Faculty of Humanities

*Version April 2018*

**BA / MA Thesis evaluation form**

The BA/MA thesis supervisor acts as the first evaluator and is responsible for the communication between evaluators, the completion and filing of evaluation forms, the registration of the final grade in Osiris, and for informing the student of both the final grade and its substantiation by the evaluators.

The BA/MA thesis evaluation process consists of four stages:

(1) The first and second evaluator assess the thesis independently of one another; each fills out an evaluation form and determines 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 her/his provisional grade after consultation with other evaluator(s), he/she must change the relevant points on her/his 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 its substantiation by:

* Sending an email with the grade and substantation and/or;
* Organising a final meeting in which the grade and substantiation are discussed and/or;
* Sending the student the final grade form.

(4) The first evaluator registers the final grade in Osiris and files the evaluation forms of the first, second, and (possibly) third evaluator.

**Evaluation Form BA/MA Thesis**

|  |
| --- |
| Student information |
| Name: |
| Student number: |
| Degree programme: |
| ECTS: |
| Title of thesis: |
| Date submitted: |
| Supervisor/1st evaluator information |
| Name: |
| Department: |
| 2nd evaluator information (not involved in supervising the student) |
| Name: |
| Department: |
| Evaluation by:  Supervisor  2nd Evaluator |
| Provisional grade:  Final grade (jointly determined by supervisor and 2nd evaluator): |
| Date: |

**formal preconditions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preconditions | Assessment | Comments |
| Correct use of language (sentence structure, spelling, punctuation) | met  not met |  |
| Table of contents and summary | met  not met |  |
| Notation and list of sources in accordance with formal rules in the field | met  not met |  |
| Design and layout in accordance with degree programme guidelines | met  not met |  |

*Note: If one of these formal preconditions has not been met, the supervisor may decide not to evaluate the content of the thesis. The student will be given one opportunity to make corrections. The standards for meeting/not meeting the preconditions are determined by the degree programme (e.g. number of language mistakes tolerated).*

**Evaluation of the content**

The evaluator first gives an assessment of each of the nine categories below, and then uses the “Substantiation” section to support the proposed grade by commenting on relevant strong and weak points of the thesis.

Categories 1 to 6 *must* all be assessed sufficient when handing out a passing or higher grade!

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Research Question | insufficient  sufficient |
| 2. Theoretical framework & academic relevance | insufficient  sufficient |
| 3. Method | insufficient  sufficient |
| 4. Analysis | insufficient  sufficient |
| 5. Conclusion | insufficient  sufficient |
| 6. Use & citation of sources | insufficient  sufficient |
| 7. Structure of the argument | insufficient  sufficient |
| 8. Composition & style | insufficient  sufficient |
| 9. Initiative (to be filled in by the supervisor) | insufficient  sufficient |

**Substantiation**

Please substantiate your proposed grade by commenting on relevant strong and weak points of the thesis, in particular those that address the first six assessment categories listed above.

|  |
| --- |
| Substantiation |
| *(Research question)*  *(Theoretical framework & academic relevance)*  *(Method)*  *(Analysis)*  *(Conclusion)*  *(Use & citation of sources)*  *(Structure of the argument)*  *(Composition & style)*  *(Initiative)*  *(Additional remarks)* |

*Note: In commenting on the quality with which the student has demonstrated her/his academic abilities, please consider answering one or more of the following questions:*

1. *Research question: 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?*
2. *Theoretical framework & academic relevance: Are the chosen theories and/or analytical concepts pertinent to the research question? Are the main concepts/terms clearly defined? 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?*
3. *Method: 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?*
4. *Analysis: Has the student sufficiently and adequately utilised her/his 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?*
5. *Conclusion: Does the conclusion answer the main question? Is the conclusion more than just a summary? Does the student reflect critically on her/his own approach? Does the paper make suggestions for further research?*
6. *Use & citation of sources: 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?*
7. *Structure of the argument: 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?*
8. *Composition & style: Is the paper readable and easy to understand? Is terminology used adequately and accurately?*
9. *Initiative: 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 (e.g. formulating a research question, familiarisation with the literature, structure of the argument, composition)?*