

## **Annex 9. Student Assessment Regulations**



## Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose	3
Recommendations	4
Assessment	4
Conduct of Examinations	6
Schedule	6
Resits and Retakes	6
Grading and feedback	7
SEA-EU 2.0 Standardised Grading System for Joint Programmes.	8
Introduction	8
Benefits of a standardised grading system	8
SEA-EU Institutions. (Information extracted from Education and Research Analysis of the SEA-EU Alliance 2.0)	9
Agreement	12
Assessment Methods for SEA-EU Joint Programmes provided by the JPWG	15
Internship Evaluations Reports	18
a) Technical Report (Timesheet). Provisional template.	18
b) Student's Reflective diary. Provisional template	19
c) Mentor's evaluation of the internship. Provisional template	22
d) Supervisor's Report. Provisional template	25

## **Introduction**

The assessment process for the Joint Bachelor's Degree in Sustainable Blue Economy is designed to comprehensively evaluate students' learning, skills and competencies across a diverse curriculum. This programme, a collaborative effort between multiple institutions, offers a multidisciplinary approach to understanding and addressing the challenges and opportunities within the blue economy.

To accurately reflect the diverse nature of the courses offered, the assessment framework incorporates a range of methods to ensure that students are assessed fairly and thoroughly in both theoretical knowledge and practical application. These methods include written examinations, coursework, practical assessments, group projects and presentations. Each type of assessment is carefully selected to match the learning outcomes of each course.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of the diverse assessment methods used in SeaBlueE is to provide a holistic evaluation of student learning and development. These methods measure academic understanding, ensuring students grasp theoretical concepts and principles, while also evaluating their ability to apply this knowledge in practical settings. By fostering critical thinking and encouraging independent research, the assessments challenge students to engage with complex issues and develop innovative solutions. Additionally, they enhance communication abilities through written and oral presentations and promote teamwork and collaboration via group projects, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the blue economy sector. Furthermore, these assessments prepare students for professional roles by equipping them with a diverse skill set that aligns with the demands of various careers in the blue economy. Finally, they support continuous improvement by providing feedback that helps students identify strengths and areas for growth, encouraging ongoing learning and professional development.

## **Recommendations**

Students are expected to be thoroughly familiar with the Code of Conduct of the SEA-EU Joint Degree Programmes and the Student Assessment Regulations included in the Cooperation Agreement (see Annex 2).

## **Assessment**

In alignment with the principles of effective teaching, SeaBlueE co-teaching teams will employ assessment methods purposefully designed to match specific learning outcomes. These methods will accurately assess the required capabilities for relevant roles within the appropriate context, whether functional or subject-specific. The assessments will focus on the specific subject matter, providing students with opportunities to demonstrate their skills and competencies in accordance with the intended learning outcomes.

SeaBlueE will employ a variety of assessment methods to comprehensively evaluate students' theoretical knowledge and practical skills. These methods are designed to ensure students are well-prepared for professional roles in the industry. Coursework and assignments will require students to research, analyse, and present information on various topics through essays and reports, testing their ability to communicate ideas clearly and concisely. Additionally, analysing real-world scenarios in case studies will allow students to apply theoretical concepts to practical situations, demonstrating their problem-solving skills and understanding of industry practices.

Continuous assessment includes class participation and formative assessments. Class participation will evaluate students' engagement in discussions, seminars, and workshops, assessing their contributions to the learning environment and their ability to interact constructively with peers and instructors. Formative assessments will provide ongoing feedback, enabling students to identify areas for improvement and monitor their progress in meeting the program's learning objectives, thereby supporting the development of both their knowledge base and professional skills.

Examinations encompass written and oral formats. Written exams will consist of essays that assess students' understanding of key concepts and their ability to articulate knowledge under time constraints. Oral exams will evaluate students' verbal communication skills and their ability to engage in academic

discussions, offering a platform to demonstrate critical thinking and analytical abilities.

