 

***Explanation.*** *This grid is intended to help to establish a grade taking into account all the intended learning outcomes for the writing of the master thesis dissertation. It is independently completed by each jury member. The global grade is not a simple arithmetic average of the letter values (A, B, C, …) for each criterion, but rather the result of the* ***global trend****. The meaning of the letters in terms of grades (out of 20) is given in the back of this document.* ***This form once completed must be returned 2 days before the oral session*** *to the secretary of the Program Commission, or* ***at the latest at the beginning of the oral session*** *to the moderator of the session.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation of the written dissertation Reader : Student(s) :** | | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | | **Lettered grades** | | | | | | |
| **C**  **o n t e n t** | **Consistency and relevance of the basics and the topic** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Formulation and clarity of the objectives, relevance and completeness of the state of the art, current status, soundness of theoretical/technical foundations, context* |  | | | | | | |
| **Appropriate methodology and use of tools** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Adequate choice of experiments, models, computations, simulations, tests, and laboratory works, or software platform* |  | | | | | | |
| **Amount of results** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Amount of work, number of results, completeness of the investigation* |  | | | | | | |
| **Validity of the produced results** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Norms, rules, accuracy, validation, robustness of the results* |  | | | | | | |
| **Innovation, originality** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Novelty, creativity* |  | | | | | | |
| **Scientific quality of the argumentation, critical mind, discussions** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Critical analysis, connection with the literature, perspectives, horizons, meeting or going beyond the objectives, critical view on the contributions* |  | | | | | | |
| **Application of norms, rules, and good practice (technical, jurisdictional, ethical)** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Terminology, rules, safety, human experiment, environmental aspects* |  | | | | | | |
| **F**  **o r m** | **Writing quality** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Care, spelling, layout, correct use of the language, conciseness and ability to synthesize, respect of length criteria* |  | | | | | | |
| **Figures and illustrations (of methodology and results)** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Readability, choice, relevance* |  | | | | | | |
| **Consistency in writing** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** | **NA** |
| *Clear and accurate explanations, consistent structure, adequate scientific / technical guideline, perceivable guideline* |  | | | | | | |
| **Global numeric grade** | | **/20** | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Letters** | **Appreciations** | **Grades (/20)** | **Definitions** |
| **A** | Excellent | ≥ 17,2 | Remarkable work |
| **B** | Very good | 15,6 to 17,1 | Work above average, with only a few minor shortcomings |
| **C** | Good | 13,6 to 15,5 | Overall good work, despite some shortcomings |
| **D** | Satisfactory | 12,0 to 13,5 | Decent work, but with shortcomings |
| **E** | Sufficient | 10,0 to 11,9 | Work just complying with the minimum criteria |
| **F** | Insufficient | < 10,0 | Additional work is required to grant the credits |
| **NA** |  |  | Not relevant (not applicable) |