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Project Regulations – taken from the general programme regulations

a- Arranging the project
The student is encouraged to arrange his/her own Project. The Project should complement the knowledge that the Student has gained during his/her Specialisation, so, if necessary, the relevant Specialisation Provider should offer assistance to the Student in finding a Project. If despite the best efforts of the Student and Specialisation Provider, a suitable Project is not found, the Core Provider shall propose a Project to the Student. However, the main responsibility for finding a project falls on the student.

b- Approval
i. Students must fill in the standard form and return it to the coordinator
ii. Each Student must obtain his/her Specialisation and Core Provider’s approval for the Project work (s)he wishes to undertake. The Specialisation Core Providers approve Projects on the basis of the information contained in the project proposal forms. Therefore, each Student must make sure his/her Specialisation and Core Providers receive the Project Proposal Form.
iii. Once approved by the Specialisation and Core Providers, each Student shall send his Project Proposal Form to his Provider, as well as to the Coordinator (EUREC).

c- Supervision
i. One month after beginning work on his/her Project, each Student should send a 1-2 pages document to his/her Core and Specialisation Providers describing his/her Project in detail, the role (s)he fulfils at the Project Host and setting out a timetable by when (s)he expects to complete different stages of his/her Project work.
ii. The regularity of progress reports to be sent by the Student during his/her project will be determined by the Core Provider.
iii. Core and Specialisation Providers will provide their Students with prompt feedback on the messages the Students send them.
iv. Core Providers and Specialisation Providers reserve the right to impose further measures to ensure adequate supervision of their Students.
v. The company or research centre at which the Students work during their Project is required to fill an evaluation template and send it to the Student’s Core Provider and to the coordinator at least one month before the Project Presentations.

d- Assessment
i. Project assessment will be in two parts: the Master Thesis and the Project Presentation. The relative weighting between the Master Thesis and Project Presentation is 80% and 20% respectively.
ii. The Steering Committee will ensure that all Students are marked according to a common scheme
iii. If a Student fails the project, (s)he may redo this course section in the following Academic Year, under approval and particular conditions of their Core provider University.

e- Handing in the Master thesis
i- Projects are assessed on the basis of six months of work.
ii- Each Student is to send his/her Master Thesis by e-mail to his/her Core and Specialisation Providers, and to the Coordinator no later than two weeks before the
first day of the Project Presentations. The files e-mailed should be in ‘doc’ or ‘pdf’ format.

iii- If the Master Thesis is not handed in on time, the student will fail the Project unless he/she has prior written permission (by e-mail) from the designated supervisor at their Core provider. The Coordinator will confirm receipt of each Master Thesis

iv- If the project hosts wishes it, Students can request their thesis content to be treated confidentially by indicating this on the cover of the thesis. In this case, the Coordinator undertakes not to allow access to the Student’s Master Thesis to anyone outside the Steering Committee.

f- Presentations
i- The Steering Committee will decide well in advance the exact dates and venue for the Project Presentations and the Coordinator will communicate this to the Students.

ii- Each Student’s Project Presentation will be heard by a jury composed of SESYM Master Professors. The Steering Committee and Coordinator will select this jury. The marks awarded by this jury will form the mark that the Core Provider awards for the Project.

iii- Each Student’s Project Presentation should last 15 minutes. The Student will then be subjected to 10 minutes of questioning on his/her Project by the jury.

iv- All Master students are requested to be physically present at the Master Presentation days in Brussels. However, under exceptional circumstances and previous approval of the student’s core university, students can have the possibility to present their Thesis in a conference call mode. In this case, the Core provider should, at the latest two weeks before the Presentation Days, send an email to EUREC approving the student’s request.

g- Departure from project regulations
If a Student requests a departure from the Project Regulations, the circumstances of his/her request will be judged by the Core Provider. If the Core Provider sees sufficient merit in the request (after consultation with the Steering Committee, if appropriate), the Core Provider will allow the departure in accordance with its standard internal rules
Information for Project Host Companies or Research Centres

The European Master on Sustainable Energy System Management has been launched by EUREC and is currently taught in 2 partnering Universities. 29 students from 17 different countries are following the courses at Hanze UAS (NL) and Zaragoza University (ES).

From June to December, the students are required to work on a practical project on the premises of a company or a research centre. If you are interested in having a qualified trainee with you over 6 months, you can contact the programme coordinator to obtain a detailed list of students, or to publish an internship offer on our website (secured area, only for EUREC students). Please indicate linguistic and educational preferences for your trainee. Contact: Nathalie Richet: richet@eurec.be. The academic directors of the participating universities will make sure the level of the project is high enough to be a challenge to our students.

The students are specialising in the following areas:

- 15 students in Sustainable Energy Management
- 14 students in System Innovation Management

The project host company or institute is expected to support the student in form of an allowance. This allowance is meant to cover at least the cost for accommodation of the student. This can be done by offering housing as an in-kind contribution to the student or in form of a small remuneration. Basically, 750 EUR should be an indicative minimum for this. If this is a problem, a company can still offer a project and wait and see if a student is accepting to work for free on the project.

The project host has to supervise the student. Students are required to work on a comprehensive project; they are writing their project thesis based on their practical experience. The company does not have to read or evaluate the thesis, though.

The students have a supervisor at their core university, as this institution is ultimately responsible for issuing the diploma and thus has to evaluate the students’ project work.

The host company has to make sure the student is covered by insurance while working on the company’s premises. The host company will usually draw up a traineeship agreement with the student and the University the student is registered.

