Guidelines Master's Thesis

Faculty of Science Universiteit Antwerpen
Master of Computer Science
Approved on May, 19th 2021

Introduction and Terminology

1. While conducting a master's thesis, a student must demonstrate the ability to study independently (under the supervision of a promotor) a complex subject matter in a scientific manner and produce a coherent text that describes his/her findings.
2. The thesis document is an original written text that is to demonstrate the student's theoretical insight in and practical experience with the methods, techniques and tools that are applied in scientific research within a particular subdomain of Computer Science. The delivery of an original contribution to said scientific domain is not a prerequisite for a successful thesis. Such a contribution is required for a doctoral dissertation (PhD).
3. The promotor, a member of the University's faculty (Zelfstandig Academisch Personeel (ZAP)), supervises the process that ultimately leads to the submission and defence of a student's thesis. The promotor selects reviewers, organizes the thesis defence and takes responsibility for a fair assessment of the thesis.
4. An optional co-promotor is an expert in the thesis's domain who can take shared responsibility for the quality of the thesis's content.
5. A supervising assistant is a member of the Teaching Assistants (Assisterend Academisch Personeel (AAP)) or Research Assistants (Bijzonder Academisch Personeel (BAP)) of the University who can be the student's first point of contact for support.
6. An internship supervisor is a member of an organization outside of the University that has commissioned an internship within the context of which a master's thesis can be completed.
7. A reviewer is a person that takes shared responsibility for assessing the thesis. A reviewer needs to have obtained at least a master's degree.
8. The research group is the group of researchers (PhD students, postdocs) for which the promotor is (partially) responsible. At least one of the thesis reviewers must be part of a research group different from the promotor's group.
9. The student submits a thesis before a predetermined date (cfr. Paragraph 39). Submission implies the student's request to defend his/her thesis.
10. The thesis defence is an oral presentation of the work described in the thesis that is followed by a round of questions from the reviewers and, potentially, other members of the audience.
11. The student administration of the faculty has a supporting in role in all matters relating to the academic teaching. Concerning the master's thesis this implies mainly the correct the registration of a thesis subject in SiSA (see paragraph 37).
12. There are three information systems involved in the end-to-end process concerning a master's thesis: the electronic teaching platform (Blackboard), the student course registrations (SisA - Studenten Informatiesysteem Antwerpen) en de digital catalogue of all subjects for a masters' thesis or research project (ESP - Eindwerken, Stages en Projecten).
13. There are two courses which are closely related to the master's thesis: "Research Project 1" en "Research Project 1". There is a certain overlap possible, yet students cannot obtain an unfair advantage when participating in a research project.

Content and form of the Master's Thesis

Learning outcomes

14. The Master's Thesis serves as an aptitude test for the master in computer science. It thereby aims to realize the following learning outcomes within the program:
    * You are able to clearly formulate a research question, motivate its relevance, and describe its context [Fundamental Research].
    * You are capable of correctly relating your work to existing scientific literature [Fundamental Research].
    * You are able to describe your own work in a correct, verifiable, and well-founded manner
    * [Reporting / Fundamental Research].
    * You have gained theoretical insight and practical experience with the methods, techniques and tools that are used within a given subdomain of Computer Science [Research and Development].
    * You are able to apply published research results or techniques to a new context independently [Fundamental Research].
    * You are competent to make well-founded choices with regards to alternatives in aforementioned methods, techniques and tools that present themselves while conducting research [Selection of techniques, methods, languages, architectures, … / Research and Development].
    * You can draw correct conclusions with respect to the implications of your own work and the research question [Fundamental Research].
    * You are capable of reporting both orally and in written form on the research conducted at an academic level [Reporting].
    * You are competent to organize and plan research activities independently under the guidance of a promotor [Leading a group of computer scientists].

