Rubric - MSc-professional internship

version: 4.1 (source: thesisinternship-rubric-v4.1_20230914.xlsm)

Criterion and subcriterion	Unacceptable		Insufficient	Needs improvement	Just sufficient	Ample sufficient	Good	Very good	Exemplary	Points of excellence
	Grade: 2	3	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10	
1. Performance (50%)										
1.1 Independence, Initiative and creativity										
Independence	The student can only execute the tasks properly after repeated detailed instructions and with direct help from the supervisor.		The student needs detailed instructions and well-defined tasks from the supervisor and the supervisor needs to monitor the student to see if all tasks have been performed.		Student depends mainly on supervisor for setting out the task, but the student performs them mostly independently.		Student plans and performs tasks mostly independently, asks for help from the supervisor when needed.		Student plans and performs tasks independently and organises their sources of help independently.	
Initiative and creativity	Student shows no initiative or new ideas at all.		Student adopts initiatives and/or new ideas suggested by others (e.g. supervisor), but cannot motivate/explain the rationale of these initiatives/ideas themselves.		Student shows some initiative and/or together with the supervisor develops one or two new ideas on minor parts of the research.		Student initiates discussions on new ideas with supervisor and puts forward their own creative ideas on hypothesis formulation, design or data processing.		Student develops and implements innovative hypotheses, methods and/or analysis of information/data. Possibly the idea for the project has been formulated by the student.	
1.2 Commitment, perseverance and adaptivity										
Commitment/ perseverance	Student is not motivated. Student escapes work and gives up regularly.		Student has little motivation. Tends to be distracted easily and shows little perseverance.		Student is motivated at times, but often refers to the work as a compulsory task. Is distracted from project work now and then.		The student is motivated and shows ownership of the project. Overcomes an occasional setback independently.		The student is very motivated, shows ownership, and overcomes setbacks independently. Student goes at length to get the most out of the project (within the planned period).	
Insight in the organization and adaptation capacity	Student does not adapt to the organisation and gives an impression of apathy or is often involved in disputes or arguments.		Student shows no insight in functioning of the organisation. Student repeatedly has difficulty to get things done within the team (e.g. receiving information, organizing materials or facilities, etc). Student does not adapt and remains passive or negative.		Student is able to indicate the responsibilities within their own team. Student gets things done within the team (e.g. gathering information, organizing resources) but only via supervisor. Student accepts how things go within the new work environment without further reflection.		Student is able to indicate the responsibilities of the different units within the organization. Student is able to get things (e.g. receiving information, organizing material facilities, etc.) done within the team independently . Student is able to adapt to the new work environment in a productive and interactive way.		Student knows how changes are realized in the organization. Student is able to independently get things done that affect the whole team. Student adapts well to the work environment, while reflecting on contributing with their personal view.	
1.3 Receiving and providing feedback										
Receiving feedback	Student does not follow up on suggestions and ideas of the supervisor. Shows a defensive attitude to feedback.		Student follows up on some suggestions and ideas of the supervisor without any critical reflection.		Student accepts feedback from supervisor. Incorporates most or all of the supervisor's feedback adequately but without much reflective discussion.		Student welcomes feedback from supervisor and asks for it when needed. Student reflects on feedback and incorporates changes after engaging in a discussion.		Student seeks and welcomes feedback from supervisor and other staff members or students. Student critically reflects on feedback, uses it as a starting point for further discussion and proposes alternatives	
Providing feedback	Student does not provide feedback to others, even when asked for.		Student only provides feedback when asked for. Feedback is general, without supporting examples or without suggestions for improvement.		Student provides well-founded (with examples), specific feedback when asked for.		Student spontaneously provides balanced (positive and negative), well-founded (with examples), specific feedback .		Student actively engages in discussion with others to deliver balanced (positive and negative), well-founded (with examples), specific and constructive feedback. Student checks whether feedback is clear for receiver.	
1.4 Development of knowledge and skills										
	Knowledge and skills remain insufficient (in relation to the prerequisites) and the student does not succeed to take appropriate action to remedy this.		Students' progress in knowledge and skills is limited and requires extensive guidance by the supervisor.		The student adopts knowledge and skills as they are presented during supervision.		The student adopts knowledge and skills independently, and asks for assistance from the supervisor if needed.		Students explores solutions independently and seeks appropriate knowledge and skills required.	
1.5 Work on personal learning outcomes										
	Student gives no attention to the personal learning outcomes.		Student tries to improve on personal learning outcomes but is not able to evaluate progress.		Students works on some of their personal learning outcomes and recognizes progress.		Students works on personal learning outcomes and critically evaluates progress.		Students manages their development on personal learning outcomes effectively. Student reflects on progress and uses that to adjust the work on personal learning outcomes.	
1.6 Time management										
	No time schedule made, or time schedule lacks all detail. Final version of report or oral presentation more than 50% of the nominal period overdue without a valid reason (force majeure)		No realistic time schedule, or repeatedly ignoring the time schedule, or mostly dependent on supervisor for keeping on track. Final version of report or oral presentation overdue up to 50% of the nominal period (without force majeur).		Mostly realistic time schedule, but no timely adjustment of time schedule if needed. Final version of report or oral presentation at most 25% of nominal period overdue (without force majeur)		Realistic time schedule, with timely adjustments of time schedule but without reconsidering tasks. Final version of report or oral presentation at most 5% of nominal period overdue (without force majeur).		Realistic time schedule with timely and effective adjustments of both time and tasks if necessary. Final version of report and oral presentation finished within planned period (or overdue because of force majeur and finished within reasonable time).	