In summary, both single and continuous assessment methodologies in the programme include alternative assessment methods and traditional examinations and academic writing.

The Joint Programmes Working Group has developed a comprehensive list of diverse assessment methods to guide teaching staff during the co-creation phase by proposing innovative approaches in evaluating both group and individual student performance (see pages 15-17). This initiative aims to create a dynamic learning environment that effectively measures a wide range of skills and competencies essential to port management and logistics. By aligning with modern educational practices and industry requirements, this approach prepares students comprehensively for professional success in the field.

The full course descriptions, provided in Annexes 5 & 6, include detailed information on the workload, overall objectives, expected learning outcomes, main course contents, teaching and learning methodologies, and assessment methods. Each course also specifies the weighting of the various assessment methods.

## Conduct of Examinations

### Schedule

The SeaBlueE implementation approach represents an innovative framework designed by the SEA-EU Joint Programmes Coordination to provide a cohesive and enriching educational experience. Structured in intensive two-week courses, the programme ensures deep engagement with specific topics, progressing students through a sequential learning pathway.

The model comprises two consecutive courses of two weeks each, followed by a week dedicated to the comprehensive assessment of both courses (see example below).

Week	Course
1	SBE101. Marine Ecosystems & Biodiversity
2	SBE101. Marine Ecosystems & Biodiversity
3	SBE102. Ocean Functioning
4	SBE102. Ocean Functioning
5	Y1 Courses #1 & 2 student's self work and assessment

### Resits and Retakes

A resit will provide students with the opportunity to be reassessed for a course they did not pass on their first attempt. This additional opportunity will allow the student to achieve a pass, ensuring that they meet the academic requirements of the course and can continue their studies. Resits will be held at the end of each semester to allow students time to prepare and demonstrate their understanding of the course material.

Students may retake failed courses in the next academic year, with a maximum of four assessment attempts in total (twice per academic year).

The unexcused nonattendance of an examination session shall in any event result in the loss of an examination attempt.

## **Grading and feedback**

Assessment weight has been established for each course (see Annexes 5&6) and are aligned with the learning outcomes of the course. To this end, it is considered essential to provide timely feedback to students immediately after the examination. This feedback will help students to understand their performance, identify areas for improvement and facilitate continuous learning throughout the programme.

## **SEA-EU 2.0 Standardised Grading System for Joint Programmes.**

### **Introduction**

In an increasingly interconnected world, the pursuit of higher education in Europe has transcended national borders, resulting in a diverse and dynamic landscape of alliances. As students cross borders in pursuit of academic excellence, there is a need for a standardised and transparent grading system that can effectively assess and compare the academic performance of different educational institutions within the SEA-EU.

This introduction explores the concept of a grading system within SEA-EU member universities, its key components, benefits, challenges and the imperative role it plays in promoting academic mobility.

Given the diversity of education systems within the SEA-EU, where each university represents a rich tapestry of educational systems, while encouraging academic innovation, it also presents challenges in assessing and comparing student performance. This standardised grading system provides a common language for academic performance and facilitates a more fluid exchange of knowledge and skills.

### **Benefits of a standardised grading system**

**Facilitating academic mobility:** A standardised grading system simplifies the process of transferring credits between universities, promoting seamless academic mobility.

**Increasing transparency:** Transparent grading criteria contribute to a clearer understanding of academic performance, allowing students, employers and institutions to make informed decisions.

**Global competitiveness:** A standardised grading system promotes healthy competition between universities, encouraging them to maintain high academic standards and international recognition.

In conclusion, the development and adoption of this standardised grading system among SEA-EU member universities is an important step towards creating a more interconnected and equitable European educational landscape. By



addressing the challenges and harnessing the benefits, this community can forge a path towards a future where academic achievement is recognised and valued in Europe.

