



This rubric is released under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 Netherlands License
 Authors: Arnold Moene, Mieke Latijnhouwers, Joanne Leerlooijer and others (Wageningen University, The Netherlands)
 For comments/remarks: contact arnold.moene@wur.nl

Compared to previous versions, the lowest extreme level (grade 2) is no longer included. This does not imply that grade 4 is the lower bound for a grid on a criterion. It is up to the assessor to extrapolate the rubric to levels below a grade of 4. The description of the upper level can never be complete. Therefore, the assessor is invited to describe points of excellence.

Rubric - MSc-internship version: 5.1 (2024-07-30)

Criterion and sub-criterion	Insufficient		Just sufficient		Good		Exemplary		Points of excellence
	Needs improvement		Ample sufficient		Very good				

	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
1 General professional competences (20%)							
1.1 Independence, initiative and creativity							
Independence	The student needs detailed instructions and well-defined tasks from the supervisor and the supervisor needs to monitor the student to see if all tasks have been performed.		Student depends mainly on supervisor for planning the task, but the student performs them mostly independently.		Student plans and performs tasks mostly independently, asks for help from the supervisor when needed.		Student plans and performs tasks independently and organises their sources of help independently.
Initiative and creativity ¹	Student shows no initiative or new ideas at all.		Student reactively develops, together with the supervisor, one or two new ideas on parts of the internship project(s).		Student proactively shows initiative and/or together with the supervisor develops one or two new ideas on parts of the internship project(s).		Student proactively initiates discussions on new ideas with supervisor and puts forward their own creative ideas on hypothesis formulation, design or data processing.
1.2 Commitment, perseverance							
	Student shows little motivation and does not show ownership of the project. Students is distracted easily by setbacks and shows little perseverance.		Student is motivated at times, but does not show ownership of the project and/or is easily distracted by setbacks.		The student is motivated and shows ownership of the project. Overcomes an occasional setback independently.		The student is very motivated, shows ownership, and overcomes setbacks independently. Student goes at length to get the most out of the project (within the planned period).
1.3 Adaptation to a working environment outside WU							
Insight in the organization	Student shows no insight in functioning of the organisation. Student repeatedly has difficulty to get things done within the team (e.g. receiving information, organizing materials or facilities, etc).		Student is able to indicate the responsibilities within their own team. Student gets things done within the team (e.g. gathering information, organizing resources) but only via supervisor.		Student is able to indicate the responsibilities of the different units within the organization. Student is able to get things done within the team for their own project (e.g. receiving information, organizing material facilities, etc.) .		Student knows how changes are realized in the organization. Student is able to independently get things done that affect not only their own project, but the rest of the team as well (actively obtains and shares information with the team, etc.).
Adaptivity	Student does not adapt and remains passive or negative.		Student accepts how things are done within the new work environment without further reflection.		Student shows evidence of adaptation to the new work environment in a productive and interactive way.		Student adapts well to the work environment, while contributing with their personal views.
1.4 Receiving and providing feedback							
Receiving feedback	Student follows up on some suggestions and ideas of the supervisor without any critical reflection.		Student accepts feedback on their own functioning from supervisor. Incorporates all of the supervisor's feedback adequately but without reflective discussion.		Student welcomes feedback on their own functioning from supervisor and asks for it when needed. Student reflects on feedback and incorporates suggested changes after engaging in a discussion.		Student seeks and welcomes feedback from supervisor and other staff members or students. Student critically reflects on feedback, uses it as a starting point for further discussion and proposes alternatives.

¹ Note that for this sub-criterion the descriptors for level 8 and 10 in large part correspond to descriptors for level 6 and 8 for the same sub-criterion in the MSc-thesis rubric. The reason for this shift is that in the context of an internship the room for initiative and creativity is generally less due to the boundary conditions set by the host organization.

	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
Providing feedback ²	Student does not provide feedback to others, even when asked for.		Student only provides feedback when asked for. Feedback is general, without supporting examples or without suggestions for improvement.		Student provides well-founded (with examples) and specific feedback to co-workers when asked for.		Student spontaneously provides balanced (positive and negative), well-founded (with examples), and specific feedback to co-workers.
1.5 Time management							
	No realistic time schedule, or student repeatedly misses milestones, or is mostly dependent on supervisor for keeping on track. Final version of report or oral presentation overdue up to 50% of the nominal period (without force majeure).		Mostly realistic time schedule, but student regularly does not reach milestones in time; no timely adjustment of time schedule if needed. Final version of report or oral presentation at most 25% of nominal period overdue (without force majeure).		Realistic time schedule, and student reaches the majority of milestones in time; with timely adjustments of time schedule but without reconsidering tasks. Final version of report or oral presentation at most 5% of nominal period overdue (without force majeure).		Realistic time schedule with timely and effective adjustments of both time and tasks if necessary. Final version of report and oral presentation finished within planned period (or overdue because of force majeure and finished within reasonable time).
2. Domain-specific competences (30%)							
2.1 Application of domain-specific knowledge							
	Student does not demonstrate understanding of (for internship task) relevant knowledge on an academic level. Student is barely able to translate own knowledge to internship tasks, even with assistance of the supervisor.		Student demonstrates some understanding of (for internship task) relevant knowledge on an academic level. Student translates this knowledge to some of the internship tasks, with assistance of the supervisor.		Student demonstrates depth or breadth of understanding of (for internship task) relevant knowledge on an academic level. Student translates this knowledge to the internship tasks, partly with assistance of supervisor.		Student demonstrates depth and/or breadth of understanding of relevant knowledge on an academic level (also beyond the internship task). Student translates this knowledge to the internship tasks independently.
2.2 Performance on domain-specific competences³							
Quality of performance	Student performs domain-specific competences ³ at a level that is insufficient for the tasks at hand. Student lacks attention to details. Student performs none or few work tasks and projects as designed/planned and deviations from design/plan are not motivated.		Student performs domain-specific competences ³ at a level that is just sufficient for the tasks at hand. Student pays little attention to details. Student performs some of the work tasks and projects as designed/planned and deviations from design/plan are not motivated.		Student performs domain-specific competences ³ correctly and pays close attention to relevant details. Student performs work tasks and projects as designed/planned.		Student performs domain-specific competences ³ correctly, and pays close attention to relevant details. Student evaluates tasks and project plan/design regularly and adjusts where needed. Performs work tasks and projects according to (adjusted) design/plan.
Awareness of performance	Student does not evaluate the outcomes/success of their performance during and after task execution, even not when asked for. Student is not transparent in their choices and/or does not act responsibly towards people and property.		Student evaluates the outcomes/success of their performance during and after task execution for some tasks, only when asked for. Student is mostly transparent in their choices and acts responsibly towards people and property. Student is able to discuss integrity ⁴ .		Student evaluates the outcomes/success of their performance during and after task execution. Uses evaluation to improve performance. Student is transparent in their choices and acts responsibly towards people and property. Student is able and willing to discuss integrity.		Student evaluates the outcomes/success of their performance during and after task execution. Uses evaluation to improve performance and discusses this evaluation proactively with co-workers or supervisor. Student is transparent in their choices and acts responsibly towards people and property. Student is able, willing and proactive to discuss integrity.
2.3 Acquisition of context-specific knowledge and competences³							
	Students' progress in knowledge and skills is limited and requires extensive guidance by the supervisor.		The student adopts knowledge and skills as they are presented during supervision.		The student acquires knowledge and skills independently, and asks for assistance from the supervisor if needed.		Students explore solutions independently and seeks appropriate knowledge and skills required.
2.4 Quality⁵ of deliverables⁶: added value for the host organisation (the quality requirements have been set at the start of the internship)							

² Note that for this sub-criterion the descriptors for levels 4-10 in large part correspond to descriptors for level 2 and 8 for the same sub-criterion in the MSc-thesis rubric. The reason for this shift is that in the context of an internship the room for providing feedback to co-workers is likely smaller (more complex) than in the case of a thesis within the context of Wageningen University.

³ 'Competences' can here be read as: 'combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes'.

⁴ Here 'integrity' may also involve potential friction between the goals of the organization and/or student's project on the one hand, and scientific knowledge and standards on the other hand.

⁵ 'Quality' here also implies: scientific soundness.

⁶ Given the diversity of organisations and tasks in which students can do academic internships, the term deliverables can have a wide variety of meanings (e.g. a physical object, an event, a wide variety documents, a method, a prototype, a dataset, research etc.). Therefore, it is necessary to define in an early stage (between host supervisor, WU supervisor and student) what will be the deliverables for a given internship, and what will be the requirements. In the case of an internship in a research environment, the deliverable *can* overlap with the scientific report but this is not so by definition (deliverables could also include e.g. datasets, methods, etc.).

	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
	Deliverables comply with none or few of the requirements. As a consequence, deliverables are not usable for host organization. The deliverables are conflict with scientific standards and knowledge.		Deliverables comply with most of the requirements. As a consequence, deliverables are usable for host organization to a limited extent. The deliverables have some scientific basis.		Deliverables comply with all of the requirements. As a consequence, deliverables are usable for host organization. In addition, the deliverables are scientifically sound/correct.		Deliverables transcend the requirements: contains new or improved functionality or is efficient/effective beyond expectations. As a consequence, deliverables have large added value for the host organization. In addition, the deliverables have a strong scientific basis.

3. Scientific report⁷ (40%)

Note: the criteria 3.1- 3.6 should *not* be interpreted as an indication of *any* prescribed structure of the report (e.g 3.1 does not necessarily refer to an Introduction). The structure of the report needs to be agreed upon between student, host supervisor and WU supervisor.

3.1 Description of professional context (the 'where')

Context	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
Information about the host organization (goals, organization, environment) and/or information about the organizational context in which the student works is missing. As a result, the context of the tasks/project(s) of the student is unclear.			Mostly generic information about the host organization (goals, structure, environment in which it operates) is provided. This includes some information about the organizational context in which the student works, but that is insufficient to understand the context of the tasks/project(s) of the student.		Information about the host organization and its goals, structure and environment is clearly linked to the goals and structure of the organizational context (group/department) in which the student operates. Information about organization is linked to the project of the student.		Information about the host organization and its goals, structure and environment is described clearly and concisely. Description is tailored to the tasks/project(s) of the student: e.g. it includes an analysis of the contribution to goals of the organization by the employees with whom the student collaborates, or an analysis of the direct work context of the student (group/department).

3.2 Description the main or overarching challenge and its of scientific background (the 'what')

Problem analysis or knowledge gap	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
The problem analysis (or formulation of knowledge gap) is absent and/or is largely incorrect. Relation of the problem analysis to the context of the host organization is missing or incorrect.			The problem analysis (or formulation of knowledge gap) is mostly correct, but is not sharp and/or contains errors. Relation of the problem analysis to the context of the host organization is present, but not well-defined.		The problem analysis (or formulation of knowledge gap) is correct. Relation of the problem analysis to the context of the host organization is well-defined.		The problem analysis (or formulation of knowledge gap) is correct, complete and concise. Relation of the problem analysis to the context of the host organization is well-defined and sharply analysed.
Project goals (or research questions)	Most project goals (or research questions) are unclear, or not realistically attainable. Delineation of the project is weak or absent.		Project goals (or research questions) are mostly clear, but lack sharpness. Some delineation of the project is provided.		Project goals (or research questions) are clear. Project goals are attainable. A clear delineation of the project is provided.		Project goals (or research questions) are clear, attainable and formulated to-the-point. Delineation of the project is well-defined.
Scientific background	Some theory/literature is used but the description lacks connection to the internships project(s) at hand and/or contains serious errors.		The relevant theory/literature is used, but the description is minimal, has not been tailored to the internship project(s) at hand, or shows occasional errors.		The relevant theory/literature is discussed and linked to the internship project(s) at hand.		The relevant theory/literature is synthesized in a clear and coherent way. The theoretical background is tailored to both the contents and the context of the internship project(s) at hand.

3.3 Description and justification of chosen approach (the 'how')

Justification	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
Student does not provide scientific support (nor any other scientifically acceptable evidence) for the approach. As a result, it is unclear whether the proposed approach is appropriate or effective.			Student provides some scientific support for the approach. Based on this, it is plausible that the proposed approach is at least appropriate or effective.		Student provides scientific support for the approach. Based on this, it is evident that the proposed approach is appropriate and effective.		Student provides coherent scientific support for the approach, linking it to the specific goals and context of the internship project. Based on this, it is evident that the proposed approach is appropriate and effective.
Description	Description of the approach is missing, minimal, incomplete or unclear, hampering replication of the methodology.		Description of the approach is mostly complete, but lacks clarity or detail at some points, hampering exact replication of the methodology.		Description of the approach is clear and complete. Level of detail allows for a close-to-exact replication of the methodology.		Description of the approach is clear, complete and concise. Level of detail and quality of description enables exact replication of the methodology.

