

Thesis Rubric MA Applied Ethics

1. PROBLEM AND RESEARCH QUESTION

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
The description is unclear and does not lead to a clear research question. Central question is missing or inadequate.	The description of the central problem and/or research question is incomplete and / or sloppy.	The description of the problem is clear and leads to a clear central question and to specific subquestions. 5.5-6: description problem and research question is adequate. 6-7: problem and RQ are clearly described and leading to relevant subquestions logically derived from the main question/topic.	7-8.5: problem and RQ is good and well-defined with well-defined sub-questions logically derived from the main question/topic. 8.5-10: Problem and RQ and sub-questions are original, clear and well-defined and sub-questions are logically derived from the main question/topic. It is clear what the student wants to contribute to the debate.	

2. ACADEMIC DEBATE

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Relevance and/or aim of research are lacking. Contribution to the debate is missing. Topic is not relevant for applied ethics.	Relevance and/or aim of research are unclear. Contribution to the debate is inadequate. Topic is not relevant for applied ethics.	Relevance and aim are clearly and coherently described. Student situates his/her thesis in the debate adequately. The topic is relevant to the field of applied ethics. 5.5-6: sufficient 6-7: clear, coherent and well-defined.	Thesis is clearly situated within the existing literature, ethical thinking and/or societal debates. The introduction serves as an appealing invitation to read the thesis High relevance for society and domain of applied ethics. 7-8.5 clearly & coherently 8.5-10 contributes significantly to the debate, appealing invitation to read the thesis.	

3. THEORETICAL CONTEXT

Theory is also part of the method in the applied ethics. In this indicator/category the focus is on whether the chosen theories & concepts are pertinent for the RQ and whether the theories & concepts are adequately elaborated upon.

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Theories and concepts are too minimal, non-selective and/or not pertinent for Research Question, and not tied together into a cohesive whole. Chosen theories and concepts/terms are not clearly defined.	Chosen theories and concepts and terms are only partly relevant and/or incomplete, and insufficiently defined, leading to poor substantiation of the proposed research.	The research is linked to relevant and representative theories and concepts, which is functional for executing the proposed research. Chosen theories and concepts are sufficiently clear described and pertinent for the RQ. Student shows	The research is well-embedded in the relevant theories, from which relevant concepts are selected and used, resulting in an accurate and coherent conceptual framework. Theories and	Good+ Originality in connecting subjects and/or makes the connection to other disciplines. 8.5-10

		knowledge of theories & concepts and the major controversies & debates concerning the topic. 5.5-6: sufficient 6-7: satisfactory	concepts are clearly defined and critically evaluated. 7-8.5	
--	--	--	---	--

4. METHOD

Overlap with theory, but in this indicator/category the focus is on the explication of the method and whether the student reflected on and justified the chosen method; does it make sense to use this method?

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Description of method is lacking.	The method is inaccurately and/or incompletely described.	The research method is comprehensively described; validity and suitability for the research question are described in some detail. 5.5-6: sufficient 6-7: satisfactory	7-8.5: The research method is comprehensively described; validity and suitability for the research question are described in detail, as well as limitations of the chosen method. 8.5-10 + The method is innovative and original.	
No justification of the method is offered.	Justification for the selected method is missing, insufficient and/or lacks a link with the research question (s)/aim(s).	Justification for the selected method is convincing and shows a clear link with the research question (s)/aim(s).	Justification for the selected method is convincing and shows a clear link with the research question (s)/aim(s), and with the context of the research. Potential weak points and/or pitfalls of the method are acknowledged.	

5. ANALYSIS & ARGUMENTATION

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Critical examination of arguments and presuppositions is lacking or minimal.	Critical examination of arguments and presuppositions is incomplete, sloppy and/or vague.	Critical examination of arguments and presuppositions are sufficient. Argumentation is clear and coherent, thorough.	+ Student indicates possible weakness or limitations of the analysis & arguments.	+ Analytic strength as well as originality of ideas and arguments.
No balance between description and (conceptual) analysis.	No good balance between description and (conceptual) analysis.	A sufficient-satisfactory balance exists between description and analysis.	+ In-depth interpretations and reflections on these in a wider context.	

6. CONCLUSION

The conclusion should not contain new aspects and/or arguments, but it is a good idea to give suggestions for future

research.

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Answer to RQ is absent or conclusion does not do justice to the content of the thesis.	Conclusions are a mere summary. The answers to the research questions are not fully supported by the analysis & arguments.	After a short summary, the research question is answered with reference to arguments. Implications and/or suggestions for further research are addressed superficially. The conclusion exceeds the level of summary of results.	After a short summary of the project, the research question is answered carefully with reference to theory and arguments. Implications are addressed, suggestions for further research included and student reflects critically on his/her own approach.	

7. REFERENCES AND SOURCES

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Very sloppy.	References in text and/or list are incomplete, inconsistent, and contain multiple mistakes. Some references are irrelevant or untraceable. References do not comply with standards of research journal(s).	References in text and list comply with standards of research journal(s). References are complete, relevant and traceable, but may occasionally contain some mistakes. Quality of sources is sufficient or satisfactory.	Idem, but no mistakes have been made. The difference between analysis of one's own and that of others is clearly marked. Critical use of literature and other sources. Quality of sources is good.	

8. STRUCTURE OF THESIS

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Structure is lacking or incomplete.	A sloppy structure (chapter, sections, paragraphs etc) and information presented in illogical order.	Structure is clear. Information is presented in a logical order, and a clear arrangements of chapters and paragraphs exists.	Good structure of parts of thesis.	A well-structured thesis.

9. COMPOSITION & STYLE; OVERALL QUALITY OF WRITING

Elements such as introduction, summary etc. are included.

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Frequent mistakes, many typos. Terminology of domain is used inadequately.	Text is not well structured and difficult to read or understand. Layout of the final	Clear construction of and variety in length of sentences. Minor mistakes in grammar or	The thesis is easy to read Formulations are varied, specific and appropriate, inviting towards further reading. Layout of the final document	

Style is inconsistent/uneven. Difficult to read & understand.	document does not meet the standards. Some mistakes in terminology of domain. Style of thesis is inconsistent.	spelling. Text is well-structured, facilitating the understanding of the reader. Layout of the final document is consistent. Terminology of the domain is used precisely and specifically. Style of the thesis is consistent (formal or informal).	is professional and attractive. Terminology of the domain is used precisely and specifically. Style of the thesis is consistent (formal or informal), and addresses the fellow students.
---	--	--	--

10. INITIATIVE, AUTONOMY & OWNERSHIP

FAIL 3.9 and lower	FIX From 4.0 to 5.5	SUFFICIENT-SATISFACTORY From 5.5 to 7.0*	GOOD-VERY GOOD From 7.0 to 8.5	EXCELLENT From 8.5 to 10
Ideas are given by the supervisor, but poorly incorporated. No 'ownership' of the topic and process by the student. Appointment and deadlines were not met.	Ideas are primarily given by the supervisor. Student tasks are primarily initiated by the supervisor (demonstrating, reflecting, making choices, planning). The tasks needed to be monitored closely by the supervisor. Student follows up on given direction. Appointments and deadlines not always met.	Ideas are generated in conjunction with supervisor. Ideas and tasks are sometimes generated by the teacher, sometimes by the student (student recognizes where help is needed and asks for it). Appointments and deadlines were respected.	Ideas are generated autonomously. Supervision meetings are primarily based on student-initiated planning, discussions and reflections. Appointments and deadlines were initiated by the student.	