PROFESSIONAL BACHELOR ELECTROMECHANICS — JURY

Evaluation form bachelor's thesis — jury

STUDENT NAME	SPECIALISATION
NAME OF JURY MEMBER AND COMPANY	**DATE OF DEFENCE**

RUBRIC	0–2 Not present	2.1–4 Insufficient	4.1–6 Moderate	6.1–8 Good	8.1–10 Excellent
CONTENT — BASED ON THE ASSIGNMENT FORM					
1 **Analysis of the IST situation** ASSIGNMENT FORM, PART A & B The initial situation was mapped out clearly and completely. The student answers questions about the reason, context and problem statement correctly and with substantiation. **Weight: 10%**					
2 **Delivery in line with the SOLL assignment** ASSIGNMENT FORM, PART C The student delivered the assignment in line with the assignment description, respecting standards, regulations and the applicable safety requirements. **Weight: 20%**					
3 **Substantiation of choices & technical depth** ASSIGNMENT FORM, PART C Components are selected on the basis of technical, economic and sustainability criteria. Calculations, diagrams or drawings show sufficient technical depth. **Weight: 20%**					
4 **Subject knowledge & command of the topic** ASSIGNMENT FORM, PART C The student shows insight into the electromechanical interrelationships. Questions about the SOLL development are answered correctly and completely. **Weight: 20%**					
5 **Independence & own contribution** ASSIGNMENT FORM, PART C — MANDATORY REFLECTION PER TASK The student demonstrates having worked independently and the own contribution to the assignment (part C) is clearly recognisable. The student also explains to what extent each task has been completed. Incomplete tasks are justified in substance. **Weight: 10%**					
PRESENTATION					
6 **Oral defence & communication** Problem statement, approach, results and conclusions are clearly distinguished from one another. The story is easy to follow. Main and secondary points are distinguished. Slides, diagrams and graphs support the presentation. The presentation is complete, clear and delivered professionally. **Weight: 20%**					

WEIGHTED TOTAL SCORE (AUTOMATIC) Complete all rubrics for a final result.

PROFESSIONAL BACHELOR ELECTROMECHANICS

Assessment criteria — reference

Overview of the level descriptors per rubric (the same explanation as the hover info in the digital version), to support completing the form on paper.

1 Analysis of the IST situation

Weight: 10%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	The initial situation is hardly or not at all described. The student cannot explain the reason or context.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	The IST situation is superficial. Questions about context or problem statement are answered incompletely or incorrectly.
4.1–6 MODERATE	The initial situation is described clearly. Basic questions about the reason and context are answered correctly.
6.1–8 GOOD	The IST situation is clear and complete. The student readily links the initial situation to the chosen approach.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The IST situation is sharply analysed. The student substantiates the problem statement in depth and also answers critical questions convincingly.

2 Delivery in line with the SOLL assignment

Weight: 20%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	The assignment has hardly or not at all been carried out. There is no demonstrable result.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Only part of the assignment has been realised. Standards or safety requirements were not or insufficiently respected.
4.1–6 MODERATE	The assignment has largely been carried out in line with the description. Standards and safety requirements have been observed.
6.1–8 GOOD	The assignment has been delivered completely and correctly. The result is working, safe and in line with the applicable requirements.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The assignment has been delivered completely and to a high quality. The student demonstrates that the result is robust, safe and sustainably deployable.

3 Substantiation of choices & technical depth

Weight: 20%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	Choices are not substantiated. Calculations, diagrams or drawings are missing or incorrect.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Choices are only partly substantiated. The technical development is incomplete or contains errors.
4.1–6 MODERATE	Choices are substantiated on the basis of technical criteria. Calculations or diagrams are correct but limited in depth.
6.1–8 GOOD	Choices are well substantiated on technical, economic and/or sustainability criteria. The technical development is correct and complete.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	Choices are strongly substantiated from multiple perspectives. The technical development shows deep insight and is convincingly defended.

4 Subject knowledge & command of the topic

Weight: 20%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	The student shows no insight into the subject. Questions are not answered or answered incorrectly.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Basic knowledge is present but insight into the interrelationships is lacking. Questions are answered incompletely or superficially.
4.1–6 MODERATE	The student has a sufficient command of the subject. Standard questions are answered correctly.
6.1–8 GOOD	The student clearly shows insight into the electromechanical interrelationships. Questions are answered correctly and completely.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The student has complete command of the subject. Even critical or unexpected questions are answered confidently and correctly.

5 Independence & own contribution

Weight: 10%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	The student’s own contribution is not recognisable. There is no, or an unconvincing, explanation of the tasks carried out.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	The own contribution is only marginally visible. The explanation of tasks not carried out or incomplete is vague or insufficiently substantiated.
4.1–6 MODERATE	The student shows a reasonable own contribution to the assignment. Incomplete tasks are acceptably justified.
6.1–8 GOOD	The student worked largely independently and the own contribution is clearly recognisable. Incomplete tasks are justified clearly and honestly.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The student worked fully independently with a clear own contribution to all tasks. Any incompleteness is justified critically and honestly.

6 Oral defence & communication

Weight: 20%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	The presentation is incomplete or incoherent. The message does not come across. Visual support is missing or misleading.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	The structure is weak. Main and secondary points are insufficiently distinguished. Slides do not support the presentation.
4.1–6 MODERATE	The presentation is understandable and sufficiently structured. Problem statement, approach and result are recognisable.
6.1–8 GOOD	The presentation is clear and well structured. Visual aids support the story. The student communicates smoothly and professionally.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The presentation is strong, convincing and professional. The student commands the stage, uses visuals optimally and actively involves the jury.