3.4 Presentation of the output / the process (the 'act')

(NB: output can be deliverables of any kind, *including* a research report).

⁷ For the scientific report there are roughly three scenarios (with many variants):

- The scientific report **overlaps** with (i.e. is equal to) the deliverable that was agreed on with the host supervisor and WU supervisor, provided that the format of that deliverable allows for the inclusion of text that addresses the various topics defined in the MSc internship assessment criteria.
- The scientific report does **not overlap** with the deliverables but refers to the deliverables where appropriate. Possibly, in the internship report parts of the process that lead to the deliverable have been documented in text or images and can be added as an appendix.
- The scientific report **partly overlaps** with (one of) the deliverables. This can be the case when the deliverable is a report (e.g. research report) in which part of the topics that need to be addressed (see MSc internship criteria) are covered. In that case the internship report can refer to this deliverable (=report) where appropriate and will include additional content for the topics that are not covered by the deliverable.

	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
	Deliverables and/or process are either not presented, or presentation is incomplete or incorrect so that the reader is unable to understand what outcomes were attained. Text or supporting illustrations (e.g. figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc.) contain several flaws. Outcomes are not related to the project goals.		Deliverables and/or process are presented, but the presentation is either unclear, incoherent or incorrect in some places. Supporting illustrations (e.g. figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc.) are either missing or have no or little added value for the reader to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.		Deliverables and/or process are presented correctly and efficiently. Text, figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc. are well-chosen and support the reader to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.		Deliverables and/or process are presented flawlessly and efficiently, with a clear storyline connecting the various outcomes. Text, figures, graphs, tables etc. are well-chosen or original, and efficiently guide the reader to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.
3.5 Critical evaluation of the outcomes and/or process, both from a scientific and host-organisation point of view (the 'look back and conclude')							
Critical evaluation of the approach	Student indicates no, or at most irrelevant, trivial, or overly generic strengths and weaknesses in the chosen approach and the implementation thereof.		Student indicates some (not necessarily major) strengths and weaknesses in the chosen approach and the implementation thereof.		Student indicates the major strengths and weaknesses in the chosen approach and the implementation thereof. Student evaluates impact of strengths and weakness on the project outcome or suggests (better) alternatives for the approach used.		Student gives a comprehensive overview of strengths and weaknesses in the chosen approach and the implementation thereof. Student evaluates impact of strengths and weakness on the project outcome. Furthermore, (better) alternatives for the approach used are indicated.
Critical evaluation of the results/outcomes	Evaluation of the results/outcomes of the project is absent, both in relation to scientific literature and in relation to the context of the host organization.		Student provides some evaluation of the results/outcomes of the project, based on scientific literature or in relation to the context of the host organization.		Student critically evaluates the results/outcomes of the project, based on scientific literature and in relation to the context of the host organization.		Student critically evaluates the results/outcomes of the project, based on scientific literature and in relation to the context of the host organization. The evaluation is both comprehensive and constructive (useful for host organization).
Conclusions	Student does not, or only partially, assess to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. Furthermore, the described relation between goals and outcomes is incomplete, unclear or incorrect. Possibly, the assessment merely repeats outcomes/results.		Student assesses to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. However, the described relation between goals and outcomes is incomplete and/or unclear. The assessment of the outcomes is formulated inexactly or vaguely.		Student assesses, to partially substantiated with results/outcomes, to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. The described relation between goals/questions and outcomes is complete and clear. The assessment of the outcomes is formulated exactly.		Student assesses, substantiated with results/outcomes, to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. The described relation between goals/questions and outcomes is complete, clear and follows a convincing line of reasoning. The assessment of the outcomes is formulated exactly.
3.6 Recommendations to the host organisation based on the internship project (the 'look ahead')							
Evaluation of relevance of the internship tasks for the host organization	Student does not identify the added value of the project for the host organization, or the evaluation of relevance is incorrect or irrelevant.		Student identifies the added value of the project for the host organization in broad or somewhat vague terms.		Student identifies the added value of their project for the host organization correctly, specifically and precisely. Student provides some recommendations based on the internship project.		Student identifies the added value of their project for the host organization correctly, specifically and precisely. Student provides recommendations beyond, but based on, the internship project.
Evaluation of relevance of the internship tasks in societal and scientific context	Student does not relate the project to issues in scientific and/or societal context, or the provided relation is incorrect or irrelevant.		Student relates the project to some issues in scientific and/or societal context. Relevance of the identified issues is mixed.		Student relates the project to relevant issues in scientific and/or societal context.		Student provides a clear and concise analysis of the contribution of the project to relevant issues in scientific and/or societal context.
3.7 Writing skills							
Structure	Main structure is at most approximately correct, and lower level hierarchy and ordering is illogical. Some sections have overlapping functions leading to ambiguity in placement of information. Level of detail varies widely (information missing, or irrelevant information given). Structure within paragraphs and transition between paragraphs are often unclear or illogical.		Main structure is correct, but placement of material in different chapters is illogical in some places. Level of detail could be improved in some places (irrelevant information given). Most paragraphs have a clear function. Transitions between paragraphs are predominantly clear and logical. Errors in structure do not inhibit correct understanding.		Main structure is correct, chapters and sections have a clear and unique function. Hierarchy of sections is correct. Ordering of sections is logical. All information occurs at the correct place. Level of detail is appropriate. Paragraphs fulfil a specific function. Transitions between paragraphs are clear and logical.		Well-structured, and clear and concise throughout. Very readable report where the structure helps to convey the storyline of the report; structure, formulation and style facilitate understanding of the report. Paragraphs each fulfil a specific function, have a clear argumentation. Transitions between paragraphs are clear and logical; creating a clear line of argumentation.

