

Evaluation Report Master Thesis (MT)

Last Name, First Name:	...
------------------------	-----

Study Program:	...
Title of Paper:	...

First Evaluator:	...
Second Evaluator:	...

Scientific Content For the justification of the points awarded, see the following assessed criteria and the additional comments of the evaluators.	Max. Points	Points Evaluator 1	Points Evaluator 2
	45 (75%)		

Criteria	Evaluation*			
	very good	mostly good	with weak-nesses	with major weaknesses or non-existent
Explanation of the problem background				
Formulation of the research question				
Explanation of the proceeding in the thesis				
Explanation of the proceeding within the individual chapters				
Discussion of scientific theories				
Discussion and application of research methods				
Answering the research question				
Clarity of the recommendations given				
Reflection on the limitations				
Reflection on the potential for generalization				
Quality of sources used				
Quantity of sources used				

Comments of the evaluators:

Scientific Form For the justification of the points awarded, see the following assessed criteria and (if applicable) the additional comments of the evaluators.	Max. Points	Points Evaluator 1	Points Evaluator 2
	15 (25%)		

Criteria	Evaluation*			
	very good	mostly good	with weaknesses	with major weaknesses or non-existent**
Form				
The required number of pages is achieved				
Use of the template (cover pages, declarations, table of contents)				
Chapter numbering				
Wording of chapter headings				
Used space for figures and tables				
Avoidance of large blank spaces				
Figures and Tables				
Numbering of figures and tables				
Use of figure and table captions				
Announcement to figures and tables in the previous text				
Language, Spelling and Punctuation				
Grammar				
Spelling				
Punctuation				
Structure of sentences				
Comprehensibility of language				
Academic language				
Citation				
Citing sources for quotations, figures, and tables				
The formal structure of citations				
Directories				
Lists of figures, tables and abbreviations (if applicable)				
List of sources				
List of AI tools used (if applicable)				

Additional comments (if applicable):

Conclusion of the evaluator:

Total Points	Max. Points	Points Evaluator 1	Points Evaluator 2
	60 (100%)
Average points given by the examiners***		...	
Grade		...	

Date: ...

First Evaluator: ...

Date: ...

Second Evaluator: ...

Points*	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	43
Grade	1,0	1,1	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,5	1,6	1,7	1,8	1,9	2,0	2,1	2,2	2,3	2,4	2,5	2,6	2,7

42	41	40	39	38	37	36	35	34	33	32	31	30	29 Points or less					
2,8	2,9	3,0	3,1	3,2	3,3	3,4	3,5	3,6	3,7	3,8	3,9	4,0	not passed					

* The evaluation of the criteria (with the exception of the fields marked in grey) does not lead to a mathematically determined awarding of points. Rather, it is up to the evaluators to award their points on the basis of the overall impression. The differentiation of the criteria and their evaluation should also help students to identify opportunities for improvement.

** Formal evaluations marked in gray lead to the paper not being passed regardless of the evaluation of the scientific content.

*** In the case of half points, the score is rounded up to the higher point value.