**SEA-EU Institutions.** *(Information extracted from Education and Research Analysis of the SEA-EU Alliance 2.0)*

The grading system is different for individual universities (tables 1–9). Five universities have a numerical grading scale, while the University of Malta presents grades in the form of letters, where A+ means excellent and F means insufficient. In the case of the University of Cadiz, the scale includes as many as 10 points, where the value from '0' to '4.9' is insufficient, '10' being excellent. At the UBO, the scores range from 0 to 20, with up to 10 points being 'failed/insufficient' and 20 being excellent. The grades are similar at UAlg. In the case of CAU, the scores range from 1 to 5, with the highest grade (very good) is '1' and insufficient/failed is above '4'. At the UG, the numerical grades range from 2 to 5, where 5 is the highest one and 2 means 'failed'. At the UNIST, the numerical grades range from 1 to 5, with '1' as insufficient and '5' as outstanding.

**Table 1. Grading system at UCA – scale from 1 to 10<sup>1</sup>**

UCA – scale 0 - 10	
9-10	Matricula de Honor – Distinction – limited to 5% of students excellent
9-10	Sobresaliente – very good
7-8.99	Notable – good
5-6.99	Aprobado – acceptable/satisfactory
0-4.99	Suspense – insufficient

**Table 2. Grading system at UBO<sup>2</sup>**

UBO – scale 0 to 20	
20	Excellent
16	Very good
14	Good
10	Acceptable
<10	Insufficient
<7	Very insufficient

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.scholaro.com/db/Countries/Spain/Grading-System/Universidad-de-Cadiz-23901>

<sup>2</sup> [https://euria.univ-brest.fr/digitalAssets/67/67493\\_Fact-Sheet-2018\\_2019---F-BREST01.pdf](https://euria.univ-brest.fr/digitalAssets/67/67493_Fact-Sheet-2018_2019---F-BREST01.pdf)

**Table 3. Grading system at CAU<sup>3</sup>**

CAU – scale 1 to 5	
Up to 1.5	Very good
1.6 to 2.5	Good
2.6 to 3.5	Satisfactory
3.6 to 4.0	Sufficient
4.1 and more	Insufficient

**Table 4. Grading system at UG**

Local grade	Definition	% of successful students normally achieving the grade	Definition
5	Outstanding	15%	EXCELLENT–outstanding performance with only minor errors
4	Very Good	35%	VERY GOOD–above the average standard but with some errors
3	Good	35%	GOOD–generally sound work with a few notable errors
2	Sufficient	15%	SUFFICIENT–performance meets the minimum criteria – fair but with significant shortcomings
1	Insufficient		FAILED–unsatisfactory performance FX–FAIL- some more work required before the credit can be awarded F–FAIL- considerable further work required before the credit can be awarded

**Table 5. Grading system at UM [%]<sup>4</sup>**

UM	
A+	UG* - 95–100
A	UG – 80–94      PG** 80-100
B+	UG – 75–79
B	UG – 70–74      PG -70-79
C+	UG – 69–65
C	UG – 55–64      PG – 55 – 69
D+	50–54
D	45–49      PG 50 – 54
E	PG 45-49
F	0–44%

\* UG – undergraduate studies, \*\*PG – postgraduate studies

<sup>3</sup><https://www.studium.uni-kiel.de/en/examinations/examination-procedure/general-information/the-grading-system>

<sup>4</sup>[https://www.um.edu.mt/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0010/409852/GeneralRegulationsforUniversityUndergraduateAwards,2019.pdf](https://www.um.edu.mt/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/409852/GeneralRegulationsforUniversityUndergraduateAwards,2019.pdf)

**Table 6. Grading system at UAlg**

UAlg	
Excellent	18-20
Very good	16-17
Good	14-15
Satisfactory	10-13
Insufficient	9 and less

**Table 7. Grading system at UPN**

UPN	
Excellent	30
Very good	27-29
Good	24-26
Satisfactory	18-23
Insufficient	0-17

**Table 8. Grading system at NORD**

NORD	
Excellent	A
Very good	B
Good	C
Satisfactory	D
Acceptable	E
Insufficient	F

**Table 9. Grading system at UNIST**

UNIST	
Excellent	5
Very good	4
Good	3
Satisfactory	2
Insufficient	1

## Agreement

The final agreement on a common grading system for SEA-EU joint programmes represents a collaborative effort among all partner institutions. Through extensive dialogue and consultation, we have established a unified framework that harmonises grading practices across diverse educational contexts.

