**Guidelines for the master’s thesis evaluation form**

(these guidelines do not need to be handed in to the ZPA)

* The form can (but does not have to be used) for the evaluation of the master’s thesis, both by the first and second reviewer. Each reviewer should hand in a separate evaluation form.
* The first reviewer should also add a longer comment that justifies the grade that was awarded.
* Please have a look at the thesis before the colloquium – if the thesis is not passed, the colloquium does not have to take place. In this case, hand in the evaluation to the Central Examination Office (ZPA). The student then gets a second chance for the thesis and only has to sit one colloquium.
* If the thesis is passed, hand in the evaluation 8 weeks after the colloquium the latest.

**Master Thesis Evaluation Form**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Student name: | Student ID number: | |
| Title of the thesis: | | |
| First reviewer: | | Second reviewer: | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Introduction: | Very good | |  |  | Fail | N/A |
| Does the introduction motivate the goals of the thesis and explain the context of the work? Does it point to existing solutions and their limitations?  Is the research question formulated clearly and does the contribution become clear? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Related Work/Background: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does the thesis describe relevant related work and relevant background information in appropriate number and detail? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Theoretical Analysis and Practical Description |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is the proposed solution to the problem (e.g. theoretical approach, experiment, implementation) well described? Are proofs and theoretical analysis carried out carefully? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation and Discussion**:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have sensible, well-justified experiments been performed? Are the results compared  to the results of similar approaches? Are the obtained results discussed with respect  to the original goals of the thesis? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusion: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does the conclusion state the results concisely and does it explain their significance?  Do the results justify the conclusions?  Does it restate limitations and open questions? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Formality and Writing Style: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is the thesis well written, easy to read and is appropriate wording used?  Are graphs, tables, formulas etc. well displayed?  Is the overall thesis and the single chapters and paragraphs well-structured?  Are all references cited correctly and the bibliography formatted properly? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working Style/Practical Skills: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does the thesis reflect an independent working style?  Does it reflect critical and original thinking?  Was the developed code correct, documented and efficient? |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade: | very good (sehr gut): | 1,0 | 1,3 |  |
| good (gut): | 1,7 | 2,0 | 2,3 |
|  | satisfactory (befriedigend): | 2,7 | 3,0 | 3,3 |
|  | sufficient (ausreichend): | 3,7 | 4,0 |  |
|  | fail (nicht ausreichend): | 5,0 |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | Signature Reviewer: |

|  |
| --- |
| Student name: |

Further comments: