



Universiteit Utrecht

FACULTY OF GEOSCIENCES
EARTH SCIENCES

MASTER'S THESIS RUBRIC

Course Code GEO4- Click here to enter text.
Credits Click here to enter text. EC

Student Name Click here to enter text.

Student Number Click here to enter text.

Title of Thesis / Report Click here to enter text.

Master's Programme Click here to enter text.

Name(s) of Internal Supervisor(s) Click here to enter text.

Host Organisation (if applicable)

Name of organisation Click here to enter text.

Country Click here to enter text.

Period From Click here to enter text. Until Click here to enter text.

Name(s) of External Supervisor(s) Click here to enter text.

Mark for Thesis **70%** Click here to enter text.

Mark for Process **20%** Click here to enter text.

Mark for Presentation **10%** Click here to enter text.

Final Mark¹

Click here to enter text.

Date dd-mm-yyyy

Name of First Reviewer Click here to enter text. Signature _____

Name of Second Reviewer Click here to enter text. Signature _____

Name of Third Reviewer Click here to enter text. Signature _____

¹ A final mark of 8.5 or higher or a sufficient final mark between 5.50 and 6.00 requires a statement of supported by a third reviewer (see the MSc Research guidelines)

Thesis						70%
(1/4)	Unacceptable (< 4.0)	Insufficient (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Abstract	Click here to enter text.	The abstract does not properly describe the problem, and/or research method and/or results.	The abstract describes the problem, research method and results at an elementary level.	The abstract describes the problem, research method and results in a concise and easy to read manner.	The abstract describes the problem, research method and results in a concise and easy to read manner.	Click here to enter text.
				The abstract is representative of the thesis content.	The abstract is representative of the thesis content, can be read and understood independently, and serves as an appealing invitation to read the thesis.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Background: theory / context / regional setting / previous work	Click here to enter text.	The background presented to introduce the research topic is incomplete and/or partly incorrect.	The background presented is limited but sufficient to introduce the research topic.	The background presented is extensive and introduces the research topic well.	The background presented is extensive and introduces the research topic well.	Click here to enter text.
		Relevant literature for the thesis research is not discussed.	The literature discussed is relevant.	The literature discussed is relevant and comprehensive.	The literature discussed is relevant and comprehensive. The background is presented in such a way that it gives new insights.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Problem definition and research question(s) / aim(s)	Click here to enter text.	The problem definition, and research question(s) /aim(s) are missing or not clearly stated, and/or are not convincingly related to the background presented.	The problem definition, and research question(s) /aim(s) are given at an elementary level. They are linked with the background presented.	The problem definition, and research question(s)/aim(s) are clearly and coherently formulated. They logically follow from the background presented.	The problem definition, and research question(s)/aim(s) are clearly and coherently formulated. They logically follow from the background presented, and convincingly demonstrate a knowledge gap in the current literature/research area.	Click here to enter text.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(2/4)	Unacceptable (< 4.0)	Insufficient (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Method	Click here to enter text.	The research method is inaccurately and/or incompletely described; validity, reliability and suitability are not explicitly described.	The research method is described at an elementary level; validity, reliability and suitability are briefly described.	The research method is comprehensively described; validity, reliability and suitability are described in some detail.	The research method is comprehensively described; validity, reliability and suitability are described in detail.	Click here to enter text.
		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 given and shows 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). Potential weak points and/or pitfalls of the method are substantiated.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results	Click here to enter text.	The collected (field, model/experimental) data contain obvious mistakes and/or appear not suitable to answer the research question(s)/aim(s).	The collected (field, model/experimental) data are suitable to answer the research question(s)/aim(s).	The collected (field, model/experimental) data are suitable to answer the research question(s)/aim(s).	The collected (field, model/experimental) data are suitable to answer the research question(s)/aim(s).	Click here to enter text.