Rubric - MSc-professional internship

version: 4.1 (source: thesisinternship-rubric-v4.1_20230914.xlsm)

Criterion and subcriterion	Unacceptable		Insufficient	Needs improvement	Just sufficient	Ample sufficient	Good	Very good	Exemplary	Points of excellence
	Grade: 2	3	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10	
1.7 Performance on research/project tasks										
	Student repeatedly makes mistakes or performs tasks inaccurately. Student violates aspects of integrity.		Student does not pay sufficient attention to details. Student does not show awareness of aspects of integrity like transparency and responsibility.		Student pays some attention to details. Student is mostly transparent in their choices and acts responsibly towards people and property.		Student pays attention to details. Student is transparent in their choices and acts responsibly towards people and property. Student is able and willing to discuss integrity.		Student is conscientious and efficient. Student is transparent in their choices and acts responsibly towards people and property. Student actively inquires, and initiates discussions, about integrity.	
1.8 Transfer of (prior) acquired knowledge to the professional context of the internship										
	Student lacks relevant knowledge expected from a MSc-student to such an extent that student is unable to perform the internship tasks.		Student partly lacks relevant knowledge expected from a MSc-student, or is sometimes unable to translate knowledge to the internship tasks, or does not increase knowledge where necessary.		Student shows relevant knowledge on an academic level (compatible with the introductory courses in their MSc-programme). Student translates this knowledge to some of the internship tasks. In a few cases, student increases knowledge where necessary.		Student shows relevant knowledge on an academic level (compatible with the most advanced courses in their MSc-programme). Student translates this knowledge to the internship tasks. Student increases knowledge where necessary.		Student shows relevant knowledge on an academic level (compatible with the most advanced courses in their MSc-programme). Student translates this knowledge to the internship tasks. Student increases knowledge where necessary and student increases the knowledge of the team/organization.	
1.9 Execution of advanced work tasks in the projects										
	Student is not competent yet to perform work tasks and projects as designed/planned.		Student performs work tasks and projects as designed/planned, but is unable to evaluate the outcomes/success of their performance.		Student performs most work tasks and projects as designed/planned. Student evaluates the outcomes/success of their performance during and after task execution for most tasks when asked for.		Student performs work tasks and projects as designed/planned and evaluates the outcomes/success of their performance during and after task execution. Uses evaluation to improve performance.		Student makes several improvements in the execution of the work tasks and projects, thereby increasing the outcomes/success beyond expectations.	
1.10 Quality of products										
	Complies with none of the prerequisites for usability. Product is not usable.		Complies with some but not all prerequisites for usability. Product is not usable.		Complies with most prerequisites for usability. Product is usable to a limited extent..		Complies with all prerequisites, resulting in usable/functional products.		Transcends the prerequisites: contains new or improved functionality or is efficient beyond expectations.	
2. Context report (40%)										
2.1 Context, goals and delineation of research/project										
Context	No context of the project given or the context described is nonsensical.		Context of the project is described in broad terms. There is no link between the described context and the project goals.		Context of the project is correct but limited in width and depth (e.g. does not go beyond the information provided by the supervisor).		Context of the project is defined well and to-the-point and includes the knowledge gap. The project goals emerge directly from the described context.		Context of the project is defined sharply, to-the-point, funnelling from the broader context to the knowledge gap. The project goals emerge directly from the described context. Novelty and innovation of the project are indicated.	
Project goals	There are no concrete project goals and the delineation of the project is absent.		Most project goals are unclear, or not realistically attainable. Delineation of the project is weak.		Rationale of the project and project goals is mostly clear, but could have been defined sharper at some points. Delineation of the project is provided.		Rationale of the project and project goals is clear. Project goals are attainable. A clear delineation of the project is provided.		The project goals are clear, attainable and formulated to-the-point. Delineation of the project is well-defined.	

