



# Bachelor Research Project

## Assessment form

The Rules and regulations for individually supervised course units apply for this research project. Upon finishing the project the thesis must be uploaded into the repository of University Library for the grade to be registered. See the Student Portal for more detailed information about (finishing) the project.

Student name: Gayeon Kim

Student number: s. 3541223

Bachelor programme:

Physics (NABBBO15E; 15 ECTS)       Physics + Mathematics (NAWIOND15; 20 ECTS)

Applied Physics (NABOTN-09; 15 ECTS)

Title of Bachelor thesis: Self-Assembly and Optical Spectroscopy of J-Type Organic Nanostructures

Final grade for the Bachelor Research Project: 7.0 (( = 2xA + 2xB + C + D)/6)\*

\* The student can only pass the assessment if all subgrades (A-D) are graded with at least 5.5.

\* If one or more of the subgrades (A-D) are lower than 5.5 or when the project is not completed in time, a first grade should be registered as FAIL. The student is offered a remediation trajectory after which a second assessment takes place.

Thesis scanned with plagiarism scanner<sup>1</sup>:  yes    no

Thesis is uploaded into the repository:  yes    no

First examiner: Richard Hildner

Signature: R. Hildner

Second examiner: Thomas L.C. Jansen

Signature: T. Jansen

Date: 10. Dec. 2021

Rubric on backside

<sup>1</sup> Guide to examiners: the plagiarism scanner *Ephorus* can be found in Nestor on the Student Portal under Organizations. Look into the Ephorus report and discuss the results with the student. Suspected plagiarism must be reported to the Board of Examiners ([esephysics@rug.nl](mailto:esephysics@rug.nl)).

example copy - not for official use

	Insufficient (<5.5)	Satisfactory (6)	Very satisfactory (7)	Good (8)	Very Good (9)	Excellent (10)
<b>A. Scientific quality of Research and Reporting</b> a. Problem analysis b. Literature research c. Research strategy and methods/techniques used d. Quality, validity, and relevance of results e. Interpretation of results f. Discussion of results g. Conclusions h. ...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partial grade A	7.1					
<b>B. Management of Research</b> a. Analytical skills b. Initiative c. Accuracy d. Independence e. ...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partial grade B	7					
<b>C. Report</b> a. Structure and layout b. Writing skills (clear, complete, concise) c. Presentation (presented results, i.e. tables, figures, etc.) d. Linguistic skills (phrasing, style, spelling, grammar) e. References	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partial grade C	6.3					
<b>D. Final presentation</b> a. Structure and argumentation b. Clarity and persuasiveness (distinction between main and side issues) c. Style and phrasing d. Usage of audiovisual aids e. Discussion (adequate in response)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partial grade D	7.5					
Comments:	Writing sometimes too colloquial; not all Figs referenced in text; Captions often too short, do not explain Figs; very few references in discussion. Used methods, quality & accuracy of results, initiative on good level; in Figs: font size small, lines too thin; abstract very technical;					

example copy - not for official use



showed, steep lessening curve during writing,  
report improved strongly compared to first draft