mark \ category	Research (50%)	Process (20%)	Communication (30%) (Report (60%) & Presentation (40%))
insufficient (<5,75)	- General problem cannot be explained - No specific research questions/objectives - Unable to place the research in a wider context, no clear literature research - The research resulted in almost no work, using already existing sources - The results do not answer the research questions - No substantial conclusions	- Not autonomus or proactive at all - Never responsive when new alternatives are suggested - Rarely taking in feedback from supervisors and implementing changes - Misuse of resources (data, computational time, people time) - No real planning, missed most of the deadlines - No original ideas were provided within the project, most of the work is copied and already developed	- Report has no structure - Report does not document sufficiently the research done, not reproducible - Report lacks visual material - Presentation is chaotic, not clear structure - Presentation has no motivation - In presentation loses audience rapidly - Candidate cannot address the questions posed - Clear lack of understanding of the scientific problem under study
6	- Motivation can be broadly discerned, but it is not well understood - General problem is vague or without clear boundaries (scope) - Sufficient introduction and justification of the research topic, but superficial (limited literature review) - The choices of methods and data are not justified or explained - Limited critical attitude and ability to reflect on the wides scope of application of the research - The answers to the research questions are satisfactory - Results interpreted to a limited extent	- Sometimes autonomous and proactive, but generally needed steering by supervisors - Rarely came up with creative new ideas and new sources of information - Little response/action to feedback from supervisors for self-improvement - Makes inefficient but passable use of resources (e.g. tools, data, own/supervisor's time) - Contribution to the project is somewhat original - Limited initiative and suggestions within the project - Basic timeline and plan prepared, but little followed or updated	- Report has just right structure, consistency and clarity, with significant corrections by supervisors - Report does not document all the parts of the research done (reproducibility issues) - Presentation follows a structure, but with some issues in clarity - Presentation gives a decent summary of motivation, problem, work done, results and conclusions - Sufficient presentation material (e.g. slides, videos, demos) - Interaction with the audience is sufficient (eye contact, body language, tone of voice, pace of speaking) - Gets attention of the audience - Can answer most of the questions raised - Shows superficial knowledge, not in depth control of the topic
7	- Motivation can be understood and related to the problem - General problem is clear with defined boundaries (scope) - Sufficient introduction and justification of the research topic, with fair literature support (decent literature review) - The choices of methods and data are partly justified - Fair critical attitude and ability to reflect on the wides scope of application of the research - The answers for the research questions are more than satisfactory - Results interpreted with a critical attitude independently	- Mostly autonomous, generally trying approaches before asking for help - Few times came up with new ideas or found new sources of information - Was able to contribute to discussions about the research during meetings - Critical attitude towards the work done, but most key issues had to be pointed out by supervisors - Uses feedback from supervisors for self-improvement - Use of resources is appropriate (e.g., tools, data, own/supervisor's time) - Contribution to the project is partly original - Some initiative and suggestions by the student - Good timeline and plan prepared, often followed or updated	- Report follows a structure, with issues in clarity and organization - Report documents all the parts of the research done (no reproducibility issues) - Report is generally well written, but contains significant errors and needs improvements - Abstract does not capture most of the work - Report properly acknowledges other work broadly and contains a fair list of references - Presentation follows a structure, but with some issues in clarity and organization - Presentation gives a decent summary of motivation, problem, work done, results and conclusions - Good presentation material (e.g. slides, videos, demos) - Interaction with the audience is appropriate (eye contact, body language, tone of voice, pace of speaking) - Gets attention of the audience and maintains it to some extent - Questions are answered well with some gaps - Confident with the content for its application
8	- Motivation is clearly shown and connected to the probelm - General problem is clear and has defined limitations - Good introduction and justification of the research topic with supporting literature (but not all included) - The choices of methods and data are justified and logical - Demonstrate critical attitude and ability to reflect on the wides scope of application of the research - The answers to the research questions are good - Results interpreted critically and discussed in a broader scope of the discipline	- Mostly autonomous and proactive, generally taking control of the project and steering it to completion with some hiccups - Sometimes came up with new ideas and found new sources of information - Was able to contribute to lively discussions about the research during meetings - Critical attitude towards the work done, but key issues had to be pointed out by supervisors - Sometimes uses feedback from supervisors for self-improvement - Makes good use of resources (e.g. tools, data, own/supervisor's time) - Contribution to the project is original, with suggestions by supervisors - Several initiative and suggestions within the project - Prepared a good and feasible plan at the beginning of the research project, which was mostly followed or adjusted when needed (e.g. according to progress and new findings)	