**Assessment form for MA Thesis in History**

NB This form is intended to help with the assessment of the thesis and with giving feedback to the student. It is also presented to assessment committees during external inspections and the like. The completed form should therefore be submitted electronically for archiving. The student must score a pass mark (v) on all components in order to be awarded a final pass mark. The following is a guideline for determining the final mark: satisfactory (v) = 6, very satisfactory (rv) = 7, good (g) = 8, very good (zg) = 9. If a student mainly scores “rv” or “g”, he/she is awarded a final mark of 7 or 8 respectively. An almost even distribution of “v” and “rv” leads to a 6.5, and an almost even distribution of “rv” and “g” to a 7.5 etc. The supervising staff member justifies the assessments in the ‘explanatory notes’ column. The alignment of the grade between the first and second readers (particularly if there are differing judgements) is described in the faculty thesis regulations.

**Name of student: ………………………………….**

**Student number: …………………………………**

**First supervisor …………………………………**

**Second supervisor …………………………………**

**Second assessor …………………………………**

u = unsatisfactory; s = satisfactory; vs = very satisfactory; g = good; vg = very good

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Introduction (final paper)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research questions and academic relevance | | u | s | vs | g | vg | explanation |
|  | The central research question is clear. The sub-questions are clear and related to the central question. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The academic and societal relevance of the thesis are explicitly mentioned and clearly formulated. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subject, research question and sub questions are related to the relevant historiography (status quaestionis). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment of academic literature | | u | s | vs | g | vg | explanation |
|  | Relevant literature is used. The used literature is diverse (books, articles, in English/ Dutch). The student clearly shows that he/ she understands the literature and is able to discuss the position of the author in relation to the relevant context. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scientific theories, key concepts and research findings are presented accurately, clearly and in a balanced way. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methods and source-material | | u | s | vs | g | vg | explanation |
|  | The used method is appropriate and clear. The student explains his/ her method. The method is consistently used. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Clear justification of the chosen literature and/or sources. The choice of the research material to be studied is in line with the problem definition. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2. Results, arguments and structure** | | u | s | vs | g | vg | explanation |
|  | Thorough analysis of research data; the information from sources and/or literature is critically processed, with attention to historical context and position of author(s). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The arguments are clearly structured in chapters, sections and paragraphs. There are clear and relevant chapters and chapter titles. In every chapter one or a few sub questions are answered. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The difference between facts, interpretation and argumentation is clear. The student explicitly refers to the relevant literature and sources when necessary. The student explicitly makes clear what is his/ her opinion when necessary and relevant. He/ she is able to make an independent analysis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3. Discussion and conclusion** | | u | s | vs | g | vg | explanation |
|  | The main research question and the subquestions are clearly answered in the chapters.  A short summary of the main conclusions is provided in the general conclusion. The student comes up with independent and original conclusions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student is able to critically reflect on the benefits and problems of the used method, concepts and theories. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student is able to explain the broader academic relevance as well as the societal relevance of his/ her conclusions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **4. Process / attitude** | | u | s | vs | g | vg | explanation | | The thesis was written with a high degree of scholarly self-efficacy within the time allowed; the supervisor’s comments were promptly and adequately incorporated. |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | |
| **6. Formal criteria** | | No | | Yes | | | explanation |
|  | The number of words of the thesis is between 15.000 and 25.000, appendices excluded. |  | |  | | |  |
|  | Language: the use of language is correct (spelling, grammar, punctuation). The writing style is academic and clear (objective and systematic, yet comprehensible and lively). |  | |  | | |  |
| References, notes and literature: it is clear were the student got his/ her information from. Notes/ references are correct and consistent in style (CMS, APA or De Buck). The bibliography is clear. |  | |  | | |  |
| Appearance: the title page contains the required elements; the text is well-presented in terms of layout and design. |  | |  | | |  |
| The check for plagiarism is executed (the thesis is uploaded on Canvas). |  | |  | | |  |
|  | | | | | | |

### Final grade

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Summary of the assessment of the thesis and/or explanation of the final grade

(if this does not follow from the assessments per component)