Content

15. The content and associated structure of the thesis depends on the type of research question addressed (cfr. appendix A). As a rule, the following aspects should be reflected in the thesis's content:
    * Formulation of the problem statement and context.
    * Formulation of the research question.
    * Description and motivation of the research method.
    * Description and discussion of the research results.
    * Formulation of a conclusion.

Structure

16. With respect to the thesis's text, its structure naturally reflects the content. Other artifacts that are produced during the course of the master's thesis, such as source code, documentation of developed software, design documentation, etc. are to be delivered to the promotor as electronic supplements to the text and are therefore not an integral part of it.
17. The student should record the relationship between "Research Project 1", "Research Project 2" and the master's thesis explicitly in the thesis' text (as a separate chapter, section or appendix). In particular the student should list all chapters, sections and paragraphs which resulted from "Research Project 1" or "Research Project 2". Even when there is no such relationship, this should be explicitly stated as "Not applicable". The supervisors of "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2" will be consulted before the thesis defence to confirm the relationship.

When this relationship is not explicitly listed, this will be seen as a form of fraud and dealt with as plagiarism following the Education and Examination Regulation UAntwerp.

Form

18. There are two common forms for a master's thesis: (a) a book or (2) an article with appendices. In the case of a book, the text is divided in chapters covering the various aspects of the research (problem statement, context, research questions, …). In the case of an article the essence of the research is summarized in a scholarly article (typically 10 pages in a small font with 2 pages of references). The appendices then cover all extra elements needed to assess the contribution of the student (e.g., a detailed description of the data collection procedures; a description of the role of other researchers the work is based upon, …).

19. As a rule, the thesis is 60 to 100 pages long. In addition, the student is obliged to attach a short summary (1 page maximum) to the thesis. The summary sets out the essential elements with respect to content, method, results and points of reference of the research.

20. The thesis is to be written in English.

Procedure

Choice of subject and promotor

21. A list with possible subjects available to the student is permanently made available through the ESP system. In addition, an informative session is organized in the beginning of May of the first master's year during which an overview of the different subjects and the procedure is given. It is possible for students to propose their own subject, given that a promotor is found who agrees to take responsibility for it.

22. The student acts upon his/her own initiative to contact and negotiate with the different promotors of the subjects of interest. During this negotiation process, a promotor can refuse to supervise a student and a student can decide to choose a different subject/promotor.

23. The choice of the thesis subject and promotor is in a first phase made through the ESP system. This choice is confirmed in a second phase via SiSA (cfr. the section on "Time Schedule" below).

Supervision

24. The following are eligible to take on the role of promotor: all faculty members listed on the course description for a master's thesis.

25. All individuals that have obtained a PhD can act as a co-promotor. As a rule, a co-promotor is an expert in the subject matter of the thesis.

26. The following can act as an internship supervisor: all individuals who are not involved in the Computer Science curriculum. An internship advisor is associated with a company or organization in which a part of the master's thesis is conducted. In general, this relates to practical or experimental activities that are conducted in the context of a specific assignment that aligns with the subject of the master's thesis.

27. The following can act as a teaching assistant: all members of the Teaching Assistant staff (Assisterend Academisch Personeel (AAP)) or Research Assistant staff (Bijzonder Academisch Personeel (BAP)) of the University of Antwerp.

28. The student specifies a work plan for the completion of the Master's Thesis, while consulting the promoter, co-promotor, internship supervisor or teaching assistant. The plan also defines how the supervision of the work will be arranged. (When will the parties concerned meet (bi-weekly / monthly / ...)? How will they contact each other (telephone / e-mail / after class / …)? Who takes the initiative (student / teaching assistant / ...?)

29. The student carries the final responsibility for the specification and execution of the plan, for promptly pointing out potential problems, and for the submission of the thesis.
30. The promotor provides the student with the necessary feedback concerning the intermediate results, corrective actions needed, and suggests solutions for problems raised. This is done in possible cooperation with the co-promotor, internship supervisor and teaching assistant.

