

Guidelines for assessment of student work

1. Scope of responsibility

The head of the module is responsible for complying with the regulatory conditions, such as when the work should begin and end, and for assigning one or two correctors. One of these correctors usually a lecturer from the School of Life Sciences and Facility Management (N) at the ZHAW, is the main supervisor during the course of the work. If the assignment is supervised and reviewed by two correctors, it must be assessed separately. The result of the assessment must be entered as keywords on a special form (for the degree programmes in Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics, Biotechnology and Chemistry). In the degree programmes in Applied Digital Life Sciences, Facility Management, Food Technology, Natural Resource Sciences, Environment and Natural Resources, Life Sciences, Preneurship of Regenerative Food Systems and Real Estate and Facility Management the assessment is recorded directly in Complexis.

2. Assessment

2.1 Content

- Does the content match the topic and task?
- Were the tests / surveys, etc. carefully planned, conducted and evaluated?
- Are the conclusions reached technically correct and relevant?

2.2 Structure

- Is the classification and order of the chapters logical and meaningful?
(see, for example, Guidelines for completing student assignments in the field Life Sciences)

2.3 Presentation

- Does the presentation of the work make use of the available technology resources?
- Are text, tables, figures illustrations, etc. sensibly located?
- How are tables, figures etc. designed and labelled?

2.4 Language

- Is the writing style clear and fluent?
- Are grammar and spelling correct?

2.5 References

- Are the references present in the text and cited appropriately?
- Are the references in the bibliography correctly and fully listed?
- Is the current literature considered?
- If applicable: Is the research protocol complete and transparent? Are the search strategies documented?
- How were the available / AI tools used and applied to support the research?

2.6 General impression

- Does the level of the work correspond to expected level?
- Was the time available efficiently?
- Did the author apply themselves fully and were they committed to the work?

2.7 Learning Development

- What insights has the student gained about their own strengths, weaknesses, and learning behavior? (Self-reflection)
- How has the student structured the learning process, set priorities, and organized the workflow? (Learning process)
- If relevant: How did the student plan, conduct, and reflect on the laboratory work? (Work process in the lab)
- How did the student maintain motivation to continue working toward their goals despite setbacks or challenges? (Motivation)
- How flexibly did the student respond to unexpected difficulties or changes and adjust the work process accordingly? (Flexibility)

2.8 Presentation

- How clear and logical is the structure of the presentation, and how effectively are the content and key points conveyed?
- How engaging and supportive are the visual aids and presentation methods used to convey the content?
- How well and clearly are questions answered and arguments presented?
- How confident and clear is the delivery in terms of language and presence? How well is technical language used, and how is a professional impression conveyed through interaction with the audience?

3. Grading system

The grading of performance is carried out according to the Framework Examination Regulations, Art. 41, on a scale from 6 to 1. Module grades are rounded to two decimal places. The module descriptions define the weighting of individual performance assessments within a module.

3.1 Calculation of final grade

The final grade is calculated by dividing the sum of all grades by the number of correctors. The grade is rounded according to the ZHAW's General Academic Regulations. Should the individual assessors' grades differ by more than 0.5, then they must agree on a new grade. In the case of a disagreement, a further expert corrector will be called upon after consultation with the Programme Director.



4. Regulation documentation

The German version of the guidelines for assessment of student work can be found here:
[Merkblatt Beurteilung studentische Arbeiten.pdf](#)

4.1 Regulation metadata

Subject	Content
Responsible for document	Head of the Staff Unit Studies
Decision-making authority	Head of Staff
Storage location	2.05.00 Lehre Studium
Publication location	Public

4.2 Regulation version history

Version	Decided on	Decided by	Validity	Description of change
1.0.0	11.05.2020	Head of Staff	11.05.2020	Adjustment of areas of responsibility and layout; transfer to GPM
2.0.0	11.03.2020	Head of Staff	11.03.2020	Adjustment to the Education Unit (previously Studies division)
3.0.0	16.02.2024	Head of Staff	01.03.2024	Integration of the study programmes ADLS, BMLD, ENR, MSLS, PREFS and REFM; formal and editorial adjustments
3.0.1	-	-	-	Neuer Dateiname, Link, 28.02.2025