



STUDENTDATA

Student name

Student number

RESEARCH PROJECT

Start date

End date

Title

Supervisor(s)

Copy front page attached?

Summary attached?

ASSESSMENT

Use rubric, fill out and attach

Research grade: 18 EC

Report & Presentation grade: 4 EC

(Grading is by a number between 1 and 10. Half integers are also permitted with the exception of 5.5)

Comments:

AGREEMENT

Name

Signature

1st examiner (*Research, Report & Presentation*):

2nd examiner (*Report & Presentation*):

TO DO

- 1) Examiner submit this form + assessment rubric + report front page + report summary to eduster@strw.leidenuniv.nl
- 2) Student needs a copy of this form for their own administration.
- 3) Student hands in a paper copy of the report to the Programme Coordinator, Oort 564.
- 4) Student send a digital version of the report to the Programme Coordinator, eduster@strw.leidenuniv.nl.

Assessment rubric – Astronomy Research Projects – Leiden Observatory

Criteria	Insufficient (<6)	Sufficient (6 – 6.5)	Good (7 – 7.5)	Very Good (8 – 8.5)	Excellent (9 – 9.5)
RESEARCH					
Scientific Knowledge	At the end of the project, the student's knowledge was inadequate.	At the end of the project, the student still has some deficiencies, but does have basic understanding.	Possesses sufficient knowledge to be able to function during research. Read and understood recommended literature.	Possesses very good knowledge, and could deal with information in a critical fashion. On track for PhD level research.	As "Very Good". Regularly contributed new literature. Deep understanding of theoretical framework and broader Relevance.
Research Skills	The work has been careless. Unable to perform research at a basic level. Has not picked up the main skills during the project.	The student had difficulty with overcoming hurdles. Took long time to learn new skills. Often the work is lacking scientific accuracy.	Student was able to learn new skills adequately. Making decisions on her/his own was difficult. Precision of work was sufficient.	Very precise. Quickly learned new techniques. Is able to take independent decisions about adjustments. On track for PhD level research.	As "Very Good". Saw connections beyond set-out boundaries. Proposed and carried out adjustments not instigated by supervisor. Obvious PhD candidate.
Interaction & Independence	The student was not able to do even simple steps by themselves. Communication was inefficient.	The student needed to be firmly guided. Overly detailed instructions were required to ensure progress.	Student can work independently. Generally asked advice and approached the supervisor to discuss research.	Worked as an independent researcher. Asked relevant and innovative questions during meetings. On track for PhD.	As "Very Good". E.g. arranged for collaboration and/or advice with others, outside normal scope.
Level and Quality of Research	The level and/or quality of research did not supersede that of simple practicals. Not enough for a research thesis.	The level and quality of the research are sufficient. Some results may not withstand a more thorough analysis.	Fulfilled parts of the potential of the research project. Some parts of the work may not be reliable.	Fulfilled most of the potential of research project. Reliable results. Could result in publication. On track for PhD.	As "Very Good"/ Clearly exceeded the goals of the research project that let to new scientific insights. Excellent interpretation.
Student Motivation	Periods of absence without reason. Student cuts corners. Not interested in the research.	Completed project with minimum effort, but showed little interest beyond. Time spent on research barely sufficient.	Worked well. Made use of advice and criticism. Clearly interested in research.	Worked hard and sees scientific research as an essential part of astronomy. Source of great enthusiasm. Eager to show results.	As "Very Good". Very active and hard working. Passionate, wanting to know everything about the subject.
REPORT					
Introduction and problem definition	Introduction shows insufficient understanding of research topic. Problem/hypothesis is not defined. Poor use of literature.	Introduction is missing depth and coherence. Problem, hypothesis is poorly defined. Some relevant literature missing.	Well-structured introduction. Refers to relevant literature. Wider context well described. Superficial in some places.	Very well written introduction, referring to almost all relevant literature. Sharply defined hypothesis.	Introduction meets all criteria of a thorough scientific report and could be used for a publication.
Description of methods	Not enough details to understand methodology. Imprecise descriptions. Cannot be used to repeat research.	Most of the used methods are described, but still some important info is missing. Too many/too few details given.	All methods have been described, but sometimes too few/many details. Possible for others to repeat experiment.	Methods are well described. All information is available.	Clear and concise and could directly be used for a scientific report or publication.
Results & Discussion	Key figures are missing or unclear. Results are not sufficiently presented nor discussed.	All results are presented, but lacking coherence. Low quality of figures. Relevance unclear.	Coherent, good quality figures and tables. Own finding placed in a wider context, but superficial at times.	Well-presented results, discussion with the right depth. Good placement of findings in a broader research area.	Meets all criteria for a thorough scientific report. Excellent placement of own findings in a broader research area.
Scientific Writing	Used language that is unsuitable for the purpose. Comprehension almost impossible. Vague and imprecise. Many grammatical errors.	Language is not always scientific and precise. At some points vague and difficult to follow. Some grammatical errors.	Language is scientific and precise. Mostly clearly written and good to follow. No grammatical errors.	Clearly written report, in good scientific language. Articulate. Would need some work for scientific report/publication.	Very persuasive. A highly articulate paper of publishable quality – with very little help from supervisor.