Defence

31. The promotor chairs the thesis defence and sees to its proper course.
32. The defence is public, open for all to attend.
33. All reviewers and (if applicable) the teaching assistant must attend the defence. In exceptional circumstances (e.g., a foreign co-promotor), a reviewer or teaching assistant can be excused from the defence. In that case a review is to be sent to the promotor prior to the defence.
34. The defence consists of an oral presentation during which the student concisely summarizes his work, followed by a question-and-answer session. Every attendee is entitled to ask questions to which the student is to respond to the best of his/her abilities.

Time Schedule

35. Although the master's thesis is formally registered in the curriculum as a 2nd semester course, students are expected to work on their thesis during the entire academic year, given the magnitude of the work. Therefore, the subject and promotor choice can already be prepared in the year that precedes the master's thesis. In any case the choice has to be made in the first weeks of the year in which the student enrols for the master's thesis.
36. The registration of a thesis subject and promoter occurs in two phases. In the first phase (to be completed by the end of June in the year preceding the thesis) the registration is handled via ESP. The student who wants to start a thesis should take initiative. The promotors verify whether all eligible students registered a master's thesis and sends a reminder to those who did not.
37. In a second phase (to be completed in the 4th week of the academic year in which the student enrolls for the master's) the choice of thesis subject and promoter is confirmed in SiSA. The student must take initiative. The promotor is to approve the choice before the end of the 5th week. During this second phase all other administrative matters (Request Internship, Risk Analysis, Work Site Form, …) should be completed as well.
38. If these deadlines are not respected, the Faculty Student Administration will withdraw the enrolment for the master's thesis. A notification is sent through e-mail.
39. The thesis is to be submitted 14 days before the end of the exam period. The thesis must be submitted in digital form (PDF) through SiSA. In addition, the student must take responsibility for sending an email with this PDF attached to all reviewers at the time of submission. The respective email addresses are provided to the student by the promotor.
40. The thesis defence is scheduled in the last week of the exam period. The promotor fixes a date, time and location in consultation with the student and reviewers.

Assessment

Who?

41. The promotor will select two reviewers for each thesis. That number can be extended if called for (e.g. when a greatest distinction is anticipated).
42. The promotors will register the for the names of the selected reviewers before the submission deadline (cfr. Paragraph 33).
43. At least one reviewer must be associated with a research group different from the promotors.

44. A co-promotor (if present) always fulfils a reviewer role.
45. An internship supervisor (if present) always fulfils a reviewer role.
46. A teaching assistant (if present) never fulfils a reviewer role but takes on an advisory role.
47. The promotor is to contact the reviewers, ask for their willingness to participate in the thesis' assessment and contact alternative reviewers if this is not the case.

Assessment criteria

48. The assessment can take into account the process (permanent evaluation), the final product (single evaluation) or both.
49. Regardless of the assessment method, each master's thesis must at a bare minimum demonstrate that the student:
   *   has independently gained insight in the subject matter;
   *   is able to present a complex subject matter at a level understandable by his fellow students.
50. The detailed assessment criteria and their impact on the final grade can be found in the assessment forms included in Appendix A. The forms contain a checklist with the conditions that should be met to award a certain grade (pass, distinction, great distinction, greatest distinction),
51. If a promoter anticipates that a master's thesis should be awarded a greatest distinction (18-19-20) then the promoter should notify the chair of the examination board. In this case, an additional jury member is added which should be external to the research group and the master specialisation.
52. If the thesis jury deems the aforementioned assessment method unfit for the thesis in question, the jury can, ad hoc and in consensus, propose their own motivation for the assessment made.
53. The assessment forms or motivation records must make note of the promotor, co-promotor and other reviewers. Also, the information regarding the thesis defence (name of the student, title of the thesis, data of the defence, …) will be recorded. Of course, the final grade is explicitly mentioned.