Rubric - MSc-professional internship

version: 4.1 (source: thesisinternship-rubric-v4.1_20230914.xlsm)

Criterion and subcriterion	Unacceptable		Insufficient	Needs improvement	Just sufficient	Ample sufficient	Good	Very good	Exemplary	Points of excellence
	Grade: 2	3	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10	
2.2 Theoretical underpinning of goals and framework										
	No reflection on relevance of theory for internship activities and internship provider. No reflection on relevance of internship activities and internship provider for theory.		The reflection on relevance of theory for internship activities and internship provider shows serious errors. The reflection on relevance of internship activities and internship provider for theory lacks clarity.		The reflection on relevance of theory for internship activities and internship provider is not wrong but minimalist. The reflection on relevance of internship activities and internship provider for theory lacks clarity.		The reflection on relevance of theory for internship activities and internship provider shows a good understanding of theory, is precise and tailored to the internship (activities and organisation). The reflection on relevance of internship activities and internship provider for theory is clear and innovative.		The reflection on relevance of theory for internship activities and internship provider shows a perfect understanding of theory and the internship providers context is precise and tailored to the internship (activities and organisation). The reflection on relevance of internship activities and internship provider for theory is clear, innovative and a potential input for a scientific article.	
2.3 Description and choice of methods and processing of information/data										
	No proper description of methods used to perform internship tasks. No explanation of the choice of methods.		Description of methods used to perform internship tasks is minimalist. Explanation of the choice of methods to perform internship tasks is minimalist, with hardly any reference to the specific challenges and demands of the internship provider.		Description of methods used to perform internship tasks is minimalist. The description and choice of methods to perform the internship tasks reflects some understanding of the challenges and demands of the internship provider.		The description of methods to perform the internship tasks is clear, and all methods are appropriate. Level of detail allows for an exact repetition of the work. The description and choice of methods to perform internship tasks reflects a good understanding of the challenges and demands of the internship provider.		The description and choice of methods to perform the internship tasks reflects an excellent understanding of the challenges and demands of the internship provider and methdological possibilities. The student provides realistic proposals to the internship provider on how to improve the performance of tasks for specific purposes.	
2.4 Presentation of data and results										
	Based on the description the reader is not able to understand what results were achieved.		Results or their connection to the project goals are unclear. Text, figures, graphs, tables etc. contain several flaws.		Results are enumerated understandably and correctly, and are connected to the project goals. Text, figures, graphs, tables, etc. are appropriate and show few flaws.		Results are presented correctly and efficiently. Text, figures, graphs, tables etc. are linked to the goals of the project goals in a logical way. Text, figures, graphs, tables, etc. are appropriate and correct..		Results are presented flawlessly and efficiently, with a clear storyline connecting the various results. Text, figures, graphs, tables etc. are well-chosen or original, and efficiently guide the reader to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.	
2.5 Evaluation of results										
Critical evaluation of own project	No reflection on the results of the project, or discussion only touches invalid, trivial or overly general points of criticism.		Student identifies only some points of weakness in the project or weaknesses which are in reality irrelevant or non-existent.		Student indicates weaknesses in the project, but impacts on the conclusions are not weighed relative to each other.		Student indicates all weaknesses and strengths in the project, evaluates their impacts on the conclusions, and weighs their impact on the conclusions relative to each other. Furthermore, (better) alternatives for the methods used are indicated.		Student indicates both strengths and weaknesses in the project, evaluates their impacts on the conclusions and weighs their impact on the conclusions relative to each other. Furthermore, original/innovative (better) alternatives for the methods used are specified.	
