

## MASTER'S DEGREE IN ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING/ MASTER'S DEGREE IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENGINEERING

### RUBRIC FOR ASSESSMENT OF MASTER'S THESES

Assessment criteria		0–5	5–7	7–9	9–10
<b>MASTER'S THESIS</b>	1. Quantitative and qualitative aspects of the thesis	<p><b>Approach and development</b> of the topic with errors or lack of specificity.</p> <p><b>Analysis and treatment</b> of the main topic of the master's thesis are very superficial.</p> <p><b>Results</b> are generic and merely descriptive, with a very superficial discussion.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> are poorly founded and lack rigour in their <b>formulation and discussion</b>.</p>	<p><b>Approach and development</b> carried out by applying basic knowledge acquired.</p> <p><b>Analysis and treatment</b> of the main topic of the master's thesis are adequate but do not go into depth. No awareness of the limitations of the models and techniques used.</p> <p><b>Results</b> are well drawn together and presented, but the discussion is insufficiently elaborated.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> are not always linked to objectives and results. Insufficient rigour in their <b>discussion</b>.</p>	<p><b>Approach and development</b> carried out with notable depth, applying different theories, models or procedures.</p> <p><b>Analysis and treatment</b> of the main topic of the master's thesis are adequate and detailed and include a critique of the models and techniques used.</p> <p><b>Results</b> are systematically drawn together, with an elaborated and detailed discussion.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> are well-founded but not well related to the <b>objectives</b>.</p>	<p><b>Approach and development</b> are very thorough; different models and procedures are applied with information from different areas of ICT.</p> <p><b>Analysis and treatment</b> of the main topic of the master's thesis are adequate and detailed, with an awareness of the limitations of the models used and effective modelling and improvement of previous ones.</p> <p><b>Results</b> are systematically drawn together, with a rigorous and detailed discussion and deep conceptual elaboration.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> are well-founded and related to the stated <b>objectives</b>.</p>
	2. Formal quality of the text	<p>Poorly <b>organised</b>, poor <b>vocabulary</b>, with many <b>typographical errors</b> and inadequate <b>bibliography</b>.</p> <p>Poorly <b>structured</b> thesis. Poorly constructed table of contents. General and background <b>information</b> is incomplete.</p> <p>Poor quality <b>graphical representations</b>, lacking physical <b>units</b>.</p> <p>The <b>English text</b> contains many grammatical errors, with incorrect English terms that make the thesis unintelligible.</p>	<p>Poorly <b>organised</b>, adequate but not very rigorous <b>vocabulary</b>, with some <b>typographical errors</b> and limited <b>bibliography</b>.</p> <p>Poorly <b>structured</b> thesis, but with some degree of coherence in the text. Very basic table of contents. Contains basic and background <b>information</b>.</p> <p><b>Graphical representations</b> of acceptable quality but with errors in <b>units</b>.</p> <p>The <b>English text</b> of the thesis contains few grammatical errors but is not very intelligible.</p>	<p>Well <b>organised</b> with adequate but concise <b>vocabulary</b>, few <b>typographical errors</b>, sufficient <b>bibliography</b> and appropriate citations.</p> <p><b>Structured</b> thesis with some shortcomings, but follows a good table of contents. Provides an <b>overview</b> of the topic and includes background information.</p> <p>Good quality <b>graphical representations</b> and appropriate <b>units</b>.</p> <p>The <b>English text</b> is polished, with virtually no errors, which makes the thesis intelligible.</p>	<p>Very well <b>organised</b>, with rigorous and concise <b>vocabulary</b>, almost no <b>typographical errors</b>, and a rich and appropriate <b>bibliography</b>, with citations.</p> <p>Well-written and <b>structured</b> thesis with a good table of contents. Thorough presentation of <b>background</b> and the <b>main topic</b> of the master's thesis.</p> <p>High quality <b>graphical representations</b> with correct <b>physical units</b>.</p> <p>The <b>English text</b> is correct, clear and concise. Appropriate scientific language is used.</p>

## MASTER'S DEGREE IN ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING/ MASTER'S DEGREE IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENGINEERING

Assessment criteria		0-5	5-7	7-9	9-10
<b>ORAL PRESENTATION AND ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM THE EXAMINATION COMMITTEE</b>	3. Content and clarity of the presentation	<p><b>Discourse</b> is disorganised and not very cohesive; does not facilitate understanding of ideas. Use of <b>vocabulary</b> and technical terms is inadequate. <b>Typographical</b> and syntactical <b>errors</b>.</p> <p><b>Graphic material</b> (diagrams, graphs, figures, etc.) is not very well prepared.</p> <p>Oral expression in <b>English</b> is not very fluent. Poor exposition; does not follow a clear <b>line of argument</b>.</p> <p>Low <b>tone of voice</b> with long pauses; does not look at the examination committee; inadequate <b>body language</b>.</p>	<p><b>Discourse</b> is organised, but it is difficult to follow the line of argument; there is little connection between different parts. Use of <b>vocabulary</b> and technical terms is adequate but not very rigorous. There are some <b>typographical</b> and/or syntactical <b>errors</b>.</p> <p><b>Graphic material</b> is not very illustrative and/or not very well prepared.</p> <p>Expressions used to communicate in <b>English</b> are very basic, but it is possible to understand what the student wants to get across. Poor <b>argumentation</b>.</p> <p>Changes in <b>tone of voice</b>, hesitant; tries to look at the examination committee; <b>body language</b> not very expressive.</p>	<p><b>Discourse</b> is organised, reasonably complete and cohesive. Use of <b>vocabulary</b> and technical terms is rigorous but not very concise. <b>Writing</b> is correct, with few mistakes.</p> <p><b>Graphic material</b> is illustrative but sometimes not very well prepared.</p> <p>Able to maintain a fluent <b>discourse</b>, speaking coherently and comprehensibly in <b>English</b>.</p> <p>Appropriate <b>tone of voice</b>, following the slides; looks at the examination committee and tries to look at the audience; appropriate <b>body language</b>.</p>	<p>Well-organised <b>discourse</b> that facilitates understanding of ideas. The different parts are cohesive. Use of <b>vocabulary</b> and technical terms is rigorous, precise and concise. Correct, error-free <b>writing</b> with good punctuation.</p> <p><b>Graphic material</b> is very illustrative and well prepared.</p> <p>Speaks correctly and fluently in <b>English</b>, using appropriate expressions and terms at all times.</p> <p><b>Delivers</b> the presentation with confidence and ease, speaking to the audience at all times; excellent <b>body language</b>.</p>
	4. Discussion with the examination committee	<p>Cannot engage in a comprehensible <b>discussion</b>.</p> <p>Does not understand <b>questions</b> posed by the examination committee. Lacks a critical attitude and cannot answer questions about the work.</p>	<p><b>Answers</b> do little to clarify the work done.</p> <p>Understands <b>questions</b> posed by the examination committee but does not follow a distinct line of argument and is unable to answer some questions.</p>	<p><b>Responds</b> appropriately, in a way that clarifies the work done.</p> <p>Makes good <b>arguments</b> for a given position and is able to respond by providing additional data.</p>	<p>Interesting and well-reasoned <b>answers</b> that focus on the most relevant parts of the work done.</p> <p>Uses the examination committee's <b>questions</b> to demonstrate a sound knowledge of the topic.</p>

This rubric can be used to assess the four criteria indicated above. Based on these assessments, the final mark for the master's thesis will be agreed by the examination committee.