Appendix: Assessment forms

Assessment criteria Master's thesis

User Guide

A thesis is evaluated by a three-person jury, which includes the promotor. This jury decides by consensus, although in practice, the promotor steers the decision. The assessment results in a grade out of 20 (integer numbers only), differentiating between [0 ... 9[which is a failing grade, [10 ... 13[or pass, [13 ... 15[or distinction, [15 ... 17[or great distinction [17 ... 20] or greatest distinction

Two possible evaluation methods for theses exist: evaluating either the process (permanent evaluation) or the product (one-time evaluation). In both cases, a text will have to include a truthful description of either the product or the process. Moreover, this text will have to be defended. In many cases, the promotor will clarify to the jury, the process (independent efforts, efficient working methods, etc.) and/or the developed product (quality, originality, etc.).

Coarse-grained Criteria

In order to maintain the advantage of diversity, a thesis is classified according to the research methods that have been employed. The methods have been selected on the basis of popular research methods in the field of Computer Science (more precisely Software engineering1). They were adjusted to take into account the limited scope of a master's thesis.
The commonly accepted research methods for a thesis are:

Feasibility Study

A feasibility study is a scientific method to determine whether a (combination of) technique(s) is usable for solving a specific type of problem. An essential factor in a feasibility study is the novelty of the technique. Therefore, a typical experiment will consist of building a prototype, and subsequently applying the technique to a sample problem. The conclusions are primarily of qualitative nature in the form of "lessons learned".

A feasibility study has the following characteristics:

> The problem is relevant: the solution is not trivial and useful to at least some people.
> The technique is innovative: it is not yet known whether it will lead to a solution.
> The application of the technique seems reasonable: there are reasons to believe that the technique can lead to a solution.

Case Study

A case study is a scientific method that aims to determine to what degree a (combination of) scientific technique(s) is appropriate for solving a certain kind of problem. Unlike a feasibility study, the technique is not very new (it has already led to solutions in the past), but it is unclear to what degree the solutions are always equally good. For this reason, a typical case study will build a prototype, experimenting with the technique on different problem instances. Subsequently, the technique's effect is quantified in order to make comparison possible.

A case study has the following characteristics:

> The problem is relevant: the solution is not trivial and useful to at least some people.

---

[1] Markin V. Zelkowitz and Dolores R. Wallace, "Experimental Models for Validating Technology", IEEE Computer, May 1998.

> The technique is useful: there are known cases in which the technique has led to a solution.
> The technique's results are uncertain: there is reason to believe that the technique does not always lead to good solutions.

Comparative Study

A comparative study is a scientific method to compare different techniques (tools, methods) in order to solve a certain kind of problem. Similar to a case study, the technique is not very new (it has already led to solutions in the past), but it is unclear to what degree the solutions are always equally good. For this reason, a typical experiment will make up a list of criteria (that don't favor any particular technique over the other(s)). Subsequently, the techniques are compared based on these criteria.

A comparative study is characterized by the following:

> The problem is relevant: the solution is not trivial and useful to at least some people.
> At least two techniques to solve the problem exist.
> The techniques' usefulness is uncertain: there is reason to believe that one technique is sometimes better than another.

Literature Study

A literature study is a scientific method to find out which techniques are applicable to solving a certain kind of problem. For a literature study, it is essential that the problem is well documented and that a family of solution techniques have already been described. But the solutions' diversity range is so large that there is no clear overview of which techniques result in the best results and in which cases they do so. For this reason, a typical literature study organizes the members of the family in a classification system covering different dimensions. The conclusions are both qualitative and quantitative in nature and are expected to point out directions for future work.

> A literature study can be recognized by the following characteristics:
> The problem is relevant: the solution is not trivial and useful to at least some people.
> There are several applicable techniques: several sources describe solutions to the problem.
> The techniques are well specified: the advantages and disadvantages for each technique are described in the literature.

Formal model

A formal model is a scientific method to determine to what degree it is possible to make a mathematical abstraction of a certain problem, and to prove a number of important properties based on that abstraction. The method emphasizes a good comprehension of the problem, in order to determine which factors should be included in the formal model. Therefore, a typical formal model will build an abstraction of the problem domain, using a mathematical technique (analytical model, stochastic model, logical model, rewriting system, ...), defend the choice of factors included in the model and draw conclusions with respect to the degree to which the problem can be solved.

A formal model has the following characteristics:

> The problem is relevant: the solution is not trivial and useful to at least some people.
> The problem can be abstracted: many factors exert an influence but are not equally relevant.
> There are a number of important properties that, once proved, facilitate the construction of solutions to the problem (e.g., synthesize a correct software solution).

Simulation

A simulation is a scientific method to study phenomena in the real world in detail and to make predictions about what can happen under certain situations (e.g., how a system reacts to external stimuli). Simulations are used when circumstances do not allow real observations (e.g., too expensive, physically impossible). Similar to a formal model, a good understanding of the problem is necessary to determine what will be included in the simulation model and what will be excluded. A typical simulation will build a model of the problem domain, using a series of events and their relationships to test the model using real observations and draw conclusions about hypothetical situations.

A simulation has the following characteristics:

> The solution is relevant: non-trivial and useful to at least some people.
> The problem can be abstracted: many factors exert influence, but they are not all equally relevant.
> The problem requires prediction: real observations (on a large scale) are practically impossible, but simulations can provide answers to "what-if" questions.

Process

Finally, there is also a separate category for assessing the process, using permanent evaluation. A process evaluation does not emphasize a student's ability to apply a certain scientific method, but rather a student's discipline and maturity to solve a complex problem within a limited period of time.

For each of the categories, the assessment form lists the prerequisites that have to be attained in order to reach a certain degree (pass, distinction, great distinction, greatest distinction). Note that the nature of the research method plays an important role for a pass or distinction degree but becomes irrelevant for great and greatest distinctions.

Fine-grained criteria

Once the degree has been decided on, the fine-grained criteria can refine the final grade. Extraordinary scores, both positive and negative, can lead to an increase or decrease of the degree.

* Clarity: The degree to which the text is written clearly and comprehensively.
* Presentation: The way the thesis was publicly defended.
* Independence: The degree to which the student has taken the initiative to solve any unanticipated problems.
* Workload: The degree to which the student has had a "normal" load during the final master's year. A normal load corresponds to that of a student who graduates in the one-but-last year during the first exam period, begins to work on the thesis around September, is enrolled in the regular study program during both semesters of the final year and submits the thesis at the end of May. An above-normal load would be, for example, an Erasmus/Socrates/...-student (those who reside abroad for at least one semester), and, to a lesser degree, late starters (those who participated in the second exam period in their one-but-last year and start work on their thesis sometime in October). A below-normal load is a student who is enrolled in a thesis year (has already passed all other subjects and is taking an extra year to work exclusively on the thesis) and, to a lesser degree, those who hand in their work late (students who hand in their thesis during the second exam period of the final year).

Out of scope criteria

The following elements will explicitly NOT be used as criteria

* Difficulty: A subject's difficulty will not be seen as a criterion, as it is too relative a term, for both the promotor and for the student.
* Amount of work: The final grade for a thesis judges the end result. The amount of work needed to achieve this result is irrelevant. This, too, is too dependent on both promotor and student.
* Source code and documentation: If an experiment requires the development of software, the quality of the code and documentation (readability, maintainability, ...) is largely irrelevant, unless it is an essential element of the experiment. The motivation is that students writing a thesis are implicitly expected to hand in high-quality work.