	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
Fluency and coherency	Vagueness and/or inexactness in wording affect the interpretation of the text. Many spelling/grammar errors occur, sometimes inhibiting correct understanding of the text. Coherency between and within chapters is absent or very limited.		Formulations in the text are ambiguous in places but this does not inhibit a correct interpretation of the text. Spelling/grammar errors are rare, and do not inhibit correct understanding of the text. Coherency between chapters, or within chapters, is limited.		Formulations in text are precise, clear and concise. No spelling/grammar errors and readability of text is good. The text is coherent both between chapters and within chapters.		Formulations in text are precise, clear and concise. No spelling/grammar errors and readability of text is excellent. The storyline of the report is recognizable at all levels (from chapter to paragraph) leading to a coherent text.
Citing and referencing	No or very limited use of literature. If literature is used, relevance is limited or not to-the-point. Reference list lacks information for many sources and/or literature is not or incorrectly referenced in the text.		Cited literature is relevant for the topic of the project, but not always to the point. Some sources have better alternatives. Reference list contains literature used, but either referencing in text contains some errors, or information about sources is incomplete or incorrect in some cases.		Cited literature is relevant to the context where it is cited, and of appropriate quality. Correct style of referencing in the text as well as in the reference list. Style is applied consistently throughout. All sources are traceable.		Cited literature is relevant to the context where it is cited. Wherever a citation would be needed, it is provided. Student uses the most appropriate and recent literature throughout. Correct style of referencing in the text as well as in the reference list. Style is applied consistently throughout. All sources are traceable. Style is appropriate for the type of document and the field of study.

4. Oral presentation (5%)

4.1 Content of presentation

Presentation of approach and outcomes	Approach and deliverables and/or process are not presented, or the presentation is either unclear, incorrect or incoherent. Supporting illustrations (e.g. figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc.) are either missing or have no added value for the audience to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.		Approach and deliverables and/or process are presented, but the presentation is either unclear, incorrect or incoherent in some places. Supporting illustrations (e.g. figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc.) are either missing or have no or little added value for the audience to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.		Approach and deliverables and/or process are presented clearly and correctly. Text, figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc. are well-chosen and support the audience to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.		Approach and deliverables and/or process are presented flawlessly and with a coherent storyline. Text, figures, visualizations, graphs, tables etc, in combination with student's explanation, efficiently guide the audience to understand what results were achieved in relation to the project goals.
Clarity and justification of conclusions	Student does not, or only partially, assess to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. Furthermore, the described relation between goals and outcomes is incomplete, unclear or incorrect. Possibly, the assessment merely repeats outcomes/results.		Student assesses to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. However, the described relation between goals and outcomes is incomplete and/or unclear. The assessment of the outcomes is formulated inexactly or vaguely.		Student assesses, partially substantiated with results/outcomes, to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. The described relation between goals/questions and outcomes is complete and clear. The assessment of the outcomes is formulated exactly.		Student assesses, substantiated with results/outcomes, to what extent the outcomes of the project(s) contribute to the goals/questions that were defined at the start. The described relation between goals/questions and outcomes is complete, clear and follows a convincing line of reasoning. The assessment of the outcomes is formulated exactly.
Ability to respond to questions	Student is able to answer no, or only the simplest questions.		Student answers informative questions well, but has difficulty to deal with in-depth questions.		Student answers both informative questions and in-depth questions well.		Student answers both informative questions and in-depth questions excellently. Answers are appropriate, clear and to-the-point and such that they enlighten the audience. Answers are logically and smoothly linked to the presentation or previous questions.

