

Master's Thesis *Conditional indicators¹*

		Not Sufficient	Sufficient
Ethics	Thesis meets the criteria for ethics with regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed consent has been organized • Privacy • Plagiarism • Harm to participants • Fraud 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proficiency in English	Student masters English to a degree that the content can be conveyed at an academic level.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear construction and length of sentences • Clear and correct style of writing • Small mistakes, but not disturbing 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Titles • Texts, headings • Figures / illustrations / maps • Tables • Length of the summary (max. 400 words) 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹Must be fulfilled as a condition for the thesis to be judged.

Written Thesis						70%
QUALITY OF RESEARCH						
(1/4)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 -7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)	
Introduction	There is no research problem, nor is there is a related research question/aim. <input type="checkbox"/>	There is a broad research problem, but there is no clear relation to the research question/aim. <input type="checkbox"/>	There is a broad research problem, and it is connected to the research question/aim. <input type="checkbox"/>	There is a clear and concise research problem, that is clearly connected to the research question/aim. <input type="checkbox"/>	There is a clear, concise and original research problem, that is clearly connected to the research question/aim. <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Student can indicate neither the social nor the scientific relevance of the research topic. <input type="checkbox"/>	Student can indicate the social or scientific relevance of the research topic. The social or scientific relevance of the research problem is not clear. <input type="checkbox"/>	Student can indicate the social and scientific relevance of the research topic. <input type="checkbox"/>	Student can substantiate the social and scientific relevance of the research topic. <input type="checkbox"/>	Student has an innovative perspective in substantiating the social and scientific relevance of the research topic. <input type="checkbox"/>	
Theory (optional for natural science students)	The project is linked to literature that is (partly) irrelevant and/or of insufficient quality to answer the research question(s). <input type="checkbox"/>	The project is linked to literature that is only partly relevant and/or incomplete, leading to poor substantiation of the proposed research. <input type="checkbox"/>	The project is linked to relevant theoretical literature, which is functional for executing the proposed research. Theories are used correctly. <input type="checkbox"/>	The project is well-embedded in the existing body of literature, from which relevant scientific theories are selected and used, resulting in an accurate and coherent conceptual framework. <input type="checkbox"/>	Student has an original or innovative approach to the existing appropriate theoretical framework. <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Critical review of the literature used is missing. <input type="checkbox"/>	Critical review of the literature used is incomplete or unclear. <input type="checkbox"/>	Thesis contains critical review of relevant literature. <input type="checkbox"/>	Student makes a meaningful link to recent debates and hot topics. <input type="checkbox"/>	The project contributes to the existing body of literature or a particular theory. <input type="checkbox"/>	

(2/4)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 -7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Research design	Research method is poorly described and does not match with the research question. Operationalization is missing, or not adequate. Standards for validity, reliability and suitability are not met.	Research method is partly incomplete, and the relation with the research question is not fully clear. Operationalization is incomplete. Standards for validity, reliability and suitability are not fully met.	Research method has been described accurately and is justified. Validity, reliability and suitability are acceptable. Method is applied correctly, matching scope and depth of the research question.	The selected research method is non-standard and checked on validity, reliability and suitability. The project is methodologically well-embedded and substantiated.	The project has an original/innovative, and appropriate methodological approach, and contributes to the existing methodology, or shows an innovative application of methods by combining elements in an original way. The research method is fully substantiated, and described transparently.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data quality	Data do not meet the standards of validity, reliability and suitability. Systematic mistakes have been made in collecting (empirical) data. Quantity and quality of the data are insufficient to answer the research question.	Accidental mistakes have been made in collecting data following academic standards. Quantity and/or quality of the data is insufficient to answer the research question fully.	(Empirical) Data are correctly collected - following academic standards of quality - and are relevant for answering the research question. Quantity and quality of the data is sufficient to answer the research question.	The collection of (empirical) data is substantiated and well-embedded in the research process. Data collection exceeds minimal academic standards and is tailored to the specific research question(s).	Student shows ambition by choosing an innovative approach or using multiple or large data collections. Data collection meets high standards (numbers, detail) , or goes beyond.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data analysis & critical analysis of results	Analysis of data does not meet minimal academic standards. Results are not linked to research question nor to existing theory.	Analysis of data does not meet minimal academic standards. Results are poorly linked to research question and/or existing theory.	Data are analysed according to minimal academic standards. Steps in analysis are transparent.	Data are critically analysed, using standard academic techniques.	Data are critically analysed using advanced appropriate analytical techniques. Student shows to have eye for important elements.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(3/4)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 -7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Conclusions	No answers to the research questions are given, or the answer does not match the results.	The answers to the research questions are not fully supported by the results / data.	Answers to research questions are presented concisely, conclusions are supported by the results / data.	Answers to research questions are presented concisely and critically. Conclusions are supported by the results / data.	Answers to research questions are presented concisely and critically, in relation to the research question. Conclusions are supported by the results / data. The conclusions give new insights in the topic.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion	No reflection on research methods or on results. Contribution to theory, practice or society is lacking.	Reflection on methods or results is incomplete and not substantiated. Theory is marginally involved, and contribution to theory, practice or society are not mentioned.	Research methods and results are reflected upon. Substantiation for contribution to theory, practice or society.	Reflection on research methods and results. Critical substantiation for contribution to theory, practice or society and research problem.	Substantiation why results are on the frontiers of science. Gives well-considered arguments for innovative contribution to theory, methods and practice or society.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No emphasis on rival explanations or limitations of the study, although they are obviously present.	Limitations and exclusion of rival explanations are missing or discussed incompletely.	Limitations are given and rival explanations are excluded without proper argumentation.	Limitations are given and some rival explanations are discussed and excluded.	Limitations are critically discussed and lead to new insights. Rival explanations are excluded by substantiation.
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Student reflects on the results, the research approach used, and the meaning of the results.	Student recognizes connections and explains the results based on the existing theory. Student recognizes weak spots in research and indicated how the method can be improved.	Student recognizes connections and connects them to theory. Student identifies important new research topics.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(4/4)