Assessment form: Feasibility study

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the problem described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply
Is the applied technique described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply.
Is the technique's application to the problem described precisely? (Is the experiment —the prototype— described clearly?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions being drawn? (Which of the techniques' steps are useful? Which steps need to be improved or even replaced?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question "why a feasibility study" answered convincingly? (Is it clear that the problem is relevant, the technique innovative and the application reasonable?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a summary of applicable techniques? (Is there information about several alternatives, apart from the applied technique?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of experiment? (Is there an explanation why the problem example is representative? Is there more information about the applied technique as a function of the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Can the experiment be repeated? (Are enough details given so that outsiders could replicate the experiment?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (Is the problem presented in a sufficiently abstract way so that the conclusions are also relevant for other problems?	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply

Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

Not applicable

Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply

Assessment form: Case Study

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the problem described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply
Is the applied technique described clearly?	Yes / No / No reply.
Is the technique's application to the problem described clearly? (Is the experiment —the technique's application to the problem instances— described clearly?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions being drawn? (To which problem instances is the technique (un)suited?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question "why a case study" answered convincingly? (Is it clear that the problem is relevant, the technique useful and the application uncertain?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a summary of applicable techniques? (Is there information about several alternatives, apart from the applied technique?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the experiment? (Is there an explanation why the problem instances are representative? Is there more information about the applied technique in function of the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Can the experiment be repeated? (Are enough details given so that outsiders could reproduce the experiment?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (Is the problem presented in a sufficiently abstract way so the conclusions are also relevant for other problems?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	Yes / No / No reply

Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

Not applicable

Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply

Assessment form: Comparative Study

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the problem described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply
Are the techniques (their similarities and differences) clearly described?	Yes / No / No reply.
Are the criteria for comparison clearly described?	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions drawn? (when should one use which technique?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question "why a comparative study answered convincingly? Is it clear that the problem is relevant, different usable techniques exist and the results seem uncertain?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is an overview of the applicable techniques presented? (Are the differences and similarities between the different techniques framed in a broader context?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the chosen criteria well motivated? (Are the different criteria explained? Is the choice for the given criteria explained with respect to the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the criteria and their application reproducible? (Is sufficient detail given, its application by a third--party would lead to the same results?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (Is the problem presented in a sufficiently abstract way so that the conclusions are also relevant for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply

Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

Not applicable

Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply

Assessment form: Literature Survey

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the family of problems/algorithms/techniques described precisely? Are the inclusion/exclusion criteria falsifiable?	Yes / No / No reply
Are the bibliographic references sufficiently deep and comprehensive? Would another researcher include the same references?	Yes / No / No reply.
Are the standards with respect to the publication of a literature survey followed? (bibliography, structure, lay-out, page limit)	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions being drawn? (Where and when is a given technique most applicable?) Does the thesis list opportunities for future work and open problems?	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question "why a literature survey" answered convincingly? (Is it clear that the problem is relevant, the technique innovative and the application reasonable?) Is it clear that the family under study is rich enough to be the subject of a literature survey? Are the opportunities for future work and open problems nontrivial?	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a good overview of applicable techniques? (Do the references cover sufficiently diverse sources? Are the similarities and differences between the techniques explained from a sufficiently broad perspective?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the study replicable? (Can all sources be selected to their origins?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (Is the problem presented in a sufficiently abstract way so that the conclusions are also relevant for other problems?	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? Does the student understand the differences between the members of the family? Can he exploit their differences to explore new directions?	Yes / No / No reply
Does the literature survey result in a new classification or extra dimensions to an existing classification? Can this classification be applied to similar families of techniques?	Yes / No / No reply
Are there suggestions to incorporate additional criteria in the classification? Does it allow for new combinations of family members?	Yes / No / No reply

Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

Not applicable

Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply

Assessment form: Formal Model

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the problem described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply
Is the formal model described clearly?	Yes / No / No reply.
Are some important properties proved based on the mathematical model?	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions being drawn? (Are the proven properties really important?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question "why a formal model" answered convincingly? (Is there an explanation of why the problem is relevant, why it can be abstracted and that it has important characteristics?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there an overview of the factors that influenced the problem? (Is there also an explanation of why certain factors were NOT included in the model?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the formal model? (Is there an explanation for the choice of the mathematical basis/formalism? Is there an explanation of the factor selection in function of the characteristics that need to be proved?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the model reproducible? (Are enough details given so that outsiders can verify the proof?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (What insight was acquired? Why is it now easier to construct solutions for the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply

Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

Not applicable

Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply

Assessment form: Simulation

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the phenomenon that will be studied described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply
Is the simulation model described clearly?	Yes / No / No reply.
Are prognoses being made? (Are predictions of what will happen in certain situations being made on the basis of the simulation?	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions being drawn? (Why are the predictions useful?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is the question "why a simulation" answered convincingly? (Why is the problem relevant, why it can be abstracted and that it has important characteristics?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there an overview of the factors that influenced the problem? (Is there also an explanation of why certain factors were NOT included in the model?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the simulation? (Is the the choice of included phenomena as a function of the performance measures explained?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the simulation repeatable? (Are enough details given so that outsiders can reproduce the simulation model/experiment?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (Are the predictions correct/relevant? What insight was acquired?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply

Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

Not applicable

Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply

Assessment form: Process Evaluation

Student: …
Title thesis: …
Data Defence: …
Promotor: …
Jurymembers: …
Supervising Assistant: …

END RESULT:	… / 20

Pass [10 .. 13[

Is the problem described precisely?	Yes / No / No reply
Was there a clear and verifiable work plan?	Yes / No / No reply.
Is the process described clearly? (When was the plan respected? When were there deviations from the plan? Why?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are conclusions being drawn? (Is the problem solved?)	Yes / No / No reply

 If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a FAIL grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Distinction [13 .. 15[

Is there an overview of the decisive moments in the process? (When was there a search for alternatives, and which alternatives were selected?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a motivation for the choice between two or more alternatives?	Yes / No / No reply
Was the process adjusted in time? (Was sufficient initiative taken to hand in solutions within the time limit?)	Yes / No / No reply
Are the conclusions convincing? (Is the problem abstracted sufficiently so that the conclusions are also applicable to similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there an overview of the decisive moments in the process? (When was there a search for alternatives, and which alternatives were selected?)	Yes / No / No reply

 If the thesis committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be given a SATISFACTORY grade. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Great distinction [15 .. 17[

Is the problem well situated within its context? (Is there a precise explanation of the greater problem the thesis needs to be situated in? Is there a convincing motivation for the choice of the smaller problem that the thesis intends to solve?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is a broad overview of the popular solution techniques given? (Is the overview of the different solution techniques almost complete?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is there a repeatable weighting of the pros and cons of the popular techniques? (Can the same kind of weighting of the pros and cons be used for a similar problem, without the solution having to be the same?)	Yes / No / No reply
Is the experiment representative? (Is it clear to which degree the experiment's results are applicable for similar problems?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions show a deep insight into the greater problem? (Are the conclusions drawn about the smaller problem that the thesis has solved linked back to the greater problem? Is there a realistic prognosis toward the future?	Yes / No / No reply

 If the reading committee answers "no" on two or more criteria, the thesis will be awarded with DISTINCTION. The fine-grained criteria will then determine the exact grade.

Greatest distinction [17 .. 20]

Does the thesis introduce a novel way of looking at the problem? (Are there elements in the text that shed inspiring new light on the problem?)	Yes / No / No reply
Do the conclusions provide a significant contribution to the problem domain? (Will the thesis be cited within the problem domain?)	Yes / No / No reply

If the reading committee answers "no" to at least one criterion, the thesis will be awarded with GREAT DISTINCTION. If not, it will be awarded with GREATEST DISTINCTION. In both cases the fine---grained criteria will determine the exact grade.

Fine-grained Criteria

Relationship with "Research Project 1" and "Research Project 2":

    Not applicable

    Sections …………… were not considered in the evaluation of the master's thesis

    Sections …………… have been assessed more thoroughly.

    The "Related work" section was assessed as being complete and systematic

    Other: ……………

Clarity (text):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Presentation (defense):	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Independence:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply
Workload:	Insufficient / Unclear / Average / Good / Excellent / No reply