This system integrates key principles of assessment fairness and transparency while accommodating the unique pedagogical approaches and disciplinary nuances of each participating institution.

Clear guidelines and criteria will be developed to assess student performance in compliance with the national regulations of the SEA-EU universities. Similarly, a system for regular review and enhancement of the grading system will be implemented, informed by the outcomes of the quality assurance system. This aims to uphold its relevance and effectiveness, fostering a cohesive academic environment where students can confidently pursue their educational goals across international boundaries.

**Grade Conversion System:** In SEA-EU Joint Programmes involving institutions from different countries or education systems, a grade conversion system is essential. This system ensures that the grades obtained by students at one institution will be the same as those obtained at another institution. The aim is to harmonise this system whose table serves as a guide for the teaching staff of each course in order to avoid the student receiving marks on different scales and to avoid misinterpretation of the results. To this end, this joint conversion table establishes a grading system under the SEA-EU umbrella, where students will be graded from 0 - 100%.

**Quality Assurance Measures:** Quality assurance measures will be put in place to monitor and maintain the integrity of the grading system. This may include periodic reviews of grading practices, calibration sessions for instructors, and mechanisms for feedback from students and faculty.

Overall, this final agreement of the grading system for joint programmes offered by SEA-EU serves to establish a framework for consistent and transparent assessment practices, promoting academic rigour and integrity across all participating institutions.

	FAIL	SUFFICIENT	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT	EXCEPTIONAL
ECTS	FX - F	E	D	C	B	A	A+
SEA-EU Joint Programmes	0 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 99%	100%
CROATIA	1	2		3	4	5	N/A
FRANCE	0 – 9.9 (<10 Insufficient; <7 Very insufficient)	10 – 10.9 (10 Average)	11 - 11.9	12 – 13.9 (12 Satisfactory)	14 – 15.9	16 – 17.9 (>16 Very good, excellent)	18 - 20
GERMANY	4,1 – 5,0	3,6 – 4,0	3,1 – 3,5	2,1 – 3,0	1,6 – 2,0	1,0 – 1,5	N/A
ITALY	0 – 17.9	18 - 22	23 - 25	26 - 27	28 - 29	30	30L
MALTA	F 0–44%	PG*: 45 - 49	<b>D+</b> UG**: 50–54 <b>D</b> UG: 45–49 PG 50 - 54	<b>C+</b> UG:69–60 <b>C</b> UG - 55–59 PG – 55 - 69	<b>B+</b> UG - 75–79 <b>B</b> UG - 70–74 PG -70-79	UG - 80–89 PG 80-100	90 - 100
NORWAY	F	E	D	C	B	A	A

	2 (Fail 50% and less)	3.0 (Pass – 51%–60%)	3.5 (Satisfactory – 61%–70%)	4.0 (Good – 71%–80%)	4.5 (Very good – 81%–90%)	5 (Excellent – 91% and more)	N/A
POLAND	N/A	Satisfactory (3.0) (average of grades up to 3.20)	Satisfactory Plus (3.5) (average of grades 3.21 – 3.70)	Good (4.0) (average of grades 3.71– 4.20)	Good Plus (4.5) (average of grades 4.21 – 4.50)	Very Good (5) (average of grades 4.51 – 5.00)	N/A
PORTUGAL	0 - 9	Passing 10 - 11	Satisfactory 12 -13-	Good 14-15	16 - 17	18 - 20	N/A
SPAIN	0 – 4,9 (Suspenso – failed)	5 – 5,9 (Aprobado – passed)	6 – 6,9 (Aprobado – passed)	7 – 7,9 (Notable – credit)	8 – 8,9 (Notable – credit)	9 – 10 (Sobresaliente – outstanding)	9-10 MH (Distinction – limited to 5% of students)