4.2 Presentation skills

Targeted at audience	Hardly suited for the intended public or intended purpose. Regularly the level of detail is inappropriate, or background of audience not taken into account.		Intended public taken into account, but at some points level of detail is inappropriate for intended audience (too much or too little).		Targeted to the intended public (language, depth, length); appropriate for the intended purpose.		Enticing and purposeful throughout, facilitating communication of the main messages to the audience.
Structure of presentation	Presentation has unclear structure or lay-out. Audience gets lost often.		Presentation is structured, though the audience gets lost in some places.		Presentation has a clear structure, is concise and to-the-point. Good separation between main message and side-steps. Presentation is coherent.		Presentation is very well structured, is concise and to-the-point. Good separation between main message and side-steps. Coherent presentation with a clear storyline. Line of

	Grade: 4	5	Grade: 6	7	Grade: 8	9	Grade: 10
							argumentation is clear and logical throughout.
Voice and poise	Presentation is uninspired and/or monotonous and/or student reads from slides; attention of audience not captured.		Presentation mostly clear, but at some moments uninspired and/or monotonous and/or unclearly spoken. At those moments attention of audience is lost. Student has trouble recovering from mistakes.		Inspired and lively presentation, clearly spoken, with varied intonation. Student recovers well from any small mistake.		Inspired and lively presentation that engages the audience. Presentation runs smooth without errors. Student is both relaxed and concentrated. Clearly spoken with varied intonation. Student applies dynamic posture (gestures), facial expression.
5. Oral defence (5%)							
5.1 Defence of the MSc-internship							
	Student is not able to defend/discuss their internship project(s) and report.		Student defends their internship work (reactively) but does not actively engage in a discussion/conversation.		Student engages in a discussion/conversation about the contents and context of their internship project(s).		Student engages in a lively and in-depth discussion about the contents of their internship project(s), as well as relevant current knowledge and contexts.
5.2 Knowledge of content and context of the internship project							
	Student does not master the contents.		Student knows most of the contents of their work. Student has difficulty to relate their work to the context of the host organization and/or the scientific context.		Student masters the contents of their work and is able to discuss the added value of their work for the host organization, or the relation to relevant current knowledge.		Student masters the contents of their work and is able to discuss the added value of their work for the host organization, as well as the relation to relevant current knowledge. Student is also able to broaden and deepen the scope of the discussion.

6. Personal reflection report (pass/fail; single-point rubric)		
	Fail	Pass
6.1 Reflection on activities and progress in relation learning outcomes of the internship		
Apply and further develop competences in a professional context		Student identifies in which competences they felt well-prepared by their MSc programme, and in which competences it was necessary to (further) develop during their internship. Student connects those competences to explicitly described experiences during the internship
Conduct tasks/projects in a professional manner		Student identifies own strengths and weaknesses regarding their ability to work on their tasks in a professional manner. Student connects those strengths and weaknesses to explicitly described experiences during the internship
6.2 Reflection on activities and progress in relation to personal learning outcomes		
Working on personal learning goals		Student describes investments (=how they worked on the personal learning outcomes), achievements (=results of these efforts; can be both successful and less successful) and how these are related (=effectiveness of the approach).
Learning from personal learning goals		Student identifies own strengths and weaknesses and connects those to explicitly described experiences during the internship.
6.3 Reflection on personal strengths and weaknesses in relation to career interests and ambitions		
Capabilities in relation to professional ambitions		Student evaluates how own strengths and weaknesses may affect their professional ambitions.
Professional ambitions (career interest + career ambition)		Students identifies if and how the experiences during the internship have strengthened or changed their ambitions with respect to their intended working field or preferred type of organization.