- Report follows a structure, with minor issues in clarity - Report documents all the parts of the research done (no reproducibility issues) - Report is generally well written, but contains a few errors and needs improvements - Abstract captures most of the work - Report properly acknowledges other work most of the time and contains a mostly complete list of references - Work yields some other output (e.g. software, data), which is added to the report - Presentation follows a structure, but with some issues in clarity - Presentation gives a good summary of motivation, problem, work done, results and conclusions - More than satisfactory material (e.g. slides, videos, demos) - Interaction with the audience is good (eye contact, body language, tone of voice, pace of speaking) - Maintains attention of the audience for most of the presentation - Most questions are correctly answered - Very confident with the content at a research and development level
9	- Motivation is clearly described and connected with the need of solutions of the problem - General problem is clear, has boundaries or limitations and is feasible - Good introduction and justification of the research topic, with vast literature support - The choices of methods and data are justified and logical - Good critical attitude and ability to reflect on the wides scope of application of the research - The answers to the research qestions are very good - Results interpreted critically and discussed in a broader scope of the discipline, with proposed solutions or alternative approaches when necessary	- Autonomous and proactive, taking control of the project and steering it - Most times came up with new ideas and found new sources of information - Was able to lead lively discussions about the research during meetings - Critical attitude towards the work done, pointing out the issues by him/her/theirselves - Uses feedback from supervisors for self-improvement - Makes very good use of resources (e.g. tools, data, own/supervisor's time) - Contribution to the project is original, with almost no intervention by supervisors - Many initiative and suggestions within the project - Prepared a clear and feasible plan at the beginning of the research project, which was followed and improved when needed (e.g. according to progress and new findings)	- Report follows a clear structure - Report documents all the parts of the research done - Report is well written, with a very few writing errors - Abstract captures the essence of the work - Report properly acknowledges other work most of the time and contains a mostly complete list of references - Work yields some other output (e.g. software, data), which is added to the report and published in an ad hoc manner - Presentation follows a clear structure - Presentation gives a very good summary of motivation, problem, work done, results and conclusions - Very good presentation material (e.g. slides, videos, demos) - Interaction with the audience is very good (eye contact, body language, tone of voice, pace of speaking) - Maintains constant attention of the audience - Questions are answered well, without further deepening in the topic - Masters the content within the research topic
10	- Motivation is perfectly presented and connected with the need of solutions of the problem - General problem is clear, has boundaries or limitations and is feasible with the approach proposed - Excellent introduction and justification of the research topic, with all literature support - The choices of methods and data are justified, logical and the most efficient at the moment - Excellent critical attitude and ability to reflect on the wides scope of application of the research, making connection to simultaneous research performed by other peers - Results interpreted critically and discussed in a broader scope of the discipline, with proposed solutions or alternative approaches when necessary - The answers to the research questions are excellent - There is a clear evidence that the student is able to design new techniques or combine different techniques succesfully in an innovative manner	- Highly autonomous and proactive throughout the process, taking full control of the project and steering it to completion in an efficient manner - Always came up with creative new ideas and found new sources of information - Was able to lead lively discussions about the research during meetings - Critical own attitude towards the work done - Actively uses both own discoveries and feedback from supervisors for self-improvement - Makes highly efficient use of resources (e.g. tools, data, own/supervisor's time) - Contribution to the project is original - Makes all initiative and suggestions within the project - Prepared an efficient, clear and feasible plan at the beginning of the research project, which was followed and improved when needed (e.g. according to progress and new findings)	- Report follows a clear and logical structure - Report thoroughly documents all the parts of the research done, which could be readily replicated using only the report as a base - Report is well written using clear scientific language and few errors - Report is visually appealing and uses figures and tables to best explain aspects of the research - Abstract captures the essence of the work - Report properly acknowledges other work everywhere and contains a complete and well-formatted list of references - Work attempts to yield other output (e.g. software, data) whenever possible, which is published following open science best practices (e.g. fully available source code on public repository with documentation and sample data) - Presentation follows a clear and logical structure - Presentation gives an easy to understand summary of motivation, problem, work done, results and conclusions - High-quality presentation material (e.g. slides, videos, demos) - Interaction with the audience is outstanding (eye contact, body language, tone of voice, pace of speaking) - Maintains constant attention of the audience - Questions are answered succinctly and with full awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of the research - Masters the content beyond the research topic