		Presentation of the data (tables, figures, charts) is incoherent, poorly structured and/or careless.	Presentation of the data (tables, figures, charts) is coherent, well-structured and careful.	Presentation of the data (tables, figures, charts) is coherent, well-structured and careful. The quality of the data (precision, accuracy) is explicitly included.	Presentation of the data (tables, figures, charts) is coherent, well-structured and careful. The quality of the data (precision, accuracy) is explicitly included.	
					All data are presented in a fully objective way; bias towards any interpretation is avoided.	
					The presentation of the data is such that the readers directly obtain new insights and are able to define their own line of thinking.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(3/4)	Unacceptable (< 4.0)	Insufficient (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Discussion	Click here to enter text.	Discussion reflects insufficiently on research question(s)/aim(s), methodology and/or on results.	Discussion reflects on research question(s)/aim(s), methodology and/or results. Individual results are discussed.	Discussion reflects on research question(s)/aim(s), methodology and/or results. Individual results are discussed. Synthesis is provided in view of the research questions.	Discussion reflects on research question(s)/aim(s), methodology and/or results. Individual results are discussed. Synthesis is provided in view of the research questions. Rival explanations are debated.	Click here to enter text.
		Insufficient consideration is given to related, published studies.	Proper consideration is given to related, published studies.	Proper consideration is given to related, published studies.	Proper consideration is given to related, published studies.	
			Contribution of the project to theory, practice and/or society is mentioned.	Contribution of the project to theory, practice and/or society is discussed in some detail.	Contribution of the project to theory, practice and/or society is well explored.	
				Limitations of the study are addressed.	Limitations of the study are addressed.	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Conclusions	Click here to enter text.	Conclusions do not do justice to the content of the thesis research.	Conclusions do justice to the content of the thesis research.	Conclusions do justice to the content of the thesis research.	Conclusions do justice to the content of the thesis research.	Click here to enter text.
		Conclusions do not include an answer to the research question.	Conclusions include an answer to the research question.	Conclusions include an answer to the research question.	Conclusions include an answer to the research question.	
		Answers to research question(s)/aim(s) are not supported by the methods and/or results presented.	Answers to research question(s)/aim(s) are presented, and match with the method and/or results presented.	Answers to research question(s)/aim(s) are presented, and match with the method and/or results presented.	Answers to research question(s)/aim(s) are presented, and match with the method and/or results presented.	
				Implications for the research field are mentioned.	Implications for the research field are mentioned as well as critical arguments for exclusion of rival explanations.	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(4/4)	Unacceptable (< 4.0)	Insufficient (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Overall quality of writing	Click here to enter text.	Reference list is incomplete or does not comply with standards of research journal(s) .	Reference list is complete and complies with standards of research journal(s) .	Reference list is complete and complies with standards of research journal(s) .	Reference list is complete and complies with standards of research journal(s) .	Click here to enter text.
		Language proficiency is basic, with frequent spelling and grammatical mistakes.	Language proficiency is basic with limited vocabulary, but correct.	Language proficiency is adequate with sufficient variation in vocabulary.	Language proficiency is good; sentences are fluent and logical.	
		Text is not well structured and difficult to read or understand.	The text contains some minor mistakes in grammar and/or spelling.	The text hardly contains any mistakes in grammar and/or spelling.	Wording is varied, specific and appropriate, inviting further reading.	
			Text is structured.	Text is well-structured, facilitating the understanding of the reader.	Text is well-structured, facilitating the understanding of the reader.	
		Layout of the final document does not meet standards.	Layout of the final document is consistent.	Layout of the final document is consistent.	Layout of the final document is professional and attractive.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plagiarism (obligatory)						
Does the Original plagiarism indicate unacceptable overlap with text of other documents? If yes, please justify. Please also justify If the overlap is considerable but can be justified. Click here to enter text.						
Are there any other indications for plagiarism? Click here to enter text.						
Additional remarks (optional) Click here to enter text.						