\* *Postgraduate studies*

\*\* *Graduate Studies*

**Assessment Methods for SEA-EU Joint Programmes** provided by the JPWG<sup>5</sup>

**Analysis Task.** A task which requires students to identify the primary elements of a problem or task at hand, and then outline the steps and skills required to ensure that the task is performed optimally.

**Assignment.** Normally an essay (or a set of written exercises) to be done away from the classroom and submitted by a set date.

**Case Study** (Exam Conditions). A research approach that is used to generate in-depth, multi-faceted understanding of a complex issue within a real-life context, which includes the application of discipline specific models, constructs and research literature.

**Case Study** (Take Home). Students are required to work through a case study to identify the problem(s) and to offer potential solutions; useful for assessing students' understanding and for encouraging students to see links between theory and practice. Case studies could be provided in advance of a time-constrained assessment.

**Classwork.** Written or oral exercises carried out by students whilst in the classroom. Examples include: discussions, debates, translation exercises, etc.

**Competencies.** Refers to a continuous process which aims at building the student's capabilities (knowledge, skills and abilities), and assessing them against stated (professional) standards.

**Dissertation.** A written treatment of a subject, normally based on a research question or proposition chosen by the student. It is carried out under the supervision of an academic, in full or partial fulfilment of a degree programme.

**Essay.** An analytical, interpretative, or critical piece of writing that expresses the writer's opinion in response to a set question, problem or issue.

---

<sup>5</sup> This is not an exhaustive list, but rather an attempt to provide a guideline of evaluation methods for teachers  
Source: Adapted from the University of Malta, A-Z of Assessment Methods, and other glossaries and websites.

**Examination.** A written assessment (using traditional pen and paper or a digital platform for the administration of the examination) which is carried out in a predetermined, restricted time span under invigilated conditions. This type of assessment is normally summative in nature.

**Fieldwork.** Work which is done on site to enable students to gain practical experience and knowledge through first hand observation.

**Internship.** An internship can be defined as any arrangement in which students are given opportunities to apply their learning and demonstrate their professional capabilities in the workplace, community context or other relevant settings. Assessment will be conducted by academic supervisors, industry supervisors or workplace mentors, or a combination of both.

**Logbook.** A systematic record of every phase of a project or placement activity.

**Long Essay.** An analytical, interpretative, or critical piece of writing that enables students to explore a specific subject area in some depth, explain theories and concepts; evaluate arguments, and express and support their own views and opinions.

**Oral Examination.** An examination during which students are required to verbally reply to questions posed to them in the spoken form.

**Oral Presentation.** Students are asked to give an oral presentation on a particular topic for a specified length of time and could also be asked to prepare associated handout(s). Can usefully be combined with self- and peer-assessment.

**Portfolio.** A systematic and organised collection of a student's work that exhibits to others the direct evidence of a student's efforts, achievements, and progress over a period of time. It should include representative work, providing a documentation of the learner's performance and a basis for evaluation of the student's progress. Portfolios may include a variety of demonstrations of learning that have been gathered in the form of a physical collection of materials, videos, CD-ROMs, reflective journals, etc.

**Poster.** The production of a large print that can be displayed in a public space. It can include graphical images, text or a mixture of both and is usually designed with the intention of promoting an idea, event, product etc.



**Report.** A written document in which information is presented in an organised format. A report would normally include a descriptive statement, an account of the conditions that are observed, findings resulting from investigation and inquiry, and a conclusive summary in which the student puts forward any recommendations.

