



## M.A. Thesis evaluation form – First evaluator

The M.A. thesis supervisor is also the first evaluator and responsible for the communication between evaluators, the completion and filing of the evaluation forms, entering the final grade in Osiris and informing the student of the final grade and the argumentation given by the evaluators in arriving at the final grade.

The M.A. thesis evaluation process consists of four stages:

- (1) The first and second evaluator evaluate the thesis independently of one another; each fills out an evaluation form with a **provisional grade**.
- (2) The first and second evaluator determine the **final grade** jointly on the initiative of the first evaluator within 10 working days of receipt of the thesis by the first evaluator. In certain circumstances a third evaluator may be consulted (see third evaluator form), in which case the final grade will be determined within 20 working days of receipt by the first evaluator. The student should be informed of this fact by the first evaluator. Should the first or second evaluator revise his/her provisional grade after consultation with other evaluator(s), he/she must change the relevant points on his/her evaluation form and – for the second evaluator - send the revised evaluation form to the first evaluator. The first evaluator will remove 'Provisional grade' from the forms submitted by the first and second evaluators and replace it with 'Final grade'.
- (3) The first evaluator informs the student of the final grade and the argumentation that led to it. This can be done in two ways:
  - a. through a final meeting between the first evaluator and the student and/or through an e-mail that includes the argumentation.
  - b. through sending the student the definitive versions of the evaluation forms of both evaluators; in which case it is essential that stage (2) has been completed accordingly: the student should not be confronted with possible differences in grading during stage (1), as such differences have been solved jointly during stage (2).
- (4) The first evaluator enters the final grade in Osiris and files the evaluation forms of the first, second and (possibly) third evaluator.

## EVALUATION FORM 1<sup>ST</sup> EVALUATOR

### M.A. THESIS

STUDENT INFORMATION
Name
Student number
Degree
Title of final paper
Date submitted
SUPERVISOR/1 <sup>ST</sup> EVALUATOR INFORMATION
Name
Department
2ND EVALUATOR INFORMATION (not involved in supervising student)
Name
Department
Evaluation: <input type="checkbox"/> Supervisor <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> -evaluator
Provisional grade:
Final grade (combined grade 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> evaluators):
Date and signature:

## FORMAL PRECONDITIONS\*\*

PRECONDITIONS		Comments
Plagiarism Rules Awareness Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> met <input type="checkbox"/> not met	
Correct use of language (sentence structure, spelling, punctuation)	<input type="checkbox"/> met <input type="checkbox"/> not met	
Table of contents and summary	<input type="checkbox"/> met <input type="checkbox"/> not met	
Notation and list of sources in accordance with formal rules in the field	<input type="checkbox"/> met <input type="checkbox"/> not met	
Design and layout in accordance with degree guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/> met <input type="checkbox"/> not met	

\*\* If one of these formal preconditions has not been met, then the supervisor/first evaluator may decide not to evaluate the content of the paper. The student will be given one opportunity to make corrections. The standards for meeting/not meeting the preconditions are determined by the degree (ex.: number of language mistakes tolerated).

## EVALUATION OF THE CONTENT

The evaluator gives a general evaluation for each category, with comments explaining the relevant strong and weak points. For an unsatisfactory evaluation, please indicate exactly which issues the student must improve in order to earn a satisfactory evaluation.

Points 1 to 7 must all be rated at least satisfactory in order to earn a satisfactory final grade.

1. RESEARCH QUESTION	<input type="checkbox"/> fail	<input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Was the research question formulated clearly? Were the sub-topics logically derived from the main topic? Was the research topic sufficiently focused, and was the reasoning behind this focus explained in the paper?</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>			

2. ACADEMIC DEBATE ON THE ISSUE	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Is the academic relevance of the research clearly stated? Are the sources relevant, representative and of sufficient academic quality? Are the sources discussed adequately and critically?</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
3. THEORETICAL CONTEXT	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Are the chosen theories and/or analytical concepts pertinent to the research question? Are the main concepts/terms clearly defined?</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
4. METHOD	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Is the choice for the research method sufficiently justified? Are the research methods used adequate to address the research question? Are they used in the correct manner? Is the method used to collect data described and justified in detail?</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
5. ANALYSIS	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Has the student sufficiently and adequately utilised his/her academic knowledge of the subject? Is there a good balance between description and analysis? Is there enough cross-referencing between the student's own empirical research results and the literature/theory?</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	

6. CONCLUSION	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Does the conclusion answer the main question? Is the conclusion more than just a summary? Does the student reflect critically on his/her own approach? Does the paper make suggestions for further research?</i></p>	
<p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
7. USE OF SOURCES & CITATION OF SOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Is the difference between the student's own analysis and the analysis of others clearly apparent? Is the citation of sources adequate and accurate? Are the references used correctly? Does the student approach the literature and other sources critically?</i></p>	
<p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
8. STRUCTURE OF THE ARGUMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Is the information presented in a logical order (for example: introduction/theoretical context, question, method, results, discussion)? Is there a clear division into chapters and paragraphs? Is the argumentation clear and coherent? Are the paragraphs and sections coherent and sufficiently limited in scope?</i></p>	
<p><u>Comments:</u></p>	
9. COMPOSITION & STYLE	<input type="checkbox"/> fail <input type="checkbox"/> satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> good
<p><i>Is the paper readable and easy to understand? Is the specialist terminology used carefully and accurately?</i></p>	
<p><u>Comments:</u></p>	

10. INITIATIVE (to be filled in by supervisor)  fail  satisfactory  good

*Has the student carefully utilised the feedback provided? Did the student respect agreements and deadlines? Did the student need much help during the process? If so, on which points (ex.: formulating a research question, familiarisation with the literature, structure of the argument, composition.)?*

Comments:

11. OTHER

*Use this space to add comments on aspects, such as the innovative quality of the research, the social relevance of the paper, etc.*

FINAL EVALUATION

NUMERIC GRADE: