**Assessment form Quantitative research**

**Research internship master Medicine**

**Second assessor: Concept scientific article/report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name student** |  |
| **Date assessment** |  |
| **City and Country** |  |
| **Name or z-nummer 2nd assessor** |  |

*Explanation of the Dutch grades for internships*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Grade*** | ***Explanation*** |
| ***10***  | *exceptional ability, indicative of outstanding grasp of the subject, originality and independence*  |
| ***9***  | *excellent, demonstrating confidence and insight in handling the subject, showing excellence and own ideas (A+ US/Canada/UK grades)* |
| ***8***  | *good performance, good overall ability and grasp of subject* *(A/A- US/Canada/UK grades)* |
| ***7***  | *fair/average; reasonable level of performance, unexceptional with average grasp of the subject (A-/B+ US/Canada; B/B- UK)*  |
| ***6***  | *sufficient performance, with scope for improvement (B/B-/C US/Canada; C/D UK)* |
| ***≤5***  | *insufficient performance (F US/Canada/UK)* |

Assessment of concept-scientific article/report

**Learning objective 1: The article complies with academic standards concerning its contents, i.e.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. is well structured,
 |
| **Score 1a** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. Includes a summary that presents the research clearly and concisely,
 |
| **Score 1b** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. includes a background explaining the problem definition and an overview of prior knowledge,
 |
| **Score 1c** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. includes one or more research questions, the relevance of which follows logically from the background,
 |
| **Score 1d** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. clearly describes the experimental and methodological approach for each research question,
 |
| **Score 1e** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. clearly and objectively describes the results, including measurement errors,
 |
| **Score 1f** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. includes a discussion section, in which results are interpreted against hypotheses and rival claims of other researchers, strengths and weaknesses are reported, and appropriate conclusions are drawn,
 |
| **Score 1g** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. correctly includes references to literature supporting claims wherever appropriate.
 |
| **Score 1h** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| Motivation in words 1a-1h:  |  |

**Learning objective 2: The article complies with academic standards concerning style and layout, i.e.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. is grammatically well-written,
 |
| **Score 2a** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. includes tables and figures to summarize important findings.
 |
| **Score 2b** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| 1. The article is as concise as possible, transparent, and persuasive.
 |
| **Score 2c** | Insufficient | Sufficient | Fair | (Very) good | Excellent | Exceptional |
| Motivation in words 2a-2c:  |  |

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCEPT SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE/REPORT:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grade Report 2nd assessor: |  |

*Grade is expressed on a numerical scale of 1 to 10 and rounded off to one decimal place*