**Research Paper.** A research paper is an extended essay which is intended to assess the students' written, analytical, interpretative and argumentative skills, based on independent research.

**Research Projects.** Potential for sampling a wide range of practical, analytical and interpretative skills. Can assess wide application of knowledge, understanding and skills.

**Research/Review Paper.** A thorough and systematic analysis of published research findings, from which students are expected to provide new insights or interpretations about a topic or field of interest.

**Role Play.** Students write or give a presentation taking on a particular role, e.g. a journal reviewer/ editor, consultant, art critic etc. This type of assignment could be paired up with a grant application exercise.

**Seminar Paper.** A seminar paper is an advanced piece of writing which is intended to present an original piece of research to a group of peers.


**Workbook.** An objective record of observations, completed tasks, or goals that have been met.

**Workshop.** Interactive sessions which provide students with opportunities to work together on solutions to real life challenges and situations.

**Written Exercises.** Problem sets or exercises, intended to test skills such as: numeracy, analytical, comprehension, reporting and written communication skills.

## Internship Evaluations Reports

### a) Technical Report (Timesheet). Provisional template.

 <p>EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF THE SEAS</p>						
Technical Report						
Week	Type of activity	Task	Department	Start date	End date	Duration in days
1						
2						
3						

## b) Student's Reflective diary. Provisional template

<b>Student's name</b>			
<b>Email</b>		<b>Phone</b>	
<b>Joint Programme</b>			
<b>Academic year</b>			
<b>Period:</b>			
<b>Start date</b>	Expected start:	Real start:	
<b>End date</b>	Expected end:	Real end:	

### Organisation data:

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>Address:</b>			
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Contact Email</b>	
<b>Website</b>			

### Academic supervisor:

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Email</b>	

### Mentor:

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Contact Email</b>	

### Short description of the company

There should be a brief description of the premises and a schematic organisation chart of the company showing the location of the service in which you have carried out your work. You should analyse how decision-making and responsibilities are organised among the people within the structure. It is also worth mentioning how informal relations are in terms of welcoming new members into the organisation, how you have been made part of the culture of the company or institution, etc.

### Reasons for choosing this internship

*Determine what were the reasons that led you to choose this internship.*

### Description of the developed tasks (maximum extension 5 pages)

*This is a summary of all the activities that have been carried out during the course of the internship. In the event that there is a programme of activities, reference can be made to this programme.*

### Evaluation of learning. Identify the learning outcomes obtained from the stage and include a brief discussion between developed tasks and SBE modules

- ☐ PLO1. Have a general knowledge of the fundamental principles of marine sciences and the fundamental principles of sustainable blue economy.
- ☐ PLO2. Identify and understand the interdependency of marine ecosystems, ocean industries, and societies that depend on them, with a wide socio-ecological perspective.
- ☐ PLO3. Identify and interpret challenges that come with the increase in the economic value of the oceans and the increasing threats on the oceans.
- ☐ PLO4. Describe alternative economic approaches in addition to traditional economic analysis.
- ☐ PLO5. Identify the different economic actors and stakeholder groups in blue industries.
- ☐ PLO6. To use marine environmental and socio-economic analysis tools, including data analysis.
- ☐ PLO7. Manage multidisciplinary data with cutting- edge capabilities in the blue industries.
- ☐ PLO8. Provide a knowledge framework to reconcile conflicting uses of the ocean and its resources and enable long- term sustainable growth.
- ☐ PLO9. Analyse policies and mechanisms that facilitate sustainable use of the ocean and maximise benefits and value creation for current and future generations.
- ☐ PLO10. Develop awareness of environmental and socio-economic problems related to blue economy based on ethical commitment and sustainability.
- ☐ PLO11. To understand the impact of socio-economic activities linked to the marine environment with a focus on sustainability.

