy to identify what was done, how it was done, and why).	The presentation provides a very good overview of all the work that was done.	The presentation provides a very good overview of all the work that was done, the limitations and potential continuations of the work.