Additional remarks on quality of research

[Click here to enter text.](#)

QUALITY OF REPORT					
(1/2)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5,5)	Acceptable (5,5 -7)	Good (7 -8,5)	Excellent (8,5 -10)
Summary	The summary does not describe problem, research method or results, and the description lacks coherence.	The summary describes two out of 3 items (problem, research method and results).	The summary describes problem, research method and results at a basic level.	The summary presents problem, selected research method and results in logical connection.	The summary presents problem, selected research method and results in logical connection and invites to read more.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Executive summary (optional)	Student was unable to make the link with the company' question.	Student answers the company's question related to the outcomes of the research.	Student answers the company's question asking the reader's attention.	By using clear reasoning, the student answers the company's question in a convincing way.	Student answers the company's question applying clear reasoning. Furthermore, the student includes extra elements that were not demanded by the company but do give the company additional support.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structure of written thesis	Incomplete in sections. (Sub) Headings missing or inconsistent. Relation between sections is missing.	All sections are present. Headings are partly inconsistent. Relation between sections is poor and not substantiated.	Good balance between introduction, body and conclusions. Sections are mutually related and logically connected (research question is leading).	Sections are logically connected and give a complete overview of research. Sections are mutually related and provided with critical argumentation (research question is leading).	Sections are clearly and logically connected and give a complete overview of research. Described logically and innovative and with good argumentation.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Source reference list	The reference list is incomplete, inconsistent, and contains and multiple mistakes. Many references are not traceable.	The reference list is compiled according to journal standards, but with multiple mistakes.	Reference list complies with standards of research journal(s) or APA. One or two mistakes are permitted. References are complete.	Reference list complies with standards of research journal(s) or APA. No mistakes. References are complete, relevant and traceable.	Reference list complies with standards of research journal(s) or APA. No mistakes. References are complete, relevant and traceable. Different types of sources are well-balanced.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(2/2)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5,5)	Acceptable (5,5 -7)	Good (7 -8,5)	Excellent (8,5 -10)
Tuning with audience	The text has been written without a clue of the intended public. Level of presentation varies per chapter.	It is not clear which is the target audience of the thesis. Level of presentation is uniform.	Student follows the standard for master thesis in selecting the audience and tunes to an academic audience / research community with master+ level.	Student shows to be well-aware of the academic standards the target audience expects. The tone of the writing is tuned to this public.	Tunes to an international level at the frontiers of science.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional remarks on quality of report
 Click here to enter text.

Process					20%
(1/2)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 - 7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Creativity and innovation	Student was unable to find solutions for unforeseen problems in the research project. Lack of new ideas and insights and no added value.	Student needed help in coming up with standard solutions for unforeseen problems in the research project. Imitation / copy of existing and well-known ideas within domain without added value.	Student came up with standard solutions for unforeseen problems in the research project. Slight change of existing and well-known ideas within domain; some added value.	Student came up with well thought-out solutions for unforeseen problems in the research project. Transfer of existing concepts from one domain to another or to another situation; added value.	Student showed a high degree of creativity in finding solutions for unforeseen problems in the research project. Introduction of totally new element to an existing situation; strong added value.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Time management	The student seriously exceeded the scheduled time or was not able to finish the project within the scheduled time without major concessions to the quality of the research.	The student did not manage to execute the project in the scheduled time or had to do minor adjustments to the proposed project to be able to finish it in time.	The project was executed in the scheduled time, thanks to the supervisor.	The project was executed in the scheduled time without compromising on the quality of the research.	The student was at all times in control of the progress, and did neither miss any deadline nor compromised on the quality of the research.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Autonomy	Student does not have ideas and does not follow the directions of the supervisor. Does not meet the expected tasks and schedules.	Ideas are given by the supervisor. Students tasks are primarily initiated by the supervisor (demonstrating, reflecting, making choices, planning). Needs close monitoring by supervisor.	Ideas were primarily given by the supervisor. Tasks are initiated by a combination of student and supervisor. Student follows-up on given direction.	Ideas are arrived in conjunction with supervisor. Meetings are a combination of teacher-regulated and student-directed interaction (recognizing where help is needed and asking for it).	Ideas are autonomously arrived. Supervision was used to exchange ideas at an academic level. The student initiated the entire research project and independently executed it, with the supervisor as equal partner.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Student has not responded to feedback.	Student has only marginally/selectively responded to feedback.	Student implements feedback without interpretation or consideration.	Student uses feedback for improvement of the thesis.	Student is intellectually stimulated by feedback and uses it for substantial improvement of the thesis.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(2/2)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 -7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Cooperation & communication with supervisor/ instructors	Not good. Student missed appointments / annulled appointments at the last moment / arrived unprepared.		Meetings with supervisor were scheduled in advance. Student sent draft texts timely and came prepared.	Good. Meetings with supervisor were scheduled well in advance. Student sent draft texts timely and came well prepared.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Additional remarks on quality of the process</p> <p>Click here to enter text.</p>					