Confrontation with literature	No confrontation with existing literature.		Only marginal confrontation vis-a-vis existing literature, or confrontation with irrelevant existing literature.		Only most obvious conflicts and correspondences with existing literature are identified. The value of the study is described, but it is not related to existing research.		Results are confronted with existing literature and a distinction is made between minor and major conflicts and correspondences. The added value of the research relative to existing literature is identified and weighed.		Results are critically confronted with existing literature. and distinction is made between minor and major conflicts or correspondences. The relative weight of own results and existing literature is assessed. The contribution of the work to the development of scientific concepts is specified.	
2.6 Clarity and justification of conclusions										
Conclusions	No link between project goals and the results plus conclusions.		Conclusions merely repeat results, or conclusions are not substantiated by results, or conclusions only address part of the project goals.		Conclusions are linked to the project goals, but not all project goals are addressed. Some conclusions are not substantiated by results or merely repeat results.		Clear link between project goals and conclusions. All conclusions substantiated by results. Conclusions are formulated exact..		Conclusions are well-linked to all project goals and substantiated by results. Conclusions are formulated exact and concise and the line of argumentation is clear, logical and convincing. Conclusions address knowledge gaps, and proposal for future research is included.	
Recommendations	No recommendations given.		Recommendations are trivial.		Some recommendations are given, but the link of those to the conclusions is not always clear.		Recommendations are to-the-point, well-linked to the conclusions and original.		Recommendations are to-the-point, well-linked to the conclusions, original and are extensive enough to serve as project description for a new MSc-internship project.	
2.7 Writing skills										

Rubric - MSc-professional internship

version: 4.1 (source: thesisinternship-rubric-v4.1_20230914.xlsm)

Criterion and subcriterion	Unacceptable		Insufficient	Needs improvement	Just sufficient	Ample sufficient	Good	Very good	Exemplary	Points of excellence
	Grade: 2	3	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10	
Structure	Document is badly structured. In many cases information appears in wrong locations. Level of detail is inappropriate throughout.. Paragraph structure is illogical and inhibits correct understanding of the text.		Main structure is correct, but lower level hierarchy and ordering is illogical. Some sections have overlapping functions leading to ambiguity in placement of information. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information given). Structure within paragraphs and transition between paragraphs are often unclear or illogical.		Main structure is correct, placement of material in different chapters is somewhat illogical in some places. Level of detail could be improved in some places (irrelevant information given). Most paragraphs have a clear function. Transitions between paragraphs are predominantly clear and logical. Errors in structure do not inhibit correct understanding.		Main structure is correct , chapters and sections have a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordering of sections is logical. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate. Paragraphs fulfil a specific function. Transitions between paragraphs are clear and logical.		Well-structured, and clear and concise throughout. Very readable report where the structure helps to convey the storyline of the report ; structure, formulation and style facilitate understanding of the report. Paragraphs each fulfil a specific function, have a clear argumentation. Transitions between paragraphs are clear and logical; creating a clear line of argumentation.	
Fluency of writing	Formulations in the text are often incorrect/inexact inhibiting a correct interpretation of the text. Many spelling/grammar errors; inhibiting correct understanding of the text.		Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording affect the interpretation of the text. Many spelling/grammar errors, sometimes inhibiting correct understanding of the text.		Formulations in the text are ambiguous in some places but this does not inhibit a correct interpretation of the text. Spelling/grammar errors are rare, and do not inhibit correct understanding of the text.		Formulations in text are clear and exact, as well as concise. No spelling/grammar errors and readability of text is good.		Textual quality of document is such that it could be acceptable for a scientific or professional journal. No spelling/grammar errors; optimal use of grammar resulting in highly readable text.	

