

MASTER "RESERVOIR GEOLOGY AND GEOPHYSICS" HEADING TO EVALUATE MASTER'S DEGREE FINAL PROJECT

	Excellent (10-9)	Good (8-7)	Sufficient (6-5)	Fail (4.9-0)
Overall rating of work	Perfect coherence and absolute clarity between the statement of objectives, problems and subsequent usefulness of the results. Originality and innovation very acceptable.	Significant internal consistency between objectives, approach problems and utility project. Originality, innovation and applied quite acceptable proposals.	Acceptable consistency between objectives, innovation, originality and practical proposals. Originality and innovation correct. Applications unrealistic practice.	Undefined objectives, inconsistent explanations, no relevance. Shortage of originality and innovation. Insufficient ideas for the implementation of the results of work
Uses of theories	Convenience explanation of the fundamental theories. Seamless integration of the foundations with the objective of the work. Clear exposition of the advances at the project.	Fundamental theories correctly exposed. Remarkable effort to synthesize theories and goals. Arguments about the process of project, quite acceptable.	Correct use of fundamental theories but not linked to the objectives. Little information about the theoretical progress about the project.	Fundamental theories irregularly exposed. Confusion of ideas and lack of immersion in their theories. Project doesn't contribute to the scientific process and knowledge.
Methodological aspects	Total adequacy between the methodology and objectives. Research instruments used perfectly and reasoned and described. Impeccable interpretation of data and results. Perfect coherence between research and conclusions.	Notable adequacy between methods and proposal thematic. Instruments and tools well selected. Reasoned and justified interpretation of results. Conclusions fairly consistent with the methodology and instruments.	Correct connection between methodology and instruments. Permissible argument about the methods used. Data obtained correctly but not analysed comprehensively. Correct conclusions but in some cases incomplete conclusions.	Little adequacy between the research theme and methodology and selected instruments. Insufficient data collection and sometimes erroneous. Interpretation of the data sets. Conclusions poor.
Formals aspects of the memory	Clarity, precision and order in the structure of the project. Very well drafting. Graphics quality very well. Completely adequate and updated bibliography.	Clarity and order in the structure of work. Quite correct drafting according to grammatical rules. Graphics quality good. Adequate and updated bibliography.	Structure and drafting acceptable. Graphics quality acceptable. Bibliography acceptable.	Structure and drafting poor. Graphics quality poor or illegible. Inadequate and outdated bibliography.

Oral presentation	Communication and debate ability very good. Excellent argumentation and defence of ideas. Oral presentation clear. 'News technologies' adjust to the need of oral presentation. Presentation time very right.	Communication and debate ability good. Acceptable argumentation and defence of ideas. 'News technologies' adjust to the need of oral presentation. Presentation time right.	Communication and debate ability correct. 'News technologies' not adjust to the need of oral presentation. Presentation time little right	Communication and debate ability poor. Confusion in the argumentation and defence of ideas. 'News technologies' inadequate. Presentation time not right.
--------------------------	---	---	---	--