****

**Research internship master Biomedical Sciences**

**Assessment form third assessor – internship supervisor**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name student** |  |
| **Internship title** |  |
| **City and country** |  |
| **Date assessment** |  |
| **Name 3rd assessor** |  |

**INSTRUCTIONS**

* To be completed by the Third Assessor.
* This form needs to be uploaded to Osiris Case after the student submitted the report.
* It is required to include written feedback in the assessment form in each feedback section.
* The student will be able to view the assessments via Osiris Case.
* For technical questions during the upload/assessment in Osiris Case you may contact: [osiriscasesupport.rha@radboudumc.nl](mailto:osiriscasesupport.rha@radboudumc.nl)

## Assessment

The research training period is assessed by the internship supervisor and an independent second assessor from the Radboudumc. If the grades for the report of the first and second assessors differ by more than 1.5, a third assessor is appointed. In that case, the partial grades and weights will be as follows:

The Internship Supervisor assesses

1. Performance: professional attitude, research skills, research activities (40%)
2. Internship report, written in the format of a concept scientific paper (10%)
3. Oral presentation and defence (10%)

The second assessor assesses the internship report (concept scientific paper) (20%).

The third assessor assesses the internship report (concept scientific paper) (20%).

**Assessment of the internship report - format of a concept scientific paper, by 3rd assessor (20%)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nr** | **objective** | **insufficient** | **doubtful** | **sufficient** | **fair** | **good** | **excellent** |
| 1 | The article complies with academic standards concerning its contents, i.e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1a | * Includes a clear and structured abstract |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1b | * includes a background explaining the problem definition and an overview of prior knowledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1c | * includes one or more research questions, the relevance of which follows logically from the background |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1d | * clearly describes the methodological approach for each research question |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1e | * clearly and objectively describes the results in text, and correctly presents results in tables and figures |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1f | * includes a discussion section, in which results are interpreted against hypotheses and rival claims of other researchers, discussion of bias and validity, reporting of strengths and weakness, and drawing of appropriate conclusions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1g | * correctly includes references to literature supporting claims where appropriate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | The student reflects on data management according to the FAIR data principles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | The internship report includes appropriate appendices to provide additional information about methods and/or results *(if applicable)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Motivation and feedback 1 – 3 (required)*** | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nr** | **objective** | **insufficient** | **doubtful** | **sufficient** | **fair** | **good** | **Excellent** |
| 4 | The article complies with academic standards and layout is used to emphasize the structure of the paper and important claims’ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | The article includes clear tables and figures |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | The article is grammatically well-written |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | The concept scientific paper is as concise, transparent, and persuasive. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Motivation and feedback 4 – 7 (required)*** | | | | | | | |

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT GRADES**

**Explanation of the Dutch grades for internships**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Grade*** | ***Explanation*** |
| ***≥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)* |

This numeric grading system applies only to the overall assessment grade for performance, report and presentation. The scores on the separate criteria should not be converted to these numeric grades and should not be used to calculate a numeric mean score. The scores on the criteria are meant as a guideline for the final grade and not as a calculation tool.

Grades are expressed on a numerical scale of 1 to 10 and rounded off to one decimal place

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade report by 3rd assessor (20%):** |  |

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK, TIPS AND TOPS**

|  |
| --- |
| **Tops *(required)*** |
| **Tips *(required)*** |