ETH

Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Department of Environmental Systems Science
Master of Environmental Science

Master's Thesis Evaluation Form

Student (last name, first name) ....

Topic of the thesis ....

Supervisor ....

The Master's thesis will be assessed by the supervisor and separately by at least one other supervisor. If the grades awarded by these two supervisors differ by more than 0.5, the thesis must be evaluated by a third person. The final grade will be determined in a discussion with all supervisors.

	Supervisor	Co-Supervisor	Co-Supervisor
Mark	....	....	....
Independent scientific thinking/originality	☐	☐	☐
General scientific competence	☐	☐	☐
Methodological competence	☐	☐	☐
Logical coherence/ Quality of presentation	☐	☐	☐
Work process	☐	☐	☐
Grade = Mean of the marks for all these categories	☐	☐	☐
			☐
FINAL GRADE * (average grade rounded to the nearest quarter)			☐

* If the thesis is awarded the final grade 6, the main supervisor must submit a written report and a copy of the thesis to the Administration Office for Master Students.

The evaluation form must be sent to the Study Administration (env_science@ethz.ch) at the latest **two weeks after the submission of the Master's thesis.**

With the agreement of the main supervisor, an excellent Master's thesis can be published in the E-Collection of the ETH Library, see http://e-collection.ethbib.ethz.ch/

Date ....   Signature of the supervisor ....

Master's Thesis: Guidelines for Evaluation and Awarding Marks

Criteria
The following questions pertaining to the individual criteria are not exhaustive and may vary in importance depending on the type of thesis.

1. Independent scientific thinking/originality
   • How significant is the independent contribution of the student to the outcome of the thesis?
   • Does the thesis show scientific originality?
   • Are there new ideas or established ideas used in a new way?
   • Are the results of the thesis novel and important?

2. General scientific competence
   • Does the candidate show sufficient familiarity with the literature on the subject of the thesis?
   • Are the aims/hypothesis/questions of the thesis clearly formulated?
   • Are the methods and techniques used properly described?
   • Are the methods adopted appropriate for the subject of the thesis?
   • Has the research (field work, experiments, modelling, etc.) been carried out carefully?
   • Have the results been appropriately tested by statistical analyses and/or sensitivity tests?
   • Are previous studies and the strengths and limitations of the own work critically discussed?
   • Are the results of the thesis placed in a broader context?
   • Are suggestions made for subsequent research?

3. Methodological competence
   • Did the student learn or even develop new techniques/methods/tools?
     (e.g. experimental design, laboratory work, programming, etc.)?
   • Are these methods/tools also useful for future studies?
   • Have these methods/tools been tested/validated and constantly improved?

4. Logical coherence and quality of presentation
   • Is the structure of the thesis logical and appropriate?
   • Are the results and conclusions clearly and logically presented?
   • Have the central questions been answered?
   • Are the facts clearly distinguishable from hypotheses and assumptions?
   • Have the formal requirements for diagrams, tables, literature sources etc. been met?
   • Is there an informative summary/abstract?
   • Is the text comprehensible and correct, both grammatically and scientifically?
   • Is the layout of the thesis well done?

5. Work process
   • Did the candidate tackle the task with dedication?
   • Did the candidate acquire the knowledge necessary to complete the task?
   • Was the research carried out independently?
   • Has the candidate made good use of constructive criticism?

Awarding Marks
Marks or grades will be awarded on the following principles:
6   excellent, among the best 10%
5.5 very good, only minor flaws
5   good, certain flaws
4.5 satisfactory, several flaws
4   barely satisfactory, obvious flaws
3   unsatisfactory, serious flaws

The candidate is entitled to an explanation of the marks awarded, either in a discussion with the examiners or in a written report.