

Rubric TFM. Master in Space Engineering.

	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target	Outstanding
Statement and motivation of the problem	The problem to be addressed is not clear. There is no rationale stating the relevance of the problem. The significance of the problem is not established.	The problem to be addressed is explained to a certain degree. The relevance and significance of the problem is not clear. The motivation to tackle it is not stated.	The problem to be addressed is explained with clarity and conciseness. There is a clear exposition of the relevance and significance of the problem.	The problem to be addressed is explained with clarity and conciseness. The discussion of the relevance and significance of the problem is done using strong arguments, and linking them to the state-of-the-art. The motivation is fully and in detailed justified.
Review of the state-of-the-art	There are obvious references missing. The review is not organized and not related to the addressed problem. The review does not show any point of improvement and does not provide a summary of the state of the art.	The review includes references covering most of the relevant approaches related to the problem. If there are some references missing, they are not critical to understand the proposed approach. Possible improvements or controversial issues can be inferred from the review.	The review covers all the relevant references for the addressed problem. The summary of the review clearly states the possible improvements or controversial issues of the topic and the proposed approach can be easily justified from it.	The review covers all the relevant references for the addressed problem. The summary of the review explains in detail the possible improvements or controversial issues of the topic and it provides a sound and complete justification of the proposed approach.
Methodology and discussion of alternatives	The work does not expose the methodology followed in the work in a clear way, nor any alternative to tackle the problem at hand is presented.	The work presents the methodology that was followed in a loose way: there is no assessment of possible alternatives or there is no link to the current state-of-the-art.	The work presents the methodology in a clear way. The document states the assumptions and explains the rationale for adopting them. There is a link to the current state-of-the-art	The work presents the methodology in a complete and understandable way. The document states all the assumptions and explains the rationale for adopting them and why this is the best option available. The methodology is completely related to the current state-of-the-art
Evaluation of results	The work does not include any kind of evaluation of the contribution; or the evaluation methodology is not adequate to the problem at hand. Alternatively, the results are completely misinterpreted or largely overstated; the evaluation is manipulated with the aim of deception.	The evaluation methodology is not adequate for the problem at hand, the validation scenario is not discussed and too simple for justifying the problem approach, part of the results are misinterpreted or the solution is not compared to previous competing solutions (if possible).	The evaluation methodology of the results is adequate, although some details deserve improvement. The full relevance of the results, or most of it, is highlighted. The evaluation scenario, if it exists, makes sound and justified assumptions. Results are correctly interpreted. There is a comparison against other competing solutions (if possible)	The evaluation methodology of the results is completely adequate. The full relevance of the results is explained and highlighted. The evaluation scenario, if it exists, is as realistic as possible. Results are correctly interpreted. There is a sound comparison against the most relevant competing solutions (if possible)
Document format and writing	Some section is not included. The document is hard to read, and presents a large number of errors or grammar issues. Figures are not clear or cannot be understood without additional information.	The document is readable, despite few typos or grammar error. Graphs are clear although they are not self-explanatory	The document follows a logical order with tables and figures that help the reader to understand the work.	The document is written with a clear style. Formulae, figures and tables are labelled, referenced and explained in the text. The document is easy to read and understand.

Thesis defense	The presenter just read the slides. The presenter did not answer the questions and showed ignorance about the main points of the problem addressed.	The presentation shows most of the work done, though some major points are not included. The presenter does not show confidence on the topic: not following a suitable pace and not answering related questions afterwards.	The presentation is clear although some minor aspect is not fully addressed (either in the presentation or in the questions afterwards). The style of the presentation can be improved.	The presentation was crystal clear. The presenter communicate captivating the audience. The presenter is able to answer the questions with looseness and confidence.
Contribution	The work does not provide any contribution to the field of study. It neither proposes a solution to the problem at hand, nor employs any novel methodology to solve it. There is no discussion on the contribution in the report or during the presentation.	The work provides and presents a minor contribution to the field of study. For instance, applying a well-known methodology in a new context or proposing a small modification to a previously existing solution or methodology.	The work provides and presents a minor contribution to the field of study. For instance, applying a well-known methodology in a new context or proposing a small modification to a previously existing solution or methodology.	The work presents a significant contribution, the used methods are partially novel (or used for the first time in the application at hand) and the impact on the area could be potentially relevant.

Competences Master Thesis. Master in Space Engineering

Competences Master Thesis. Master in Space Engineering		
	M6	
CB6	X	To possess and understand knowledge that provides a basis or opportunity to be original in the development and / or application of ideas, often in a research context
CB7	X	Students must know how to apply the knowledge acquired and their ability to solve problems in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to their area of study
CB8	X	Students must be able to integrate knowledge and face the complexity of making judgments based on information that, being incomplete or limited, includes reflections on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgments
CB9	X	Students must know how to communicate their conclusions and the knowledge and ultimate reasons that sustain them to specialized and non-specialized audiences in a clear and unambiguous way
CB10	X	Students must have the learning skills allowing them to continue studying in a way that will be largely self-directed or autonomous.
CG1	X	Capacity for the formulation, critical verification and defense of hypotheses, as well as the design of experimental tests for verification.
CG2	X	Ability to make value judgments and prioritize in making conflicting decisions using systemic thinking
CG3	X	Ability to analyze and correct the environmental and social impact of the technical solutions of any space system
CG5	X	Ability to handle the English, technical and colloquial language
CE16	X	Ability to perform, present and defend an original exercise carried out individually before a tribunal, consisting of an integral project of Space Engineering of a professional nature in which the competences acquired in the teachings are synthesized, will be exercised through the Final Master's Project.

Evaluation Matrix

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Para cada uno de los 12 criterios a evaluar, marque una X en alguna de las celdas amarillas de las columnas "1", "2", "3" ó "4" según la puntuación que desee otorgar. Recuerde que solo debe marcar una celda amarilla por cada criterio.

2. La casilla B21 (NOTA TFM) deberá mostrar la nota numérica de la calificación obtenida en el TFM

CRITERIA		1	2	3	4	Competencias
REPORT (4 POINTS)	Statement and motivation of the problem	0	0,4	0,7	0,9	CB7/CG3
	Review of the state of the art	0	0,3	0,6	0,8	CB8
	Methodology and discussion of alternatives	0	0,3	0,6	0,8	CG1/CG2
	Evaluation of results	0	0,3	0,6	0,8	CB7/CE16
	Document format and writing	0	0,2	0,5	0,7	CB9
DEFENSE (3 POINTS)	Thesis Defense	0	1	2	3	CB9/CG5/CE16
CONTRIBUTION / EFFORT (3 POINTS)	Technical / Scientific Contribution	0	0,5	0,8	1	CB6/CE16
	Report of Supervisor	0	1	1,5	2	CB10
GRADE	0	0	0	0	0	
Propuesta para Matrícula de Honor (MH): Sí / NO						

"Nota aclaratoria: sólo es competencia del tribunal evaluar el desempeño del alumno en relación con el contenido del trabajo solicitado por el tutor y en ningún caso la idoneidad del mismo en el seno del máster que compete a su Comité de Dirección y/o Comisión Académica. El presidente del tribunal velará por el cumplimiento de este aspecto"

Máster Ingeniería de Sistemas Electrónicos y Aplicaciones

Nombre Alumno/a

TRIBUNAL CALIFICADOR	Firma de los miembros del Tribunal
Presidente	<input style="width: 100%; height: 30px;" type="text"/>
Vocal	<input style="width: 100%; height: 30px;" type="text"/>
Secretario	<input style="width: 100%; height: 30px;" type="text"/>

Fecha defensa