

Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student (last name, first name)

Topic of the thesis

Main supervisor

Evaluation (for criteria see back of this sheet)

The Master's thesis will be assessed by the main supervisor and separately by at least one other person. If the grades awarded by these two examiners differ by more than 0.5, the thesis must be evaluated by a third person. The final grade will be determined in a discussion with all examiners.

	supervisor	2nd examiner	3rd person
Mark
Independent scientific thinking/originality	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
General scientific competence	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Methodological competence	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Logical coherence/ Quality of presentation	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Work process	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Grade = Mean of the marks for all these categories	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
FINAL GRADE * (average grade rounded to the nearest quarter)			<input type="text"/>

* If the thesis is awarded the final grade 6, the main supervisor must submit a written report and a copy of the thesis to the Administration Office for Master Students.

With the agreement of the main supervisor, an excellent Master's thesis can be published in the E-Collection of the ETH Library, see <http://e-collection.ethbib.ethz.ch/>

The evaluation form has to be sent to:

Administration Office Department of Environmental Systems Science
Diana Haller
Universitätstrasse 16 |
8092 Zürich
CHN H 41 | phone +41 44 632 53 75
diana.haller@usys.ethz.ch

Date Signature of the main supervisor

Master's Thesis: Guidelines for Evaluation and Awarding Marks

Criteria

The following questions pertaining to the individual criteria are not exhaustive and may vary in importance depending on the type of thesis.

1. Independent scientific thinking/originality
 - How significant is the independent contribution of the student to the outcome of the thesis?
 - Does the thesis show scientific originality?
 - Are there new ideas or established ideas used in a new way?
 - Are the results of the thesis novel and important?
2. General scientific competence
 - Does the candidate show sufficient familiarity with the literature on the subject of the thesis?
 - Are the aims/hypothesis/questions of the thesis clearly formulated?
 - Are the methods and techniques used properly described?
 - Are the methods adopted appropriate for the subject of the thesis?
 - Has the research (field work, experiments, modelling, etc.) been carried out carefully?
 - Have the results been appropriately tested by statistical analyses and/or sensitivity tests?
 - Are previous studies and the strengths and limitations of the own work critically discussed?
 - Are the results of the thesis placed in a broader context?
 - Are suggestions made for subsequent research?
3. Methodological competence
 - Did the student learn or even develop new techniques/methods/tools?
(e.g. experimental design, laboratory work, programming, etc.)?
 - Are these methods/tools also useful for future studies?
 - Have these methods/tools been tested/validated and constantly improved?
4. Logical coherence and quality of presentation
 - Is the structure of the thesis logical and appropriate?
 - Are the results and conclusions clearly and logically presented?
 - Have the central questions been answered?
 - Are the facts clearly distinguishable from hypotheses and assumptions?
 - Have the formal requirements for diagrams, tables, literature sources etc. been met?
 - Is there an informative summary/abstract?
 - Is the text comprehensible and correct, both grammatically and scientifically?
 - Is the layout of the thesis well done?
5. Work process
 - Did the candidate tackle the task with dedication?
 - Did the candidate acquire the knowledge necessary to complete the task?
 - Was the research carried out independently?
 - Has the candidate made good use of constructive criticism?

Awarding Marks

Marks or grades will be awarded on the following principles:

- 6 excellent, among the best 10%
- 5.5 very good, only minor flaws
- 5 good, certain flaws
- 4.5 satisfactory, several flaws
- 4 barely satisfactory, obvious flaws
- 3 unsatisfactory, serious flaws

The candidate is entitled to an explanation of the marks awarded, either in a discussion with the examiners or in a written report.