



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Department of Chemistry

Assessment protocol for project- and diploma work at Bachelor's level

Student name.....

Civil registration number

Course code Number of higher education credits

Project title

.....

Starting date.....

Supervisor/tutor name and affiliation

.....

.....

1. Project work performance	Grade
a. Theoretical and/or practical laboratory skills	
b. Initiative and problem solving ability	

2. Written thesis	Grade
a. Organisation and data handling	
b. Description of the project scientific background, relevance of reference list.	
c. Discussion and interpretation of results	

In each category the grades G (passed) or VG (passed with distinction) are awarded. If the student fail in one or more categories, the form is marked with R for those categories, and the student is encouraged to submit a new, improved version of the work for renewed examination. The grades in categories 1 and 2 are awarded after discussion with the supervisor/tutor.

3. Oral presentation	Grade
a. Ability to present and discuss the work	

4. Was the project timeframe kept? (15 hp projects should not exceed 12 weeks, 30 hp projects 24 weeks and 60 hp projects 48 weeks).	yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--	--

Overall grade:	
Grade: For G (to pass) all six categories must be graded G, for VG (to pass with distinction) at least three categories must be graded VG and there must be a "yes" answer in category 4.	

Abstract and popular science description Submitted and passed?	yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--	--

Name and affiliation of the examiner

.....

.....

Date

.....

Examiner signature

Evaluation and grading of advanced level projects and master diploma thesis work

1. Project work performance

a. *Theoretical and/or practical laboratory skills*

VG. The experimental work has been skilfully and thoroughly performed, with high scientific standards concerning both the implementation and the documentation of the lab work.

G. The experimental work has been carried out with good scientific standards, both concerning implementation and documentation of the lab work.

b. *Initiative and problem solving ability*

VG. The student has demonstrated substantial independence, creativity and a lot of own initiative.

G. The student shows some independence and good ability to evaluate, perform control experiments and find mistakes in his/her own work.

2. Written thesis

a. *Organisation and data handling*

VG. The manuscript is well structured and easy to read. The Material and Methods section enables an exact replication of the experimental work. Tables and figures are relevant and easy to understand.

G. The manuscript is generally of good quality as described above, but needed substantial correction and/or revision to become acceptable.

b. *Description of the project scientific background, relevance of reference list.*

VG. The introduction gives a good general overview of the research field and comprises a relevant introduction to the project. References are used correctly and the complete list of references is appropriate, and without bias towards certain authors, journals or time periods.

G. Relevant conclusions are drawn from the data and results obtained, demonstrating that the foundation of the scientific method has been understood.

c. *Discussion and interpretation of results*

VG. Relevant conclusions are drawn from the data and results obtained. The student shows good understanding of the significance of the results obtained, and can relate his/her results and conclusions to what others have described in the literature. The student is able to suggest relevant future experiments and research plans.

G. Relevant conclusions are drawn from the data and results obtained, demonstrating that the foundation of the scientific method has been understood.

3. Oral presentation

a. *Ability to present and discuss the work*

VG. A pedagogic, well-structured and enthusiastic presentation. The student is able to discuss the work with ease, and shows that he/she understands the methodology and different angles to interpret the results.

G. A presentation of good quality as described above, but that can have some weaknesses.