**General assessment of stay**

*Indicate whether the training received in the degree has contributed to the development of the internship and whether it has served to consolidate the knowledge acquired in the degree.*

**Personal conclusions and degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the practice**

*What aspects of the internship have been most beneficial to you, to what extent it has contributed to consolidating or rethinking your academic and/or professional future, what problems or incidents have you encountered, what do you think can be improved in the future, etc.*

**Improvement suggestions**

Place and date,

(Student signature)

(Approval of academic supervisor)

### c) Mentor's evaluation of the internship. Provisional template

**Name of the student:**

**SEA-EU Joint Programme:**

**Please, fill in this form to evaluate the student's internship.** Please put a cross (☒) in the box that best describes their experience.

**We ask that, where necessary, you fill in the comments to support your point of view.** All six sections must be completed.

Evaluate from 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest mark and 5 the highest).

1	EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT'S SKILLS:	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
In my experience of the student, they are:							
a)	Creative						
b)	Autonomous and can take the initiative						
c)	Adapt to a new work environment easily						
d)	Able to learn						
e)	Able to create good working relationships with colleagues						
f)	Able to take constructive criticism on board						
g)	Personally invested in the internship/ organisation						
h)	Punctual						

i)	Responsible						
j)	Able to communicate orally, both effectively and professionally						
k)	Able to write effectively and professionally						
l)	Motivated						
m)	Able to work in a team						
n)	Skilled enough to fulfil the tasks demanded of them						
o)	Able to organise their work						

2	OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH THE INTERNSHIP	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
a)	I am satisfied with the student's performance in my organisation.						
b)	I am satisfied with the management of the internship by the University.						
c)	I am satisfied with the collaboration with the academic supervisor						

d)	I am satisfied with the competencies and skills previously acquired by the student						
e)	I am satisfied with the tasks the student carried out during the internship						

<b>Start date of the internship</b> <i>please Indicate the exact date on which the student began the internship</i>		<b>End date of the internship</b> <i>please indicate the exact date on which the student ended the internship</i>	
Comments:			

Disclaimer: I certify that the above facts are true to the best of my knowledge of (INSERT STUDENT NAME)

**Professional Mentor's Name and Signature:**

(INSERT MENTOR'S NAME)

(INSERT SIGNATURE)



### d) Supervisor's Report. Provisional template

Name of the student:

SEA-EU Joint Programme:

Duration of the internship (period/ECTS):

Please, fill in this form to evaluate the student's internship. Please put a cross (☒) in the box that best describes their experience.

We ask that, where necessary, you fill in the comments to support your point of view. All **six** sections must be completed.

Evaluate from 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest mark and 5 the highest).

1	EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT'S COMPLIANCE	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
a)	The student has attended the mandatory preparatory sessions (where relevant)						
b)	The student has completed all the documents and has complied with all the activities that have been required of him/her.						

2	EVALUATION OF THE SOFT SKILLS ACQUIRED BY THE STUDENT	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
a)	The student has adequate people-skills enabling them to create and maintain professional relationships.						

b)	The student has the ability to adapt to new situations						
c)	The student has organisational and planning skills.						

3	EVALUATION OF THE PORTFOLIO SUBMITTED BY THE STUDENT	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
a)	The student has demonstrated the acquisition of the 11 Programme learning outcomes (PLOs)						
b)	The student has shown adequate written communication skills.						
c)	The student has made a final report taking care of the quality of its presentation and content.						
d)	The student has been able to analyse and summarise their experience - taking a measured and objective look at their internship tasks.						

4. With this in mind and using the table below as a guide please give the student a letter grade from A+ -> F : \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

FAIL	SUFFICIENT	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT	EXCEPTIONAL
F	E	D	C	B	A	A+
0 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 99%	100%

Disclaimer: I certify that the above facts are true to the best of my knowledge of (INSERT STUDENT NAME)

**Academic Advisor's name and Signature:**

(INSERT SUPERVISOR'S NAME)

(INSERT SIGNATURE)