Process						20%
(1/2)	Unacceptable (< 4.0)	Insufficient but reparable (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Proposal	Click here to enter text.	Research (research questions/aims and methods) was proposed and largely formulated by supervisor.	Research (research questions/aims and methods) was proposed by supervisor and formulated by student.	Research (research questions/aims and methods) was proposed by supervisor, and worked out in detail and formulated by student.	Research (research questions/aims and methods) was proposed in conjunction with supervisor, and worked out in detail and formulated by student.	Click here to enter text.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation	Click here to enter text.	The work programme was not accomplished due to underperformance of the student.	Work programme was accomplished but with some deviation from the agreed time planning .	The student followed the time planning allowing the project to be completed without delay.	The student followed the time planning allowing the project to be completed without delay.	Click here to enter text.
		The student was insufficiently prepared at progress meetings.	The student was sufficiently prepared at progress meetings. Performance of activities could be assessed.	The student was well prepared at progress meetings. Performance and quality of results could be assessed.	The student was well prepared at progress meetings. Performance and quality of results could be assessed. Opportunities were created for scientific discussion.	
		Student did not fulfil agreements.	Student did not fulfil all agreements but this did not jeopardize the progress.	Student fulfilled the agreements.	Student fulfilled and went beyond the agreements.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Autonomy in applying methodology	Click here to enter text.	Continuous supervision and support was necessary to enable the student to apply the required techniques and methods.	After an instruction period, the student was able to operate independently and to apply the required techniques and methods.	After an instruction period, the student was able to operate independently and to apply the required techniques and methods.	After an instruction period, the student was able to operate independently and to apply the required techniques and methods.	Click here to enter text.
				Student noticed mistakes and/or technical problems in the methods used.	Student noticed mistakes and/or technical problems in the methods used.	
					Student suggested or independently implemented improvements in the methods.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(2/2)

Additional remarks *(optional)*

Click here to enter text.

Presentation						10%
(1/2)	Unacceptable/ (<4.0)	Insufficient but reparable (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Content	Click here to enter text.	Project (research questions/aims, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) was not clearly transferred.	Project (research questions/aims, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) was clearly transferred.	Project (research questions/aims, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) was clearly transferred.	Project (research questions/aims, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) was clearly transferred.	Click here to enter text.
				The length of the different parts of the content were balanced and accommodated in the available time frame.	The length of the different parts of the content were balanced and accommodated in the available time frame.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation skills	Click here to enter text.	Following the presentation was hindered because the student formulated unclearly or used an inappropriate style.	Student formulated clearly and used correct terminology.	Student formulated clearly and used correct terminology.	Student formulated clearly and used correct terminology.	Click here to enter text.
				Presentation was supported by non-verbal communication skills.	Presentation was supported by non-verbal communication skills.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(2/2)	Unacceptable (<4.0)	Insufficient but reparable (4.0-5.4)	Acceptable (5.5-6.4)	Satisfactory (6.5-7.4)	Good (7.5-8.4)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Supporting media	Click here to enter text.	Audio-visual media were insufficient, contained mistakes and/or distracted from the storyline.	Audio-visual media were appropriate and the presented material was correct.	Audio-visual media were appropriate and the presented material was correct.	Audio-visual media were appropriate and the presented material was correct.	Click here to enter text.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Audio-visual media supported the verbal explanations.	Audio-visual media supported the verbal explanations. Graphics were optimized to improve their readability and to transfer the important aspects.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questions	Click here to enter text.	Student could not provide answers to questions directly related to the methodology or the research subject.	Student was able to answer questions directly related to the methodology or the research subject.	Student was able to answer questions directly related to the methodology or the research subject.	Student was able to answer questions directly related to the methodology or the research subject.	Click here to enter text.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The answers to the questions were clear and persuasive.	The answers to the questions were clear and persuasive showing that the student is in control of the research project.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional remarks (optional) Click here to enter text.						