The company or research centre at which the Students work during their Project is required to fill an evaluation template and send it to the Student’s Core Provider and to the coordinator before the Project Presentations.
PROJECT PROPOSAL FORM

STUDENTS HAVE TO FILL IN THE FORM, SEND IT FOR APPROVAL TO THEIR SPECIALISATION and CORE PROVIDER UNIVERSITIES AND, ONCE APPROVED, SEND IT BACK TO EUREC.

EUREC MUST RECEIVE ALL PROPOSAL FORMS AT THE LATEST BY END OF JUNE

The Project Proposal

Project Title

Objective and methodology:

- Introduction to set the context and reason for the development of the project (max. 150 words):

- Objectives - 4-6 measurable activities to meet the aims (max. 150 words)

- Proposed scientific methodology – how are you going to solve the problem and meet the objectives (max. 150 words)

- Main expected outcomes of the project (max. 150 words)

- References 2 or 3 peer review journal articles related to the topic under investigation (when applicable)
Entity offering project

Address:
_______________________________________
_______________________________________
Country: ________________________________
Tel: _________________________________
E-mail: ______________________________

The Student

Name
_______________________________________
Core and Specialisation Universities
_______________________________________

Name and contact details of the Supervisors in the Core and Specialisation Universities
_______________________________________

Other relevant information: (dates/pay...)
_______________________________________

Signature of approval of Research Project Proposal by 1st Supervisor Core University
_______________________________________

Please return this form to richet@eurec.be by end of June.

EUREC EEIG
Place du Champ de Mars 2
1050 Brussels
Belgium
Academic year 2018-2019

Title: (Template thesis cover)

☐ This thesis has to remain confidential upon specific request of the host organisation
(Tick if appropriate-delete if not confidential)

Full Name of Student: Name of student

Core Provider: Name of core University

Specialisation: Name of specialisation University

Host Organization: Name and address (+country) of company or research centre

Academic Supervisor:

Submission Date:
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Table 1. Font Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>Footnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 points</td>
<td>Normal text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 points bold</td>
<td>Subheadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 points bold</td>
<td>Headings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 points bold</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference


**Guidance Marking Scheme for Project Dissertations**
(comprehensive report, summary paper and presentation in Brussels)

Name of Student: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Introduction: (max 10)</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Background and context of the topic</td>
<td>9-10 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objectives of the project</td>
<td>7-8 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research question</td>
<td>5-6 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Literature research</td>
<td>3-4 Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Methodology: (max 10)</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clear description and justification of the method(s) applied</td>
<td>9-10 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Soundness of methodology</td>
<td>7-8 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriateness of theoretical framework</td>
<td>5-6 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Data analysis, discussion, conclusions (max 30)</th>
<th>/30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of the results and critical comparison with theoretical models</td>
<td>25-30 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding of the results' practical implications</td>
<td>20-14 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correct and logical conclusions drawn from the analysis, consistent with the activity’s objectives</td>
<td>15-19 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-14 Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-9 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Report writing: (max 10)</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Logical structure of report and literary accuracy</td>
<td>9-10 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of paragraphs, headings, tables, figures, literature list, appendices</td>
<td>7-8 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proper length (40 pages max, including references)</td>
<td>5-6 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Project activity and student effort: (max 10)</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with project supervisor(s)</td>
<td>9-10 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project planning</td>
<td>7-8 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstration of initiative</td>
<td>5-6 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitment and effort</td>
<td>3-4 Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL COMPREHENSIVE REPORT** /70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. 6 page summary: (max 10)</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Completeness</td>
<td>9-10 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conciseness (6 pages max including references+ 20 max for appendices)</td>
<td>7-8 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structure and language</td>
<td>5-6 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-2 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL SUMMARY PAPER** /10

**SUB TOTAL PRESENTATION** (consolidated results from Steering Committee jury) /20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total mark report + summary+ presentation (max =100)</th>
<th>/100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date: 

Assessed by: 

**Brief comments:**

1 The first 4 boxes guide the assessor in providing marks for the specified aspects of the project as manifest in the written report (including the Appendices where appropriate). The 5th box requires a mark for the organisation and effort put in by the student throughout the project that may or may not be reflected in the written report itself.

* Supervisors will be responsible to assess the comprehensive report in the respect of the core University regulations.
**Project - Oral Presentations**

**Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>A (100)</th>
<th>B (100)</th>
<th>C (100)</th>
<th>D (100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marker’s Name .................................................................**
**Marker’s Signature ..........................................................**

**KEY:** A – Structure/Logic/Communication; B - Use of resources/timekeeping; C – Presentational style; D - Response to questioning

**Notes:**

**A – Structure/Logic/Communication:** A mark is awarded for how well a student structures their presentation including the use of introduction, methodology, results and conclusions. The mark also reflects the logic of the student’s methodology and conclusions, i.e. is it well thought through. Finally, the mark reflects how well the student is able to communicate an overview of their project through the oral presentation.

**B – Use of resources/timekeeping:** The mark here reflects how well the student has used audio/visual resources, e.g. are PowerPoint slides well laid out and clear. This mark also reflects how well the student has kept to their allotted time – if they run overtime, they can expect to be penalised.

**C – Presentational style:** This mark reflects how well the student is able to present themselves. Do they speak clearly to their audience, do they interact well with their slides, are they easy to understand, e.g. if they just read verbatim from notes, they can expect to be penalised. Allowance should be made if English is not the student’s native language.

**D – Response to questioning:** A final mark is given reflecting how well the student holds up under questioning. Are they able to think on their feet? Questioning also teases out how well the student has understood the aims, objectives and implications of their project, and whether it is largely their own work. N.B. It is important that the ‘jury’ ask sufficient questions to give a meaningful mark here.