Rubric - MSc-professional internship										
Criterion and subcriterion	**Unacceptable**		**Insufficient**	**Needs improvement**	**Just sufficient**	**Ample sufficient**	**Good**	**Very good**	**Exemplary**	**Points of excellence**
	Grade: 2	**3**	**Grade: 4**	**5**	**Grade: 6**	**7**	**Grade: 8**	**9**	**Grade: 10**	
Citing and referencing	No literature cited or no proper reference list.		Reference list lacks information for many sources and/or literature is not or incorrectly referenced in the text.		Reference list contains literature used, but either referencing in text contains some errors, or information about sources is incomplete or incorrect in some cases.		Correct style of referencing in the text as well as in the reference list. Style is applied consistently throughout. All sources are traceable.		Correct style of referencing in the text as well as in the reference list. Style is applied consistently throughout. All sources are traceable. Style is appropriate for the type of document and the field of study.	
2.8 Evaluation of relevance of the internship tasks										
- Evaluation of relevance of the internship tasks for the organization	No evaluation of the project in relation to the organization.		Incorrect or only superficial identification of added value of the project for the organization.		Student identifies the added value of the project for the organization in broad or somewhat vague terms.		Student identifies the added value of their project for the organization correctly and specifically and precisely,		Student identifies the added value of the project for the organization, and relates this to the overall goals of the organization and future prospects.	
- Evaluation of relevance of the internship tasks in societal and scientific context	No evaluation of the project in relation to scientific or societal context.		Relevant issues ignored, or irrelevant issues addressed.		Student relates the project to some issues in scientific and/or societal context. Relevance of the identified issues is mixed.		Student relates the project to relevant issues in scientific and/or societal context		Idem +suggestions for future actions towards positive impact on science/society.	
3. Oral presentation (5%)										
3.1 Content and level of presentation (note: relative to the rubric of 2021/2022, this criterion combines part of criterion 3.2 + criterion 3.3 and 3.4)										
Presentation of data and results	Based on what is presented the audience is not able to understand what results were achieved.		Results or their connection to the project goals are unclear. Text, figures, graphs, tables etc., and/or how they are explained by the student, contain several flaws.		Results are enumerated understandably and correctly, and are connected to the project goals. Text, figures, graphs, tables, etc., and how they are explained by the student, are mostly appropriate and show few flaws.		Results are presented correctly and efficiently, and are clearly linked to the project goals. Text. figures, graphs, tables, etc., and how they are explained by the student, are appropriate and correct.		Results are presented flawlessly. Text, figures, graphs, tables etc., in combination with students explanation, efficiently guide the audience to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.	
Clarity and justification of conclusions	Student provides no link between goals, results and conclusions.		Student presents no clear conclusions, merely repeats results or does not substantiate conclusions by results, or only addresses part of the project goals.		Student links conclusions to the project goals but does not address all project goals. Some conclusions are not substantiated by results or merely repeat results .		Student makes clear links between all project goals and conclusion and substantiates all conclusions by results. Formulates conclusions exact.		Conclusions are well-linked to all project goals and substantiated by results. Conclusions are formulated exact and concise and the line of argumentation is clear, logical and convincing,	
Ability to respond to questions	Student is not able to answer questions.		Student is able to answer only the simplest questions.		Student answers informative questions well, but has difficulty to deal with in-depth questions.		Student answers both informative questions and in-depth questions well.		Student answers both informative questions and in-depth questions excellently. Answers are appropriate, clear and to-the-point and such that they enlighten the audience . Answers are logically and smoothly linked to the presentation or previous questions.	
3.2 Presentation skills '[Assessment-form-MSc-thesis-WU-2022-2023v1.4.xlsm]Rubric'!B34										
Targeted at audience	Unsuited for the intended public or intended purpose.		At some points a bit off target; makes it difficult for the audience to follow.		Intended public taken into account, but at some points level of detail is inappropriate for intended audience (too much or too little).		Targeted to the intended public (language, depth, length); appropriate for the intended purpose.		Enticing and purposeful throughout, facilitating communication of the main messages to the audience.	
Structure of presentation	Presentation is chaotic.		Presentation has unclear structure or lay-out.		Presentation is structured, though the audience gets lost in some places.		Presentation has a clear structure, is concise and to-the-point. Good separation between main message and side-steps.		Presentation is very well structured, is concise and to-the-point. Good separation between main message and side-steps. Line of argumentation is clear, logical and convincing throughout	
Voice and poise	Presented in such a way that the majority of audience could not follow.		Presentation is uninspired and/or monotonous and/or student reads from slides; attention of audience not captured.		Presentation mostly clear, but at some moments uninspired and/or monotonous and/or unclearly spoken. At those moments attention of audience is lost.. Student has trouble recovering from mistakes.		Inspired, lively presentation, clearly spoken. Student recovers well from any small mistake.		Lively and relaxed though concentrated presentation. Clearly spoken in such a way that it keeps audience's attention. Smooth without errors.	

