PROFESSIONAL BACHELOR ELECTROMECHANICS

Evaluation form bachelor's thesis — supervising lecturer

STUDENT NAME	SPECIALISATION
SUPERVISING LECTURER NAME	**DATE**

Enter a score for each rubric. The weighted total score is calculated automatically. **This evaluation counts for 10% of the final assessment of the bachelor's thesis.**

RUBRIC	0–2 Not present	2.1–4 Insufficient	4.1–6 Moderate	6.1–8 Good	8.1–10 Excellent
TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT					
1 **Technical calculations & programs** Correctness, completeness and justification of calculations or program code. **Weight: 20%**					
2 **Diagrams, drawings & flowcharts** Quality and correctness of the technical documentation. **Weight: 15%**					
INFORMATION GATHERING & REPORTING					
3 **Use of sources** Relevance, reliability and correct processing of sources. **Weight: 15%**					
4 **Planning** Layout and follow-up of the planning. **Weight: 15%**					
5 **Reporting of results** Clarity and substantiation of the reported results. **Weight: 20%**					
6 **Technical file** Completeness and structure of the entire submitted file. **Weight: 15%**					

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

COMMENTS / EXPLANATION OF THE ASSESSMENT

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 Technical calculations & programs

Weight: 20%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	Calculations or programs are missing or fundamentally wrong.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Calculations or programs are incomplete or contain significant errors.
4.1–6 MODERATE	Calculations or programs are largely correct. Minor inaccuracies.
6.1–8 GOOD	Calculations or programs are correct and complete. The approach is clearly justified.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	Calculations or programs are correct, complete and show technical depth. Assumptions and limitations are stated explicitly.

2 Diagrams, drawings & flowcharts

Weight: 15%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	Diagrams, drawings or flowcharts are missing or unusable.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Diagrams or drawings are incomplete or contain errors that make them unusable.
4.1–6 MODERATE	Diagrams or drawings are understandable and largely correct. Minor inaccuracies.
6.1–8 GOOD	Diagrams or drawings are correct, complete and laid out according to the applicable standards.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	Diagrams or drawings are correct, professionally laid out and add substantive value to the report.

3 Use of sources

Weight: 15%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	Use of sources is absent or completely unreliable.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Sources are limited or of insufficient quality. References are inconsistent or missing.
4.1–6 MODERATE	Relevant sources are used and correctly cited. Basic rules for referencing have been followed.
6.1–8 GOOD	Sources are relevant, reliable and correctly processed. References are complete and consistent.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	Use of sources is broad, critical and well thought out. Different types of sources are distinguished and correctly integrated into the text.

4 Planning

Weight: 15%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	There is no planning or the planning was not kept up.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	The planning is incomplete or was rarely updated. Deadlines were not met.
4.1–6 MODERATE	A planning is present and was reasonably kept up. Minor deviations are not justified.
6.1–8 GOOD	The planning is realistic and up to date, and deadlines were met. Deviations are justified.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The planning is thorough, consistently kept up and shows proactive adjustment. The student anticipates risks and communicates delays in good time.

5 Reporting of results

Weight: 20%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	Results are hardly or not at all reported.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	Results are described incompletely or unclearly. Conclusions are missing or superficial.
4.1–6 MODERATE	Results are described clearly. Basic conclusions are present but only partly substantiated.
6.1–8 GOOD	Results are reported clearly and completely. Conclusions are correct and substantiated.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	Results are reported excellently with critical analysis. Conclusions are sharp, substantiated and linked to the objectives.

6 Technical file

Weight: 15%

0–2 NOT PRESENT	The technical file is absent or completely incomplete.
2.1–4 INSUFFICIENT	The file is incomplete. Important parts such as plans, diagrams or calculations are missing.
4.1–6 MODERATE	The file is reasonably complete. The structure is present but not all parts are equally developed.
6.1–8 GOOD	The file is complete and well structured. All expected parts are present and correctly developed.
8.1–10 EXCELLENT	The file is complete, professional and directly usable by third parties. Structure, completeness and quality are excellent.