

Master's Thesis Rubric and Grading Form – version FP Committee

20 EC – Educational Science and Technology

Student Name : _____
 Student Number : _____
 Thesis Title : _____
 Supervisor : _____
 Second Reader : _____

Assessment Components

Component	Weight	Raw Score (1-10)	Weighted Score	Comments
1. Problem Definition Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear line of argumentation - Relevance: Social/scientific significance clearly articulated - <i>* Demonstration of a critical and original perspective on the problem</i> 	10%	_____	_____	
2. Theoretical Framework Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literature Review: Comprehensive for scope, current sources, critical analysis - Research Question: Clear, specific, and researchable - Clear line of argumentation - <i>* Demonstration of a critical and original perspective in the application of theory</i> 	15%	_____	_____	
3. Research Design & Methodology Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Method Selection: Appropriate for research question(s) aligned with theoretical framework - Justification: Clear rationale for methodological choices - Ethical Considerations: Addressed sufficiently where relevant - Data quality and handling: Data collected or selected is appropriate for the research questions and documented in a systematic approach - Clear communication of methodological choices 	15%	_____	_____	

Component	Weight	Raw Score (1-10)	Weighted Score	Comments
-* <i>Demonstration of a critical and original perspective (novel approach) in research design and methodology</i>				
4. Analysis & Results Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analytical rigor: concise use of appropriate analytical techniques - Clear and structured presentation of the findings in relation to research question(s) - Results reported adhere to academic conventions - ** <i>Demonstration of a critical and original perspective in the analysis</i> 	15%			
5. Conclusions & Discussion Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interpretation: Meaningful discussion of findings in relation to theoretical framework - Critical Reflection: Discussion of strength and weaknesses, acknowledges limitations, considers alternatives - Implications: Discussion of implications in relation to theory, policy, and practice - Conclusions: Clear formulation of conclusions in line with actual findings - * <i>Demonstration of how the project advances knowledge and/or practice</i> 	15%			
6. Process & Agency ** Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Student Agency: Takes ownership of the research process and decisions where applicable - Initiative: Proactive problem-solving and help-seeking when appropriate - Project Management: Organized approach, meets deadlines, manages resources effectively - Professional Communication: Effective communication with supervisor and others involved - Dealing with Feedback: Responds constructively to feedback and processes it appropriately 	20%			

Component	Weight	Raw Score (1-10)	Weighted Score	Comments
7. Oral presentation & Defense Assessment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation Quality: Clear structure, engaging delivery of presentation - Content: Accurate summary, key insights highlighted - Defense: Responds effectively to questions 	10%			

All components have to be scored at least 5.5 to pass the Final Project

**: Demonstrating innovativeness and/or strong scientific or practical contribution in this component is not a requirement but can be awarded if applicable*

***:* Can only be assessed by the supervisor, not by the second reader

Overall observations

Final Calculation of assessment by Final Project Committee

Total Weighted Score (for parts 1 – 7) : _____ / 10

Final Calculated Grade : _____

Final Rounded Grade Agreed : _____

Supervisor Signature : _____

Date: _____

Second Reader Signature : _____

Date: _____

Master's Thesis Assessment Rubric

Detailed Criteria and Scoring Guidelines for Teachers

Component 1: Problem Definition (10%)

Assessment Criteria:

- Clear line of argumentation
- Relevance: Social/scientific significance clearly articulated
- *If applicable: Demonstration of a critical and original perspective on the problem

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Clear and logical flow from broader context to problem. Main components are well presented and seamlessly connected. Coherent argumentation, easy to follow reasoning from broader problem to the research problem.

7-8: Logically structured with clear progression. Main components are present and generally well-connected. Minor gaps in logic that don't significantly hinder understanding. Argumentation is coherent but may lack the seamless flow of excellent work

6-7: Problem statement is adequately structured and understandable. Main components are present but connections between them could be stronger. Some logical progression is evident, though transitions may be abrupt. Reader understands the problem but may need to work harder to follow the reasoning.

5.5-6: Problem statement is present but structure is somewhat unclear. Components exist but are loosely connected. Logic is occasionally difficult to follow or contains inconsistencies. Argumentation is fragmented; reader must infer some connections.

Below 5.5: Problem statement is unclear, unfocused, or absent. Components are missing or poorly articulated. Logical connections are absent or confused. Argumentation is incoherent; reader cannot discern the research direction. May present multiple disconnected ideas without integration.

Component 2: Theoretical Framework (15%)

Assessment Criteria:

- Literature Review: Comprehensive for scope, current sources, critical analysis
- Research Question: Clear, specific, and researchable
- Clear line of argumentation
- * If applicable: Demonstration of a critical and original perspective in the application of theory

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Coverage of major perspectives and current sources, critical analysis. Precisely formulated research question that directly flows from the theory and is operationalizable, seamless logical progression from theory to research question, well-reasoned justification for theoretical choices.