Rubric - MSc-professional internship

version: 4.1 (source: thesisinternship-rubric-v4.1_20230914.xlsm)

Criterion and subcriterion	Unacceptable		Insufficient	Needs improvement	Just sufficient	Ample sufficient	Good	Very good	Exemplary	Points of excellence
	Grade: 2	3	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10	
4. Oral defence (5%)										
4.1 Defence of the MSc-internship										
Defence	Student is not able to defend/discuss their research/project and report.		Student has difficulty to explain the subject matter of the research/project and report.		Student defends their project.		Student engages in a discussion about the contents of the project and relevant current knowledge.		Student engages in a lively and in-depth discussion about the contents of the project and relevant current knowledge and contexts.	
Contents and context	Student does not master the contents.		Student limits theirselves in the discussion to own data, and/or repeatedly demonstrates misunderstanding of own project.		Student knows most of the contents of the work. Student has difficulty to place it in it scientific, societal or practical context.		Student masters the contents of the work and is able to place it in scientific, societal or practical context.		Student masters the contents of the work and beyond. Student pro-actively places it in its scientific, societal and practical context, both narrow and wide.	
5. Reflection report (pass/fail)										
	Pass	**Fail**								
5.1 Reflection on activities in relation to personal learning outcomes and programme learning outcomes										
Project Goals experience - own strengths and weaknesses	Student identifies own strengths and weaknesses and connects those to explicitly described experiences during the project goals.									
Personal learning goals (self-management)	Student describes investments (=how they worked on the personal learning outcomes), achievements (=results of these efforts) and how these are related (=effectiveness of the approach).									
Project Goals experience - programme learning outcomes	Student describes at least one event or situation in which they was involved and that relates to a formulated learning outcome of the study programme, properly distinguishing between the event description and the personal emotions involved, and able to formulate personal points of improvement and related actions in a future similar situation.									
5.2 Reflection on personal strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional ambitions										
Capabilities in relation to professional ambitions	Student evaluates how own strengths and weaknesses may affect their professional ambitions.									
Professional ambitions (career interest + career ambition)	Students identifies if and how the experiences during the project goals have strengthened or changed their ambitions with respect to their intended working field or preferred type of organization.									