

First Stage Evaluation: formative feedback form

This evaluation is to inform the student and give feedback on the progress of the current thesis project of the student.

Date:

Student name:

Student number:

First Stage evaluation:

1st session	2nd session
Supervisor: Thesis advisor can evaluate all sessions; Daily supervisor can evaluate only first session of the first stage; Daily co-supervisor has no responsibility in evaluation procedure.	Supervisor: 2nd committee member* *mandatory for repair possibility
Based on: (select all that apply) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General impression supervisor(s) Project proposal Literature overview (Draft) Thesis chapter First Stage Review presentation Other: 	Based on: (select all that apply) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General impression supervisor(s) Project proposal Literature overview (Draft) Thesis chapter First Stage Review presentation Other:
Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue Repair possibility 	Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue Stop this project
Signature daily supervisor or thesis advisor:	Signature thesis advisor

You can sign by using your digital signature OR by clicking fill and sign and placing your signature in the box.
 Once the form is signed, you will not be able to edit it.

Category	Criteria	no	not yet	yes	n/a	Feedback
1) Quality of work						
<i>The student is able to design this computer science research project.</i>	The student has formulated a research question or a problem description or an objective for this research project.					
	The student shows sufficient progress in explaining relevant literature.					
	The student has produced initial results line with the research question or objective					
2) Performance						
<i>The student is able to execute this research project.</i>	The student has a critical attitude towards summarized literature or own work.					
	The student shows initiative to give his/her own input within the project.					
	The student interacts with peers and supervisors satisfactorily.					
	The student has made a project plan.					
3) Writing						
<i>The student is able to produce relevant scientific document(s) of sufficient quality.</i>	The student has written a coherent document meeting requirements in terms of content (e.g., thesis chapter, project proposal).					
	The structure of the document and presentation of the content (text and figures) is acceptable.					
	The student expressed argumentation using correct spelling and grammar.					
4) Presentation & Defence						
<i>The student is able to present the progress of this research</i>	<i>Only if applicable, a presentation during the first stage review is not a requirement.</i>					

Motivation for overall conclusion:

For continuation of the project the criteria of 1) Quality of work and 2) Performance should not have the judgement "no". In case of 1 or more "no" judgements, the project can only continue if the supervisor has sufficient argumentation to make an exception.