MSIAM2 internship evaluation form (defence)

Student Name:
Supervisor Name:
Supervisor email:
Organization name, city and country:
Internship subject title:
Dates of internship:

The MSIAM MSc thesis defence committee consists at least of the chair (designed by the MSIAM head) and the MSc thesis reviewer. The MSc thesis advisor participates to the defence but is not a member of the jury. He.she may be allowed to attend the deliberation of the committee but does not take part to the student rating.
We ask the MSc thesis committee to provide a written evaluation of the following items. For each item, a scoring range [0 max] is provided. Please see the detailed signification of possible scores on the back side of the page.

1/ Clarity of speech, balance of exposition and involvement of candidate; [0-5]
2/ Scientific level [0-5]
3/ Clarity and editorial quality of slides/blackboard; [0-3]
4/ Audience was more or less well-addressed; [0-2]
5/ Scientific curiosity and maturity [0-3]
6/ Excellent timing in all respects. [0-2]
Answers to questions are addressed in 2/ (in relation with the technical quality of the work by the student) and 5/ (in relation with hindsight on the topic and putting it in perspective).
The global score is between 0 and 20.

Grade	0	1	2	3	4	5
1/ Presentation clarity						
2/ Scientific level						
3/ Slides(or blackboard) quality						
4/ Attention to the audience						
5/ Scientific curiosity and maturity						
6/ Timing						

Major strengths:

To improve:

Other Comments

How would you rate the defence ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Average
Date, Name, signature:

Please send this evaluation form to msiam2@imag.fr the week before the oral defence.

item	Grade
Presentation clarity, organization, level of pitch [0 to 5]	5: Exceptional. Brilliant exposition, very well organized, pitched at some ideal level for the audience, good choices of items to highlight (including demo, examples, etc.) 4: Good and clear exposition, well organized, pitched at a good level for the audience, correct choices of items to highlight. 3: Globally rather well organised but some parts lack of clarity or are too basic or too detailed. 2: Some shortcomings in the global structure. Some parts are unclear or confusing. 1: Lack of work, not a professional presentation (for example: pitch at the wrong level for the audience, unclear, lack of examples, etc.) 0: Basically, the presentation is hardly understandable.
Scientific quality of presentation [0 to 5]	5: Exposition and answers to questions denote an excellent scientific level, particularly in math. Numerous complex concepts in math are mastered, as well as the scientific approach; perfectly well rendered: analytical skills, from theory to validation of results. 4: Exposition and answers to questions denote a very good scientific level. Several complex concepts in math are mastered, as well as the (well-rendered) scientific approach. 3: Exposition and answers to questions of satisfying scientific level. Some complex concepts in math are mastered. Rather well rendered scientific approach. 2: Sound presentation, from a scientific viewpoint. Some concepts of low mathematical complexity in math are mastered. Exposition of the scientific approach not-so-well addressed. Answers to questions directly related to what was done lack of accuracy. 1: Some errors in the presentation. Low mathematical level. Unsatisfying answers to technical questions directly related to what was done. 0: Several errors in the presentation. Obviously, the topic is not acquired. Irrelevant answers to questions directly related to what was done (or could not answer).
Quality of slides (form only) [0 to 3]	3: Excellent set of slides (and/or use of blackboard). Well illustrated, no typo, easy to read. 2: Good set of slides, meeting standard requirements. 1: Slides would require some proofreading. Lack of work on their conception. 0: Numerous errors and typos. Insufficiently illustrated, or bad choice of illustrations.
Communication toward audience [0 to 2]	2: Excellent speaker, dynamic, good elocution, cares well for audience. 1: Satisfying, but some points need improvement. 0: Hesitates frequently, seems to discover slide contents, does not care for audience.
Scientific culture and hindsight [0 to 3]	3: Exposition and answers to questions denote an excellent coverage of the topic and hindsight regarding the concepts involved. Real and relevant perspectives are proposed. Obvious scientific culture. 2: Exposition and answers to questions denote satisfying hindsight on the topic and scientific culture. 1: Some lack of perspectives on the topic, a somewhat narrow views regarding the concepts involved. Low scientific culture. 0 : Total lack of perspectives on the topic and of scientific culture. Strong difficulties to make connections between different concepts.
Timing [0 to 2]	2: Very good timing. 1: Slightly too short / too long. 0: Ways too short / too long. Had to be interrupted by the jury