# GUIDE FOR A SUPERVISED PROJECT EVALUATION

## GUIDELINE AND REQUIREMENTS OF A SUPERVISED PROJECT AT THE MSC PROGRAM

The supervised project at the MSc program implies taking charge of a specific mandate, with clear deliverables and deadlines, which amounts to 9 credits[1]. This mandate must allow the student to resolve a research problem, or a problem derived from practice, with rigorous methods. Consequently, it is necessary that the student shows that he masters the knowledge acquired during the MSc program[2] and his capacity to mobilize it using a scientific method.

To learn more about this activity, the various forms of supervised projects, and the program's requirements, please read the [Guidelines and Requirements](#) of supervised projects.

## REMINDER OF THE MAIN PRINCIPLES OF RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH[3]

### Ethics (A) and integrity (B) in research

A.1. To guarantee the anonymity of participants in research requiring data collection.
A.2. To respect, treat fairly and protect participants in research requiring data collection.
A.3. To ensure that consent is given voluntarily and knowingly and to protect participants from risks linked to the research.
A.4. To guarantee confidentiality and to handle private and/or sensible data correctly.
B.1. To show thoroughness in the analysis and the diffusion of the research results: To not commit any violations (fraud, cheating, plagiarism) by carrying out research data collection, analysis, and presentation in a rigorous and transparent manner.
B.2. To respect the standards and rules of intellectual property by citing sources in an appropriate manner.

---

[1] To meet the requirements of the MSc program, a supervised project of 9 credits corresponds to 405 hours of work. That is, about 40% of the working load devoted to a thesis in the MSc program.

[2] To learn more about the MSC learning objectives please click on this link: https://www.hec.ca/en/students/my-program/msc/documents-en-us/msc_learning_objectives_competencies.pdf

[3] Adapted from the Tri-Agency Framework on Responsible Conduct of Research (2016) https://rcr.ethics.gc.ca/eng/framework-cadre.html and the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans – TCPS 2 (2018) https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html

## FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clarity in the formulation of the problem | The problem under study is perfectly formulated. | The problem under study is very well formulated. | The problem under study is adequately formulated. | The problem under study is sufficiently well formulated. | The problem under study is poorly formulated. |
| Links established with knowledge acquired in the field of specialization | Links established with knowledge acquired in the field of specialization are excellent. | Links established with knowledge acquired in the field of specialization are very good. | Links established with knowledge in the field of specialization are good. | Links established with knowledge in the field of specialization are fair. | Links established with knowledge in the field of specialization are insufficient. |

## LITERATURE REVIEW (FOR A WORK OF 9 CREDITS)

| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance of references | All the references used are perfectly adequate for conceptualizing and/or solving the problem. | Most of the references used are very adequate for conceptualizing and/or solving the problem. | Most of the references used are adequate for conceptualizing and/or solving the problem. | Some references used are not adequate for conceptualizing and/or solving the problem. | Most of the references used are inadequate for conceptualizing and/or solving the problem. |
| Appropriate use of literature | All links have been fully established between the references used and the research problem. | Most links have been very well established between the references used and the research problem. | Most links have been well established between the references used and the research problem. | Some links between the references used and the research problem must be improved. | Most links between the references used and the research problem are missing. |

## METHODOLOGY

| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relevance of the methods chosen and justification of the choices | All the selected methods are very appropriate, and their use is very well justified. | Most of the selected methods are appropriate, and their use is very well justified. | Most of the selected methods are appropriate, and their use is well justified, but a few changes must be made. | Most of the selected methods are appropriate, and their use is well justified, but many changes must be made. | Most of the selected methods are not appropriate and their use is not well justified. |
| Rigour in data collection and analysis | All the methods used to collect and analyse data are applied with the utmost rigour. | Most of the methods used to collect and analyse data are applied with a very high level of rigour. | Most of the methods used to collect and analyse data are applied with a high rigour. | Most of the methods used to collect and analyse data are applied with an acceptable level of rigour. | Most of the methods used to collect and analyse data are applied without much rigour. |

| ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Depth of results analysis | The depth of the analysis exceeds expectations. | The depth of the analysis largely meets expectations. | The depth of the analysis moderately meets expectations. | The depth of the analysis hardly meets expectations. | The depth of the analysis does not meet expectations. |
| Results interpretation accuracy | All results are accurately interpreted. | The majority of results are accurately interpreted. There are very few interpretation errors. | Most results are accurately interpreted, but there are several interpretation errors. | There are as many accurately interpreted results as there are interpretation errors. | The majority of results are poorly interpreted. |
| Ability to meet objectives of the mandate | The analysis completely meets objectives. | The analysis meets objectives in a very satisfactory manner. | The analysis meets objectives in a satisfactory manner. | The analysis meets objectives fairly well. | The analysis does not meet objectives. |

| Ability to take a critical look and discuss the limitations and implications of the project | All the limitations and implications are identified and discussed. | The majority of limitations and implications are identified and discussed. | A good part of the limitations and implications are identified and discussed, but some aspects could be improved. | Part of the limitations and implications are identified and discussed, but some aspects could be improved. | The limitations and implications are not identified or discussed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## QUALITY OF THE WRITING

| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clarity in presenting results | The presentation of the results is extremely clear. | The presentation of the results is very clear. | The presentation of the results is clear. | The presentation of the results lacks clarity. Minor changes are required. | The presentation of the results is not clear. Major changes are required. |
| Grasp of the language used in the field of specialization | The document demonstrates a perfect grasp of language used in the field of specialization. | The document demonstrates a very good grasp of the language used in the field of specialization. | The document demonstrates a good grasp of the language used in the field of specialization. | The document demonstrates a fair grasp of the language used in the field of specialization. | The document demonstrates a poor grasp of the language used in the field of specialization. |
| Structure and conciseness in writing the report | The document is excellent in terms of structure and conciseness. | The document has very few weaknesses involving either the structure or conciseness criteria. | The document has few weaknesses involving both the structure and conciseness criteria. | The document has several weaknesses involving either the structure or conciseness criteria. | The document has many weaknesses involving both the structure and conciseness criteria. |
| Adherence to the rules of writing an academic work (spelling, syntax, layout, etc.). | All the rules for writing an academic work (spelling, syntax, layout, etc.) are scrupulously adhered to. | All the rules for writing an academic work (spelling, syntax, layout, etc.) are adhered to, but there are a few minor errors. | All the rules for writing an academic work (spelling, syntax, layout, etc.) are adhered to, but there are several minor errors. | Most of the rules for writing an academic work (spelling, syntax, layout, etc.) are adhered to, but there are a few significant errors. | There are significant shortcomings in adherence to the rules for writing an academic work (spelling, syntax, layout, etc.). |

| Adherence to citation and bibliographic standards | All citation and bibliographic rules are scrupulously adhered to. | All citation and bibliographic rules are adhered to, but there are a few minor errors. | All citation and bibliographic rules are adhered to, but there are several minor errors. | The majority of citation and bibliographic rules are adhered to, but there are a few significant errors. | There are significant shortcomings in adherence to citation and bibliographic rules. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AUTONOMY** | | | | | |
| Criteria | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Adherence to the established timeline | The student established a timeline to complete the project and consistently adhered to it. | The student established a timeline to complete the project and adhered to it most of the time. | The student needed establishing a timeline to complete the project and adhered to it most of the time. | The student needed help establishing a timeline to complete the project but did not adhere to it most of the time. | The student needed help establishing a timeline for completing the project but never adhered to it. |
| Initiative taken to do what is necessary to complete the project | The student always showed initiative to do what was necessary to complete the project. | The student often showed initiative to do what was necessary to complete the project. | The student needed a little help to do what was necessary to complete the project. | The student showed little initiative to do what was necessary to complete the project. | The student showed no initiative to do what was necessary to means to complete the project. |
| **GRADE** | | | | | |
| | A+/A | A-/B+ | B/B- | C+/C | E |