7-8: Solid coverage of major perspectives with good balance of current and foundational sources, meaningful critical analysis. Well-formulated research question with clear theoretical connections and operationalizable concepts, logical progression from theory to research question, good justification for theoretical choices.

6-7: Adequate coverage of main perspectives with reasonable mix of sources, some critical analysis. Understandable research question with adequate theoretical connections, basic logical progression from theory to research question, some justification for theoretical choices provided.

5.5-6: Limited coverage with few recent sources, primarily descriptive with minimal critical analysis. Vague or broad research question with weak theoretical connections, weak logical progression from theory to research question, limited justification for theoretical choices.

Below 5.5: Limited or inappropriate coverage, irrelevant or outdated sources, no critical analysis. Absent, vague, or incoherent research question with no clear theoretical connection, no clear logical progression, absent or incoherent justification for theoretical choices.

Component 3: Research Design & Methodology (15%)

Assessment Criteria:

- Method Selection: Appropriate for research question(s) aligned with theoretical framework
- Justification: Clear rationale for methodological choices
- Ethical Considerations: Addressed sufficiently where relevant
- Data quality and handling: Data collected or selected is appropriate for the research questions and documented in a systematic approach
- Clear communication of methodological choices
- * If applicable: Demonstration of a critical and original perspective (novel approach) in research design and methodology

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Methods are exceptionally well-suited to the research questions and theoretical framework. The justification shows comprehensive, nuanced rationale for all choices, and procedures around data collection/selection and handling are meticulously explained and presented in a highly organized manner. Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of context-specific ethical issues and proactively addresses potential challenges.

7-8: Methods are well-suited to the research questions and theoretical framework. The justification shows a strong, clear rationale for the choices, and procedures around data collection/selection and handling are thoroughly explained and presented in a well-organized manner. Demonstrates good awareness of context-specific ethical issues.

6-7: Methods are appropriate for the research questions and theoretical framework. The justification shows an adequate rationale for the main choices, and procedures around data

collection/selection and handling are sufficiently explained and presented in an organized manner. Demonstrates basic awareness of ethical issues.

5.5-6: Methods are generally suitable for the research questions but may show some misalignment with the theoretical framework. The justification shows a basic rationale for some choices, and procedures around data collection/selection and handling are minimally explained and presented with limited organization. Demonstrates limited awareness of ethical issues.

Below 5.5: Methods are poorly suited to the research questions and/or theoretical framework. The justification is weak or absent, and procedures around data collection/selection and handling are inadequately explained and presented in a disorganized or unclear manner. Demonstrates insufficient awareness of ethical issues.

Component 4: Analysis & Results (15%)

Assessment Criteria:

- Analytical rigor: concise use of appropriate analytical techniques
- Clear and structured presentation of the findings in relation to research question(s)
- Results reported adhere to academic conventions
- * If applicable: Demonstration of a critical and original perspective in the analysis

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Analytical techniques exceptionally well-suited with rigorous application. Findings presented with exceptional clarity and structure, directly addressing research questions with insightful presentation. Results adhere meticulously to academic conventions. Demonstrates exceptional critical thinking, strong synthesis, and innovative analytical perspectives.

7-8: Analytical techniques well-suited with good application. Findings presented clearly and thoroughly, in relation to the research questions. Results adhere to academic conventions. Demonstrates solid critical reflection, clear connections between findings and research questions, and thoughtful insights.

6-7: Analytical techniques appropriate with adequate application. Findings presented in organized manner, sufficiently addressing research questions. Results adhere to academic conventions. Demonstrates some critical reflection, sufficient connections, and basic analytical insights.

5.5-6: Analytical techniques generally suitable but with limitations in application or rigor. Findings presented with basic structure, minimally addressing research questions. Results show limited adherence to conventions. Demonstrates limited critical reflection and weak connections.

Below 5.5: Analytical techniques poorly suited or applied without rigor. Findings presented in disorganized manner, failing to address research questions adequately. Results do not adhere to academic conventions. Demonstrates minimal reflection and no clear connections.

Component 5: Conclusions & Discussion (15%)

Assessment Criteria:

- Interpretation: Meaningful discussion of findings in relation to theoretical framework
- Critical Reflection: Discussion of strength and weaknesses, acknowledges limitations, considers alternatives
- Implications: Discussion of implications in relation to theory, policy, and practice
- Conclusions: Clear formulation of conclusions in line with actual findings
- * If applicable: Demonstration of how the project advances knowledge and/or practice

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Findings discussed with exceptional depth in relation to theoretical framework. Comprehensive critical reflection on strengths, weaknesses, limitations, and alternatives. Implications for theory, policy, and practice thoroughly explored. Conclusions precisely formulated and strongly aligned with findings. Demonstrates significant advancement of knowledge/practice.

7-8: Findings discussed clearly in relation to theoretical framework. Solid critical reflection on strengths, weaknesses, limitations, and alternatives. Implications for theory, policy, and practice well-articulated. Conclusions clearly formulated and aligned with findings. Demonstrates clear advancement of knowledge/practice.

6-7: Findings discussed adequately in relation to theoretical framework. Some critical reflection on strengths, weaknesses, and limitations. Implications for theory, policy, and practice sufficiently addressed. Conclusions appropriately formulated and generally aligned with findings. Demonstrates some advancement of knowledge/practice.

5.5-6: Findings discussed superficially in relation to theoretical framework. Limited critical reflection on strengths, weaknesses, and limitations. Implications minimally addressed. Conclusions basic and weakly aligned with findings. Demonstrates limited advancement of knowledge/practice.

Below 5.5: Findings poorly or not discussed in relation to theoretical framework. Minimal or absent critical reflection. Implications absent or inadequate. Conclusions unclear, absent, or misaligned with findings. Demonstrates no discernible advancement of knowledge/practice.

Component 6: Process & Agency (20%) **

** can only be assessed by the supervisor, not by the second reader

Assessment Criteria:

- Student Agency: Takes ownership of the research process and decisions where applicable
- Initiative: Proactive problem-solving and help-seeking when appropriate
- Project Management: Organized approach, meets deadlines, manages resources effectively
- Professional Communication: Effective communication with supervisor, responds to feedback constructively

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Demonstrates exceptional ownership of research process and decisions with independent, confident direction. Highly proactive in problem-solving and strategic help-seeking. Excellent project management with consistent adherence to deadlines and efficient resource use. Professional communication with supervisor, responds constructively and thoughtfully to feedback.

7-8: Demonstrates strong ownership of research process and decisions with good independent direction. Proactive in problem-solving and appropriate help-seeking. Strong project management with adherence to deadlines and effective resource use. Clear, professional communication with supervisor, responds well to feedback.

6-7: Demonstrates good ownership of research process and decisions with adequate independent direction. Shows initiative in problem-solving and seeks help when needed. Adequate project management with general adherence to deadlines and reasonable resource use. Effective communication with supervisor, responds appropriately to feedback.

5.5-6: Demonstrates basic ownership of research process with limited independent direction. Shows some initiative but reactive rather than proactive. Acceptable project management with occasional missed deadlines or inefficient resource use. Basic communication with supervisor, limited response to feedback.

Below 5.5: Demonstrates limited or no ownership of research process, heavily dependent on supervisor direction. Minimal initiative, poor problem-solving, and inadequate help-seeking. Poor project management with frequent missed deadlines and ineffective resource use. Ineffective communication with supervisor, does not respond constructively to feedback.

Component 7: Oral Presentation & Defense (10%)

Assessment Criteria:

- Presentation Quality: Clear structure, engaging delivery of presentation
- Content: Accurate summary, key insights highlighted
- Defense: Responds effectively to questions

Scoring Guidelines:

9-10: Presentation has exceptional structure and highly engaging delivery with professional polish. Content provides accurate, comprehensive summary with key insights expertly highlighted and contextualized. Defense demonstrates deep understanding with elaborate, insightful responses that anticipate questions and connect to broader theoretical and practical implications.

7-8: Presentation has clear structure and engaging delivery with strong professional quality. Content provides accurate summary with key insights well-highlighted and explained. Defense demonstrates solid understanding with thoughtful, insightful responses that address questions thoroughly and make relevant connections.

6-7: Presentation has adequate structure and clear delivery with reasonable engagement. Content provides accurate summary with key insights appropriately highlighted. Defense demonstrates good understanding with appropriate responses that address questions sufficiently and show basic competence.

5.5-6: Presentation has basic structure and delivery with limited engagement. Content provides generally accurate summary with key insights minimally highlighted. Defense demonstrates basic understanding with simple responses that address questions at surface level with limited elaboration.

Below 5.5: Presentation has poor or unclear structure and weak delivery with minimal engagement. Content provides inaccurate or incomplete summary with key insights poorly or not highlighted. Defense demonstrates limited understanding with inadequate responses that fail to address questions effectively or show significant gaps in knowledge.

*: Demonstrating innovativeness and/or strong scientific or practical contribution in this component is not a requirement but can be awarded if applicable

The general meaning of the scores is as follows:

Assessment score	Mark	Meaning
≤ 54	< 6	Insufficient; the thesis does not correspond to what can be expected
55-62	6	Sufficient; the thesis meets the expectations
63-67	6,5	
68-72	7	The thesis meets the expectations more than sufficiently
73-77	7,5	
78-82	8	Good thesis
83-87	8,5	
88-92	9	Very good thesis
93-97	9,5	
98-100	10	Excellent, exceptionally good thesis