Presentation					10%	
(1/2)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 -7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)	
Content	Relevance and coherence of problem definition, aim or research questions remains unclear, or are absent. Incomplete overview of theory, methods and approach, relevance not addressed.	Incomplete presentation of problem definition, aim and research questions, which remain unsubstantiated and are not logically connected. Limited overview of theory, methods and approach, relevance not addressed.	Problem definition, aim and research questions are presented, but are unsubstantiated or not logically connected. Somewhat limited overview of theory, methods and approach, relevance not well addressed.	Clear problem definition, aim of the study and relevant and clear research questions. Clear overview of theory, methods and approach.	Clear problem definition, aim of the study and relevant and clear research questions, all of which are logically connected. Clear and convincing argumentation for choice of theory, methods and approach.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Presentation of the results does not focus on relevant main findings. Incoherent argumentation throughout the presentation. Research questions are not answered.	Presentation of the results does not focus on relevant main findings. Weak discussion of research findings. Research questions are not answered.	Clear overview of relevant main results. Conclusions which answer the research questions are presented, but argumentation is weak.	Clear overview of relevant main results Convincing argumentation for conclusions, which answer the research questions.		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Relevance and wider context of the research findings are not discussed.		No attention for wider context or relevance of research findings.	Limited attention for wider context and relevance of research findings.	Relevance and wider context of the research findings are discussed and connected to problem definition.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Presentation skills	Student formulates unclearly or needs too much time to formulate sentences. Limited contact with the audience. Very unstructured presentation. Lack of balance between the different parts.	Student formulates without care and/or rushes through the text without tuning to the audience. A clear structure is missing. Lack of balance between the different parts.	Students speaks clearly and makes eye-contact with the audience. The presentation has a clear structure, but is slightly unbalanced.	Student speaks fluently, formulating clearly. Student makes ample eye-contact with the audience. The presentation has a clear structure and a good balance between the different parts.	Student speaks fluently with a dynamic voice, formulating clearly. Student captivates the audience. Clearly structured presentation with a logical flow and a good balance between the different parts.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Bad time management, more than 5 minutes deviation from the timeslot.		Time management OK, no more than 2-5 minutes deviation from the timeslot.	Good time management, no more than 1-2 minutes deviation from the timeslot.	Excellent time management, <1 minute deviation from the timeslot.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(2/2)	Unacceptable (< 4)	Insufficient (4 -5.5)	Acceptable (5.5 -7)	Good (7 -8.5)	Excellent (8.5 -10)
Supporting media	No attention paid to layout of slides. Slides are not clearly readable. Too much content on one slide. No use of pictures, figures or other media.	Limited attention paid to layout of slides. Slides are not clearly readable. Too much content per slide. Limited use of pictures or figures, no use of other media.	Slides have a good layout and are clearly readable. Not too much content per slide. Use of pictures or figures to support the presentation, but no use of other media.	Attractive slides. Clearly readable. Not too much content per slide. Use of pictures, figures, animations or movies to support the contents of the presentation.	Attractive slides with a professional look. Everything clearly readable. Not too much content per slide. Creative use of pictures, figures, animations, movies or other media to support the contents of the presentation.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questions	Student is not able to give substantiated answers to questions related to scientific content, methods or results. Student is unable to address questions about the wider context and theory of the research subject.	Student has difficulty answering questions related to scientific content, methods or results. Student is unable to address questions about the wider context and theory of the research subject.	Questions on scientific content, methods or results are answered, but lack clarity or persuasion. Student is unable to address questions about the wider context and theory of the research subject.	Questions on scientific content, methods or results are answered clearly, showing that the student masters the research subject. Student has difficulty to address questions about the wider context and theory of the research subject.	Questions on scientific content, methods or results are answered clearly and persuasively, showing that the student masters the research subject. Student is able to clearly address questions about the wider context and theory of the research subject.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Additional remarks on presentation Click here to enter text.</p>					