

MSc Thesis in Atmospheric and Climate Science - Assessment Form

The main supervisor calculates the final grade (to be entered in eDoz no later than four weeks after submission of the Thesis. Like all other written examinations, the main supervisor must store this form for two years (it may be stored digitally).

If the Master's Thesis is awarded the final grade 6, the main supervisor must submit a written report. Master's Thesis with the best grade (6) can be suggested for the ETH Medal. The main supervisor has to state reasons for the outstanding and excellent thesis.

Name | Student Number

Title of Master Thesis

Main Supervisor

Additional Supervisor

Examiner

Please refer to the guidelines for further information on the supervising committee.

Assessment (see following pages for a description on assessment criteria)

Grades from *all involved supervisors/examiners* have equal weight for the final mark.

	Main Supervisor	Additional Supervisor	Examiner
NAME and Acad. Title of Supervisors			
1. General Impression (25%)			
2. Scientific Results and Interpretation (55%)			
3. Form (20%)			
Mean Grades			
Date (dd/mm/yyyy)			
Signature of all supervisors (please sign)			
Final Grade (average of mean grades)			

In agreement with the main supervisor an excellent Master's Thesis can be published by E-Collection, see link:
<http://e-collection.ethbib.ethz.ch/>

Master Thesis: Guidelines for assessment and grading

Each Master Thesis will be assessed by at least two persons (see MSc Thesis Guidelines). The examiners will evaluate the Master Thesis in accordance with the following criteria and guidelines.

Assessment Criteria

1. General Impression (25%), e.g.

- Does the candidate demonstrate an in-depth knowledge and understanding of the relevant scientific and technical literature?
- Does the candidate formulate a well-defined research problem?
- Does the candidate develop original ideas and solution strategies?
- Has the work been carried out independently and in a focused and efficient manner?

2. Scientific Results and Interpretation (5%)

- Has the collection of data and results (field work, petrographic and structural data, field survey data, laboratory experiments, simulation results, analyses ...) been carried out carefully and correctly?
- Are the methods adopted appropriate to the subject matter?
- Have the methods (e.g. analytical methods and protocols, instrument calibration, operating conditions for analytical instruments, simulation methods and model setup, layout of field measurements, mapping methods, ...) been thoroughly, yet concisely, documented? Is the documentation sufficient for the reader to reproduce the approach?
- Is there a meaningful error analysis and discussion of uncertainties?
- Are observations and results thoroughly and systematically documented? Are all relevant data available in raw form (→ Appendix and/or data repository)?
- Are key results presented in clear writing, in a logical sequence and supported by clear, graphical presentations (maps, photos, sketches, charts...)?
- Are the observations clearly distinguishable from hypotheses and suppositions?
- Is the presentation of results in a meaningful relation to the methods?
- Do the discussion, interpretation and conclusions build on (and are they supported by) the results?

3. Form (20%)

- Does the thesis have a clear structure (e.g. Introduction – Methods – Results – Discussion – Conclusions – Appendix)?
 - Is there a comprehensive, informative *abstract*?
 - Does the *introduction* give a concise, yet comprehensive and meaningful review of the current state of knowledge regarding the thesis topic? Is broader context of the thesis topic laid out? Is there a clear claim of the objectives of the study?
 - Does the *methods section* match the criteria listed under 2?
 - Is the *discussion* building on and supported by the results and supported by them? Does the work address the questions asked? Is a comparison made between the results and published data? Are the results placed in a broader context?
 - In the *conclusions*: are the core findings presented in clear statements? Are the conclusions clearly and logically presented?
 - *Appendices*: Is there an electronic data repository (DVD) with all relevant data, figures and text?
- Is the text scientifically correct, clearly understandable and in a grammatically sound language?
- Have the formal requirements for diagrams, tables, literary sources etc. been met?
 - Are all figures and tables accompanied by meaningful captions that can be comprehended without reading the main text?

- Do all figures have proper scales and legends?
- Are font sizes, line thicknesses, symbols sizes etc. in the figures chosen appropriately?
- Do figures/graphs show the essentials or are they overloaded / have a meaningless scale?
- Are geographic maps clearly readable (ideally: line art) and reduced to relevant contents in order to allow orientation (and topography etc. where necessary)? Or are they a mere copy/paste of irregularly colored bitmaps of satellite images with cosmetic changes from Google Earth and alike?
- Are all figures clearly readable and properly sized on printouts? Is there sufficient contrast?
- Is color in diagrams used sparsely and to highlight information only? If colors and/or grey-scales are used, have they been selected such that they are easily distinguishable?
- Do tables contain all relevant information including e.g., units, columns with error estimates, geographic coordinates (if applicable)? Are only significant numbers of digits given? Are meaningful symbols, conventions or abbreviations used for reporting “not analyzed”, “below detection limit” etc. or are the tables just copy/ pasted output from programs?
- Is the literature list complete and properly formatted? Are all references listed that are cited in the thesis (and only those)?